

**REVEREND BHAM'S
FUTILE ATTEMPT TO
EXONERATE HIMSELF
FROM HIS HARAAM
SHENANIGANS**

**PUBLISHED BY:
THE MAJLIS
PO Box 3393
Port Elizabeth, 6056
South Africa**

THE REVEREND'S RADIO LAMENT

While Mr. Navlakhi of SANHA is adept in the art of fabricating and spinning arguments to halaalize carrion, the Reverend Abraham Bham has gained some expertise in the art of spinning arguments to justify zina and kufr. His sorry lament on Channel Shaitaan was designed to exonerate himself from the villainy of promoting zina and kufr which were the themes of the so-called 'marriage' conference where Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) and the Sahaabah (radhiyallahu anhum) were made targets for the mockery of the kaafir clown.

The lament of the Reverend in no way whatever exonerates him from culpability. On the contrary, he has displayed self-pity in a wrongful manner. He was arguing and pleading for exculpation. His attempt to free himself from the haraam debacle of the zina-kufr function has miserably failed, for men of intelligence cannot be duped by the hollow and insincere lament of the Reverend. For his ilk, the Qur'aan states unequivocally:

“Say (O Muhammad to them): ‘What do you mock at Allah, His Aayaat and His Rasool? Do not present excuses. Verily, you have committed kufr after (having accepted) Imaan.’ (At-Taubah, Aayat 66)

Proffering excuses will not avail. The need is to make an unconditional declaration of Taubah. The villainy and sin of the debacle have to be accepted. Nothing short of a sincere Taubah is acceptable to Allah Ta'ala. Let us now examine the Reverend's sorrowful and hollow lament.

THE KAAFIR CLOWN DEBACLE

(1) In his lamentable response, Reverend Abraham Bham said:

“My response is not going to be in the category of speaking about clown, ringmasters or mickey-mouse. Err Allah Ta’ala in the Holy Qur’an says “Do not dispute with the people of the scriptures except in a way that is good.””

This is the type of devious argument which people of deviation employ. While the reverend is not concerned with the honour of Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam), Hadhrat Aishah (Radhiyallahu anha) and Hadhrat Abu Hurairah (Radhiyallahu anhu), he is desperately concerned with exonerating himself from the haraam debacle of kufr for which he was responsible.

Being concerned with the Clown of Kufr is of fundamental importance. The Clown is an inextricable factor of the zina-kufr function. He cannot be swept away or hidden under the carpet. The focus may not be shifted from all the kufr and zina which had transpired at the function which the Reverend and his cohorts had fully promoted.

The Qur’aanic verse quoted by the Reverend is an attempt to pull wool over the eyes of the unwary and ignorant. We are addressing people who profess to be Muslims. The Reverend says that he is a Muslim. The Clown says that he is a Muslim. The Aayat refers to the Yahood and Nasaara. The Shariah’s punishment for the blasphemer is execution, not to speak to him *“in a way which is good”* as the Reverend deceptively argues. The aayat has been misdirected. It has absolutely no relevance in so far as the kufr of the clown and the promotion of zina and kufr by the Reverend are concerned.

The Reverend advises that we should speak with ‘decorum’ regarding the disgusting kufr uttered by the clown. While he defends the clown, castigates those who condemn the clown for his kufr, he shockingly ignores the blasphemy and the insult vituperated at Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam), Hadhrat Aishah (Radhiyallahu anha) and Hadhrat Abu Hurairah (Radhiyallahu anhu). The Aayat pertaining to the Ahl-e-Kitaab cannot be presented to justify the clown’s kufr antics nor to defend the murtad clown.

The Reverend is stupid. Added to his stupidity is his arrogance and contumacy. For his edification, let him open his ears and listen! During the Khilaafat of Hadhrat Umar (Radhiyallahu anhu) a group of youngsters playing in the street severely assaulted a Christian priest who had insulted Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) in their presence. The inflamed children killed the priest. The relatives of the priest hastened to Hadhrat Umar and demanded that punishment be meted out. They demanded Qisaas.

When Hadhrat Umar (Radhiyallahu anhu) heard the full story, he expressed his *shukr* (gratitude) to Allah Ta’ala for the Imaani fervour and courage He had bestowed to the children. He praised and exonerated them. He dismissed the claim of the relatives of the priest. Despite this killing having been what they will nowadays term ‘extra-judicial’, Hadhrat Umar (Radhiyallahu anhu) upheld the sentence meted out by the children to the blasphemer. He did not cite the Qur’aanic aayat which the Reverend recited in defence of the clown who had blasphemed Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam). Stupid molvis of this era tear just any aayat from the Qur’aan and just any Hadith from the Books of Ahaadith to suit their stupid ideas in the attempt to bolster their nafsani agendas.

The ayat referring to the Ahl-e-Kitaab does not deal with blasphemers – those who disparage and insult Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam), the Sahaabah and Islam. The Aayat instructs a methodology of Da'wat and Tableegh to be observed in general, but not in every circumstance. As far as the clown is concerned, the Shariah's *ahkaam* pertaining to *Shatm-e-Rasool* (*Abusing / insulting the Nabi – Sallallahu alayhi wasallam*) and *Irtidaad* (*becoming a murtad / renegade by disgorging the effluvium of kufr*), are applicable.

The Aayat referring to the method of Da'wat to the Ahl-e-Kitaab cannot be applied to an adulterer, a thief, a murderer, etc. The harsh *Hudood* (*prescribed punishments*) come into force. To a greater degree will the severe punishment for blasphemy apply to the clown and all blasphemers. Those who promote the blasphemers will also be dealt with harshly.

The Reverend suffering from the malady of excessive self-pity goes to stupid lengths to vindicate himself and in offering covert and veiled defence for the blaspheming clown.

Sight should not be lost from Rasulullah's treatment of some blasphemers on the occasion of the Conquest of Makkah. Despite the general pardon and amnesty extended by Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) to all the mushrikeen of Makkah, certain blasphemers of the clown's ilk were excluded and were put to death despite their pleadings and their intention of accepting Islam. One chap was in fact killed whilst hanging on to the *Ghilaaf* of the Ka'bah, and a woman singer was executed as well because she used to compose lewd songs of insult against Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam). Several such blasphemers were not spared and were executed. The Aayat

cited by the moron Reverend did not save these blasphemers. For the blasphemers, the Qur'aan's message is unambiguous:

“Do not present excuses. Verily, you have committed kufr after having embraced Imaan.”

The citation of the Aayat by the Reverend is a clear attempt to bamboozle unwary people with calculated deception which is the trademark of these molvis drowned in their egotistical narcissism. It is the disease of *hubb-e-jah* (love for filthy name and flapdoodle fame) which has constrained the Reverend to embark on his damage-control exercise to vindicate the colossal damage he and his clown have perpetrated with their explicit kufr. Thus the ‘decorum’ about which the Reverend speaks is in fact an attempt to defend the indefensible acts of zina and kufr which were the fundamental ingredients of the zina-kufr so-called marriage conference.

(2) Employing his forked-tongue deception, the Reverend says: *“I have not come here to justify or appease anyone.”*

In fact, this is precisely what the Reverend's pitiful lament was all about. He laboured and struggled to vindicate himself and to defend the clown with the Qur'aanic aayat which has absolutely no relevance to blasphemy uttered by one professing to be a Muslim. His mournful lament was also calculated to deceive the unwary and the ignorant. His entire lament was a futile attempt to defend and justify what cannot be defended and justified in terms of the Shariah.

A RED HERRING LAMENT

(3) The Reverend says: *“When you come in the Qabr, when you stand in front of Allah, you will stand alone.”*

If this is indeed his belief, what was he doing on the radio standing in front of thousands trying to justify himself and the clown? A man of Haqq will not stoop to the despicable level of attempting to clear his name from slander. If the Reverend believes that the accusations against him are slanderous, then he should go to some Shaikh to learn what the reaction of a Mu'min should be. Whilst he endeavours to project an image of innocence for himself by arguing deceptively the Qabr scenario, he acts in blatant conflict with the attitude which the Qabr scenario requires of a true Mu'min. What does a man who is at home in kuffaar gatherings, immoral gatherings and zina-kufr gatherings know of the Qabr? The Qabr story is a portrayal of his *nifaaq*.

THE KUFR FUNERAL DEBACLE

(4) The Reverend abortively laboured to exonerate himself from the kufr antics associated with the burial of the politician, Ahmed Kathrada. Whatever his religious persuasion was – Allah Alone knows – the fact is that there is no clear evidence to confirm that he had renounced Islam. As such it was imperative – Waajib – to have given the deceased an Islamic burial. In total and wanton rejection of the family's wishes AND THE DIRECTIVE OF THE DECEASED HIMSELF, the Reverend and another character, Ismail Wadee, colluded with the politicians to give the deceased a kuffaar funeral service, and to bury him in a non-Muslim cemetery. The Reverend is guilty of falsehood by claiming that he did not have a dirty hand in despatching the deceased like a non-Muslim *maitah*.

If the Reverend was a Muslim at heart, he would never have participated in that kufr-style funeral and burial service. He is

fully aware that the family is the *Wali* of the mayyit, yet he and Ismail Wadee acted in conflict with the Shariah, the wishes of the family, and Kathrada's burial directive, to satisfy the whims and desires of the politicians and their own shaitaani egos. He is solely responsible for the debacle of the haraam burial.

It is another issue that a man will die the way he led his life, and be resurrected among his associates on the Day of Qiyaamah. Those who neglected and abandoned Salaat will, for example, be resurrected with Fir'oun, Haamaan and Qaaroon. The mayyit's life was squandered in haraam politics and with non-Muslim politicians, hence he was sent off into Barzakh in non-Muslim style. Allah Ta'ala operates in mysterious ways which are not always comprehensible to people. However, this does not allow a Muslim to act in contravention of the Shariah. We have to add that Allah Ta'ala had chosen the Reverend to oversee the kuffaar-style funeral/burial service. After all, the title of Reverend has not been awarded to him for no valid reason. Only a Reverend is capable of conducting a funeral kuffaar-style. Although we say in terms of the *Zaahiri Shariah* that the Reverend had committed kufr regarding the burial, the scenario befitted the mayyit and the Reverend.

The 'Kathrada Foundation' consisting of non-Muslims had no legal right over the body of the mayyit. The family had the right. However, since Allah Ta'ala in His Wisdom willed that the mayyit be accorded a non-Muslim funeral service, the family shunned its responsibility and acted spinelessly by acquiescing to the haraam funeral service.

The family had the obligation to assert their Islamic and constitutional right which demanded that their mayyit should not be subjected to the un-Islamic haraam burial service

which the Reverend gleefully arranged to fulfil the inordinate lusts of his ego. No one could compel him to submit to the massive haraam abomination which he had perpetrated. His stupid attempt to shift the blame to the non-Muslim Foundation is unacceptable and palpably false and designed to hoodwink the Muslim community.

The family debunks Bham's claim that the funeral was ordered by the Kathradah Foundation and the Provincial government. The grave in the non-Muslim section of the cemetery was selected by Ismail Wadi, the executor of Kathrada's will, and a board member of the Foundation. But both these entities had no right and no power to compel acceptances of their desires even if they had expressed such wishes which are in conflict with Islamic rites.

Disgorging a blatant LIE, Reverend Bham said:

“Now, we know that Marhoom Ahmad Kathrada had a Foundation, and the decision with regard to his burial and with regard to where he will be buried and with regard to his funeral was made by his Foundation, the Provincial Government of the ANC, which Ahmad Kathrada throughout his life had been a member of the ANC. And that was the decision that was there, that was made by certain members of the Foundation, which of course I'm not a member of the Foundation, and of course it was made by the provincial government and the Jamiat did not have any say with regard to that decision.”

The following interview with the Family debunks the Reverend's LIE. The following transpired:

The Majlis: *Did the late Ahmed Kathrada leave a burial directive regarding his funeral / burial service? If yes, what*

were his instructions? A copy of the directive shall be appreciated.

The Family: He did give a verbal burial directive to his wife (non-Muslim) and another family member that he should be buried Islamically within the prescribed time. Thus upon his demise his wife excluded herself from the entire burial process due to his wish of being buried Islamically and she accordingly advised the family to attend to the burial. The family then turned to the Ulama for guidance and were advised that it is permissible to delay the burial for a day. The Ulama present were Ebrahim Bham and Moosa Seedat.

The Majlis: *What were the family's wishes? Did the family agree to have a non-Muslim style funeral service?*

The Family: The family were guided by the Ulama. Had those Ulama who were present at the time objected to the delayed burial and unislamic funeral service the family would have accepted the advice of the Ulama.

The Majlis: *Whose idea was it to bury him where he now lies? When did Mr. Wadee enter the scene? And who authorized him to negotiate the burial?*

The Family: Ismail Vadi is the executor of the deceased's estate as per the will. This is where his authority stems from. According to a family member, Ismail Vadi convinced them that it was permissible to bury there.

The Majlis: *Did the Kathrada Foundation have any role in the burial?*

The Family: The Kathrada Foundation did not have a direct role.

However, Vadi is a board member.

The Majlis: *Since the Family is the Wali of the mayyit, why did they not restrict the burial to the Sunnah Janaazah system?*

The Family: They believed that it was permissible as there were Ulama guiding them. Subsequently, prior to the burial and on the same day of death, when objections were raised regarding the permissibility, none of the family members cared to enforce the truth and challenge those Ulama to avoid division in the family as other members were content with the ruling of the Ulama.

The Majlis: *Why did the family agree to delay the burial almost two days when it is an established fact that the mayyit should be buried the same day as soon as possible?*

The Family: Because Bham and Seedat said it was permissible.

The Majlis: *At what stage did Mr. Wadee inspect the burial site? Was Ahmed Kathrada still alive at that stage? And, who asked Mr. Wadee to choose the grave?*

The Family: Yes, he was alive at the time of the inspection. **The Foundation chose the site.**

It should now be clear that the organizers of the whole haraam funeral and burial debacle were Bham and Wadi. To bootlick the politicians, Bham, Seedat and Wadi deemed it appropriate to invite the Wrath of Allah Azza Wa Jal by acting in violent conflict with the Shariah. The more these agents of Iblees attempt to exonerate themselves, the further they sink into the quagmire of lies, falsehood and haraam.

THE LENASIA EIDGAH DEBACLE

(5) In a huge presentation of pure bunkum, the Reverend painfully and baselessly attempted to justify the **INVITATION** which the NNB jamiat of Fordsburg had issued to the deputy president for attending the Eidgah and to address the gathering of musallis. His claim that the deputy president invited himself thereby imposing on the Muslim community his will, is a blatant LIE. And, even if we have to assume that the deputy president had invited himself, it was the obligation of the NNB jamiat to have politely declined.

The Reverend's attempt to justify his haraam invitation with the non-Muslim delegations which visited Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) in Musjid-e-Nabawi is corrupt and baseless. This miscreant jaahil Reverend is not a mujtahid. Leave alone being a mujtahid, his jahl is conspicuously displayed on a range of masaa-il. He dwells in jahl-e-muraqqab.

It is not the function of a muqallid to dig out Ahaadith, submit them to his opinion and fabricate masaa-il. Ijtihad was the function of the Aimmah-e-Mujtahideen. The Muqallid has to incumbently submit to the masaa-il of the Shariah as formulated by the Fuqaha. The Reverend portrays his jahaalat of the simple, basic mas'alah pertaining to entry of people in a Musjid. It is not permissible for even a Muslim to enter a Musjid without Wudhu. What now is the fatwa pertaining to a non-Muslim who perpetually wallows in the state of janaabat – physical janaabat (najaasat-e-haqeeqi) and spiritual najaasat (kufr), hence the Qur'aan commands that the najis mushrikeen should not be allowed near to the Musjid.

It is haraam to seek to scuttle this mas'alah of the Shariah by digging out a Hadith and fabricating a stupid mas'alah on the basis of opinion. The Pillar in Masjid-e-Nabawi which marks the place where the delegates sat does not cancel the mas'alah of prohibition. While the pillar is in its place, the mas'alah of prohibition remains unaffected in its place. We have published a detailed explanation on the impermissibility of permitting non-Muslims in the Masjid as well as the impermissibility of them giving Muslims a bayaan.

“Interacting with the authorities” does not necessitate compromising the principles and teachings of the Deen. It does not warrant the perpetration of haraam. The community has been interacting with the authorities since the time Muslims settled in this country. Such interaction never required the presence of politicians in the Musaaqid to address the musallis. However, the type of interaction which the moron Reverend is advocating is bootlicking at the cost of undermining the Deen, and corrupting what is holy to us.

Muslims go to the authorities as citizens of the land. The authorities are the servants of the citizens. So, the stupid priest of the cross should not produce this red herring to daunt and scare the community. If the authorities deny us our religious and constitutional rights merely because we say that the deputy president or the president is not allowed to enter the Masjid, then such denial will be oppression and injustice. In the face of oppression we have to adopt Sabr, and tolerate the oppression for the sake of Allah's Pleasure and to protect our Deen.

The Reverend advocates undermining the Deen for the sake of student visas and other requisites which the authorities are bound to provide, not as favours, but as constitutional rights.

The authorities are paid more than fat salaries by the citizens. They are obliged by the constitution to fulfil the mandate granted to them, and to deal with all citizens justly in terms of their own principle of non-discrimination.

Furthermore, it is not said that the authorities are corrupting us as this Reverend – the agent of Iblees – has framed his rubbish. We say that the Reverend and his evil NNB jamiat are corrupting the community with their promotion and commission of fisq, fujoor and kufr. No one said that the authorities are corrupting us. The charge is simply that the evil committed by the miscreants of the NNB jamiat is corruption which corrupts the ignorant and the unwary.

The ‘repercussions’ which the Reverend mentions are his hallucination to instil fear in the community. He implies that in order to curry favour with the authorities we have to undermine our Deen and act in violation of the Shariah despite this not being compelled on us by the authorities. We are sure that the deputy president would have understood the mas’alah of prohibition better than the shaitaani Reverend and his NNB jamiat cohorts. If the Shar’i reasons had been explained rationally to the deputy president, assuming that he had invited himself, he would have understood, and if he really wanted to pass a message to the Muslim community, it could have been done by publication in the media.

“Non-Muslims coming into our environment” is not the issue. They are not prohibited from coming into such of our environments which are public places besides the Musaajid. A shaitaani hall where haraam wedding functions and other acts of shaitaaniyat are committed would have better served the Reverend’s insatiable crave for publicity and bootlicking. He

could have arranged for the deputy president's 'bayaan' at such a hall where he, his NNB jamiat and their ilk could have assembled for their merrymaking. The Musaaqid are not venues for politicians to deliver messages.

The Reverend Abraham Bham and his NNB jamiat cohorts are the fulfilment of Rasulullah's prediction regarding the preponderance of the ulama-e-soo'. Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) alerting the Ummah to these villains, said:

“Soon will there dawn an age when.....the worst of the people under the canopy of the sky will be their ulama. From them will issue fitnah, and the fitnah will rebound on them.”