



The Light — U.K. edition

July 2010

The Lahore Ahmadiyya monthly magazine from U.K.

Published from London by: **Ahmadiyya Anjuman Isha'at Islam Lahore (U.K.)** • Reg. Charity no: 278963
First Islamic Mission in the U.K., founded 1913 as the Woking Muslim Mission, Woking, Surrey
Darus Salaam, 15 Stanley Avenue, Wembley, HA0 4JQ (U.K.)
Centre: 020 8903 2689. President: 020 8524 8212. Secretary: 01753 575313.
E-mail: aaail.uk@gmail.com ♦ websites: www.aaail.org/uk • www.ahmadiyya.org

Assalamu alaikum: Our next meeting —

Date: **Sunday 4th July 2010**
Time: **3.00 p.m.**
Speaker: **Dr Mujahid Saeed**
Topic: **Religion above the world**

Dars-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.

Friday prayers and monthly meetings are
webcast live on: www.virtualmosque.co.uk

Articles in Pakistan media following the attacks on Ahmadi mosques in Lahore

[*Editor's Note:* Although these appalling, inhuman attacks were directed against the Qadiani Jama'at of the Ahmadiyya Movement, and the reaction in the Pakistani media, quoted below, refers only to the Qadiani Jama'at, yet these articles are still of interest to members of our Lahore Ahmadiyya Movement. Note that we do not endorse each and every point in these articles as being accurate.]

Daily Times, Pakistan, 31st May 2010

In a feature called *View*, Yaseer Latif Hamdani wrote as follows under the title *The Second Amendment* (of the Pakistan Constitution):

The Second Amendment laid the foundations of intolerance and religious tyranny in Pakistan, which has manifested itself in other ways. Since then our state has been in a downward spiral.

The violence against the Ahmadiyya community underscores the bigotry that has become the hallmark of our beloved homeland. A community — already sacrificed at the altar of political expediency — has now been made to pay the ultimate price.

Amongst the dead, which included retired army officers and other contributors to Pakistani society, was reportedly the youngest brother of Chaudhry Zafarullah Khan. For those who are unaware of who Chaudhry Zafarullah was, he was the author of the Lahore Resolution, Pakistan's first foreign minister and Pakistan's advocate before the Boundary Commission. In other words, this community has paid for such crimes as their valiant contribution to the Pakistan Movement, their significant role in the development of Pakistan and the fact that Pakistan's only Nobel Prize was bagged by them. Yet what happened on Friday was waiting to happen, given the neglect and at times outright bigotry that our governments, both federal and provincial, have been guilty of on this count starting with the PPP government in 1974.

Things were not always like this. It bears remembering that in 1944 when a group of Muslim divines approached Jinnah to persuade him unsuccessfully to turn all Ahmedis out of the Muslim League, Jinnah was resolute against such bigotry. He responded to them by saying, “Who am I to declare non-Muslim a person who calls himself a Muslim?”¹ It was for this reason that many religious parties and even self-styled freedom fighters like Mirza Ali Khan denounced the Muslim League as a “bastion of Qadiyanism”. Yet such was the force of character of our founding father that he not only stood against such bigotry but without any fear appointed the leading Ahmedi Muslim at the time to shoulder the most important responsibility for the Muslims of South Asia, i.e. of arguing Pakistan’s case before the Boundary Commission. So long as the Quaid’s colleagues were at the helm, there was some semblance of common sense that prevailed on this issue. When in 1953, the Majlis-e-Ahrar and the Jamaat-e-Islami, both groups that had opposed the creation of Pakistan, started a mass agitation movement to have Ahmedis like Chaudhry Zafarullah turned out from the government and excommunicated from Islam, Khawaja Nazimuddin, himself a devout Muslim, refused to bow under their pressure. His government fell a few weeks later and the establishment stepped in to sweep up the mullahs with extreme prejudice.

In 1974, Zulfikar Ali Bhutto was determined to hang on to power by hook or by crook. Though not a bigot himself, Bhutto was ill-advised by his law minister Abdul Hafeez Pirzada. As a result, the PPP stabbed in the back the one community that had helped them in winning the 1970 elections,² by putting a question to parliament that it had no authority to determine. As a result Bhutto managed to hang on to power for another three years. The usurper who replaced Bhutto, General Ziaul Haq, took bigotry against the Ahmedis to another level altogether with his unconstitutional and inhumane Ordinance XX of 1984 specifically targeting this community. His bigotry was upheld by our independent judiciary in *Zaheeruddin v The State*, where the dispensers of justice compared Islamic symbols with Coca Cola’s intellectual property in an argument that defies all legal sense and logic to justify the ban on the Ahmedis from using any

Islamic symbols — symbols that are central to their faith.

Martin Lau, a leading legal scholar of religious freedom in common law jurisdictions, has argued in his paper on *Zaheeruddin v The State* that Pakistan has abolished religious freedom for Pakistanis, Muslims and non-Muslims alike, through this judicial precedent. My own view is that the very idea of Pakistan as a bastion against the tyranny of the majority was killed the day our parliament decided to take it upon itself to excommunicate a sect from Islam. The Second Amendment laid the foundations of intolerance and religious tyranny in Pakistan, which has manifested itself in other ways. Since then our state has been in a downward spiral. The Gojra incident, violence against Shias, and now the massacre of the Ahmedis is only symptomatic of the real sickness that emerges from the 1974 Amendment. Pakistan shall continue to be on the wrong side of history as long as the Second Amendment remains in the constitution of this republic.

The time has come for the PPP government to undo this great injustice done to not just a minority sect but to Pakistan itself. All roots of Pakistan’s current existential crisis with Islam emerge from that one foul act that was brought about on the ill-advice of Abdul Hafeez Pirzada, who is now challenging parliament’s sovereignty, the same sovereignty he had argued 36 years ago as being absolute. It is now up to the PPP to make a clear choice. Will it continue to defend a dubious legacy or will it come out decisively against religious bigotry?

History beckons President Zardari and Prime Minister Gilani to clear the name of Pakistan’s largest political party by undoing what it did in 1974. In this they must be supported unwaveringly by the MQM and the ANP — for they claim to be the guardians of secular liberal politics. The Sharif brothers must also atone for their sins — of having spoken from both sides of their mouths — by supporting this move. Even the religious parties, the Jamaat-e-Islami foremost amongst them, must state unwaveringly that while they may not consider the Ahmedis Muslims, they are willing to leave this final judgement to God.

If they manage to undo this grievous injustice and act of inhumanity, the ladies and gentlemen in our parliament will secure for themselves a permanent place in Pakistan’s history as the visionaries who restored Jinnah’s Pakistan, which is to be built on the ideals of justice, fair play, impartiality and complete equality for all citizens of Pakistan. ■

1. *Editor’s notes*: A Lahore Ahmadi journalist, Abdul Aziz Shora of Kashmir, who died this April at the age of 90, was present at Mr Jinnah’s press conference in May 1944, when this incident took place. A few years ago he recorded a sworn statement reporting the whole episode.

2. In our opinion this unwise incursion of the Qadiani Jama’at into politics, by campaigning for a political party, was a contributory factor in the rise of anti-Ahmadiyya feelings.

The link to the Daily Times article quoted above:

http://www.dailytimes.com.pk/default.asp?page=2010\05\31\story_31-5-2010_pg3_5

The Dawn, 13th June 2010

[An article entitled *The Cult of Bigotry by Huma Yusuf* appeared in the *The Dawn*, 13th June 2010. Nawaz Sharif, a former Prime Minister and at present the leading opposition politician, who is not previously known for sympathy towards Ahmadis, made a statement condemning the atrocity and describing Ahmadis as “our brethren and asset for the country”. Mr Sharif was immediately denounced by the fundamentalist religious leaders and asked to apologise for thus describing Ahmadis. One such organisation is the JUI-F referred to in the *Dawn* article quoted below. This is the Deobandi Jamiat Ulema-e-Islam (M. Fazil-ur-Rahman wing).]

The Cult of Bigotry by Huma Yusuf

What kind of sick democracy do we live in, where the declaration of equality of all citizens of the state can be deemed unconstitutional? This twisted logic was deployed by the JUI-F in its criticism of Nawaz Sharif’s comments describing Ahmadis as ‘brothers and sisters’ who are an ‘asset to the country’.

Among several other absurd reactions to Sharif’s statement, the JUI-F’s reasoning should serve as yet another wake-up call to the government that urgent social, political and legal measures must be put in place to fight the culture of bigotry and discrimination that is flourishing in Pakistan.

The JUI-F argued that Sharif was violating the constitution, which identifies Ahmadis as a minority community (never mind the fact that in a democracy, minorities enjoy an equal citizenship status and can be equal assets to the state).

This, however, was not the worst critique Sharif had to endure: the Wafaqul Madaris al Arabia accused Nawaz Sharif of defying religion and siding with ‘traitors’; ulema gathered at a seminar accused Nawaz Sharif of kowtowing to the US with his conciliatory remarks about Ahmadis; the ulema board of the Jamia Naeemia Madressah was convened to deliberate whether or not Sharif committed blasphemy by referring to non-Muslims as our ‘brethren’; and across the Pakistani blogosphere, which is supposedly populated by the nation’s educated elite and middle-class progressives, the question of whether Sharif is a *kafir* continues to be debated.

The irony of the backlash against Sharif cannot be lost on anyone. Since the Taliban launched an onslaught against the Pakistani state, the PML-N [Nawaz Sharif’s party] has refrained from con-

demning terrorism and extremist ideology in a forthright manner. Rather than explicitly blame the Taliban for the suicide bombings that have rocked the country, PML-N stalwarts have consistently pinned responsibility on a ‘foreign hand’.

Infamously, in February, the PML-N’s Rana Sanaullah consorted with leaders of the banned Sipah-i-Sahaba during the Jhang by-elections. And in March, Chief Minister Shahbaz Sharif caused a firestorm by suggesting that the Taliban ought to have spared Punjab on the premise that the provincial government and the militants enjoyed an ideological affinity.

In other words, the PML-N has made every effort not to enter into a confrontation with the forces of extremism. In fact, in the wake of the May 28 attacks on the Ahmadis in Lahore, Shahbaz Sharif’s adviser, Zaeem Qadri, conceded that the provincial government had not made an effort to clamp down on bigoted and anti-Ahmadi posturing for fear of an ‘adverse reaction’.

Qadri’s defensive position is a throwback to Mian Muhammad Khan Daultana, the chief minister of the Punjab in 1953 who refused to take on the religious parties as they waged an anti-Ahmadi campaign, fearing a ‘head-on clash’. Daultana’s inaction became the subject of the now iconic judicial inquiry headed by Justices Muhammad Munir and M.R. Kiyani.

As Sharif makes every effort to clarify and retract his statements, he should probably re-read the Munir Report, the most eloquent defence of secularism which cautioned against trying to define what a Muslim is — thereby bringing a religious matter into the realm of the state — over 50 years ago.

After asking a gathering of ulema to offer their definitions of a Muslim, and finding that consensus was impossible, the justices wrote, “If we attempt our own definition as each learned divine has done and that definition differs from that given by all others, we unanimously go out of the fold of Islam. And if we adopt the definition given by any one of the ulema, we remain Muslims according to the view of that alim but kafirs according to the definition of everyone else”.

This is exactly the lesson that Sharif learned in the past few days. Despite all his party’s attempts to curry favour with rightwing and extremist forces, he ‘went out of the fold’ by making even the most insipid remarks in support of the Ahmadi community. By refusing to learn from history, the PML-N has repeated it. The tigers of Punjab are now cowering in a corner, licking their wounds,

while talk of a military operation in their home province circulates on the international stage. It seems the monster of militancy and bigotry has grown so wild that it has come to threaten its benefactors.

But those who have been critical of the PML-N's apathy towards extremism should not feel smug. The backlash against Sharif — a powerful politician with Saudi backing and rightwing credentials — underscores just how cheaply accusations of blasphemy (and, by extension, incitements to violence) can be come by in Pakistan.

In our newly established culture of 24/7 news reporting, people accuse and abuse with impunity — a fact that is increasingly exploited by the religious right. And any society in which an accusation that is not backed by evidence can carry so much weight if dressed in the trimmings of religious purity is doomed to endless cycles of violence, hate and regression.

The day someone like Sharif is awaiting an ulema board's verdict on whether or not he committed blasphemy is the day that the government should brainstorm and implement non-military means to curb bigotry. The calls for a thorough reform of the education system and curriculum and the repeal of Article 2 are endless, but they continue to fall on deaf ears.

Perhaps, then, as a stop-gap measure, the government should try a different tack, one that is less daunting than education and constitutional reform.

Last year, after dismissing the human rights implications of the legislation, the government passed the Anti-Terrorism Amendment Ordinance (2009), which significantly shifted the burden of proof onto those accused of being involved in terrorist activities. In a similar vein, the government should consider legislation that shifts the burden of proof of blasphemy onto the accuser, and doles out strict penalties against those who make false accusations. ■

The Express Tribune, 15th June

I never really cared for Ahmadis

by Fasi Zaka

I have never really been vocal about rights for Ahmadis, even privately, but my compassion trigger is easily pulled if there are atrocities against Pakistani Hindus and Christians. Part of this can be ascribed to my belief in the prejudice that the Ahmadis are a relatively well-off community,

making the Christians and Hindus of Pakistan uniquely guilty of a double crime, first for not being Muslims and second for being poor. These two communities seem especially vulnerable.

I have changed my mind. And it's not because of the attack in Lahore that killed so many Ahmadis. The whole country, Muslim and non-Muslim, is under attack by the Taliban.

What really helped me see the inhuman treatment of the Ahmadis in Pakistan is the absence of condemnation for it. Nawaz Sharif in his condolence message said Ahmadis were our brothers; it's been enough to get the Pakistani religious world on his case. While sympathy is not outlawed for Ahmadis, it may as well be.

Those of us with a passport have declared that "I consider Mirza Ghulam Ahmad Qadiani to be an impostor prophet and an infidel and also consider his followers, whether belonging to the Lahori, Qadiani or Mirzai groups, to be non-Muslims." Most of us do not believe that Mirza Ghulam Ahmad Qadiani was a prophet, but do we have to rub it in? Imagine if the UK put in that sort of column for a prophet of another faith.

We have declared not just that we don't believe in Mirza Ghulam Ahmad, but added the connotation that he was an imposter. People who follow imposters must be crooks, right? Let's stop the pretence that they are equal, or human.

But no, we are a peaceful people, right? Of course we are. I read a very poignant anecdote in columnist Mosharraf Zaidi's article recently; he described how an old friend would never say salaam to him in return. His friend is an Ahmadi, he can go to jail for that. I cringe when I see Pakistanis stumbling over one another to felicitate a white westerner who chooses to say salaam when greeting us in our country. Why not put him in jail too? He could be an atheist, whereas at least the Ahmadis believe in the oneness of God.

But, you see it's not about that. Ahmadis are a secretive people up to no good. They won't even tell you they are Ahmadis. But who wouldn't be secretive if they could go to jail for saying they are Muslim, or responding in kind to a salutation of salaam. Or for that matter having a Quran in their home, the same kind you and I have.

Sunnis don't believe in the imam of the Shias. What about Barelvis and Bohris? Its time their special treatment ended. If anything we have been too moderate. We need to cut diplomatic relations with Indonesia because they refuse to declare Ahmadis non-Muslim as it may open a Pandora's

Box of declaring other groups the same. Why is the amir of the Jamaat-i-Islami, Munawar Hassan, silent on this? He could address this diplomatic issue, after all he did want to cut off diplomatic relations with many countries over the Facebook fiasco.

Pakistani Ahmadis aren't allowed to go for Hajj, but Ahmadis from other countries are. Maybe we should cut off relations with Saudi Arabia too. Also, since we Muslims believe in equality, I would suggest all non-Muslim countries make it mandatory that we wear special collars to identify us as Muslim when we visit. Or is that going too far since we haven't, obviously, in the case of the Ahmadis?

The truth is the bulk of this country doesn't like Ahmadis. They are Pakistan's Palestinians. Their humane treatment and acceptance will decide whether we are a people who can move forward in the future, or if we will become a fragmented warlord state divided on sectarian lines.

And yes, Ahmadis are worse off in Pakistan than Christians and Hindus. We want to forcibly convert Christians and Hindus. But Ahmadis shouldn't exist. Period. ■

Why Pakistan's Ahmadi community is officially detested

[A report of the above title, by **Mohammed Hanif of BBC News, Karachi**, was broadcast on BBC Radio 4 in its programme *From Our Own Correspondent*. Its text was published on the BBC's news website on 16th June 2010. We quote it below.]

When a Pakistani Muslim applies for a passport or national ID card, they are asked to sign an oath that no Muslim anywhere in the world is asked to sign.

The oath goes like this: "I consider Mirza Ghulam Ahmad an impostor prophet. And also consider his followers, whether belonging to the Lahori or Qadiani group, to be non-Muslims."

Like millions of other Pakistanis, I have signed this oath several times without giving much thought to exactly what Mr Ahmad stands for, or what the technical difference between Lahoris or Qadianis is. I want my passport, and if I have to sign up to a fatwa to get it, so be it.

But like millions of people from my generation I also remember that when I was growing up, the

minority Ahmadi sect were considered just another Muslim sect. Like scores of others I had friends who were Ahmadis. We played cricket together, and sometimes, when our parents ordered us off to the mosque, we even prayed side by side.

Last month, when more than 90 Ahmadis were massacred in two mosques in Lahore, I remembered the precise moment in 1974 when it all began to change. There were street protests by religious parties against Ahmadis demanding that they should be declared non-Muslims.

One day I saw some bearded activists standing outside a clothes merchant's shop in our town, chanting anti-Ahmadi slogans and turning customers away, telling them that buying clothes from Ahmadis was haram - forbidden. At the time I was learning to memorise the Koran from a very kind, mild-mannered teacher. I asked him what exactly was wrong with the Ahmadis. He explained to me that they didn't believe that the Prophet Muhammad was the last and the final messenger. I said OK, maybe that makes them kafirs, infidels, but who says that kafirs can't sell cloth? My teacher's response was a full-handed slap, so sudden, so unexpected that it rang in my ears for days to come.

That same year Pakistan's first elected parliament declared Ahmadis non-Muslims. Then in 1984 Pakistan's military dictator and self-appointed guardian of the faith General Zia-ul-Haq inserted that oath in the constitution that we are all required to sign.

Because of the new laws, Ahmadis have been sent to prison simply for using the Muslim greeting Assalamu alaikum, or putting a Koranic verse in a greeting card.

Over the last three decades the hatred against Ahmadis has become so widespread that Pakistan is now embarrassed by the only Nobel laureate it has ever produced. Dr Abdus Salam won the Nobel Prize for physics and, as a proud Pakistani, accepted his award in national dress. But he was an Ahmadi so there is no monument to celebrate him, no universities named after him. The word "Muslim" on his gravestone has been erased. Even the town he is buried in has been renamed in an attempt to erase our collective memory.

This hatred was evident in the reactions to the massacre. TV channels were more obsessed with making sure that in their broadcasts Ahmadi mosques were called "places of worship". When you refuse to call a place of worship by its proper name, you are implying that it's not a mosque, it's not a church, it's not a synagogue, it's a place where godless people do godless things.

And all the various Islamic political parties, whose leaders often refuse to pray together, are united on this.

When Pakistan's main opposition leader Nawaz Sharif used the phrase "our brothers" for the murdered Ahmadis, leaders from 11 political parties came together to condemn him and threatened to issue a fatwa declaring him a heretic.

Over the last three decades the siege has been so palpable that those Ahmadis who couldn't afford to emigrate have taken to hiding their identity. If you want to destroy someone in public life it's enough to drop a hint that they are Ahmadi. In the 1980s, the former chief minister of Punjab and current federal minister didn't attend his own mother's funeral because there were rumours that she was an Ahmadi. When the funerals of the massacred Ahmadis took place there were no officials, no politicians present.

Pakistan's liberal bloggers and some English-language columnists did write along the lines that Ahmadi blood is on our hands. Others were adamant that it was yet another Friday, yet another massacre by the Pakistani Taliban, and we should just fight this sort of terrorism and leave the sectarian debates alone.

Two incidents in the past week made me realise how pathological our response was. At a vigil to mark the massacre, where a handful of people had turned up, a passer-by asked me "Are you an Ahmadi?" My own loud and aggressive denial surprised me.

Then an Ahmadi friend whose father survived the Lahore massacre wrote to me saying: "You know we have been living like this for decades. [Did] something like this have to happen for you to speak up?" ■

Mosques of bigots

[Ikram, a regular writer on our Lahore Ahmadiyya blog, made the following contribution recently.]

Essentially, it is the Mullahs, who are bigots or hypocrites, who just cannot tolerate message of empathy or peace for the victims of a carnage. The mosques that seed and nurture such bigotry and provide the loudspeakers and mouthpieces to such an evil ideology and the cloak of pseudo piety is well identified in Quran:

9:107. And (there are among the hypocrites) those who have built a mosque to cause harm (to

Islam) and to promote disbelief and in order to cause discord among the believers, and to provide a hiding place for him who had already made war against Allah and His Messenger. And they will certainly swear (saying), 'We meant nothing but good (in building the mosque)'. But Allah bears witness that they are certainly liars.

9:108. (Prophet!) never shall you stand in that (mosque for prayer). Certainly, the mosque which was founded upon piety (and observance of duty) from the (very) first day is more worthy that you stand (for Prayer) therein. In this (mosque) there are men (performers of Prayers) who love to become purified; and Allah loves those who purify themselves externally and internally. [Which these Bigots do not]

9:109. Is he, who founded his edifice on taking Allah as a shield and (on) His good pleasure, better or he who founded his edifice on the brink of a hollowed and crumbling water-worn bank so that it toppled along with him into the Fire of Hell? And Allah guides not the wrong doing people (to the ways of success).

9:110. This building of theirs which they have built will never cease to rankle in their hearts unless their hearts are torn to pieces (with anguish and repentance). And Allah is All-Knowing, All-Wise.

The fact is that these Mullahs *built mosque[s] to cause harm (to Islam)* and out of these mosques *cause discord among the believers*. These mosques and madressahs *provide a hiding place for him who had already made war against Allah*, essentially sanctuary and nurseries for terrorists who create sectarianism, terror and destruction in the land. When asked, these Mullahs *will certainly swear (saying), 'We meant nothing but good (in building the mosque)'. But Allah bears witness that they are certainly liars.*

We know that *Allah loves those who purify themselves externally and internally*. The world is witness that these Bigots are not the ones *who purify themselves externally and internally*. Their thoughts and acts reek venom. If the mosques, madressahs and Mullahs represent virtuousness then Pakistan should have been "heaven on earth" as the Land of The Pure has the highest per capita and per square mile density of such institutions.

No matter how many mosques the Bigots build, how many commit the Quran to memory, how many rituals they celebrate therein, how long beards they display, the fact of the matter as borne by sixty years of Pakistan history is that *Allah guides not the wrong doing people (to the ways of success).*

Suffice is to say that: *This building of theirs which they have built will never cease to rankle in their hearts unless their hearts are torn to pieces (with anguish and repentance).* ■

Does the Qadiani Jama‘at consider other Muslims as Muslims?

On the Qadiani Jama‘at TV channel MTA there was a live programme on Saturday 12th June called *Raah-i Huda*. In this programme, Mr Mujib-ur-Rahman, a prominent member and representative of their Jama‘at, was interviewed from Pakistan by telephone at just before 6.00 p.m. U.K. time.

In regard to the allegation that the Qadiani Jama‘at does not hold *janaza* prayers of deceased non-Ahmadi Muslims, Mr Mujib-ur-Rahman stated most forcefully that saying *janaza* prayers is what is called a *fard kifaya* in Islam, which means that if any other Muslims have held the *janaza* prayers of a non-Ahmadi then there is no requirement for the Qadiani Jama‘at to hold them as well for that person. He added that in the case where there were no other Muslims who could hold the *janaza* prayers of a non-Ahmadi (for example, in a foreign country with few Muslims), then the Qadiani Jama‘at does hold *janaza* prayers for that non-Ahmadi. He was proud that if there are no other Muslims to hold the *janaza* prayers for a non-Ahmadi, then the Qadiani Jamaat holds it and fulfils this Islamic duty which other Muslims could not do.

He also stated that if non-Ahmadi Muslims started saying *janaza* prayers for deceased members of the Qadiani Jamaat, then they would, on their part, start holding the same for non-Ahmadis deceased persons.

He also stated that in the time of the Promised Messiah, before he was declared *kafir* by the Ulama, Ahmadis used to pray behind non-Ahmadi imams and join *janaza* prayers behind non-Ahmadi imams. But after he was declared *kafir*, then according to Hadith this declaration of *takfir* reflected back upon his opponents. Mr Mujib-ur-Rahman stated that this was the only reason why his Jama‘at members do not say *janaza* prayers of a non-Ahmadi behind a non-Ahmadi imam.

Fine words indeed. But unfortunately, the position of the Qadiani Jama‘at as laid down by their second Khalifa, Mirza Mahmud Ahmad, whom they regard as the Promised Reformer, is

quite the opposite. We give extracts below from books that are available on the website of their Jama‘at, alislam.org.

“Now another question remains, that is, as non-Ahmadis are deniers of the Promised Messiah, this is why funeral prayers for them must not be offered, but if a young child of a non-Ahmadi dies, why should not his funeral prayers be offered? He did not call the Promised Messiah as *kafir*. I ask those who raise this question, that if this argument is correct, then why are not funeral prayers offered for the children of Hindus and Christians, and how many people say their funeral prayers? The fact is that, according to the Shariah, the religion of the child is the same as the religion of the parents. So a non-Ahmadi’s child is also a non-Ahmadi, and his funeral prayers must not be said. Then I say that as the child cannot be a sinner he does not need the funeral prayers; the child’s funeral is a prayer for his relatives, and they do not belong to us but are non-Ahmadis. This is why even the child’s funeral prayers must not be said. This leaves the question that if a man who believes Hazrat Mirza sahib to be true but has not yet taken the *bai‘at*, or is still thinking about joining Ahmadiyyat, and he dies in this condition, it is possible that God may not punish him. But the decisions of the Shariah are based on what is outwardly visible. So we must do the same thing in his case, and not offer funeral prayers for him.”

(*Anwar-i Khilafat*, p. 93 of original edition, and p. 150–151 of online edition. See book no. 5 at: www.alislam.org/urdu/au/?j=3 on the Qadiani Jama‘at website. The translation into English is ours.)

The book from which we quote below is the Qadiani Jama‘at’s own English translation of the *A‘inah-i Sadaqat* by Mirza Mahmud Ahmad, published under the title *The Truth about the Split*. Referring to an article he had earlier written, Mirza Mahmud Ahmad explains:

“The article was elaborately entitled — ‘A Muslim is one who believes in all the messengers of God.’ The title itself is sufficient to show that the article was not meant to prove merely that ‘those who did not accept the Promised Messiah were deniers of the Promised Messiah’. Its object rather was to demonstrate that those who

did not believe in the Promised Messiah were not Muslims.” (p. 144; from the 2007 edition online at www.alislam.org)

“Regarding the main subject of my article, I wrote that as we believed the Promised Messiah to be one of the Prophets of God, we could not possibly regard his deniers as Muslims.” (p. 146)

“Then in my own words, I summarised the purport of the quotations as follows: ‘Thus, according to these quotations, not only are those deemed to be *kuffar*, who openly style the Promised Messiah as kafir, and those who although they do not style him thus, decline still to accept his claim, but even those who, in their hearts, believe the Promised Messiah to be true, and do not even deny him with their tongues, but hesitate to enter into his *Bai‘at*, have here been adjudged to be *kuffar*.’ ”

“And lastly, it was argued from a verse of the Holy Quran that such people as had failed to recognise the Promised Messiah as a *Rasul* even if they called him a righteous person with their tongues, were yet veritable *kuffar*.” (p. 148).

Earlier in the same book, he wrote:

“Now, as we hold that the revelation which came to the Promised Messiah are such that their acceptance is obligatory on mankind in general, to us, the man who rejects the Promised Messiah is a kafir agreeably to the teachings of the Holy Quran, although he may well be a believer in all the other truths of religion...” (p. 60)

Before Mr Mujib-ur-Rahman’s statement can be accepted, despite his good intentions, the Qadiani Jama‘at **must clearly dissociate itself** from these views of their second Khalifa. We understand that some years ago when Mr Mujib-ur-Rahman appeared for the Qadiani Jama‘at in a court case in Pakistan, these quotations were put to him, and he replied that it is only the writings of the Founder of the Ahmadiyya Movement that are authoritative in establishing what the Jama‘at should believe, and not anyone else’s statements. This response too needs to be widely announced as a basic principle by the Qadiani Jama‘at, namely, that if the viewpoint of someone in the Jama‘at, even the view of a *Khalifa*, as to the claims of the Founder, conflicts with the teachings of the Founder himself, then the Founder’s standpoint is to be taken as the authoritative and correct one. ■

Islamic terms are “trade marks like Coca Cola”

May only be applied to genuine Muslims and not to Ahmadis

Ruling of Supreme Court in Pakistan

by the editor

An appeal was once filed in Pakistan against the state, pleading that its laws which prohibit Ahmadis from using Islamic terms, such as calling themselves Muslims, saying that their religion is Islam, calling their mosques as mosque or *masjid*, etc., violated the right of freedom of religion guaranteed in the constitution of Pakistan. The case was *Zaheer-ud-din v. The State* 1993. The Supreme Court of Pakistan rejected this appeal, with one judge dissenting with the judgment. It ruled that the state must protect certain terms that are peculiar to Islam from being used by way of deception or forgery. The judgment stated:

“It is thus clear that intentionally using trade names, trade marks, property marks or descriptions of others in order to make believe others that they belong to the user thereof amounts to an offence and not only the perpetrator can be imprisoned and fined but damages can be recovered and injunction to restrain him issued. This is true of goods of even very small value. For example, the Coca Cola Company will not permit anyone to sell, even a few ounces of his own product in his own bottles or other receptacles, marked Coca ColaFurther, it is a criminal offence carrying sentences of imprisonment and also fine. The principles involved are: do not deceive and do not violate the property rights of others.”¹

According to this judgment, the words ‘Islam’ and ‘Muslim’ are on a par with brand labels such as Coca Cola, KFC, McDonalds, Nike, Sony, etc. and may only be placed on the genuine product. And the state in Pakistan is the licence holder which decides who is the genuine Muslim and who is the fake! One would have thought the brand name owner would be Allah the Most High, but it appears that the state in Pakistan has appointed itself as the authorised holder of the Almighty’s trademarks!

1. For the information about this court case, we acknowledge a paper by Martin Lau, which is included in the course study materials of the School of Oriental and African Studies, the University of London.