



The Light — U.K. edition

July 2008

The Lahore Ahmadiyya monthly magazine from U.K.

*Published from London by: Ahmadiyya Anjuman Isha'at Islam Lahore (U.K.)
The first Islamic Mission in the U.K., established 1913 as the Woking Muslim Mission*

Darus Salaam, 15 Stanley Avenue, Wembley, HA0 4JQ (U.K.)

Centre: 020 8903 2689. President: 020 8524 8212. Secretary: 01753 692654.

E-mail: aaill.uk@gmail.com ♦ websites: www.aaill.org/uk • www.virtualmosque.co.uk

Assalamu alaikum: Our next meeting —

Date: Sunday 6th July 2008

Time: 3.00 p.m.

Speaker: Shahid Aziz

Topic: Modern Technology

Regular activities:

Darus-i Quran and Hadith:

Every Friday after Jumu'a prayers.

Meetings of the Executive:

First Sunday of every month at 2.00 p.m.

Meeting of the Jama'at:

First Sunday of every month at 3.00 p.m.

Hazrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad as Defender of Islam

*Speech at Darus Salaam, Lahore,
Saturday 24th May 2008*

by Dr Zahid Aziz

[Editor's Note: The article below represents the speech which I delivered in Urdu at the Convention in Lahore, Pakistan, at the Centre of the Lahore Ahmadiyya Movement, held on 24–26th May 2008 to commemorate the hundredth anniversary of the death of the Founder of the Ahmadiyya Movement. It is not a word-by-word translation, and it also contains some extra matter that was omitted in the delivered speech.]

“Surely We have revealed the Reminder and surely We are its Guardian.” — The Holy Quran, 15:9

The subject that has been assigned to me by the organisers of this convention is: “Hazrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad as a Defender of Islam”. Hence I have recited this verse.

Contents:

- Hazrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad as Defender of Islam — Speech by Zahid Aziz 1
- Khilafat resources list — contradicts own beliefs 6
- False statement by a Maulana of South Africa 7
- Photographs from the Convention 8

Before coming to the topic of my speech, I thank Almighty Allah that He has enabled us to see this occasion, and gather upon it, where we are commemorating the 100th anniversary of the death of Hazrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad. We must also express our gratitude for all those people, many of whom are no longer on this earth, who through their sacrifices and hard labour enabled this Movement to continue in existence for a 100 years after its Founder's death.

What particularly moves me to express this thankfulness is that our Movement has reached this point after passing through many calamitous storms and crises which threatened to destroy it. In the lifetimes of many people present here, the

events in Pakistan of the summer of 1974 occurred, which placed the very existence of our Movement in doubt, particularly within this country. Those friends can still be found who then sincerely feared for the survival of this Movement, those enemies can still be found who hoped that this was the end of us, and those former members also still exist who deserted this Movement to save themselves from drowning with this ship. But thanks to Allah, and due to the struggle against all odds of some devoted senior members, the ship was saved and continues to sail in rough conditions.

When I pondered over the topic assigned to me, ‘Hazrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad as a Defender of Islam’, I began to consider whether under this heading I could correctly convey the services rendered by him. This is because his mission was to make Islam triumphant, by arguments and writings, but ‘defending’ seems to be a negative activity. Then there is also the saying that “attack is the best form of defence”. Thinking about this, I reached the conclusion that *defence* of Islam is, in fact, the way to make it triumphant. Regarding this saying, it may well apply in the business of the world, where by attacking you can best defend yourself, but in the field of religion attacking another religion does not establish the truth of your own faith. Thus I leave this saying to the domain of army generals, of whom there are numerous in this country, both serving and retired!

I first raise the question: **Is the defence of Islam at all important?** You may be surprised to know that traditionally Islamic religious leaders have held that there is no need to respond to objections against Islam and it is not the duty of a Muslim to do so. According to them, as Islam is the true religion, it means that any criticism of it must be false and need not be entertained. An American expert in Islam, Dr Freeland Abbott, in his book entitled *Islam and Pakistan*, published some forty years ago, compares the approach of the orthodox Muslim religious leader Maulana Maudoodi with that of Hazrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad, and writes that while Mirza Ghulam Ahmad is anxious to prove the truth of Islam, Maulana Maudoodi simply assumes it.

This is why we find that the usual response by Muslims to any criticism of Islam or the Holy Prophet Muhammad is only to make some protests, hold demonstrations, declare that the criticism is due to a conspiracy by anti-Islamic forces, and even to threaten violence against the critics.

Hazrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad strongly took the view that to establish the truth of Islam it is essential and vital to refute and reply to all objections against it. He writes:

“It is undoubtedly true that Europe and America have been given a huge collection of objections against Islam by Christian clerics, and their philosophy and sciences raise a separate kind of objections. I have found that the modern age has produced about three thousand hostile criticisms presented as objections against Islam. Were it not for the bad consequences of the negligence of Muslims, the existence of these objections poses no threat to Islam. In fact, it was necessary that they should come into existence so that Islam should be seen shining with truth from every aspect.” —*Izala Auham*, p. 772

It is a fact, which we have ourselves experienced, that whenever some allegation is made against Islam or its Holy Prophet (or against the Ahmadiyya Movement or its Founder), and we carry out study and research in order to reply to it, then not only do we discover a powerful reply to the allegation but we also learn some new and inspiring point which further proves the truth of the man or the system that we are defending. That is a sure characteristic of the cause of truth. If a man is accused of some charge in court, then at most what may be established in his favour is that he is not guilty of it and the charge is false. However, clearing him of the charge will not further show that he is of impeccable character. However, in case of a true cause or a man of truth, answering accusations against them shows them not only to be innocent of the charges but it also further reveals some new aspect of their greatness.

Hazrat Mirza *sahib* has not only replied to specific allegations against Islam and the Holy Prophet Muhammad but has also discussed the philosophy of why such allegations arise and how we ought to respond. In this connection I draw your attention to a memorial he addressed to the Governor of the Punjab, the state in India in which he lived, in the year 1898. A Christian had written a highly scurrilous book against the Holy Prophet, entitled *Ummahat-ul-Mu'min*, or ‘Mothers of the Believers’. A Muslim association, the Anjuman Himayat-i Islam of Lahore, appealed to the state government for this book to be banned. Hazrat Mirza *sahib* in his memorial, dated 4th May 1898, responded to the standpoint of this association and opposed it. We quote some extracts from it below:

"It is true that the author of *Ummahat-ul-Mu'min* has used deeply offensive language, and it is to be regretted even more that despite these strong and foul words he could not substantiate his allegations by referring to any reliable sources of Islam. Nonetheless, we must not, instead of explaining to this mistaken person in a polite and calm way and replying to this book in a rational way, adopt the method of persuading the government to stop its publication, and believe that this would give us victory. This would not be a real victory. In fact, to run after such ways and means would be an indication of our defeat and helplessness, and we would be guilty in a sense of using force to suppress someone's voice.

Even if the government had this book burnt or destroyed, or took similar action, we would forever be liable to the charge that, being unable to reply to it, we asked the government to intervene, and we behaved like those who are overcome with anger and are incapable of replying. Of course, after replying to the book we can respectfully appeal to the government that all religious parties should be required to give up the inflammatory technique employed these days and not to depart from civility, good manners and politeness.

It is essential to keep open the door of freedom of religious criticism to some extent so that people may progress in knowledge and understanding ... Everyone has the right to discuss any religion with sincere motives and thereby give himself and other people the benefit of finding out how to find salvation according to his thinking. ...

We most certainly do not wish that instead of us replying to this book the government should take the Christian writers to task on our behalf or destroy their books. On the contrary, after we have published a refutation of this book, couched in calm and measured terms, this book will lose all value and standing, and in this way it will perish by itself."¹

He then adds that "a grave harm" which Muslims would suffer by getting this book banned is that subsequently they would not be able to

publish a refutation of it since it would be entirely unreasonable and inappropriate to refer to the contents of this book in the reply, as the book would have been banned! Without a reply to the book, the world will think that all that the Muslims could do was to get the book proscribed and "this causes even more damage to our religious honour than the opponent has tried to do by his abusive writing" (p. 42).

As to dealing with our offended feelings, he writes:

"We assure the government that we hold fast to patience with a painful heart in the face of the abusive and harsh words used by the author of *Ummahat-ul-Mu'min*. We certainly do not wish to subject the author and his associates to any legal penalty. Such a response is not worthy of those who claim to be well-wishers of humanity and to be zealous to bring about real reform." (p. 42–43)

Interestingly, he goes on to say that most sensible Muslims agree with his approach:

"It is also worthy of stating before the government that although my Movement has some differences of a secondary nature on certain matters with other Muslims, but on this issue no sensible Muslim disagrees with the point that we have not been taught to display rage and fury in support of our religion. On the contrary, the Quran instructs us: *Argue not with the People of the Book except by what is best* [29:46], and in another place: *Call to the way of your Lord with wisdom and goodly exhortation* [16:125] ...

But to seek the help of the government or to show fury and rage ourselves is not by any means beneficial for our real purpose. These are ways of fighting worldly disputes, and true Muslims and followers of the Islamic path do not approve of them because these ways cannot produce results that are of benefit in guiding mankind." (p. 43)

He further supports this from the Holy Quran by quoting 3:186 and explaining:

"Its translation is that God will try you by sending tribulations in respect of your properties and lives, and you will hear from the People of the Book and the idolaters much hurtful talk. But if you are patient and guard yourself from taking unworthy

1. *Majmu'a Ishtiharat*, v. 3, p. 41–42.

action then God will regard you as a people of great resolve. ... This was undoubtedly a prophecy for the present age and has been fulfilled ...

According to this prophecy of the Quran it had to happen that a time should come when a Holy Prophet, whose followers extend over a large part of the world, should be verbally abused by Christians, who lay claim to being civilized, and he should be called by them by the worst possible epithets. ... Even an intelligent Christian can realise ... what painful hurt this must cause to Muslims and how grieved they must feel...

Nonetheless, in the above verse we are emphatically told that upon hearing such foul words which hurt our feelings we must have recourse to patience. There is no doubt that approaching the authorities forthwith is a kind of impatience. ... God the Most High has also taught us in the Quran that there is no compulsion or coercion in religion, as He says: ‘There is no compulsion in religion’ [2:256] and ‘will you compel people till they believe?’ [10:99]. But such means [asking for the book to be banned] are included in the meaning of compulsion and coercion, which bring a sacred and rational religion like Islam into disrepute.” (p. 44–45)

You can see that the approach to dealing with abusive, and indeed more general, criticism of Islam as presented by Hazrat Mirza *sahib* here is highly appropriate and most fitting in the present circumstances and the light of recent events that recur with regularity. In fact, it is the only way by following which Muslims can restore the dignity of Islam in the world.

In this city of Lahore, within the huge Miani Sahib cemetery, there is the plot well known to our *Jama‘at* where our elders are buried. We visited it yesterday. Near to our plot, you pass the small tomb of Ilm-ud-Din *shaheed*, regarded as a martyr. In the late 1920s an Arya Samaj Hindu in Lahore, a book publisher by the name of Raj Pal, wrote a bitterly vituperative book against the Holy Prophet Muhammad entitled *Rangeela Rasul* (which would mean ‘The Licentious Prophet’). The young Muslim Ilm-ud-Din, inflamed after listening to a *khutba* on the subject by a famous Maulana, went and stabbed Raj Pal to death in his bookshop. He was convicted of murder and hanged, a punishment he accepted willingly. Today he is very well known and a Muslim hero. But Raj Pal was the

only one abuser he could silence! On the other hand, Maulana Abdul Haq Vidyarthi, on behalf of our *Jama‘at*, wrote articles and books in refutation of the Arya Samaj sect. His writings destroyed all the allegations of the Arya Samaj against Islam wherever and whenever they arose, and handed the Muslims a permanent, literary weapon to defeat such abusers of Islam over and over again. You can see whose service to Islam is greater and in accordance with the teachings of Islam. Yet Ilm-ud-Din *shaheed* and his story are widely honoured, while in comparison very few Muslims in Pakistan have heard of the name or of the work of Maulana Abdul Haq Vidyarthi, who is buried a little further on in the same cemetery.

Hazrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad, in his writings, has answered specific charges against Islam and the Holy Prophet Muhammad. The following are the principal allegations that he has dealt with:

- That Islam preaches unprovoked war and violence against followers of other faiths.
- That Islam did not spread because its teachings were acceptable but by either offering people material gain and loot in this life and sensual pleasures in the next life, or by coercion and force.
- Allegations relating to marriages of the Holy Prophet, and the permitting of polygamy as well as divorce in Islam.
- That the Holy Prophet had grave moral shortcomings and could not purify his followers, whereas Jesus was sinless and perfect.
- That Islam does not teach the higher morals that are taught in the Gospels.
- That the concepts of revelation from God, acceptance of prayers by God and miracles are outcomes of man’s ignorance and superstition, are unsupported by any evidence, and have been shown to be false by modern science.

For his treatment of these subjects, please refer to his following books: *Government Angrezi Aur Jihad*, *Arya Dharm*, *Nur-ul-Quran Part 2*, *Barakat-ud-Dua*, *Chashma-i Masihi*, *Chashma-i Ma‘rifat*, and *The Teachings of Islam*.

A principle revived by Hazrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad, which enables most allegations against Islam to be refuted, is that the Holy Quran must be given precedence over all other sources of Islam. No conclusion should be accepted from Hadith reports, or rulings of Islamic jurisprudence, which

is contradicted by the Quran. Maulana Muhammad Ali has also stated in a *khutba* that, having been answering objections against Islam for forty years, he always found that the vast majority of them do not relate to anything in the Quran but arise from some Hadith report or story in a biography of the Holy Prophet.

It is to be regretted that the inauthentic stories contained in these biographies of the Holy Prophet are sometimes given credibility by Muslim writers, instead of being exposed and rejected as contrary to the Quran, in the first place, and even contrary to Hadith reports. In 1983, a book entitled *Muhammad: His Life Based on the earliest sources*, was published, written by a highly scholarly English convert to Islam, Martin Lings (d. 2005), who worked at the British Museum, rising to the position of Keeper of Oriental Printed Books and Manuscripts. His knowledge and scholarship of Islam is not in any doubt. Unfortunately, his book is nothing but a collection of the most credulous and least authentic stories from the biographies of the Holy Prophet that appeal to those who reduce religion to fables and tales of wonder. This book was immediately awarded a prize by the government of Pakistan of several thousands of dollars as the best biography of the Holy Prophet ever written in English.

We may give two examples from this book of the kind of material that brings the sacred figures of Islam into disrepute and subjects them to criticism from the opponents of Islam. We are told that the famous companion, Abu Dharr, before his acceptance of Islam, was a highwayman, i.e. a robber of travellers, as this was the occupation of most of his tribesmen. When he received information that the Holy Prophet was preaching the oneness of God in Makka, he came to see the Holy Prophet and embraced Islam. So far so good. Then we are told that after he returned to his tribe, "many of whom entered Islam through him", he continued his occupation as a highwayman, but with the following difference:

"...when he had despoiled a caravan he would offer to give back what he had taken on condition that they would testify to the Oneness of God and the prophethood of Muhammad." (p. 54)

Did Abu Dharr not learn by accepting Islam that robbery was a great sin? According to Lings' account, when Abu Dharr accepted Islam, the Holy Prophet, upon learning that he belonged to a tribe who were well known to be robbers, expressed "amazement" that such a man had been guided by God to become a Muslim. This would lead to the

conclusion that the Holy Prophet must have preached to him that robbery was a most serious sin in Islam. Yet according to Lings, Abu Dharr, after going back and in fact converting many of his people to Islam, still continued committing acts of robbery. Worse still, and far worse, is the claim quoted above that now he would return his spoils to the victims of his crime on condition that they testified to the *Kalima*. This palpably false story confirms the allegations that Islam spread by coercion, that the Holy Prophet did not bring about any reform of character, and that Islam does not teach even ordinary morals, let alone high ones.

In citing the second example from Lings' book, we apologise to readers and seek forgiveness of Allah for quoting a statement derogatory to the dignity of the Holy Prophet Muhammad. Christian critics of the Holy Prophet allege that once when he visited his married cousin Zainab at her house he became aroused with the desire to marry her himself. They charge him with arranging to receive revelation clearing the way to marry her after divorce from her husband Zaid, as he otherwise could not marry her since Zaid was his adopted son and Arab custom did not allow such a marriage. Here is what is reported in Lings' book:

"It happened one day that he [the Holy Prophet] wanted to speak to Zayd about something and went to his house. Zaynab opened the door, and as she stood in the doorway telling him that Zayd was out but inviting him none the less to enter, a look passed between the two cousins which made each one conscious of a deep and lasting bond of love between them. In a moment the Prophet knew that Zaynab loved him and that he loved her and that she knew he loved her." (p. 212–213)

Although the further elements of the story given by Lings, namely, that Zaid and Zainab subsequently divorced agreeably and that the Holy Prophet then married Zainab, are no doubt true, but the misconceived passage above enables the critics of Islam to allege that the Holy Prophet wanted to follow base human desires, which is unworthy of a man sent by God, and that his revelation merely supported him in his own desires. A natural question arises: how do we know that the feelings of the Holy Prophet and Zainab were as portrayed above, when neither of them ever reported this to anyone? This is nothing but a piece of ill-considered imagination by some earlier source, who has embroidered the events with fictitious details, more in the style of romantic novels than religious literature.

In a subsequent edition of Lings' book the above wording has been toned down, although it essentially conveys the same meaning as here.

The reason why even eminent Muslim writers and scholars accept such baseless stories is that they either do not realise or are unconcerned about their implications for the defence of Islam. If they believe, as would appear to be the case, that these stories illustrate the human side of the Holy Prophet and his companions, then they do not understand why prophets were sent, how they are purified by the hand of God, and how they purify and reform their followers. Hazrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad, and those who followed him in conducting the defence of Islam, are well aware of the damage done by such reports, which have no basis in any case and contradict the real earliest source of the Holy Prophet's life, which is the Quran.

The vast criticism of and allegations against Islam, as referred to by Hazrat Mirza *sahib*, were widely propagated to Muslims during the times of colonial rule. Then, after Muslim countries became independent, this criticism disappeared from public view. The next generations of Muslims became unaware of its existence. Since the start of the present century, when certain events have led to Islam being regarded by many in the West as a great threat to its civilisation, it is those same allegations that have re-emerged and been broadcast by certain hostile quarters in order to vilify Islam. Muslims are puzzled, bemused and alarmed. But these charges against Islam are not new. Those who read the works of Hazrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad and his followers in the defence of Islam are familiar with them. That Great Defender of Islam has provided Muslims with all the material they need to defend Islam even in the present age.

Khilafat resources list — contradicts own beliefs

On the Qadiani *Jama'at* website alislam.org, a list of recommended resources and reading material has been added in connection with their celebration of one hundred years of what they believe to be their *khilafat*. In this list, under 'Selected Books', we find English translations of the books *Asmani Faisala* ('The Heavenly Decree') and *Nishan-i Asmani* ('The Heavenly Sign') by Hazrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad. These translations were first published in 2006 and 2005 respectively. These are two books in which he has strongly declared before other Muslims that he does not

claim to be a prophet and that he holds the same basic beliefs as the *Ahl-i Sunna*, which are the beliefs that make a person a Muslim. These declarations plainly contradict the Qadiani creed that Hazrat Mirza *sahib* claimed to be a prophet.

We quote below his exact words as given in these translations done by the Qadiani *Jama'at*. In the first book, *Asmani Faisala* or 'The Heavenly Decree', he addresses one of the leading *Ulama* of India who had issued rulings against him declaring him as *kafir* and unbeliever. Hazrat Mirza *sahib* mentions in this book that, in response to these rulings, he had already been publishing statements about his beliefs in order to refute the charge that he had become a *kafir*. With reference to those statements he writes in this book:

"With deep humility and modesty I made it clear that I am not a *kafir*; that Allah knows I am a Muslim, and I believe in all the articles of faith which the *Ahl-e-Sunnah wal Jama'at* profess, that I believe in the *Kalimah*, *La ilaha ill-Allah, Muhammad-ur Rasulullah*, that I face the Qibla when praying, that I am not a claimant to Prophethood and that, in fact, I consider such a claimant to be outside the pale of Islam." — p. 6 of the translation.

The last words above are a plain contradiction of the Qadiani *Jama'at* belief that Hazrat Mirza *sahib* claimed to be a prophet. He says he even regards any such claimant as falling outside the religion of Islam.

He also writes that anyone who believes in "the articles of faith which the *Ahl-e-Sunnah wal Jama'at* profess", as he does, is a Muslim and cannot be branded as *kafir*. This again contradicts the Qadiani *Jama'at* standpoint, which is that belief in these articles of faith is **not** sufficient to make a person a Muslim unless he also believes in the Promised Messiah to be a prophet.

In the second book, *Nishan-i Asmani* or 'The Heavenly Sign', he clearly sets forth his own claim in the following words:

"I know with perfect certainty and it is my firm belief that our Prophet (sa) is Khatamul Anbiyya. No Prophet, new or old, will come after him and not an iota or tittle of the Quran will be abrogated. Yes, *Muhaddath* will come, who have converse with Allah, the Exalted, and in whose persons certain characteristics of Perfect Prophethood are manifested. Indeed, in certain respects, they have the very grace and dignity of Prophethood, and I am one

of them. But these religious clerics have failed to comprehend my reasoning.” — p. 52 of the translation.

Here we are told that the Holy Prophet Muhammad being *Khatam-un-nabiyyin* means that “no prophet, new or old, will come after him”. As against this, the Qadiani *Jama‘at* literature is full of arguments, which are repeated again and again by every member of this *Jama‘at* from the *khalifa* downwards, that *Khatam-un-nabiyyin* does not mean the Last Prophet and that prophets can come after the Holy Prophet Muhammad.

Moreover, he does not claim to be any “type” of prophet. His claim of being a *muhaddas*, i.e. a saint who receives revelation without being a prophet, is expressed here so unambiguously and categorically that no comment by us is necessary.

Since the year 1914 up to now, whenever the Lahore Ahmadis present such extracts to the Qadiani leaders and spokesmen, they trot out the explanation that the Promised Messiah expressed these views prior to the year 1901, and that in 1901 he altered his claims by issuing a leaflet, *Ayk Ghalati Ka Izala*, in which he announced that he was not just a *muhaddas* but was in fact a prophet, and that prophets can come after the Holy Prophet Muhammad. But this explanation is nowhere to be found in these two new translations. Both books carry a Foreword by the publisher where it could have been given. It seems that the publishers and translators have either failed to realize the simple fact that their own beliefs are here contradicted by Hazrat Mirza sahib, or they are avoiding mentioning this ‘change in 1901’ theory because it is so preposterous and ridiculous. ■

False statement by a Maulana of South Africa

The famous Pakistani Urdu newspaper *Nawa-i-Waqt*, Lahore, dated 31st May 2008, carries a short interview with a Maulana Mufti Zubair Bayat, (page 20, column 3) described as President of the *Jami‘at-ul-Ulama* of the Natal province in South Africa. The Maulana was interviewed by a *Nawa-i-Waqt* correspondent during the Maulana’s visit to Makka where he was performing *Umra*.

One question which the Maulana was asked by the interviewer was as follows:

“How many Qadianis are there in South Africa, and what line of action are the

Muslims there taking in order to defeat the mischief (*fitna*) of Qadianiyyat?”

The question is itself biased against the Ahmadiyya Movement by assuming that it is a *fitna* and that to defeat it is a creditable achievement! If the question was merely prejudiced, the reply given by the Maulana was entirely false. He said:

“A few years ago, Muslims in South Africa instituted a court case against Qadianiyyat in the High Court. They made it clear that the Ahmadiyya community is not a sect of Islam but is a new religion. They have no connection with Muslims; in fact, the Qadianis are a non-Muslim group. The High Court of South Africa considered the beliefs of the Qadianis and, being sensitive to the feelings of the Muslims, it ruled in favour of Muslims by declaring the Qadianis as kafir. On the side of the Muslims, Ulama from Pakistan such as Maulana Manzoor Ahmad Chinioti and others played an important role. If today there are any Qadianis in South Africa, it must be an insignificant number.”

As this Maulana is from South Africa, he cannot plead ignorance for his mis-statements in this reply. While being on *Umra* in Makka, a sacred occasion, he has uttered a number of absolute untruths in his reply, as we explain below:

1. No “Qadiani” was at all involved in any such court case in South Africa. In one case it was a member of the Lahore Ahmadiyya Movement and in the other case it was a Sunni imam who was being persecuted by the ulama because he regarded Ahmadis as Muslims. This was in the 1980s.
2. The “Muslims in South Africa” never instituted any court case against any Ahmadi. Both court cases were instituted against the Ulama.
3. No court in South Africa has at all, ever, ruled that Ahmadis are kafir. In fact, in the case that concluded in 1985 the court ruled that Lahore Ahmadis, the plaintiffs, are Muslims. The court determined that the Ulama were defaming our members by calling them kafir, and it prohibited them from continuing with this defamation.
4. The claim of the Maulana that “Muslims in South Africa” filed a suit is quite shameful for the following further reasons: (a) The Ulama vigorously submitted to the court in 1984 that the court, being secular, was not

qualified to determine who is a Muslim. (b) When the court ruled in favour of the Ahmadi plaintiff, the Pakistani Ulama and legal experts who had been helping the Ulama in South Africa published statements in Pakistani newspapers in November 1985 saying that “the judge was a biased Jew” and as “Qadianis are agents of Israel” therefore he ruled in their favour.

But now history is turned on its head and we are told by the Maulana in his interview that the Ulama actually themselves asked the court to determine if Ahmadis are Muslims, and the court gave a ruling in favour of the Ulama. What, we ask, happened to the “biased Jewish judge” story that was splashed across Pakistani newspapers by these Ulama in November 1985 and retold in Muslim organs all over the world? ■

Photographs from the Convention in Lahore:

Hazrat Ameer Dr A. K. Saeed opening the Convention, 24th May, and (below) a section of the audience.

