

# Why Does Anis Ali, a Muslim, Wear a Sikh Kara?

by Hugh Fitzgerald



A curious story recently appeared in the British *Daily Mail* about one Anis Ali, a Muslim train driver at Heathrow who brought suit for “religious discrimination” because he had heard after the fact about training for drivers that involved a mock-terrorist attack, in which the “suspicious package” that had been planted had a sign on it – “Allahu akbar.” Naturally he was horrified – even though he had not been present for the training – and naturally he sued for lots of money to soothe his feelings, for Mr. Anis Ali is a sensitive plant. This preposterous suit did not succeed, but he did manage to extract, from two Sikh colleagues who expressed some anxiety about his wearing a Sikh “kara” bracelet, two thousand pounds apiece. The story is here: “Muslim train driver loses religious discrimination claim after suing security firm

working for Heathrow Express that used fake bomb daubed with words 'Allahu Akbar' as part of training exercise," by Janna Carr, [here](#).

*A Muslim train driver has lost his religious discrimination claim after suing a security firm for using a fake bomb with the words 'Allahu Akbar' on it as part of a training exercise.*

*Anis Ali, 36, launched a claim for compensation after he discovered that the fake suspicious package planted to test security procedures had the Arabic words for 'Allah is Greater' on it, an employment tribunal heard.*

*Mr Ali – who worked for Heathrow Express at the time – said that seeing the words of Islam connected to a simulated terror device 'violated his dignity' and created a 'hostile environment' for him.*

*However, the tribunal ruled he had not been discriminated against and it was unreasonable for him to take offence because 'this phrase has been used in connection with terrorist attacks'...*

Mr. Anis Ali can hardly be unaware that thousands of terrorist attacks have been carried out by people who shout, in Arabic, as they do their deed, "Allahu akbar." Does he need reminding? The two men who hacked Drummer Lee Rigby to death on a London street shouted "Allahu akbar." The Muslim driver running down pedestrians on Westminster Bridge shouted "Allahu akbar." As they massacred the cartoonists at the offices of Charlie Hebdo, the Kouachi brothers shouted "Allahu akbar." When Major Nidal Hasan murdered 13 of his fellow soldiers at Fort Hood, he shouted "Allahu akbar." So did he bombers at the Bataclan nightclub in Paris. The Muslim who murdered Sara Halimi cried "Allahu akbar," and so did the Muslim who stabbed Mireille Knoll and set her on fire. The killer of Rabbi Jonathan Sandler and three little children outside a Jewish school in

Toulouse cried "Allahu akbar." The Muslims who mowed down pedestrians in Nice, in Barcelona, in New York? All of them, in carrying out their carnage, managed to shout "Allahu akbar." Shall I go on, Mr. Ali? Or do you take my point, which was also the point of the employment tribunal judge who dismissed – a Daniel come to judgment – your absurd complaint. If you wish to take offense at having "the words of Islam connected to" terror, than you must take it up with all those Muslim terrorists, of whom I provided the tiniest sample above, for there have been nearly 38,000 terrorist attacks by Muslims around the world since 9/11. Or you might want to object to the most esteemed collector and winnower of hadith, Bukhari, who relates that Muhammad himself claimed in a well-known hadith that "I have been made victorious through terror." Did Muhammad's remark connecting Islam and terrorism "violate your dignity" and "create a hostile environment" for you? If so, I'm sorry. But Muhammad is always right. What do you expect us, the world's Infidels, to think, what with all this Allahu-akbaring when acts of terror are carried out, and the very words of Muhammad himself make that connection?

*Mr Ali, from Morden, south London, claimed that Redline had discriminated against him because of his religion by using the words Allahu Akbar in this context.*

*However, his claim was dismissed by employment judge Laurence Antsis, who ruled this was not directed at Mr Ali, saying: 'Regrettably, this phrase has been used in connection with terrorist attacks.'*

*He added that it was 'legitimate' for Redline to reinforce the suspicious nature of its packages by 'referring to known threats and matters connected with previous terrorist incidents' and it was 'not reasonable' for Mr Ali to take offence.*

Common sense prevailed, as it so often does not, and we should

be grateful for the no-nonsense judgment of Judge Laurence Antsis. The phrase “Allahu akbar” has long been uttered by Muslim terrorists, and it made sense to use the phrase as part of the “suspicious package” that was planted at Heathrow.

*Mr Ali, who now works for Great Western Railway, made two other claims of unlawful harassment related to his religion by colleagues at Heathrow Express and was successful in these.*

*In November 2016, a duty station manager called Davinder Hare complained to Heathrow Express about Mr Ali – known as Anis – wearing a Sikh kara bracelet despite being a Muslim.*

*He claimed that Muslim men would wear a kara to attract and then rape Sikh girls.*

*He emailed bosses and attached an article, which was extremely critical of the religion of Islam.*

*In March 2017, another Sikh colleague – a train driver called Narinder Rai – made similar remarks about why Mr Ali would wear a kara.*

This is the heart of the matter. Why would a Muslim wear what is a clear Sikh symbol? Was he asked that question by the tribunal? I am convinced the English judges had no knowledge that a Muslim male wearing a bracelet, and one which was clearly connected to the Sikh religion, was violating Muslim strictures. In trying to pass himself off as a Sikh, Anis Ali may indeed have been up to no good – with Sikh girls in mind who might be fooled, initially, into trusting him as a fellow Sikh. Even if that was not Anis Ali’s intention, this sort of thing has happened many times before, so often as to make his Sikh colleagues’ suspicions entirely justifiable.

*The tribunal, held at Reading, Berkshire, ruled that Heathrow Express and Mr Hare would have to pay Mr Ali a total of*

*£2,000 for 'injury to feelings' on grounds of religious discrimination for the first incident.*

*For the second incident, the tribunal ordered Heathrow Express and Mr Rai to pay combined £2,000 on the same grounds.*

*In November last year, Mr Ali was celebrated for his 'selfless' volunteer work during the coronavirus pandemic, completing 733 tasks for the NHS since March and donating more hours than any other volunteer in London.*

Mr. Anis Ali's "selfless" volunteer work is all well and good, but it should not affect any decisions about whether his two Sikh colleagues should each be made to pay him 2000 pounds for expressing their alarm about the reasons for his wearing a Sikh bracelet known as a "kara," and that is clearly recognized as such by Hindus, Sikhs, and Muslims in the U.K. as readily as in the subcontinent.

The heart of the matter is this: why would a Muslim wear a "kara" bracelet, and do so over at least two years (the first complaint was in 2016, the second in 2017) if not to fool Sikh girls into thinking he was one of them? The Qur'an is firm in telling Muslims not to take Jews and Christians, and by extension all non-Muslims, as friends, for "they are friends only with each other." They are further told that they are the "best of peoples," while non-Muslims are "the most vile of created beings." Now why would Anis Ali want to appear to be one of the "most vile of created beings"? There is a dress code for Muslim men as for Muslim women, and among its prohibitions is wearing silk or gold. Here is the relevant hadith: "The Prophet (peace and blessings of Allaah be upon him) said: "These two [gold and silk] are forbidden for the males of my ummah and permissible for the females. Narrated by Ibn Maajah, 3640; classed as sahih ('authentic') by al-Albaani in Sahih Ibn Maajah."

As can easily be found at dozens of websites devoted to the proper dress for Muslims, "It is haram to imitate the mushrikeen and kuffar in their manner of dress, so it is not permissible to wear clothing that is unique to the kuffar."

The "kara" bracelet is "unique to the kuffar" (in this case the "kuffar" are Sikhs). It is one of the required "Five Kakaars," or 5Ks, that Sikh males must observe. These are the Kesh (uncut hair), Kangha (a wooden comb for the hair), Kara (a steel bracelet), Kachera (a cotton tieable undergarment), and the Kirpan (a steel dagger large enough to be used to defend oneself).

The Sikhs who complained – unlike the English judge who found no merit in their alarm, and forced each to pay 2000 pounds to Anis Ali for "injury to his feelings" – knew that Muslims are forbidden from wearing anything that is closely associated with the kuffar. The "kara" certainly qualifies as a symbol of allegiance to Sikhism. Muslim males are forbidden from wearing any jewelry except a single silver ring. Why would Anis Ali have violated the clear prohibitions of Islam? Davinder Hare and Narinder Rai are two Sikhs whose worries are based not on prejudice or wild surmise, but on their knowledge of how some Muslim men pass themselves off as Sikhs, the better to attract and seduce Sikh girls. The "kara" is their disguise.

Muslim men have been preying on Sikh girls in the U.K (as well as in Pakistan) for many decades. That story has been lost in the larger story of Muslim grooming gangs preying on white English girls. Especially in the Midlands, Sikh girls, too, have been targeted. Often their Muslim seducers, expensively dressed, arrive in flashy cars to pick them up at the end of the school day. And some pass themselves off as Sikhs. The girls are introduced to drink or drugs, sweet-talked all the while, then used for sex and eventually, passed around like party favors to other members of the grooming gang. For decades Sikhs have been complaining to the police about these grooming gangs, but gotten nowhere, just as the parents of

English girls got nowhere: the police were afraid of being accused of "racism." Unlike the English parents, the Sikh communities have organized vigilante groups to monitor the activities of Muslim men around Sikh girls. It was out of that knowledge of the need to be hyper-vigilant that Narinder Rai and Davinder Hare, quite independently of one another, complained about Anis Ali and his – for them all too explicable – wearing of the "kara." It's too bad that those who sat in judgment on them, and made them pay, literally, for their understandable alarm, didn't realize what a violation of Muslim rules Anis Ali had committed, and even more unforgivable, knew nothing, apparently, about the Muslim use of deception to inveigle Sikh girls into a hell of forced sex and drugs from which many never recover. Surely Anis Ali intended no such thing. Why, then, was he wearing the kara?

First published in