

ISRAEL, PAKISTAN AND THE MUSLIM WORLD

PUBLISHED IN TERJUMAN-UL-QURAN &
VICTORY NEWS MAGAZINE

ISLAMIC FOUNDATION, LEICESTER UK

(September 2003) – (13 May 2004)

PROF. KHURSHID AHMAD



ISRAEL, PAKISTAN AND THE MUSLIM WORLD

By Prof. Khurshid Ahmad

To resolve differences and to try to untangle the complicated issues is the sign of wisdom and prudence. But the irony is that the power-occupying generals and their like-minded intellectuals are ruthlessly trying to make the settled issues controversial. The obvious result of this is that neither a way out of the quagmire of internal problems and difficulties is being unearthed nor is any silver lining in the politics of foreign policy seen on the horizon. In addition to the flood of bankruptcy of thought, contradictory approaches, and faux pas, it is now the principles stand and time proven and undisputed issues that are becoming susceptible, vulnerable and ephemeral, as the doors of violating each and every principle, fact and established norm are opened up in the name of interests.

There was already a heavy burden of problems, but the poverty of thought and absence of any principles in the field of foreign policy has exposed the country and the nation to such dangers and risks which, if not encountered forthwith, may, God forbid, imperil Pakistan's ideological identity and historical role. Mere expediency would not solve these problems as the issue is about principles and strategic interests of the country and the nation, which cannot be compromised for the sake of someone's pleasure or for some concessions.

The question of recognizing Israel has been raised quite passionately and fanatically. The conspirators from both within and without are trying to level the ground in Pakistan for Israel's recognition.

The question is that why this issue has been raised at this point of time. It is time when there is fire and blood everywhere in Palestine, Intifada-al-Aqsa has entered its third year and about 2,500-3,000 Muslim men, women and children have been killed during this period. According to a report of the human rights body 'LAW' in Palestine, Zionists have captured about one-and-half million people since 1948, tortured them and jailed them without any trials. They inflicted injuries to 300,000 Palestinians out of which 40,000 were rendered permanently disabled. They expelled from Palestine its original inhabitants in so large numbers that now Palestinian refugees outside Palestine, about four-and-half million, total Israel's whole population. Some 800,000 are living today in the refugee camps. 170 hospitals, 315 schools and seven universities have been completely destroyed; 60 percent of cultivable land of Arab territories have been burnt; 370 factories have been razed; and over 600,000 animals have been killed.

Now, a 210-mile long huge wall is being erected because of which Israel would occupy 10-15 percent more of the already ransacked land of Arabs. Thus, the region that is being considered the centre of the future state of Arabs would be broken up into many parts and Israel's army and settlers would continue to occupy it.

In the light of this unending saga of oppression and suppression as well as the deliberate strategy, it is not difficult to find out that Israel is not ready to any proposal for peace. In spite of the so-called road-map and appointment of its favourites as Palestine's Prime Minister and police chief, its attacks on innocent public with tanks and F-16 fighter are continuing unabated. Political leaders and Ulema are being target-assassinated. The entire Arab population is besieged by erecting walls, so much so that even Yasser Arafat has been cornered and confined to his official compound. It is clear that the so-called road-map is nothing but a mirage, an illusion since there is not 'ground' under the feet of Palestinians - what to talk of map!

Such is the terrible situation, on the hand, but, on the other, a monologue about recognizing Israel was started before General Pervez Musharraf's visit to Camp David. Then, Secretaries of Foreign Affairs and Information began sermonizing in favour of recognizing Israel. As if not to be left behind, the Interior Minister and Sardar Abdul Qayyum also jumped into the foray. This made Jan's Intelligence Digest of July 2003 almost declared that Pakistan had decided to recognize Israel. It said:

"Pakistani authorities, particularly the military leadership close to the President, have already taken a decision to establish direct links with Israel. Musharraf seems determined to push forward with his agenda in the near future."

According to this defence journal, this all is being done as it would facilitate Pakistan and its army, with respect to relations with India and United States, in purchasing weapons.

"The decision of recognizing Israel is set to have a significant impact on the General Pervez Musharraf's attempts to stabilize Pakistan as well as his own political future."

The message of these intelligence reports about defence issues is that while decision has been taken "General Musharraf is keen on testing the likely reactions; both at home and abroad."

While we would present our view substantiating it with arguments, we want to foretell the result of our analysis in clear words that recognizing Israel would be an error of Himalayan proportions on our part, and that it would incite nation's hatred and protest besides inviting Allah's wrath. This would throw the country into instability, rather than giving strength, to Pakistan or to Pervez Musharraf's rule. An analysis of what has been written on this and what has been said in speeches and comments since it was first suggested clearly establishes that, except a few individuals, the entire nation is against it.

The Foundations for Legitimacy of a Country

The question of recognizing a country relates to international law, diplomacy, and trade. It is not necessary for every country to recognize each and every country, or to establish diplomatic or trade relations with it. This issue is, in the main, related to two aspects: first, whether the country

with which relations are under consideration is a legitimate and sovereign entity; and second, if it is in our national interests to establish diplomatic and trade relations with it. The first question has its own legal, political and ethical grounds, while the second one is concerned solely with interests. Also, under international law and traditions it is not necessary to recognize and establish of diplomatic and trade ties with every country with which you are not in the state of war. For various reasons, many countries did not recognize one another for decades, without incurring any harm.

From a pure legal perspective, to recognize a country is to accept it as a legitimate entity. According to international law, a country should meet four conditions for this: defined geographic borders, population, sovereignty, and territory.

These are essential elements for a country to be recognized as an independent entity. Recognition is, therefore, not conferred on a country whose case is disputable with respect to any of these four elements. A country or area that is under the control of some other force is not recognized as sovereign; it is also not recognized if it is considered as lacking in legitimacy for any other reason - and this may span a period of many centuries.

The Status of Israel

The case of Israel is altogether different from other countries.

The Palestinian land was not the original habitat of Israelis, who entered it 1,300 years BC and occupied it after battles for 200 years. They were twice moved out of the land. Romans expelled them completely from Palestine in 135 AD. In the history of 6,000 years, Israelis' stay was just about four to five hundred years in the Northern Palestine, and about eight to nine hundred years in the South; whereas Arabs have been living for 2,500 years in the Northern and for 2,000 years in the Southern areas.

Divine Pledge or Myth

Zionists base their claim on the Palestinian land in a so-called Divine pledge in the Bible. This is no more than a myth, at the most. On the basis of this make-believe, imaginary right, Europe's rich and politically ambitious Jew leadership launched a Zionist movement towards the end of the 19th century. With temptation, oppression and suppression, political manoeuvring and colonialist designs, and by pitching Arabs and Turks against each other, they got foothold in this land during the times of British mandate. Thus, the goal of establishing a Jewish state of Israel was realized apparently under a UN General Assembly resolution on 14 May 1948, but in reality by the use force and military might and Palestinians' forceful expulsion and genocide. Arther Koestler, a Jew intellectual and writer, was enamoured in his youth by Zionism and left his home in Germany to move to Jewish settlements (kibbutz). But when he witnessed the cruelty meted out to Palestinians, he summed up the whole tragic episode:

"One nation solemnly promised to a second nation the country of a third nation"
(Arther Koestles, Promise and fulfillment, London, 1949, P-4)

In 1914, there were just 3,000 Jew families living in Palestine and their number could only reach 56,000 in spite of large-scale emigration of Jews to Palestine after the First World War, whereas there were 644,000 Palestinian Arabs at that time. When Israel was given the form of a State with the use of force, bloodshed and oppression, Jews held just 5.6 percent of the Palestinian land and barely constituted 33 percent of Palestine's population. It is worth mentioning here that the Jew population had increased ten-fold as Jews from 80 countries of the world had been settled here for over a period of 30 years while Palestinians were being expelled and their towns were being destroyed!

Through the UN resolution, 56 percent of the Palestinian land was presented to Jews on a platter while the remaining 44 percent was sanctioned to the independent State of Palestine. However Israel's extremist groups occupied 78 percent of the land when it was still the year 1948, followed by occupation of what remained of Palestine, including Eastern Jerusalem, in 1967.

A 'Stolen' Land

We do not intend to narrate the whole tragic episode, we want to highlight the historical fact that Israel is not a real and natural State coming to existence on the basis of the right of self-determination of the people of the region. Rather, it is a 'stolen' land and a state that has come into being by expelling the original inhabitants from their lands and settling the colonizers from outside. Without understanding the genesis of this State, it is impossible its position in the region. It is not a Middle Eastern State, it is an embodiment of a colonizing power's domination and suppression in the heart of the Middle East, a state that is devoid of legitimacy under the international law - and would remain so. It owes its existence to 'occupation by force' and to accept occupation a basis for conferring legitimacy to a country is not only a violation of the international law, it also constitutes a menace to international peace.

Writing in the International Herald Tribune, 25 July 2003, an expert of international law John V. Whitbeck says that the roadmap is an illusion. He rightly depicts the situation when says:

"The roadmap builds on a false premise, that the real problem is Palestinian resistance to the 36 years occupation and not the occupation itself"

He rightly concludes that not any so-called violence by Palestinians but Israel's occupation of Palestinians' land is the cause of problem. Peace is not possible without an end to the occupation. It is necessary to keep in view the following facts in order to understand the nature of and truth about this State:

Occupation by Force

Israel's Jews were not the original inhabitants of the region - nor are they to this date. They were collected from all over the world and given control of others' country by expelling the original inhabitants, merely with sheer use of force and under the umbrella of colonial power. Then, the United Nations was used for giving it legal legitimacy. These outsiders are imposing their culture and life-style on the region and are there only on the basis of force.

Not Based on Self-Determination

Israel is the only country in the world that has come into being on the basis of the UN General Assembly's resolution in utter violation of the UN Charter according to which people of a region can achieve freedom only by exercising their free will and their right of self-determination. Since Arabs were 66 percent of Palestine's population, the UN refused to opt for plebiscite in connivance with the US, Britain, and Russia and instead passed a resolution for Palestine's division for the establishment of two states.

Even the manner in which this all was done was quite questionable. The vote in the General Assembly was twice deferred due to lack of majority as only 30 of the then 56 members favoured it, 13 opposed it, and 13 remained neutral. By deferring the vote for two times and employing pressure and money, the US and the Zionist lobby forced three neutral countries (Haiti, Philippines, Liberia - which all were under the United States influence) to vote for the resolution for Palestine's division. So, this resolution was adopted by committing three violations of the UN Charter:

- a) Decision about a country's future without plebiscite
- b) Deferment of vote for two times
- c) Obtaining three countries consent 'under duress'

These facts are part of history and are available in the form of confessions in the speeches of the members of the United States Congress.

No Specified Borders

Israel is the only country whose establishment and existence depend on continuous and unnatural transfer of population and occupation of the region through oppression and use of force, and expansion of border through war and military might. Its borders are not yet defined. It got 56 percent of the Palestinian land in the wake of the UN resolution, which was enhanced to 78 percent through military aggression in 1967. After the 1967 war, directives for its retreat to pre-war positions were issued through UN resolutions 242 and 338, which were repeated in more than 20 resolutions, but Israel refused to heed to these calls.

The roadmap that is being talked about these days practically gives 40 percent of the 22 percent of land that was given to Palestinians, and the remaining area, which would be called Palestinian Authority now and Palestinian State after 2005, would remain in shambles and at the mercy of the occupier. This territory would neither be contiguous, nor would transportation from one part to another be possible without passing through Israel Check posts. Moreover, this so called State would never have its own army and the responsibility for law and order and policing would be with Israel, which would control all highways and water resources. Those who are talking about recognizing Israel today should tell as to what is the basis of their logic and what is that they are advocating for?

Expansionist Agenda

Here, it should be clearly understood that Israel's ideological basis is founded on 'expanding boundaries', which is but another name of imperialism and a threat to the whole region. Israel and its entire leadership has never kept the matter a secret and have openly declared that Greater Israel is their goal. Ben Gurion had said in 1948:

“The Achilles heel of the Arab coalition is Lebanon. Muslim supremacy in this country is artificial and can easily be overthrown. A Christian State ought to be set up there, with its southern frontier on the Litani. We would sign a treaty of alliance with this state. Thus when we have broken the strength of the Arab Legion and bombed Amman, we could wipe out Transjordan; after that Syria would fall. And if Egypt dared to make war on us, we would bomb Port Said, Alexandria and Cairo. We should thus end the war and would have but paid to Egypt, Assyria and Chaldea on behalf of our ancestors.”

(Ben Gurion diary, May 21, 1948)

Before this, at Versailles Peace Conference in 1919, World Zionist Organization had presented a map of its proposed Jewish State. According to this map, the areas that Israel wants to occupy include Egypt up to the Niles, whole of Jordan, whole of Syria, whole of Lebanon, a big portion of Iraq, Southern region of Turkey, and upper Hijaz up to Madina Munawwarah. **(My Diary at the Conference of Paris with Documents, D.H. Miller, vol 5, p 17)**

Addressing the Israeli parliament Knesset in 1982, just three years after the Camp David Accords, Israeli Prime Minister Manahan Begin had clearly said:

"By rights, the northern border of the Land of Israel ought to include the Golan Heights. That it was not included following the break-up of the Ottoman Empire in 1918 and the establishment of Britain's mandate over Palestine was due to the arbitrariness of colonial rulers in an era that has passed, never to return. We are not bound by this arbitrariness."

World Zionist Organization and Israeli leadership have always laid claim on accession of large areas and never showed any reservations in expressing their plans for their forceful occupation.

“Palestine is a territory whose chief geographical feature is this; that the river Jordan does not delineate its frontier but flows through its centre.”

(Vladimir Jabotinsky, at the 16th Zionist Congress in 1929)

“Take the American Declaration of Independence for instance. It contains no mention of the territorial limits. We are not obliged to state the limits of our state.”

(Ben Gurion's Diary, May 14, 1948)

“To maintain the status quo will not do. We have to set up a dynamic state bent upon expansion.”

(Ben Gurion in Rebirth and Destiny of Israel, The Philosophical Press, New York, 1954).

“During the last 100 years our people have been in a process of building up the country and the nation, of expansion, of getting additional Jews and additional settlements in order to expand the borders here. Let no Jew say that the process has ended. Let no Jew say that we are near the end of the road.”

(Moshe Dayan in Ma'ariv, July 7, 1968)

Israel's Defence Minister Moshe Dayan had said in an interview to the Times:

“Our father had reached the frontiers which were recognized in the Partition Plan. Our generation reached the frontiers of 1949. Now the Six Day generation has managed to reach Suez, Jordan and the Golan Heights. This is not the end.”

So, such are Israel's designs. Is there still any doubt about the fact that by its nature Israel is not a peace-loving state but a colonialist power? To recognize it, therefore, amounts to give legitimacy to colonialism. It would be relevant to present the perceptions of some known figures of the West about the State of Israel:

If it is proper to 'reconstitute' a Jewish state which has not existed for two thousand years, why not go back another thousand years and reconstitute the Cannanite state; the Cananites, unlike the Jews, are still there - H.G. Wells.

The cause of unrest in Palestine, and the only cause, arises from the Zionist movement, and from our promises and pledges in regard to it. (Sir Winston Churchill, 14 June 1921, in the House of Commons.) A Zionist state in Palestine can only be installed and maintained by force and we should not be a party to it.-(President Franklin Roosevelt, 5 March 1945). The Jewish state idea is not in my heart. I cannot understand why it is needed. It is connected with narrow-mindedness

and economic obstacles. I believe it is bad. I have always been against it.- (Albert Einstein, 1946.)
 These references are found in William Baker's eye-opener "Theft of a Nation".

The conclusion at which William Baker, himself a scholar of anthropology and history, arrives is:

Now consider what has taken place from 1917 to the present day. The entire country of Palestine has been "taken" by political Zionists, and it would seem the entire world has believed, supported and participated in the "theft" of an entire country from an entire nation. Land, homes, customs, economy, everything which formerly belonged to the Arab people have been replaced with Israeli control and influence, including the very name of the country! The assumption that Palestine is the Jewish homeland and they only require aid to get back what is "rightfully" theirs has been so well propagandised that one is accused of "discrimination" or anti-Semitism if not supportive of the occupation and theft of Palestine. But we must insist on presenting the facts regardless of the emotional response incurred from others, or there will never be a just and lasting settlement of this tragic injustice,

(Theft of a Nation, by William W. Bakes, Jireh Publication, West Missouri, LA. USA, 1989)

Racist State

The matter does not stop here. Israel is not just a colonial and expansionist State; it is also a racist one. If a Jewish State is formed in a region on the basis of Jews' majority there, perhaps no one would object to it as there are also Hindu States (like Nepal), Buddhist States (like Thailand and Sri Lanka), and Christian States (including the Vatican) in the world. But this is not the case with Israel. Occupying others' land, expelling them from their homes, and establishing a State by force and violence, its claim is that Jews being distinct and superior than other nations on racial grounds, and others are inferior, it is their right to establish their Great State and rule over the rest. This is quite like the mentality South African racist and apartheid regime. It is this feature that makes Israel a racist state contrary to the UN Charter as well the International Charter of Human Rights. This also makes it a menace to peace in the region, besides its enjoying an upper hand over other States in the region for its military power and nuclear capability.

Weizman, leader of the World Zionist Organization and first President of Israel ridiculing the democratic principle of majority and minority in the wake of the Balfour Declaration, had contemptuously declared that Jews were "qualitatively" better than the "native" Arabs. He had said:

The democratic principle reckons with the relative numerical strength; and the brutal numbers operate against us for there are five Arabs to one Jew...This system does not take into account the fact that there is a fundamental qualitative difference between Jew and Arab. The present system tends to level down the Jew politically to the status off a native.

When Einstein asked him what would become of Arabs if Palestine was given to Jews, Weizman shrugged, "What Arabs? They are hardly of any consequence."

The first Israeli Prime Minister Professor Ben Zion Dinur wrote in the foreword to History of the Haganah:

"In our country there is room only for the Jews. We shall say to the Arabs: Get Out! If they do not agree, if they resist, we shall drain them out by force." **(Quoted by Roger Garudy, The Case of Israel: A Study of Political Zionism, London, 1983, p 38)**

It is for such views that Arabs do not have the rights of second and third grade citizens in Israel, while under the Law of Return every Jew living in any corner of the world has the racial right to Israeli citizenship. The law that Israeli parliament has recently passed, for whose repeal the UN Human Rights Commission has demanded, holds that if an Arab man living on the West Bank in Palestinian marries an Arab woman living in Israel, the couple would have no right to live in Israel - either live separately, or leave Israel! So, what more proof is required to realize that Israel is a racist entity, and not a democratic state, and to recognize it would amount to negating the dignity humanity has so far achieved. In his charge-sheet against Israel, renowned French scholar Roger Garudy maintains:

1. The Zionist state of Israel possesses no legitimacy - historical, Biblical or juridical - in the place where it has been established. Nor does it possess any moral legitimacy; its conduct, both international and external (racism, expansionism, state terrorism) makes it a state like any other, and even sets it among the worst of states resembling those with which it is in fact most closely connected namely:

The United States, from which it takes over, for use against the Arabs, the worst of that country's traditions, namely its treatment of the Indians and the Blacks; whose worst actions, such as the Vietnam war, it emulates and whose "democratic" fictions combined with support, in Latin America, of the dictatorships it apes; South Africa, whose apartheid and archaic colonialism it practices; and El Salvador - Guatemala, Paraguay (the chief piece of refuge off the old Nazis), to whom Israel supplies arms and instructors to help them terrorize their peoples.

2. The constituent doctrine of the State of Israel, political Zionism - born not of Judaic tradition, which merely provides it with camouflage and pretexts, but of Western nationalism and colonialism of the 19th century - is a form of racism, nationalism and colonialism
3. This state, sprung from this false ideology and from a series of acts of violence and terrorism, was created in the name of an illegal decision by the United Nations' Organization (dominated at the time by the Western powers) and by means of pressure

and corruption. It has survived not through its own work and its own strength but, just like the Crusader states in their day, through an influx of money and weapons from, the West, and above all through the unconditional and unlimited backing of the United States, which has used it as a major element in its world strategy, as a wedge driven into the Middle East.

4. The Zionist State of Israel, stripped of the myths that were used to justify its foundation, and of the intellectual (and sometimes physical) terrorism that is used to protect it, is thus simply one state among the rest, without any halo or privilege or sacred character. Because all states owe their origin, just like Israel's, not to any "right" but to a certain relation of forces, and to accomplished facts.

(Roger Garudy; *The case of Israel: A Study of Political Zionism*, London, 1983, ppl57-158)

Islamic Viewpoint

The issue of the Israel's recognition is not just about recognizing or not recognizing a State. The land of Palestine is important not only for Palestinians or Arabs, it is important sacred for all Muslims. Al-Qudus is a place of sanctity for us where there are Masjid Al-Aqsa and the Dome of the Rock. For its being the first Qibla for Muslims, it is the most sacred place after Masjid Al-Haram in Makkah and Masjid Al-Nabawi in Madinah. The Holy Qur'an is witnessed to its sacredness:

سُبْحَانَ الَّذِي أَسْرَى بِعَبْدِهِ لَيْلًا مِّنَ الْمَسْجِدِ الْحَرَامِ إِلَى الْمَسْجِدِ الْأَقْصَا
الَّذِي بَرَكْنَا حَوْلَهُ لِنُرِيَهُ مِنْ آيَاتِنَا إِنَّهُ هُوَ السَّمِيعُ الْبَصِيرُ ﴿١٧﴾

“Glory to Allah who did take His Servant for a Journey by night from the Sacred Mosque to the Farthest Mosque, whose precincts We did bless, in order that We might show him some of Our Signs. He is the One Who hears and sees (all things).”

(Al-'Isra' 17:1)

Jewish occupation of Al-Aqsa and talk of recognition of Israel! Could there be any more perverse thinking?

Hostility towards Pakistan

From Day One, and particularly after acquiring nuclear capability, Pakistan has been a special target of Israel's hostility. Israel is working in collusion with India to destabilize the whole region and, more specifically, Pakistan. Is our leadership is unconscious of the designs of Israeli leadership? Ben Gurion's vow in Jewish Chronicle's issue of 19 August 1967 is recorded in history and serves as an eye- opener.

After the events of 11 September 2001, Shimon Perez, who has been Israeli Prime Minister, had said in an interview to the Newsweek that he and General Pervez Musharraf were on the same boat!

Right at the time when the General and his associates were talking about national debate on recognizing Israel, its official spokesman announced that Ariel Sharon would visit India in September and that even if Pakistan accepts Israel, it would give more importance to its relations with India. **(Ausaf, London, 12 July 2003)**

Perez's statement published in The Nation on 9 January is also worth pondering. He had said that Israel would side with India in case of an India-Pakistan war. So, is it this Israel with which expectations of good-will and friendship are being entertained!

The Views of Iqbal and Jinnah

While our leaderships do not tire talking about the vision of Pakistan's founding fathers, but know little about their views and feelings about Israeli and Zionist designs. Allama Iqbal very well knew the implications of Europe's being in clasp of Jews. He also asked: if Jews have any right on the Palestinian land, why should Arabs not lay claim on Spain!

On 25 October 1947, Quaid-e-Azam gave an interview to Reuters and made his position known. About a dozen of his statements from 1933 to 1948 as well as his letter to the U.S. President Truman are proofs of his stand against Israel. But the condition of our leadership is such that it has eyes but does not see, has ears but does not listen, and has heart but does not understand.

In the light of the principles that Islam have given us, as well, we have no justification to sanction its legitimacy by recognizing it for some vague interests at this juncture and isolate ourselves from the people of Palestine, Arabs, Muslims all over the world, and all oppressed people. Being an occupying force and oppressive power, it is playing havoc with the lives of our Muslim brethren. It is Arab people, not rulers and opportunists, who are our companions on the journey to common destination. Those who give preference to their own interest to those of the Muslim community and consider attaining the pleasure of their Western lords as their success, cannot be our co-travellers.

According to a recently conducted survey in Palestine, 87.9 percent of the population are in favour of Intifada al-Aqsa; 65.3 percent and 60.5 percent fully support armed struggle in Israeli territory and occupied West Bank; and 59.9 percent vote for suicide attacks. Abu Mazen commands confidence of only 1.8 percent of the population; and 67.8 percent think that he has been made Prime Minister only because of external pressure. However, 51.9 percent feel that resolution of the issue in the present circumstances is possible in the form of the establishment of two separate States, provided that the Palestinian States is really sovereign and independent to run its own affairs. **(Impact International, May 2003, p 13)**

But the signs of the establishment of such a Palestinian State are nowhere to be seen. In such circumstances, even a bit of retreat from our principled position would result in dire consequences. In the present situation, our duty is to support and back up our innocent and hapless brethren, rather than emboldening Israel by talking about its recognition. Qur'anic command shows us the way:

لَا يَنْهَىٰكُمْ اللَّهُ عَنِ الَّذِينَ لَمْ يُقَاتِلُوكُمْ فِي الدِّينِ وَلَمْ يُخْرِجُواكُم مِّن دِيَارِكُمْ أَن تَبَرُّوهُمْ
وَتُقْسِطُوا إِلَيْهِمْ ۗ إِنَّ اللَّهَ يُحِبُّ الْمُقْسِطِينَ ﴿٨﴾ إِنَّمَا يَنْهَىٰكُمْ اللَّهُ عَنِ الَّذِينَ قَاتَلُوكُمْ فِي
الدِّينِ وَأَخْرَجُواكُم مِّن دِيَارِكُمْ وَظَاهَرُوا عَلَىٰ إِخْرَاجِكُمْ أَن تَوَلَّوهُمْ ۗ وَمَن يَتَوَلَّهُمْ
فَأُولَٰئِكَ هُمُ الظَّالِمُونَ ﴿٩﴾

“Allah does not forbid you, with regard to those who do not fight you for your Faith nor drive you out of your homes, from dealing kindly and justly with them; for Allah loves those who are just. Allah only forbids you, with regard to those who fight you for your Faith and drive you out of your homes, and support others in driving you out, from turning to them for friendship. Those who take them for friends are indeed the wrongdoers.” (al-Mumtahinah 60:8-9)
