

Muslim Libel Case.

Moulvi Mohamed Suleiman

What is your opinion of a claim to prophethood by "barroz"?—In my opinion, a claim to prophethood by "barroz" is a false claim. A claimant of prophethood by "barroz" is considered to be a Kaffir by the Sunnat-Jama'at. It is tantamount to saying the Prophet Muhammad is a Kaffir.

With regard to point of difference No. 3, belief in the prophets is a fundamental branch of the Muslim faith and we see that neither the whole of the Muslims nor its components were able to know these were prophets of Allah. According to the teachings of the Sunnat-Jama'at, an admission as prophets is an addition to the perfect religion of the Quran.

With regard to point of difference No. 2 this is the belief of the Qadiani party. This refers to the Qadiani section of the Ahmadies. They do claim that Mirza Ghulam Ahmad himself was the actual prophet.

Have you read any of the books by Mirza's son?—Yes, I have read some of them. One book is written by Mirza's son in Urdu.

What is that book?—Tasdiqulmessih. Page 3 deals with the "Seal of Prophethood—confirmation of the Messiah."

Are you sure that Mirza's son is the author of this book?—Yes, I have sworn that it is written by Mirza's son, Bashiruddin Ahmad.

His Lordship:—He says so at his own peril!

Witness:—Certainly I should say that this was written by Mirza's son. I had this book in India before. On page 91 of this book:—"People in the old days were tested and why not similar tests be applied to Mirza and see whether he is a true prophet or not?" He comes to the conclusion on the same page:—He gives his opinion and quotes Chapter 4 verses 150 and 151 of the Quran. When the Promised Messiah and Mahdi claimed to be such he was individual at that time. At this stage Mirza received a revelation in the English language "I will give you a large part of this land." He received another revelation in Urdu:—"A warner came to the world and the world did not admit him but God accepted him." From my study of Mirza's works, Mirza's son's statement that his father claimed prophethood is correct.

Evidence for Defence.

Moulvi Mohamed Suleiman

His Lordship:—There is no statement in Mirza's writings but there is such a statement in the writings of his supposed son?

The Review of Religions contains an article which makes this statement?—I do not know the author.

With regard to point of difference No. 4 in that Indian case, is it a fair statement?—As far as I know it is a fair statement. Some people do not believe Jesus was carried away to God before crucifixion and that he actually died.

Where is this stated?—In the tradition of Bukhari.

Will this belief affect a person's status?—I cannot say that this will affect a person's status.

What views do the Ahmadies of Lahore hold in this respect?—The Ahmadies of Lahore hold that Jesus was born of a father and a mother while the Ahmadies of Qadian that he was born of Virgin Mary only. Those of Qadian teach Mirza's teachings in this respect.

With regard to the second part of point of difference No. 4, what is your opinion?—Both parties believe that.

Is it opposed to orthodox teachings?—Yes, most certainly.

Is it supported by the Quran?—There are statements in the Quran about the second advent, supported by the Traditions. Chapter 43 verses 57, 60 and 61. "And he (Christ) shall be a sign of the approach of the last hour, therefore doubt not thereof."

What is your opinion about Sale's translation?—It is quite agreeable to that of several doctors. Sale's translation is quite agreeable to the teachings of orthodox Muslims. See also page 94 of Sale's.

At this stage the proceedings were adjourned to the 2nd March.

The Court Adjourned.

Ninth day—Tuesday, 2nd March, 1926.

Mohamed Suleiman continued his evidence:—

Have you any authority to show that Mahdi is different from Messiah?—Yes, page 283 of Arbean Hadiz.

What does it say there?—The wife of the Holy Prophet relates that the Holy Prophet said that the Mahdi should be a descendant of his daughter Fatimah.

Muslim Libel Case.

Moulvi Mohamed Suleiman

What is a Hadiz?—A Hadiz is a recognised book of traditions.

Had Mirza ever claimed himself to be a descendant of the Prophet's daughter?—No, but it is evident from his own writings.

What traditions refer to "Messiah"?—In Mishkat page 472. It says, "Hozaifa son of Osaidulghafari said the Holy Prophet came upon us and they were talking some affairs. The Holy Prophet said, 'What are you talking about?' The Holy Prophet says, 'You will see ten signs before the Resurrection day:—(1) smoke, (2) jahl, (3) dabar, (4) rising of the sun from the west, (5) descent of Jesus, son of Mary,' referred to in Chapter 43 verse 60 and page 950 of Sale's translation. On page 479 of Mishkat, "I swear by him———"

His Lordship:—All this is not material.

His Lordship ruled that it was not necessary to produce a long list of traditions. The Plaintiffs say they are not followers of Mirza. They only think that the Muhammadan mission at Woking is a great missionary effort. Such evidence as showing what Qadianis believe is immaterial.

Mr. Mundell:—If what the Qadianis believe is immaterial I suppose most of the evidence is immaterial. I am prepared to tender evidence as to the teachings of Mirza in accordance with his son's claims.

His Lordship:—I shall have nausea.

Mr. Mundell:—It is a statement in the "Ahmadia Movement" and in Farquhar. Mr. Sarwar said that the son of Mirza claims his father was a minor prophet. I want to show that Mirza taught that he was not only a prophet but that he was all prophets and that persons who did not believe him were Kaffirs. Your Lordship will remember that the first paragraph of the alleged libel containing quotations is borrowed from Mirza's books. One of these refers to those who assist.

His Lordship:—I do not follow that at all.

Evidence on the traditions was discontinued.

Mr. Mundell tendered a book—"Ahmad and His Claims."

Have you seen this book before?—Yes. I took part in a religious debate with Dr. Abdul Karim of Mogar of Ahmadia Anjuman in India and this book was referred to.

Evidence for Defence.

Moulvi Mohamed Suleiman

What does this book contain?—This book contains some extracts from the teachings of Mirza and also some other articles published from time to time by his successors. I have checked some articles from which this book was derived.

These publications are from a paper, the “Review of Religions,” published in Qadian during the lifetime of Mirza and subsequently.

Mr. Mundell:—My Lord, the Review of Religions is referred to by Muhammad Ali in his books on the Ahmadia Movement, in vol. I, vol. II, and vol. III, pages 24, 33 and 49; vol. IV page 1 and a number of other pages.

Who is the compiler of this book?—Allahdin. He is, as far as I know from Abdul Hakim, a missionary from Allahabad, Deccan.

Where did you have this book from?—I had this book from Dr. Abdul Hakim and read it in India.

Is this book sold to the public?—This book is being sold in the Ahmadia Anjumans in India and in Calcutta at Lodchipuri. (The book was exhibited.)

What is the opinion of Ulemas concerning Ahmadies?—I should think that about 500 ulemas have said Ahmadies are Kaffirs and there may be more.

Who lead the religious movement in India?—Speak in generally, people follow what the Ulemas condemn. If they (the Ulemas) say that they (certain people) are Kaffirs, they are Kaffirs.

When did you last come from India?—In October last.

Since when were the Ahmadies considered Kaffirs?—Ever since Mirza claimed prophethood and ever since the Ulemas passed their decrees, the Ahmadies are not considered as true believers. I refer to certain people who get authority under Islam to pass such decrees.

Who are entitled to pass decrees?—A fazal is qualified as Maulvi Fazal entitled to pass religious decrees in religious matters.

His Lordship:—Do they get qualifications from the different universities?—Yes, (1) from Deoband University in the northern Province near Delhi, (2) from University of Delhi, (3) from the University of Lahore. Most people pass their examinations in Lahore.

Muslim Libel Case.

Moulvi Mohamed Suleiman

Do those who pass the examinations pass decrees?—

Yes.

His Lordship:—Suppose you pass two different decrees, what will happen?—I cannot give my opinion. Questions are decided according to the teachings of the Quran and of the traditions.

Mr. Mundell:—A dispute is to be decided having regard to the most strongly supported traditions?—Yes.

His Lordship:—You must have a person like the Pope, a recognised religious leader, to decide such questions?—In Chapter 4 verse 59 page 218 of Muhammad Ali's translation of the Quran, it says "O you who believe! Obey Allah and obey the Apostle and those in authority from among you; then if you quarrel about any thing, refer it to Allah and the Apostle, if you believe in Allah and the last day; this is (the) better (part) and very good in the end."

Mr. Mundell:—Have you seen any fatwahas in favour of the Ahmadies?—No.

Do the Ahmadies pray behind the orthodox Muslims?—In my experience, the Ahmadies do not pray behind the orthodox Muslims.

Do the orthodox Muslims pray behind the Ahmadies?—No, they are not allowed. Ahmadies pray separately and do not mix up with us (Sunnat Jama'at) Ahmadies have got their own mosques. I have seen them praying in their own mosques. I have seen them praying in their own houses.

Cross-examined by Mr. Campbell:—

When did you first come from India?—I first came from India to Malaya in 1906. My father brought my mother and me.

Have you ever returned to India?—Yes, in 1918.

From 1906 to 1918 what were you doing?—I received my education at Batu School and partly in Victoria Institution and St. John's School, Seremban.

What did you do after 1918?—In 1918 I went to Chankara, Moqar in Ferozepore, in north-western India (Punjab).

When did you return?—I returned in 1918 to Taiping after 6 months.

Evidence for Defence.

Moulvi Mohamed Suleiman

What were you doing after that?—I was a clerk in the Government service, in the Secretariat in Taiping. I remained there for about one month. I was transferred to Kuala Lumpur. I was a clerk in the Customs Department. In the beginning of 1919 I was transferred. I stayed there for about ten months. Then I was transferred to Port Swettenham.

Were you still in the Customs Department?—Yes.

How long did you remain there?—For two years.

After that where did you go?—I was transferred to Pahang at the end of 1920.

Were you still in the Government service?—Yes, in the District Office. I was a general clerk under the District Officer for about 6 months. Then I was given notice and left for India.

You were dismissed by the Government?—Yes.

You went to your country?—I went back to my country in Ferozepore District and stayed until 1925 some time in June. I studied in a Muhammadan school at Allahabad.

Did you not stay at Cheymore after you came back?—Yes. I then came to Kuala Lumpur.

Have you now any employment?—I give private tuition in Arabic and in the Muhammadan religion.

Have you written to the papers with reference to this case?—No. I do not think I have.

Are you a supporter of the Ahmadia Movement?—No. I have not supported the Ahmadia Mission in any way.

Witness was shown a copy of a newspaper called "The Light" and he admitted having written the following article appearing in it:—

"AHMADIA MOVEMENT"

Sir, Yesterday I observed in the columns of a daily Malay paper of Singapore, that some of the Ulama of of Singapore consider the Ahmadia Movement as dangerous to Islam. They are of opinion that the works of Maulana Muhamad Ali and of Khwaja Kamal-ud-din are against the teachings of Islam. It is stated that in the course of his translating the Holy Quran the Moulvi has failed up to the true and real facts of the Quranic history.

Muslim Libel Case.

Moulvi Mohamed Suleiman

These critics presume that Islam is not only founded upon five principles, but that it is founded upon many more principles and the Virginity of Mary together with the Living of Jesus in the Heavens are a portion of such fundamental principles of Islam. Hence they attack the Moulvi for having an idea that Jesus, son of Mary, is dead.

May I ask these critics if they have ever faithfully looked into the writings of the Mirza Saheb or of Maulana Muhammad Ali or the Khwaja? I presume they have not. Had they studied the teachings of these generous personalities, they would not have in such a blind way attacked the very pure ideas of these famous leaders.

I am not an Ahmadi but I can assure these critics that the Holy Mirza, a personality lost in the love of Allah and his Rasul, never in his life styled himself as Nabi or Rasul. He believed that Muhammad (Peace and Blessings of God be upon him) was the last and seal of the Prophets. He believed that the Holy Quran was the Last of the Books of Allah.

To support this I quote below from the Mirza's last literary work, Haquqat-ul-Wahy, for the information of the blind critics of Singapore:

'Prophethood finished with Muhammad. No Book after the Quran. No Shariat after Muhammad's Shariat. Muhammad is the Last of Prophets, the last link of the chain.'

Regarding the Maulana and the Khwaja, I dare say that these critics are barbarous in attacking these personalities. This is ungratefulness. They ought to be thankful to these pious leaders or rather guardians of Islam for having guarded our religion from the furious attacks of Christian and other non-Muslim missionaries of the present days. It should be whole-heartedly remembered that it is the Khwaja who has with the help of Allah flown the banner of Islam high above the towers of London, an act which none of the Singapore critics can ever perform.

As to the death of Jesus, there is no verse in the Holy Quran that tells us about his being alive in the Heavens. Surely he is dead and certainly he is not coming back to lead the Singapore critics. The Holy Quran, the Hadith of the Holy Prophet and the Qaul (words) of Imam Malik are the evidence of his death. By no means can the views of the critics bring him back to this world. His body lies peacefully in Kashmir and his soul in the

Evidence for Defence.

Moulvi Mohamed Suleiman

Heavens. Hence it is quite childish to believe that he is coming back to save the world. However, even if he is alive and not dead, his existence can be of no use to us. We are the followers of Muhammad (Peace and Blessings of God be upon him), not of Jesus.

It is a matter of the greatest pity that these critics do not even understand that belief in these petty things has got nothing to do with the principles of our religion. Islam is founded on five principles only and the belief in the Life or Death of Jesus and the Virginity of Mary has got nothing to do with Islam. If he is dead let him be so and if he is still alive in Heavens, let him live there.

The Holy Quran does not permit us to fight on these petty things. It is a pity the critics have closed their eyes to the Divine injunction—'Hold fast to the rope of Allah, all of you and do not disintegrate.'

If they are really anxious to promote the cause of their religion, let them take that light to the Christians, the Chinese, and Budhists of Malaya. If however, they are not able to perform this glorious act, it is certainly more graceful to keep quiet and not obstruct soldiers of Islam like the Maulana and the Khwaja in their Jihad to illumine the world with the light of Islam.

Chemor, Perak.

F. M. S.

MAULVI MOHD. SULAIMAN,"
KHADAMI-i-AHLI-HADITH.

Mr. Campbell:—Do you know Mr. Qudrat Shah?—
Yes.

Did you write this letter to him?—Yes. The letter reads as follows:—

"c/o. Mr. AHMAD,
Chief Clerk Surveys,
K. Lumpur,
2/2/26.

My dear Qudrat Shah,

What a matter of regret that you people having moved the matter, have no one to lead your lawyer, who I think has not much knowledge of our religion.

The case should have been settled by this time but there seems to be not a single Alim there who can lead the Lawyer or even prove to him the hidden facts in the different trifling questions.

Muslim Libel Case.

Moulvi Mohamed Suleiman

I am sorry, that though I feel it but yet am unable to go there, the reason of which is that I have no expenses to travel to the place because I have newly come here and have got no maintenance as yet. Otherwise I would have been the first to block the Marshy Paths of the Singaporian Ulmas who are nothing but unfortunate Fanatical Weak Personalities.

However if the matter is not properly decided, I suggest that it should be appealed to higher Authorities and in the meantime I will see if I can be a help in the matter.

As you may not know who I am, I wish to point out that I am Moulvi Mohamed Sulaiman a faithful Supporter of the Ahmadiyya Mission and a true friend of Maulvi Shamsuddin, Ahmadee.

I repeatedly suggest that the matter be carefully taken in hand on the Line of the Quran, which is the Law for the guidance of all Mankind.

Dear Brothers—you should have led your Lawyer properly and if even you have failed to do so far, please do it now. The Quran and nothing else should be the Judge and if it is done so you will see that the Singaporeans will see a big loss written on their faces.

Wasslam,
I am your's,
M. M. SULEIMAN."

Re-examined by Mr. Mundell:—

Are you a faithful supporter of the Ahmediyya Movement?—No, I am not a supporter.

Were you a supporter?—I have not supported the Ahmediyya movement in any way.

Look at the letter. It says "As you may not know who I am, I wish to point out that I am Moulvi Mohamed Sulaiman a faithful supporter of the Ahmediyya Mission." Did you write this?—Yes.

Was it a lie?—No.

Then it is true?—Yes, What I wrote is true but I am not a supporter of the Ahmediyya movement.

What was your reason for writing that?—My reason was to get in touch with them and get some of the books of Mirza in their possession.

Evidence for Defence.

Moulvi Mohamed Suleiman

You told a lie to get books?—Yes.

That was your object?—Yes.

Who is Samsuddin?—He is an Ahmadiya and he stayed with me in Kuala Lumpur.

You are a true friend of his?—I am a friend of any person.

Did you want to come here and give evidence on behalf of the Ahmadiyyas?—Certainly not.

What was your object in writing that letter?—To get information to defend the orthodox Muslim religion.

With reference to the letter sent to "The Light," were you paid for it?—No.

You did not write it for the sake of reward?—No. When I wrote that letter I was impressed by a book I had read, "There are no sects in Islam," by Khwaja Kamaludin.

Do you change your opinions from day to day?—No. The information in that letter was contained in the book "There are no sects in Islam." I based the letter on that book.

Why did you say, "I am not an Ahmadee but I can assure these critics that the holy Mirza never in his lifetime styled himself as Nabi or Rasul."?—Because that is the saying of the Ahmadiyya sect of Lahore.

You told the Court that you had read the books of Mirza and that he did claim to be the Nabi?—The opinion expressed in "There are no sects in Islam" made me change my belief at that time.

His Lordship:—Now you have changed your views?—Yes.

His Lordship:—Tomorrow you may change again?—I was informed by a Maulvi that I was in the wrong path.

Mr. Mundell:—And you were re-converted to orthodox views?—Yes.

The whole of this letter was written when you were under the obsession of the book, "There are no sects in Islam"?—Yes.

What is your object in writing the second letter?—I wrote this letter to get some religious books of the Ahmadies so that I might defend my faith. That is religious diplomacy.

Muslim Libel Case.

J. Mohamed Ismail Marican

His Lordship:—After writing these two letters you have the face to appear in the witness-box?—I have written in 1925 and 1924 in India against the Ahmadies. I tried to publish some such articles but the press refused to accept them.

Mr. Mundell:—When was this?—This was on the 30th of January of this year.

Did you volunteer to give evidence for the defence?—Yes.

Are you getting anything for giving evidence?—No. I eat in Mr. Dawood's house and not in the defendant's.

Did you know Mr. S. Qudrat Shah?—No. I knew his name only. Mr. Shamsuddin told me to write to him.

Where were you then?—I think I was still in Kuala Lumpur.

When was that?—On the 2nd February 1926. I cannot exactly remember.

J. Mohamed Ismail Marican, (defendant,) sworn states:—

“I live at No. 18-2 Wilkie Road. I am a piecegoods merchant. I belong to the Shaffi of the Sunni Sect.”

Do you take a deep interest in religion?—Yes.

Do you follow the practices?—Yes.

Is it the general opinion in Singapore that you practise your religion?—Yes.

You remember Khwaja Kamal-ud-Din coming to Singapore in 1921?—Yes.

Did he raise a fund?—Yes.

Did you subscribe to that fund?—Yes.

Who asked you to do so?—Mr. Mohamed Ghouse Maricar.

He is a relation of yours?—Yes.

Did you know then that Khwaja Kamal-ud-Din was an Ahmediyya?—No.

If you had known, would you have had subscribed \$500?—No.

Did you in 1921 know anything about Ahmediyyas?—I knew nothing about Ahmediyyas.

Evidence for Defence.

J. Mohamed Ismail Marican

When did you first learn about Ahmediyyas?—After Daud Shah's arrival in April 1925.

Pamphlets were issued by various people?—Yes.

Did you see the pamphlet issued by the 1st plaintiff?—Yes.

Did you see the pamphlet issued by K. C. Marican?—Yes.

Did you see the letter written by Bashir A. Mallal?—Yes.

Can you read English?—I know little.

Did you attend the meeting held by Daud Shah at the Town Hall?—Yes.

Was there any challenge to him at that meeting?—Yes, by three Maulvis.

Who were the three Maulvis?—Sharfudin Sahib, M. Osman, and Abdul Rahman.

This challenge was refused?—Yes. They said that Daud Shah translated the Quran wrongly and his practices were wrong.

What was the challenge?—They asked Daud Shah on what he said.

Did you hear any questions put?—Sharfudin wanted to ask questions and approached Mr. Sarwar and Mr. Sarwar did not give a chance to answer these questions. So Sharfudin left the Hall and people hooted at Daud Shah.

Was a pamphlet subsequently issued by the three Maulvis?—Yes.

It was offering a challenge to Daud Shah?—Yes. This was a challenge.

Was it after that challenge that the notices of the plaintiffs were published?—Yes.

Later a notice was issued in your name?—Yes.

Will you explain to His Lordship how that notice came to be issued in your name?—After the trouble these three Maulvis came to my shop in Arab Street. I asked them to tell me details of the religious trouble.

Who prepared the notice?—The three Maulvis prepared the notice.

But you signed it?—I did not sign on any paper but I permitted my name to appear on the paper. I paid for the printing.

Muslim Libel Case.

J. Mohamed Ismail Marican

Did you, before you agreed to allow your name to be published, see that what the notice stated was correct?—I was satisfied by what the Moulvis told me that what the notice stated was true.

Did they refer you to any authorities?—Yes.

Do you know why they came to you?—They came to me because Daud Shah was staying with my relation.

Were you shown any authority for the 1st paragraph of the alleged libel?—They told me that it is written in a book.

Did they show you the book?—No.

Were you shown any authority with regard to paragraph 4 (a), "Hence, in accordance with the decision of the Sunnat Jama'at world that the Qadiani sects are Kafir." ?—I was shown an authority regarding this. They showed that a Qadiani is a Kaffir and those who believe him are Kaffirs.

What is the name of the book which says this?—These authorities were in Arabic and Hindustani. The Maulvis are my priests and I have to believe them.

What was the gist?—They told me that Mirza was a Kaffir for claiming Madiship and Messiahship and all those who follow him are Kaffirs and all who believe him and the followers are Kaffirs. The Maulvis showed 288 signatures of Ulemahs in the book.

You kept the books, did you?—Yes.

Did they read these books in your presence?—Yes. They told me the effect. These are the books (put in merely to show that defendant was acting in good faith.)

Now did you at this time know Daud Shah?—Yes, I knew him personally.

What was the reason why you say he was of the Qadiani sect?—He translated Muhammad Ali's Quran into Tamil and edited the paper "Darul Islam" and was the joint editor with Khwaja Kamal-ud-Din. Khwaja Kamal-ud-Din is a disciple of Mirza Ghulam Ahmad.

Did you ever ask Daud Shah whether he was an Ahmadi or not?—I did not ask him because if people be convinced he will be declared a Qadiani and so I did not ask him. They declare all those people who spoke to Daud Shah are Kaffirs.

Evidence for Defence.

J. Mohamed Ismail Marican

Was the Singapore public greatly excited about Daud Shah's arrival?—Yes, in fact the whole of Malaya.

Did you at this time know Meeran Lebbaik Maullim, the 1st plaintiff?—I knew him.

Did you know him long?—About two or three years.

Did you know K. C. Marican the 2nd plaintiff?—Yes. He knows me from infancy because he was a clerk of my father.

Have you questioned them as to whether they were Ahmadies or not?—I did not ask the 2nd plaintiff, but I asked the 1st plaintiff.

When was this?—This was during the trouble.

Was that before or after you published the notice?—I cannot remember.

What did you say to him?—I asked him why he created the trouble in the Town Hall with Daud Shah. He told me "you better not interfere because the Singapore people are fools and not sufficiently educated."

Did you ask him whether he was a Qadiani or not?—I did not ask that question because he always behaves and speaks against Islam.

In what way?—According to the Quran a Muslim must pray but the 1st plaintiff would ask you what would happen if you do not pray and such other things.

Is it to your knowledge that the 1st plaintiff had a reputation of going against Islam in India?—Yes, and here also. Every evening at Campbell Lane there is religious discussion in which he takes part.

Have you been present at these discussions?—Once I have been there.

When was this?—A year ago.

Why did you dispute with the 1st plaintiff and not with the 2nd plaintiff?—The 1st plaintiff is of a controversial nature. The 2nd plaintiff is senior to me and I do not like to dispute with him. I treat him with respect.

What was your reason for saying that the plaintiffs and Bashir A. Mallal are Qadianis?—Because they supported Daud Shah. They were instrumental in bringing about that meeting in the Town Hall. They also published articles in the paper in praise of Daud Shah. They always spend their time with Daud Shah.

Muslim Libel Case.

J. Mohamed Ismail Marican

How were they responsible for calling the Town Hall Meeting?—Bashir A. Mallal caused a notice to be signed by him in Tamil.

Were they not given seats on the platform with Daud Shah?—Yes.

Was not a photograph taken in a group with Daud Shah?—Yes.

Did you attend that meeting?—Yes. I attended the meeting personally.

Was there anything stated in the meeting to which you objected?—I went late to the first meeting and I did not hear anything said against Islam.

His Lordship:—On a perfectly harmless meeting you call Daud Shah a Kaffir?—But the Alims told me so.

Mr. Mundell:—At the time of the meeting did you know the difference between the teachings of Ahmadies and non-Ahmadies?—No.

His Lordship:—Why did you not ask them to publish this pamphlet in their own names?—They came from India for the purpose and I had no objection to letting them use my name. They had no money of their own for printing.

You could have asked them to sign their own names?—I spoke for the general good. There is nothing in that. There is no harm in putting my name there.

Mr. Mundell:—Are you sure that they came from India for this purpose?—I don't know if they came from India for the purpose.

Why should you follow their suggestions rather than the suggestions of Daud Shah?—Daud Shah is not a Maulvi and I must believe what a Maulvi says. The general public was against Daud Shah.

Why did you include the name of K. C. Marican?—K. C. Marican has issued a pamphlet and supported Daud Shah.

Had the other of the plaintiffs or Bashir A. Mallal published any vicious creeds?—Yes. It was stated in the notice.

Did the plaintiffs say that Daud Shah was right in following Mirza Ghulam Ahmad?—Yes.

What did they say about Daud Shah?—They said the actions of Daud Shah are right.

Evidence for Defence.

J. Mchamed Ismail Marican

What opinion did they hold with regard to Daud Shah's translation of the Quran?—They said that translation is correct.

Did they not say that the general public was wrong in condemning him?—Yes.

How do you explain “with a view to rob them of their money by their ravings”?—These words do not refer to the public but to the Qadiani sect who rob the public.

Does the first portion of paragraph 23 which reads as follows “The Qadiani sectaries who are unmindful of the iman (faith) being brought to naught” refer to the plaintiffs?—Yes.

The second portion “With a view etc.” refers to Qadianis?—Yes.

Does paragraph 24 “when challenged (for discussion) by intelligent people who understand these things, they meet such challenge with false slander, and when invited to adduce proof, they excuse themselves by saying that they would bear up without entering into debate,” refer to the plaintiffs?—No. This refers to the Qadiani sect.

Does paragraph 25 of the alleged libel “under such false pretexts couched in clever language, it is natural for them to dupe (people) and pretend to be dull-witted” refer to the plaintiffs?—No. It refers to the Qadiani sect.

Does paragraph 26 “with science or words (Illmul-kalam) that is to say, having acquired a smattering of English (they would wield) a scientific, clever and glossy prose style” refer to the plaintiffs?—No. It refers to the Qadiani sect.

Does the portion of paragraph 26 which reads “What they give is vile calumny” refer to the plaintiffs?—No. It refers to the Qadiani sect.

Could you give particulars of things that the Qadianis say which are untrue?—The whole of the doctrine of the Qadianis is not true.

How do you explain “what they stir up is the act of tale-bearing to our benign and righteous Government”?—I cannot prove. But this sentence refers to Qadiani sect generally. I heard that Mr. Sarwar told the C.I.D. that one of the Maulvies was a political lecturer.

What is your reason for putting in this sentence?—I put this sentence in because I heard that who belong to the Qadiani sect carried tales to the Government.

Muslim Libel Case.

J. Mohamed Ismail Marican

His Lordship:—Do you say that Mr. Sarwar belong to the Qadiani sect then?—It appears to me that due to his actions he belongs to the Qadianis but I am not a religious authority.

What grounds other than these have you for suggesting that by their acts and deeds, the plaintiffs and Bashir A. Mallal belong to the Qadiani party?—Because they supported Daud Shah.

What is your reason for saying that Daud Shah belongs to the Qadiani party?—Because they supported Daud Shah and the Alims say that one must not translate the Quran into Tamil.

Have you seen Daud Shah's translation of the Quran into Tamil?—Yes.

Is there any other reason for suggesting that Daud Shah belongs to the Qadiani sect?—Because Daud Shah is joint editor with Khwaja Kamal-ud-Din as editors of the Darul-Islam.

What kind of a paper is this Darul-Islam?—It is something like "The Muslim Review" and it is run on the same lines as Muslim Religious Review.

Did you publish any other notices against the plaintiffs?—No.

The photo of the plaintiffs with Daud Shah was produced and marked 46.

Cross-examined by Mr. Campbell:

These three Maulvis who came from India, did you know them before they came from India?—No.

Was this man Sharfudin a leader of them?—I cannot say whether he was the leader. These three man are learned.

Was Sharfudin a great lecturer?—Yes.

Is he the editor of Saifull-Islam?—Yes.

Is it an ordinary newspaper?—Yes.

Is it a religious and commercial paper?—Yes.

Is it a paper of the South India?—Yes.

Did Sharfudin collect money for this paper of his—that is, contributions to capital?—I cannot say, I do not know.

Did he not try to get some from you?—I am a contributor.

Evidence for Defence.

J. Mohamed Ismail Marican

Did you buy shares in the company which runs this paper?—No.

Were you asked to buy?—Nothing of the paper was spoken to me at all.

(A photo of Sharfudin was produced).

Have you seen this man before?—I have never seen this photo before.

Where were you educated?—In Singapore.

At what school?—Anglo-Chinese and Victoria Bridge Schools.

Do they teach Tamil?—I studied Tamil at home.

Do you claim to be a clever scholar?—I know very little. I can write very little.

You know some English?—Yes.

I hope your style is not glossy?—I cannot speak good English.

Do you know Malay?—Yes.

Do you know other language?—No.

Can you recite the Quran?—Yes.

Do you know Arabic?—No.

Have you a knowledge of the teachings of Mirza Ghulam Ahmad?—I knew nothing about Qadiani before Daud Shah came.

Can you speak Urdu?—No. But I can understand little.

Can you write it?—No.

Do you know Persian?—No, not at all.

How did you come to know of the Qadianis?—What I knew was from the three Maulvis.

Did you see the alleged libel before it was printed?—Yes.

Did you see the alleged libel in manuscript before it was printed?—Yes. I first saw it at my office.

Did you see who wrote it?—I did not see who wrote it but these three Maulvis brought it to me already written out.

They asked for money to print it?—Yes.

They asked permission to use your name?—Yes.

How many copies were printed?—Over 2000 copies.

Muslim Libel Case.

J. Mohamed Ismail Marican

Where were they distributed?—Some distributed in Singapore and the three Maulvis took some away.

They are taking a leading part against the Qadianis?—Yes.

When did they leave?—Last year about two months after the publication of the alleged libel.

Where did they go after leaving Singapore?—They went to F.M.S. on their way to India.

Have you reason to believe that they were also published in India?—That I cannot say.

You took no steps whatever in the matter?—No.

You allowed them to use your name and to do what they like with the circulation?—They cannot make use of that notice.

You left them to do what they care about them?—Yes.

Your object was to give them to the Maulvis?—Yes.

What did it cost?—About \$26.

How long had you known this Sharfudin?—I knew him only after his arrival in Singapore.

Why did you accept him as a Maulvi?—He is a secretary to the Vellore school. It is a religious school. He is also an Alim.

How did you know?—He told me so.

He also had a reputation?—Yes.

Have you any knowledge of his writings?—No.

You know whether he is writing anything?—Yes.

Have you read any of his works?—No.

What are the fundamentals of Islam?—God is One, Muhammad is His prophet. Also belief in the Judgment Day, belief in Hell and Heaven.

Are these all the fundamentals of Islam that you can give?—Yes.

Against which of these fundamentals do the Ahmadies offend?—Although they believe these fundamentals, but since they claim Messiahship, I cannot call them true Muslims.

Who claim Mahdiship and Messiahship?—Mirza Ghulam Ahmad claimed to be the Promised Messiah and Mahdi.

Evidence for Defence.

J. Mohamed Ismail Maricar

Are you quite sure of that?—I first came to know about that section by the three Alims or Maulvis.

What connection has Daud Shah with Mirza Ghulam Ahmad?—Khwaja Kamal-ud-Din and Daud Shah are joint editors and in addition Daud Shah is translating the Quran.

What connection has Muhammad Ali with Mirza Ghulam Ahmad?—Muhammad Ali is a disciple of Mirza Ghulam Ahmad.

Who told you that?—The Maulvis told me so.

On the date of the publication of the notice did you know of this sect?—No.

Is it a serious thing to be called a Kaffir?—If it is true I am called a Kaffir, I admit it.

Does it hold him up to contempt?—No.

Is it a disgraceful thing for a Muhammadan to become a Kaffir?—There is no shame. Even Mr. Sarwar says 'if a man calls me a Kaffir I would not mind it.'

Would the other Muhammadans consider it disgraceful?—They would not take it disgraceful if I am really Kaffir. That depends upon people. Some people may not take it and some people would not.

If you are called a liar and swindler, will it reflect on your credit?—It will reflect if it is true.

What about the man who is called a Kaffir himself?—On account of religion I must say.

You are not in good terms with L. Mohamed Ghouse Maricar?—No.

He gave his house to Daud Shah when he was here?—Yes. In my brother-in-law's house.

He was associated with Daud Shah?—Yes.

Are you in good terms with the 1st plaintiff?—Yes.

Are you in good terms with the 2nd plaintiff?—Yes.

Did you believe them to be good Muslims before Daud Shah came?—I cannot say. As regards the 1st plaintiff when I was in India I was told that he was a fanatic. As regards the 2nd plaintiff I took him for a Muhammadan.

Have you anything to say against the 1st plaintiff?—I am not competent to say anything against him.

Are there people in this world whose hobby is to discuss religion?—I do not know that.

To what school do you claim to belong?—Shaffi.

Muslim Libel Case.

J. Mohamed Ismail Marican

Do you agree with the four sects?—Yes.

Do you say that it is possible to do that?—I am not an Alim, I must accept them.

His Lordship:—You perform a wonderful feat in agreeing with them all?—I am not an Alim.

Mr. Campbell:—Did you issue the notice to help religion?—Yes. Sharfudin asked me to do it.

His Lordship:—You did not care who are affected?—They showed me the authorities.

You made no study of Mirza Ghulam Ahmad's teachings or those of his son?—The general public was against him and therefore they were correct.

Mr. Campbell:—What did the general public know about Mirza?—I thought the general public knew about Mirza Ghulam Ahmad.

You thought so because these three Maulvis told you so?—I have heard some learned Arabs and some other people lectured on the subject in the mosque since the arrival of Daud Shah.

I put it to you there has not been a single one Arab who is learned?—About 7 or 8 persons I have heard while Daud Shah was present in Singapore.

Who were these lecturers?—I cannot mention any names.

Were these swarming to Singapore to correct Daud Shah?—Yes.

They have gone away now?—Yes.

Is it true that these people came to you and persuaded you to publish the alleged libel with your permission?—I went through the notice. I was satisfied with it. They told me there were good authorities. I had to believe them.

Have you ever heard the plaintiffs or Bashir A. Mallal deny the Unity of God?—No.

Have you ever heard the plaintiffs or Bashir A. Mallal deny that Muhammad was the last prophet?—No.

Have you heard them say that Muhammad was not the seal of prophets?—No.

Have you heard them say that what is wrong according to the Quran is right?—I don't know.

Evidence for Defence.

J. Mohamed Ismail Marican

Have you ever heard them say what the Quran says is a good action is a wrong action?—No.

Have you ever heard them say that it is wrong to pray?—No.

Have you ever heard them say that it is wrong to perform the pilgrimage?—No.

Have you ever heard them say that it is wrong to give alms?—No.

Have you ever heard them say that there is no judgment day?—No.

Have you ever heard them say they intended to shortly change their religion?—No.

Had you knowledge of the teachings of Muhammad Ali before the case?—No. I heard from the three Maulvis that the Quran was mis-translated.

Have you firsthand knowledge of the beliefs of Muhammad Ali?—Not before this case.

Have you any knowledge of the beliefs of Khwaja Kamal-ud-Din?—I know nothing about Mirza Ghulam Ahmad or Daud Shah or Khwaja Kamal-ud-Din before this case.

Who were the persons who supplied the names of the persons to be put in this circular?—The Maulvis supplied the names.

His Lordship:—Any other name is just the same?—Their names are put in because they published notices.

With regard to tale-bearing, do you suggest that Mr. Sarwar reported to the C.I.D. department?—Sharfudin told me so. Since they supported Daud Shah they were Qadianis.

And therefore they carried tales to the Government?—Yes.

Do you say that the intention of the Qadianis is to rob people of their money?—The plaintiffs did nothing to rob the public but they supported the people who intend to rob the public of their money.

Why do you say that they intend to rob the public of their money?—Daud Shah collected from the Sunnat Jama'at for his Quran and thereby he robbed them and Khwaja Kamal-ud-Din collected money to build the mosque. Therefore they rob their money.

Muslim Libel Case.

H. G. Sarwar

An anonymous letter was produced.

Mr. Campbell:—Do you know anything about this anonymous letter?—I know nothing about this letter. I did not write it.

Re-examined:—

Mr. Mundell:—Any one introduced the three Maulvis to you?—They came by themselves. Nobody introduced them to me.

Before they came to you did you know that they were recognised by the orthodox Muslims in Singapore?—Yes.

Did any of them besides Sharfudin lecture here?—Yes, and the other two also lectured in the Mosque.

Did you know them by reputation before you knew them?—Yes. The Government also respect them. Sharfuddin was Secretary of the Society of Alims in Trichinopoly. I knew him by reputation and therefore allowed my name to be published.

Have they lectured in the mosque on Fridays?—Yes. They have lectured in the mosque on Fridays during the service.

Were they respected afterwards before they left?—They were respected greatly.

Any form of respect shown to them?—His hands were kissed by the public. He was given dinner before he left for India.

Did you allow the 2nd plaintiff's name to be used in this circular?—Yes.

What is your idea for writing his name?—I included his name because he supported Daud Shah and that applies also to Bashir A. Mallal and the 1st plaintiff.

Mr. H. G. Sarwar, recalled by Mr. Mundell:—

Was the evidence you gave as to the meaning of the word 'jihad' given as your own opinion or as the teachings of Sunnat Jama'at?—The evidence I gave as to the meaning of the word 'jihad' was given as the meaning of the Arabic word and as used in the Quran. Mostly it is translated as 'strive to work hard,' 'to labour' and sometimes 'to fight.'

What are the orthodox teachings with reference to this word?—The meaning in the Quran is 'to strive.' The word is used a hundred times in that sense. The post-classical meaning of the word is 'to fight' and in some cases that postclassical meaning is attached to the word in the Quran in my opinion wrongly. They swear by 'jihad' i.e. 'swear very hard.'

The general meaning among Easterns is 'working hard in the path of God.' It has now acquired a special meaning of a 'religious fight.' At the time when the Quran was written it meant 'striving hard'; for example 'A man churned the milk with jihad,' means that he did it so vigorously that he took all the butter out of it.

What are the orthodox teachings as to prophethood in Barroz?—I have never heard of this, but the orthodox believe in 'The Ulemah of my community are like the prophets of Israel.'

Is it a tradition that Jesus will come back and be buried near the prophet at Medina?—This is accepted by some. I am not an expert on traditions. Some say that these traditions are not to be believed. It is not a part of the essentials of Islam.

Can you say whether these traditions as to the return of the person of Christ are generally accepted by orthodox Muslims?—All that I can say is that there are some.

Can you say what percentage accept these traditions?—The people are generally ignorant people and they know nothing about these traditions. How can you say about the percentage? It is very hard when one is on oath to say the percentage. I cannot say that all traditions are correct.

At this stage the proceedings were adjourned to the 3rd March 1926.

Tenth Day—Wednesday, 3rd March 1926.

Mr. Sarwar's evidence continued:—

I have got a book from the Raffles Library by Alfred Guilanine M.A. Professor of Oriental Languages at Durham University. It is published by Clarendon Press at Oxford.

In the Chapter **Criticism of (Hades) Traditions by Muslims**, page 77 and page 81, he shows that many of the traditions are of doubtful authority.

His Lordship:—Belief in these traditions cannot be a test of one's faith?—The acceptance of a particular one of these traditions cannot possibly be considered a test of the Muslim faith.

Muslim Libel Case.

H. G. Sarwar

Mr. Mundell:—What about those traditions relating to the death of Jesus Christ?—It is a coincidence that these traditions appear in this book. The author very fairly states the case. Christ according to my view had not a father. About 90 per cent. of the people both learned and not learned believe that Jesus was born of a virgin.

Would the suggestion that Christ had a father be an addition to the faith in the Quran?—It is an inference from the language of the Quran. Muhammad Ali in his translation of the Quran interprets it so that that inference is not necessary. Many others before him have also refused to draw that inference from the language of the Quran.

Can the term Kaffir be applied to a person who has once been a Muslim?—Technically no. The right word for such a person is 'murtad.' If you say that he becomes a Kaffir then you will not be far wrong.

What does the Quran say about Kaffirs?—God is referring to those who are hypocrites, people who make mockery of God. I do not lay much stress on this point.

His Lordship:—There is a fine distinction in Minhaj, page 436. With regard to this the author says, 'believes a prophet or does something the like thereof etc.'

Would the claim, in your opinion, of false prophethood according to the orthodox teachings make a man a Kaffir?—Certainly. It would be against the Quran.

Will it make you a Kaffir if you believe in the Quran and do not believe in the other Holy Books?—Yes.

Cross-examined:—

Do the various sects of Islam claim the right to define for themselves what are and what are not true traditions?—Most certainly the Sunnat Jama'at claim this right and the Shias do not accept them. They have their own traditions.

Which traditions would the Sunnat Jama'at accept?—The Sunnat Jama'at generally accept two books, namely Sahi Bukhari and Sahi Muslim. Even amongst these they criticise certain traditions found even in these two books.

Is it correct to say to distinguish between true and untrue traditions is a right which a sect can exercise?—That is correct.

His Lordship:—Some sects follow one tradition and some another?—Yes.