Hakikat Kitabevi Publications No: 19

ISLAM'S REFORMERS

M.Sıddık Gümüş

Eighteenth Edition

Hakîkat Kitâbevi
Darüşşefeka Cad. 53/A P.K.: 35
34083 Fatih-ISTANBUL/TURKEY
Tel: 90.212.523 4556–532 5843 Fax: 90.212.523 3693
http://www.hakikatkitabevi.com
e-mail: info@hakikatkitabevi.com
SEPTEMBER-2015

Publisher's Note:

Those who wish to print this book in its original form or to translate it into any other language are permitted to do so. We pray to Allâhu ta'âlâ to reward this beneficial deed of theirs, and we thank them very much. The permission is granted on the condition that the paper used in printing will be of good quality and that the design of the text and setting will be properly and neatly done without mistakes.

A Warning: Missionaries are striving to advertise Christianity, Jews are working to spread out the concocted words of Jewish rabbis, Hakîkat Kitâbevi (Bookstore), in Istanbul, is struggling to publicize Islam, and freemasons are trying to annihilate religions. A person with wisdom, knowledge and conscience will understand and admit the right one among these and will help to spread out that for salvation of all humanity. There is no better way and more valuable thing to serve humanity than doing so.

HÜSEYN HİLMİ IŞIK,
'Rahmat-Allahi 'alaih'

Hüseyn Hilmi Işık, 'Rahmat-Allahi 'alaih', publisher of the Hakikat Kitabevi Publications, was born in Eyyub Sultan, Istanbul in 1329 (A.D. 1911).

Of the one hundred and forty-four books he published, sixty are Arabic, twenty-five Persian, fourteen Turkish, and the remaining are books in French, German, English, Russian, and other languages.

Hüseyn Hilmi Işık, 'Rahmat-Allahi 'alaih' (guided by Sayyid 'Abdulhakim Arwâsî, 'Rahmat-Allahi 'alaih', a profound scholar of the religion and perfect in virtues of Tasawwuf and capable to guide disciples in a fully mature manner; possessor of glories and wisdom), was a competent, great Islamic scholar able to guide to happiness, passed away during the night between October 25, 2001 (8 Sha'bân 1422) and October 26, 2001 (9 Sha'bân 1422). He was buried at Eyyub Sultan, where he had been born.

TYPESET AND PRINTED IN TURKEY BY:
İhlâs Gazetecilik A.Ş.
Merkez Mah. 29 Ekim Cad. İhlâs Plaza No: 11 A/41
34197 Yenibosna-İSTANBUL Tel: 90.212.454 3000

Bismi'llâhi 'r-rahmâni 'r-rahîm

PREFACE

Allâhu ta'âlâ has compassion on all the people on the earth. He sends useful things to everybody. In the next world, He will do the favour of forgiving whomever He likes of the guilty Muslims who are to go to Hell, and He will put them into Paradise. He alone is the One who creates every living creature, keeps every being in existence every moment and protects all against fear and horror. Trusting ourselves to the honourable name of Allâhu ta'âlâ, we begin to write this book.

Hamd be to Allâhu ta'âlâ! Peace and blessings be on His most beloved Prophet, Muhammad (sall-Allâhu 'alaihi wa sallam)! Auspicious prayers be on the pure Ahl al-Bait (immediate relatives) and for each of the just and faithful Companions of that exalted Prophet!

The measurement of intelligence, using the testing methods, was done first by the Ottomans. As is written in American literature, the European statesmen were very much bewildered when the Ottoman Armies came to Vienna. They were terrified with the fear that Islam was spreading over Europe and Christianity was perishing. They endeavoured much in search of a solution for stopping the Ottoman attack. One midnight, the British ambassador in Istanbul cabled a message in cipher. He could not wait till morning to give the good news to Europe: "I found, I did!" he said. "I found the reason why the Ottomans won victory after victory and the solution for stopping them." And he explained as follows: "The Ottomans never torture the prisoners of war but treat them like brothers. They test the intelligence of little children no matter of which nationality or religion they are. Keen-witted children are selected and educated by qualified teachers in the school called 'Enderûn' in the Palace and, being taught Islamic knowledge, Islamic morals, science and culture, they are brought up as strong, enterprising Muslims. The distinguished commanders who caused the Ottoman armies to gain victory after victory and the outstanding men of politics and administration like [the two great Ottoman viziers] Sokullu and Köprülü all had grown up from among those keen-witted children brought up in this manner. For stopping the Ottoman attacks, it is necessary to extirpate these Enderûn schools and their branches, the madrasas, and to cause Muslims to decline in knowledge and science."

The dismal, heartrending events in the Ottoman history show that this suggestion of the British ambassador met with acceptance and the Scotch and Paris freemasonic lodges began to work assiduously. Many schemes were prepared to deceive Muslims and to prevent the

madrasas and schools from educating learned and scientific men of religion and administration. Younger generations were deprived of knowledge, were made irreligious and were accustomed to diversion and dissipation in Europe. They were given false licenses and diplomas to guise them as scientists and were sent back to the mother country to act as insidious enemies. Such ignorant persons of diplomas, the bigots of science, through very shrewd schemes costing millions and set by frreemasons, were made to take the lead in the Ottoman State. For example, Mustafa Reshid Pasha, Fuad Pasha and the like removed scientific courses from madrasas, while Mithat Pasha and Talât Pasha pared down the religious courses. In the time of Fâtih Sultan Muhammed Khân (Mehmed the Conqueror) the religious and scientific knowledge taught in madrasas had been in very advanced levels. But after Tanzimât (the political reforms of Abdülmejid in 1839), especially in the time of the Union Party, those levels fell down. The enemies of Islam became succesful by acting very insidiously and hypocritically. Especially Mithat Pasha had been prepared to attack mercilessly against Islam and the Qur'ân through perfidious plans. If the strong îmân and the keen intellect of Sultan Abdülhamid Khân II had not stood stiff like a steel shield against this poisonous dagger intended to be thrust through Islam, the enemy plans of destruction would have crushed Muslims. There are many evidences of this in the twelfth volume of **Türkiye Tarihi** (History of Turkey, Istanbul, 1967).

The enemies of Islam have always been trying to annihilate Islam and Muslims. Communists have been attacking through every kind of propaganda, loathome lies, slanders and very wild, barbaric tortures. Muslims see these base attacks and do not get deceived. Freemasons, however, have been attacking Islam through insidious, sweet words, smiling face, financial help and flattery. They say that all people, religious or irreligious, are brothers and that religion is unnecessary. They try to annihilate Islamic brotherhood to replace it with masonic brotherhood. The most terrible enemies of Islam are those who, pretending to be Muslims and disguising themselves as men of religious authority, try to demolish it insidiously from the inside. Such bigots of religion have come forth in Arabia and India. They deceive Muslims in their speech and articles with such misleading words as, "We will reform the religion. We will purify Islam from superstitions and heresies. We will expose the commands of the Qur'ân to view." They cause disunion and make brothers enemies to one another. Islam, however, commands union, mutual love and help. It is a duty for every Muslim to do favour and to disembarrass other Muslims and even non-Muslim fellow-countrymen, foreign businessmen and tourists. Rasûlullah (alaihi 's-salâm) said, **"The best of men is the one who is helpful to mankind"; "The person who owes a debt of human rights will not enter Paradise unless he pays it"; "Do not rebel**

even if those who govern you are Abyssinian unbelievers!" Both in his own country and in unbelievers' country, every Muslim should observe everybody's rights, should not do harm or offend anybody and should obey the laws and the administration. For this purpose, we should teach Islamic knowledge and its beautiful morals to the youth. If the pure youth are left ignorant of Islam, their belief in Islam and their morals will be corrupted by being deceived by false heroes and hypocritical friends, thus they will run toward endless disaster and ruination.

To attack Islam means to assassinate all the people on the earth, to tread on the human rights and human liberty and to attempt to change the prosperity of men into disaster. This evil offence has been committed for the pleasure, entertainment and fun of a handful of passion-blinded, stone-hearted group. May Allâhu ta'âlâ rescue people from this very ominous, grievous disaster; Âmin! Mere prayers with tongue or pen will not be accepted; it is also necessary to hold on to the means and make every effort possible. Muslims should know their frank and insidious enemies who attack their faith and happiness. They should not believe the lies of these enemies and should not disunite, nor should they forget that they are brothers. In the subject on "Bâghî", Ibn 'Âbidîn wrote: "The Khârijîs explained away (ta'wîl) the inexplicit documents (dalâ'il), that is, they attributed unclear, unusual meanings to some âyats and mutawâtir hadîths. Those who departed from Hadrat 'Alî's (radiy-Allâhu 'anh) soldiers and fought against him acted this way. They said, 'The judge is Allah only. Following the decision of two arbitrators, Hadrat 'Alî left the caliphate to Mu'âwiya (radiy-Allâhu 'anhumâ) and committed a grave sin.' This wrong explanation caused them to fight against him. They said 'disbelievers' about those who did not believe as they did. And now, those who follow Muhammad ibn 'Abd al-Wahhâb, who appeared in Najd, claim that solely they themselves are Muslims. They say 'polytheists' about those who do not believe as they do, and they regard killing them and taking away their property and women as halâl. The 'ulamâ' of fiqh, the mujtahids, did not say 'kâfir' about those who, like the Khârijîs and Wahhâbîs, departed on account of inexplicit documents, but said 'bâghî', **'âsî'** or 'ahl al-bid'a', that is 'non-madhhabite' or 'heretic'. One becomes a kâfir if he explains away wrongly and does not believe a dalîl with a single meaning which is openly understood. An example of this is to deny that the universe will be annihilated and that the dead will come to life again. However, one does not become a kâfir by slandering or denying the caliphate of Hadrat Abû Bakr and Hadrat 'Umar (radiy-Allâhu 'anhumâ) if he concludes this as a result of attributing an uncommon meaning to a document. He who says, ''Alî is God. Jabrâ'il went wrong in bringing the wahî,' becomes a kâfir, because, such words cannot be deduced from ta'wîl or ijtihâd but stem from

following the nafs. One becomes a kâfir, too, if he attributes adultery to Hadrat 'Â'îsha (radiy-Allâhu 'anhâ) or denies that her father was a Sahâbî, for both claims show the denial of the open dalîl declared in the Qur'ân al-kerîm. One also becomes a kâfir by saying, without a ta'wîl, that it is halâl to attack Muslims' property and lives; he would not become a kâfir, if he, supposing himself to be following Islam, said it upon the ta'wîl of an inexplicit dalîl from the Qur'ân or Hadîth." As it is seen, if a person who carries out his 'ibâdât and calls himself a Muslim or ahl al-qibla holds a belief unconformable to Ahl as-Sunna, and if his belief is the denial of an explicit dalîl, this belief is a kufr whether it was based on a ta'wîl or not. If it is the denial of an inexplicit dalîl and if he has a ta'wîl, it is not a kufr. If it comes out of following the nafs and is intended for worldly advantages without a ta'wîl, it is also a kufr. One also becomes a kâfir if he, following his nafs and for worldly advantages, tries to prove a thought or belief of his to be a religious fact by explaining dalâ'il away. He is called a 'zindîq'. Belief held by following (taqlîd) a man of bid'a but without knowing about the ta'wîl is also kufr, for his taqlîd of someone in the things to be believed is invalid if the dalâ'il are not known. One who says that the ijmâ' is not a dalîl does not become a kâfir. He becomes a man of bid'a. His words unconformable to the ijmâ' are not kufr.

Seeing this grievous danger that has descended upon Muslims, our hearts break. In order to awaken and protect the youth against this destructive attack, we deemed it a great duty and the only means of our attaining the everlasting felicity to render a small service of writing down the deceptive attacks of some foreign, religiously ignorant people, who advocate reform in the religion, and exposing the truth by answering them one by one. Thus we want to show to the youth the group of heretics who claim to pursue the cause of Islam. In this book, we do not write anything out of our short sights; the answers are collected from the Ahl as-Sunna scholars' books, and a letter from the book **Maktûbât** by al-Imâm ar-Rabbânî Ahmad al-Fârûqî as-Sirhindî, the great scholar and exalted guide of Muslims, is appended after the conclusion of the book. Also a glossary to look up for the words froeign to the English reader is appended at the end. Now the eleventh English edition is presented to the youth.

May Allâhu ta'âlâ make us all attain the wordly and heavenly felicity! May He protect us against harming ourselves and others! Âmin.

Mîlâdî	**Hijrî Shamsî**	**Hijrî Qamarî**
2001	**1380**	**1422**

ISLAM'S REFORMERS

(THE BIGOTS OF SCIENCE AND OF RELIGION)

In this book, the heretical ideas of some reformers from outside Turkey, are set up in paragraphs, which they have written against Islam, and necessary answers are given to them. Thus, sixty-three paragraphs have been formed. **'Reform'** means 'to return something defiled to a former state, to correct.' **'Religion reformer'** means 'he who renews, renovates the religion.' Today, however, those bigots who try to change and demolish Islam from the inside call themselves **"religion reformers'.** Therefore, there are three groups of reformers in the religion which are told about in detail in the forty-second paragraph, in which it will be seen that it is wrong and out of place to use this word for Islam.[1]

1 - The reformer, in order to deceive the youth, pretends to be a man of religion; he says:

"In accordance with the modern age, improvements in our religion also should be done. Many superstitions, which does not have place in the religion, have been mixed with Islam later. It is necessary to clear them off and return our religion to its earliest true, pure state."

It is obvious that for the recent two or three hundred years there has been a standstill, even a decline in Muslims. Seeing this decline, it is very unjust, very wrong to say that Islam also is on the decline. This decline happened because Muslims did not trust the religion and they have been slack in carrying out its commands. Unlike other religions, Islam has not been mixed with superstitions. Maybe the ignorant have wrong beliefs and words. Yet these do not change what is declared in the fundamental books of Islam. These books declare the sayings of Rasûlullah (sall-Allâhu 'alaihi wa sallam) and the knowledge coming from his Sahâbîs. All of them were written by the most efficient, exalted scholars. They have been approved unanimously by all Islamic scholars. For centuries, no alteration has taken place in any of them. That the words, books and magazines of the ignorant are erroneous cannot be grounds for attributing defects or stains

[1] Please see page 189 in the Turkish book **Fâideli Bilgiler** (Useful Information).

to these fundamental books of Islam.

To attempt to alter these basic books in accord with the fashion and situation in each century means to make up a new religion for each century. To attempt to rationalize such alterations with the paralogism that you are trying to adapt them to the Qur'an al-kerîm and Hadîth ash-sherîf shows that you are unaware of the Qur'ân al-kerîm and the Hadîth ash-sherîf, and it reflects a blatant misconception of Islam. To presume that the commands and prohibitions in Islam will change in accordance with the time means to disignore the reality of Islam. The Qur'ân al-kerîm says, **"Muslims command the things that are ma'rûf."** Ziyâ Gökalb and similar ferocious reformers, who attacked the Qur'ân al-kerîm and Islam impudently, attempted to alter Islam according to customs and fashion by saying 'convention and custom' for the word 'ma'rûf', thus ingratiating themselves with their masonic masters and capturing posts. In order to get what was mundane, they sold their faith. Ziyâ Gökalb was given the membership of the Central Committee of the Union Party as a recompense for this service of his. If Islam, as he said, gave place to customs, even at its beginning, it would not have prohibited the bad customs of the ignorant Arabs and would have tolerated idolatry, which was the most valuable custom of that time and which had gone deep into the Ka'ba.

Islamic religion is built upon knowledge and is conformable to reason in every respect. On affairs declared inexplicitly in the Qur'ân al-kerîm and the Hadîth ash-sherîf, to pass new rules compatible with reason and knowledge, that is, to make qiyâs or ijtihâd, is one of the main sources of Islam. Yet this job devolves on a Muslim possessing the necessary knowledge. If the reformers, instead of meddling with the fundamental books, thought of annihilating superstitions which have become established among the ignorant, nothing would be said against them. They would be serving Islam. But, if we are supposed to believe that they bear such good thoughts, first they have to prove that they are real and sincere Muslims. A non-Muslim's pretending to be Muslim and attempting to attack us with our own weapon is very unjust, shameful and disgraceful of him. The religion reformers should not only pretend or claim to be Muslims, but also prove to be Muslims. It is not permissible for a Muslim to feign irreligiousness, unless there is the fear of death. As for the irreligious reformers, does 'irreligiousness' mean 'hypocrisy, mendacity' so that they pretend to be Muslims when it

suits their purpose? It is not permissible to question a person who says, "I am a Muslim," and we have to know him as our brother-in-Islam; but he should not play tricks with our faith. If we see him speak ill of and belittle the fundamental teachings of our religion, it will be not only permissible but also necessary to question him and to call him to account. We do not force the reformers to adapt themselves to our religion or madhhab but only want them to say frankly whether they are Muslims or not and their deeds to be in agreement with their words, for Islam has certain and unchangeable rules and Muslims have to talk in comformity with these rules. While some people who say that they are Muslims do not regard it a guilt that they dissent from Islam by holding the basic teachings of Islam of no account and making fun of them, they become angry when they are told that they have dissented from Islam. They mean that Islam should be attacked and the attacker should not be told that he attacks Islam and becomes a disbeliever; it should be free to attack Islam, and those who do so should not be told anything! They insult those who refute them in such terms as "retrogressive" or "fanatic", which have been made up by communists. And about those who, like themselves, attack the religion, they say "modern, enlightened." The truth is that they themselves are fanatics. Those who pretend to be men of religion are the bigots of religion and those who attack Islam as scientists are the bigots of science.

Alteration in the basic teachings and books of Islam and to adapt them to the present time means the defilement of Islam. A Muslim is a person who believes and reveres these basic teachings and who has promised not to attempt to alter them. And 'democracy, freedom and secularism' do not come to mean 'not keeping one's word or giving up one's belief'. Islam does not command that the non-Muslim compatriots should be forced to be Muslims. Is there a democracy more egalitarian than this?

The bigots of science, the one group of our insidious enemies, accepting all the customs, fashions and immoral, exploiting, crushing movements in Europe and America, try to spread them among youngsters. As for Islam, they never mention it as if it were a guilt that should be covered, or they regard it heavy and horrible as if it were a crushing burden. On the other hand, some others say that religion is necessary for possessing a sound society and unity and it should be adapted to the present time and Islam should be cleared of superstitions. However, there is no superstition in the books of the Ahl as-Sunna scholars. There are

superstitions amongst the ignorant of Islam. And for clearing these off, it is necessary to disseminate the Ahl as-Sunna books and teach them to the youth. When the reforms these bigots want in Islam seem harmful to the basic teachings of Islam, we should rebut them showing proofs among âyats and hadîths and say, "You have no right to make alterations in Muslims' religion as if it were your own possession." The bigots in religion want to blemish the great Muslim scholars and replace them. They tread on the basic teachings of Islam and on the Muslim scholars who collected them and spread them all over the world.

Mûsâ Jârullâh Baykiyev of Kazan, Russia, who appeared under the mask of a reformer, wrote in his book published in the time of the Ottomans:

"Islam, which Allah sent through His Prophet, was established upon knowledge. It corrected the human life and established a social order. It defined the civilized actions one by one. It set up a professional order based upon justice and advantage. Such a professional order strengthened Islam. It spread over continents. Later in Iran, enjoyment, revel and dissipation spread among Muslims. After this, a greater instigation came forth. Greek philosophy, which was based upon only thoughts and theories, was translated. Study on work and matter ceased. Islam came to a theoretical state based upon delusion and phantom. The pure îmân of Muslims was all mixed up with gossips called ***'ilm al-kalâm.*** *Thus, social, economic and civil studies ceased. In mosques, madrasas, houses and everywhere, time was passed with trivial, useless theories and thoughts. Books of kalâm slandering the positive science were disseminated everywhere. Useless thoughts, unnecessary articles were considered as of Islam. Is there a word of value or a useful idea in al-Ghazâlî's book* ***Tahâfut*** *or in the philosopher Ibn ar-Rushd's answer to it? Who will ever mention or write today the deliriums in the books of Nasîr ad-dîn at-Tûsî, a geometry and astronomy scholar, or in the books of thousands of people praising or slandering him? Is there anything which could be said to be Islamic in the innumerable books of the scholars of the Ash'arî madhhab telling about Allah's attributes and deeds and human will, or in the shameless criticisms between Shî'ites and Sunnîs? Is there anything of reason, of idea or of Islam in at-Taftâzânî's books or in their world-wide commentaries and annotations or in the books of fiqh, kalâm, mantiq, usûl, tafsîr, nahw, sarf, hikma?"*

These mendacities of the Russian Baykiyev have been quoted

over and over again and applauded at every opportunity by the religion reformers amongst us and this mendacious disbeliever has been called the "Luther of Islam". His slanders will be answered in the ninth paragraph below.

Another of the masked ideas of religion reformers and bigots with false diplomas is,

"The strongest, the most useful force for bringing people to goodness and union is religion. A nation without religion cannot survive."

But from the passwords leaking out of their statements, it is understood that they do not believe in religion. For example, they say:

"The Orientals are very intelligent people. For six thousand years the sacred hands ruling the souls and morality of people have always risen in Central Asia. For people in need of worship, the keen intellects of the East have created idols and left them as souvenirs. When the oriental intellects were unable to find opportunity for studying on matter, their imagination became very wide and brilliant. For this reason, poetry, philosophy, astronomy, spiritual knowledge, alchemy, sorcery, mu'jiza, karâma and the like were given birth in the East and spread over the world. Nevertheless, since good nature and good thoughts are spiritual, there is nothing so useful as religion to strengthen them. Man cannot live without religion."

Though religion reformers do not believe that Islam is a religion sent by Allâhu ta'âlâ through the Prophet, they say that it is necessary for the maintenance of ethics and social order and for promotion in worldly affairs. In other words; religion, to them, is to be believed for this world. They mean that though there is no real religion one might believe in a religion for having good manners and procuring social advantage. This belief is superficial, but in order for it to be very useful, it should be believed in as if it were true. They say, "It should be believed though superficially," most probably because they see that Europeans and Americans are very reverent to their faith.

Whatsoever it may be, the enemies of Islam, too, feel compelled to say that religion is necessary. For, unless a force, which obliges people with its attraction and compels them to arrange their businesses, is made divine and its divinity spread, it remains weak.

Others, on the other hand, try to establish morals through

knowledge. Knowledge presents morals as a virtue. But this has not reached beyond theory, and is not as effective as the hadîth. **"Salvation is in honesty only."** It simply could not be said, "It is without foundation," about the religion, which is "so necessary, so useful." It simply is not right to pretend to believe something which is not believed. They are paradoxical, like holding the truth and the lie equal.

How could it ever be admitted that the religion which brings people to ecstasy and is so dominant over man's existence and morality be without foundation or invented by people? Are people to depend on the religion or is the religion to be invented by people? People's worshipping the things which they themselves have fabricated is heretical. Such heresy was widespread among the people who worshipped idols before Islam and it was symptomatic of their being base and stupid.

The reformer says:

"The golden chain, that is, the idea of nationality, which has been discovered in recent centuries to tie people tightly and safely to one another, will replace the coarse chain, which will some day break. If, instead of brotherhood in religion, the concepts of nationalism and patriotism had been established, the youth would have survived."

If the modernist reformer believed in religion, he would not compare religion with nationalism or education, nor say "the coarse chain" about Islamic brotherhood while saying "the golden chain" about national unity. It is understood from the statements made by reformers that religion is supposed to correct the morality of the common people, who will be made to believe not superficially but truely; in order to bind the people to themselves like a flock of sheep, they will give place to the religion; the people shall believe in the religion, but they themselves will not; they will be able to put the religion into a new mould every day; morality of the people will be corrected by means of religion and the irreligious modernists will not need good manners. Don't the reformers deem it necessary for themselves to have good manners?

2 - The reformer says:

"Hadrat Prophet rejected the dictatorial regime and sovereignty. Nevertheless, Islam was convenient for the establishment of such a regime. It proved to be so, too."

The reformer is very wrong in this idea of his. While the

constitutions of European kingdoms regard the kings sacred and unquestionable. Islam, with the hadîth, **"Each of you are a shepherd. All of you are responsible for the people you rule,"** holds rulers equal to average compatriots, and it does not give place to dictatorship or sovereignty. Islamic laws are heavenly. The ruler also has to adapt himself to Islam and to maintain it like every compatriot. The rulers who turned dictators were those who departed from Islam and misused their powers. Hadrat 'Umar al-Fârûq (radiy-Allâhu 'anh), the Caliph, who was questioned on his excess fabrics which in fact he had taken from his son's share in the equally distributed booty taken in war, and Hadrat 'Umar ibn Abd al-'Azîz, who, on the day he became the Caliph said to his wives, "I undertook a heavy task. Maybe I will not have time for you. If you wish, you may get your mahr[1] and alimony and go," were the paragons of Islamic leadership. Islam cannot be blemished if such people are few.

3 - The reformer says:

"A short while after the Era of Prosperity, Islam became a sharp weapon which would, for clearing the roads leading to silver armchairs [high positions], form heaps of dead people on both sides. In the combats in which Hadrat 'Alî fought for the caliphate, the Qur'ân, the Holy Book of Allah, on the points of the spears of his opponents was used as a trick in the war. The Qur'ân, which is right, was used as a means for winning the sovereignty cause, which was false."

Those combats were not for sovereignty. They were for the fulfilment of Islam's commandments. And unlike what the reformer says, the Qur'ân was not used as a means for winning the war of sovereignty. Whatever each side did against the other was intended to find out what was right and to follow Islam, and Islam was not a weapon that would form heaps of corpses for clearing the roads leading to gilded silver armchairs, but it was a shield to stand against such a weapon.

[Those Muslims who fought against Hadrat 'Alî (radiy-Allâhu 'anh were not sinful. 'Sin' means 'guilt committed against Allâhu ta'âlâ', that is, 'breaking the rules of Islam.' They had not elected Hadrat 'Alî to be the Caliph. Because they (radiy-Allâhu 'anhum) did not regard him the Caliph, they took up swords. If they had elected him it would have been sinful for them to oppose the Caliph. It was true that they erred even though they had provided

[1] Please see the twelfth chapter in the fifth fascicle of **Endless Bliss.**

religious proof for not electing him the Caliph; yet is was an error of ijtihâd and was intended to follow Islam.]

Question: "Isn't Islam to make people attain happiness and to keep peace? Does it cause bloodshed to obey Islam?"

Answer: 'Alî's (radiy-Allâhu 'anh) Muslim opponents followed Islam but erred in following Islam. Bloodshed was the result of the mistake they did when following Islam, rather than the fruit of following Islam. Likewise, in the Battle of Uhud, many of the forty of the Prophet's ('alaihi 's-salâm) companions whom he had ordered to block a pass had been martyred. Their death was not caused by their following Rasûlullah's order but by the error of some of them in carrying out the order. Following Islam never harms anybody; it is always useful. It makes a person attain happiness. Disobeying Islam or going wrong while following it is harmful.

The Muslims against whom Hadrat 'Alî declared war wanted to follow Islam but, in choosing the way Islam had shown for the accomplishment of that deed, they went wrong. Since they were the people loved and distinguished by Allah, their error was not a sin; the error in ijtihâd was blessed rather than sinful. It was more blessed than the worship of the good Muslims of later generations. It was said, **"The right, good deeds of the good are like the errors of the distinguished."** That is, the wrong deeds of the former are more useful, more valuable than the right deeds of the latter. For this reason, those who died from both sides were martyrs. They won the heavenly reward.

Reading the corrupt history books written for political interests, for procuring what is mundane and the sentimental stories written by bâbâs in Iran, young people are deprived of learning about the greatness of the Prophet's companions and they get wrong ideas fixed into their minds. For the benefit of youngsters who struggle to learn the beauty of Islamic faith, which is the cradle of today's civilization and which commands us to study on the matter and on the spirit, we prepared the Turkish books **Hak Sözün Vesîkaları**[1] and **Eshâb-ı Kirâm** in order to tell them about the superiorities of the Prophet's companions. In these books, through sound documents which we had gathered from the most precious sources, we explained the lives of the Prophet's companions, their services to Islam and their love for

[1] **Documents of the Right Word**, in English, 496 pp., is available from Hakîkat Kitâbevi, Fatih, Istanbul.

one another. We think it would be proper to give some information here, too.

Hadrat Qayyûm ar-Rabbânî Muhammad Ma'thûm al-Fârûqî as-Sirhindî (rahmatullâhi 'alaih), the great Muslim scholar respected by and the qutb of the Awliyâ' of his time, wrote in the twenty-second letter of the first volume of his **Maktûbât:**

Dear son! The end of this world is near. Things that darken the hearts have increased. Everybody is being dragged by these dark currents. At such a time as this, a hero who will bring back a sunna and annihilate a bid'a is urgently needed. Unless we are illuminated with the light of the Sunna of Rasûlullah (sall-Allâhu 'alaihi wa sallam) we cannot get into the right path! Unless we follow the footsteps of the exalted Prophet, it will be in vain to try to escape calamities. Without following the Beloved Prophet of Allâhu ta'âlâ, the happiness of advancing in a path of tasawwuf and love for Allahu ta'âlâ cannot be attained. Allâhu ta'âlâ in the thirty-first âyat of the sûrat âl 'Imrân, tells His Beloved Prophet to tell others, **'If you love Allah, follow me! Allah loves those who follow me!'** He who wants to attain happiness should follow, in everything he does, him (the Prophet) who is the greatest in the religion and in the world! He has to try to perform all his actions, 'ibâdât , and trade as he did. In this world, those who try to be like the one dear to a person will seem lovely and beautiful to that person. This person will love and appreciate them much, too. Likewise, those who love the darling will always be loved. The enemies of the darling will also be enemies to the lover. For this reason, all the virtues visible or invisible can be attained by loving that exalted Prophet; this love is the gauge of perfection and improvement. Allâhu ta'âlâ created His Prophet as the most beautiful, the best, the most lovable human being. In him, He accumulated every virtue, every kind of beauty and every superiority. All as-Sahâbat al-kirâm loved him. All their hearts burnt with love for him. It was the sweetest flavor for them to see his moon-like face and his luminous beauty. They sacrificed their lives and possessions for their love of him. They loved him more than their lives and possessions, briefly, more than all that could be loved. Because they loved him excessively, they loved those who loved him. For this reason, they loved one another very much, too. They became hostile against those who could not understand his superiority or see his beauty and attain the happiness of loving him. Due to this love for him and for one another and their hostility for others, they earned the love and

approval of Allah; they got promoted and became the most exalted, superior and respected human beings, since the major worship is to love the dears and dislike the enemies. Those who say that they love Allâhu ta'âlâ have to be like the Sahâbat al-kirâm. One should also love those whom his dear loves, and feel hostility towards the enemies of his dear. This love and hostility is not a forced desire, but a natural outcome. The lover is somewhat crazy in his love and hostility. For this reason it was said, **'Unless a person is said to be crazy, his îmân is not perfect!'** Those who do not have this craziness are deprived of loving. Unless there is hostility, there cannot be friendship! In order to be sincere in saying, 'I love,' it is necessary to be hostile against the enemies of the beloved. Our words should not be misunderstood! It should not be presumed that hostility against the Prophet's companions was for the same reason!

Some people say that, in order to love Hadrat 'Alî (radiy-Allâhu 'anh), it is necessary to bear hostility towards the greatest ones among the Sahâbat al-kirâm of the Prophet. This thought is quite wrong, since hostility should be felt towards the enemies of the beloved so that one may love. Enmity towards his friends is unnecessary. Allah declares in the sûrat al-Fat'h that the Sahâbat al-kirâm were rahîm to one another, that is, they loved one another. 'Rahîm' means 'extremely and continuously merciful and mutually loving.' This âyat reports that the Sahâbat al-kirâm loved one another very much. In Arabic grammar, 'rahîm' is a 'sifat mushabbaha', an adjective with a sense of continuity. For this reason, it is understood that this great mutual love among the Sahâbat al-kirâm was continuous. This âyat shows that such evils as resentment, envy and hostility, which are incompatible with mercy and mutual love, could not exist among the Sahâbat al-kirâm. **'Among my umma, the most merciful to my umma is Abû Bakr,'** was said in the Hadîth ash-sherîf. Could it be possible that a person who was the most merciful of the umma bore ill-will and hostility against one of the umma?

The Hadîth says, **'Allâhu ta'âlâ asked Mûsâ ('alaihi 's-salâm), "What did you do only for Me?" When he answered, "O Allah! For Thee, I performed salât, fasted, paid zakât and made dhikr," Allâhu ta'âlâ said, "The salât you performed is the way leading you to Paradise; it was your duty as a human slave. Your fast will protect you against Hell. The zakât you paid will be a parasol over you on the Day of Judgement. Your dhikr will be light for you through the darkness of that day. What did you do for ME?"**

When he said, "O Allah! Tell me the thing which is for Thee!" Allâhu ta'âlâ declared, "O Mûsâ! Did you love those whom I loved and did you bear hostility against My enemies?" Mûsâ ('alaihi 's-salâm) realized that the most valuable thing to be done for Allâhu ta'âlâ was al-hubbu fi 'llâh wa 'l-bughdu fi'llâh.'

It was true that in the Battle of Siffîn Hadrat Mu'âwiya (radiy-Allâhu 'anh) had copies of the Qur'ân al-kerîm attached to the points of spears and thus put an end to the bloodshed among Muslims. The fight had been stopped by the end of the first month of the new year, Muharram, 37 A.H. Messengers ran between the two sides to come to an agreement. When Muharram ended, Hadrat 'Alî (radiy-Allâhu 'anh) declared that the time was up and the rebellion had not been given up. First, Ashtar, who was on his side, came forward with his soldiers. The Damascenes went to meet him. Ashtar was one of the conspirators who had excited the 'Camel' Battle. **Qisâs-i Anbiyâ** says, 'In the 'Camel' Battle, there were twenty thousand people on the side of Hadrat 'Alî and thirty thousand on the opposite side. When they were about to come to an agreement, 'Abdullâh ibn Saba', Mâlik Ashtar and other leaders of those who had martyred Hadrat 'Uthmân (radiy-Allâhu 'anh), assembled one night and planned to commence the battle. They unexpectantly assaulted the opposite side. Those who were on the side of Hadrat 'Â'isha (radiy-Allâhu 'anhâ) were bewildered at this sudded attack. Ashtar and his friends told Hadrat 'Alî (radiy-Allâhu 'anh) that the opposite side assaulted and they resisted.' It is seen that 'Abdullâh ibn Saba', a Jew, and his friends were the ones who incited both the battles and broke the agreements. In Siffîn, Hadrat 'Alî attacked the Damascenes with all his soldiers and much blood was shed in few days. Selecting ten thousand people, he attacked again. Hâshim, who carried his flag, attacked, too, continuously saying, "O those who love Allah! Come with me!" It was a very bloody combat. All Thursday night they fought until morning. And those who did not die were either wounded or exhausted. On Friday, Ashtar assaulted again. Mu'awiya and 'Amr ibn 'Âs (radiy-Allâhu 'anhumâ), upon finding out that forty-five thousand Muslims on their side and twenty-five thousand on the opposite side had died, searched ways of preventing the shedding of fraternal blood and rescuing Muslims from this calamity. Hadrat 'Amr ibn 'Âs said, "Let's show them the Qur'ân to tell them that Muslims are brothers." Hadrat Mu'âwiya commanded to attach copies of the Qur'ân on the

points of spears. His soldiers cried out. “We call you to Allah’s book,” and the opponent soldiers saw the Qur’ân and gave up fighting. Hadrat ’Alî summoned Ashtar, who was taken back from the battle by force. Agreement was settled. Thus, the combats which lasted one hundred and ten days came to an end. The attachment of copies of the Qur’ân on the points of spears prevented the shedding of the blood of thousands of Muslims. The great fire of instigation among Muslims was thus extinguished.

4 - The reformer says:

“The combats for sovereignty caused the splitting into the madhhabs, Muslims’ parting into groups!”

Attribution of the splitting into the maddhabs to fights for sovereignty may be done by ignoramuses who do not know what the madhhabs are. It is to mix the religion with politics. The madhhabs resulted from the freedom of idea which Islam has endowed upon people. If in the separation of the madhhabs there is a purpose of ingratiating oneself with the occupant of a high post, this exalted post is certainly the Divine Post.

5 - The reformer says:

“The disputes on whether the Qur’ân was creature or not extirpated the basis of Islam.”

The reformer gives another example of mixing the madhhabs with politics; Caliph Ma’mûn oppressed the scholars who did not regard the Qur’ân as a creature. However, his tortures were not intended for political purposes. If it had been intended for political purposes, he could have found many other reasons for doing it. If we are to say that Ma’mûn applied his tortures for political purposes, then irreligiousness, rather than the religion, was mixed with politics. The reformer attempts to impute the guilt of irreligiousness to the religion.

6 - The reformer says:

“As years elapsed, the Qur’ân and the Hadîth, in the power of those who wished to be rulers rather than men of religion, changed shape like magic tricks. Being unable to overcome the enemy with argumentation, they interpreted the Qur’ân as they wished and made up hadîths which would suit their purposes.”

The reformer speaks ill of the branches of knowledge which he knows nothing about. He attempts to blemish the most precious pages of the books of tafsîr. On the parts which the writers of those books wrote through ijtihâd, everyone has the right to enter

into discussion provided they will observe the rules of discussion and decency. Yet nothing can be so out of place and so funny as for a reformer who knows nothing about the eloquence of the Qur'ân, to slander az-Zamakhsharî's tafsîr.

7- The reformer says:

"False hadîths were made up. Everybody knows that there are many mawdû' hadîths."

Nobody can be so unjust as to speak ill of the knowledge of hadîth which was based not on reason or experience but on relation and narration. I wonder how many hadîths the reformer knows to speak like that. Can he say a single hadîth with its documentary references? He only knows the word mawdû' that he has heard by chance. The great scholars of Islam have written thousands of books not only on the knowledge of hadîth but also on how to find out mawdû' hadîths among the sahîh ones. If they had not written these books, the reformer would not even know the word mawdû'. The scholars of hadîth very strictly forbade to say "a hadîth" for a saying if it was not for certain that Rasûlullah ('alaihi 's-salâm) uttered it, no matter how good or useful it was. In fact, there have been people who attempted such a very dangerous lie as to make up hadîths. But Muslim scholars have worked without getting tired and bored, looked for such falsehoods, found them and discarded them from books. If it had not been for these continuous studies of Muslim scholars, could such religiously ignorant reformers ever distinguish one mawdû' hadîth? Muslim scholars have accomplished such a delicate and difficult study of recognizing hundreds of thousands of hadîths together with their narrators and evaluating the soundness of each. As for the reformer, he confuses those who have made up hadîths with those who have found out and discarded the made-up hadîths, arouses suspicion among Muslims by talking ill of all of them and tries to undermine the confidence in the Hadîth. The harm caused by those who made up hadîths has not been greater than that caused by the clamours of reformers. By putting forth the harm of making up hadîths to attribute the fall of the Ottoman Empire to it, he slanders unjustly against Islam by implying that the real cause of the fall of the Ottoman Empire was Islam.

8 - The reformer says:

"In order to make sure the correctness of hadîths, Hadrat al-Bukhârî travelled through Islamic countries in Asia and Africa for many years. At nights, he used to get up ten or fifteen times and

record the hadîths which he remembered together with their narrators. He is said to have memorized three hundred thousand hadîths two hundred thousand of which were not sahîh. He understood that only seven or eight thousand of the six hundred thousand hadîths which he had gathered were sahîh. This fact shows how direly religious knowledge is mixed up. Observing al-Bukhârî's way of study, some European scholars say that even the hadîths he selected [as sahîh] are doubtful. You can imagine how other hadîth books are."

By starting with six hundred thousand and reducing the number of sahîh hadîths to seven thousand and then eventually to zero, this reformer shamelessly copies this idea from Europeans. If, instead of taking information about hadîths from Europeans, he had taken it from the specialists of this knowledge, for sure he would not have said so. The knowledge of hadîth, which is like a boundless sea, is a miracle of Islam. This great sea will not become turbid with few stones thrown by the enemies of Islam. If there were none of the innumerous proofs showing that Islam is the right and glorious religion, the dumbfounding work of the scholars of **'ilm al-hadîth** would suffice to show it. Their books are so many that their catalogues alone fill up libraries. These scholars make up an army of thousands, an army of ikhlâs and specialization that has attained Allâhu ta'âlâ's help. Intellectual and mental capacities of reformers, who run after material advantages and temporary, loathsome pleasures, cannot comprehend the sublime cause of this effort. The study of hadîths and their narrators was dependent upon so subtle and so numerous principles that a special branch of knowledge called **usûl al-hadîth** was established. A hadîth-i-sherîf could be recorded in a book only if it had been heard from a person who had an entirely dependable reason, powerful memory, righteousness and honesty, and he, in his turn, would have to have heard it from such another person, which, in its entirety, means an unbroken retrograde chain of dependable, trustworthy narrators back to Rasûlullâh ('alaihi 's-salâm). Above each hadîth its narrators were listed one by one. Do Ibn Taimiyya, 'Abduh, Maudoodi and the like, who cannot comprehend the superiority of the Ahl as-Sunna scholars, and ignorant modernist reformers, who cannot comprehend Islam, presume that such dependable hadîth books are like history books? The hadîth scholars knew, as it were a miracle, that modernist reformers would later appear to attack the Hadîth, and they wrote in detail the biographies of all

as-Sahâba (radiy-Allâhu 'anhum) and many of the Tâbi'ûn who had reported hadîths. **Usud al-ghâba, Al-isti'âb, Al-isâba** and similar great books of biographies hold places in libraries all over the world. Can another person be shown besides Muhammad ('alaihi 's-salâm) for memorizing each of whose sayings life-sacrificing efforts have been given and the importance and significance of whose personality and life affected his companions and caused all their lives, biographies and superiorities to be transferred into books? Through words far from knowledge, the religion reformers shamelessly want to bury this Glorious Star, who shines in the sky of honour, under the soil where the wastepipes of their disputes end.

9 - The reformer says:

"The religion, sources of which had been blurred by personal ambitions and political fights yet at the beginning, was made a toy during the era of 'Abbâsis. Right then the Ottoman Empire was established."

Poor Ottomans! How unfortunate that it was coincident with their birth! If the sources of Islam were so much turbid, on which basis would the religious reforms be made today? Reformers keep almost all hadîths under suspicion. I wonder what they would say about the Qur'ân. Is this source blurred, too? We quoted above their idea that religion was necessary to correct morals. Could the religion do this if its sources were blurred and it were made a toy. Their words do not make any sense. As for the Russian reformer Baykiyev, he was aggressive against kalâm and fiqh. He blamed Muslim scholars for having left their work aside and busying with Greek philosophy. In those days, however, Greek philosophy was translated into Arabic and introduced into Muslim countries as an advancement; it blurred the minds of many people, and the scholars of kalâm examined those new ideas and answered them one by one. Thereby they protected the Sunnî belief against a shock. Also today it is an honourable task for our religious men to examine the knowledge, science and new discoveries on the points concerning Islamic beliefs and answer them. Why do religion reformers, while understanding this necessity today, try to blemish the former scholars for having done their duty in their time? Then they blindy endeavour, without foundation in knowledge, to humiliate Islamic scholars. They say on the one hand that it is a big guilt today not to adapt religious knowledge to new discoveries, and on the other hand, they claim that the former scholars were guilty of mixing the

religion with philosophy and new discoveries of their time; everything religious men do is a guilt according to reformers.

10 - The reformer says:

"Pure Islamic beliefs were dirtied, corrupted by the movement called 'Ilm al-kalâm."

This quotation from the Russian reformer Baykiyev's book is an obvious evidence of his ignorance of Islam. How **'ilm al-kalâm** shed light on and served Islam can be understood by only those who studied it from within. There cannot be any use in attacking such a vast branch of knowledge with such adventitious argumentation. The bigots of science always attack **'ilm al-kalâm** in such terms as "theories" and "thoughts that cannot be experimented". They do not know that religious knowledge is learned by way of narration, one generation relating it to the next one, and that experimentation is essential in technical sciences. In man, the place for these two kinds of knowledge is his brain, which only thinks, judges and understands whether what he hears or does is wrong or not. However, he experiments with his limbs, not with his brain. Does this reformer know what he knows with his hands or understand through his feet?

11 - The reformer says:

"When fiqh books were written, 'adhâb (torture in Hell) and thawâb (reward in Paradise) were reckoned essential for worship. Thus, Islam was deprived of being a social religion. If, instead of saying, 'He committed that sin,' or telling about the severity of the fire of Hell they had told about the usefulness of Islam on morals and society, and if, with no mention of torture and reward, they had tried to persuade the reason and intellect, they would not have deprived Islam of being a social religion. The human reason cannot entirely comprehend Allah's wisdom. We believe this. Yet, not all the commands and prohibitions are so [difficult to comprehend]. The causes of most of them can be comprehended through intellect. When scholars could not understand a point, they dismissed it by saying 'Allah knows'."

Islam is a heavenly religion. Like in other heavenly religions, Islamic knowledge is composed of two parts: religious knowledge and scientific knowledge. Scientific knowledge is also of Islamic knowledge. In order to be a scholar of Islam, contemporary scientific knowledge should also be learned as much as possible. Scientific knowledge changes and advances as time elapses. Religious knowledge never changes. This knowledge consists of

beliefs, commands and prohibitions. They were declared by Allah. All these commands and prohibitions are calied **"Islam".** Following Islam is called **'ibâda** (worship). Muslims worship because Allâhu ta'âlâ commanded it to be their duty. The commands and prohibitions of Islam are very useful in many respects for men in this world and in the next world, but one should intend to worship because it is Allâhu ta'âlâ's command and his duty as a human creature. Something done without thinking in this mamner will not be worship. It will be an average action having no connection with the religion. For example, if a man performs salât without intending to carry out Allâhu ta'âlâ's command and his human duty, but with the intention that salât is an exercise of physical training, his salât will not be sahîh. He does not worship but he merely takes physical exercises.

Likewise, if one fasts with the thought of resting his stomach and for dieting, his fast is not sahîh and maqbûl. And a Muslim who fights and risks his life not for strengthening Allâhu ta'âlâ's religion, for spreading Islam or for harming the enemies of Islam but for fame, honour, property or rank does not worship at all. He will not be rewarded for jihâd. He does not die a martyr if he loses his life. A man who quits alcohol only because it is harmful to his body cannot escape the sin of drunkenness. Similarly, he who abstains from adultery and from going to brothels lest he might catch horrible diseases such as gonorrhea and syphilis is not deemed chaste and pure in Islam.

Niyya (mental resolution, intention) for worship is very important in Islam. It determines whether each action done is compatible with Islam or not. If it were not a duty to escape Hell and go to Paradise as ordered by Allâhu ta'âlâ, worship performed by merely thinking about Paradise and Hell would not be acceptable, either. The great men of tasawwuf, al-Awliyâ' al-kirâm, have not thought of them in worship; they have thought of only Allâhu ta'âlâ's command and approval. Yet, it has been deemed enough for every Muslim to think of his advantages pertaining to the next world. Worship differs from customs in that it is necessary not to think of mundane advantages in worship. Actions performed for the sake of Allâhu ta'âlâ for advantages pertaining to the next world, are of worship. Actions done for worldy advantages are deemed customs.

In Islam, intention is so important that if an action commanded by Islam is done for mundane advantages, it is not sahîh and maqbûl and becomes a worldly affair. When something

worldly is done for advantages pertaining to the next world, it becomes worship. A Muslim gains thawâb even for putting a morsel to his wife's mouth. If one takes this hadîth into consideration, purifies his thought and corrects his intention, he does not miss the opportunity of gaining thawâb in eating, drinking and in every worldly affair by thinking of heavenly advantages. Self-seeking and egoism will result if human beings get accustomed to seeking for wordly advantages and material profit in every affair and even in worship. In fact, Islam demands the suppression of such evil desires of the nafs, self-sacrifice against materialism, abhoring egoism, and the purification and exaltation of morals and spirit.

It is a very evident fact for reasonable people that following Islam could not be based upon mundane advantages. In addition, the following âyats and hadîths show this fact:

The twentieth âyat of the sûrat ash-Shûrâ purports, **"We increase the earnings of those who work for winning the next world. And to those who work for wordly advantage, we give what is of it. But they will not obtain anything in the next world."**

The eighteenth and nineteenth âyats of the sûrat al-Isrâ purport, **"Among those who wish for this world, whose favours and flavours last short and end soon, We give whom We want what We wish. The rewards for those who work for the favours of the next world are plentiful."**

The sixteenth âyat of the sûrat Hûd purports, **"We abundantly give for the labour of those who want to live and amuse themselves in this world. We spare nothing. In the next world, they will be given the fire of Hell only. Their labour will come to naught in the next world. For the work they do only for this world, there is no reward in the next world."**

A hadîth states, **"It will be said, 'The recompense of anything done for someone besides Allâhu ta'âlâ should be asked from him.' "**

Another hadîth states, **"For the good actions done for the next world, Allâhu ta'âlâ' gives reward in this world, too. But He never gives reward in the next world for the things done only for this world."**

A hadîth written firstly in the **Sahîh** of al-Bukhârî is very famous: **"Every good deed will be evaluated according to the intention."**

It is not forbidden to think of the worldly uses and the social

advantages of the rules of Islam together with their uses in the next world. In fact, it is the duty of religious men to explain these uses through contemporary knowledge. But this is not the subject of fiqh or usûl al-fiqh books contrary to the reformer's view. Fiqh teaches religious duties of people, and usûl al-fiqh shows how these duties are derived from the four sources of Islam. The social aspects to be put forward about the rules of Islam, however, are to be prepared as a means of defence and argumentation against the enemies of Islam rather than against Muslims. Although it is very useful for Muslims to know the worldly benefits of the rules of Islam, they shall only know it and not go as far as to establish their worship on the basis of wordly benefits. Otherwise, worship will be spoilt. However much wordly usefulness there is in the duties which Islam commands, one should do them only to carry out Allâhu ta'âlâ's commands and escape punishment in the next world. When there is such an intention, it is not harmful to think of their worldly uses in addition.

To leave the advantages pertaining to the next world aside and seek for only social benefits in worship and to take this notion as essential is symptomatic of the disease of denying Islam. When due attention is paid, the symptoms of that hidden disease will be seen in the speech and writings of religion reformers. Otherwise, anybody with a smattering of religious knowledge and even a person who thinks only through his reason and intellect would certainly appreciate the importance of intention. Such implausible, illogical words of reformers make one think that they do not believe in the future life. Although worldly usefulness of the rules of Islam is very important and very obvious, those who believe in Paradise and Hell do not want even to remember their worldly advantages. In comparison with the immeasurable, infinite happiness and the very painful, endless disasters in the next world, the temporary pleasures and sorrows of this world are worth nothing. If the reformers, who pretend to undertake the trouble of telling Muslims about the importance of the future, believed in that most important future called "the next world", they would lay as much stress on the next world of Muslims at least as the religious scholars laid on this world of Muslims, and with their touching voice and tearful pens they would cry also a little for the happiness pertaining to the next world. If the rules of Islam were based upon social benefits, it would result in alterations and corruptions of these rules in the process of time.

12 - The reformer says:

"There is no need to limit the number of madhhabs in four. If Muslims remain packed together within the limits of four madhhabs, no improvement will be possible. First of all, man's reason should be freed from being a slave of the religion. Reason is an unlimited blessing given by Allah. It is necessary to get out of the four madhhabs and to give freedom to reason."

And Celâl Nûrî, another reformer, writes in his book **Târîkh-i Tedenniyyât,**

" 'The gate of ijtihâd has been closed,' they say. Nonsense! The Ottomans remained chained to wrong, coarse laws. On the other end of the world, social conditions had already improved. The Ottomans did not follow them. They lagged behind."

The standards of living have changed, and science and arts have improved, but from which inventions have the rules of Islam prevented them, so that reformers direct such unpleasant allusions as "coarse laws" to them? Does Islam say, "Don't construct roads, don't run trains, don't build ships, leave your minerals under earth or sell the right of exploiting them to communists or capitalists, don't do trade with disbelievers. Machinery, techniques, planes, electricity and radio are the inventions of disbelievers; don't learn them. Don't earn money. Kill each other in football games?" No! Islam emphatically commands -as well as it considers morals and virtues- to work in arts, sciences and to search and learn what the disbelievers have invented. This will be explained more detailedly in the following pages.

13 - The reformer says:

"Islamic laws, which were formerly suitable for the Ottomans, did not suffice and became deficient later, because they were like the Arab bedouins at the beginning of the establishment of the Ottoman State. Later, they spread in Europe and the social life changed. As for the laws, they remained fixed."

It is obvious how reformers regard Islam by saying that Islam is a religion suitable for bedouins living in tents and it needs reform in order that it be accepted by civilized nations. On the one hand they say, "Superstitions have been mixed with the religion. It needs to be returned to its former state." On the other hand they do not hesitate to say, "The former state of the religion was for those who lived in tents in Arabian deserts."

14 - The reformer says:

"Islam was put forward by only one man."

These words of the reformer show his disbelief in that the religion was sent by Allâhu ta'âlâ. Also Dozy, a Dutchman (1820-1884), said so. Dozy and our reformer, who copies him, suppose that Islam is the unripe fruit of aberrant thoughts like the law concerning homosexuality passed by some hundred members of the British Parliament. The law made by human beings is certainly temporary, soon being changed by the ones who make it.

15 - The reformer says:

"Even if we would suppose for a moment that eveything known as reality in the religion would be accepted as reality..."

Do religion reformers want the religion to turn from one state to another like a man who does not keep his word? A religion which would take a new shape every day is not necessarily to be sent by Allâhu ta'âlâ. Everybody can do this. And the reformers want a religion which is to be changed when it does not suit their purposes!

16 - The reformer says:

"'Where there is nass, ijtihâd is not permissible, and the commands which were stated clearly cannot be interpreted differently'; these words are the two basic laws of Islam. For this reason, Muslim scholars have said 'harâm' about the interest in banks. However, interest is the food of capital. Capital is the dynamo of trade."

The religion reformer seems to praise interest. He admires the capitalists in Europe and America who sedentarily earn money without any work. However, this exploitation of capitalists has given birth to communism. By outlawing the practice of interest and commanding zakât, Islam prevents the owners of capital from exploiting workers and peasants and blocks the ways leading to communism. Misrepresenting Islam's prohibiting definitely every kind of interest as an obstacle for progress is as nonsensical as refreshing an outdated complaint. Islam has prohibited not the banks but their exploiting the people.

17 - The reformer says:

"Our Master the Prophet very beautifully puts it, ***'In case reason ('aql) and narration (naql) contradict each other, reason must be followed.'*** *Thus it is seen that the religion might be changed in accordance with necessity."*

A fact which reason shows and can grasp never changes. For this reason, Muslim scholars said that narration could be changed through a proof shown by reason. Yet it is equally obvious that

through the reason of this reformer, who knows nothing about logic, it is impossible to put forth the proof that will cause the narration to be changed. Rasûlullah (sall-Allâhu 'alaihi wa sallam) divided Islamic knowledge into two groups as **'ilm al-abdân,** the knowledge of matter and science, and **'ilm al-adyân,** the religious knowledge. Religious knowledge can be understood only through narration. Its sources are the Qur'ân al-kerîm and the Hadîth ash-sherîf.

Things that can be perceived through sense organs are limited in number. Knowledge beyond this limit cannot be understood through sense organs, or they may be misunderstood. Furthermore, man's perceptive powers are mostly weaker than those of animals. Man may find and comprehend through his mind the things which he cannot comprehend through his sense organs, yet mind, too, has a limit of comprehension. Mind cannot find or comprehend the knowledge beyond this limit. If mind attempts to understand the things which it can never grasp, it will go wrong. In such knowledge, mind cannot be relied on. For example, Allâhu ta'âlâ's Attributes, the things in Paradise and Hell, the way of performing 'ibâdât and much of religious knowledge cannot be grasped by mind. If mind contradicts narration about such knowledge, narration will be followed and it will be decided on that mind is mistaken about this matter.

Four kinds of knowledge are declared in the Qur'ân: îmân, ahkâm, qisas and akhbâr. **Îmân,** the knowledge of what must be necessarily believed, can never be changed. The beliefs of every prophet and umma have been the same. There is no difference among their beliefs. **Ahkâm,** Allâhu ta'âlâ's commands and prohibitions, can be altered, but only by Allah, who made such alterations through His prophets. **Qisas** are the 'descriptions of the states and lives of the past peoples and ummas', and **akhbâr** tells about 'the happenings that took place in the past and those which will take place in future'. Among such reports are that the creatures live with water, what the signs of the coming of the end of the world are and that there are rivers in Paradise. No change can be made in qisas and akhbâr. And if some religious teachings seem to contradict one another, they cannot be adapted to mind, either. They will be adapted to one another. A piece of teaching that has several meanings should be understood so as not to contradict another piece of teaching that has been declared clearly. Here, reason's task is, of the two teachings that seem opposite, to understand the right meaning of the one that has

several meanings in accord with the one that can be understood clearly.

As for the second division of Islamic knowledge, scientific knowledge; it can be understood through sense organs and by observing, examining, calculating and experimenting with the tools which are assistants for these organs. All of these are done with mind and intellect. Here, what mind finds out can be relied on; when there is contradiction between narration and scientific knowledge, mind will be followed, that is, narration will be explained compatibly with mind. And the hadîth which the reformer quotes means this. But we should not believe the impostors who pretend to be scientists and talk not through science but through sensations and ambitions, the liars and enemies of religion and morals. Though Muslim scholars esteem mind very highly, one of them, Hadrat Shaikh-i Akbar Muhyiddîn ibn al-'Arabî, regards narration superior to mind in his book **Al-futûhât.** While Baykiyev, the Russian master of reformers, who clamours that mind should be given freedom, speaks intentional reflections on Muslim scholars, he gives a high place to the Shaikh-i Akbar.

18 - The reformer says:

"Another example showing the unchangeable strictness of Islam is the institution of awqâf. The rule ***'Shart-i wâqif is exactly like nass-i shâri','*** *(The conditions laid down by the wâqif, who grants property to a religious foundation, are exactly like the commands in the Qur'ân and the Hadîth) is one of the main principles in the fiqh books."*

Properties and goods granted to awqâf belong to the wâqif when alive. Since all the constitutions on the world recognize that everybody has the right of using his property to his own wish, no one has the right of speaking ill of the necessity that the property granted to a foundation should be used under the conditions he wishes.

19 - The reformer says:

"The cause of the increase in the properties of awqâf is not because of piousness or goodness but because of the pillagers' giving one percent of the houses they have pillaged as alms to a mosque, to a madrasa or to a dervish lodge in order to guarantee the ninety-nine percent for their own and their children's advantage, lest someone might pillage the wealth they have pillaged."

The principles concerning awqâf should not be discussed in such ignorant terms but by examining minutely. To be brief, fortunately the religious foundations have survived without changing up to now, and as the result, the properties which amount to almost half of the State's budget have been reserved for the nation. If it had not been for the principles of religious foundations, may be this great wealth would have no longer existed today.

20 - The reformer says:

"Many parasitical people live among Muslims today. Though it is declared that man has nothing but his labour, madrasas, imârets (food-kitchens for the poor) and dervish lodges get filled by millions of lazy, so not useful but harmful, people."

It is an âyat in the sûrat an-Najm which declares that man has no profit other than of his labour. Religion reformers mention this âyat very frequently but they understand its meaning little. Those who know the preceding and following âyats easily comprehend that this âyat is about the advantages pertaining to the next world. Moreover, men can utilize also the things which they do not work for. Inheritance is an evident example for this. This âyat declares that as one will not suffer harm from another's guilt in the next world, so his advantage will be only what he deserves. Every Muslim has to try to work for the advantages of this world provided it will not harm the advantages of the next world. Such work is an 'ibâda, a religious duty. In urging people to work, it is out of place to interpret this âyat wrongly.

It is appalling that the reformer regards students as parasites, and the imârets established for the benefit of the poor and the destitute, not as good places but as harmful places. There is no doubt that madrasas and imârets help education, culture and humanity. Should not we build hospitals for the poor, either?

21 - The reformer says:

"Christianity also was fixed. They strove not to change it. Later, the rebellion of a Christian reformer spread out far and wide. The fixed, unchangeable rules fell down."

All the heavenly religions were fixed. The thing called "religion" must be stable. If it is changed by people, the new one will be called not a "religion" but "irreligiousness".

22 - The reformer says:

"The white may mix with the black race. The mulattos cannot establish a civilization. The spirit, that is, the common feelings, of

each race will fade away. This theory put forth by Gustave Leubon has been witnessed by the Ottomans. With the foreign blood which mixed with their race as the result of the method of devşirme (recruiting boys to be brought up as Janissaries) and through concubines, the Ottoman spirit deteriorated. This added to their genius but spoiled their morals."

Gustave Leubon said, "Of the mixed races, the minority will die, their blood changing after a few generations." Because the majority was Turkish in the Ottoman Empire, the Turks did not vanish but they increased in number and became stronger. Today, democracy has improved so far as to be said to be limitless in European countries, and races have been mixed altogether. Did this cause them to lag behind? There is not a pure race in the United States, where the mixture of various races has not prevented advancement in civilization. If they were honoured with being Muslims, their morals also would be perfect and the ancient Islamic civilization would enlighten the whole world. While races have mixed more in the course of history, there has not been any decrease in civilization. According to the reformer, people must have been more civilized in the old times when people mixed least.

It is very unsound, and extremely ridiculous, to regard the mixing of races as the reason for the immorality or corruption which led the Ottomans to a catastrophic end. The one and only real cause of the corruption and immorality was the irreligiousness of the educated and the ignorance of the uneducated. The role of irreligiousness in worsening morals was much more effective than that of ignorance. It is for this reason that the educated irreligious are worse and baser. Therefore, survival of societies necessitates religious knowledge and a method of education based on religious knowledge. In order to prevent the fall of the Ottomans, those who wanted to rescue them from ignorance, which was yet their own disease, dragged them to the destruction of irreligiousness, which was more perilous, and thus they annihilated them altogether.

23 - The reformer says:

"After caliphate increased the power of the Ottoman rulers, sultans became sort of semigods in the eyes of the people. A gesture on their part could cancel personal wealth, honour and even life. This dictatorial torment was feared more than Allah's Hells were."

Islam's first article at the head of all its constitutions have been

"Those commands which [Muslims are ordered to commit what] **Islam prohibits should not be obeyed."** The rulers presiding over Muslim countries, whether they be called a caliph, a sultan or else, cannot go as far as to make their every wish done. They can never be semigods. Among the Ottoman rulers, none was seen to behave so excessively. There were very merciful ones, and the cause of their fall was not cruelty but mercy. This resulted not from the religion but from disobedience to the religion. The conditions and limitations which Islam put on individuals and from which rulers were not exempted were always known by all the Muslim nations. Long before the declaration of human rights in Europe, Islam had given it to Muslims not only as a right but also as a duty to disobey the despotic commands of rulers who would violate Islam and act lawlessly.

24 - The reformer says:

"Not the religion itself but the conception of religion by Muslims, the dictatorial administration based on the religion and the family education which was also based on the religion have put the individual in such an unsuccessful state in social life."

It is the main principle of religion reformers to impute every guilt to the religion in such a manner as to remind of the proverb, "Attack the weak!" and to camouflage behind such words as, "not the religion itself but the conception of religion."

25 - The reformer says:

"Muslims, who believed that they could not do anything and who looked resigned because of the idea of qadâ' and qadar lived under fear for centuries and became obedient, comtemptible, sycophantic and deceitful like the slaves who trembled under scourges in Europe in the Middle Ages. The causes of the corruption of the Ottomans to such a degree were the principles of qadâ', qadar, tawakkul and contentment taught by the religion, and the proposed sufficiency of belief in order to become a Muslim, simply believing by heart and confessing by the tongue. Qadâ', qadar and tawakkul have annihilated the determination and will in Muslims and by decreasing their confidence in their work and in their own personalities caused them to abase themselves so far as to endure every kind of torture and humiliation. The idea of being content with little made people lazy. And since it was too simple to be a Muslim, none of the modern and moral qualities was regarded necessary for being a Muslim, and it was considered that Muslims could do every evil; which in turn led to laziness and immorality."

We will tell about all these clearly and in full detail in the following article.

26 - The reformer says:

"The Muslim believes that what happens, whether good or evil, has been predestined in eternity by Allah: 'We are human creatures. The creature cannot help it. Allah makes everything. The creature cannot change qadar. For example, the sustenance of everybody has been determined in eternity. Whatever we do, we cannot change it. A danger will harm us if Allah wills, and it will not if He does not will.' Besides having tawakkul there is no way out for Muslim." Thus, he tries to undermine the basic beliefs of Islam.

All the Islamic beliefs stated in the last paragraph are correct. Like the ignorant people who misunderstand qadâ' and qadar, the reformer probably cannot understand these concepts. Nevertheless, all Muslims, even the ones who misunderstand them, like them, while the reformer dislikes them. If Muslims were lazy because of this belief, they would have to be lazy in worshipping, too; one who is lazy because of his belief that nothing is in his power, would be lazy not only in worldly affairs but also in duties pertaining to the next world. If Islam had tied man's hands, feet, option and will in worldly affairs, it would have kept them tied also in religious affairs. Do reformers believe that people with such a belief are lazy also in all their 'ibâdât including salât and fast? If they do so, why don't they complain also about this kind of laziness? They do not mention or write about this laziness; is it because Muslims do not believe in qadâ' and qadar in their affairs pertaining to the next world, or is it because reformers slight the next world? As we all know, Muslims have become lazy also in performing their religious duties today. And this should not be out of their love for the religion, should it? If Muslims depended on the religion firmly, they would not be slack in their religious duties. Whence has this laziness come over Muslims? When it is observed minutely, it will be understood that sweetness of our life and comfort, that is, following our nafs, is the cause. Ignorance has been added to it. Our ignorance has prevented us from realizing the necessity of endeavour and self-sacrifice for ensuring sweeter life and continuous comfort in Paradise. Then, it is a very unjust, groudless slander to indicate the exalted and valuable realities of Islam as the cause of this laziness. And it is a very loathsome slander to impute evils, especially fawning, hypocrisy, flattery and lie, to Islam. These evils

are caused by self-seeking, that is, by abandoning Islam and clinging to the world and by giving up the rules of morals. In short, the main causes of immorality are irreligiousness and ignorance. A person who puts his trust in Allâhu ta'âlâ, i.e., who has tawakkul, and who believes in qadar does not condescend to fawning and lie, nor does he believe that advantages outside qadar can be obtained through these ways. A person who believes that profit and loss are from Allâhu ta'âlâ simply does not humiliate himself before creatures. He will not flatter anybody. However, those who deny qadâ' and qadar and rely only on intermediaries, especially on illegal, evil intermediaries, will do so. Also it is out of place to ask, "What degenerates Muslims is not tawakkul and belief in qadar, but isn't it misunderstanding them?" Evils and immoralities cannot result from any manner of understanding tawakkul and belief in qadar, for this belief and evils are antonymous to each other. There is no relation between them. Even misunderstanding the teachings of tawakkul and qadar does not lead to evils. Shame on those mouths and pens who, instead of looking for these evils and immoralities in the denial of tawakkul and qadar, search for a relation between evils and Muslims' belief! Do they diagnose the diseases of Muslims contrarywise like this? We should not complain about tawakkul and belief in qadar of the flatterers and liars who wish to attain their evil desires; instead, we should recommend that they have tawakkul and belief in qadar. See what our Master Fakhr al-'âlam (sall-Allâhu 'alaihi wa sallam) said in the Hadîth ash-sherîf:

"Fear Allâhu ta'âlâ and cling to good intermediaries in order that you may obtain the things you wish. Do not cling to evil intermediaries! I swear by Allâhu ta'âlâ within Whose Omnipotence and Will I exist, that nobody goes from this world to the next world without completely taking his sustenance, which has been determined in eternity."

Another idea which the enemies of Islam frequently repeat is, "The scholars do not encourage Muslims to earn money. By saying that this world is transitory they alienate Muslims from this world." However, the duty of religious scholars is not to teach Muslims their needs and advantages which they could know and understand through their instincts, that is, their natural actions such as feeling for nipples to suck, as soon as they are born. "Earn money, do not become destitute, stop your hunger, put the morsel into your mouth, rest when you get tired..."; it is not necessary to tell these not only to human beings but even to animals. The duty

of religious scholars is to teach useful and luminous teachings such as not to forget about the next world while obtaining worldly advantages, to observe other's rights and justice, not to follow the nafs, to trust in Allâhu ta'âlâ and not to be slack in working and thus to add a spiritual power to one's own power.

Question: "Having misunderstood qadâ', qadar and tawakkul, Muslims have become lazy and then their morality has been spoiled and they have dived into evils. Isn't that right?"

Answer: It may be right. When such evils as flattery and mendacity appear in some Muslims, they will wholely forget about qadâ', qadar and tawakkul. Then what must be done is not to correct their understanding but to make them believe again. If, instead of doing this, qadar and tawakkul are spoken ill of, they will be altogether alienated from these. We should not blame qada', qadar and tawakkul but condemn their bad behaviors.

Tawakkul is not a weakness but a power in Muslims, who practise tawakkul because it is commanded by Islam. Islam, while commanding tawakkul, prohibits laziness. The âyats, **"Endeavour in the way of Allâhu ta'âlâ, which is the righteous way",** and, **"The person who has the heaviest burden is Muslim who thinks of both this world and the next world and works for both,"** and the hadîth, **"Allâhu ta'âlâ does not excuse incapacity, slackness. You should utilize your brains and intellect! Even if the difficulty of the job seems to overcome you, you should keep on working, saying, 'Allâhu ta'âlâ's help is sufficient for me!' "** are the evidences for this fact. The hadîth, **"Tether your camel and put your trust in Allâhu ta'âlâ!"** openly declares that it is necessary both to have tawakkul and to work. Muslim scholars have told and written these commands of Islam in books in every country in every century.

Tawakkul does not mean not to work and become lazy. Tawakkul is done for beginning a job and accomplishing the job begun. It helps to remove the fear of failing in a difficult job. The proof of this is the âyat, **"When you begin any work, have tawakkul in Allâhu ta'âlâ, trust in Him!"** This âyat points out that, besides tawakkul, not only labour but also determination, which is above labour, is necessary. Then every Muslim should work, be determined and then trust in Allah.

Religion reformers say that man should trust in himself, and Muslims say that he must put his trust in Allah only. Because the enemies of Islam do not believe in tawakkul and for replacing the power and courage granted by tawakkul, they are compelled to

meet this need with the word self-reliance. It is seen that tawakkul is not unnecessary for Muslims. Some being to be trusted in is necessary.

27 - The reformer says:

"Muslims believe that their sustenance has been determined in eternity. They think that Allah the Most Generous will meet their needs. Like an old carriage that may break into pieces at any moment on the road, they drag on along the road of means of subsistence which would be shown to them by some chance event. They do not think that they may increase their earnings by working. They do not regard it necessary to work. This is the effect of the religion in their sitting lazily and resignedly.

"A free person having power of will believes that he himself has some power capable of doing. This self-reliance gives man the strength of struggle for life. As he struggles, as the hardships obstructing his purpose increase, he feels stronger and wishful to fight more with the increased fire of his shocked pride. He is sure that he will win at last. Nothing can resist against this confidence, this belief. If we want to live, let's form self-reliance."

We learned too much from such bloody and fervent lessons of self-reliance in the First World War. We saw how great troubles we got ourselves into. Self-reliance may also result in such crazy attacks. If tawakkul in Allah had been preferred to self-reliance during the war, none of the subtle points, which were more reasonable and more legal than those actions, would have been neglected, because, in putting one's trust in Allah it is necessary to follow the Divine Rules, which make one esteem every subtle point. Islam commands both to work and to have tawakkul. Those who idle and say that they have tawakkul are the defective people who do not perform one of these two duties. Islam disapproves such people, for they perform one of the two commands of Islam and neglect the other. Reformers who slander them are as defective as they are, because they, too, abandon one of the duties and emphasize only the other duty. In fact, their fault is graver than that of those who do not work, since we human beings, after working as hard as we can, are in need of putting our trust in Allâhu ta'âlâ and expecting the reward of our work from Allâhu ta'âlâ; we further need to have a second tawakkul so that we shall not forget Allâhu ta'âlâ but expect His help while utilizing in working the power which is said by reformers to be in us and is given to us by Allâhu ta'âlâ since the real, inexhaustible, unconquerable power can be attained by not forgetting Him.

Despite the âyats, **"If Allâhu ta'âlâ helps you, no one can overcome you. If He does not help you, no one can help you. Then, Muslims should trust in Allâhu ta'âlâ!"** and **"O My Beloved Prophet! Tell them, 'Unless Allâhu ta'âlâ wills, I am not able to be of any use or harm to myself,' "** and many other âyats, does it befit reformers who claim to help the religion to abrogate tawakkul and look for something named "self-reliance"? They cannot say, "Seeing that tawakkul is misunderstood, we demand this," for self-reliance is to trust only in oneself and is quite contrary to tawakkul and spoils one's tawakkul. Moreover, it gives way to egoism and self-esteem. Self-reliance contradicts the knowledge of logic, too, for it shows inability to find somebody else to trust in, and unless the one who trusts and the other who is trusted do not exist, the word 'trust' does not have any meaning. Explaining the vicious circle in logic, it is said, "One thing must need itself." In literature, self-reliance is dealt with extensively but in the sense of trusting in others' help, and when it is as excessive as to make one forget the trust in Allâhu ta'âlâ, it is evil and harmful. Self-reliance, with this bare meaning, does not have any value except its senselessness against reason and logic, and it does not help one to obtain -from oneself- a great power which does not exist in him. Everybody has self or ego, and self-reliance does not cause one to be distinct from or superior to others. A Turkish proverb says, "He who has not suffered another person's punch regards his fist a heavy stone." Two opposing forces each of whom has done his best for the means to success and puts his trust not in himself but in Allâhu ta'âlâ might seem equally powerful to win, but the one who believes that he is right also believes that his opponent will not utilize tawakkul. When they depend on their self-reliance, however, there is no reason for such belief, and though one may say, "Allâhu ta'âlâ will help me because I am right," he may not say, "My ego will help me because I am right." Because, the ego of the unjust one desires superiority more and assaults more wildly. It is not a defect for tawakkul to be useless for the one who is aware that he is wrong. It shows that it cannot be used for evil purposes as self-reliance is used.

Since in tawakkul you put your trust in Allah alone without trusting in others' help in your work, much more power results from it than does from self-reliance. The reason why religion reformers speak ill of tawakkul must be because they do not realize this. Neither the person who has tawakkul just trusts in Allah and sits idly, nor the one who has self-reliance just trusts in

himself and sits idly. So, both will work and neither will trust in other people. But the person who trusts in himself is lonely, and a Muslim who has tawakkul has his Allâhu ta'âlâ besides his own labour, getting power from this Inexhaustible Source. A Muslim who has tawakkul works with all his strength and does not fall into such self-esteem or egoism of regarding his gain as from himself.

Since self-reliance means to work with much energy without trusting in anybody else to help him, tawakkul, too, puts such hard labour into a shape suitable with reason and logic and embellishes it with modesty. What is expected from self-reliance is provided by tawakkul in a more proper and better justified way.

28 - The reformer says:

"The obscuration of high realities among the medley of superstitions has been caused by the contentment, tawakkul and resignation of Muslims. The hadîth telling that contentment is an inexhaustible treasure has been mis understood to the extent that it is not even believed that it is necessary to work."

"It is a very unjust slander to blemish Muslims with laziness just because of their contentment. 'Contentment' does not mean 'not working; using whatever one finds by chance and not looking for anything else'. It means 'being satisfied with what is earned by one's physical labour and not casting covetous glances on others' earnings'. It teaches that others' earning much more should not be envied and that one should work hard like them. It teaches not to stock the remaining part of what one needs of one's earnings, and to give it to charitable institutions defined by Islam and to help the poor, the destitute, the diseased and mujâhids. So, contentment is not only the source of good morals but also an unconquerable fortress providing man with happiness when he is in deprivation. The poet says:

"O Time; While attacking people, don't suppose that I am like other people and don't march upon me! You can't twist my arm! Don't suppose I am alone against you! There is an undefeatable army behind me: my contentment!"

29 - The reformer says:

"Sects sprang up in Islam. They parted into two even in îmân. Those who followed the Prophet's companions were called 'Ahl as-Sunna'. Those who departed from this path were called ahl al-bid'a. Ahl al-bid'a parted into seven groups. Today's Muslims have chosen the way of Jabriyya among these ahl al-bid'a groups.

Those who claim to be Ahl as-Sunna say, 'Man can do nothing. Allah creates everything and man does what is predestined.' According to them man is incapable in every respect."

The reformer mistakes Ahl as-Sunna for Jabriyya. It is true that man is incapable before the Divine Power in every way. Yet if Muslims considered themselves incapable and others powerful, then the reformer would have a right to speak.

30 - The reformer says:

"There was nearly no Ottoman family in which they did not blunt and kill the abilities of comprehension, observation and inquiry in children with suppressing, ignorant answers. The utterly ignorant people, who believed that men were of infinite impotence, that everything was made by Allah, that grave was an intermediary that interceded with Allah for man, that the head of the state was the absolute ruler, and who lived in the world of dreams full of genies, fairies and vampires, always answered their chidren's questions as 'Allah makes,' 'Allah has predestined so,' 'Don't ask too many questions.' or 'Be quiet, it is a sin, it is disbelief!' Religious scholars did not or could not tell people the moral, social uses in worshipping. Parents' prohibitive treatment of children was because scholars misunderstood and misstated Islam. It was forbidden for the child to think and ask about religion, morals, customs and honesty. Thus, it resulted in tawakkul, resignation, loss of power of will and hesitation, which in turn developed into viciousness and impersonality in the child. All these were qualities that caused easy defeat and settlement of bad habits."

All the evils which the religion reformer writes are, in actual fact, imputed to the religion, especially to the teachings of qadâ' and qadar and to the unquestionability of religious knowledge.

It is never right to blame Islam and its scholars by putting forth the idea that graves are intermediaries between Allâhu ta'âlâ and men. All Islamic scholars refute this idea. The Ahl as-Sunna scholars have unanimously prohibited Mulims from worshipping anybody besides Allâhu ta'âlâ. The belief that the dead, and even the alive, are intermediaries between the Creator and His human creatures exists not in Islam but in Christianity. While they impute this to Muslims and regard it viciousness, why don't they regard Christian Europeans vicious? Recently, the viciousness and immoralities of the children brought up in European fashion by modernist families have been filling the columns of daily papers even though they do not have that "old-fashioned" religious training. It is very unfair to blame Islam on

account of the indulgent policies we have been following with our children, such as being too tolerant and too affectionate towards them, so much so that they do not feel compelled to care for themselves and become accustomed to laziness. In Islam the father does not have to continue to care for his child who has matured mentally and reached the age of puberty and who should work and earn; therefore, every father has to teach his child a craft as well as knowledge and manners.

There are three principal groups having different views concerning the effect of man's will on his actions: the Mu'tazila, Jabriyya and Ahl as-Sunna.

According to the **Mu'tazila,** Allâhu ta'âlâ has given men power and will and man creates all his actions. They say that trembling of the arm and beating of the heart occur from themselves, but man creates the raising of his arm and the stepping of his foot, and if man did not create his optional actions Allâhu ta'âlâ would be unjust for rewarding for goodness and torturing for evils. They put forth the âyats, **"Allâhu ta'âlâ does not treat men cruelly. They treat themselves cruelly,"** and **"It is the retribution for what they have done."**

And according to the **Jabriyya,** "The pencil has written in eternity all that would happen, and its ink has dried lest it might be changed later. Everything has been predestined in eternity. Things that are in Allâhu ta'âlâ's knowledge and everything which He has predestined in eternity will come out just as it is predestined. No one can change this. The eighteenth âyat of the sûrat ar-Ra'd says, **'Allâhu ta'âlâ is the Creator of everything.'** Allâhu ta'âlâ is the One who creates man, who gives man power and will, and who creates all his actions."

Muhammad Ma'thûm al-Fârûqî (rahmatullâhi 'alaih) wrote:

"Those who belonged to the Jabriyya said, 'There is no will or option in man. Man is compelled in his actions. He is like a tree swaying in the wind. It is not correct to say that man did something. Everything is done by Allah.' These words cause them to become disbelievers. He who believes so is a disbeliever. According to them, 'Man will be rewarded for good deeds and he will not be tortured for evil deeds. Disbelievers and sinners are excusable. They will not be regarded guilty or punished, for the evils are done not by themselves but by Allah, who compels men to do them.' These words cause disbelief, too. Allâhu ta'âlâ declares in the twenty-fourth âyat of the sûrat as-Sâffât, **'They will be questioned on their belief and on what they have done.'** The

hadîth says that seventy prophets cursed those who belonged to the Jabriyya. Every reasonable person can easily understand that their words are wrong. It is obvious that trembling of the hand is different from raising the hand optionally. Trembling of the hand is not within man's wish, but raising the hand is within man's option and will. It is clearly understood from the Qur'ân that the followers of the Jabriyya are in the wrong path. Allâhu ta'âlâ declares in the fourteenth âyat of the sûrat al-Ahqâf, **'They will be rewarded for the good they have done.'** He declares in the twenty-ninth âyat of the sûrat al-Kahf, **'You may believe or not. We have prepared fire for the cruel** (disbelievers)**.'** And it is declared in the thirty-third âyat of the sûrat an-Nahl, **'Allâhu ta'âlâ did not torment them. They tormented themselves by disbelieving and sinning.'** If there were no option or power of choosing in man, Allâhu ta'âlâ would not say, **'They tormented themselves,'** in this âyat. Many people think like the Jabriyya and say that men cannot do what they wish. They say that they are compelled to commit sins and that they commit them compulsorily. They consider themselves excusable and innocent. On the contrary, Allâhu ta'âlâ has given men as much option and power as to perform the commands and prohibitions. Beating of the heart and man's walking are certainly two different actions. Beating of the heart is not within man's power. But man walks if he wants and he does not if he does not want to. Because Allâhu ta'âlâ is All-Bounteous and All-Merciful, He has not commanded men things that are not within their power. He has wished them to do things which they are able to do. The last âyat of the sûrat al-Baqara, declares, **'Allâhu ta'âlâ has commanded his human creatures things which they are able to do.'** It is surprising that the Jabriyya group get offended by and oppose to those who do not listen to them and who annoy them. They take every kind of trouble to bring up and train their children. They do not let other men approach their wives and daughters. They hurt those who do so. They do not say that they are compelled and therefore are excusable and tolerable. When the subject changes to affairs pertaining to the next world, however, they say, 'We cannot help it, Allâhu ta'âlâ makes everything,' and shamelessly commit the evils prohibited by Islam and abstain from worshipping commanded by Islam.

"Though they say that there is not any wish or will in man, they commit whichever evil they wish. Allâhu ta'âlâ says in the seventh âyat of the sûrat at-Tûr, **'The day whereon Allâhu ta'âlâ will torture them will certainly come. No one can prevent it.'**

When they see a mad person in their own house or if they see him commit a sin, they tolerate him by saying that he does not have wisdom and option. Yet they punish sane people who commit sins. Then they punish them because they have option and commit sins willingly. The Jabriyya group departed from the right path by saying that man did not have option and the Mu'tazila group deviated because they disbelieved qadâ' and qadar. They became ahl al-bid'a. They went wrong. It has been the lot of the Ahl as-Sunna scholars to find the right path which is between these two extremes. It is reported that al-Imâm al-a'zâm Abû Hanîfe asked Imâm Jâ'far as-Sâdiq (rahmatullâhi 'alaih) 'O the grandson of Rasûlullah! Has Allâhu ta'âlâ left the affairs to men's wish?' He said in response, 'Allâhu ta'âlâ does not leave the attribute of being Rabb (Creator) of His human creatures.' Abû Hanîfa asked again, 'Does He make His creatures do work under compulsion?' He answered, 'He neither forces them nor leaves it to their wish. It is something between these two.' Allâhu ta'âlâ declares in the one hundred and forty-eighth âyat of the sûrat al-An'âm, **'The polytheists will say, "If Allah willed, we and our fathers would not be polytheists, and we would not prohibit anything by ourselves." '** As in this âyat, disbelievers and polytheists say that Allah has willed them to have disbelief and polytheism. Allâhu ta'âlâ will not admit this pretext of theirs. Such words show their ignorance and foolishness.

"**Question:** The Ahl as-Sunna scholars have said that every good and evil thing happens as predestined, willed by Allâhu ta'âlâ. Then disbelievers disbelieve because Allah has willed it so, don't they? Is their pretext not justifiable? Why would not their words be admitted?

"**Answer:** Disbelievers do not say that they were forced into an evil state or that they are excusable. They do not regard disbelief and sins as guilts. They do not consider them evil. They say, 'Allah likes and approves eveything He wills; if He did not like, He would not will. He wills our polytheism and disbelief and has us do what we do. Therefore, He likes and approves all. He will not torture those who do these.' Allâhu ta'âlâ says at the end of the above-quoted âyat, **'So those who preceded them disbelieved** [the prophets of their time]. **Therefore they tasted Our torture. Tell them: "Do you have any knowledge that you can show us as a proof? But you only guess and lie." '** Allâhu ta'âlâ declares in the Qur'ân and in other holy books that disbelief is loathsome and that He never likes it. He announces that disbelievers are

accursed, that they will never attain His Mercy and that they will be tortured eternally. He declares that they speak out of ignorance. Will to do something may not indicate approval for it. It is for certain that Allâhu ta'âlâ wills their disbelief and sins. No one can do anything which He does not will. Though He wills them, He does not approve or like them. The Qur'ân expresses this clearly. These words of disbelievers agree with the Jabriyya belief. They said that they did not have option in their actions, and Allâhu ta'âlâ refused their words and cast them to their teeth, since such a belief was wrong as pointed out above.

Maybe these words of disbelievers are intended for derision, rather than a statement of their belief, for they do not regard their situation bad. They believe that they are good and say that Allâhu ta'âlâ approves and likes their conduct.

"**Question:** 'Everything men do happens with Allâhu ta'âlâ's will. Good and evil things have been predestined and recorded in eternity. Then is there place for man's option and choice? Doesn't everybody have to do the good and evil things predestined in eternity?"

"**Answer:** The predestination in eternal past is in this manner: 'So and so will do such and such a deed with his own desire.' Then the eternal predestination points out not that men do not have option, but that they do have option. If it showed that they did not have option, Allâhu ta'âlâ would act without option in His daily creations and deeds, and He would be compelled to do so, for Allâhu ta'âlâ creates everything in accord with the eternal predestination. Allâhu ta'âlâ is autonomous. He wills, opts and creates what He wills and opts."[1]

The **Ahl as-Sunna'**s belief is between those of the Mu'tazila and Jabriyya. According to the Ahl as-Sunna, man neither creates nor is compelled to do his deeds. The Ahl as-Sunna's teachings can be explained as follows:

In Islam, like in all other heavenly religions, everything happens according to the predestination and will of Allâhu ta'âlâ. And, since man does not know how an action has been predestined in eternity, he has to work in accordance with Allâhu ta'âlâ's command. Qadâ' and qadar are not obstacles against man's working. Men should think about qadâ' and qadar not before doing something but after doing it. The twenty-second

---

[1] **Maktûbât** vol. I, 83 rd. letter.

âyat of the sûrat al-Hadîd says, **"Everything that would happen in the world was written in Lawh al-mahfûz and predestined in eternity before the world was created. We tell this to you so that you would not be sorry for the opportunities you have missed, nor should you feel arrogant for your good deeds and for the blessings Allâhu ta'âlâ has given you. Allâhu ta'âlâ dislikes the arrogant."** This âyat shows that a person who believes in qadâ and qadar will never fall into despair, hopelessness or self-esteem. Belief in qadâ' and qadar does not prevent man from working. It encourages him to work. The hadîth, **"Work! Everybody will find himself attracted to what has been predestined from him,"** tells that man's work will show how qadâ' and qadar will happen, that there is a strong relation between work and qadâ' and qadar. A man's working for goodness shows that goodness has been predestined in eternity for him, since everybody is attracted towards doing the actions which have been predestined for him in eternity.

As it is an obligation for Muslims to believe in qadâ' and qadar and to know that all the good and evils are from Allâhu ta'âlâ, so it is their duty to do good and strive to abstain from bad behaviour. That Allâhu ta'âlâ knows how something will happen before it happens or that He destines and decrees according to this knowledge of His is not a compulsion over man. Because He knew in eternity also how man would use his will and option. This knowledge or predestination is not contrary to the wish and will of men. Allah's knowing in eternity does not influence the happening or not happening of actions. **"Knowledge is dependent upon the known,"** has been said in order to show that knowledge would not affect actions.

A person does some good or bad thing, and Allâhu ta'âlâ knew in eternity that that thing would be done, and predestined it according to His knowledge. Allâhu ta'âlâ's predestining will come true and His knowledge, which caused this predestination, will not prove wrong. It is seen that man is not compelled to do this work. Allâhu ta'âlâ knew in eternity that this person would do that work with his own will and wish. Man's option or will is the cause of qadâ' and qadar in eternity. That is, man will wish to do that work not because Allâhu ta'âlâ knew and predestined in eternity that work to be done so. Allâhu ta'âlâ has predestined it so, because He knew in eternity that man would use his will to do so.

The first cause in man's doing something is his own will and option. Though Allâhu ta'âlâ predestined in eternity an action

which man would do with his own consent, man's will and option were within the divine knowledge in eternity, and probably before the predestination. For this reason, the eternal predestination helps man's will and option. Because man can do nothing by himself and everything must be created by Him, Allâhu ta'âlâ with His predestination makes man wish to do a certain action. The Ahl as-Sunna differ on this from the Mu'tazila and their followers, the Shî'ites, who say, "Allâhu ta'âlâ creates men and gives them power and will, and further than that He is not concerned." As for the Ahl as-sunna, who follow the âyat, **"Allah is the Creator of you and of the things you do;"** they say that every movement, every work of man happens from Allâhu ta'âlâ's creating, inventing, giving him power and having him do. His creating takes place after man uses his will and option. This part of the action, which is called "irâdat juz'iyya" (partial free will) or "kasb" (acquirement), belongs to man and Allâhu ta'âlâ does not create or invent it. For, it is not a material being. Creation and invention happen in the beings which are not thought or imagined but which exist outside (khârij) and affect our sense organs.

Divine Knowledge is unlike human knowledge and it must always prove to be right. That Divine Knowledge has always proved to be right has been misunderstood by the Jabriyya and reformers, and they have supposed that Divine Knowledge was dominant, effective over men's actions. However, this quality of Divine Knowledge does not change itself from knowledge to compulsion. A teacher may know beforehand that his pupil will not succed in the examination. This knowledge of his will not be a compulsion over or a cruelty to the student if he cannot pass the examination. Allâhu ta'âlâ knew in eternity everything that will happen later. That everything happens in accord with this knowledge does not show that there is no will or option in man. Allâhu ta'âlâ knew in eternity also what He would create. Since His creating certainly in accord with this knowledge of His does not show lack of will or option in Him, so it is not correct to deny the existence of will and option in man.

When man wants to do something, first he opts, chooses, decrees or wishes to do it. Then he does it. For this reason, man does not have to do an action. He does if he wishes, and he does not if he does not wish.

Man's wish to do an action necessitates his initial remembrance of that action by seeing, hearing or thinking about it; it has to occur to his heart. Man either wishes or not to do it

when it occurs to his heart. For example, one may find something useful and do it, but someone else may find it unnecessary and may not do it. Who brings an action, its usefulness or unnecessity to the hearts of those who are said to be free in their actions? Why does not one's thought occur to another? If it occurs, why does it seem unnecessary to another? Those various reasons are not within man's power. For this reason, some Ahl as-Sunna scholars have said, "Men are free in their voluntary actions, yet they are not free but compelled in their will and option." Somebody said, "I do what I wish," to Hadrat Imâm al-Ghazâlî. Hadrat Imâm said, "Can you wish what you wish?" Hadrat Abû 'l-Hasan al-Ash'arî interpreted the âyat in the sûrat ad-Dahr of the Qur'ân as, **"You wish only what Allâhu ta'âlâ wills!"**[1]

Allâhu ta'âlâ declares: **"Your Rabb creates what He wishes. He alone opts, chooses. They do not have will and option"** (sûrat al-Qasas, 68); **"Know for sure that Allâhu ta'âlâ gets between man and his own heart"** (sûrat al-Anfâl, 24); **"You cannot bring whomever you love to the right course. Allâhu ta'âlâ brings to the right course whomever He wishes"** (sûrat al-Qasas, 56); **"Even if We sent down angels to them and made the dead talk in front of them and gave them everything they wanted, they would not believe unless Allâhu ta'âlâ willed so"** (sûrat al-An'âm, 111); **"Whomever Allâhu ta'âlâ wills to guide to the right path, He widens his chest for Islam, and He keeps the chest of whomever He wills to send astray so narrow and tight that it is impossible for the truth to enter and for him to ascend to heaven"** (sûrat al-An'âm, 125); and **"Even if I want to advise you, it will not avail if Allâhu ta'âlâ has willed that you remain in deviation"** (sûrat al-Hûd, 34). The Mu'tazila who disbelieve qadâ' and qadar and those who follow them are astonished at these âyats.

The conversation between Mûsâ (Moses) and Âdam ('alaihima 's-salâm) about qâdâ' and qadar is narrated at length in a hadîth.[2]

Alongside these documents showing that the human will is also under some compulsion, there is the obvious fact that man has freedom that will hold him responsible for what he does. The lawcourts all over the world and even everyone's conscience do not want a cruel man who hurts others to be forgiven. Even a

[1] There is detailed information about qada' and qadar in **Endless Bliss** II, 3.

[2] For its explanation, see **Endless Bliss** III, Chapter 38.

fervent fanatic of the Jabriyya does find himself rightful to get angry with and even to retaliate upon a man who attacks him unjustly. A poet says, "Slap on the neck a member of the Jabriyya who says he is content even with the torments of qadâ' and qadar! If he says, 'What are you doing!' tell him that qadâ' and qadar made you do so! Let's see if he will acknowledge you to be right!"

All the laws of justice and moral principles over the world approve and emphasize the Divine Justice decreed in the seventh and eighth âyats of the sûrat az-Zilzâl in the Qur'ân, **"He who does favour in the slightest degree will attain its rewards, and he who makes harm in the slightest degree will attain its retribution."**

Allâhu ta'âlâ declares in the hundred and forty-eighth and following âyats of the sûrat al-An'âm, **"The polytheists will say, 'If Allah willed, we would not be polytheists'... Tell them: 'Final decision belongs to Allâhu ta'âlâ; He would have guided all of you to the right path if He had willed.' "** This âyat does not oppose the words, "If Allah willed we would not be polytheists," of polytheists, and their wrongness is not in that they think that they are guilty because Allâhu ta'âlâ has willed it so, but in that they utter these words in order to rebut prophets and rescue themselves from being guilty. Their words, "If Allah willed, we would not be polytheists," are right. As a matter of fact, it is declared in this âyat, **"He would have guided all of you to the right path if He had willed."** It is declared in the hundred and seventh âyat of the sûrat al-An'âm, **"If Allâhu ta'âlâ had willed, they would not have been polytheists."** Though these words of polytheists are correct, they are loathsome because they utter these words in order to rebut prophets, and they are insulted in the âyat for this reason. As Allâhu ta'âlâ did not have to will all the things which He has commanded, so He did not have to will any of the things which He has prohibited. That is, Allâhu ta'âlâ willed in eternity all that would happen in the world, and among them were also the things which He has prohibited and disliked. Willing is different from approving, from liking. These two should not be mistaken for each other. It can be easily understood that Allâhu ta'âlâ may have forbidden men to do a certain action though He might will that action to be done.

Furthermore, the eighth âyat of the sûrat al-Balad and the eighth âyat of the sûrat ash-Shams openly declare that Allâhu ta'âlâ has given men material and spiritual power and showed the good and evil paths and that man is responsible.

It is seen that in one respect man is a free agent. In this world

and the next he is responsible for everything he does. But there is also al-Irâdat al-Kulliyya (Total Free Will) that does not leave man's will and option alone. Man cannot decide on whether he is capable or incapable. It is very difficult to solve this problem. It would be quite right to say that it is a puzzle having no equal in the world.

Hadrat Abû Mansûr al-Mâturîdî interprets the âyat, **"You wish only what Allâhu ta'âlâ wills,"** as **"Allahu ta'âlâ's Will united with your will. When you will you find His Will present."** According to al-Ash'arî, this âyat does not unite but relates Allâhu ta'âlâ's will with man's will and it wants men to will good things. It means that such will of theirs will get power from the Divine Will and that man's will like his every action needs Allâhu ta'âlâ's permission. The âyat, **"They do not have will and option,"** was said about the disbelievers of Quaraish who said, "That Qu'rân should have been sent down to one of the notables of Mecca or Medina," and it meant that men did not have the will of appointing the Prophet. The âyat, **"Allâhu ta'âlâ gets between man and his own heart,"** was revealed in order to declare, as it is explained in the Qur'ân commentary by al-Baidawî, that Allahu ta'âlâ sees and knows the secrets in the hearts.

As for the hadîth reporting the conversation between Âdam and Mûsâ ('alaihima 's-salâm) and the former's victory, according to the Ahl as-Sunna scholars, in the disliked action of Hadrat Âdam, kasb (acquirement), qadâ' and qadar and tawba (repentance) came together. Repentance and acquirement cancelled each other like two opposite electric charges. There only remained qadar, and it is said that no one could be blamed for qadâ' and qadar. After the part concerning Hadrat Âdam of what he did was corrected by his repentance, that part concerning his descendants, that is, that it caused men to live on the earth, is of Divine qadar for men.

The above-mentioned âyats about that deeds happen only from Allâhu ta'âlâ's will are meant for cases when qadar turns into qadâ'. Man begins to do the action predestined in qadar with his own will, and after Allâhu ta'âlâ wills it also, the action turns into qadâ', that is, it happens. Then, when the actions in qadar turn into qadâ', man's will cannot change it; felicity and misfortune cannot go back. The âyat, **"We have barricaded them on their front and back. We have put a blind before their eyes; they will not see any more,"** in the sûrat Yâ Sîn, and the âyat, **"Allâhu ta'âlâ has sealed their hearts and put a covering over**

their ears and eyes," at the beginning of the sûrat al-Baqara refer to this fact. These âyats indicate in addition that those who somehow attain love of Allâhu ta'âlâ will be protected and led to the right path, and those who cause the Divine Wrath will be abandoned to their evil deeds. Very delicate and subtle actions may cause this love or this wrath. For this reason, man should be very careful towards Allâhu ta'âlâ. Before the actions in qadar turn into qadâ', man's will and option is in his own power, though he may be influenced by exterior effects.

Men have will and are free in their thoughts and actions. Yet their thoughts and actions are related to some reasons, which do not deprive men of being free because they exercise will also without these reasons and they will and do without any reason. When man does not will while there are reasons, the action does not happen most of the time. If the existence of reasons necessitated the action to be done, Allâhu ta'âlâ's will and option also would be ineffective. Before man wills to do an action, he thinks about it in his mind. Then he wills the alternative which influences him more. A salesman sells to the customer who will pay more. This customer is not forced to buy. The salesman is sort of compelled to sell to the one who pays more. If someone happens to anger him by saying, "You cannot sell it to the one who pays less", different issues and additional considerations will influence his selling.

Allâhu ta'âlâ, through the religions He has revealed, has declared to men good and evil deed and His blessings and punishments, which are retributions for them, thus He has prepared reasons for man's will. On the other hand, He has also created in man's mind reasons and thoughts which may lead him to good or evil ways and which struggle and dispute with one another. If, after the struggle between the reason which Allâhu ta'âlâ has declared and those which He has created in the human mind, the good alternative has more influence on man, he wills the good. For example, if an official who knows about the rules and regulations requiring that he should work well does not follow the rules, for instance, if he takes bribes, some reason in his mind, having more influence than the prohibition of the rules, has compelled him to commit this corrupt deed. He could not help an action which should not have been done, and he has done it. Though the money offer and the love of money which Allâhu ta'âlâ has created in the human mind have compelled his will and option to take bribes, the law will not approve it.

Like the state laws, Allâhu ta'âlâ has put religious and moral rules and commanded strictly to follow them. On the other hand, He has created an-nafs al-ammâra, which is always malignant, in men. This can be likened to the State and official who should perceive that he is experiencing a vehement test and should be very alert when the State sends him a bribe in an underhanded way in order to test him.

The religious scholars have not left to Muslims the trouble of dealing with such subtle teachings, which otherwise would have exhausted their minds. They have studied them minutely and written thousands of books. It is surprising that the religion reformers, while they approve children's observations and questions, criticize what the religious scholars have studied and written.

Though communists and some naturalists say that everything is made by nature, (Allah forbid!) they cannot comprehend its secret power. Why should it be a guilt for Muslims to believe that everything is made under the secret power?

About qadâ' and qadar, Hadrat Shaikh-i Akbar Muhyiddîn ibn al-'Arabî had a different comment, and Shihâb ad-dîn Mahmûd ibn 'Abdullah al-'Âlûsî, Muftî of Baghdad, followed him. According to them, willing the good or evils is a peculiarity in man and Allâhu ta'âlâ does not create such peculiarities. For example, they say, "Allâhu ta'âlâ did not make the apple to be apple. He only created it." Al-Âlûsî (1217-1270 A.H., Baghdad), in **Rûh al-Ma'ânî** (his nine-volume tafsîr printed in Egypt), interprets the âyat, **"Final decision belongs to Allâhu ta'âlâ,"** (al-An'âm, 149) in the same viewpoint. In this respect, his thoughts are incompatible with the explanation of the Ahl as-Sunna scholars, and they have not been approved by those who know the matter. According to him, since the reasons of evils in evil men are not created by Allâhu ta'âlâ, it will not be cruelty for Him to punish them, yet because men cannot change these reasons, they must be excusable, that is, though men's deeds escape Allâhu ta'âlâ's compulsion, they will go under nature's compulsion. Even if it is not cruelty to punish men who are under another compulsion, without Allâhu ta'âlâ's compelling them, it is not right for him to say, "Those who are in Hell enjoy torment," in order to rescue men from this state. Furthermore, to say that Allâhu ta'âlâ does not create peculiarities is symptomatic of a belief that verges on naturalism and materialism.

Islamic scholars' writing many books about qadâ' and qadar

does not mean busying with delusions, illusions and superstitions as the religion reformers say. Each of them is a study based on knowledge. It is a grave slander and irreverence for them to say about Islamic scholars that they mixed genies and fairies with the fancies of vampires. The source of fancies and fables which are often told by women, ignorant people and children must be the novels and motion pictures filled with fancies and murders produced in and brought from America and Europe and the corrupt beliefs of Jews and Christians, rather than the books of Islamic scholars.

Genies certainly exist, and it is necessary to believe in their existence. Yet it is wrong to take illusions and fancies as genies.

Nobody has the right to distort Muslims' belief in qadâ' and qadar in order to represent this belief as an obstacle against working and progress. These slanders leak out from comnunists and freemasons. Belief in qadâ' and qadar prevent slackness and egoism. Instead of leaving the events beyond his comprehension, knowledge and power to the unconscious will of the coincidence, it is obvious that man's work will make him more succesful if he connects the wheel of his will to the regular motions of a machine that includes everything from the atom to the sun, that is, if he tries to set his measures by the predestination. A member of the Jabriyya can be silenced by saying, "If you were at a dangerous place and told that the enemy would attack and you believed it, would you say, 'They will do what is predestined. They cannot do anything else. There is no way out of what Allah has predestined,' and remain there or would you get ready to resist or go somewhere else?" Thus it will be affirmed also by the Jabriyya that the sense of need for escaping the danger and working for one's needs exists in man's creation. It is not reasonable to believe in qadar in insignificant affairs and deny it when you are in great danger or need.

It is because of ignorance, inattention and laziness that Muslims lag behind. And I wrote about the origin of the ignorance in the preface. Muslims' belief should not be corrupted by confusing such noble knowledge of qadâ' and qadar with the guilt.

31 - The reformer says:

"Because Europe was small and crowded and its soil was barren, Europeans had to struggle with nature and make progress in science and arts in order to live. Also the fights among needy Europeans caused this. The hot climates in Africa slackened the

people. The plentiful and various fruits in the equatorial jungles caused laziness. Since the hot deserts of Africa and the cold mountains of Europe did not exist in Asia, Asians lived comfortably. They worked easily in earning their living. The continent of Asia became the cradle of civilization. Then an eastern country may work and progress also. The reason why the Ottomans lagged behind was not their being orientals or the climate of the country. The reason was in the religion and in the concept of qadâ' and qadar."

Even if it would be admitted for a moment that the Ottomans misunderstood qadâ' and qadar, abhorred themselves and surrendered to the events, the reasons which gave birth to their retrogression were different. Let us explain them:

As soon as the progressives, who disliked Muslims' surrendering to the event, opened their eyes, they took advantage of this state of the people and began to deceive them and to snatch positions and advantages. If they strove for the progress of the country, the people, whom they blame for having been accustomed to obedience and resignation, would also surrender to them, and progress would not be difficult at all. So, the fault belonged not to the people but to the progressives occupying high positions who did not lead the people to the right path.

Revival of the people was definitely necessary, but such a large nation certainly could not revive itself altogether in a short time; those who revived first did not work in a good manner and thought only of themselves, lending themselves to vicious acts. They said, "Before the remaining people wake up, let's provide for our own pleasures and advantages." No matter what would happen after them, they strove to keep the eyes of the people closed so that their posts remain secure. The one obstacle preventing the people's revival and progress became two. The people were confused whether to awaken from sleep or to escape the cunning progressives' hypnosis. The retrogression of the Ottomans was caused not by those who had been sleeping since the old times but by the satans who appeared later.

32 - The reformer says:

"We should reform the religion. We should begin with îmân first. Îmân could not be mere belief with the heart and affirmation with the tongue. The religion distinguishes good from bad, beautiful from ugly. Goodness should be the fundamental of îmân and evil should be the cause of disbelief. As a fard has various fundamentals, so îmân should have fundamentals such as justice,

direction, patriotism, honour and honesty. The six fundamentals of Âmantu could not be Islam. Islam, which is a perfect social religion, causes misery merely for this reason. Îmân should be corrected in such a manner as to value the Muslim."

Is îmân solely to believe or should it include beautiful a'mâl (deeds, conduct or practice) as the reformer claims? Islamic scholars examined it centuries ago and parted into groups for this reason. According to the Ahl as-Sunna, îmân is only to believe with the heart, and if one cannot express it with the tongue, he will be forgiven. The Mu'tazila and especially the Khawârij, said, "Îmân could not be apart from deeds; he who commits a grave sin loses his îmân." However, the disagreements between these groups were always based on the knowledge they understood from the Qur'ân and Hadîth. As for religion reformers, who know nothing about religious knowledge, they attempt to change îmân with their defective minds and corrupt intentions. They try to imbue the youth with this sophism, which sounds quite right but which in fact bears a very secret danger. By pretending to compare a Muslim who both believes in Allâhu ta'âlâ's religion and follows it with the Muslim who only believes in it but does not follow it, they try to make îmân lose its value and to distort Muslims' belief, rather than trying to defend following Islam. As a matter of fact, it is written in the book **The Evidences of Divine Mercy** by the excessive Russian reformer Baykiyev, "Muslims who have remained behind versus the disbelievers who have advanced cannot be called believers, and since every religion or faith is right, a polytheist or disbeliever cannot be considered bad." Obviously, such writings are intended to belittle îmân, which is peculiar to Muslims. The excessive reformer tries to envenom Muslims all over the world with the idea of reforming the religion.

Religion reformers in Muslim countries cunningly pretend to be Muslims. They say that they want to strengthen and improve the religion. When due attention is paid to their words, it is seen that they take the religion as a man-made system put forth by Muhammad ('alaihi 's-salâm) but not as a religion sent by Allâhu ta'âlâ.

The above-cited idea of reformers that good conduct must be added to îmân is not intended to reveal the knowledge discussed by Muslim scholars for centuries but to hold good deeds superior to îmân, that is to reshape Islam by discarding the religious fundamentals of îmân and 'ibâdât and mixing what they believe to

be good conduct and beautiful morals with the contemporary educational methods in the name of Islam. However, this new system will be a religion believed only for worldly considerations.

Religion reformers think only of ethics and the order of the world. As quoted at the beginning of this book, they say that though the religion is without foundation, it will be good to believe it superficially and to make the people believe as if it were true, since it is a useful force correcting moral values. They want deeds to be a part of îmân, but they cannot provide any naqlî (narrated, traditional) or 'aqlî (mental) document for this. They only make statements having nothing to do with knowledge and reason but sensations fit for the understanding of the ignorant, such as, "What's the use of îmân without a'mâl? By excluding a'mâl from îmân, the scholars of kalâm have reduced Islam to a theoretical religion, though it is a perfect social religion." They rave these words among the smoke which the fire of their hostility against Islamic scholars heaps before their reason. Because they know nothing about the books of the scholars of kalâm, they attack Islam under the pretext of criticizing the immoralities which they witness in those carrying the Muslim names. In order to expose to view how much unright and immoral they themselves are, the words of the Ahl as-Sunna scholars, especially of the specialists of kalâm, are explained briefly in the following:

According to the Ahl as-Sunna, he who commits a grave sin does not lose his îmân, that is, he does not become a disbeliever. A Muslim who commits a sin is called **"fâsiq"** (sinner). Sinners with sound îmân or i'tiqâd may or may not be subjected to torture in Hell in the next world. If they are subjected to torture later they will attain the Divine Mercy and will go out of Hell. The basis of Islam is to believe in the Oneness of Allâhu ta'âlâ and in all the rules, that is, the commandments and prohibitions which were brought by Allâhu ta'âlâ's Prophet Muhammad ('alaihi 's-salâm) certainly from Him. Though it is not a condition of îmân to carry out the commands and to abstain from prohibitions, belief in the necessity of doing the commands and avoiding the prohibitions is a condition of îmân. He who does not believe as such is not a Muslim and is called **"kâfir".** However good work and inventions useful to humanity disbelievers may do, they will not escape punishment in the next world. 'Ibâdât and all good deeds, valuable as they are, remain secondary in comparison with belief in them. Îmân is essential and all good deeds are accessory. Îmân and the deeds done by one who has îmân are useful to him

both in this world and in the next world. They make man attain salvation. Good deeds done without having îmân may make one attain happiness only in this world but not in the next world. The religion reformers think of good deeds only, probably because they do not believe in the next world. Because they think only of worldly ease and happiness, they regard good deeds superior to îmân. In the book **Kavm-i Cedîd** (Modern People), which was published in the time of the Party of Union, real Muslims, having îmân and good deeds are called **"Kavm-i Atîk"** (Ancient People). It derides Muslims and says, "They say that a man who has îmân will be rescued in the next world, no matter how much evil he commits, and the person without îmân will get no good in the next world, even if he does every kind of goodness in the world." However, Allâhu ta'âlâ declares, **"Disbelievers' good deeds** [and inventions useful to men] **in this world are like a mirage seen distant in the desert. A thirsty man supposes it to be water from the distance. But when he gets near it, he cannot find what he expects. On the Day of Judgement, he will find Allâhu ta'âlâ and give his account to Him, who makes the good deeds done by disbelievers in this world look like a mirage, that is, who annihilates them"** (sûrat an-Nûr, 19); **"The good deeds of those who disbelieve in Allâhu ta'âlâ are like ashes blown about by the wind on a stormy day. In the next world, they get no use from those deeds"** (sûrat Ibrâhîm, 18); **"On the Day of Judgement, We will turn their good deeds into thin dust flying towards those for whom they do them, since they do not do for us,"** (sûrat al-Furqân, 23) and **"Shall we declare those whose labours prove most vain? They suppose they do good actions in the world. However, they are people who strive in vain. They have not believed the âyats of their Rabb and that they would enter His presence in the Judgement. We annihilate their favours. We do not neutralize their evils with their favours."** (sûrat al-Kahf, 103-4) These âyats show that the Ahl as-Sunna belief is right.

Although the âyats stating the worthlessness of the favours done by disbelievers in this world show that they will be given no reward, they will cause the punishment to be alleviated according to some Islamic scholars. For the âyat, **(Their punishment will not be alleviated,"** (sûrat al-Baqara, 86; sûrat âl 'Imrân, 88) these scholars said, "It will not be alleviated in respect of time; they will be tortured eternally." These scholars based their view upon the âyats, **"On the Day of Judgement, we will put forward the balance of justice. No one will suffer. He who does goodness as**

small as a mustard seed will attain its reward." (Sûrat al-Anbiyâ, 47) and **"He who does goodness in the slightest degree will get its reward."** Furthermore, there are the hadîths stating that Hâtim Tâî who was very generous, and Abû Lahab, who emancipated his jâriya Suwaiba, who had given him the good news of the Prophet's birth, will be tortured lightly. And the hadîth reporting that the punishment of Abû Tâlib, who loved the Prophet ('alaihi 's-salâm) very much, will be light is very famous. Disbelievers living in dâr al-Islâm have to follow the mu'âmalât part of Islam, and following Islam causes one to earn reward or one's punishment to be alleviated. Since there is no reward for disbelievers in the next world, it is probable that their punishment will be alleviated. Moreover, one who embraces Islam will attain the rewards of the good deeds he has done before becoming a Muslim. As it is reported in the **Sahîhain** of al-Bukhârî and Muslim, Hakîm ibn Hazâm, when he embraced Islam, asked the Prophet ('alaihi 's-salâm) about the good deeds he had done before embracing the true faith. The Prophet said, **"You became a Muslim, the auspicious and useful deeds you have done before being acceptable."**

[When an unbeliever becomes a Muslim, all the sins he has committed are forgiven.[1] Similarly, when a Muslim (Allah forbid!) loses his îmân and becomes an apostate, all the favours he has done become void.]

The Qur'ân al-kerîm and the Hadîth ash-sherîf show that îmân is the belief within the heart, that is, its affirmation by the heart.

The âyats **"Those who believe and those who do pious deeds,"** and **"Those who perform pious deeds after having believed,"** indicate that belief and deeds are separate. If deeds were a part of îmân, they would not be declared separately. When something is attributed to something else, it will be understood that the two things are different. In the âyat, **"When two groups of Muslims fight each other, reconcile them,"** (sûrat al-Hujurât, 9) those Muslims who commit sins, like fighting each other are still called "Muslims". The âyat, **"Certainly Muslims are brothers. Reconcile your brothers!"** (sûrat al-Hujurât, 10) declares that they are Believers. Allâhu ta'âlâ says, **"Certainly Allah does not forgive polytheism. He forgives the sins except polytheism of whomever He wills,"** (sûrat an-Nisâ, 47, 115) and the hadîth says, **"Hadrat**

[1] And he becomes absolutely pure. Therefore, we should try to win his prayer for us by showing respect and affection towards him.

Jabrâ'îl (Gabriel) **came to me. He brought the good news; he who dies without having attributed anything as a partner to Allâhu ta'âlâ, that is, without being a disbeliever, Paradise is the place where he will go at last, even if he has committed adultery, even if he has committed theft."**

The âyats and hadîths above indicate that belief and practice are different from each other. The Mu'tazila and the Khawârij, who said that practice was a part of belief, put forth as documents the âyats, **"If one becomes a disbeliever, it does not harm Allâhu ta'âlâ who needs nothing,"** (âl 'Imrân, 97) and **"Allâhu ta'âlâ made you love îmân. He placed it into your heart and He made disbelief, sins and disobedience seem ugly to you."** (al-Hujurât, 7) They further said that the following words of 'Umar (radiy-Allâhu 'anh) also emphasized the meaning they understood from the former âyat: "I wish I could send official inspectors out to find those who have properties but do not go on hajj and to make them pay jizya, for they are in disbelief." However, the word 'disbelief' in the âyat and in this quotation means the 'denial of hajj'. In the last âyat, îmân and sins are classified in different classes, but it does not mean that they are opposite. There are many things which may be together though they differ in respect of beauty and ugliness. The âyat, **"What a bad quality it is to be sinful after having believed,"** in the same sûra very openly defines the places of îmân and sins. It tells that sinfulness is a bad quality unbecoming to Muslims and that the sinner has îmân. The latter is understood from here, because real evil and atrocity is in bringing îmân and sinning together, hence a believer's sinning is worse than a disbeliever's sinning.

A Muslim, who affirms the Existence and Oneness of Allâhu ta'âlâ and the rules He has declared through His Prophet ('alaihi 's-salam), certainly feels sorry if he somehow fails to follow these rules. Someone else who does not acknowledge Allâhu ta'âlâ and His Prophet ('alaihi 's-salâm) and does goodness not as a command of Allâhu ta'âlâ but for some other reason does not even accept to be a human slave to Allâhu ta'âlâ. Allâhu ta'âlâ's treatment of these two surely will not be the same. A lazy son useless to others but decent and thinks of his faults and feels shame in the presence of his father and another son, who is studious, clever and helpful to everybody but one day opposes his father and utters offensive terms such as, "Who are you? I don't recognize you," are to be treated differently by the father. The first one is tolerated, while the other's every goodness comes to

naught at once and he is dismissed; begging to be pardoned is the only thing he can do. The Muslim sinner and the disbeliever are like these children.

It simply is not right to get a Muslim, who believes and likes Islam, out of Islam just because of his faults. Îmân, since it means accepting the Muslim program and respecting it even if none of its rules is carried out, is the basis of Islam. If deeds were a part of îmân, every sinner would be a disbeliever. There would be no Muslim in the world. In the Hadîth, some good acts are associated with îmân and some evils with disbelief, but such analogies are intended to tell about the extent of goodness or badness of those good acts and evils. Other âyats and hadîths show that they are apart from îmân and disbelief. The hadîths, **"Modesty is a branch from îmân"; "Cleanliness is half of îmân"; "Îmân is salât"; "A Muslim is a person in whom people will trust"; "A Muslim does not commit adultery while being a Muslim"; "Every habit, every disposition may exist in a Muslim. Only perfidy and mendacity do not exist in him,"** must be interpreted in the same sense. By likening the absence of the good qualities such as modesty, cleanliness, salât, trustworthiness, chastity and rectitude and the existence of the evils such as mendacity, perfidy and adultery to the absence of îmân, these hadîths point out their importance. By esteeming some actions as highly as îmân, their importance is emphasized. For the religion reformers who say, "How can the Ahl as-sunna scholars separate from îmân the things which the Prophet included in îmân?" the hadîth, **"The person who dies as a Muslim will go to Paradise at last even if he has committed adultery and even if he has committed theft,"** is a good answer. The âyat, **"Men will not be freed after just having said, 'We believe,' but it will be understood whether their word 'We believe' is true or false from their enduring the troubles they meet on the way of religion"** (sûrat al-Ankabût, 2) points out the great importance of enduring troubles.

The eighteenth âyat of the sûrat al-Ahzâb declares that the people who prevented others from going to jihâd with Rasûlullah ('alaihi 's-salâm) and who, in the battles which they occasionally joined hypocritically, did not help him and his companions and who stayed deadly motionless at moments of danger in the battles and whose tongues were sharper than their swords and longer than their spears during the sharing of booties and who escaped from charitable deeds, were not Muslims. It is meant that the people of real and firm îmân would not be so and that all the

worship and useful deeds of those who did so were unacceptable. Hadrat Hasan al-Basrî, one of the distinguished among the Tâbi'ûn, has a well-known saying: "One simply does not insert his hand into a hole in which it is known that there is a snake. If he does, it means that he does not believe that there is a snake there." Likewise, a person who believes in Allâhu ta'âlâ and in Hell should not do things prohibited by Islam. A sinner's saying, "Allah is the most generous, He likes to forgive. I sin because I rely on this," is like inserting his hand thinking that the snake will not bite.

Sins taste sweet to the nafs. A Muslim may commit sins being deceived by his nafs, but his reason and îmân make him feel distress while sinning. Man believes with his reason, and he is dragged into sins because they taste sweet to the nafs. Therefore, îmân and disobedience are different. If inserting one's hand into the snake's hole tasted sweet to the nafs, or if this action caused something that would taste sweet to the nafs, for example, if he were told he would be given a certain sum of money if he inserted his hand, perhaps then he would follow his nafs and insert his hand.

Deficiency in a'mâl (deeds) does not cause man to depart from the religion. When a sin destroys îmân in the heart, for example, if the sinner denies that it is a sin then it becomes disbelief. Actions peculiar to disbelievers and considered as signs of disbelief, such as wearing rope girdle called "zunnâr" worn by Christian priests and worshipping idols, have been regarded as signs indicating denial and removing îmân from the heart. The religion reformer says, "Why should a Muslim become a disbeliever just because of using something? Why should an action done with the hand, foot or head take away îmân from the heart?" These actions themselves are not disbelief, but they are signs indicating that îmân in the heart is corrupt. Throwing the Qur'ân into dirty places and making up words, writings, caricatures, plays and motion pictures ridiculing one of the commands and prohibitions of Islam are actions which cause disbelief themselves.

When the religion reformers who want good deeds to be included in îmân are observed carefully, there is next to none among them who performs salât, fasts and abstains from alcoholic drinks and pork. They believe they should not commit these evils so they may be called Muslims. This shows that their proposals are insincere and that they in fact want not to do good actions but to demolish îmân. Moreover, if good actions or conduct were a

condition of îmân, all of those who do evils wold necessarily be non-Muslims except prophets who do no evil, and no one on the earth could be called Muslim. Religion reformers choose some good habits to be conditions of îmân, since, according to them, men make the religion. Therefore, whatever they want is good to them. In fact, they indirectly say that it is not evil to commit adultery, to have alcoholic drinks, to ignore zakât and salât, and indeed they do not regard observance of these as conditions of îmân. They probably do not know that Islam has punishments for many crimes also in this world and that it urges people to do good; it is fard to perform al-amru bi 'l-ma'rûf wa'n-nahyu 'ani 'l-munkar, that is, to give advice, for the 'ulamâ' to the cruel and for ordinary Muslims to one another. While Islam enforces performance of good deeds and abstention from evil things in this manner, reformers do not regard this sufficient, or, rather, they want none of the Islamic commands but some other concepts to be fundamentals of îmân so that they may call most Muslims disbelievers; what might be the purpose of such an attempt?

Islam considers wearing rope girdles worn by Christian priests and worshipping idols and similar acts as signs of disbelief. A person does not necessarily become a member of another religion because of having done something peculiar to that religion, yet it comes to mean that he admits that the thing peculiar to that religion be seen on him, and îmân in his heart may be thought to have been sapped. Hadrat al-Imâm-al-a'zam Abû Hanîfe said, "One may go out of Islam through the same way whereby he enters Islam." Here, the 'way' means 'believing of the heart', that is, when îmân goes into the heart one becomes Muslim, and when îmân goes out of the heart one departs from Islam.

A person who says he is a Muslim should not do or use the things peculiar to disbelievers unless there is strong necessity, and he should try not to give the impression of a disbeliever. He should think not that he will be mocked when He does the things peculiar to Islam but that he will be respected, and he should feel honour in doing them. It is not permissible to slight the things which are reported by the scholars of Islam to be important by saying, "What do these have to do with îmân in the heart?" For, there is a way leading to each organ from the heart. The acts which Islam commands are good, and those it prohibits are evil. This is true, though people may not understand it today. When the things Islam prohibits are done, the heart darkens and hardens. When grave sins are committed frequently, îmân may go

away.

As it is necessary to carry out the duties commanded in Islam, so it is necessary to believe that each of them is a duty. A Muslim who believes so will for certain carry out these duties willingly.

Believing with the heart is not only the basis of Islam but it is also the highest worship. As it is written in the **Sahîh** of al-Bukhârî, when Rasûlullah (sall-Allâhu 'alaihi wa sallam) was asked what was the highest deed, he said, **"It is to believe in Allâhu ta'âlâ and His Messenger."** and he recited the Âmentu.

That îmân is essential in Islam does not reduce the importance of deeds (a'mâl, 'ibâdât), for it is îmân that causes the performance of deeds. Strong means secures the result. A Muslim whose îmân is strong lays more stress on the importance of a'mâl. Since Muslims have to believe every duty to be a duty separately, those who commit sins fear that their îmân may be harmed and even gone. As a matter of fact, he who slights a sin, for example, by saying, "What if I do it," will become a disbeliever even if he does not commit that sin. I wonder if religion reformers, who want to add some a'mâl to îmân, can realize the importance of a'mâl that well? Those who say that one cannot become a Muslim only by believing with the heart and one must have good actions think of such deeds not to be for love of Allâhu ta'âlâ and for attaining the next world but for the world and worldly happiness.

It is equally wrong to say, "Accept and believe the commands and prohibitions of the religion and then nothing else could make you better off, whether you perform them or not," since he who slights these commands and prohibitions becomes a disbeliever.

Îmân means believing with the heart. For achieving this, first of all knowledge is necessary. Knowledge and practice are two different things. Though knowledge necessitates practicing strongly, the two are not the same. They are separated in the French proverb, "Bien penser et bien dire ne sert rien sans bien faire" (Unless done well, pondering well and saying well are useless.) Contrary to this proverb, Islam says that thinking well without including doing well, that is, sole îmân, is useful.

In summary, the good deeds performed without believing in Allah or not because they are His commands but for some other reasons are of no value. Îmân without comprising deeds, however, is valuable and useful. Muslims carry out the rules of Islam in order to escape the probability of being punished in the next world. In fact, the attainment of worldy happiness is possible for

them by observing these rules. Deeds are an essential part not of îmân but of the perfection of îmân. In one respect, îmân is knowledge. While every kind of improvement and happiness in the world is expected from knowledge, why should one be surprised at that in the next world man will attain happiness owing to îmân, which is based on powerful knowledge? Îmân, which is so valuable, should not be supposed to be unimportant. Those who despise it despite the greatness of the eternal reward it will bring to man are the wretched people who have not been honoured with the fortune of attaining it.

While people give so much consideration to worldly advantages and spending most of their energy for them, they do not pay attention to the fact that they are near an endless happiness or calamity. They never think about this. Allâhu ta'âlâ has given men reason and imposed useful duties on them. In order to inform them, He sent prophets (*'alaihimu 's-salâm*). If one does not know about the laws of life and how to struggle for life, or if he knows but does not work in accordance with them, he will suffer harm. Similarly it will certainly be harmful not to know or not to follow the religious laws pertaining to the next world, the laws which were put and commanded by Allâhu ta'âlâ more importantly, though you know them. As such questions as "Why did He create the miserable and the destitude? What fault do they have?" are out of place and do not help such people, so it is useless to say, "Why has He created the men whom He will torture in the next world?" Man, whose birth and death are not in his own power, has no right to speak ill of Allâhu ta'âlâ's laws pertaining to this world and the next. He can attain happiness only by following these laws.

Some ignorant people who have believed in the lies of communists and freemasons say, "What is religion on earth? Who has seen Paradise and Hell? Such words are the stories of early people and bigots; they are false." If they understood scientific knowledge and Islamic history by learning them from conscientious teachers and if they saw that scientific improvements and new inventions strengthen and prove Islamic beliefs they would cling to Islam tightly, or at least be respectful, decent towards it. If they learned Muhammad's life (*'alaihi 's-salâm*) from books written correctly, they would fall in love with his intellect, beautiful habits and accomplishments. The events showing that hundreds of thousands of people have been attached to him very sincerely, their manners, obedience and excessive love

towards him, and that they would sacrifice their possessions and lives for his sake, fill thousands of pages of history all over the world. It is as obvious as the existence of the sun that such a person, who is the source of all knowledge and the master of all beautiful habits and goodness, is Allâhu ta'âlâ's Prophet ('alaihi 's-salâm). The Hero, who began alone, defeated the two great empires of the world down to the ground with his intellect, patience and keen sight, established a devoted nation within twenty-three years and left behind an unchangeable book that would make people attain ease, happiness and civilization until the end of the world: these suffice for reasonable and just people to embrace Islam. There is no need for another miracle or witness. To deny the words of this exalted Prophet ('alaihi 's-salâm) means to deny history and events. He who knows but does not believe him is a slave to his nafs, to his sensual desires, or an eccentric person who does not wish goodness, working, progress, mutual love, social justice, and who does not think of his and all people's happiness, or an utterly ignorant person who knows nothing about science and history. Every reasonable and just man who learns the beautiful life of Rasûlullah ('alaihi 's-salâm) and the subtleties and uses in the commands and prohibitions of Islamic faith should believe him at once, like him and become a Muslim willingly, as humanity requires. It was true that Abû Lahab and Abû Jahl did not believe him though they saw him and the Byzantine Emperor Heraclius and Persian Shah Perviz did not believe him though they read his letters. Their denying him was a sign of their ignorance, stupidity, ill spirit, or foul heart and persistence.

33 - The Reformer says:

"While the Christian world was moaning under the cruel, burning torture of Catholics, they were quite behind. Christians would kneel before priests, who seemed to have concealed all the mysteries of religion in their beings, which were like the obscure squares of churches, and who hummed the words of an unintelligible language in a magic manner. They would kiss the pavements of churches and suplicate to these idols whom they regarded messengers between Hadrat 'Îsâ (Jesus) and themselves. Likewise, as the hodjas read the Qur'ân, Muslims of every race listen to this thing without understanding it as if they were bewitched. A reformer among Christians came forth and translated the Bible. When the Bible was understood, priests, who had been looked on as God's representatives, began losing their

value. The Luther of Islam has now come forth in Asia: Mûsâ Baykiyev of Kazan translates the Qur'ân into Turkish. This good news means that the thoughts and consciences of Muslims will escape slavery. The rules of the religion, which had been put forward by the four madhhab leaders and been mixed with politics even as early as in the time of the fourth caliph, are uncertain.

"How could right and truth be broken into pieces? The four madhhab leaders tell differently how a rite is to be performed. How could all the four be right? Reason does not accept that the intellect of the four leaders surpassed the intellect of all people who have come after them. To say, 'Only the rules they derived are right; it is not right to derive other rules,' means to put the human mind into chains.

"People's needs change in process of time. As it is declared in the Qur'ân, ***'Every day is different.'*** *To consider the fixed rules derived by the four leaders in the old times as a measure for the everyday needs means not to follow the Qur'ân. The founder of Islam knew that these would happen, so he said that the rules would change in the course of time. It is not compatible with Islam to measure the changing, improving needs with unsuitable rules. The ijtihâd of the four leaders does not mean the religion. As these learned and superior men derived religious rules from the Qur'ân and Hadîth, so every Muslim who has reached the grade of a mujtahid may very well derive new rules from these two sources."*

The reformer starts with the translation of the Qur'ân al-kerîm. Today, majority of those who say they are Muslims complain that the Qur'ân has not been translated up to now and that the religious knowledge has remained secret. They blame Islamic scholars as if these scholars have prohibited translating the Qur'ân. This complaint is quite wrong. Islamic scholars have not attempted to translate the Qur'ân into another language, for they have thought of themselves as incapable of translating Allâhu ta'âlâ's Word without spoiling the expression, eloquence and perfection in its own language. However succesful the translation might be, it has been concluded that it is impossible to reach the deep meanings of Allâhu ta'âlâ's Word. The Qur'ân has deep meanings that do not exist in other holy books. It descended at a time when contests of eloquence took place in Arabia, and it outshone all of them. Translation of such a book must have the same quality, which is impossible. Accomplishing a translation

worth the Qur'ân, which has an eloquence above man's ability, necessitates having ability above the human ability. This is a matter of ability, that is, it is a matter of protecting the superiority of the Qur'ân. Those who want to taste the flavour of eloquence and deep meanings in the Qur'ân have to learn Arabic literature and many a branch of Islamic knowledge such as tafsîr, usûl al-fiqh, and then they can enter the holy presence of the Qur'ân. They must not expect the Qur'ân to come to them.

Writing a Turkish explanation (tafsîr) of the Qur'ân and translating it into Turkish are different. Its translation is more difficult than explanation. It is not true that it has not been translated into or explained in Turkish. It has been, but it has not been liked by connoisseurs of the subject. Religion reformers are wrong in their claim that the first attempt belongs to Russian reformer. If the conscience of Muslims are supposed to escape slavery with a single translation as they say, they should have escaped it with former translations. Moreover, those who accomplished the Turkish explanations such as **Mawâkib** and **Tibyân** were not utterly ignorant in ethics and religious knowledge like those who attempt to translate it today are. They were authorized, prominent scholars having a say in each of the twenty main branches of knowledge and in the numerous helping branches of knowledge. Muslims have been reading and utilizing them. Do religion reformers, who do not like those Turkish explanations want a different translation suitable for their own points of view? A translation done by the ignorant who do not know even the Arabic grammar will be forced to be accepted as the Qur'ân by all Muslims, and religion reformers will call a haphazard Turkish translation of the Qur'ân "the Qur'ân" and have the Turks perform salât reciting such a Turkish "Qur'ân". The real danger endangering one's being Muslim, probably, is to attempt to recite any translation instead of the Qur'ân in salât, rather than translating the Qur'ân. The Divine Word in the Qur'ân is in its own Arabic words and sentences that are on the peak of eloquence and deep meaning. These words and sentences are not man-made. All of them have been arranged by Allâhu ta'âlâ. Each of them bears various meanings. It cannot be decided in which of these meanings is the Divine Purpose. None of the different translations done according to different meanings can ever be called the Qur'ân.

The âyats of the Qur'ân were given different meanings in different ijtihâds by the religious leaders, and a rule was derived

from each of them by each leader, and these rules made up the four madhhabs, while at the same time the original unity of the Qur'ân was maintained. If the Qur'ân were translated according to the rules of each madhhab, what the Hanafîs, for instance, would recite in salât would be different from what the Shâfi'îs would recite, thus, each school of Muslims, each madhhab, would have a different religious book. Islam, like Christianity, would be in utter disorder. Do religion reformers want the Qur'ân to be translated so that Islam will fall into such a state? In order to protect the unity of the Holy Book of Muslims and to keep Allâhu ta'âlâ's Book away from the smallest doubt, Muslim scholars have declared to preserve the Qur'ân as it came from Rasûlullah (sall-Allâhu 'alaihi wa sallam). Moreover, because a few âyats quoted by some of the prominent Sahâbîs, such as Abdullah ibn 'Abbâs, Abdullah ibn Mas'ûd and Hadrat 'Alî (radiy-Allâhu 'anhum) were very slightly different from the Qur'ân which we possess today and which was authorized unanimously by the majority of the Prophet's companions, they were called **qirâ'at shâdhdha** (exceptional recitals) and, though they have been documents for the scholars of fiqh and used in explanations of the Qur'ân, they have never been permitted to recite in salât. How could it ever be permissible to recite Turkish or even Arabic translations, which have been done by this person or that and which are liked today and probably will not be liked and will take different shapes tomorrow, instead of the Qur'ân in salât? No Muslim scholar has permitted it. Al-Imâm al-a'zam Abû Hanîfa was reported to have said once that the Qur'ân could be read in Persian in salât, yet Nûh ibn Mariam said that the Imâm had changed this ijtihâd of his and the scholars of usûl were opposed to reciting it even in Persian.

Reading the Qur'ân even without understanding its meaning will be given thawâb. This is for protecting the Qur'ân, which stands for Islam's constitution, from being altered. Turkish explanations or translations of the Qur'ân can be and have been written, and Islamic scholars have not forbidden this, yet it can neither bear the eloquence of the Qur'ân nor convey the Divine Purpose. Muslims who want to understand the Qur'ân and the subtleties in it and to taste the flavour of its eloquence should read it in its own language and they should not be reluctant to learn the knowledge necessary to enjoy its pleasure. As it is necessary to learn English, French and Arabic languages and literatures in order to understand and enjoy the delicacies in the

poems of Shakespeare, Victor Hugo and Mahmûd Bâqî, so it is very wrong to attempt to understand the eloquence and subtleties of Allah's Word without taking pains to learn the necessary knowledge to understand it. Reading anything, even if in Arabic, other than those words which Archangel Jabrâ'îl ('alaihi 's-salâm) brought to our Prophet (sall-Allâhu 'alaihi wa sallam) never means reading the Qur'ân. Reading the Qur'ân when one is junub, for example, is harâm, though reading others is not harâm.

Religion reformers say that one should understand what one recites and what one asks from Allâhu ta'âlâ in salât. Such words indicate that they have not comprehended what 'ibâda means; the salât that man has to perform was not prescribed by man himself but by Allâhu ta'âlâ, who has declared to His Prophet ('alaihi 's-salâm) how salât and the other kinds of 'ibâdât are to be performed and what is to be recited during performance. Hadrat Prophet ('alaihi 's-salâm) himself performed them and told them to his companions exactly as he had been taught. Even Hadrat Prophet ('alaihi 's-salâm) was not allowed to change the fard, wâjib and harâm, which he never did. Our religious leaders understood all of these by seeing and hearing them from the Prophet's companions (radiy-Allâhu 'anhum), and they wrote them in their books. As these profoundly learned scholars reported, the Qur'ân al-kerîm to be recited in salât has to be in Allâhu ta'âlâ's Word. The duty will have been done only in this way. Those who want to understand the meanings of what they recite in salât can learn their meanings beforehand easily by studying a little. Why should not they study for this while they study for many years, learn many a branch of knowledge and many a foreign language for worldly advantages? Outside of salât, a Muslim can pray to Allâhu ta'âlâ in his own language. He can learn the meaning of the âyats he recites in salât from the books of the Ahl as-Sunna scholars. Those who attempt to learn from books of the enemies of Islam and of the religion reformers will learn wrong, false, loathsome things and their toil will have been wasted.

In order to learn and teach the meanings in the Qur'ân and with pleasure, the religious knowledge correctly and to perform salât easily and Muslims all over the world use Arabic as the religious language. Muslim men have to perform the five daily prayers of salât in congregation in mosque. If everybody performed it with his own language, Muslims who are of various nationalities and speak different languages would not be able to

perform salât together. The same danger arises if the khutba is translated. If it is read in various languages, Muslims will part into separate mosques for salât on Fridays and 'Iyd days, which will result in the danger of the breaking of the unity of Muslims.

Reformers try to eliminate the ijtihâds of our madhhab leaders in order to distort Islam. It is not right, neither for a reasonable friend nor for even an ignorant, slanderous enemy, to say, or even to think, that Islam was spoilt in the time of the Prophet's companions. How would it ever be possible today to find the real shape of a religion if it had been spoilt one thousand three hundred years ago? If it had been spoilt, these reformers' efforts to correct the religion, to make "true" ijtihâds, would have been in vain. If the basic knowledge of Islam had not been correctly available for the madhhab leaders, not even the name or sign of that knowledge would have remained for today's religion reformers. They pretend to make ijtihâd under their masks not by depending on the Qur'ân and Hadîth but by making up false ideas with their own defective mind and short sight as they please. They say that the right and truth cannot be broken but at the same time they try to belittle the four madhhabs by saying, "How could all the four be right?" Further, their idea that ijtihâd should be free, that modern people, too, can make ijtihâd, is an attempt to break the truth into pieces. While each of them likes what he himself understands or thinks and blames others' conclusions, and while they try to open the gate of ijtihâd, they do not even notice that they close it. Contrary to their nonsense, Islam has not limited the right and authority of making ijtihâd to four people. Each of the Prophet's companions made ijtihâd, yet, because we do not possess today the collections of their ijtihâds, their madhhabs have been forgotten. Only the books of four madhhabs survived. Ijtihâd, like commentating or translating the Qur'ân, is a subject of specialization and ability. It is obvious that these reformers, who are unable even to distinguish things that cause disbelief and polytheism, do not possess this specialization and ability.

34 - The reformer says:

"In religions, in social systems, shortly, in all the divine and social rules, there is one common thing; fear. Islam can be put in such a manner as to accomplish the social advantages and prohibit the social evils. If the scholars of fiqh had had this point of view, the most beautiful laws would be Islam today. But by associating all the affairs with the tortures in Hell and the blessings in

Paradise, the scholars of fiqh deprived Islam of a social order. Instead of observing and understanding the greatness of Allah and the delicacies in nature and thus loving Allah, Muslims fear His Hell and fear that He may make them fall into the hands of the cruel. The children fear their fathers and women their husbands. This fear in Muslims fastens the arrangement of social life with a chain of fire. The society of those who have come together with a heartfelt happiness being attached to one another through reason, intelligence and mutual love is certainly better, more sincere and more lasting than a made-up, false and temporary society bound by the power of fear. Men should love their Allah, their Prophet, their religion, their government, themselves, their families and nation not out of fear, but because they are Allah, the Prophet, the religion, the government, the families and the nation."

The reformer observes the fear of Allâhu ta'âlâ and fear of government and of parents from one single point of view and attempts to make religious, political and social reforms with a scratch of the pen. Islam, too, rejects the societies based on dictatorship and cruelty. The hadîths, **"The most beautiful of alms is the true word uttered in the presence of the cruel men of administration,"** and, **"If my umma fall into such a state as to abstain from saying, "You are cruel," to the cruel, Allâhu ta'âlâ does not help them,"** indicate this. Then, it is an obvious injustice to impute the social diseases caused by cruel governments to Islam. Islamic religion has always rejected the fear arising from false and temporary forces of the cruel. The reformer mixes the various reasons of fear with one another. The reason for the fear of Allâhu ta'âlâ is quite unlike these false and temporary forces, nor does the chain fastened to it ever break. As the force increases it unites with right. It is for this reason that the result of combats and revolutions furnishes a right for only the winning side. If there is a mediator country stronger than the two warring countries, that can limit the right of the winner. It is seen that force can be limited and deprived from right, too, even if it is more. Allâhu ta'âlâ's power, above which there is no power and which is the source of all powers, is also the source of right and truth. It is for this reason that it is as sublime and spiritual to fear and shiver from Allâhu ta'âlâ's power as it is to love Him.

In this world, it is regarded a humiliation to fear the great, though loving and respecting them is not considered as something damaging one's honour and esteem. In contrast, those who are

exalted in Islam deem it the greatest honour to humiliate themselves before Allâhu ta'âlâ. This very difference is the subtle point which make fear valuable. As man becomes mature and spiritual, he will still be interested in material needs and material dangers since he cannot escape being material. Therefore, the attachment through fear is the strongest and most valuable. The reformer says that this is not strong, for he sees that the person who attaches himself to Allâhu ta'âlâ through fear changes whenever he finds an opportunity. However, not even for a moment can man find an opportunity against Allâhu ta'âlâ, who sees and knows all his secret and public behaviour and who is never mistaken. The hadîth, **"What a good human being Suhaib ar-Rûmî is. He wouldn't commit any sin even if he didn't fear Allâhu ta'âlâ,"** provides for unity and indicates that fear is a strong means. Reformers suppose that the fear of Allâhu ta'âlâ and love of Allâhu ta'âlâ are different, and they like the latter and are against the former only because they are foreign to the religious knowledge and sources of Islamic religion.

Men are advised to fear Allâhu ta'âlâ in the âyats, **"Those who have much knowledge fear Allâhu ta'âlâ much"** (sûrat al-Fâtir, 28); **"There are two heavens for the person who fears the greatness of his Allâhu ta'âlâ"** (sûrat ar-Rahmân, 46); **"They alone are the believers whose hearts feel fear when Allâhu ta'âlâ is mentioned,"** (sûrat al-Anfâl, 2; sûrat al-Hajj, 35) and **"Those who obey Allâhu ta'âlâ and His Prophet and those who fear Allâhu ta'âlâ and who are cautious of Him are the ones that will be saved on the Day of Judgement."** (sûrat an-Nûr, 52) It is easy to understand now why the reformers who know nothing about these âyats do not have any right to attempt to reform Islam or to criticize the religious scholars who have placed the fear of Allâhu ta'âlâ into Muslims's hearts. If it were bad to place the fear of Allâhu ta'âlâ in Muslims, it would be necessary (Allah forbid!) to criticize the Qur'ân on account of this. Almost every page of the Qur'ân invites Muslims to the fear of Allâhu ta'âlâ with the command, **"O ye who believe! Fear Allâhu ta'âlâ!"** It is declared in the thirteenth âyat of the sûrat al-Hujurât, **"To Allâhu ta'âlâ the most valuable of you is he who fears and is cautious of Him."** 'Ittiqâ' in these âyats means 'to fear'. It originates from their imitating European Christians that reformers want to eradicate the fear of Allâhu ta'âlâ in Muslims and to replace it with the thought that Allâhu ta'âlâ is only benevolent, merciful and protective over His human creatures, as Christians believe. To

love Allâhu ta'âlâ considering Him only as merciful, bountious and not to fear His wrath and punishments means to consider Him weak like a ruler who is unable to operate the law or like the parents who spoil their children by doing what they wish. Those who make progress in a path of tasawwuf, when they are suffused in His attribute of Jalâl (Severity), can not think of the Divine Mercy or of the love of Allâhu ta'âlâ, and when His attribute of Jamâl (Beauty) surrounds them, they forget about the torture in Hell and the fear of Allâhu ta'âlâ; in these states called ecstacy of tasawwuf, they utter words slighting love or fear, respectively, but when they recover, they repent for such words.

The âyats **"Those who work should work for these very happinesses!"** (sûrat as-Sâffât, 61) and **"Those who compete one another should compete for this,"** (sûrat al-Mutaffifîn, 26) order to work willingly for the blessings in Paradise.

Ahmed Mithat, a so-called modernist reformer, in his book **Nizâ-i 'Ilm ve Dîn** (The Disputes Between Knowledge and Religion), tries to flout the belief in the Rising Day, which is a fundamental of îmân, while he represents each of the blessings of Paradise such as food, drinks and houris as concepts pleasing one's greed and materialistic desires. It is glaringly evident that the religion reformers, whose sole concern in this worldly life is to run after these pleasures, who castigate the Islamic scholars because they do not state that the religious practices also should be intended to attain these worldly pleasures, and who say that people should devote themselves to worship in order to attain these worldly pleasures, which, to them, are more attractive, more delicious and more effective than anything else, expostulate about the existence of these pleasures in Paradise for the purpose of maligning the Sharî'at. Such unpleasant allusions to Islamic scholars, who struggled to get Muslims absorbed in performing 'ibâdât in order that they might attain the blessings of Paradise and escape punishment in Hell, have been seen so often. For example, a Bektâshî said:

> ***"Whenever a zâhid***[1] ***mentions Paradise,***
> ***He talks about eating and drinking."***

Such words direct unplesant allusions to the eighteenth âyat of

[1] A person who has much zuhd, i.e. who has freed his heart from whatever is worldly.

the sûrat al-Wâqi'a. Another group in denial of the blessings of Paradise and the punishments in Hell say that they are of no value when compared to love of Allâhu ta'âlâ. Yet the fact is that a person's performing 'ibâdât for them does not indicate that he does not love Allâhu ta'âlâ. Those whom Allâhu ta'âlâ loves are in Paradise and Allâhu ta'âlâ is pleased with those who are in Paradise. Indeed, the greatest felicity is to attain His approval. But one cannot attain Allâhu ta'âlâ's approval by ridiculing the blessings in Paradise which Allâhu ta'âlâ praises and tells Muslims to strive to attain. Because religion reformers want 'ibâdât not in order to escape the punishment and to win reward in the next world but for worldly order and comfort, it is understood that they do not think of Allâhu ta'âlâ's approval.

Love of Allâhu ta'âlâ is the teaching which Islam considers as the most important. But saying that this love alone will suffice for worldly order and regarding the fear of Allâhu ta'âlâ insignificant and unnecessary, although it is the source of every sort of happiness, is a clear sign of knowing nothing about the Qur'ân al-kerîm and Hadîth ash-sherîf. Hadrat Muhammad ('alaihi 's-salâm), the most exalted of men in every respect, said, **"It is me who, among you, fears and stands in awe of Allâhu ta'âlâ most!"** This hadîth and the preceding one about **"Suhaib'** point out that the fear of Allâhu ta'âlâ is necessary. Fearing Allâhu ta'âlâ should not be supposed like fearing a cruel person! It is the fear combined with reverence and love. In poems which lovers wrote to their darlings there are many couplets telling about similar fear in them. A lover who regards his darling much higher than himself does not deem himself worthy of this love and explains his feelings in such a fear.

Fear of Allâhu ta'âlâ and love of Allâhu ta'âlâ are like two wings taking people to salvation and happiness. The Prophet (sall-Allâhu 'alaihi wa sallam) said, **"If a person fears Allâhu ta'âlâ, everything fears him. If he does not fear Allâhu ta'âlâ, he fears everything,"** and **"The extent of one's intellect will be evident in the extent of his fear of Allâhu ta'âlâ."** A person who fears Allâhu ta'âlâ tries strictly to carry out His commands and to abstain from His prohibitions. He does not harm anybody. He shows patience towards those who harm him. He repents for his faults. He is a man of his word. He does every goodness for Allâhu ta'âlâ's sake. He does not cast malicious glances on the possession, life or chastity of anybody. He does not wrong anybody in trade. He does favours to everybody. He abstains

from doubtful things (between harâm and halâl). He never flatters the occupiers of high posts or the cruel. He respects men of knowledge and good morals. He likes his friends and they like him. He gives advice to wrong-doers and does not follow them. He is compassionate towards those younger than him. He shows honour to his guests. He does not talk behind anybody's back. He does not run after his pleasures. He does not say anything harmful and even useless. He never treats anybody harshly. He is generous. He wishes property and rank in order that he may do favours to everybody by means of it. He does not behave hypocritically. He is not arrogant. Thinking that Allâhu ta'âlâ sees and knows every moment, he never commits evil. He is firm to His commands and runs away from His prohibitions. In short, those who fear Allâhu ta'âlâ are useful to their country and countrymen.

35 - The reformer says:

"Because the Ottoman state was based on the principles of the religion it started everything with madrasa education. In madrasas today, Arabic, sarf, nahw, logic, fiqh, badî', bayân, ma'ânî are taught. They teach them in order to correctly understand the religious books which are in Arabic. They say that the gate of ijtihâd has been closed. The majority of those who got education in the madrasa have remained on the first steps of these branches of knowledge. Not [even] one out of a hundred hodjas knows how to read and write correctly. Many of the hodjas, whose lives elapse in the madrasa, cannot pass beyond reading and writing as if it were a sea without shores, and the meaning remains unknown to them like the poles. They are lazy, ignorant and fanatical. I wish their fanaticism were for something which they knew. They are fanatical in defending something which they do not know. And their purpose is to exploit Muslims and live comfortably. Though these hodjas are ideally and morally ignorant, they are in the disguise of religious scholars. There are real scholars among them. It is a debt for us to respect them. Today, there is nothing left of Islam in madrasas. Pulpits, made in order to teach the religion, decency and the Qur'ân, are used for nothing but deceiving Muslims."

When the excessive reformer Baykiyev of Kazan, Russia, said these words, Islam, whatever was left of it on the earth, existed only in the madrasas which he disliked, and today in communist Russia, whose programs begin with the statement that it is necessary to eradicate religions, none of those madrasas and

mosques, which offend the eyes of this excessive reformer, remains. Religion reformers should know also that religious hodjas who, to them, are reactionaries in every respect are also behind in robbing the people when compared with them. Since their lives elapse in contentment, they get little use from the people. On the other hand, they do not neglect rendering even small services to them. When no hodja was left behind within four years of the First World War to wash dead bodies in villages, it was understood that even the hodjas, who were regarded ignorant, were not unnecessary or useless. Later in the time of Sultan Vahîddedîn Khan, many of the subjects that are taught in today's high schools were reinstated in the curricula of the madrasas in Istanbul, yet it was seen that no hodja was graduated as qualified as the earlier ones. We have told briefly in the preface about the reasons that caused the decay of these centers of knowledge which in the past had educated Molla Fenârî, Molla Husrev, Ebussu'ûd, Ibn Kemâl, Gelenbevî and many others. Freemasons had not only deprived the madrasas of knowledge and monetary funds but also spread the nickname 'softas' (bigots) for 'students'. It is surprisingly fortunate that, despite such defeatism and neglect shown to them, madrasas have produced men of knowledge who could more or less rebut the enemies of religion, and this must be because of the faid and baraka (blessing) in the exaltedness of the profession of teaching Islam. Some madrasa graduate men of religious profession, being unable to endure the insults directed to them through official tongues, have had to throw themselves into other areas of business in order to protect their honour, while some others, taking no notice of the insults, have adhered to their religious and national customs and continued living in an endeavour against their nafs. It is obvious that those who graduated from the madrasas which had been brought into an undesired state and deprived of teaching knowledge and science could not be men of knowledge. For this decay, there was another more effective reason, which was unnoticed and therefore not mentioned by religion reformers: the hodjas who should have performed the duty of al-amru bi 'l-ma'rûf wa 'n-nahyu 'ani 'l-munkar more than others kept silent against and even followed the cruel who put the madrasas into such a state, even sometimes helping the degenerate who introduced irreligiousness into this country and eradicated the religion. Although the fingers distinguishing right from wrong with unmistakable attention and unshaken conviction should

belong to religious hands and there should be men of religion ahead of fighters for Islam opposing to injustice, the recent state of men of religion has been more tragic. Men of religion, who, while teaching that the intended couple had to be of the same social class, held the madrasa student and the Sultan's daughter in the same category and regarded helpers of the cruel baser than everybody, have been replaced by those who are much baser in piousness than they are in knowledge today.

In the following, the news reported in the daily **Vakt** dated June 20, 1928, is given:

The professors of the Faculty of Theology in Istanbul have announced the program of the improvements that will be done in our religion suitably with the modern life and progress. This announcement is signed by Köprülü Fuâd, Ismâil Hakkı of İzmir, Sherâfeddin Yaltkaya, Mehmed Alî Aynî and their friends and says: "Like other institutions, the religion also should follow the current of life. The religion cannot remain dependent upon its old forms. In the Turkish democracy, the religion also has to undergo its development. Our mosques should be made inhabitable; desks and coat-racks should be put in them, one should be allowed to go in them with shoes. Language of worshipping should be Turkish, and the Qur'ân and the khutba should be read in Turkish. Musical instruments should be placed in mosques. The khutba should be delivered not by imâms but by religious philosophers. The Qur'ân should be studied not with the view-point of kalâm or tasawwuf but of philosophy. We request that this program, which concerns the ultimate policy of Turkey and will have a creative effect on all Muslim countries, be accepted."

36 - The reformer says:

"Children, after learning religious knowledge and believing in many things at home, study mathematics, biology and scientific subjects when they go to school. The things in which they have believed before without seeing and the knowledge which they learn by seeing and thinking about in high school conflict with each other in the children's brains. The belief and morals which they have learned before deteriorate. And they cannot establish a new belief or morals with their fresh information. I have not seen a youngster who has formed a new belief and morals firm and based on knowledge."

The religion reformer means that the youngsters who have graduated from high schools have neither religious knowledge or religious morals nor morals that is independent of the religion and

based on sheer thought and mental knowledge. The lessons taught in the high school, science, biology and astronomy do not harm or annihilate the îmân attained at home; on the contrary, they consolidate it. Islam commands learning the latest scientific knowledge with the intention of making îmân conscientious and firm, living comfortably and being ready to stand against disbelievers' attacks.

37 - The reformer says:

"The child believes that the skies are made of layers of ceilings; the student believes that it is an endless space and that the earth stands on the horns of a water-buffalo. When they learn that the earth is not plain but it rotates in space and how our globe has formed, the geologic lessons, how life began, light and electricity; their îmân deteriorates. Those who prepared the curricula in high schools could not think of uniting experimental knowledge, that is, scientific knowledge, with religious knowledge. Astronomy tells the greatness of Allah better than religious books do. Could science and biology be thought of as different from the religion? As religious feelings in school children slacken, morals, customs and national bonds gradually melt. This situation facilitates the establishment of new morals and belief; yet, since there is not a leader to establish them, it easily makes them immoral or easy preys for any malignant influence. Let us compare incomplete knowledge of a student with the religious and moral knowledge and belief of an uneducated person. The student's thought progresses very slowly and his valuable bonds have melted. As for the uneducated person, he is ignorant but his religious bonds are rather strong. He is willing to die for them.

"If, instead of melted religious bonds, an education based on knowledge and an idea of patriotism are established in the youth, the youth can live on. But they cannot achieve this. In a confused mood, they recoil from the morals and customs of their country. They admire Europeans but they cannot get their morals, either. What they learn from Europeans is confined within the arid zone of imitation."

At this point, the religion reformer seems to have perceived the facts and to be rather reasonable. However, if due attention is paid, he implies that the lessons taught in high schools harm îmân and morals. This is quite wrong. Knowledge, whether it is much or little, is not harmful, but it is useful. The harmful thing is to place ignorance and evils into the heads in the name of knowledge, and to appoint ignorant, immoral people to be

teachers. It is not knowledge and science but irreligious, ignorant teachers who harm the religious knowledge and beautiful morals the youngsters have acquired from their mother homes. Such an inefficient, irreligious teacher puts his own irreligious, immoral ideas, lies and slanders secretly amid the scientific facts he teaches. The callow brains cannot distinguish these lies from science and are deceived by believing them as truth. The pure children who fall into the traps of the enemies of faith and chastity are made to read the papers, magazines and novels of the enemies of Islam, which in turn undermine their morals and îmân. This is the method whereby the younger generations are misled out of their faith in communist countries.

It is understood from his writing that this reformer, too, had received pure family education in his family home and later fell into the talons of a vicious teacher hostile to Islam and was poisoned and deceived. When he heard that the skies were made of layers of ceilings, he himself might have supposed that they were storied like an apartment house. He imputes his own misunderstanding to Islam, thus attacks Islam through this way, too. However, Islam teaches that the space which they consider endless and which is full of millions of stars each of which is a sun is only the first sky. This first sky, which they suppose to be endless, is only a drop of ocean beside the second sky. And each of the seven skies is as much bigger than the one it surrounds. Scientists, let alone being opposed to this teaching of Islam, admire it. The poor reformer once took it that the earth was on the horns of an ox the like of which he had seen in the shed. If he knew about the group of stars arranged in the shape of an ox as defined in the entry 'thawr' in **Qâmûs,** he would not write ill of Allâhu ta'âlâ's Messenger ('alaihi 's-salâm) in such a manner now. It is estimated today that when this hadîth sherîf was uttered this constellation was on the extension of a straight line that is imagined to be extending from the sun to the globe. Our Prophet ('alaihi 's-salâm) held out his blessed sword and said, **"My Allâhu ta'âlâ created my sustenance on the point of my sword."** He meant that he fought against unbelievers to make his living on what his share of the booty was. A villager who was listening to him asked, "Where is my world?" He said, **"Your world is on the horns of the ox."** He meant, "You plough your land with your ox and earn your sustenance." The Arabic word 'dunyâ' (world) is a noun. One of the infinitives derived from this word is 'adnâ', which means 'to subsist' as it is defined in **Qâmûs.** In those days

the ropes of the plough were fastened to the horns of the ox. Because its horns were useful, the Prophet (’alaihi ’s-salâm) said so. He signified that the villager should plough his field. This hadîth might have various meanings, but we should avoid interpreting it with our short sight and limited knowledge lest we should fall into the pitfall of denying or doubting it.

Religion reformers frequently recommend national bonds in place of religious bonds in order to unite and improve individuals. However, the original meaning of the word ‘milla’ is ‘dîn’ (religion), and it has been used later for a community of people born and live on the same land, that is, for ‘nation’.

Let’s give some deatils about religion and nation.

Dîn al-Islâm, the religion of Islam, is the belief in Allâhu ta’âlâ, in His Oneness and in all His prophets (’alaihimu ’s-salâm).

Allah is the Being who creates everything, whose existence has no end or limit and whose state cannot be comprehended with mind, but whose attributes forming His Divinity and Creativeness only are known. He exists by Himself and is One. Nothing besides Him can exist by itself. He alone is the One who creates and keeps everything in existence.

‘He exists by Himself’ does not mean ‘He has come into existence from Himself.’ If it meant so, He would have come into existence later. On the contrary, His existence is necessary, and He was never nonexistent. To exist by Himself means that His existence does not need anything. His existence is necessary for the existence of all beings. He has the perfect attributes for creating and keeping everything in such an orderly state. Deficiency, fault or defect cannot exist in Him.

If there were not a single being creating all creatures, everything would come into existence by itself or nothing would exist. It is not reasonable that everything exists by itself; for existing by itself requires being existent before itself, that is, to have existed always; everything had to be wâjib al-wujûd (indispensable being). If it were so, it would not come into being out of nonexistence, nor would it cease from existence. Indeed, every creature comes into existence after it has been nonexistent, and it later ceases to exist. Then, it is obvious that no creature is wâjib al-wujûd. Besides, coming into existence by oneself is not easily understandable to reason. Wâjib al-wujûb has to be single. The Single Being who creates all beings except Himself is necessary. If the existence of the single wâjib al-wujûd were not

necessary for the existence of creatures, we would not accept His existence by Himself, either.

Existence of every creature by itself is so far from being scientific that even the naturalists say, "Nature made so," or "Natural forces made it." Thus, inadvertently, they explain that creatures do not come into existence by themselves, but there is One Maker. However, they refrain from acknowledging this Maker's Names and Attributes worthy of Him. They adhere to a concept of nature which is without knowledge or will. We do not see any physical or chemical event occur by itself. We say that certainly some force affects an object to start moving or to change its motion or stop moving. To suppose that all creatures have suddenly come into existence in such an order and regularity would be to deny physical and chemical events. Nothing can be as ignorant as denying the One Creator who possesses Knowledge, Power and Will and creates everything from the atom to the 'Arsh out of nothing, and supposing that every event happens by chance, which is a concept incompatible with the laws of physics and chemistry.

It is not reasonable to say that there is not a creator creating these creatures out of nothing or that everything comes into being by itself, for some work must be done to come into existence from nonexistence and, according to laws of physics and chemistry, every work is done by a force. That is, according to scientific point of view, a source of force certainly has to exist beforehand. If the existence of a preceding being were necessary to create every being, beings' creating one another would have to go on continuously from eternal past to eternal future. If the case were so, nothing would exist. For, beings which have no beginning and all of which have been born from one another mean nonexistence. This can be explained with an example; I have a dollar which I have borrowed from you. And you borrowed it from a friend of yours. And he had borrowed it from someone else. Now, if this succession of lending goes round to all the people in the world, if it does not have a beginning, that is, if it does not begin with the last person on the world who initially possessed it not by borrowing but in some other way, the dollar which I say I have, does not exist. That is, it belongs to nobody, for if we suppose that it belonged to someone, he must have taken it from someone else, who does not exist on the earth to give it to him. How can it pass from hand to hand while there is not someone to lend it first? If someone had lent it first, someone else would now posses this

dollar. The existence of the dollar indicates that it has been given not from eternity but from someone first. In other words, if such a chain of dependence were supposed to begin from eternity, every being depending upon another being for its existence without reaching a being whose existence did not depend upon another, nothing would exist. As long as the existence of a being needed another, which needed another and another, and thus one needed another endlessly, nothing could be thought of existing; everything which we see in existence would have to be nonexistent, for it would also need something else which would have to exist before itself, but which in reality did not exist, for it would also need something else to exist before itself. It is the same with the third, the forth, the fifth... it is always the same.

The existence of Hadrat Âdam can easily be understood after this reasoning. If Hadrat Âdam had not existed and men's fathers had been infinite, there would have been no man on the earth; for, if the number of fathers had been infinite, there would have been neither the first father nor his children, that is, mankind. Since men exist, the first father has to have existed.

It is very important to believe in the next world, like believing in Allâhu ta'âlâ. If the next world did not exist, the good deeds which have not been rewarded and the evils and wrongs that have not been punished in this world would never be recompensed, which would be a very great defect for this world which, as we see, has the most delicately artistic and orderly characteristics. While the smallest state or any society has a court of justice, this tremendous world, which we call the Universe, will definitely have a court of justice. The need in the next world for giving men their rights is so important that men of idea in Europe, though they cannot understand the existence of Allâhu ta'âlâ through science, think over morals and accept His existence unanimously. To comprehend the existence of Allâhu ta'âlâ by thinking over morals means that, since it is seen that the conscience, which may always go wrong and cannot control the spiritual responsibilities and is not equally powerful in every person, is not able to protect the morals and since it is also seen that virtues are not appreciated and many an evil are common and cherished although everything in the world has been created very orderly and beautifully, men's wrongdoings have to be recompensed in the next world.

It is very surprising that Europeans do not comprehend Allah's existence through science, even though scientific knowledge, which discovers the dumbfounding regularity in,

relations between and laws concerning all living and lifeless beings from the atom to the 'Arsh, shows Allah's existence obviously. As it is understood that a world called the hereafter is necessary for the retribution of the wrongs done in the world and hence it is thought that these worlds should have a creator, so it is easier to see the orderly, delicate constructions of beings and the well-calculated relations, interactions and laws between them and to believe in Him who creates them. In other words, while the existence of the next world, and hence the existence of Allâhu ta'âlâ creating it, is concluded from the need to recompense the defects and baseness in men's morals, it is surprising that the Creator's existence is not understood by seeing the beauties and regularities in beings. It indicates that men are evil-natured; they acknowledge Allâhu ta'âlâ when they think they need Him, and they pay no attention to Him and ignore His blessings when they think they do not need Him.

The one who creates the beings out of nothing must be one. If there were two creators, for instance, they would not agree on doing something and their wishes would not happen together; if neither wish happened, both of them would be impotent; if the wish of one of them happened, the other would be impotent. The impotent cannot be creative. If what the wishes of both were alike, they would again be impotent, because they would be forced to come to a mutual agreement.

When Islam came, people in Arabia had been worshipping idols and statues. Their thoughts were fixed into the existence of many gods. For this reason, Islam laid much emphasis on the evils of polytheism, and Muslims' belief began with kalimat at-tawhîd. Men possess religious feelings naturally. For this reason, he who does not believe in Allah is spiritually sick, psychopathic. Such defective people are deprived of a great spiritual support and are in a very deplorable condition. As one of the European men of idea has said, "Piousness is great happiness, but I could not attain this happiness," so Tevfîk Fikret, one of the religion reformers in our country, ridiculed Islam and Muslims in his poem "Târîkh-i qadîm", but he could not help expressing the need of having îmân gushing out from his poetic spirit in his following lines:

"This loneliness is a loneliness like the loneliness in the grave,
To believe! That is the spiritual embrace in that loneliness."

The Oneness of the Creator whose existence is necessary can also be explained in this way: if there were more than one

creators, their combination would not be wâjib al-wujûd (the necessary, indispensable, being), because the existence of a combination needs the existence of each of its parts, and the being whose existence is necessary should not need anything. Then, no combination can be wâjib al-wujûd. The combination of the parts whose existence is necessary would be neither indispensable (wâjib) nor dispensable (mumkin), for the dispensable being would not exist by itself and needs a creator. Accepting the existence of this creator distinct from the combination would be contrary to the combination's being wâjib, while considering this creator to be in this combination would come to mean that something would create itself, which is impossible. For example, if the combination of two indispensable parts were indispensable, this combination would also be dispensable because it needs the existence of both its parts, which is illogical. If the combination of the two were dispensable, it would have to be nonexistent.

This explanation, that wâjîb al-wujûd (the Indispensable Being) cannot be more than one, rebuts the naturalists who say that everything exists by itself and is wâjib al-wujûd. Indeed, as explained above, let alone that everything exists by itself as a wâjib al-wujûd, it is impossible even for a creature to be a wâjib al-wujûd.

The irreligiousness which has been propagated by the progressives imitating Europe up to now has been in the nature of disbelieving Allâhu ta'âlâ. For instance, many have said, "The problem is whether Allah exists. If there is Allah, I will immediately believe all the religious knowledge." But recently, seeing the new steps taken in science, especially the observations on the atom, radioactivity, matter and energy, hence being unable to deny the existence of Allâhu ta'âlâ, they have begun to speak ill of prophets (*'alaihimu's-salâm*). They have said, "Everybody is free. Worship is not forbidden. Everybody worships his Allah as he wishes. Nothing besides reason can be an intermediary between Allah and man." However, a person who believes in the next world has to believe in prophets, too. It is very illogical to consign the knowledge about blessings and punishments in the next world to reason. Especially ignorant people can never reason them out. Islam commands to believe in all prophets. Jews and Christians never believe in Muhammad (*'alaihi 's-salâm*), the Prophet of Islam. They speak ill of this exalted Prophet. As for Islam, which was preached by Muhammad (*'alaihi 's-salâm*), it expels from Islam those who deny Mûsâ (Moses) and 'Îsâ (Jesus)

(’alaihimu ’s-salâm) and utter words humiliating them. Suppose a ruler assigns a governor to a province and, after this governor rules that province for some time, the ruler assigns a new governor; how will it sound if some people say, “We won’t disregard the advice of the former governor! We won’t obey the orders which the new governor brought”? While the first governor was the ruler’s official, are not the successors his officials? Jews do not acccept ’Îsâ and Muhammad (’alaihimu ’s-salâm) as prophets. While Mûsâ (’alaihi ’s-salâm) was Allâhu ta’âlâ’s prophet, how could it be impossible for them to be His prophets? Christians, even though they see this wrong belief in Jews and disapprove them, are unaware that they themselves do the same mistake and slander Muhammad (’alaihi ’s-salâm). This wrong belief of Jews and Christians is not based on a scientific observation. It is nothing but taking the old for granted and refusing the new only because of newness, i.e., sheer bigotry.

’Îsâ (’alaihi ’s-salâm) was born without a father. His mother Hadrat Mariam took him from Jerusalem to Egypt. After staying there for twelve years, they came back to Jerusalem and settled in the village **Nâsira** (Nazareth). He was revealed to be the Prophet when he was thirty years old. Three years later, Jews wanted to kill him. Allâhu ta’âlâ took him to heaven alive. Yudâ Sham’ûn (Judas Iscariot), a hypocrite who resembled him, was crucified. Because ’Îsâ (’alaihi ’s-salâm) was without a father, Christians worship him calling him “Allah’s son”. If being born without a father took a person out of being human and made him divine, Âdam (’alaihi ’s-salâm) would more necessarily be divinized, because he was created both without father and without mother. Hence, Christians have spoilt their revealed religion and impaired it to an illogical state.

Jews deny ’Îsâ (’alaihi ’s-salâm) and because he was created without a father regard him illegitimate. Muslims are fair in this respect and, escaping the excessiveness shown by both groups, regard him as Allâhu ta’âlâ’s human creature and prophet. Europeans today are very advanced in science and technology, yet remaining attached to an ancient prophet, they are deprived of the greatest improvement and progress. They have not gotten rid of this fanaticism today, either. Not only retrogressive are they in refusing the new religion, but also they have distorted the old one. Forty years after ’Îsâ’s (’alaihi ’s-salâm) ascent to heaven, the Romans captured and ruined Jerusalem and pillaged and killed or captivated the Jews. There was not any Jew left in Jerusalem. His

twelve apostles went to different places. The Injîl (the heavenly book revealed to him) was lost. Later new books were written under the name of the Injîl. Four of these books spread widely. The Gospel of Barnabas was almost completely true, but those who had been deceived by corrupt gospels destroyed this gospel, a copy of which has been discovered in the twentieth century and reproduced in English in London and Pakistan. The 'Îsâwî religion, the true religion of 'Îsâ ('alaihi 's-salâm) was reduced to a form which he could not recognize if he saw it. Thus, Christianity came into being. This regression did not stop until the nineteenth century, when many of them became irreligious.

As the prophethoods of Mûsâ ('alaihi 's-salâm) and 'Îsâ ('alaihi 's-salâm) were evident through miracles, so the prophethood of Muhammad ('alaihi 's-salâm) is obvious through miracles. In the time of Mûsâ ('alaihi 's-salâm) magic was very much advanced; medicine in the time of 'Îsâ ('alaihi 's-salâm) and poetry and eloquence in the time of Muhammad ('alaihi 's-salâm) were very much advanced. Allâhu ta'âlâ bestowed on each of these prophets the miracles in the fields which each umma esteemed. It is written in books clearly and detailedly that Muhammad ('alaihi 's-salâm), like 'Îsâ ('alaihi 's-salâm), resuscitated the dead and that the disbelievers of Quraish called Muhammed ('alaihi 's-salâm) a magician, as the Pharaoh and his men had called Mûsâ ('alaihi 's-salâm) a magician.

Muhammad ('alaihi 's-salâm) was ummî, that is, he did not go to any school; he did not read or write, nor did anybody teach him. But he put forth a book, the Qur'ân, full of historical, scientific, moral, political and social knowledge. He caused rise of emperors who spread justice all over the world only by following that book. The Qur'ân is his greatest miracle. In fact, it is the greatest miracle of all prophets. This miracle was given only to Muhammad ('alaihi 's-salâm). Religion reformers should feel embarrassed while saying that, when he was a child yet, he spoke to a priest for a few minutes on a journey to Damascus and acquired all his knowledge from that priest. There cannot be another slander as unsound and funny as this one. The masterpieces of eloquence that had been chosen from among thousands of poems and had been hanging on the walls of the Ka'ba for many years and that had made their authors a genius, a hero each, were torn down and their authors submitted themselves to the âyats that could never be the result of a few minutes' conversation with a priest! Today, there is no need to

attempt again to understand the eloquence of the Qur'ân. This Divine Book, when Arabic was on its summit, had the most efficient specialists in Arabic language sign under its superiority. Among the specialists in Arabic literature contemporary with Muhammad ('alaihi 's-salâm), there was next to no one who did not see and believe the divine superiority in the eloquence of the Qur'ân.

He did not arrogate to himself such an honour and perfection which, in an art that was considered as the most exalted skill in his time, made everybody acknowledge its superiority, but he said that it came from Allâhu ta'âlâ whom no one knew, and through this honour and superiority he tried to represent not himself but that unknown person. This is surprisingly incompatible with the human wishes of those who seek for fame and personal advantages. Those who consider the pleasure of governing people superior to the pleasure of knowledge and ma'rifa are those who cannot appreciate the value of knowledge and ma'rifa. A poet will not change even one of his poems that prove him to be in the highest stage of his art for the presidency of government. Even if there might be someone to change it, he would change it for material advantages. Muhammad ('alaihi 's-salâm) said that he was not a president and, instead of sovereignty and pomp, he lived moderately like everybody. To his daughter Hadrat Fâtima (radiy-Allâhu 'anhâ), when she asked for something of little value, he said, **"We prophets do not leave inheritance behind. What is left behind us will be alms,"** and he left nothing for his family when he passed away. One must be muddle-headed and one's conscience must be darkened to suppose that such a person was after sovereignty. The probability of being a liar (may Allâhu ta'âlâ protect us from saying so!) for that exalted Prophet ('alaihi 's-salâm) who came forward saying, **"I do not say these words from myself. I declare Allâhu ta'âlâ's commands. I am a man like you,"** is so remote, so wrong that European and American men of idea have had to acknowledge it unanimously. They have had to say that he accomplished the high rank, which he attained through the religion he had put forth, with his keen wit, strong sight and smart intellect. Also communists, realizing that they could not belittle that exalted Prophet, say that he accomplished all these under the influence of a sort of an epileptic fit (may Allâhu ta'âlâ protect us from saying so!) in which he daydreamed an angel coming to him. Though they accept his genius, intellect, diplomacy and accomplishments, they say that he spoke what he

imagined out of illness. This is obviously a folly which they say out of the illness of denial that has pervaded their minds, because one part of their words proves the other to be a lie. In other words, communists refute themselves with their own words.

Literary men understand the author of a poem from the literary style of the poem without looking at his signature. The specialists in literature examined the Hadîth ash-sherîf, which are Rasûlullah's (*'alaihi 's-salâm*) sayings, and the Qur'ân al-kerîm and saw that they were unlike each other. It has never been seen in the history of letters that one person had two kinds of style completely unlike each other; it is impossible. It is like a man having two faces unlike each other.

Another respect in which the Qur'ân is different from and superior to the Hadîth and other divine books is that up to present time it has remained unchanged as it descended from heaven. Not only its letters and punctuation have remained unchanged, but also, besides the various pronunciations of the words in the Qur'ân, their being pronounced in long, short, open, closed, deep or thin voice has remained as Rasûlullah (*'alaihi 's-salâm*) revealed and pronounced them. One could not help being bewildered at the science called **"ilm al-qirâ'a"**, on which many books have been written, and at Muslim scholars' studies and services in this way. Not a single word has been taken out of or added to the Qur'ân later, for Muslim scholars have put a very strong principle lest the Qur'ân be injured, lest even a small doubt approach it: that the Qur'ân must be conveyed through unanimity in every century. In every century from the Prophet's (*'alaihi 's-salâm*) companions up to today, it has come to us through hundreds of thousands of people who have memorized the Qur'ân and who could not be thought of as agreeing on a lie. It flows towards eternity like an overflowing river that never stops for a moment. Despite the presence of enemies of Islam all over the world today, every letter and dot of one copy of Allâhu ta'âlâ's book, thanks be to Him, are the same in another. It may be understood how dependable the faithful's Book is also from the fact that no matter how emphatic they may be, some different pronunciations, which belonged to some great companions of the Prophet (*'alaihi 's-salâm*) but were not accepted unanimously, have not been considered to be of the Qur'ân. For example. Hadrat 'Abdullah ibn Mas'ûd (*radiy-Allâhu 'anh*) conveyed the âyat **"fasting for three days",** which defined the atonement (kaffâra) for breaking an oath, as **"fasting for three consecutive**

days", and the scholars of fiqh taking this as a document, made it necessary to perform the atonement by fasting for three days without intervals. But, though Hadrat 'Abdullah ibn Mas'ûd (radiy-Allâhu 'anh) was one of the great ones of the Prophet's ('alaihi 's-salâm) companions and a very dependable person, the word **mutatâbi'** (consecutive) was not included to the Qur'ân, because he was alone in his argument. As a precaution, only the meaning of his word was taken and, again as a precaution, it was not put into the Qur'ân. These are called **"qirâ'at shâdhdha".**

Rasûlullah's ('alaihi 's-salâm) own sayings are called **al-Hadîth ash-sherîf.** Surprisingly cautious labours have been done in learning and preserving the Hadîth. Every saying of Fakhr al-'âlam (the 'Honour of all creatures', Prophet Muhammad) was memorized by his campanions and conveyed to those who did not hear it or who came later. Thus, **'ilm al-hadîth,** which is like an infinite sea, was established. Despite the Qur'ân, the evident, unequalled miracle, why should not Muhammad ('alaihi 's-salâm) whose life and sayings are minutely obvious and each action was a proof of his prophethood, be a prophet, while believing in Mûsâ and 'Îsâ's ('alaihimu 's-salâm) being prophets by depending on complicated and obscure histories? We are surprised at and regret this denial and obstinacy on the part of Jews and Christians.

Nationality is not a virtue which one can obtain by working and wishing. Nationality is the unity of advantage of those who have been born and grown up in the same country. It is a favour gained from birth without working for it. One should be thankful to Allâhu ta'âlâ who has endowed this favour upon him. And one is thankful by endeavouring for the continuation of the endowment and for being much more helpful to others. Islam is the integral part of Turkish nationalism and orders that one should work for the continuity of this nationalism and for being more helpful to others, that one should love others and render the same rights also to the fellow-countrymen of other religions and that justice and social rights should be shared equally. Those who live in the country where the above-mentioned orders and national duties are undertaken should be proud of their nationalism and pray for their ancestors, ghâzîs and martyrs who bequeathed this favour to them. They should love and respect their national anthem and flag which are the symbols of this unity and happiness of theirs. They should obey the laws and government that directs them and works for their welfare, and they should pay their taxes willingly. For those who love one

another as such, not disturbing the members of other religions or sects or doing harm to them is not a defect but a virtue for nationalism and shows that Islam, the religion we belong to, is the righteous religion and that Muhammad (’alaihi ’s-salâm), our exalted prophet, is the blessing over all the worlds of beings. The word ‘nationalism’ is not a meaningless, out-of-date word as it is used by the governing minority in some technologically advanced countries, e.g. in East Europe, especially in Russia. Those who exploit the people believe in and are attached to it only as much as the irreligious are attached to morals. A person needs to be among one’s nation so that he may lead a comfortable life. He has to live in a society so that it may protect his existence, rights and needs; this is what civilization means. And this society is his own nation. We have already said that men should live in society in order to protect the rights which one cannot gain by himself. Living in a society requires reciprocal help and sacrifice. Let us study the matter to see whether one would rather sacrifice one’s life for one’s religion or for one’s nation.

A nationalist may think this way: the feeling of dying for the nation should be in common. It should be considered an injustice for one person to die while another person enjoys living. The profit of the nation is necessary for my own profit. If I sacrifice myself in that way, I will be sacrificing the real purpose for the sake of the means. I, first of all, think of myself. I cannot sacrifice myself for another person. If self-sacrifice is for receiving fame and reputation, who on earth wants to be annihilated for temporary fame and honour? No one knows on what hill and in what dale the soldiers who, in an army of millions, died for their nation, are, and their names have been wiped out from the hearts of people. Those men sacrificed their possessions along with their lives. To be more clear, they are, on their account, in a pitiable condition, rather than being praiseworthy. If the self-sacrifice I would render for the nation would not be appreciated and, in addition, if I would be deemed guilty because of those who envy me, what would become of me?

In nationalism, there is no thoughtful or logical reason that forms the power of self-sacrifice in man. Nor can self-sacrifice based on unreasonable feelings receive its reward. Especially the progressives and exploiters, who govern the nation, will never sacrifice their lives for the sake of such feelings. It happened so in communist countries. As it was witnessed in the Second World War, those who had fought in the battlefield and won honour

were executed by shooting when they came back lest they might seize the power. As for the people, they do not have the idea of sacrificing their lives for one another. The feeling and mania of nationalism in reformers, who try to imitate Europeans to the extent of adoration and who suppose their every idea, every deed to be the very truth and the very happiness, are, imitative in this mania as well. Men have adhered to the occupational, professional and sectional bonds, i.e. to nationalism, which they invented with their minds and thoughts, more firmly than they have to racialism. If we put aside the swindler politicians who use nationalism as a means for their own advantages, the remainder's nationalism results by hearing and imitating. It is seen that religious men also join in this imitating.

The thirteenth âyat of the sûrat al-Hujurât declares that human beings, the descendants of the same parents, can be graded only according to their fear of Allâhu ta'âlâ, and there cannot be racialism in Islam. Some put forth this âyat in favour of parting Muslims into nations and say that Islam is not against parting into different nationalities and all should be respected. However, to divide Muslims into separate nationalities means to pave the way to racial conflicts.

The hadîth, **"On the Day of Judgement Allâhu ta'âlâ will say: 'O men! I chose a family, a lineage** (having common religious qualities, e.g. fear of Allâhu ta'âlâ). **You chose another family** (you emphasized racial considerations). **I said, he who fears Me more is more valuable. You did not give up saying, "He is so and so's son. For this reason, that man is superior to this man." Therefore, today I exalt My family and debase your family. You should know very well that My Lovers are those who fear Me,' "** explicitly shows how Muslims should be.

Fiqh books write that man and woman to be married should be suitable for each other and add the races and nationalities to this criterion. This may make one suppose that racialism and nationality also are important in Islam. Yet the fact is that in nikâh[1] every kind of suitableness, right or wrong, between the man and the woman are considered. If it were permissible to break the nikâh done with the consent of the both sides because of racial and national difference, then it would be rightful to suppose so. Since all the different nations world over are trying to

[1] Marriage contract prescribed by Islam. There is detailed information about nikâh is **Endless Bliss, V**, 12.

exploit other people to their advantages, we, too, have to care for our own nationality. We, too, have to defend our nationality against our enemies. To do this does not mean to attach a special importance to nationality, for the notion of nationality is based on sentiments, rather than on a scientific essence. Georgy Zaidân, the author of **The History of Islamic Civilization,** writes that the idea of nationalism existed in the beginning of Islam and that even the policy of Hadrat 'Umar (radiy-Allâhu 'anh) was based on this idea. He puts forth Hadrat 'Umar's (radiy-Allâhu 'anh) endeavours not to leave any polytheists on the Arabian Peninsula as an evidence to prove to this. However, those endeavours were for a national unity based on religious unity.

In Christian religion there is not a reasonable principle left. It has taken the shape of superstitions and complicated ceremonies. Moreover, Christians belonging to the same faith, even to the same sect, have been living under the administration of different governments. For this reason, European governments looked for another bond. As a result, religious unity developed into the feeling of nationalism in Europe. Islam, establishing commercial, industrial and social order, includes the idea of nationalism. There is no need for establishing an additional concept of nationalism among Muslims. For this reason, it is written in all books teaching elements of the religion, "Religion (dîn) and nationality (milla) are the same." Moreover, it will be quite right to say that the Europeans' suspicions against Islamic religion arise from the fact that there is also a feeling of nationalism in every rule of this religion. If Muslims do not disunite, they will, by getting use of the fact that Islam represents nationality, find a way to overpower many nationalities that have not become firm on the earth.

From Islam's representing nationality, lingual unity also occurs to the mind, and since the adhân and the Qur'ân are recited in the five daily prayers of salât each day in Arabic in all Muslim countries, it provides for this unity. It is for this reason that in order to separate a nation from Islam and annihilate the unity of Muslims, the enemies of Islam try to change the language, grammar and alphabet of that nation. And the severest blow to be inflicted on a nation's religion comes through this way. As a matter of fact, Muslims in Sicily and Spain have been Christianized with this method. And now, Russians use this sharp weapon to annihilate the îmân in Muslims of Turkistan. Their dungeons, electric furnaces, expulsions in Siberia and merciless massacres cannot be as effective as this sharp weapon. Celâl Nûrî

Beg recommends Arabic as a common language for Muslims in his book **Ittihâd-i Islâm.** Yavuz Sultan Selîm Khan endeavoured for this purpose, and the religious books have been disseminated in Arabic in all Muslim countries in the course of history. Arabic has become a religious language in all Muslim countries. The hadîth says that everybody will speak in Arabic in Paradise. The purpose is not aimed at making every Muslim nation Arabic. While the English language becomes a common language in many countries, no government opposes it. Today it has become a strong necessity for a man of knowledge and science to know one, and even more foreign languages. The Hadîth says, **"He who learns the language of a race protects himself against their harm."** It is for this reason that as our youngsters learn Arabic, so it is necessary and useful for them to learn European languages. This may enable them to perform many services which in turn will bring them rewards in the Hereafter. The reason why, for many centuries, Europeans have looked upon us as foreigners is not the difference of national feelings but their not knowing the religion of Islam.

The Hadîth says, **"If you do not try to bring the wicked amongst you to the right course, that is, if you do not perform al-amru bi'l-ma'rûf wa 'n-nahyu 'ani 'l-munkar, Allâhu ta'âlâ will give upon you so bad calamities that in order to get rid of them even the entreaties to Allâhu ta'âlâ of the good ones among you will no longer avail."** The 110th âyat of the sûrat âl 'Imrân commands Muslims to perform al-amru bi 'l-ma'rûf wa 'n-nahyu 'ani 'l-munkar. When Yavuz Sultan Selim Khan said to the non-Muslims under his rule, "Either become Muslims or I will put you to the sword," Islamic scholars said that this would not be right, that is, they performed an-nahyu 'ani 'l-munkar. So, the Sultan gave it up. There may be eccentric people who consider his behaviour wrong. Indeed, this behavior of that honoured Sultan, who yielded to the religious scholars and understood that these unfair, groundless religious feelings could not be of Islam, is worth praising. The difference between religious ideas and feelings and national ideas and feelings appears on such delicate points as this. National thoughts of the irreligious may neglect right and justice, but Islamic thoughts cannot, for the virtues such as right and justice are within the boundaries of Islam.

Islam has contributed a high, pure feeling of justice to mankind. After the First World War, courts of justice were established in Istanbul in order to exile and kill the guilty

Armenians, but the muftî of Boghazlayan, his hand on his chest full of îmân and his beard wet with tears, opposed the officials in the courts who had tortured the Armenians. Of old, Europeans, thinking that some bigoted Turks could be dangerous for non-Muslims, used to become hostile against real Muslims. By the way, today's progressives call Muslims, who carry out Allah's commands and abstain from prohibitions, e.g. those who perform salât and who have their wives and daughters covered when going out and who do not have alcoholic drinks, "bigots". However, 'bigotry' or 'obstinacy' means 'holding to one's own sect and opinion and refusing others' right words that are not agreeable with his'. A person who persistently defends an unright thing is called "bigot". Bigotry is a bad habit which Islam rejects.

When our master Rasûlullah ('alaihi 's-salâm) was asked what Islam was, he said, **"Islam means to esteem Allâhu ta'âlâ's commands great and to pity His creatures."** Muslims who walk on the luminous path which Rasûlullah (sall-Allâhu 'alaihi wa sallam) points out in this hadîth know that it will deserve a severe punishment in the next world to meddle with others' rights no matter of what race, nation or religion they are. The above-mentioned behaviour of a muftî shows obviously that no one will suffer harm from Muslims. Though in Islam working is for the benefit of individuals and of the society, Muslims' purpose is a divine thing which is above this usefulness. It is natural and necessary to think of advantages, yet it is a shame, a defect and bad egoism to consider it superior to every purpose and one cannot escape this egoism by considering national feelings to be above everything. A person who behaves with such national feelings thinks that he also is of that nation and therefore he behaves more or less egoistically. As for the purpose that motivates Muslims, it is purer and nobler. Above all, every Muslim who works for Islam, for Allâhu ta'âlâ, behaves with great love and sacrifice. Advancement of his nation will be easier and firmer. It will not harm other nations. Muslim means one who takes his each step for Allâhu ta'âlâ and does all his reckonings within the consideration of His approval. Such a person cannot do any harm either to himself or to anybody. In contrast, those who abandon the religion and Allâhu ta'âlâ and who think of nationality devoid of religion may not, at least sometimes, behave rightfully and fairly against other nations. To be religious means to be for everybody as in the French proverb, **"Chacun pour soi et Dieu pour tous."**

The sixty-forth âyat of the sûrat âl 'Imrân says, **"O Jews and Christians, who say, 'We believe in Allah's book'! Come to the word** [îmân, six principles of îmân] **on which we have no disagreement."** We refer this difference between the nationality that provides religious freedom and that does not to the arbitration of humanity!

38 - The reformer says:

"In the Islamic family life, the man is the absolute ruler and the woman is the natural subject. In Anatolian villages there are women who work more than their husbands and who plough like their husbands. The man works outside and the woman works inside the house. They do not have time to go around or to divert. Their material and spiritual needs are quite limited. The man, crushed under poverty and oppression, tortures his wife as if he revenges himself on his wife. The woman obeys and never rebels. The man's thought is not so extensive as to treat his wife rightfully and with pity. The woman's intellect and thought are not so much as to look for the reasons why she endures all these hardships and for the way of escaping them. For this reason, divorce hardly occurs to her mind. In big cities, where people admire Europeans and try to be like them, divorce takes place more often. They lose Islamic customs, their personalities, their spirits, and the value of family. For such reasons as money, beast-like sexual desires and following the fashion, women also have to work. The religions, nationalities, ideas and feelings of these people, who are called 'progressives', are unlike one another. Especially the girls who have received education in Europe or America and come back have lost their spiritual values all the more. They live like Christian women. Their behaviours are insincere and imitative."

The religion reformer's point of view and writing are reasonable here. We hear about those women who admire even Christian women's confessing before the priest. How terrible an example of injuring the basis of our religion out of a craze of imitating Europeans and Americans! In Islam, one does not need be forgiven by a man before one can entreat Allâhu ta'âlâ to forgive one's sins; let alone having one's sins forgiven by a man, it is not permissible even to tell about one's sins to another person. As it is a guilt to commit sins, it is another guilt to tell someone else about them. See this delicacy, this purity in our religion! While it would become one to admire this delicacy in Islam in protecting man's dignity and honour, one should have fallen into the ditches of aberration dug for the progressives if one admires

the scandal of confession in Christianity, which casts down chastity and honour, especially of women.

In Islam, a woman does not have to work or earn money, neither indoors nor outdoors. If she is married, her husband, if she is not narried, her father, or, if she has lost her father, her closest relative, has to work and bring her everything she needs. And the government's treasury called **"Bayt al-mâl"** provides for the woman who is without anybody to support her. In Islam, the burden of living is not shared between wife and husband. A man cannot force his wife to work in the field, in a factory or in any place. If the woman wishes and if her husband allows, she may work at places where there is work for women without joining with men. But, what the woman earns is her very own. Her husband cannot take anything from her by force. He cannot force her to buy what she needs for herself, either. Nor may he force her to do the work inside his house. The woman does the housework as a gift and favour to her husband. And this is a virtue which Muslim women have. It is a noble sentiment inherent in them. Islam's recognition of such rights for the woman and its protecting her against being a slave or a plaything in men's hands, indicate that Allâhu ta'âlâ has endowed her with a great value as a birthright.

Islamic books detailedly explain the beautiful duties of the woman towards her husband, of the man towards his wife, his children, his parents, towards his neighbors and even towards non-Muslim citizens. The Hadîth says, **"Among you, the one who has the most perfect îmân is the one with the most beautiful morals"; "The best of you is the one who is good towards his women at home"; "I was sent to preach to you all the good morals."** In Islamic books, there are innumerable other hadîths that arrange the family life, that separate the duties of the man and the woman and encourage them to work. Religiously ignorant people's wrong, depraved behaviors incompatible with these hadîths cannot be defects or stains for Islam. Seeing these facts, it is obvious how wrong and unjust the writings of the people who call themselves "progressives" are.

39 - The reformer says:

"The modern, imitative lady wants to go around naked like a Christian girl. She wants to flirt with the man she wishes. She wants to go wherever she wishes whenever she wishes. She is unaware that she is tearing up her faith, morality and customs. She looks at the veiled Muslim women hatefuly and mockingly. In

fact, she swears at them. A youngster meets a girl by chance near a bridge, in market place, at a place of entertainment, in a gathering at the neighbor's, on a passenger boat or in school, and they come to an agreement and get married. Yet they do not know that such a marriage will bring forth a terrible immorality in the future.

"In every corner of the world, there is a different understanding of woman's chastity. In Islam, woman's chastity begins with veiling. The religion has clearly pointed out to whom of the relatives Muslim woman will show herself and whom she will not. The woman is chaste as long as she follows it. At the minute this chastity slackens, moral corruption commences. Today, the man goes out with his improperly dressed wife. The husband and wife look for their different pleasures in others. The man goes to taverns, to gambling-dens and to brothels. He does not hesitate to commit every sort of immorality. The moral corruption in women is caused by their husbands. I know a university student married to a prostitute. A woman who has dirty memories in her mind cannot be a chaste wife. A married man whom I know goes to family gatherings with his wife. His wife went to bed with a father and he with a young mother. One day, I saw four of them together. Another progressive married a woman who was also a progressive. He had his wife show herself scantily dressed to his friends. When the man was not at home, his wife accepted male guests. Eventually, she fell in love with one of them. She got divorced from her husband and the home was ruined. A month later, she loved another.

"School is a place of education, a home of virtue. Yet, let me say with regret that even the most decent children lose their decency there. The child learns loathsome words and evil habits in school. It spreads the dirty things it learns in school or outside even at home. They do not hesitate to say that they dislike the religious, moral behaviors of their family.

"Our women's addiction to music and to instruments has become a nuisance. They listen to the tunes of sexy, lazy, drunken people whose hearts burn with the deprivation of the pleasures in their imaginations, tunes that do not arouse emotion in the spirit but stir only the basest bestial emotions such as dancing and embracing one another. Pay attention to the songs listened to on the radio also. They are all entreaties and adventures of the voluptuous persons who tremble with the desire to embrace one another. The meanings of the sounds of radio coming out from the

houses, reveal that the virtues of religion, morals, modesty and embarrassment in the families gradually fade away. When the jazz band starts, all the beings move with a magic wire to which the souls are fastened. With their heads, hands and with every part of their bodies, they proclaim their love to one another. Sometimes eight or ten or even fifteen men tack themselves on to a woman, and I compare them to cats and dogs which follow their female in groups and oppress it. While the man is able to think that the dishonesty which he perpetrates against a stranger woman will be done to his own mother, sister or mate, he still does it. Now I ask, what is this if it is not because of the absence of the feeling of chastity in him? Since religious and moral feelings continue in villages, fornication and dissipation are very seldom."

Though there are admonitory facts worth attention about women in the religion reformer's long writing above, he does not propose any solution for this complicated problem. These social diseases have been reported from a resonable point of view as they are seen, yet he considers European women superior to Muslim women in Istanbul and does not say that it is bad for Europeans to dress immodestly. In fact, he wants the youth of Istanbul to be educated like them. About the excessive honesty of our women in villages, he means that it may corrupt soon because it is not based on principles pertaining to knowledge. In the lines he grievously tells about the immoralities among the learned and progressive women in Istanbul contemporary with him, it is not understood what knowledge he wants to be taught in order to protect them against evils.

Everybody, learned or ignorant, knows that honesty and chastity are very precious and praiseworthy qualities. But many people do not act in accordance with this knowledge of theirs. The religion reformer is not right in his thought that, though there is much honesty in villages, the idea of honesty is weak. When the customs and beliefs that have settled unconsciously and unknowingly become sacred traditions, they are more dependable than thoughts and theories based on intellect and knowledge. Moreover, it is unfair to assume that fear of Allâhu ta'âlâ and the feeling of honesty and chastity based on such strong fundamentals as religion and morals are deprived of fundamental knowledge.

40 - The reformer says:

"It is a very weak precaution to form separate groups for men and women or to put silk curtains between them in order to protect the honesty of women. In Muslim countries, through our

sharp imagination we think a Venus of every woman under her coloured silk dress, and, by deriving meanings from these wonderful statues, we fill the empty parts of our heart with them. Among the western psychologists, there are many who admire the imaginative pleasures in the veiling of the east as well as its sunny, flowery horizons.

"It is for certain that veiling increases the beauty of woman. The reason is that, while we see the subtleties and perspectives of everything close to us, distance makes these subtleties and perspectives seem decorated to us. As our eyes do not clearly see from the distance the things which they are used to seeing closely, our imagination completes the beauty of the things which we suppose to be beautiful. Things that are ours and which we do not esteem today will be valuable when we lose them. Now, when distance and curtains come between something and us, our emotions and sorrows arise proportional to our desire for that thing. When we see a veiled woman outside, our imagination wakes up. We imagine what is in our mind to exist under the veil. In order to arrange our social life, we should give the woman the place she deserves. Islam commands the woman to veil herself. But it does not explain how she will be veiled, nor does it prohibit to give the woman the rights which exist in her nature. If the purpose of veiling is to keep the generation pure and chaste and to protect it from adultery and evils, we could provide for it in some other way. For example, we should control ourselves, by training our minds and intellects, which Allâhu ta'âlâ has endowed on human beings. Thus, we should clean and correct the nafs in such a manner that it should desire goodness instead of running after its bestial desires. A highly learned, educated girl whose reason and thought function can obtain the spiritual strength to protect her honesty through her reason and thought even if she could not find it in the religion. When she gets used to being with boys in her early ages, it will not do her harm when she becomes an adult. It is never harmful for a girl, who has reason and thought enough to understand what chastity and honesty are, to go out unvelied as she wants, to go where she wants. Yet this change has to be made in the process of time. We cannot say to Muslim women, 'Come on, throw your veils away and act as you wish.' We should act very shrewdly. We see that we have not been able to establish the constitutional government well. Its consequence has been very dismal. Let the woman dress stylishly and gracefully for the time being to satisfy the sense in her

creation. Later on, her unveiling will gradually replace. The government should put the dressing of the woman in an order for the time being. Beautifully dressed as she may be, let her cover the parts tempting sexual desires and accept the headgear and mantle instead of veil. Later on the process will follow its natural course. Moreover, women are rightful to go about, to know the pleasures and life. For example, let it be her right to eat in restaurants, to go about, to go to movies and theatres. Yet, before doing these, men should be prohibited through a law to assault them."

If attention is paid to the religion reformer's words, it will strike the eye that they are the plans, programs which freemasons prepared centuries ago and have had their men say in every century. These were said and written by the religion reformers in the time of the Union Party. When they brought freemason Reshid Pasha to the fore, they had him say the same things. When they made the ignorant and ignoble members of the Party of Union to seize power by providing weaponry and substantial aid for them, they, on the one hand, had religion reformers say these and, on the other hand, they passed new laws. They began attacking Islam. I say, "the ignoble members of the Party of Union," because the majority of these cruel people, who declared wars stupidly, caused bloodshed of hundreds of thousands of Muslims and killed innumerable innocent people in dungeons and on gallows, were ignoble. But if Muslims learn their religion well and teach it to youngsters, the plans of the enemies of Islam will fall down on their own heads. Allâhu ta'âlâ declared in the eighth âyat of the sûrat al-Israâ, **"When Islam comes, polytheism and unbelief cannot survive."** This âyat shows that if Muslims work depending on reason and on Islam, unbelievers cannot harm them. Those who attack Islam will die away.

This reformer writes many other important and dismal facts; in fact, it is a masonic tactic to write an entire book of true, sweet and creamy facts among which they cunningly plant a single line of their venomous ideas in order to poison the younger generations and mislead the people. Another technique of these enemies of Islam apply for deceiving Muslims is to coat their poisons with sugar and have Muslims swallow them like pills.

The Muslim woman veils herself not only for protecting her honesty but also to draw the spiritual border distinguishing woman and man from each other. Owing to veiling, man behaves formally and respectfully even towards a woman of his family in

the street. Veiling is the curtain of modesty put between man and woman. If a veiled woman is imagined to be more beautiful in a man's fancy, this will increase, rather than decrease, her honour.

He says that, rather than aesthetic beauty, social use should be looked for in a woman and she should be given a place in social life. This is not right because a woman does not give up adorning herself in the present social place of hers, either.

It is necessary to train the nafs in order not to be taken in by the bestial emotions. Yet it is never correct to leave this job to self-control and to give up veiling. It is often seen in newspapers that, among the people who receive education and training, there are many who cannot control themselves. **Self-control** is something easy to talk about but difficult to exercise. It is declared in the sûrat Yûsuf that even a great prophet as Yûsuf ('alaihi 's-salâm) said, **"I do not say my nafs does not want evil things."** What is left for others to say? The degree of self-control is different in everybody. One even cannot understand this by himself. Especially according to the person who has received the lesson of honesty and chastity not from the religion but from his own reason only, the value of honesty does not go further than the thought of pretending to be honest. No matter how much the value of honesty is appreciated, no matter how much reasonable his intellect and thought are, reason may be unsuccessful against the nafs that exists in man's creation and can deceive anybody. For this reason, it is necessary yet at the beginning not to let the nafs move and to close the ways tempting it. The veiling of women is a measure closing these ways most decisively and most easily.

It is not correct, either, to think of co-education to form the familiarity between girls and boys which will in future help them to protect their chastity and honesty. If the youngsters get used to mixed life, it will cause the danger of regarding its evil consequences most normal. Women's exposing themselves to men is a natural state indicating natural attraction between man and woman. Any man, let alone Muslim, will not believe in the mendacious, silly words denying this reality. In beaches, where women exhibit their arms, shoulders, necks and legs to men and where they divert together, do men no longer look at them? Women, seeing that exposing their arms, necks and legs was being natural, began to expose their breasts, back and shoulders and to use miniskirts. This piecemeal indulgence, with its destination untold, is symptomatic of a forceful instinct innate in women. In

other words, as women feel that exposing certain parts of their body is being something observed with indifference, they begin to expose their other parts as well. In process of time their former immodesty turns into a degree of modesty looked on as unnaturally conventional. This coactive spreading of the gradual slackening in the measures of dressing among women is evidently for reasons other than the professed purposes such as physical convenience and airing. Any degree of unveiling, whether suddenly or slowly, may be a step taken towards moral corruption. Even this immodesty, with which men partly satisfy voyeuristic desires with women, is dissipation itself. The examples showing that women's exhibiting themselves to men and living in mixed societies give way to fornication, immorality, home ruining, family disasters and deaths, are encountered frequently.

Islam does not say, "Do not talk with women or girls! Do not amuse yourselves with them! Live without women like priests." Islam says, "Do not seduce your neighbor's wife or daughter; do not tear their modesty veils; do not ruin homes; marry the girl you like; amuse yourself with her freely, comfortably and as you wish." In order to make a girl happy, it commands to work, earn and marry early when young.

It is seen with regret that women's dancing with other men, or being exchanged as partners in balls, does not bring her to ease, nor encourage her to work but ruins her home.

The balls, which have arisen against the man-woman relations' remaining only between wife and husband and done in order to embody mixed and unlimited relations, began to take the place of the assemblies of nikâh in Islam, with the difference that Muslims' nikâh announces that a certain man and a certain woman come together, while in the society balls, many men and many women, married or unmarried, are announced to approach one another at random. Islam permits a man and a woman's coming together only after (the Islamically prescribed marriage contract called) Nikâh.

If the woman, like in society life, is given the freedom of living with other men, her male relatives and husband will be jealous and suffer the pangs of conscience, and it gives way for the husband to amuse himself with innumerable other women. Who on earth does not know or understand this? Though the so-called primitive and reactionary men desire this pleasure very well, the pangs of conscience brake and stop them. Loose-willed men who could not stand against the desires of their nafs have broken this

brake of the conscience under the pretext of being civilized and advanced and dived into the so-called social life, which is very sweet to them. Those who run after their sensual desires spread this life quickly. Some people consider this life "advancement", while others evaluate it as "following nature". However, Islam points out the way of living which is most suitable with nature. Islam, though the most natural religion, departs from nature on occasions when human nature departs from virtue. It sides with virtue. Whether it is called a civil right or a return to nature, and no matter how much it is praised, the most evident cause of this current and the power which drags it along are lust and pleasure. If society men did not think of their own mutual pleasures but intended to give women rights and freedom instead, they would not want to exchange their wives. It must be for this reason that some male feminists, when they understand that they cannot take advantage of someone's wife or daughter, do not allow their own wives and daughters not only to talk to him but also to show themselves to him. It can be understood very well that those who offer their wives and daughters to other men at balls and night clubs are the ones who sacrifice them for better posts. If attention is paid to those men who want women to be given rights and freedom more than women want, they are the people who seek for diving into the odorous, soft gatherings of women who swarm in the halls and overflow into the streets and for amusing themselves easily with others' wives. These wretched people cannot think that other men also will freely attack their wives, daughters and sisters. Or, being in ecstacy with these pleasures and flavours, they forget about this excruciating harm, or they do not hesitate to sacrifice them for their amusements and lusts.

In society life, those men who gain much satisfaction and little loss are the ones who do not have young women among their relatives beautiful enough to be looked at. Among the main reasons why men want women to be given freedom are such deceitful and egoistic reasons. There may be some people to say that we write excessively on this subject. But this is the home truth of the matter; for this idea has not come to women brought up in Muslim countries out of admiring men's progress in knowledge and science. Such a desire for freedom has not been seen in the women of honest men who have high posts in knowledge and science. If men had not fallen into the life of amusement and dissipation, there would not have been women who want this kind of freedom. Nor would there have been men

who would have sided with and advocated such women.

Those men who want women to be given such a freedom say, "We do not ask for something illegitimate." When they are asked what legitimate things they want, they cannot answer. They dismiss it by saying, "We will rescue women from slavery." It is declared in the 33rd âyat of the sûrat an-Nisâ, **"Men are the educators, employers of women. Allâhu ta'âlâ has created men superior to women."** They will rescue women from their place pointed out in this âyat! What on earth is legitimate in this? There are many reasons and uses why Islam holds men superior to women. This superiority is a must, a necessity for the orderliness of family life. Nor does the word, "Man and woman should have equal rights in the family life. Life is in common," have any value. It is declared in the 22nd âyat of the sûrat al-Anbiyâ', **"If there were another god besides Allâhu ta'âlâ, the Universe would get out of order and be in utter disorder."** According to those who base their thought on the strong logic in this âyat, every member of the family should have a separate right, value, honour and degree, and a head among the family is necessary. Even in a republican government, in which the people are said to be given all rights, there is a head of the State. Then, as in government administration, the final word has to be ended up by one person in every assembly and in the family, which is also an assembly.

In order to prove that their statements are right and legitimate, some reformers support their words by saying, "We will give women independence in knowledge and science." Since by independence or liberty they mean, "We will rescue women from men's control," they intend to say, "We will change the âyat," and they call it "slavery" for women to be under men's control and not to be able to go where they want without men's permission. While Anatolian women, who are crushed under employment, do not want to escape slavery, the free women of Istanbul do! They say, "Owing to the freedom of knowledge and arts, women should work like men and thus escape depending on men for their living." Do men twit their women with the bread they bring home that they will rescue women from this parasitic, derogatory life? On the contrary, modern women twit their men with the work they do indoors. They even try to load men with housework. When attentively observed, Muslim men are in a more pitiful situation than their women are, for the burden of earning money, finding and bringing the home's needs are on men's shoulders. To attempt to load women also with this burden

by saying, “Life is in common,” will mean for men to shake women off their protection by saying, “Look after yourselves,” which is thoroughly against women.

If the statement, “Life is in common,” means, as the religion reformers defend it, for women to help with the burden of earning, with which men are loaded, they might as well render this help inside the house. Many of the society families have servants in their houses. Like men, women also have their dresses made by tailors. What is more surprising is that, in the houses of the society women, cooking, looking after the children and almost all the housework are done by servants. Thus, the woman’s own earnings cannot even afford the expenses of her own ornaments, cosmetics, perfumes and hair-dresser’s and the servant’s wages. The burden of subsistence still remains on the man’s shoulders.

It is seen everywhere in what a miserable and pitiable situation the women who share the burden of subsistence are if they are too ugly to be looked at on the face. The beauty of the girls who rely on their beauty and who try to be pretty decreases as they get older, and especilly the skin of those women who use powder, lipstick and rouge become uglier being worn away by friction day by day. When they do not use rouge, their faces become wrinkled, ugly like tripe. Therefore, when they get up every morning, they have to make their toilet and make up for hours in front of the mirror. On a winter morning, as I was riding the tramcar in the twilight, I saw a dustwoman sweep the snow on the ground. I was grieved for her. I wished that this Muslim granny had, instead of having attained such a freedom, been lying down in her warm room or reading or preparing her children’s needs. Islam has loaded all the needs of the woman to her husband. If she is without a husband, her closest relative is to supply her needs. If she is without anybody, Bait al-mâl, that is, the government treasury, is to support her. Every need of the woman should come to her. We have heard very often about women’s laments, complaints about their own lives.

Religion reformers, who cannot deny the miserable, dismal position of ugly working women, attempt to defend this also and say that if pretty women are put at the sales departments, there may be customers who would more probably buy their beauty instead of the goods for sale, and thus the sales may decrease. Let alone the misery of ugly women who, having attained their freedom, work among men and the exhaustedness of those who strive hard before the mirror to make themselves pretty every

morning, the real meaning of this freedom and independence, which the remainder are supposed to have or, rather, are defended to have by those men who are more loyal to the king than the king is to himself, is to depart women from their virtues and natural tendencies, such as forming a family, bringing up children, arranging a home, and to make them join the hard, troublesome life of men, to get rid of the need of marrying and to become like single men or immoral men who are not faithful to their wives. This disorderly life, which has demolished the family life, has first commenced in those men who imitate Europeans, and later women also have been dragged down to this ditch. Where is the helpless young generation being dragged? Showing respect and politeness towards women, which has become a custom in society life, is sheer ostentation and done in order to diminish the miserableness and pitiable condition of women. In Europe today, there is nothing cheaper than women, married or unmarried. Society women who have gone far away from Islam are dragging on to this condition, too. It is obvious how numerous the unmarried couples are. The reason why voluptuous thought is dominant in oriental poetry is because life of fornication and dissipation has been very little in the east. An oriental poet wants to write about the kiss which his sweetheart has promised him, but which is something never seen, in order to make his lyric poem more vivid. On the other hand, in Europe this is done in the street, but no one takes notice. Widows are cheaper. Today, in Europe and in Muslim countries where society life and freedom of women have been spread, men get married easily. As for women, it is difficult for them to find a husband. Men are reluctant and look for beauty and money in marriage. As for the woman, she readily accepts a man's proposal of matrimony. Contrary to this trouble which women have in setting up a home, they are easily accepted by those youngsters who look for a mate for one or two nights.

In Muslim countries, there cannot be found a girl too old to find a husband. Men and women share one another, and each of the remaining women has become a housewife owing to the blessing of **ta'addud al-zawjât** in Islam. In contrast, in Europe the remaining girls earn money from men without being married and illegitimately, and they look for a husband to marry.

In Europe, at places where there is society life, there is not the thing called love because women and girls swarm everywhere. Yet in Muslim countries, a man sees a pretty woman once in a blue

moon. On this rare occasion he falls in love with her. The curtain which this love has put before his eyes and the curtain of veiling of other Muslim women come together not to show him a prettier one. In fact, because the second curtain does not show him -let alone another- the same woman once more, the flame of love gets fanned. This shows that the woman is so valuable and important in Muslim countries. What value can women have in society life, which takes them away from the state of belovedness?

Let us listen about the pitiable situation of the society women from a great lady poet of France, Madame de Lara Mardirous, as translated by Cenâb Şihâbuddin Beg in his magazine **Evrâk-i Eyyâm:** "Tell your [Muslim] girls to appreciate the value of their happiness! Let them get used to living veiled. Living veiled will protect them against so many inconveniences that... Oh, if they could only know the number of girls who have sobbed and cried on my shoulder. My ears are full with the very terrifying and heartrending complaints of the beloved girls. Yes, it seems as if it were very sweet to be able to enter a ball full of lights and flowers. But, what a grievous serpent is the jealousy that gnaws at the heart of the woman who has gone there with her husband she loves. Could you imagine it? Each of the balls, theatres and places for meeting is a cell of torment of **'Saint office',** a hell for a man who is faithful to his wife or for a woman who loves her husband. Inform your wives and sisters well about these facts!"

There is a saying which is chewed like a gum in the mouths: "The advancement of women is necessary for the advancement of men, because a nation, one of whose two wings cannot function, cannot make progress. It can make progress only together with the women." Such complicated, vague words show that those who cannot explain their purposes clearly attempt to communicate them under helping words. The advancement of women means not to leave them ignorant, not to slight their morals and education. Islam says nothing against having women do fine arts, which are suitable for their delicacy. It is permissible for women to do the fine works which men cannot do both in warfare and during peace and to learn them from other women. But, still they should stay away from men not related to them.

The strongest thing that attaches the Muslim Turks to their country is their religious and traditional pure life in the family. Among them, those who consider this life of women's and nâ-

mahram[1] men's being away form one another as a duty are attached to their country with a most sensitive vein.

Another powerful weapon which religion reformers use to defend that women should work among men is material and economic advantages. For example, "You open a shop and put a girl at the cashier or counter. The customers will increase with the lustful gifts which the shop presents to the sense of sight," they say. However, Muslim customers do not go to such shops where immodestly dressed women work and alcoholic drinks are sold. The earnings that come through harâm means are wicked and without Allâhu ta'âlâ's blessing. Their consequence will be harmful both in this world and in the next.

It is harâm and a grave sin for women and girls to exhibit themselves undressed to nâ-mahram men and for men to look at them. It does not become a Muslim to earn worldly property by means of harâm. Goods earned in such a way are useless and without Allâhu ta'âlâ's blessing. He who slights the harâm becomes a kâfir.

If a person claims to be a Muslim, his actions have to be in conformity with the Sharî'at. If he does not know how he should behave, he has to learn by asking a scholar in the Madh-hab of Ahl as-sunna, or by reading books written by scholars belonging to this Madh-hab. If what he has done runs counter to the Sharî'at's prescription, he is by no means free from the state of sinfulness or denial (of Islam). In this case, he has to do true penance daily. Any sin or any act of denial is definitely pardonable, depending on the (trueness of the) penance one has done. If the person concerned does not do true penance, he will be tormented, i.e. punished, both in this world and in Hell. Kinds of these punishments are written at various places in our book.

Parts of the body that men and women have to cover, both during namâz and elsewhere, are called **"Awrat Parts."** If a person says that Islam does not contain any concept in the name of awrat parts, he becomes a disbeliever. If a person does not attach importance to the fact that one has to cover those parts of one's body that are awrat according to the (agreements of the scholars called) ijmâ', i.e. in all the four Madh-habs, or that one should not look at those parts of other people's bodies; in other

[1] Men and women who are forbidden to show themselves to members of other sex are called **nâ-mahram**. There is detailed information on this subject in **Endless Bliss**, IV, 8.

words, if he does not feel any fear as to the torment he would be subjected to (in case he failed to observe this important rule), he becomes a disbeliever. Parts between a man's knees and loins are not awrat parts according to the Hanbalî Madh-hab. A person who says, "I am a Muslim," has to learn and respect the credal tenets of Islam and the commandments and prohibitions that are communicated in ijmâ', i.e. in agreement by all the four Madh-habs. Not to know them does not grant an exemption. It is equal to knowing and disbelieving. A woman's entire body, with the exception of her face and hands, is awrat according to all the four Madh-habs. The same rule applies to women's exposing their awrat parts, singing, or reciting aloud the (eulogy that praises our Prophet 'sall-Allâhu 'alaihi wa sallam' and which is called) Mawlid, in the presence of men. If a person floutingly exposes a part of his, or her, body which is not awrat with ijmâ', i.e. which he, or she, does not have to cover according to (at least) one of the remaining three Madh-habs, he, or she, will not become a disbeliever, although an act of this sort is one of the grave sins. An example of this is men's exposing their limbs between the knees and the loins, e.g. their thighs. It is farz for every person to learn what he or she does not know. And as soon as he or she learns any new religious tenet, (such as, covering the awrat part), he or she has to do penance and begin to observe it, (e.g. cover the awrat part concerned).

The following hadîths are quoted from the book **Zawâjir** [Egypt, 1356 A.H. (1937)] by Shafi'î scholar Hadrat Ibn Hajar al-Makkî [889-974 A.H. (1494-1567)].

"Do not show your thigh, and do not look at the thigh of a person dead or alive."

"Allâhu ta'âlâ will severely punish those who show the private parts of their body to others."

"The parts between men's knees and navels are their private parts."

"It is a grave sin to expose one's private parts."

"Three kinds of people will never go to Paradise. The first one is the dayyûth, that is, the person who takes no notice of his wife's relations with other men. The second one is the woman who makes herself look like men. The third one is the one who continues to have alcoholic drinks." Women's making themselves look like men means to dress like them, to wear coats and trousers like them, to cut their hair like theirs, which are grave sins.

"There are two groups of people who will go to Hell: in the first group are those who carry whips or truncheons and beat people unjustly. The second group are the women who show themselves undressed to men, that is, who go near men in a thin, transparent dress. Such women go near men for evil purposes."

Abû Dâwûd reported Hadrat 'Âisha (radiy-Allâhu 'anhâ) as having said that her sister "Asmâ' came near Rasûlullah (sall-Allâhu 'alaihi wa sallam). She had a thin dress on her. The colour of her skin was visible. Rasûlullah ('alaihi 's-salâm) did not look at his sister-in-law. He turned his blessed face away and said, **'O Asmâ'! When a girl arrives the age of performing salât, she should not show men her parts other than her face and hands.' "** It is understood from this hadîth that it is a grave sin for women to go immodestly dressed near men. Imâm az-Zahabî says that Allâhu ta'âlâ will punish in this world and in the next those women who show men their ornaments, e.g. gold, pearls over their outer dress, who use perfumes or are dressed in multi-coloured, silk tissue, with broad cuffs which expose their arms, and show themselves to men in this manner. Because these evils exist mostly in women, Rasûlullah ('alaihi 's-salâm) said, **"On the Night of Mi'raj, I saw Hell. I saw that the majority of the people in Hell were women."**

"He who believes in Allâhu ta'âlâ and in the Last Day should enter the public bath wrapping himself with a large bath-towel. He who believes in Allâhu ta'âlâ and in the Last Day should not send his wife to public baths!"

"The country of Iran will come into Muslims' possession. There are buildings called 'hammâm' there. Men shall enter the hammâm covered with a large bath-towel and send their wives there only for a bath-cure or for getting clean from haid and nifâs!"

"A person who believes in Allâhu ta'âlâ and in the Last Day should not stay with a nâ-mahram woman in a room!"

"Towards the end of this world, it will become harâm for the men of my umma to go to hammâms; for there will be people whose private parts are exposed there. May Allâhu ta'âlâ damn him who uncovers his private parts and him who looks at another's private parts!"[1]

---

[1] It goes without saying that the public baths mentioned in these hadîths were not used by both sexes at the same time. There were different public baths for each sex. The limitations imposed in these hadîth-i-sherîfs, therefore, involve those public baths used by only one sex at the same time.

"The person who commits adultery is like the person who worships idols." This hadîth points out that adultery is a grave sin.

"When a Muslim who insists on drinking wine dies, Allâhu ta'âlâ punishes him like a disbeliever worshipping idols." Adultery is certainly a graver sin than drinking wine.

"This umma will go on being auspicious until adultery spreads among them. When adultery spreads among them, Allâhu ta'âlâ punishes all of them."

"Allâhu ta'âlâ's punishment becomes halâl for people of a country where adultery and ribâ have spread."

Rasûlullâh (sall-Allâhu 'alaihi wa sallam) asked as-Sahâbat al-kirâm (radî-Allâhu 'anhum), **"How do you consider adultery?"** They said, "O Rasûl-Allah! Allâhu ta'âlâ and His Messenger have forbidden adultery. It will be forbidden until Rising-Day." He said, **"If a person commits adultery with his neighbor's woman, he will be tortured more than he who has committed it with ten different nâ-mahram women."**

"Paradise is harâm for the dayyûth," Dayyûth (cuckold) is the person who knows but keeps quiet and does not get angry at his wife's committing adultery.

"The hand of the person who touches a nâ-mahram woman lustfully will be fastened to his neck on the Day of Resurrection. If he kisses her, his lips will be burned in Hell fire."

It is a grave sin to commit fornication. It is a graver sin to commit adultery. The sin graver than this is fornication or adultery committed with a mahram relative. It is a graver sin for a widow to commit adultery than it is for a girl to commit fornication. It is a graver sin for an old man to do it than it is for young people. It is a graver sin for a religiously learned man to do it than it is for an ignorant person.

The reason why we have written long about the harm of women's uncovering themselves is because we do not want our fellow countrymen to get into trouble in this world and the next, and it stems from our feelings of goodness and service for them. In fact, it does not become a Muslim to know himself honest and good and to consider uncovered women and men and society women base and bad. When a Muslim sees those who go about uncovered, drink alcohol and live society life, he should feel pity for them or, if possible, advise them in kind words or writings compatible with the Book and laws or, at least, pray for their desisting from that harmful life. When we see a sinner, we should

remember our own sins and think of the punishments that will be given to us in case our faults and sins are not forgiven! It is harâm to find fault with, to slander or backbite (ghîba) anybody, which is a graver sin for us than their sins. Allâhu ta'âlâ loves those who have patience, do goodness, give service to and advise others, and who have soft words and smiling face and do favours. He does not love those who admire themselves. We should do the good things Allâhu ta'âlâ likes! We should be sweet-tempered. Harsh treatments and punishments are the government's duties. A Muslim does not hurt anybody with his tongue or hand. It is a sin to hurt anybody and arouse fitna. And causing fitna is a graver sin. It does not befit a Muslim to sin. He obeys the State and laws. He does not violate any law. He is an honourable person who wins everybody's love and regard.

The Hanafî 'âlim Khair ad-dîn ar-Ramlî wrote in the subject of "Nafaqa" in **Al-fatâwâ' al-khairiyya:** "It is wâjib for the husband to have the wife live in a house he owns or rents. The husband who does not supply the wife with nafaqa (livelihood, means of subsistence) is to be imprisoned. The house should be among the neighbors who are sâlih. These neighbors help the woman in her religious and worldly affairs and prevent the husband's oppression. The house should contain a kitchen, a toilet, a bathroom and rooms. Anyone whom the wife does not approve cannot live in this house. If the husband escapes or disappears and does not supply her livelihood, the wife applies to the court for nafaqa. She cannot demand separation from the husband. The judge determines the amount of alimony according to the customs and tells her to borrow that amount of money from her rich relatives, to whom he orders to lend her. He imprisons those who will not lend her. The court finds the husband and has him pay the lender. Because the husband has committed a grave sin, he is also punished with ta'zîr. If the wife, seeing her husband's escape and fearing that he will not give nafaqa, applies to the court demanding him to appoint a guarantor, the judge orders him to appoint a guarantor. If the husband does not escape and does not bring the nafaqa, the judge determines the nafaqa, that is, the amount of [money for] food, clothes and rent and makes him give it to her every month. A man who owns (the amount of) nisâb[1] and has to pay zakât must give the nafaqa of the (wife even if she is) rich. If the woman proves with two witnesses that her husband

[1] Border of richness dictated by Islam. Please see **Endless Bliss**, V, 1.

has fled and has not left nafaqa, the Shâfi'î judge abolishes the nikâh. After the 'idda (length of time within which a woman may not remarry), she may marry another man according to the Hanafî madhhab. If, later, the husband turns up and proves that he has left nafaqa, it will be overruled. Nafaqa is not given to the woman who is obstinately disobedient or who is told that she has been divorced." Yet, it is not easy to divorce the wife and to demolish her home and happiness.

He wrote in the subject of "Nikâh": "If a father has given his adolescent daughter in marriage to a man without taking her permission, and if she does not accept it when she learns it, the nikâh is not sahîh. She is to be believed if she says, 'I refused when I heard.' " The passages above show that the Muslim woman is not a toy in the hands of the man and that women's rights are under the guarantee of the state.

41 - The reformer says:

"Woman is not a creature whom man will use as he wishes or dismiss whenever he wants. According to the will of Allâhu ta'âlâ, who wishes people to be happy in this world and in the next, we should set rules for matrimony. Though Europeans have prohibited having more than one wife, many of them have a few illegitimate wives or mistresses."

Polygamy is one of the reasons why European progressives or imitators attack Muslims. The fact, however, is that whereas Muslims marry up to four women, Europeans cohabit with several women. Islam has laid conditions for marrying up to four. Not everybody can fulfill these conditions. For this reason it is limited for Muslim men to marry more than one and it is the lot of very few people. Besides, it is not a command but a conditional permission. It is seen that in places where it is forbidden to marry more than one woman, prostitution and adultery increase.

Its unpleasant effect on women is the main reason which religion reformers put forth why they speak ill of marrying more than one woman. They also say that marrying more than one causes an increase in population. The word that this increase is peculiar only to hot climates and the assertion that sexual power decreases in those whose brains function are ideas incompatible with observation and reason. In fact, when we observe the reasons for the propagandas based on women's rights and freedom in cold countries that are said to be civilized, voluptuous desires for women appear from under the masks.

Though it is obvious that the imitators of Europe amongst us run after their sexual desires in this respect, their real aim, principle purpose, is to attack Islam; this can be understood from every statement they make. Their idea of giving rights to women or freeing sexual, bestial desires remains secondary; it is seen that they strive with all their forces to annihilate Islam by attacking the rules and even the permissions peculiar to Islam and to bring into their place the immoralities of Europeans and Christianity. See how Ziyâ Gökalp, a very insidious, clever religion reformer working behind the curtain of Turkish nationalism outpoured his venom in his poem "Din ve Ilm" (Religion and Knowledge):

"As long as the woman is incomplete, this life will remain deficient!

So that the structure of familly be suitable with justice,

Betrothal, divorce, inheritance; in these three equality is a must!

As long as a girl is a half man in heredity and one-fourth in matrimony,

Neither the family nor the nation will advance."

As he attacks the Qur'ân and salât in his other writings so in this poem of his he attemps to blemish Islam under the cloak of women's rights. The progressives insist on that woman and man should be equal. Why don't they correct the anatomical and physiologic inequality which Allâhu ta'âlâ has made! A cock directs eight to ten hens. But two cocks cannot stay together in a flock of fowls. This is the same with almost all kinds of animals. People who live on breeding sheep keep two or three rams in the flock and slaughter or sell the others.

Equality between man and woman does not exist in every respect. Woman can ifluence man only with her attractive power on man. She is always inferior to man in many ways. In every place of the world, woman wants to adorn herself. No matter how much cherished they are, they are in the position of belonging to others like a precious thing. Women, who cannot sacrifice the desire of looking pretty for anything, consider themselves as rewards for men or for those who are chosen from among men. The rights given to them in some countries, for example, their equality with men, cannot remove the defects in their creation. Though man's brain is bigger and heavier than woman's, women in villages work as much as or even harder than men. Yet these labours have not rendered them dominant or ruling. It has been

declared in the Qur'ân that men are superior to women. Allâhu ta'âlâ has created men stronger than and dominant over women. Parents mostly want a baby-boy. This indicates that man is a support, a power in life, and women is a deficiency. Women, no matter what she does, can have only one child in a year. Here, man's activity is without limits. A man can have as many children as the number of his wives in a year, and the father and mothers of these children are known. In respect to bringing up children, a man is sort of equal to hundreds of women.

Furthermore, the number of girls born is bigger than that of boys. Wars decrease the number of men more. And sometimes, where men are reluctant to marry, the number of women is thousands more than men. We often read in newspapers that this is so. For example, the report from the daily **Türkiye** of Rajab al-fard 3, 1393 (August 2, 1973) Thursday issue said:

"According to the vital statistics prepared in the United States, women live longer than men.

"Statistics show that the female population is 2 million more than the male population and that, of the people aged 25 and above, women are more than men.

"According to the statistics of the world population, for 1000 men of age 65 and above, there corresponds 1275 women; in 1980, in this age group, there will be 1500 women for 1000 men, and this unequillibrium will go further because of more increase in the female population. Two-thirds of the women aged 65 and above are widowed, and the ratio of widows to widowers is 3. During 1950-1960, the number of widows made a rise of 17.7 percent, while the number of widowers made a fall of 2.4 percent.

"Again in the United States it is estimated that newly born baby-girls die seven years later than baby-boys among all who die in childhood. The reason is that the possibility of death of the prematurely born baby-girls is 50 percent less than that of such baby-boys. Within the first month after birth, the death of baby-boys is 50 percent more than that of baby-girls. Of the babies that die within the first age, 75 out of 100 are boys.

"During the period of growth, girls grow more rapidly, begin to speak earlier and, up to a certain age, develop more quickly than boys. The ratio of boys to girls who die between the ages of 5 and 9 is 2. Between the ages of 10 and 19, this ratio is 1.45.

"In all age-groups, the number of men who have heart-disease is more than that of women. In the critical period of the ages

between 40 and 70, two out of 3 deaths of heart-disease are men. Ulcer, cancer, pneumonia and tuberculosis are more common among men. Women's cancers, for example, of womb or breast, are more easily cured than men's cancers of lungs, stomach or prostate.

"May be women catch many more kinds of diseases; but their diseases are less mortal. It is found out that men and women more easily catch 245 and 120 out of some 365 kinds of dangerous diseases, respectively."

On Rajab al-fard 5, 1404 (April 18, 1983), **Hürriyet,** a daily published in Istanbul, reported: "According to the official results of the census, the ratio of widows to widowers in Istanbul is 17:4." This means that the number of widows is four times greater than that of widowers.

Another evidence showing that women are more numerous is that there is an enormous number of women who live on selling their honesty. It is obvious that such women are numerous especially in advanced countries. If a married or single man who cannot help having intercourse with such a woman marries her and spends his money for her home instead of paying it to her for dishonesty, will it be bad? Religion reformers or progressives cannot say, "It won't be bad, it will be good," for they want women to remain in a status that would always keep them prone to supersedure. Those who dislike marrying more than one must be those who are afraid that not many women will remain for them to amuse themselves with.

If they say, "Man's view of the women with whom he has intercourse illegitimately and his view of his own wife are different," they in fact regard those women who work illegitimately as lowly people who have lost their value. For this reason, they consider the sexual relations of a woman of high rank a much more shameful deed, a scandal.

Women are led to prostitution out of necessity, need or seduction. It cannot be thought of for man because he does not earn but pays money. This also shows that woman cannot be equal to man.

No matter how pretty she is, a woman does not give up trying to be attractive for man. Those with diminished bashfulness turn womanhood into a commercial material. It is seen that woman is more timid than man. This timidity is not because their lust is little, but because they are more capable of concealing their

sensations than men are. As lust is more in women, so their bashfulness is more than men's. Even a woman with diminished bashfulness sits awaiting at the brothel. It is the man who visits her and even pays her. In no place of the world is there a brothel where clients are women and prostitutes are men.

Women's bashfulness provides them with greater patience and determination. It prevents them from rushing into many heavy jobs. With the exception of communist regimes, where human beings, regardless of sex, are held equal with animals and slaves, although some of them, for the purpose of deceiving Muslims, disguise their administrations under spurious appelations such as "Socialist Islamic Republic', there is next to no country where women are armed and sent to the battlefield no matter how difficult the conditions are. When men decrease in number, they employ women in supply service behind the front and in easy jobs. In reply to men, who undertake these heavy and risky jobs and who sacrifice their lives for their country and children, such a self-sacrifice as not being sorry for their husbands' marrying more than one can be expected from women in order to prevent the loss of population caused by heavy industries and wars.

In fact, men's jihâd against the enemy is compared to women's struggling with their nafs in the Hadîth:

"Allâhu ta'âlâ imposed jealousy on women and jihâd on men. The woman who believes and endures this task will be rewarded in the Hereafter as if she were a martyred fighter for Islam." This hadîth points out that women should be patient about their husband's marrying another woman. The woman will both be jealous and endure this. And this great self-sacrifice has been held equivalent to men's jihâd. It is correct to hold jihâd equivalent to ta'addud az-zawjât, because the latter causes the population to increase and war causes it to decrease. In the magazine **Bayân al-haqq,** Mustafâ Sabri Effendi (rahmatullâhi 'alaih) explained this equivalence in detail.

Islam does not command ta'addud az-zawjât, but it permits it. Though it is not sinful not to use this permission, it is a religious duty to believe in that this permission is compatible with social life, knowledge and reason, and to refute those who say that this is not so. Moreover, it is a condition for those who do not want to use this permission not to meet the need of ta'addud az-zawjât in a sinful way. Although there is no one who attempts to use this permission today, religion reformers censure it as the separatists reiterate the combats between 'Alî and Mu'âwiya (radiy-Allâhu

'anhumâ) that took place fourteen centuries ago -the 'fait accompli' which have been evaluated well by Islamic scholars- and thus caluminate the Prophet's companions (radiy-Allâhu 'anhum). Such out-of-place and out-of-time discussions serve nothing but sow discord among Muslims and motivate the enemies of Islam. Ta'addud az-zawjât is not a command but a permission. It is written in the Turkish book **Ni'met-i Islâm** that it is even not a mustahab[1] but a mubâh.[2] It is fard to believe in that it is not permissible to criticize this permission of Allâhu ta'âlâ. It is kufr to deny or dislike this permission, which is clearly declared in the Qur'ân. Let us also add the fact that the husband who, because the laws forbid it and he respects the emotions of his wife, prefers to live only with her will be rewarded in he next world for having done without ta'addud az-zawjât. Islam's permitting it is intended to protect chastity and to increase the population. If we look carefully at the words of those who dislike it, the thing which annoys them is not marrying more than one but marrying up to four, since they obviously have more than four mistresses and do cohabit. If all brothels were closed and public and private prostitution were prohibited, they would immediately change their opinion; such words as, "Since ta'addud az-zawjât is unnatural, it has not held on among Muslims," would not be uttered any more and ta'addud az-zawjât would spread by itself.

Marrying more than one could not hold on because of its unsuitability; so it was replaced by prostitution and adultery, which are suitable for civilized men! Is that right? Many men are in a position that will not allow them to deny that they fill the vacancy of ta'addud az-zawjât with illegitimate affairs. Therefore, by tearing the curtains between man and woman, they play with women's chastity and honour. In European countries where women are given full freedom, men and women are all mixed up. Islam has set an equilibrium between women and men and commanded women to veil themselves in order to maintain the order.

Though the foregoing discussion provides the necessary response to a modernist religion reformer who says, "A man's marrying up to four women is injurious to women's rights. One man's having one wife is the equal and evenhanded commitment of human rights. Ta'addud az-zawjâd spoils this equality and

[1] A deed or behaviour commended, though not commanded, by Islam.
[2] Permission.

justice," the following points also will be helpful:

It is obvious that in countries where there is not ta'addud az-zawjât, illegitimacy and prostitution have spread out instead. Then, how can one ever say that pushing women towards prostitution will make them attain a right and an equality? It can be understood that all these clamours are intended to provide men with their amusement under the mask of giving women rights. The statistics show that the number of women in the world is greater than that of men. For this reason, more than one woman corresponds to a man. When women are fewer than men, ta'addud az-zawjât disappears by itself; the words 'injustice' and 'inequality' will remain without reason. Man, being unable to find another woman, will live with one woman. But, when there are more women and a man cannot overcome his desires, should he opt the legitimate way or the illegitimate way? Here is all the difference of views between religion reformers and Muslims. Is it necessary to close the legitimate way or the illegitimate way? Certainly, it is necessary to close one and to spread and facilitate the other. But which one? It is seen that this difference is based on the difference between being Muslim and not being Muslim. Advancement and progress of Muslims can be achieved by holding fast to Islam. It is impossible to attain salvation by abandoning Islam, which is unnecessary.

Many people argue saying, "While nikâh is performed, every sort of condition can be laid down. The woman can demand from the man whom she is to marry to remain with a single wife throughout their married life and to give her the right of divorce." These words are right. Islam gives woman this right, too. There is detailed information on this subject in **Radd al-muhtâr.**

If a man, for the sake of his respect for the emotions of his first wife, should not marry another woman, should he succumb to his sexual desires and satisfy his desires in other places. Should he injure his own chastity and honesty and spoil the chastity and honesty of another woman? Should he sin as much as he wants and deserve the punishments stated in the above-quoted hadîths? Should evil feelings arise in his wife when she finds out these illegitimate, evil deeds of her husband? Should her chastity be injured lest her feelings should not be injured? We wonder if a woman who might hear that her husband cohabits with bad women will not suffer a heavy blow? Will not the effects of being a dishonest man's wife be added to this? Moreover, if we think about the harm done to the wife's chastity; its harm to the

husband; the harm done to the husband or wife of the woman or man with whom they have illegitimate relations, respectively, and the harm done to the children affected by these offenses, and the health that is risked to venereal diseases, it will be easier to decide correctly and reasonably. Syphilis and gonorrhea spread through promiscuous relations and threaten the whole world. See the Divine Wisdom! Allâhu ta'âlâ has sent the worst, the most dangerous diseases in the actions outside of Islam. The children involved are not only the children that have not been born; Islam's subtle command **rajm** (stoning to death) against adultery is the punishment commanded by Islam to prevent the birth of the child that would be born out of adultery as a degenerate bastard and would have no honour in humanity. When the children in the home are smeared with these dangerous diseases, the whole family will be dragged on to death materially and spiritually. With ta'addud az-zawjât, which prevents all these harms, only the first wife is harmed slightly. This harm is psychological but not a harm pertaining to conscience, for ta'addud az-zawjat is what Allâhu ta'âlâ, whom she loves more than her life, permits.

In order to prevent these harms, Islam expects from women this self-sacrifice, which will be rewarded in the Hereafter. Thereby they will contribute to the population increase and help other members of their sex to find a husband. If women be brought up with this sacred, religious education, the uses of which are obvious, the side-effects of ta'addud az-zawjât, which are only to emotions and to the nafs, will disappear. The progressives claim that they are determined to make progress by enduring all kinds of difficulty. While the man is ready to die in war, should not he expect an insignificant self-sacrifice from his wife, since it will rescue the individual, the family and the entire society from a great disaster? Would not it be good if she, instead of having the baseness of ignoring her husband's habitual, evil, harmful deeds, accustom herself to a useful, noble feeling? They will be helpful to men in their struggles to protect their chastity, and at the same time pay their religious debts in return for men's sacrifice in warfare.

In the time of the Union Party, Mensûrî Zâde Saîd, the deputy of Manisa, offered the National Assembly to pass a law to prohibit ta'addud az-zawjât. The majority of deputies said it was impossible. The law was not passed. As for the question what Muslims should do in a country where such a law is in operation, Muslims do not violate the laws even if they are in a country of

disbelievers. They do not commit any crime. Each of them live with one woman with whom they marry according to Islam and to the laws, with nikâh and a formal registration. Opposing the laws and the government gives way to punishment, trouble and fitna (mischief against Muslims.), which is not permissible. It is declared in the Hadîth, **"Fitna is asleep. May Allâhu ta'âlâ damn him who wakes it."** May Allâhu ta'âlâ protect Muslims against fitna and calamities! Âmin.

In the Ottoman Empire, marriage contracts were registered at municipalities or marriage offices, where marriage licences were obtained, and canonical marriage contract (nikâh) was performed compatibly with its principles by a pious Muslim who knew the religious knowledge of his madhhab correctly and performed salât regularly. The quantity of gold money which is called **mahr-i mu'ajjal** or **mahr-i muejjel** and upon which the couple agreed was recorded in the licence during the performance of nikâh. Mahr-i mu'ajjal was paid by the man to the woman before the wedding. **Mahr-i muejjel** was the money he was obliged to pay in case of divorce. If he did not pay it or the alimony for his children to her every month, either an equal amount was allotted from his salary and paid to her or he was imprisoned. Because of the fear of this high compensation, of misery of remaining a bachelor or of failure to marry again, nobody would divorce his wife. In fact, nobody would marry his daughter to the man who had divorced his wife unfairly. Till death, every Muslim led a happy, prosperous life together with his wife and children in mutual love and in peace which formed out of the karâma inherent in nikâh. He was an honourable person among his circle and acquaintances and was given high esteem and credit by everybody.

42 - Abul A'alâ Mawdûdî, one of the religion reformers of the present time, introduces Imâm al-Ghazâlî as a reformer in his book **The Revivalist Movement in Islam.** He writes:

"Imâm al-Ghazâlî extirpated the Greek thoughts so as to remove their effects from Muslims' minds. He corrected the mistakes of those who attempted to defend Islam against philosophers and scholasticism according to their own thoughts. He revealed the rational effects of the principles of belief, reopened the spirit of ijtihâd, arranged the programs of education, introduced the moral principles of Islam and invited the government and officials to follow Islam. Yet he was inefficient in the knowledge of the Hadîth, and he dwelt too much on rational knowledge and inclined to tasawwuf more than necessary."

He attributes defects to this great scholar, who has been one of the greatest Ahl as-Sunna scholars. He calls these imaginary defects "dangerous attitude". He extravagantly goes on:

"Ibn Taimiyya removed these dangers, revived Islam's spirit of ideations and morals and accomplished the explorations of renewal. A short while before him, no one had dared to invite the people to Islam for fear of calumniation; the narrow-minded scholars had cooperated with the cruel rulers, and it was his lot to unfurl the banner of renewal against them. He was profound in interpretation of the Qur'ân and a leader in the Hadîth and he took Islam from where al-Ghazâlî had left it. He defended Islamic faith and found more beautiful proofs for Islamic spirit than al-Ghazâlî had. Al-Ghazâlî's judgement had remained under the harmful influence of rational thoughts. Ibn Taimiyya was more effective and chose the way of reason, which was closer to the spirit of the Qur'ân and Sunna. Thus, he won a wonderful success. Men of knowledge did not know the interpretation of the Qur'ân. Those who were educated scholastically were not able to establish the connexion between themselves and the Qur'ân and Hadîth. It has been only Ibn Taimiyya's lot to accomplish the real explanation of Islam. He made ijtihâds by deriving his inspiration directly from the Holy Book, from the Sunna, and from the way of living of the Prophet's companions. Ibn al-Qayyim, his disciple, studied over the divine causes, whose meanings had not been solved, and established Islamic principles. By clearing out the evil effects that had leaked into the Islamic system, he purified and refreshed it. He attacked the bad customs that had been accepted as parts of Islam and had been support for religious punishments and tolerated by scholars for centuries. This honest act turned the whole world against him. Those who came later raced with one another to calumniate him."

Religion reformers can be classified in three groups:

The first group is that of the profound Ahl as-Sunna scholars. They corrected heresies, wrong deeds and superstitions that had been introduced among Muslims by ignorant people and by the enemies of Islam. They revealed the true knowledge transmitted by the Ahl as-Sunna mujtahids as they had heard it from as-Sahâbat al-kirâm. They did not say anything from themselves. They are called **"mujaddidîn"** (revivers). The Prophet ('alaihi 's-salâm) praised them and foretold that they would come and render service to Islam: **"After me, a scholar will appear every hundred years. He will strengthen my religion."** Mujaddidîn were

praised in this hadîth: **"The scholars of my umma are like the prophets among the Children of Isrâ'îl."** The absolute mujtahids such as al-Imâm al-a'zâm (the Gratest Leader) Abû Hanîfa, al-Imâm ash-Shâfi'î and the like, who were madhhab leaders, al-Imâm ar-Rabbânî Ahmad al-Fârûqî as-Sirhindî, the 'ulamâ' who were attached to the madhhabs in each century and Hadrat al-Mahdî, who will come in the future, are among these mujaddidîn. Some hypocrites, who use the religion as a means for political purposes and worldly advantages, have been representing themselves as religious men and murshids. Every one of them has been writing that he himself is the very mujaddid predicted in the hadîth. The ignorant believe one of them and call him a mujaddid. However, Rasûlullah (sall-Allâhu 'alaihi wa salam) described the characteristics of mujaddidîn. He said that they all would be in the path of as-Sahâbât al-kirâm (radiy-Allâhu anhum). And those who are in this path are the Ahl as-Sunna scholars. These mujaddidîn, who were predicted in the Hadîth, are the great scholars of the Ahl as-Sunna, the apples of Muslims' eyes. They did not say anything from their own minds or opinions, nor did they give âyats and hadîths meanings according to their own ideas and understandings. They tried to spread and emphasize the meanings given by the scholars of tafsîr and hadîth. How could Mawdûdî ever say "ignorant" about these profound scholars whom Rasûlullah (sal-Allâhu 'alaihi wa sallam) praised?

In the basic books of Islam, there is no mawdû' hadîth or heretical belief or deed which the enemies and the ignorant have tried to introduce into Islam. The mujaddid's duties are not to change the religious books of Islamic scholars, nor to disesteem the value of religious knowledge in these books, nor to add new information to them. His duties are to reveal the religious teachings that were written in their books but were forgotten later, to explain and teach them to others. An exalted Islamic scholar of this capacity is called a **"mujaddid"** rather than a "reformer".

Religion reformers in the second group believe in and pay respect to the Qur'ân and Hadîth, but they refuse their meanings and the knowledge given in the books of Islamic scholars. They derive meanings from the Qur'ân and Hadîth according to their short sight. They differ from the knowledge of the Ahl as-Sunna scholars on many points. They are called **"ahl al-bid'a"** (heretics).

Our Prophet ('alaihi 's-salâm) predicted also that they would appear. The Hadîth ash-sherîf says, **"My umma will part into**

seventy-three groups. Seventy-two of them will go to Hell, and one will not go to Hell owing to their îmân."[1]

In the third group of religion reformers are the insidious disbelievers. These enemies of Islam, by disguising themselves as Muslims and uttering gentle words such as, "We renovate the religion, reproduce its main sources and restore it to its former position," try to demolish Islamic faith, to change and defile the true meanings of âyats and hadîths. They strive to destroy Islam form the inside. Because they pretend to be Muslims and say, "We renovate the religion and purify it from superstitions," ignorant people suppose such disbelievers to be real mujaddids. They believe them. So these reformers are very successful. In order to deceive Muslims, they praise a few Ahl as-Sunna scholars and write that they admire them, yet they dislike most of the teachings written in their books and call them superstitions. Of the hadîths written in these great scholars' invaluable books, they say "mawdû', made-up" about the ones which do not suit their purposes and which hinder their advantages. They impose their own heretical, harmful concoctions in the name of truth. Thus, they try to blemish these great scholars. Another group of them constantly speak ill of, and even attribute disbelief to, one or two of the Ahl as-Sunna scholars.

From the term 'religion reformers', we Muslims understand the **lâ-madhhabî** (non-madhhabite, non-Sunnî) people, that is, members of the second and third groups. The group which is declared in the above-quoted hadîth to possess the true faith and will not go to Hell for this reason is called the **"Ahl as-Sunnat wa 'l-Jamâ'a".** This hadîth shows that a person is either a Muslim or a disbeliever. And a Muslim is either a Sunnî or a heretic. Then a person who does not belong to the Ahl as-Sunna is either a heretic or a disbeliever.

Today, Muslims should be quite adequately learned lest they should be deceived by these subversive religion reformers who

---

[1] This hadîth is reported in many valuable books. For example, it is written on the first page of the translation of **Al-milal wa 'n-nihal** that it exists in the four books of **Sunan** and that it is explained more detailedly in at-Tirmidhî's book. It is also written in the **Sahîhain** of al-Bukhârî and Muslim. Furthermore, it is written on the 609th page of **Sharh al-Mawâqif,** which is one of the greatest kalâm books taught in high grades of madrasas, and in the 67th letter of the second volume of **Maktûbât** by al-Imâm ar-Rabbânî. The ahl al-bid'a and disbelievers deny this hadîth.

have spread all over Muslim countries. Freemasons, the insidious enemies of Islam, in order to cause Muslims to depart from their religion, try on the one hand to make the government administrators freemasons. On the other hand, they educate freemasonic men of religious profession. Freemasonic administrators try to pass laws prohibiting what is fard and commanding what is harâm or even disbelief and, to promote the reformist men of religious profession, who are their associates in the guilt. For example, Âlî Pasha (d. in 1287/1871, buried in the Suleymâniye Mosque yard), who was made Grand Vizier five times during the times of Sultan 'Abd al-Majîd and Sultan 'Abd al-'Azîz, was a freemason. He invited Jamâl ad-dîn al-Afghânî, a religion reformer hostile to Islam, to Istanbul, and co-operating with him he began to reform the religion. But the Ahl as-Sunna scholars were vigilant enough not to leave the field to them. They proved Jamâl ad-dîn's ignominy, and Âlî Pasha could no longer support him.

Jamâl ad-dîn al-Afghânî was born in Afghanistan in 1254 A.H. He came to Kabul in 1261. He stayed there for ten years. He read many books on philosophy. For some time, he spied for the Russsians upon Afghanistan and earned much money from the Russians. In 1285, he came to Egypt and became a freemason. Âlî Pasha brought him to Istanbul and assigned him duties. Hasan Tahsin, the rector of the University of Istanbul and another freemason educated in Paris by the Grand Vizier Rashid Pasha and announced to be a disbeliever by the Shaikh al-Islâm,[1] had him give lectures that year. But, when he spoke recklessly, the great scholar Hasan Fahmi, the Shaikh al-Islâm, gave the fatwâ that he was a disbeliever. Hasan Fehmi Effendi was one of the profound scholars of his time and the hundred and tenth Shaikh al-Islâm of the Ottoman Empire. He had won the first place in the examination of ru'ûs. He became a mudarris, that is, a professor of religious knowledge at the university. He educated many disciples. Having been promoted through various positions, he became the Shaikh al-Islâm. When Sultan 'Azîz went to Egypt, he prepared the khutba delievered at the Jum'a prayers. He kept long company with Hadrat Shaikh Saka, the famous scholar at Jâmi' al-Azhar. The Egyptian scholars admired his knowledge. Owing to this scholar's righteous opposition, Jamâl ad-din was disgraced. Âlî Pasha had to dismiss Jamâl ad-dîn from Istanbul. It

[1] Chief of Religious Matters.

is written in the book **Ad-durar** by Adib Is'hâq of Egypt that Jamâl ad-dîn was the chief of the freemasonic lodge in Egypt. He imbued Egyptians with revolutionary ideas. In order to increase his fame, he pretended to side with those who prepared the event of "A'râbî Pasha" against the British. He made friends with Muhammad 'Abduh, the muftî of Egypt. He imbued him with his reformatory thoughts. Muhammad 'Abduh wrote: "Before I saw Jamâl ad-dîn my eyes had been blind, my ears deaf and my tongue dumb." In London and in Paris, Jamâl ad-dîn wrote many harmful articles on reform in the religion. In 1886 he came to Iran. He did not keep quiet there, either. Fastened with chains he was left inside the Ottoman borders by five hundred cavalrymen. He went to Baghdad and London. He wrote articles against Iran. Thence he came to Istanbul, where, co-operating with the Bahâ'îs[1] he exploited the religion as a means for politics. He tried to stir up an insurrection in Iran. A year later, his chin became cancerous and he died in 1314 A.H. (1897). He was buried in the Cemetery of Shaikhs near the Maçka Barracks in Istanbul. An American had a tomb built for him. After the Second World War, his bones were taken to Afghanistan. Freemasons write differently about his hostility against Islam, his revolutionary and mischievous adventures. They are not ashamed of saying "ignorant, reactionary" about the Shaikh al-Islâms and Muslim scholars for the sheer purpose of proving that he was great.

Great Muslim scholar Hadrat Sayyid Abdulhakîm Arwâsî (d. in 1362/1943) said, "It was Ibn Taimiyya who invented the heresy of reform in the religion first. Later on, this heresy was led to unbelief by the ignorant and by the enemies of Islam." Ibn Taimiyya was born in Harrân in 661/1263 and caught a disease that caused his death in prison in a fortress in Damascus in 728/1328. He did not like the Ahl as-Sunna scholars. He denied tasawwuf entirely. He called Islam's beloved scholars such as Muhyiddîn ibn al-'Arabî and Sadr ad-dîn al-Qonawî "disbelievers". However, he was not too ignorant to know that he who called a Muslim "disbeliver" would himself become a disbeliever. It is a shame he tried to adapt Islam to his own opinion and narrow mind and, denying the facts which he could not comprehend, he went astray. 'Abd al-Wahhâb ash-Sha'rânî (rahmatullâhi 'alaih), one of the leading 'ulamâ' of Islam and a specialist in 'ilm at-tasawwuf, exposed Ibn Taimiyya's this

[1] A heretical group explained in the thirty-sixth chapter of the second fascicle of **Endless Bliss**.

deplorable state in his **Tabaqât al-kubrâ,** in the preface of which he wrote: "Only Walîs can recognise a Walî. If a person who is not a Walî or does not know anything about wilâya does not believe in wilâya, this indicates his obstinacy and ignorance. Anexample of this is Ibn Taimiyya's denial of tasawwuf and his belittling 'ârifs. One should not read such people's books, keeping away from them as if running away from wild beasts. Abu 'l-Hasan ash-Shâdhilî, one of the superiors in tasawwuf, reported in detail the state of those who denied Awliyâ'." Therefore, Ibn Taimiyya's followers bear hostility against Hadrat 'Abd al-Wahhâb ash-Sha'rânî and have aimed their arrows of slander at this great scholar of Islam.

Ibn Taimiyya said that the early Muslims had adapted themselves to the Qur'ân and Hadîth, ant that the madhhab leaders who had appeared later had inserted their own opinions, and he censured the Ahl as-Sunna. On the contrary, as written in the seventeenth article above, the Ahl as-Sunna scholars, in regard to religious knowledge, never departed from the way of narration (naql). They did not follow their own points of view. It is accepted unanimously by Muslim scholars that especially al-Imâm al-a'zam Abû Hanîfa (rahmatullâhi 'alaih) followed the narration in every respect and held his own point of view inferior to it.[1] While slandering the Ahl as-Sunna scholars in this respect, Ibn Taimiyya himself interpreted the Qur'ân according to his own point of view. Thus, he himself differed from the early Muslims. This shows that he was not sincere in his word. He said that the Ahl as-Sunna scholars had misunderstood the Qur'ân and Hadîth and that even the Sahâbat al-kirâm had gone wrong on many points, that he himself corrected Allâhu ta'âlâ's religion and that only he understood the true meaning of the Qur'ân. He disliked the great mujtahids of the first and second centuries of the Hegira, who had been praised in the Hadîth, and the Muslim scholars who have spread the mujtahids' madhhabs all over the world. For this reason, he began to fall into disesteem in the view of men of knowledge. The authorities of religion co-operated and began to observe minutely the way he had taken, and it was concluded that he was heretical and harmful. The chair of professorship that he had inherited from his father was taken back from him. However, he did not keep quiet. He reproduced the words of the heretical group called "Mushabbiha" and said

---

[1] For documented explanation, see the 27th chapter of **Endless Bliss**, I.

that Allâhu ta'âlâ was material and an object. He supposed that the Creator was in the shape of man. By giving wrong meanings to symbolic (mutashâbih) âyats and hadîths according to his own comprehension, he went wrong. He was so badly fixed in this heretical belief that one day he said on the pulpit of the mosque in Damascus, "Allâhu ta'âlâ descends on the earth from the sky as I descend now," and got down from the pulpit. Ibn Battûta reported this. The 'ulamâ' of the four madhhabs, by writing answers refuting these words of Ibn Taimiyya, prevented the deterioration of Muslims' i'tiqâd. The book **Ar-raddu 'ala 'l-mushabbihi fî qawlihi ta'âlâ ar-Rahmânu 'ala 'l-Arsh-istawâ** by Muhammad ibn Jamâ'a, who was a Shâfi'î scholar of fiqh and hadîth and had been the qâdî Of Egypt, Damascus and Jerusalem and passed away in 733 (1333), is full of these invaluable answers. In the fatwâ book **Tâtârhâniyya** and in **Al-milal wa 'n-nihal** and in many other books, it is written that the groups of **Mujassima** and **Mushabbiha,** i.e. those who believe Allâhu ta'â'lâ to be a material being who sits, gets down and walks on the 'Arsh, are disbelievers. In 705 A.H. scholars and officials, who had been convened in the presence of Egyptian Sultan Nâsir, sentenced Ibn Taimiyya to confinement in the well of Cairo fortress because he spread such heretical words. Because he gave wrong fatwâs which the Ahl as-Sunna scholars did not consider permissible, he was again imprisoned in the Damascus fortress in 720. His words about visiting prophets' graves and blessed places also made a mess and caused fitna. For this reason, he was imprisoned again in Damascus in 726. In 728 (1328), he became ill in the dungeon and died.

Ibn Taimiyya said that he was in the Hanbalî madhhab. However, one has to adapt one's belief to that of the Ahl as-Sunna so that one can be in one of the four right madhhabs. Many words of his indicate that he did not belong to the Ahl as-Sunna and, on the contrary, he disliked the Ahl as-Sunna. He represented himself as a mujaddid, as a reformer. Hanbalî scholar Mar'î (d. 1033 A.H.) wrote a biography of Ibn Taimiyya titled **Kawâkib,** in which he quoted Ibn Taimiyya's writings that denied the necessity of following the imâms of madhhabs and even the ijmâ'. Though he attacked the Ahl as-Sunna scholars because they had done qiyâs, he himself did qiyâs on many matters, especially in his book **Majmû'at ar-rasâ'il wa 'l-masâ'il.** He did not believe in the greatness of Awliyâ' and attacked visiting graves. He mutilated the hadîth, **"Only three mosques are visited at the**

expense of a journey," to distort it into "Only three mosques are visited," and said that it was a sinful act to visit even Rasulullah's (sall-Allâhu 'alaihi wa sallam) grave. Hadrat Ibn Hajar al-Hîtâmî answered this in detail in his book **Fatâwâ al-fiqhiyya.** In the 222nd article of the book **Nuzhat al-hawâtir** by 'Allâma 'Abd al-Hayy al-Hasanî (d. 1341/1923), it is written that Muhammad 'Abd al-Hayy al-Luknawî, an Islamic scholar of India (d. 1304/1887), debated upon this subject with Muhammad Bashir, a lâ-madhhabite Indian. Ibn Taimiyya was aggressive against the madhhab of Hadrat Abu 'l-Hasan al-Ash'arî, one of the greatest Ahl as-Sunna scholars, and against this profound scholar's explanation of qadar and of the Names of Allâhu ta'âlâ and against his explanations of the âyats about the punishment in the next world. He said that the punishment in Hell would not be eternal also for disbelievers and that every kind of tax paid to the State would stand for zakât. He did not admit that the words incompatible with what the four madhhabs had unanimously declared were disbelief. He strived to rebut the honour and fame of the Ahl as-Sunna scholars. In al-Jabal mosque in Sâlihiyya, he said that Hadrat 'Umar (radiy-Allâhu 'anh) had made many mistakes. In another gathering, he said that Hadrat 'Alî (radiy-Allâhu 'anh) went wrong three hundred times. A hadîth, which is written in the book **Kunûz** by al-Manâwî, in Imâm Ahmad's **Sahîh** and in the book **Mir'ât al-kâ'inât,** states: **"Allâhu ta'âlâ has put the true word on 'Umar's tongue,"** by which Rasûlullah ('alaihi 's-salâm) meant that Hadrat 'Umar (radiy-Allâhu 'anh) would never go wrong. Ibn Taimiyya opposes this hadîth by saying, " 'Umar made many mistakes," Indeed, he was learned enough to have known of this hadîth. He was vastly learned on the Hadîth, yet the multitude of his errors counterbalanced the amplitude of his knowledge. It was true that many of the Sahâbat al-kirâm except 'Umar (radiy-Allâhu 'anh) might have made mistakes in those matters that were to be solved through ijtihâd. But their mistakes were the mistakes in ijtihâd. For this reason, even the mistakes of those great people and also of the Ahl as-Sunna scholars in those matters understandable through ijtihâd will be rewarded (thawâb) in the next world, since all of them were mujtahids. As for Ibn Taimiyya's mistake in the teachings pertaining to belief, it took him away from the right path and aggravated the punishment he deserved. By presuming himself to be a mujtahid, he became above himself and led himself to disaster. He went further and mercilessly attacked the great men of tasawwuf such as Sadr ad-

dîn al-Qonawî, Muhyiddîn ibn al-'Arabî and 'Umar ibn al-Fârid. He said that al-Ghazâlî's books were full of mawdû' hadîths, and he did not neglect to criticize our scholars of Kalâm. He could not understand that the madhhabs arose out of the differences of ijtihâd and supposed that they were the results of philosophical thoughts. He considered it as a guilt that the Ahl as-Sunna scholars had said that the old churches in Muslim countries should not be touched, and for this reason, he vituperated the great men of Islam.

Mawdûdî, like Ibn Taimiyya, misrepresents Imâm al-Ghazâlî as defective. Great scholar Ibn Hajar al-Makkî, in commenting on the causes of disbelief, wrote that any person who asserted that there were errors in Imâm al-Ghazâlî's writings either envied him or was an atheist.[1] Hanafî scholar Ibn 'Âbidîn wrote at the end of his **Al-'uqûd ad-durriyya,** "A person who says that Imâm al-Ghazâlî was not an 'âlim is the most ignorant among the ignorant and the worst of fâsiqs. He was Hujjat al-Islâm and the most superior of the scholars of his time. He wrote very valuable books on fiqh."

Some Muslim scholars declared that Ibn Taimiyya had departed from Islam and become a renegade. Profoundly learned scholars such as Ibn Battûta, Ibn Hajar al-Makkî, Taqî ad-dîn as-Subkî and his son, 'Abd al-Wahhâb, 'Izz ad-dîn Ibn Jamâ'a and Abû Hayyân az-Zâhirî al-Andulûsî, whose words have been regarded as documentary evidence, considered him a man of bid'a, a heretic. Even those who said he was a heretic did not deny his knowledge, intelligence and zuhd, but, a hadîth written in **Mishkât** states, **"The worst of the bad is the bad man of religion."** Hadrat al-Imâm ar-Rabbânî Ahmad al-Fârûqî wrote in his fifty-third letter:

"The good scholar is the best of mankind. The evil scholar is the worst of mankind. Men's happiness and doom depend upon scholars. A great man saw the Satan sitting unoccupied and asked why he was loitering. The Satan said, 'The heretical scholars of the peresent time do my work. They do not leave any work for me to lead the people astray.' "

Imâm as-Subkî, too, used to praise Ibn Taimiyya's knowledge

---

[1] **Al-a'lâm bi kawati' al-Islâm,** p. 137, with references to Ibn as-Subkî and other scholars. This book of Ibn Hajar's was printed on the page margins of **Zawâjr**, another book written by him. It is in Arabic and available in Istanbul.

and intelligence much. Burhân ad-dîn ibn Muflih wrote in his **Tabaqât** that Imâm as-Subkî praised Ibn Taimiyya much in the letter he had written to az-Zahabî. However, Imâm as-Subkî, in his work **Ar-raddu li Ibn Taimiyya,** and his son 'Abd al-Wahhâb, in his **Tabaqât,** wrote that Ibn Taimiyya departed from the Ahl as-Sunna and went astray. Many persons whom he imbued with his ideas, especially his disciples Ibn al-Qayyim and az-Zahabî, praised him too much. 'Alî al-Qârî ' and Mahmûd Âlûsî, who are considered as religious scholars because of their annotations to famous books and who lived on writing on the Qur'ân and valuable books, and Muhammad 'Abduh, who claimed to be a mujtahid, followed in his footsteps and departed from the Ahl as-Sunna.

Yûsuf an-Nabhânî, one of the profound scholars of the present century, in his book **Shawâhid al-haqq,** and Shaikh al-Islâm Mustafâ Sabri efendi, one of the great Ottoman scholars, in his book **Al-'ilm wa 'l-'aql,** and Abu Hâmid ibn Marzûk, a Damascene scholar, in his two-volume work, which was partly published by offset under the title **At-tawassulu bi 'n-Nabî wa Jahalat al-Wahhâbiyyîn** in Istanbul in 1395 A.H. (1975), proved Ibn Taimiyya's heresy with documents.

Those who approve Ibn Taimiyya, in order to prove that he was judged and imprisoned unjustly, write: "His writings against the men of tasawwuf offended them. His fatwâs about divorce made the scholars of fiqh feel hostile towards him. And his fatwâs about the Divine Attributes hurt the scholars of Kalâm. Therefore, the scholars of Kalâm, fiqh and tasawwuf co-operated against him, and he was punished." They think that they can make everybody believe that religious scholars would become hostile towards or torture or denounce a Muslim because of a few words. They misrepresent him as a victim of oppression and the scholars as cruel. On the contrary, Ibn Taimiyya rose in rebellion against the Ahl as-Sunna. He spread the fire of fitna over the Muslim world. For example, when Abû Hayyân, a scholar of Arabic, came to Cairo in 700 A.H., Ibn Taimiyya said to him, "Who is Sibawaih that you call him a scholar of Arabic! There are exactly eighty errors, which you cannot distinguish, in his book." Hearing these words which would not become a man of knowledge, Abû Hayyân preferred to keep away from him and censured him in his Qur'ân commentary **Al-bahr** and also in its abridgement titled **Nahr.**

Ibn Hajar al-Askalânî quotes az-Zahabî in his book **Durar al-**

kâmina, "When talking on knowledge, Ibn Taimiyya used to become angry, try to defeat the person whom he talked to and offend everybody." Imâm as-Suyûtî wrote in his book **Kam' al-mu'ârid,** "Ibn Taimiyya was arrogant. He was self-conceited. It was his habit to represent himself as superior to everybody, to slight the person whom he talked to and to make fun of great Muslims." Muhammad 'Alî Beg, a Damascene scholar, wrote in his book **Hittat ash-Shâm,** "Ibn Taimiyya's and Priest Luther's aims were identical. Whereas the Christian reformer was successful, the reformer of Islam was unsuccessful." Mawlânâ Muhammad Ziyâullah, one of the prominent 'ulamâ' of Pakistan and the imâm and khatîb of the city of Siyalkut, wrote in the 93rd page of his work **The Truth of Wahhâbism** (Published in Urdu in 1969): "Mawlawî 'Abd al-Hayy Luknawî (d. 1304 A.H.), the great 'âlim of India and the author of hundreds of invaluable books known by the world, said in his book **Ghais al-ghamâm,** 'Like the predecessor Ibn Taimiyyat al-Hurrâmî, the successor ash-Shawqânî was very learned but less intelligent. The latter was exactly like, even more inferior than the former.' "

Goldziher writes that Ibn Taimiyya deemed the right madhhabs to be bida' and, saying that they had changed the original purity of Islam, attacked them and also opposed the Ash'arî madhhab and tasawwuf and announced visiting the graves of prophets and Awliyâ' to be a sinful act.

Mustafâ 'Abd ar-Razzâq Pasha, former Rector of the Jâmi' al-Azhar and student-follower of Muhammad 'Abduh, wrote: "When issuing a fatwâ, Ibn Taimiyya did not follow any madhhab, but he acted in accordance with the proof he himself had found. He denied the kashfs of tasawwuf leaders."

Ibn Taimiyya wrote about Sadr ad-dîn al-Qonawî: "Sadr ad-dîn, a friend to Muhyiddîn ibn al-'Arabî, surpassed his master in scientific knowledge and Kalâm, yet he was worse in disbelief, less learned and had less îmân than his master had. Since such people's faith was disbelief, more skillful ones of them were more excessive in disbelief." Some Islamic scholars said that Ibn Taimiyya was a disbeliever, and others, the majority, said that he was one of ahl al-bid'a. Shaikh al-Makkî, a scholar contemporary with Yavuz Sultan Selim Khan, answered the attacks against Hadrat Muhyiddîn ibn al-'Arabî and wrote: "Ibn Taimiyya said that disbelievers would get out of Hell after burning there for a number of years and supported this claim with the hadîth, **'Some day the doors of Hell will open and grass will grow on its ground.'**

He also quoted some other hadîths. On the other hand, it is clearly stated in the Qur'ân that disbelievers will remain in Hell eternally. There has been tawâtur and ijmâ' on this fact. Most scholars said that Ibn Taimiyya had contradicted the tawâtur and ijmâ."[1]

It is written on the ninety-sixth page of **Mukhtasar-i-Qurtubî**: "Those who say that all the inhabitants of Hell will go out and that Hell will become empty, in fact, negate the Qur'ân and Hadîth. The Ahl as-Sunna scholars, the just imâms, unanimously said that the punishment in Hell will be eternal for disbelievers. The âyat, **'We will throw those who part from the Believers' path into Hell,'** is an answer to them. The first division of Hell, where those believers with many sins will be punished, will become empty. Its other divisions, where disbelievers will be punished, will never be emptied. Believers will be set free from the punishment by attaining shafâ'a and only their place will become empty and grass will grow on the ground of the first division of Hell. Imâm al-Qurtubî writes that the hadîth quoted above is mawqûf, that it was not reported to have been heard from Rasûlullah ('alaihi 's-salâm). Hadrat Muhyiddîn ibn al-'Arabî, too, said that the doors of Hell will never be opened and that disbelievers will remain in Hell eternally. Those scholars who said that they would go out of Hell meant that sinful believers will go out."[2] Ibn Taimiyya, exploiting the hadîths stating that believers will go out of Hell, denied the âyats, tawâtur and ijmâ'. Calling the Ahl as-Sunna scholars "disbelievers" causes one to become a disbeliever. It is written in the subject on the qâdî of the book **Radd al-muhtâr** that it is disbelief to deny the hadîths which were not interpreted differently by the Salaf as-Sâlihîn and which are tawâtur. Mâlikî scholar Muhammad ibn 'Abdullah of Tanja, who is famed with the name Ibn Battûta, gave many quotations from Ibn Taimiyya that were incompatible with Islam and wrote: "Ibn Taimiyya had much knowledge. But there was something wrong with his mind... I was in Damascus. During the Friday salât, he, after reciting the khutba, descended the stairs saying, 'Allâhu ta'âlâ descends on the world's sky as I descend now.' Ibn Zahrâ, a Mâlikî scholar, explained the wickedness of his statement in detail to the congregation. The ignorant majority of the congregation had believed Ibn Taimiyya

[1] **Al-jânib al-gharbî,** Râshid Effendi section, Suleymâniyye Library, Istanbul.

[2] **Mukhtasaru tadhkirat al-Qurtubî,** p. 96.

to be on the right path and liked his pompous words much. Upon the Malikî scholar's objection, they beat him with their hands and shoes. He fell down. His turban fell off and his silk skull-cap appeared. Exploiting this as a proof, [Islam forbids man to wear silk clothes], they took him to the Hanbalî qâdî. The qâdî punished him with ta'zîr and imprisoned him. Mâlikî and Shafi'î scholars said that this ta'zîr was unjust. The affair was taken to Nâsir the Ruler. A council of scholars was appointed and they came to the conclusion that Ibn Taimiyya caused partition (fitna) among Muslims. With the command of the Sultan, he was imprisoned in Damascus."[1] May Allâhu ta'âlâ endow comprehension and guidance to the right path upon those who consider our madhhab leaders as inferior to him, although his heresy was proved and he was punished by the scholars of his time and by all Muslims! May He protect Muslim children against believing heretics! Âmîn.

Hadrat Ibn Hajar al-Makkî wrote: "One of Ibn Taimiyya's superstitious absurdities was his denial of tawassul or istighâtha, putting Rasûlullah (sall-Allâhu 'alaihi wa sallam) as an intermediary when praying to Allâhu ta'âlâ. No scholar before him had ever said so. Because of this absurd idea of his, he became a topic of discussions among Muslims. The opposite of his fatwâ is the truth. It is always good to put Rasûlullah (sall-Allâhu 'alaihi wa sallam) as an intermediary. He could be put as an intermediary before and after he was born, in this world as well as in the next world. One of the proofs showing that he could be put as an intermediary before he was born is the fact that prophets and the Awliyâ' of their ummas had done so. Ibn Taimiyya's slanderous word was not based on any fact or rule. A hadîth reported by Hâkim an-Nishâpûrî, a hadîth scholar, declares that, **'When Âdam ('alaihi 's-salâm) was mistaken, he said, 'O my Rabb! Forgive me for the right of Muhammad ('alaihi 's-salâm).' Allâhu ta'âlâ said, 'I have not created Muhammad ('alaihi 's-salâm) yet. How do you know him?' And he said, 'O my Rabb! When Thou created me and gave me soul, I raised my head and saw the writing, "Lâ ilâha ill Allah Muhammadun Rasûl Allah," all around the 'Arsh. I understood that Thou had put the name of**

[1] **Tuhfat an-muzzâr,** p. 9. The author of this history work, Ibn Battûta, dictated it to his secretary, Ibn Jazî. It has been translated into various languages. The second translation into Turkish by Muhammad Sherîf Beg was printed in Istanbul in 1335 A.H. (1917). The above-quoted passage is also quoted in Yûsuf an-Nabhânî's **Jawâhir al-bihâr** in the entry " 'Abd al-Ghanî an-Nabulusî".

him whom Thou loved most among Thine human creatures next to Thine Name.' And Allâhu ta'âlâ declared, 'O Âdam! You have said the truth. Among Mine human creatures, he is the one whom I love most. Since you ask my pardon for his right, I have forgiven you immediately. If it were not for Muhammad (alaihi 's-salâm) I would not have created you.' 'Muhammad's (alaihi 's-salâm) right' means 'Allâhu ta'âlâ's loving and cherishing him very much' or 'his rights upon other human creatures' or 'his right which Allâhu ta'âlâ, as a blessing upon him, recognizes upon Himself'. Likewise, it was said in a hadîth, **'What is human creatures' right upon Allâhu ta'âlâ?'** In this context, 'right' does not denote something that must be done by Allâhu ta'âlâ, for Allâhu ta'âlâ does not have to do anything. He does it if He wills. Asking something from Allâhu ta'âlâ for Rasûlullah's (alaihi 's-salâm) right cannot be said to be polytheism since it is not asking it from him. Allâhu ta'âlâ declares that He loves His Messenger (alaihi 's-salâm) very much and that He has bestowed a high rank upon him. Allâhu ta'âlâ is asked to give for the right, for the sake of his love and this high rank. One of the blessings, gifts which Allâhu ta'âlâ has bestowed upon His Messenger is that He accepts those prayers sent through his right, through his high rank. For the person who disbelieves this blessing, the greatest loss is his deprivation of it. Rasûlullah (sall-Allâhu 'alaihi wa sallam) was put as an intercessor when he was alive, too. An-Nasâ'î and at-Tirmidhî reported that a blind man came to Rasûlullah (alaihi 's-salâm). He begged him to pray so that his eyes might open. Rasûlullah (alaihi 's-salâm) said to him, **'I will pray if you wish, but you can be patient if you like. Patience will be better for you.'** When the man said, 'I would like you to pray. I have nobody to lead me. I am in great difficulties,' Rasûlullah (alaihi 's-salâm) said, **'Perform ablution and then say, "O my Rabb! I turn towards Thee through Thine Beloved Prophet, whom Thou hast sent as a blessing upon people. I ask from Thee! O Muhammad (alaihi 's-salâm)! I turn towards my Rabb through thee. O my Allah! Make him an intercessor for me!" '** Also Imâm al-Baihakî reported that the blind man stood up and, blessed with the sense of sight, walked away. Rasûlullah (alaihi 's-salâm) himself did not pray but taught him the prayer. He wanted him to turn towards Allâhu ta'âlâ, to entreat Him and to put Rasûlullah (alaihi 's-salâm) as an intercessor and wished his prayer to be accepted in this way. He was and has been put as an intercessor both when he was alive and after his death. The Salaf as-Sâlihîn, after his death, said this

prayer very often and attained their wishes through it. As reported by at-Tabarânî and al-Baihaki, a man whose request was not accepted by the Caliph 'Uthmân (radiy-Allâhu 'anh) went to Hadrat 'Uthmân ibn Hanîf, a Sahâbî, and asked his help. He taught him this prayer. When he approached the Caliph after saying the prayer, his request was accepted. In a hadîth reported by at-Tabarânî, Rasûlullah ('alaihi 's-salâm), when praying, said, **'For the right of Thine Prophet and Thine other prophets preceding him'. Tawajjuh, tawassul, istighâtha** and **tashaffu'** through him, through other prophets or Awliyâ' all mean the same thing. Islam has also declared it permissible to put some kind of deed or 'ibâda as an intermediary. The Hadîth informs that, of old, some people who were imprisoned in a cave, entreated by mentioning their old deeds done only for the sake of Allâhu ta'âlâ and the stone that had plugged the opening of the cave opened the way and they were rescued. While a prayer is accepted for the sake of one's own good deeds, it is certain that the prayers sent through those who have performed the best deeds will be accepted. 'Umar ibn al-Khattâb (radiy-Allâhu 'anh) prayed for rain by putting Hadrat 'Abbâs (radiy-Allâhu 'anh) as an intermediary. None of us, Sahâbat al-kirâm objected to it. The reason why he did not pray through Rasûlullah ('alaihi 's-salâm) or through his blessed grave but through Hadrat 'Abbâs was because he deemed himself very low and considered Rasûlullah's ('alaihi 's-salâm) relatives higher than himself. His praying through Hadrat 'Abbâs, in actual fact, meant praying through Rasûlullah ('alaihi 's-salâm). The words 'tawassul', 'tawajjuh' or 'istighâtha' do not show that the one through whom you pray is higher than the one to whom you pray, because the one with a high status is made an intermediary while asking from the one with a higher status. 'Istighâtha' means 'asking for help from somebody by putting someone else as an intermediary'. The former is higher than the intermediary. Muslims, when praying through Rasûlullah ('alaihi 's-salâm) or Awliyâ', do not think otherwise. Nothing else comes to their hearts when saying these words. Allâhu ta'âlâ alone is the One who is prayed to and is asked from; the Prophet is an intermediary, a mediator between. Only Allâhu ta'âlâ helps by creating or making; the Prophet is the cause, the intermediary of the help. Allâhu ta'âlâ is the Real Helper, and Rasûlullah ('alaihi 's-salâm) is the symbolic helper. A hadîth reported by al-Bukhârî declares, **'On the Rising Day, they will pray first through Âdam, then through Mûsâ and then**

through Muhammad (’alaihimu ’s-salâm).’ ‘Praying through Rasûlullah’ means ‘asking him to pray’. He is alive in his grave and perceives the demand of the person who asks from him. According to an authentic narration, there was dearth in the time of Amîr al-Mu’minîn ’Umar (radiy-Allâhu ’anh) and a Sahâbî visited Rasûlullah’s (’alaihi ’s-salâm) grave and said, ‘O Rasûl-Allâh! Pray for your umma so that it shall rain! Your umma are about to perish.’ Rasûlullah (’alaihi ’s-salâm) showed himself to him in his dream and said that it would rain. And it did rain. He also said in the dream, **‘Go to ’Umar! Tell him my salâm! Give him the good news that it will rain. Tell him to act mildly.’** ’Umar (radiy-Allâhu ’anh) was severe and strict in carrying out the commands of the religion. The Sahâbî told the Caliph about his dream. The Caliph listened and wept. According to some reports, this Sahâbî was Bilâl ibn Hârith al-Muzanî (radiy-Allâhu ’anh). Here, the point is not the dream but the Sahâbî’s praying through Rasûlullah (’alaihi ’s-salâm) in his dream. As it is seen, Rasûlullah (’alaihi ’s-salâm) can be asked also after his death, as it was done when he was alive, to pray so that one’s wishes might come true. In addition to the fact that wishes have come true through his praying and intercession, there is the fact that others’ prayers sent through him before he was born, when he was alive or after his death have been accepted. On the Rising Day, he will intercede with Allâhu ta’âlâ for his umma, and his intercession will be accepted. This fact has been reported as ijmâ’ by Islamic scholars. Hadrat ’Abdullah ibn ’Abbâs (radiy-Allâhu ’anhumâ) reported the hadîth saying that Allâhu ta’âlâ declared to ’Îsâ (’alaihi ’s-salâm), **‘O ’Îsâ! Believe in Muhammad (’alaihi ’s-salâm)! And command your umma that those of your umma who will live in his time should believe in him! Had it not been for Muhammad (’alaihi ’s-salâm), I would not have created Prophet Âdam (’alaihi ’s-salâm). Had it not been for Muhammad (’alaihi ’s-salâm), I would not have created Paradise and Hell. I created the ’Arsh on the water. It moved. When I wrote, “Lâ ilâha ill Allâh,” on it, it stopped.’** This hadîth was reported with sahîh references by Hâkim. Would not a prayer be accepted, which is asked for the sake of such a prophet, who has such a high status and infinite honour, and who attained Allâhu ta’âlâ’s blessings? Would not a prayer sent by asking for his intercession be accepted?”[1] The

[1] This passage is translated from Ibn Hajar al-Makkî’s **Jawhar al-munzam.** It is also quoted in **Shawâhid al-haqq.**

prayers which Nûh, 'Ibrahîm and other prophets had asked for the sake of Muhammad ('alaihimu 's-salâm) are written in tafsîr books.

Imâm as-Subkî, as quoted in **Shawâhid al-haqq,** said, "There are two forms of tawassul of Rasûlullah ('alaihi 's-salâm); the first one is to ask from Allâhu ta'âlâ for the sake of his high status and baraka. One of the terms **'tawassul', 'istighâtha'** and **'tashaffu' '** is used when praying so. All of them mean the same. He who prays by expressing one of these terms asks from Allâhu ta'âlâ by putting Rasûlullah ('alaihi 's-salâm) as an intermediary. He asks from, prays to, Allâhu ta'âlâ through him. Even in worldly affairs, He immediately gives the thing which is asked from Him by putting someone whom He loves very much as an intermediary. The second form of tawassul of Rasûlullah ('alaihi 's-salâm) is to ask him to pray to Allâhu ta'âlâ so that you may attain your wish, for he is alive in his grave and understands what is asked from him and he can ask for it from Allâhu ta'âlâ. Also in the next world, he will be asked to intercede, and he will intercede, and his intercession will be accepted."

Hadrat Shihâb ad-dîn ar-Ramlî, as quoted in the book **Shawâhid al-haqq,** said, "Prophets and Awliyâ' can be made intermediaries even after their death. The mu'jizât of prophets and the karâmât of Awliyâ' do not cease after their death. The hadîth clearly declares that prophets are alive and perform salât and hajj in their graves. It is known also that martyrs are alive and they help warriors."

Muhammad ibn 'Abd al-Wahhâb[1] read Ibn Taimiyya's and his disciple Ibn al-Qayyim al-Jawziyya's books and deviated from the right path. He got their ideas fixed into his mind.

43 - Another religion reformer who inflicted great harm on Islam is Muhammad ibn 'Abd al-Wahhâb, who died in 1206 (1762). His followers are called the **Najdîs** or **Wahhâbîs.** They say:

"All Muslims who have spread over the world for six hundred years have been polytheists, unbelievers. Since it is fard to worship Allah directly, nothing can be put as an intermediary for worship. It will be polytheism to pray or to ask for help from anybody besides Allah and it will never be forgiven. All of those who, mentioning the names of prophets or Awliyâ', ask for help from

---

[1] For detailed information about that person, see the books **Confessions of a British Spy**, and **Advice for the Muslim**, available from Hakîkat Kitâbevi.

them and who respect shrines by performing vows, alms and other things, are polytheists. 'We expect their shafâ'a. We render them intermediaries in order to approach Allâhu ta'âlâ'; these words do not rescue them from polytheism. Polytheists of the time of Rasûlullah also used to pray and beg Allah when they were in trouble. When they became safe, they used to pray angels, Awliyâ' and idols. Likewise, today's polytheists beg such and such a chief dervish or such and such shaikh. These polytheists are worse than the ancient polytheists. Let alone the polytheists who beg a shaikh, even those who say, 'O Rasûl-Allah! Do shafâ'a for me, come to my rescue,' are unbelievers, too."

Muhammad ibn 'Abd al-Wahhâb explained the kalimat at-tawhîd according to his own point of view and disseminated his opinion that all Muslims had been polytheists.

The Ahl as-Sunna scholars refuted him and declared that he was on a wrong path. Sulaimân ibn 'Abd al-Wahhâb, Muhammad's brother, wrote a great book to refute him. The books **Fasl al-khitâb** and **Kashf al-khijâb** by 'Alî ibn Ahmad, a famous molla and a scholar of Basra well-known with the name al-Kabânî, prove that he deviated from the right path.

He had the book **Dalâil al-khairât** put in fire because it contained such words as 'Sayyidinâ' and 'Mawlânâ'. On the other hand, Sultan 'Abdulhamîd Khan II read this book every day. Ibn 'Abd al-Wahhâb frequently said, "If I could, I would demolish the Prophet's shrine. I would throw away the golden gutter on the Ka'ba and put a wooden gutter in its place." He called those who would not believe him "unbelievers". He frequently said that Hadrat "Umar ibn al-Fârid and Hadrat Muhyiddîn ibn al-'Arabî were unbelievers. He derided the hadîth, **"The parting of my umma into madhhabs is [Allâhu ta'âlâ's] compassion for them."** He did not believe that the waqf (pious foundation) was Islamic and said that the stipend paid to the qâdîs was a bribe. Al-Kabânî rebutted these one by one with documents.

Ibn Taimiyya claimed that it was sinful to go to a river-side, hot spring, forest, mountain, cave, etc., as health resorts or to vow something for a grave and that it was polytheism to visit graves, to sacrifice animals near shrines or to ask for help from the dead.

According to the Ahl as-Sunna scholars, it is sunna to visit Rasûlullah's ('alaihi 's-salâm) shrine. In fact, some of them said it was wâjib. Ibn 'Âbidîn wrote in the commentary of **Ad-Durr al-mukhtâr,** "Before Ibn Taimiyya, no scholar had prohibited visiting tombs. He made up a new bid'a. He fell into disesteem before all

Muslims." A hadîth reported in the **Sahîh** of Muslim declares, **"I prohibited to visit graves before. From now on, visit them!"** Najm ad-dîn 'Umar ibn al-Hajjî, in his book **Al-jawâb fi'r-raddi 'alâ Ibn Taimiyya,** proved that it was permissible to visit tombs and refuted Ibn Taimiyya with sound evidences. Also Burhân ad-dîn Ibrâhîm ibn Muhammad wrote a beautiful book under the same title.[1]

Wahhâbîs say that an act prohibited by Ibn Taimiyya is unbelief. According to him, people make vows or pray beside shrines, walk around them, kiss their covers, take samples of soil from them, as well as those who ask for help from Awliyâ', are disbelievers. He claimed that those who do not consider these as disbelief are disbelievers, too. In fact, he wrote, "It is halâl to kill those who benefit from Prophets and Awliyâ' as mediators between Allâhu ta'âlâ and themselves for the purpose of becoming to Allâhu ta'âlâ, and to confiscate their property,"[2] which was in effect an indirect command to slaughter Muslims and to plunder their proprety. The fact, however, is that he who does not believe the well-known indispensable beliefs in the religion, e.g. the Oneness of Allâhu ta'âlâ or the fact that it is fard to perform salât five times a day, will be an unbeliever. A Muslim who believes what are declared clearly cannot be called an unbeliever because of a mere doubt. Ibn Taimiyya should have used the word 'shirk' (polytheism) for such people to mean minor polytheism, but Wahhâbîs say it is polytheism equivalent to unbelief. It is open polytheism to worship idols. The hidden polytheism **(shirk khafî),** however, is to ask something from anyone besides Allâhu ta'âlâ. Men cannot escape hidden polytheism. Even prophets begged Allâhu ta'âlâ to protect them against it. Following the nafs, sexual desires and ostentation are examples of this kind of polytheism, which removes the thawâb of worship. But no scholar has said, "Ostentatious people are unbelievers. It is halâl to kill them and to confiscate their property."

Prostration (sajda) towards the sun, the moon, stars, idols or statues for the purpose of worshipping them is unbelief. It is not unbelief but a sin to prostrate before other things for reverence without the purpose of worshipping them. Though it is unbelief to sacrifice an animal for something whom one worships, it is not

[1] These two books exist in the Suleymâniyye Library, in the "Beshir Aga" section with call number 142.

[2] Muhammad ibn 'Abd al-Wahhâb, **Kashf ash-shubuhât,** also translated into Turkish.

unbelief but harâm for a worshipper of Allâhu ta'âlâ to make a sacrifice for others without worshipping them. To worship someone means to entreat them and to believe that everything, useful and harmful alike, comes from them and made by them. It was stated (by some scholars) that it would be makrûh for the worshippers of Allâhu ta'âlâ to take samples of soil from graves or to walk around them. According to Wahhâbîs, however, acts of this sort are polytheism. The graves which the Sahâba built for the martyrs who had fought against Musailamat-ul kadhdhâb[1] were above ground level, which was intended for others to recognize them and recite the Fâtiha for their souls. The heretics censure Sahâba for this reason, too. They demolished these graves. This shows that they are on al-Kadhdhâb's way.

They said it was a bid'a to build tombs over graves or minarets for mosques or to eat with spoons. They ruined Husain's (radiy-Allâhu 'anh) tomb in Karbala and plundered the invaluable things in it. They burned and ruined the city of Tâ'if and massacred the Ahl as-Sunna Muslims including the women and children and plundered their possessions. The most valuable books such as the **Sahîhain** of al-Bukhârî and Muslim and thousands of books on hadîth, fiqh and other fields, even the Qur'ân, were trodden underfoot. Out of fear, no one dared to pick them up. They even dug in the ground and looked for possessions. They set the city afire. They demolished the tombs in Mecca and the blessed houses where the Prophet ('alaihi 's-salâm), Abû Bakr, 'Umar (radiy-Allâhu 'anhumâ) and Fâtima (radiy-Allâhu anhâ) had been born. They said it was polytheism for muezzins to recite the Salawât for the Prophet's soul. They proscribed smoking and burned all the pipes, hookahs, cigarette-boxes and musical instruments in Mecca.

Putting forth the âyats, **"Besides Allâhu ta'âlâ, do not pray to anybody, who is neither useful nor harmful to you!"** and **"Do not pray to another person together with Allâhu ta'âlâ!"** and the hadîth **"Prayer is the essence of worship,"** they said that he who asked for something from someone besides Him would become an unbeliever. However, the prayer prohibited in the âyat means the 'prayer that is performed as worship' in the Islamic knowledge. This prayer can be performed only to Allâhu ta'âlâ. And, a person who knows that only Allâhu ta'âlâ can be

[1] An unbeliever who claimed to be a prophet. He was killed by Wahshî 'radiy-Allâhu anh'.

worshipped, that He alone can be prayed to, that no one besides Him is creative, that everything is made by Him, is permitted to put Prophets and Awliyâ' as intermediaries and ask help from their souls by thinking that they are the beloved human creatures of Allâhu ta'âlâ who has given their souls the power to help people. They are alive in their graves in a life which we do not know. Their souls have been given miracles and the power to do work. A person who believes so cannot be called a polytheist. However, Muslims ask the souls of Awliyâ' to help them purify their hearts and to give them faid and ma'rifa, knowledge which has flowed from Rasûlullah's ('alaihi 's-salâm) blessed heart to their hearts. They do not ask for the transitory things of this world such as property and position. They do not even think about them.

Allâhu ta'âlâ declares in the sûrat az-Zumar, **"Those who worship beings other than Allâhu ta'âlâ say, 'We worship them only so that they intercede for us,' "** and points out that this pretext will not rescue them from Hell. Ahl al-bid'a liken the Ahl as-Sunna to idolatrous disbelievers and say that the words "In order to approach Allâhu ta'âlâ, we put His beloved human creatures as intermediaries," will not rescue the Ahl as-Sunna from polytheism. Since idolaters are polytheists, it is true that their protext does not rescue them from the punishment of polytheism, yet it is not polytheism to put His beloved human creatures as intermediaries. Why should the Ahl as-Sunna be rescued from polytheism, then? If a person who has killed another on purpose says in the law-court, "I did not think of killing this man. I knew it was a guilt to kill a man," he will not be listened to and will be punished. Though his words are true, he is punished not because of his words but because he killed a man. If an innocent person utters the same words and an enemy of his pleads against him by saying, "You have punished the one who uttered such words. Punish this one, too!" he will not be punished, since punishment of the former person was for having killed a man. Likewise, the idolaters will go to Hell not because of their above-quoted words but because they worship beings other than Allâhu ta'âlâ.

Muslims cannot be called unbelievers by making an analogy to this âyat, which refers to polytheists, for, although unbelievers and polytheists said that Allâhu ta'âlâ created the good and the evil and everything, they worshipped the statues called al-Lât and al-Uzza and angels, which, they believed, were worth worshipping and could have Allâhu ta'âlâ do everything they wished. With this

belief, they prostrated themselves before them, made sacrifices to them and vowed to them. As for Muslims, they do not make sacrifices to Rasûlullah (’alaihi ’s-salâm) or to the souls of Awliyâ’. They make sacrifices only to Allâhu ta’âlâ and send its thawâb as a gift to the souls of Awliyâ.’ **“Shafâ’at yâ Rasûl-Allâh!”** (’alaihi ’s-salâm) means “O the Prophet of Allah! I love you much, for He commands us to love you. Because I love you, may He have me attain thine intercession!” This is said briefly like the âyat, **“Ask the village,”** in the Qur’ân. ’Umar (radiy-Allâhu ’anh), during a visit to the Ka’ba, said before the **Hajar al-aswad,** “You cannot do anything! But I kiss you in order to follow Rasûlullah (’alaihi ’s-salâm).” ’Alî (radiy-Allâhu ’anh) said upon hearing this, “Rasûlullah (’alaihi ’s-salâm) said, **‘On the Day of Judgment, the Hajar al-aswad will intercede for people.’ ”**[1] And ’Umar thanked ’Alî (radiy-Allâhu ’anhumâ) for his advice. While a stone can be helpful, is it possible that prophets and others who are loved by Allâhu ta’âlâ cannot be helpful? Allâhu ta’âlâ declared that He would admit the prayers and intercession of those whom He loved.[2]

Hadrad Mawlânâ Khâlid al-Baghdâdî, a profound scholar and a treasure of miracles, wrote in his work **Ar-risâlat al-Khâlidiyya,** “Muslims, when holding on to a means, think that it will be a means through which Allâhu ta’âlâ will create what they wish; they do not believe that the means will be the maker. As for polytheists, they believe that their idols will create or have Allâhu ta’âlâ create it. Those who cannot distinguish between these two beliefs perish by falling into the whirlpool of denial.”

Yûsuf an-Nabhânî, citing from the book **Khulâsat al-kalâm**[3] by Sayyid Ahmad Dahlân, writes: “Some say that a person who regards Rasûlullah (sall-Allâhu ’alaihi wa sallam) or another Prophet or a Walî as an intermediary or visits his grave and says, for example, ‘O Rasûl-Allah (’alaihi ’s-salâm), I ask for your intercession,’ becomes an unbeliever. By putting forth the âyats such as, **‘Do not pray to anybody besides Allâhu ta’âlâ!’ Who else can ever be more heretical than the one who prays to somebody**

---

[1] This hadîth is reported by at-Tirmidhî, an-Nasâ’î, al-Baihakî, at-Tabarânî and al-Bukhârî in his **History.**

[2] The forgoing ten paragraphs were paraphrased from the seventh volume of Jevdet Pasha’s **History.**

[3] Second part of this book is reproduced by Hakîkat Kitâbevi, Fâtih, Istanbul, Turkey, 1395 (1975).

besides Allâhu ta'âlâ?' and **'Those to whom you pray besides Allâhu ta'âlâ can do nothing. If you ask anything from them, they will not hear you. Even if they heard you, they would not answer you. On the Day of Resurrection they will deny your polytheism,'** which descended for unbelievers, these people of bid'a called the believers 'unbelievers'. Muhammad ibn 'Abd al-Wahhâb, the founder of Wahhâbism, said, 'These âyats show that a person who addresses a grave and asks for intercession is a polytheist. Ancient idolaters, too, believed that their idols could make nothing, that Allâhu ta'âlâ alone created everything, but they said that their idols would intercede with Allâhu ta'âlâ for them, and, therefore, they became polytheists. Also, those who ask for shafâ'a at graves or shrines become polytheists.' These words are very wrong, for the believers neither worship Prophets or Awliyâ' nor attribute them as partners to Allâhu ta'âlâ, but believe that they, too, are creatures, impotent human beings, who are not worth worshipping and cannot do any use or harm. Because they are His beloved, select human creatures and He pities His human creatures for their sake, the believers try to get benefit through them. On the other hand, the polytheists mentioned in the âyats believed that the idols were worth worshipping, and they were polytheists because of this misbelief. When they were told that the idols were neither useful nor harmful, they would say that they worshipped them so that they intercede with Allâhu ta'âlâ for them. It is surprising, indeed, that the true believers are compared to idolatrous unbelievers. If it were polytheism for the believers to ask for intercession. Rasûlullah (sall-Allâhu 'alaihi wa sallam), as-Sahâbat al-kirâm or the Salaf as-Sâlihîn would have never asked for intercession. As a matter of fact, when praying, Rasûlullah (sall-Allâhu 'alaihi wa sallam) said, **'O my Rabb! Give me for the right (haqq) of those human creatures whom Thou gave when they asked!'** It is obvious that he asked for intercession in these terms. He taught this prayer to his companions and declared, **'Pray in this manner!'** It is declared in a hadîth quoted in **Al-Jâmi' al-kabîr** by Jalâl ad-dîn as-Suyûtî and reported by Ibn Mâja, **'When leaving your house for the mosque, say this prayer!'** Islamic scholars said this prayer every day. At-Tabarânî, Ibn Habbân and Hâkim reported that when interring Fâtima bint Asad (radiy-Allâhu 'anhâ),' Alî's (radiy-Allâhu 'anh) mother, Rasûlullah (sall-Allâhu 'alaihi wa sallam) said, **'O my Rabb! Forgive Mother Fâtima bint Asad for the right of Thine Prophet and Thine other prophets who came before me!'** " Also, Ibn Abî

Shaiba and Ibn 'Abd al-Birr reported this hadîth with more details as written in the book **Al-Jâmi' al-kabîr** by as-Suyûtî. There is an evident tawassul in the prayer Rasûlullah ('alaihi 's-salâm) taught a blind Sahâbî. These people of bid'a, however, prohibit that prayer and say that he who says it becomes an unbeliever. It can never be right for them to say so, for as-Sahâbat al-kirâm always said that prayer when Rasûlullah ('alaihi 's-salâm) was alive.

"While visiting the Masjid an-Nabawî, Ja'far Mansûr, the second 'Abbâsid caliph, asked Imâm Mâlik, 'Shall I turn my face to the Ka'ba or face Rasûlullah's ('alaihi 's-salâm) grave when reciting prayers?'[1] Imâm Malik said, 'How can you turn your face away from Rasûlullah ('alaihi 's-salâm)! He is the cause of you and your father Âdam ('alaihi 's-salâm)! Turn your face to him and pray through him!' Hadrat Ibn Hajar al-Makkî wrote in his book **Jawhar al-munzam** that this report was so authentic that it cannot be rejected. Those who say that Imâm Mâlik said that it was makrûh to pray while facing Rasûlullah's ('alaihi 's-salâm) grave slander the exalted imâm by saying so.

"It is not right that only prophets ('alaihimu 's-salâm) can be put as intermediaries, for Hadrat 'Umar (radiy-Allâhu 'anh), when praying to Allâhu ta'âlâ so that it would rain, put Hadrat 'Abbâs (radiy-Allâhu 'anh) as an intermediary. None of the Sahâbat al-kirâm who were present there said anything against him. Since Rasûlullah ('alaihi 's-salâm) had said, **'Allâhu ta'âlâ has placed the truth into 'Umar's tongue,'** Hadrat 'Umar's putting Hadrat 'Abbâs (radiy-Allâhu 'anhumâ) as an intermediary is an apparent evidence, a sound document and was intended to show everybody that it was permissible to put others besides Rasûlullâh (alaihi 's-salâm) as intermediaries, for everybody knew that it was permissible to put prophets as intermediaries, and there were those who hesitated if it was permissible to put others as intermediaries. 'Umar (radiy-Allâhu 'anh) taught that it was permissible. If the had prayed through Rasûlullah ('alaihi 's-salâm), it would have been understood that it was not permissible to pray through others for rain. However, this does not show that the dead cannot be put as intermediaries, for all as-Sahâbat al-kirâm prayed through Rasûlullah ('alaihi 's-salâm) after his death. Some examples of it have already been given above.

---

[1] One stands between the Ka'ba and the Prophet's blessed grave when standing in the Masjid an-Nabawî.

"Some people, on the one hand, say, 'No one besides Allah can affect. He who says that someone else also can affect becomes a disbeliever,' and on the other hand, claim, 'The alive can be put as intermediaries, but the dead cannot. The alive can affect, but the dead cannot.' Their words disagree with each other. Believers deem both the dead and the alive as intermediaries or causes and believe that Allâhu ta'âlâ alone creates and affects everything.

"When saying that it is polytheism to pray through somebody, the heretics show examples from the words of ignorant people, who say, e.g., 'Do my such and such affair,' towards a dead Walî's grave or regard ordinary people as Awliyâ' and expect miracles from them. However, even such ignorant people who express such wrong words and thoughts believe also that no one besides Allâhu ta'âlâ can create use or harm. They know they have recourse to Awliyâ' in order to get blessings from Allâhu ta'âlâ. And the heretics say that they try to prevent their wrong, doubtful words. We remind the heretics that none of those who express such wrong, doubtful words ever think that somebody besides Allâhu ta'âlâ can create use or harm. They all have recourse to Awliyâ' in order to get a share from their blessings. When they say, 'Awliyâ' did,' they do not mean that Awliyâ' affected. If they want to prevent doubtful words, why do they call all believers 'polytheists'? They say he who has recourse to somebody (tawassul) for any reason becomes an unbeliever. If they are sincere in their word, they should prohibit only the words which they consider as doubtful and teach the manners of tawassul. Moreover, the words which they prohibit are metaphorical words with different meanings, for example, 'This food has satiated me,' or 'This medicine has cured me,' which are interpreted compatibly with reason and Islam by Ahl as-Sunna scholars as, 'What satiates one is not the food or the medicine but Allâhu ta'âlâ. The food or the medicine is a means created by Allâhu ta'âlâ.' When a Muslim says that a thing can affect, the one who hears him should interpret it in this way. The fact that the speaker is a Muslim shows that he has expressed it in this meaning, as the scholars of **ma'ânî** (semantics) have concluded unanimously.

"Ibn Taimiyya and his disciples said that tawassul was harâm. The Wahhâbîs said that it was polytheism. The fact, however, is that the Prophet ('alaihi 's-salâm), as-Sahâbat al-kirâm and all Muslims practised tawassul. It is not possible that the entire umma have committed harâm or kufr. It is declared in the Hadîth, **'My umma do not agree on deviation!'** It is declared in the

hundred and tenth âyat of the sûrat âl 'Imrân, **'You have become the best of ummas!'** Is it conceivable that all or the majority of such an umma would have agreed on deviation or heresy?

"Ibn Humâm, a Hanafî scholar, said, 'It is better to turn towards the Prophet's ('alaihi 's-salâm) grave than towards the qibla when sending one's prayers.' To say that al-Imâm al-a'zam (rahmatullâhi 'alaih) said, 'It is better to turn towards the qibla', would be a gross misrepresentation against the exalted imâm, for he wrote in his book **Musnad** that 'Abdullah ibn 'Umar (radiy-Allâhu 'anhumâ) said, 'It is sunna to turn towards the Prophet's ('alaihi 's-salâm) grave, your back being towards the qibla.' All the Hanafî scholars have reported that al-Imâm al-a'zam (rahmatullâhi 'alaih) said, 'It is mustahab to turn towards the Blessed Grave.' Rasûlullah (sall-Allâhu 'alaihi wa sallam) is alive in his blessed grave and recognizes those who visit him. Those who visited him when he was alive used to turn towards his blessed face, and the Ka'ba would be behind them. It is certainly the same while visiting his blessed grave. If, in the Masjid al-Harâm, the mosque around the Ka'ba, a person approaches to tell something to his master or father who stands towards the Ka'ba, he certainly says it facing him, the Ka'ba being behind him. Turning one's face towards Rasûlullah ('alaihi 's-salâm) is certainly more necessary than turning towards one's father or master. The scholars of the four madhhabs unanimously said that it was necessary to turn towards the Prophet's ('alaihi 's-salâm) blessed grave when visiting. Imâm as-Subkî quotes their writings one by one in his book **Shifâ as-saqâm.** That al-Imâm al-a'zam was against tawassul, as written in the tafsîr of Âlûsî, is not true. No Hanafî scholar has agreed with this statement. All Hanafî scholars report that tawassul is mustahab. We should not believe Âlûsî's statement.

"Az-Zarkânî wrote: 'When one says, "O my Rabb! I pray to Thee through Thine Prophet ('alaihi 's-salâm). O the Prophet, who is [Allâhu ta'âlâ's] compassion for men! Intercede for me in the presence of Thine Rabb!" Allâhu ta'âlâ accepts this prayer.'[1]

"The above-given proofs extirpate the heresy fabricated by Wahhâbîs. As Imâm al-Baihakî reports, a villager visited Rasûlullah ('alaihi 's-salâm) and begged him to pray so that it would rain and said, 'We have nobody besides you to trust

[1] Az-Zarkânî, his annotation to **Al-mawâhib al-ladunniyya** in 8 volumes Beirut, 1393 (1973).

ourselves to. The place where men will take refuge is their Prophet (’alaihi ’s-salâm) only.’ Rasûlullah (’alaihi ’s-salâm) did not say anything against him and, as Anas ibn Mâlik noted, Rasûlullah (’alaihi ’s-salâm) immediately mounted the pulpit and prayed for rain. The prayer was hardly finished when it began to rain. It is written in the **Sahîh** of al-Bukhârî that a villager complained about dearth to Rasûlullah (’alaihi ’s-salâm) and as soon as Rasûlullah (’alaihi ’s-salâm) began to pray, it began to rain, upon which he said, **‘If Abû Tâlib was alive, he would be pleased very much.’**

“Great scholar Hadrat Ibn Hajar al-Makkî wrote in his book **Khairât al-hisân,** ‘Imâm Muhammad ash-Shâfi’î, on the days when he was in Baghdâd, would visit Imâm Abû Hanîfa’s grave and greet him. He would pray through the imâm so that his wish would be accepted.’ And Imâm Ahmad used to pray through al-Imâm ash-Shâfi’î. In fact, when his son, ’Abdullah, was surprized at this, he said, ‘O my son! al-Imâm ash-Shâfi’î is like the sun among men! He is like good health for bodies! In Western countries, Imâm Mâlik would be put as an intermediary when praying, and al-Imâm ash-Shâfi’î heard this and did not oppose it. Imâm Abu ’l-Hasan ash-Shâdhilî said, ‘The person who asks something from Allâhu ta’âlâ should pray through Imâm al-Ghazâlî.’ It is written in the book **Sawâ’iq** by Ibn Hajar al-Makkî that al-Imâm ash-Shâfi’î always prayed through **Ahl al-Bait an-Nabawî.**

“As Allâhu ta’âlâ has made pious deeds and worship means for attaining happiness and high grades, so He has made His beloved, select human slaves, Anbiyâ’, Awliyâ’ and Sulahâ’, whom He has commanded us to love, intermediaries for the admission of prayers. It is for this reason that as-Sahâbat al-kirâm and all scholars performed tawassul when praying. None of them denied this. By giving wrong meaning to âyats and hadîths and denying many true reports, ahl al-bid’a have been defiling Muslims’ îmân. They have been striving to cause Ahl al-qibla (Muslims) to dissent from the right path. Any person, upon whose lot Allâhu ta’âlâ has endowed auspicion and happiness, will learn the above evidences, and thereby escape the disaster of being deceived by those heretics.”[1]

44 - Mawdûdî, in the first edition of this book **The Revivalist Movement in Islam,** slandered the Islamic faith and the Ahl as-

[1] Yûsuf an-Nabhânî, **Shawâhid al-haqq.**

Sunna scholars. Muslims with right belief in Pakistan began to defend themselves and refuted his slanders and heretical thoughts with documents. Mawdûdî, altogether confused with these righteous criticisms, had to tidy his book up. Changing some of its parts and attempting to explain away some others stupidly, he published it again. In order to save his face, he wrote in the preface, "Reviewing the parts which are misunderstood, I have tried to prevent the heartbreaking criticisms." Nevertheless, in the same book, he did not give up speaking ill of the words of reverence such as 'Imâm', 'Hujjat al-Islâm', 'Qutb al-'ârifin' and 'Shaikh al-Islâm', that had been presented to the Ahl as-Sunna scholars by Muslims, and proclaimed that he did not think the Ahl as-Sunna scholars worth these high titles. On the other hand, in praising Ibn Taimiyya and 'Abduh, who are documentedly proved to have had departed from the Ahl as-Sunna, the right path, he did not neglect to write the words 'Imâm' and 'Ustadh' (master) before their names. He generously lavished upon those heretics the titles of honour which he so frugally retrenches from the scholars of Ahl as-Sunna. Titles of honour and personages entitled to each are explained in detail on the four hundred and eighty-seventh page of the fifth volume of **Radd al-muhtâr**, an annotation to Ibn 'Âbidîn. It is written detailedly on page 487 of the fifth volume of Ibn 'Âbidîn's **Radd al-muhtâr** for whom and which words of reverence can be used.

At the beginning of **The Revivalist Movement in Islam,** Mawdûdî says:

"Islamic faith propounds its own philosophy, which greatly differs from irreligious philosophies. Its knowledge about the Universe and mankind is quite antonymous to the knowledge of the irreligious."

He means that there is philosophy in Islam and that Muslim scholars are philosophers. His deductions are similar to the Europeans' extraneous understanding of Islam. As explained in detail in our book **Se'âdet-i Ebediyye,** degrading Muslim scholars down to the degree of philosophers is symptomatic of a misjudgement based on narrow personal valuations.

Islamic knowledge is divided into two groups: **religious** and **scientific.** Scientific knowledge in Islam is obtained by observation, close examination and experimentation, as is the knowledge of the irreligious in Europe and America about the Universe and man. To say that these two groups of knowledge are antonymous means to deny the existence of scientific knowledge

in Islam which in turn means to make matters worse. A quotation from the exalted Islamic scholar Imâm al-Ghazâlî would go with the situation: "An unschooled attempt to help Islam would, let alone help, damage Islam."

Mawdûdî says on the thirty-third page of his book:

"One of the two reasons why the institution of caliphate weakened was because Hadrat 'Uthmân was devoid of the charismatic leadership possessed by his predecessors."

With these words, he tries to blemish 'Uthmân's (radiy-Allâhu 'anh) governance. Sayyid Qutb, an Egyptain writer, also attacks Hadrad 'Uthmân (radiy-Allâhu anh) with the same presumptions in his book **Al-'adâlat al-ijtimâ'iyyatu fi 'l-islâm.** Speaking ill of Hadrat 'Uthmân Dhi 'n-nûrain (radiy-Allâhu 'anh), who was recommended by Hadrat 'Umar (radiy-Allâhu 'anh) and elected by the Prophet's ('alaihi 's-salâm) companions unanimously and whose superiority had been declared in many hadîths is a symptom of being too ignorant to understand that it is a grave sin to speak ill of him or a symptom of attempting to demolish Islam insidiously from behind the screen. Each of the Sahâbat al-kirâm was a hero honoured by being praised in the hadîths, **"The highest people are those who live in my time,"** and **"My companions are like the stars in the sky. If you follow any one of them, you will find the right path,"** and in the âyat, **"They are very strong against disbelievers."** To misrepresent 'Uthmân (radiy-Allâhu 'anh) as the cause of the weakening of the institution of caliphate can be done only by those who cannot realize their honours. The history is in the open. The extent of lands conquered in the time of Hadrat 'Uthmân (radiy-Allâhu 'anh) was much greater than the former. Muslim lands extended from Philippines to Tunisia. The capacity of this book would not suffice to tell about the improvements he made in administrative, military and social fields. His attempts and achievements in administrative, military and economic fields are told in detail in the fifth chapter of the Turkish **Hak Sözün Vesîkaları.**[1] Those who misrepresent Hadrat 'Uthmân's (radî-Allâhu 'anh) martyrdom as a defect for him reveal what they think about the prophets whom the Children of Isrâ'il had martyred and about the hadîth, **"No prophet suffered as much torture as I have."** Evidently, the reason why they do not speak ill of Hadrat 'Umar's

[1] **Documents of the Right Word**. Please see the book list at the end of this book.

(radiy-Allâhu 'anh) martyrdom by his servant is because they cannot find the favourable opportunity. Let us tell these ignorant people again that each of the Sahâbat al-kirâm was a perfect leader and a courageous mujâhid. From Hadrat Habîb (radiy-Allâhu 'anh), who challenged the enemies in his speech on the gallows in Mecca, up to Abû 'Ubadia (radiy-Allâhu 'anh), the Conqueror of Damascus, and to Hadrat Khâlid (radiy-Allâhu 'anh), who was amongst the fighters of the army that came to Constantinople, it would make a long legend to write about the superiority of each of them in every respect.

"Caliphate, which had the qualities of prophethood, was passed on to cruel sovereigns. Thus, once more, administration was seized by those who were against Allah. Islam was pushed away from the power. Atheism seized the power and domination under the name of caliphate. Rulers were said to be the shade of Allah on the earth."

Statements of this kind do not befit the mouths and pens of believers. These absurd, crazy words against Mu'âwiya (radiy-Allâhu 'anh), one of the prominent Sahâbîs, impute atheism to all the caliphs up to Sultan Muhammad Vahîdeddin Khan, the last caliph of Muslims, and, therefore, are not worth answering. His attempt to interpret wrongly the hadîth stating that Muslim rulers are zill-Allâh (Allâhu ta'âlâ's shade) and his considering Muslims so stupid as to suppose that Allâhu ta'âlâ is a material being that makes a shade cannot rescue him from the ditch in which he has fallen. All Islamic caliphs were Muslims. Especially the Ottoman caliphs held on to Islam in everything they did and were proud of their devotion to Islam. Those who read the written will of 'Uthmân Ghâzî, the founder of the Ottoman Empire, which is written in many books, for example, in **Qisâs-i Anbiyâ',** will understand the truth.

"It was the above-given conditions that incited the scholastic duel, which gave birth to various madhhabs, the Mu'tazila creed and the atheistic and sceptical inclinations."

It is surprising that he associates the birth of madhhabs with the movements of fitna (mischief, disunion). Rasûlullah (sall-Allâhu 'alaihi wa sallam) foretold it and praised beforehand the four madhhabs in that their birth would be Allâhu ta'âlâ's compassion. They did not arise from worldly conditions. They arose from religious, divine reasons pertaining to knowledge. Those who observe Islam from without and cannot penetrate into its essence strive to base the sacred, spiritual manifestations on

substance and appearance.

Mawdûdî, behind the scene, fiercely attacks tasawwuf and says:

"Philosophy, literature and knowledge coming from Greek, Persian and Indian skies were shared. The peoples belonging to polytheist societies that have converted to Islam brought with them many of their polytheistic beliefs and ideas. When they were introducing idolatry into Islam, the 'âlims whose main concern was worldly advantages co-operated with them. With the idea of giving place to graves and to Awliyâ' in worship, the meaning of the Qur'ân was distorted. Many a hadîth was misinterpreted."

This passage, too, is entirely mendacious and slanderous. Greek, Persian or Indian philosophies have not taken place in any of the basic books of Islam. On the contrary, the Ahl as-Sunna scholars have answered them one by one and refuted the ones which were incompatible with Islam. And, let alone comparing them with the Islamic literature, no one has ever condescended to use the word 'literature' for their sayings. If Mawdûdî wants to attack the seventy-two heretical groups or heretics among ignorant people with these words of his, it does not prove him good-willed to attack them as if they were of Islam or religious scholars, for none of them can represent Islam. The Ahl as-Sunna scholars of all ages have shown them Allâhu ta'âlâ's path and distinguished their good aspects from the bad ones. They have written thousands of books for this purpose and have not left any need for the help of the people like Mawdûdî. If Mawdûdî wants to serve Islam, he should reproduce the advices and warnings of those blessed scholars of Islam, instead of misrepresenting, by putting forward the words of a few ignorant or heretical people, those most flourishing ages of Islam, during which the Ahl as-Sunna scholars spread light. Thus he will prove himself to be sincere in the sense which he has attributed to the word 'mujaddid'. Also, he will render a true service to Islam. But he does not mean to do so. He claims that bad customs of Iranians spread among Muslims and thus Islam was spoilt. In this subject, too, he misrepresents the events in an appalling way.

It is a historical fact that the evils of Iran and Rome contaminated the pre-Islamic Arabs, but not Islam! As he says, idolatry had penetrated into the Ka'ba. As a matter of fact, it was for this reason that when the Prophet came forward and started to carry out his task of commanding what was good and prohibiting what was evil, all the Arabs became his enemies. All of them were

in a pitiable condition. The entire Arabian Peninsula was awash in ignorance and heresy. They could not understand the good word. They refused the exalted Prophet (’alaihi ’s-salâm) who invited them to salvation. Before Islam, the evils of the fire-worshipping Iranians and the idol-worshipping Romans had spread over the Arabian Peninsula. In Iran, a person named Majdak had invented a new religion and spread the ideas of shared property and common wives far and wide. He had prohibited the property rights. He had established today’s communism in Iran. He had turned the social life and moral values in Iran upside down. Afterwards, Nushirwân Shah struggled to brake this current, yet he was not able to entirely extirpate it.

As for the Romans; their moral life had become even worse with the evils that had come to them from the Greeks. A philosopher named Aristipus of Cyrene had made up a moral theory and said, “The purpose of life and morals is amusement and sensual pleasure. It is to enjoy everything. Everything which satisfies one’s ambitions, desires and tastes is good. One should run after them.” This meant the end of morals. How can illegitimate acts ever be good? Those who worked only for this purpose tolerated the evils such as theft, perfidy, dishonesty and murder in order to attain their aims. These were the moral principles of the ancient Greek civilization! An irreligious civilization should have been so. This system led many people to despair and suicide, for a person could not always be without care and griefs; he could not obtain every taste he would desire and, when he could not get to his purpose, he would try to flee from life. Among the followers of this philosophy, a Greek named Agerias regarded it a heroism for those who could not attain their pleasures to commit suicide. With the influence of his exciting speeches, there were many suicides among his audience. Also in the twentieth century, there are those who kill others or commit suicide upon being unable to attain a base flavour or a sexual desire. For this sheer reason, the ancient Greeks and Romans had been absorbed in pleasure and dissipation. Its consequence had been the corruption of social life and the demolition of economy. Both civilizations had died away for this reason. As the Romans began introducing these evils into the Arabian Peninsula, Islam came to rescue the humanity.

With Islam, the glooms of nescience over the Arabian Peninsula cleared away. The lights of virtue and spiritual

knowledge shone out. Fraternity settled among the people and clans. The people who had remained behind for many centuries began to advance and gain strength by following Rasûlullah (’alaihi ’s-salâm). They challenged shahs and kings whose sovereignties they had been observing with admiration. Conquering their lands they disseminated Islam there. History is in the open! Books, documents, works are on hand!

Mawdûdî says on the thirty-seventh page of his book:

“The morals of Greek philosophy and monastic life and a general pessimistic attitude towards life became natural in Muslim societies. This led Islamic knowledge and literature to deviation and supported monarchism. It confined the entire religious life to certain rites and ceremonies.”

Rasûlullah (sall-Allâhu ’alaihi wa sallam) gave the good news that a mujaddid would come and strengthen Islam in the beginning of each century. And it has come true. In every century, Islam has illuminated the humanity in every field through the leadership of the Ahl as-Sunna scholars and has been the source of civilization. In order to portray Ibn Taimiyya as a source of illumination like the sun, Mawdûdî tries to enshroud the great Islamic civilization and to obscure the luminous skies of the century of the Tâbi’ûn, who were praised in the Hadîth, and the following century. Those who read Islamic books and true histories written by reasonable pens in Europe will not have difficulty in comprehending his destructive tactics.

He tries to strip the Ahl as-Sunna scholars of the meaning of the word ‘mujaddid’ in the hadîth we have quoted above. He blames the Ahl as-Sunna scholars, e.g. Hadrat al-Imâm ar-Rabbânî, for having said that Hadrat al-Mahdî, who had been mentioned in the Hadîth would be the mujaddid of the third millenium. In addition, he insults Muslims and men of Tasawwuf by calling them “ancient type reactionary people”. He makes fun of sacred beliefs by saying, “Could jihâd be performed with spirituality, amulets and prayers and could tanks be destroyed with malediction?” He stigmatizes those who believe so with the words ‘populace’ and ‘ignorant’. He defends that al-Mahdî will be far from the said spiritual values, that he will be “the most modern of the modern who has a deep authority in the main problems of life,” that he is afraid that scholars and mutasawwifs will clamour against the novelty which he will bring. However, in the times when Hadrat al-Mahdî will appear ’Îsâ (’alaihi ’s-salâm) will descend from heaven and they will meet each other, there will

not be any Islamic scholar left on the earth and Islamic knowledge will have disappeared. Ignorance and heresies, which Mawdûdî tries to impute on the early Muslim ages praised in the Hadîth, will appear in that future time as pointed out again in the Hadîth. The attacks of the people like Mawdûdî to the Ahl as-Sunna and their attempts to extinguish the Ahl as-Sunna knowledge indicate that those gloomy days pointed out in the Hadîth are drawing near. When Hadrat al-Mahdî will appear and renew the Ahl as-Sunna knowledge, those same non-madhhabite people, heretics and religion reformers will cry and oppose him and Hadrat al-Mahdî will put them to the sword. Hadrat al-Imâm ar-Rabbânî wrote in the 255th letter in the first volume of **Maktûbât** that al-Mahdî will kill the heretics occupying religious posts in Medina. Mawdûdî thinks that al-Mahdî will be "not a man of supernatural works or karâmât, inspirations and spiritual accomplishments, but a man of struggle like other revolutionists." He says, "Al-Mahdî will found a new school of thought. As this world has witnessed sinful leaders such as Lenin and Hitler, so there will come a virtuous leader."

Mawdûdî, who disagrees with the Ahl as-Sunna in many matters, takes Hadrat al-Mahdî as an ordinary leader. Great scholar Ahmad Ibn Hajar al-Makkî cited some two hundred characteristics derived from the hadîths about him in his book **Al-qawl al-mukhtasar fî 'alâmat al-Mahdî.** A person who reads this book can easily see the difference between the real al-Mahdî whom Rasûlullah ('alaihi 's-salâm) described and the imaginary one whom Mawdûdî tries to visualize.

That the first mujaddid in Islam was 'Umar ibn 'Abd al-'Azîz is another product of Mawdûdî's short sight. 'Umar ibn 'Abd al-'Azîz was one of the mujaddidîn of the first century of the Hegira, but he was not the first mujaddid. According to the unanimity of Islamic scholars and historians, the first mujaddid was Abû Bakr as-Siddîq (radiy-Allâhu 'anh) who, after Rasûlullah's ('alaihi 's-salâm) death, subdued the renegades and prevented the mischief and instigation that arose among the new Muslims on the Arabian Peninsula.

He says on the fifty-fourth page:

"After the death of 'Umar the Second, the administration was obtained by irreligious hands, which became an obstacle against Islam's way. Fortunately, the Umayyads and 'Abbâsids could not prevent Islam's progress. Since the hadîth and fiqh scholars were unfamiliar with rational knowledge, they remained devoid of

interpreting and explaining the Islamic system under the light of contemporary inclinations of thought. They could do nothing but resort to vicious influences. Imâm Abu 'l-Hasan al-Ash'arî and his successors were not successful, either, because, though they possessed scholastic knowledge, they had not been educated in rational knowledge. They went so far in opposing the Mu'tazila that they introduced into the religion things which did not have place in the religion. Scholars, rulers and masses of people altogether turned their backs to Allah's Book and our Prophet's Sunna. The wars declared for luxury, ambition and avarice by a notorious group governing the State caused a serious retrogression. Knowledge and arts disappeared. Meanwhile, Imâm al-Ghazâlî came up and won the confidence of the caliph in Baghdad. But he departed from the palace and tried to refute the Greek philosophy. He criticized all the [Ahl as-Sunna] madhhabs for their weak aspects and inclinations incompatible with Islam. He revived the system of education which had been decaying. Worldly knowledge and religious knowledge had been far away from each other. Yet he was inefficient in hadîth. He dealt too much with rational knowledge. He was in the wrong to have too much interest in Tasawwuf. It was Ibn Taimiyya's lot to revive Islamic thought and spirit by avoiding these three dangers."

It is true that there have been some Muslim rulers who perpetrated cruelty and wrongdoing under the influence of sycophants and renegades who surrounded them. But Muslim scholars struggled to draw them to the right course by telling them Islamic commands and prohibitions in speech and writing. Therefore, the worst ones among them were more just and more useful than the best ones of irreligious rulers. The world's histories write about this fact. Those who read the book written by Lord Davenport, an Englishman, will easily comprehend not only that Mawdûdî is wrong but also that he is after sedition. We want to emphasize that non-sahâbî Islamic caliphs might have been cruel and committed sins, yet none of them ever was an unbeliever. They were by no means hostile to Islam. Each of them had commissions of knowledge, Shaikh al-Islâms and counsellors. None of them ever thought of preventing Islam's progress. All of them struggled to serve Islam. Mosques, schools, madrasas, roads, hospitals, fountains, baths, bridges and various institutions of charity and arts which each of them handed over to the next generation were innumerous. Their remains and many of them themselves are in the open. Millions of Muslims benefit from

them today. It is a tactic of the enemies of Islam to attempt to vilify them by putting forward their human defects. Islamic shcolars' staying away from the sultâns does not show that sultâns were evil. Following the hadîth, **"The one who approaches and is modest towards a rich man because he is rich will lose one-third of his îmân,"** scholars kept away from every rich or famous person, yet they did not neglect to warn them about Islam's commands and prohibitions. Mawdûdî, who cannot sense the nuance between these two, attacks Islamic scholars and caliphs by writing in a haphazard way. If, instead of writing about their few faults, he had the honour of writing about their goodness and services to Islam, he would fill volumes of books. Especially the Ottoman caliphs were all learned, pious, just, perfect and blessed persons.

An argument based on the surmise that the scholars (in the branches) of Hadîth and Fiqh were devoid of rational knowledge betrays an utter lack of understanding concerning the greatness of Islamic scholars. An Islamic scholar is a great person who has reached the grade of ijtihâd in religious knowledge and learned well what has been discovered up to his time in experimental knowledge and who has attained the degree of Wilâyat al-khâssa al-Muhammadiyya in the ma'rifa of the heart.

For the truth-seeking younger generation, who are confused by Mawdûdî's aggression, which is so vulgarly sordid as to call the Muslim caliphs "irreligious", the short biographies of some caliphs in the history book **Mir'ât al-kâ'inât** are translated in the following paragraphs:[1]

"VI: Mu'âwiya[2] (radiy-Allâhu 'anh) was one of Rasûlullah's ('alaihi 's-salâm) clerks who wrote down the Qur'ân. He acquired his prayers which asked blessings on him. He had a strong reason and intellect, much clemency, generosity and administrative power. He was mild, majestic and brave. He looked as if he had been created to be a sultân. He conquered Sudan, Afghanistan, many parts of India, Cyprus, going to the last one in person. He sent troops to Constantinople. His caliphate was rightful.

"The lâ-madhhabî slander Mu'âwiya on account of his combat

---

[1] The Roman numeral in front of each name shows his order of caliphate and the Arabic numerals in parentheses show the dates of his birth and death in the Muslim calendar. Long biographies of Khulafâ' ar-Râshidîn, Umayyad and Abbasid caliphs are given under the heading "Iwâz" in the famous work by ad-Damîrî.

[2] The book begins with blessings invoked on Hadrat Mu'âwiya.

against 'Alî (radiy-Allâhu 'anhumâ) and grievously exaggerate the sad situations which might take place in any combat. When the Ahl as-Sunna scholars give them answers based on the Qur'ân, the Sunna and reason, they lose their head. They cannot find anything to say. They begin to tell about the evils of his son, Yazîd. They say, 'He paved the way for a bad tradition wherein caliphate was a patrimonial institution. He turned caliphate into sultanate.' On the subject about public prayers, Ibn 'Âbidîn says, 'A Muslim candidate for the caliphate must be elected by the notables of scholars and administrators or designated by the former Khalîfa as his successor. Also, a Muslim who has seized power by using force is the rightful Khalîfa. Abû Bakr (radiy-Allâhu 'anh), when he was about to die, designated 'Umar (radiy-Allâhu 'anh) Khalîfa. All the Prophet's companions accepted it.' It is seen that it was a rightful act compatible with Islam for Mu'âwiya (radiy-Allâhu 'anh) and for all other Khalîfas to designate their sons, whom they themselves brought up and trained, or others whom they could confide in, for their place. A preceding Khalîfa can not be blamed on account of the cruel acts perpetrated by his successor(s). (19-60)

These written attacks which Mawdûdî so wantonly spearheads against Muslims' Khalîfas and the scholars of Ahl as-Sunna are not only devoid any scientific value but also in glaring contradiction with historical and religious facts. The following passages from a Persian work of Shâh Walî-Allah, whom Mawdûdî praises very much, is an evident proof for the pure youth:

"Mu'âwiya ibn Abû Sufyân (radiy-Allâhu 'anhumâ) was one of Rasûlullah's ('alaihi 's-salâm) companions. Among as-Sahâba, he was wellknown for his beautiful virtues. Avoid injuring him even in your thoughts, nonetheless for the danger of speaking ill of him! Or else you will be committing harâm. It is declared in a hadîth reported by Abû Dâwûd, **'Do not speak ill of my companions! Even if you give gold as huge as Mount Uhud in the name of alms, you will not attain blessings equal to those which they attain for having given a handful of barley as alms!'** Again in a hadîth reported by him, Rasûlullah (sall-Allâhu 'alaihi wa sallam) pointed to Hadrat Hasan (radiy-Allâhu 'anh), **'This son of mine is mature. Through him, I expect, Allâhu ta'âlâ will reconcile two armies of my umma.'** A hadîth reported by at-Tirmidhî declares about Mu'âwiya (radiy-Allâhu 'anh), **'O my Rabb! Make him hâdî and muhdî!'** that is, "Keep him in the right

path and make him a means for guiding others to the right path.' A hadîth reported by Ibn Sa'd and Ibn 'Asâkir declares about Mu'âwiya (radiy-Allâhu 'anh), **'O my Rabb! Teach Him the Book and make him own countries and protect him against punishment.'** Rasûlullah ('alaihi 's-salâm) knew he would become Khalîfa. It is obvious that because he pitied his umma very much it was necessary for him to pray so that the person who would take the lead would be in the right path so that he could guide them to the right path. It is declared in a hadîth reported by Hasan (radiy-Allâhu 'anh) and conveyed by Ad-Dailamî, **'Someday Mu'âwiya will be the head of the State.'** Hadrat Mu'âwiya (radiy-Allâhu 'anh) said that since the day when Rasûlullah ('alaihi 's-salâm) had said to him, **'O Mu'âwiya! When you become head of the State, do favours!'** he had been awaiting the time when he would become Khalîfa. A hadîth reported by Umm Hirâm (radiy-Allâhu 'anhâ), a Sahâbî, declares, **'Of my umma, those who will fight in the first naval battle of Islam will certainly enter Paradise.'** Mu'âwiya (radiy-Allâhu 'anh) fought in the first naval battle of Islam during the caliphate of Hadrat 'Uthmân (radiy-Allâhu 'anh). And Umm Hirâm (radiy-Allâhu anhâ), because she had heard the hadîth herself, joined his troops and was martyred when she landed [on Cyprus]. With the blessing of these prayers by Rasûlullah ('alaihi 's-salâm), he became a just, trustworthy Khalîfa He kept a few of Rasûlullâh's ('alaihi 's-salâm) hairs, which, in order to be blessed with them, he requested in his will to be put into his nose.

"Rasûlullah ('alaihi 's-salâm) prophesied the Battle of Siffîn between 'Alî and Mu'âwiya (radiy-Allâhu 'anhumâ), too. The scholars al-Bukhârî and Muslim reported the hadîth: **'Unless two great armies fight each other, the end of the world will not come. Both of them will fight for the cause.'** In a hadîth reported in the **Sahîh** of al-Bukhârî, the Prophet ('alaihi 's-salâm) said to Ammâr ibn Yâsar, **'You will be killed by some disobedient people.'** He was killed by Mu'âwiya's (radiy-Allâhu 'anh) soldiers....[1]

"There are some hadîths castigating the Umayyad Khalîfas, but some other hadîths praise them. A hadîth declares, **'Caliphate will be in Medina, and sultanate will be in Damascus.'**

"It is declared in a hadîth, **'Up to the twelfth Khalîfa, Islam will be held in high esteem. They all will belong to the Quraish.'** More than half of these twelve Khalîfa, who were praised in this

---

[1] Shâh Wâlî-Allah ad-Dahlawî, **Izâlat al-Khafâ,** p. 571.

hadîth, were the Umayyad Khalîfa. It is declared in a hadîth reported by Ibn Mâja, **'People with a black flag will come from the east, and they will fight the Arabs. Obey their Khalîfas! They are the Khalîfas guiding to the right path!'** This hadîth and the like praise the Abbâsid Khalîfas...[1]

"A Khalîfa who carried on Rasûlullah's ('alaihi 's-salâm) task of guidance as he had done was called **khalîfat râshida.** These were perfect, real Khalîfas. A Khalîfa who did not carry out this task precisely and who did not obey Islam was called **khalîfat jâbira...**[2]

"Rasûlullah's ('alaihi 's-salâm) task of guidance contained three levels. The first level was to have Allâhu ta'âlâ's commands and prohibitions obeyed by using power and force. This is called **'sultanate'.** His second task was to teach His commands and prohibitions. His third task called **'ihsân'** was to purify the heart. Al-Khulafâ' ar-râshidîn were successful in all these three levels. Those who succeeded them managed only the task of sultanate. The task of teaching was given to the imâms of madhhabs, and the task of ihsân was given to the great men of Tasawwuf."[3]

"VII: Yazîd ibn Mu'âwiya became Khalîfa in 60 and died four years later in Hawwârin, which is located between Damascus and Tadmur. He was buried there. (23-64)

"VII: Mu'âwiya II ibn Yazîd was very intelligent, very pious and very just. He resigned from caliphate after forty days. (44-64)

"IX: Marwan ibn Hakam was a fiqh scholar. He was very clever and very intelligent. He read the Qur'ân very beautifully. He abstained from sins and feared Allâhu ta'âlâ very much. He was the beloved son-in-law of Hadrat 'Uthmân (radiy-Allâhu 'anh). It was written on his seal, 'I trust in Allâhu ta'âlâ. I ask from Him.' (2-65)

"X: 'Abd al-Malik ibn Marwan was a scholar of hadîth and fiqh. He was famous for having much zuhd and 'ibâdât . Imâm an-Nâfi', a prominent one among the Tâbi'ûn, said, 'In Medina, I have not seen a person who was learned in fiqh more profoundly, worshipped more, knew the knowledge and manners of hajj more or read the Qur'ân more beatifully than 'Abd al-Malik.'

---

[1] Ibid, p. 601.

[2] Ibid, v. II, p. 330.

[3] Ibid, p. 342. A hadîth written on its 567th page calls such a Khalîfa **"Malik al-adûd",** who has been called "Khalîfa" symbolically. The **khulafâ' al-jâbira** came next.

According to many scholars, 'Abd al-Malik was one of the seven fiqh scholars of Medina. Imâm ash-Shâ'bî, another prominent one among the Tâbi'ûn, said, 'I found myself superior to every scholar whom I interviewed. I found only 'Abd al-Malik superior to me.' He fought Mukhtâr, the chief of the Râfidîs[1] who shed much blood, and slew him. His caliphate was religiously rightful. He repaired the Ka'ba, a construction which survived to the present day. Before him, Byzantine gold coins and Persian silvers had been in circulation, and he was the Khalîfa who coined the first Islamic money. He is the conqueror of Adana and Sicily. He sent his son Maslama to conquer Constantinople. Maslama (rahmatullâhi ta'âlâ 'alaih) performed salât in the big church of St. Sophia and built the Arab Mosque. (26-86)

"XI: Walîd ibn 'Abd al-Malik was very pious and charitable and worshipped much. He read through the Qur'ân in every three days. His good deeds and favours were countless. As soon as he became Khalîfa, he appointed his cousin, 'Umar ibn 'Abd al-'Azîz, the governor of Medina. He had the Umayya Mosque built in Damascus, spending four hundred chests of gold coins. It was Walîd who built the first hospital and soup kitchen for the poor in Muslim history. He himself paid the debts of religious men. His commandant, Kutaibiya, took Bukhâra peacefully from the Turks. He was the conqueror of Andalusia (Spain), Ankara, Samarkand and India. It was written on his seal: 'O Walîd! You will die and be called to account!' (46-96)

"XII: Sulaimân ibn 'Abd al-Malik was learned, zealous, literary, eloquent, charitable and just. He abstained much from tormenting others. One day, a person told him that his farm had been taken from him cruelly. Because he feared Allâhu ta'âlâ much, he got down from his throne, removed the rug and put his cheek on the ground. He took an oath that he would not withdraw his cheek from the ground until an order would be written to that cruel official. The order was written immediately and given to the farmer. (60-99)[2]

---

[1] One of the earliest heretical groups in Islam.

[2] Another example showing the justice of Islamic Khalîfas is written in Hadrat Sayyid Abdulhakîm al-Arwasî's (rahmatullâhi ta'âlâ 'alaih) note book: "Khalîfa Sulaimân asked Hadrat Abu Hâzim, one of the Tâbi'ûn, 'We don't want to die. What is the reason?' He said, 'O Sulaimân! You have destroyed your next world and made this world prosperous. Certainly you wouldn't like to go from a prosperous place to a destroyed one.' "

“XIII: ’Umar ibn ’Abd al-Azîz ibn Marwan (rahmatullâhu ta’âlâ ’alaih) was a good, just Muslim. (61-101)[1]

“XIV: Yazîd ibn ’Abd al-Malik had been formerly addicted to dissipation. But when he became Khalîfa, he became pious and just. (71-105)

“XV: Hishâm ibn ’Abd al-Malik was very intelligent, efficient in governing and benevolent. Everybody liked him. His goodness and justice were known far and wide. When some goods were brought to the Bayt al-mâl, he would not accept them unless forty persons bore witness to that they were taken in a halâl way. (71-125)

“XVI: Walîd ibn Yazîd was literary, eloquent. Because he was seen to be mentally deficient, a year later he was slain as he was reading the Qur’ân. (92-126)

“XVII: Yazîd ibn Walîd ibn ’Abd al-Malik was intelligent, clever and devoted to Islam. He prohibited alcoholic drinks. (90-126)

“XVIII: Ibrâhîm ibn Walîd ibn ’Abd al-Malik was Khalîfa for seventy days which elapsed fighting Marwan. (?-126)

“XIX: Marwan ibn Muhammad ibn Marwan was brave, intelligent and efficient in administration. He conquered many lands. He fought the Khawârij and killed their chief Dahhâk. He was overcome and killed by the ’Abbâsids. (72-132)

“XX: ’Abdullah Saffâh ibn Muhammad ibn ’Alî ibn ’Abdullah ibn ’Abbâs was learned, intelligent, provident, eloquent and generous. He died of smallpox. He is the first Khalîfa of the ’Abbâsids. (104-135)

“XXI: Mansûr ibn Muhammad had much knowledge and decency. He did not care for amusement. He was brave and

---

[1] Mawdûdî, too, praises him. He says that ’Umar ibn ’Abd al-Azîz was the first mujaddid and writes about some of his innumerable good deeds, but he does not attribute any share of these good deeds to Khalîfa Sulaimân who had designated ’Umar as his successor. To him, the Khalîfas spoilt the institution of caliphate by designating their sons or relatives as their successors and thus governed the Islamic republic dictatorially like kings. He searches for and counts all their faults and defects and disgraces them with unbelief, but he does not ever see their good deeds. Indeed, they designated their successors with the intention of following Islam. Then, religion reformers speak ill of the followers of Islam but praise those who adapt Islam to their own thoughts and points of view.

patient. He worshipped much. (95-158)

"XXII: Mahdî ibn Mansûr was learned, brave, intelligent and very generous. Everybody liked him. His i'tiqâd was very pure. He slew (a number of irreligious people called) zindiqs. (126-169)

"XXIII: Hadî ibn Mahdî was learned, intelligent, eloquent and generous. It was written on his seal, 'I believe and trust in Allâhu ta'âlâ.' (147-170)

"XXVI: Hârûn ar-Rashîd ibn Mahdî performed a hundred rak'as of salât every day and every night. He went on hajj one year and on ghazâ the following year. He observed Islam in everything he did. He had in himself all the beautiful habits. (148-193)"

Al-Imâm al-a'zam Abû Hanîfa, Imâm al-Ghazâlî, Imâm an-Nawawî, Ibn Hajar, al-Imâm ar-Rabbânî and Khâlid al-Baghdâdî and many other great scholars were identical with these people. It is obvious that people like Mawdûdî, Sayyid Qutb and Hamidullah are quite outside this circle. Nothing can be so credulous as associating Islamic scholarship with such people who are quite unaware of Islamic knowledge and Islamic scholars and who cannot penetrate into the inner essence of Islam but observe it from without like non-Muslim orientalist writers. The branches of knowledge taught in madrasas which Mawdûdî calls "scholastic knowledge" are **'ulûm an-naqliyya** (religious knowledge). And what he calls "rational knowledge" is **'ulûm al-'aqliyya** (scientific, experimental knowledge). These two branches make up the Islamic knowledge. It does not befit a Muslim to say that fiqh and hadîth scholars have known one of these branches of knowledge without knowing the other. Islamic scholars have been the very exalted people praised in the Qur'ân and Hadîth. They are the heirs of prophets. They have organized the division of labour among themselves, each undertaking the job of disseminating a separate branch of knowledge. This division of labour confuses the ignorant, and they suppose that Islamic scholars have not been exalted in other branches of knowledge. Hadrat 'Abd al-Wahhâb ash-Sha'rânî wrote at the beginning of his book **Al-mîzân al-kubrâ:** "Hadrat Abû Hanîfa, the founder of and expert in the knowledge of fiqh, was a great Walî like Hadrat 'Abd al-Qâdir al-Jîlânî. He was a man of karâmât like him. But he did not undertake to spread the knowledge pertaining to the heart or to purify the souls. He undertook the task of spreading all kinds of physically practised worship, that is, the knowledge of fiqh. The

mujtahids whom he educated were like him." It is seen that the insidious enemies, who want to demolish Islam from within, try to blemish Islamic scholars in this respect also in order to deceive young Muslims. They may praise Islamic scholars through false, roundabout words exaggerating them greatly in order to conceal their destructive plans. We should not believe them. One who reads, for example, Imâm Muhammad al-Ghazâlî's Persian book **Kîmyâ' as-Sa'âda** will easily realize his profundity in medical knowledge. He tells that blood is cleaned as the bile and other harmful substances are separated from the blood in the liver, that the spleen, kidneys and the gall bladder play roles in this procedure and that the health will derange when the quantities of substances in blood change, in a manner quite coincidental with the information given in today's physiology books. Since Islamic scholars were so superior not only in scholastic knowledge but also in rational knowledge, they were successful in everything they did in every century, and Islamic countries were the homes of civilization. Their thousands of books, which spread their superiority over the world, are in the open. They fill the world's libraries. Many of them have been translated into foreign languages. Everybody except insidious enemies sees and expresses this fact. It is sufficient to see the book **Kashf az-zunûn** to know about their works. The mischief-makers, who bore Muslim names and who belonged to the seventy-two groups, the members of which, according to the hadîth, will go to Hell, introduced into Islam some superstitions long before, like contemporary **religion reformers** do now. But the Ahl as-Sunna scholars investigated and cleaned them off one by one. Today there is no superstition or mawdû' hadîth in the basic books of Ahl as-Sunna. Shams ad-dîn as-Sahâwî, ash-Shawkânî, Ibn Taimiyya, 'Abduh, 'Alî al-Qârî and Ismail Hakkı said that there were mawdû' hadîths in the basic books of Ahl as-Sunna, especially in al-Baidâwî's tafsîr book and in al-Ghazâlî's **Ihyâ'.** They are not right; it is a calumniation against these great scholars.[1]

The phrases "declared for luxury, ambition and avarice", which Mawdûdî uses about jihâd, which is one of Islam's five basic 'Ibâdât, reveal his own personality. Since the âyats and hadîths commanding jihâd have become tawâtur, it is not necessary to quote them here in addition. He himself admits them in his book

[1] For details on this subject, see below, the 55th article.

Holy War in Islam. Our ancestors performed jihâd not for pleasure or ambition but for spreading Allâhu ta'âlâ's Word. Jihâd is carried out by the State, by its army. People perform jihâd by serving the army.

Mawdûdî confuses mistakes the rightful madhhabs with the heretical groups. In none of the Ahl as-Sunna madhhabs, either of i'tiqâd or 'amal, is there a mawdû' hadîth or anything incompatible with Islam. There are mawdû' and un-Islamic aspects in the seventy-two heretical groups. All Islamic shcolars, especially Hadrat Imâm al-Ghazâlî, criticized these heretical groups. Mawdûdî does not like the Islamic education, which has spread its arts and established its universities over three continents from Philippines and India to Portugal and from Bukhâra to Morocco. This is like attempting to plaster the sun with sticky mud to hide the truth. One is surprised not at such a writer but at those who suppose him to be a Muslim scholar.

He says on the seventy-ninth page:

"Shâh Walî-Allah ad-Dahlawî removed the old doubts concerning i'tiqâd. He illuminated the brains with a new spirit."

He means that Shâh Walî-Allah ad-Dahlawî (rahmatullâhi 'alaih), too, was a religion reformer. Walî-Allah ad-Dahlawî's works bear witness for the fact that he was Sunnî; this fact is also declared by Hadrat 'Abdullah ad-Dahlawî. That Muslims' imân has been doubtful for centuries is a lie made up by the lâ-madhhabî. Mawdûdî could not be too ignorant to know that doubtful îmân is not îmân. But it is a heresy worse than ignorance to say that Muslims' îmân has been doubtful for centuries. The îmân of the Ahl as-Sunna who make up ninety percent of Muslims on the earth, has been true in every century, and they did not doubt anything in which they believed. Besides, the members of the heretical groups were not so numerous as to represent Islam.

Mawdûdî says on the eighty-first page of his book:

"The difference between the idea and doctrine of caliphate and sovereignty was explained by Shâh Walî-Allah, and the pictures from the Hadîth, which were not known before him, were drawn by him. He wrote in his book ***Musaffâ:*** *'The idiots of our century have abandoned ijtihâd. They do not know where they are going, with their rings put on their noses like camels. Each has chosen a different path. It is a shame that they do not have a common understanding.' "*

Hadrat Shâh Walî-Allah ad-Dahlawî did not say "idiots" about the Ahl as-Sunna scholars in any of his books, but he complained about the heretical groups who dissented from the four madhhabs. The following passage from him is very descriptive of his reverence towards the Ahl as-Sunna scholars:

"Rasûlullah ('alaihi 's-salâm) said, **'Great scholars will come in Iran.'** Besides great hadîth scholars such as al-Bukhârî, Muslim, at-Tirmidhî, Abû Dâwûd, an-Nasâ'î, Ibn Mâja, ad-Dârimî, ad-Dâra-Qutnî, Hâkim, al-Baihakî and many others who were educated in Iran, there are the great fiqh scholars such as Abû 't-Tayyib [Qâdî Tâhir at-Tabarî], Shaikh Abû Hâmid [al-Isfarâ'inî], Shaikh Abû Ishaq ash-Shîrâzî, and al-Juwainî ['Abdullah ibn Yûsuf and his son], Imâm al-Haramain 'Abd al-Malik ibn 'Abdullâh al-Juwainî and Imâm Muhammad al-Ghazâlî and many many others, who were also educated in Iran. Even Imâm Abû Hanîfa and his disciples in Mâwara an-nahr[1] and Khurasan are the scholars of Iran and are within the circle blessed with the good news in the hadîth. A hadîth declares, **'There will come a mujaddid in every hundred years.'** As he declared, a mujaddid came in each century and strengthened the religion. In the first century of the Hegira, 'Umar ibn 'Abd al-'Azîz removed the cruelty of the rulers and established the principles of justice. In the second century, al-Imâm ash-Shâfi'î explained the knowledge of îmân and separated the knowledge of fiqh. In the third century, Abû 'l-Hasan al-Ash'arî formulated the Ahl-as-Sunna knowledge and rebutted the people of bid'a. In the fourth century, Hâkim and al-Baihakî and the like established the fundamentals of the knowledge of the Hadîth, and Abû Hâmid and the like spread the knowledge of fiqh. In the fifth century, Imâm al-Ghazâlî opened a new way and said fiqh, tasawwuf and kalâm were not different from one another. In the sixth century, Imâm Fakhr ad-dîn ar-Râzî spread the knowledge of Kalâm; and Imâm an-Nawawî spread the knowledge of Fiqh. Thus, a mujaddid, coming in each century up to our time, strengthened the religion. We should not dismiss the matter by saying that the above-quoted hadîth and the like are the miracles predicting future happenings. We should also realize the importance and the value of the predicted happenings."[2]

---

[1] Transoxiana.

[2] Shâh Walî-Allah ad-Dahlawî, **Izâlat al-Khafa 'an khilâfati 'l-Khulafâ'.** v. II. p. 377, Karachi, 1372.

Shâh Walî-Allâh ad-Dahlawî wrote in another book:

"One of the wâjibs of Islam is to learn the Divine Rules (al-Ahkâm al-Ilâhî), which can be learned from the Qur'ân, the Hadîth, the works of as-Sahâba and of the Tâbi'ûn and from the teachings deduced from the Qur'ân and the Hadîth. **Fiqh** is the branch of knowledge that deals with the Divine Rules, and **fuqahâ'** are the scholars of fiqh. Fuqahâ' had different madhhabs, and the scholars who came later differed from one another in choosing and following these madhhabs. Many of them said that one of the famous madhhabs should be chosen and be followed in one's every business. For those who cannot understand the Qur'ân, the Hadîth and the books of scholars, this manner of following (taqlîd) is a great blessing on condition that their taqlîd be intended to follow the Qur'ân and the Hadîth. If you strongly believe that the ijtihâd[1] of the mujtahid (you have been following) disagrees with (a certain rule clearly stated in) an âyat or hadîth with an open meaning, you should follow, concerning the matter in question, another mujtahid whose ijtihâd appears to be in closer agreement with the Book or the Hadîth. In this case, you should not be prohibited from following another madhhab. Scholars of later generations who have perfectly learned the Sunna and the Works (of early Islamic scholars), who have thoroughly studied the words of (at least) one of the scholars of Islamic fiqh, who know the hadîth, -

---

[1] Ijtihâd means to infer meanings from the figurative âyat-i-kerîmas in the Qur'ân al-kerîm. A scholar who is learned enough to perform ijtihâd is called a mujtahid. Performing ijtihâd requirs first learning the basic essentials of Islam, the Qur'ân al-kerîm, all the hadîth-i-sherîfs with all the particulars and details entailed, such as the time of revelation of each and every âyat-i-kerîma, where and upon what event it was revealed, the âyat-i-kerîmas that invalidated others, which ones invalidated which ones, and so forth, learning all the contemporary scientific branches, which in turn requires years of lucubration and self-sacrifice. This book would be too short to explain all the requirements. Our aim here is to help our readers to develop an idea as to the stupendous size of the job of ijtihâd. Those scholars who devoted all their worldly lives to this unutterably painstaking job of ijtihâd did us so great a favour by doing so that any degree of gratitude would fall short of paying them their dues. May Allâhu ta'âlâ lavish them with rewards in the Hereafter! Please read the five fascicles of **Endless Bliss** and the book **The Sunni Path** for detailed information.

and also the names of the blessed and trustworthy people who transmitted the hadîth-, which a faqîh (scholar of fiqh) has utilized as a document, and who are therefore authorized to serve their madhhab by comparing the seemingly contradictory hadîths and deducing new rules and, (if necessary,) to deduce new rules by studying within the methods and principles established by their madhhab, are called **Mujtahid-i-fi-l-madhhad)** (Mujtahid within a madhhab.) This way of following is very blessed, too. Most Muslims follow the madhhab which has spread in their country or which they learn from their fathers or masters. This way of following is suitable for those who can read the books of only one madhhab and cannot study the sources utilized by the madhhab. Islamic teachings are composed of three parts, namely, **zâhir, nawâdir** and **takhrîj** teachings, the last one being the teachings deduced by scholars. All three of them exist in the sciences of **fiqh, tasawwuf** and **'aqâ'id.** A scholar who is able to distinguish the three kinds of Islamic teachings from one another in all of these three sciences and to deduce rules for each kind of these teachings is called an **'âlim of Islam** or **mujtahid.** Only such an 'âlim can understand the Qur'ân and the Sunna. In the books **Tahzîb** by al-Baghawî, **Hidâya** by Imâm al-Haramain, **Sharh al-wajîz** by ar-Râfi'î, **Ghâya** by 'Izzad-dîn ibn 'Abd-as Salâm, **Sharh al-muhadhdhab** by an-Nawawî, **Adab al-futyâ** by Abû 'Amr ibn Salâh and in **Kitâb al-bahr** by Badr ad-dîn az-Zarkashî, knowledge is divided into two, one of which must be learned by everybody. Learning the other is a fard kifâya, and, therefore, an 'âlim who has become a mujtahid learns it; if there is such an 'âlim in a town, others need not learn it and, if there is no such 'âlim, all Muslims are sinful. If such an 'âlim can deduce rules from the Qur'ân, Hadîth, ijmâ' and qiyâs without depending upon a madhhab, he is called a **mustaqil** (independent) **mujtahid.** There has not been such a mujtahid for a long time.

"There are four groups of non-mustaqil mujtahids. A mujtahid in the first group does not follow the imâm of his madhhab in searching for documents and deducing rules. Because he is on the way of an imâm, he is said to belong to an imâm's madhhab and is called a **mujtahid muntasib.** He is a mujtahid mutlaq, and there must always be such a mujtahid. The **as'hâb at-tarjîh,** i.e. the second group, depend on the methods and documents of the imâm of the madhhab, and each is called a **mujtahid muqayyad.** A mujtahid in the third group knows the documents of his madhhab.

A mujtahid belonging to the fourth group can understand the teachings of his madhhab and conveys them to others.

"Ordinary Muslims who are not able to perform ijtihâd and do not study Islamic sciences are permitted to follow a madhhab. However, a scholar who has reached the capacity to perform ijtihâd is not allowed to follow a madhhab."[1]

Shâh Walî-Allah's writings above clearly show the fact that Mawdûdî is a heretic who has not realized the greatness of the Ahl as-Sunna scholars, all of whom were praised in the hadîth and who followed the same path and spread and strengthened Rasûlullah's (sall-Allâhu 'alaihi wa sallam) path.

Mawdûdî writes altogether nonsense on the eighty-third page; see what he writes in a delirium:

"Because of the difference of opinions with regard to fiqh, the Hanafî and the Shâfi'î madhhabs have judged each other resentfully to defend its own opinion and have become excessively dangerous to each other. Every madhhab overflows with details, and facts get lost in an abundance of interpretations."

These delirious words are excessively slanderous against the madhhab leaders. In no fiqh book is there a single word written with resent or jealousy against any of the four madhhabs. On the countrary, each madhhab considers it permissible to follow other madhhabs when in difficulty.[2] Such a corrupt, absurd and blatant lie as this can be written only by a heretic attacking Islam from behind the scene. Poor Mawdûdî has tried to dive into kalâm and fiqh, which are the important subjects of Islam, but, being inexperienced, he has been drowned.

On the ninetieth page, he praises Shâh Walî-Allah and says that he selects the following lines from his book **Al-tafhîmât:**

"In the contemporary age, reality, which is compatible with the spirit of Divine Knowledge, combines the Hanafî and the Shâfi'î madhhabs. The Qur'ân commentaries should be reviewed and the

---

[1] Shâh Walî-Allah ad-Dahlawî, **Al-intibâh,** part III. The author of **It'hâf,** an annotation to **Al-intibâh,** wrote: "The person who said that a Muslim should give up following a madhhab and adapt himself directly to âyats and hadîths was Shawkânî, not Shâh Walî Allah ad-Dahlawî," and added that ash-Shawkânî's words were better and superior, thus confessing the fact that he was against the madhhabs.

[2] For details, see 'Abd al-Ghanî an-Nablusî's **Khulâsat at-tahqîq** and our book **The Sunni Path,** p. 32.

parts that are against the Hadîth should be sifted out, and what is without essence and value should be discarded."

These statements would exasperate any Muslim who knows his religion and madhhab. It is unbelievable that such a great scholar as Shâh Walî-Allah would have such heretical ideas. In order to show the fact to our brothers-in-Islam and to disgrace Mawdûdî, we will give some quotations from the same book:

"The origins of Islam are the Qur'ân and the Hadîth. There is no other source. Ijtihâd is permissible in deciding about worldly affairs. A religious matter that has already been prescribed cannot be changed. The teachings of Sharî'at do not contain qiyâs or ijmâ'."[1] The anti-madhhabite people say, "The gate of ijtihâd cannot be closed. Ijtihâd can be done anytime," thus they try to change the religious knowledge. They refer to Shâh Walî-Allah as a support for these words. However, Shâh Walî-Allah clearly writes above that he never admits ijtihâd and qiyâs in the religious knowledge and also shows that the words and references of such non-madhhabite people as Mawdûdî and Sayyid Qutb are unsound.

"Read the hadîth books of al-Bukhârî, Muslim, Abû Dâwûd and at-Tirmidhî and the Hanafî and Shâfi'î fiqh books! Hold fast to the books **'Awârif al-ma'ârif** and **Ar-risâlat an-Naqshibandiyya!** These great people wrote about the dhikr and yâd dasht so clearly that there is no need to learn them from a murshid. It is a very great blessing to attain the grades of the great men of tasawwuf"[2]... "I dreamt of Rasûlullah ('alaihi 's-salâm). I asked him which madhhab and tarîqa were better and which he liked best. 'All the madhhabs and tarîqas are equal. None is superior to another,' he said."[3]

"Muslims have parted into madhhabs. The scholars reported the religion that had come from Rasûlullah ('alaihi 's-salâm). They agreed on most of the teachings, and there remained some insignificant disagreements on a minor part. But the majority of scholars held on to the right path and rejected those who deviated from their path. From fear, the separatists either hid themselves or behaved double-facedly, which showed that they were the

---

[1] Shâh Walî-Allah ad-Dahlawî, **At-tafhîmât al-ilâhiyya,** v. II, p. 142, Pakistan, 1387 (1967).

[2] Ibid. p. 290.

[3] Ibid. p. 301.

people of bid'a. We should hold fast to the teachings on which the right madhhabs agreed, and we should not deny the ones on which they disagreed. He who says that it is fard to follow the madhhab of a certain person who was not a prophet becomes an unbeliever; Islam had existed before that person was created, and fiqh scholars had preached it. Muslims have always followed one of the right madhhabs, for they have believed that the imâm of the madhhab correctly reported the religion coming from Rasûlullah ('alaihi 's-salâm). My heart feels that it would be good to compare the present teachings of the two most widespread madhhabs, the Hanafî and Shâfi'î, with hadîth books. When the teachings without foundation,[1] were excluded, the two madhhabs would seem as if they were united. Of the remaining teachings, the ones that were common in both madhhabs would be taken. Those which were not common would be classified as rukhsa or 'azîma. In case of darûra (necessity or emergency), the ones that were rukhsa would be followed."[2] Here he gives definite answers to the lâ-madhhabî and shows that their statement, "Our opponents are polytheists," is kufr, (i.e. something which causes one to go out of Islam). This passage, only the last sentence of which is played as a trump card by Mawdûdî, does not at all support his point of view, but it exculpates the madhhabs from the slanders with which the ignorant people and heretics smeared the madhhabs. As a matter of fact, Shâh Walî-Allah explained it more clearly: "What Allâhu ta'âlâ likes is to search firstly through the Qur'ân and the Hadîth. If a person can comprehend and draw conlusions from them, he is endowed with a great blessing. If he cannot comprehend them, he should follow the madhhab of an imâm who, he believes, understood them correctly and suitably with the Sunna and communicated clearly what he understood.

---

[1] With these words, Shâh Walî-Allah meant the teachings made up in the books written by ignorant men of religion. Such teachings do not exist in the basic books of the Hanafî and Shafi'î madhhabs or in hadîth books. When such teachings are cleared off, it will be seen that there is very little difference between these madhhabs, for there is no difference pertaining to the teachings that are expressed clearly in the Hadîth between the two madhhabs, even among the four madhhabs; and there are not many differences pertaining to the teachings that are not expressed clearly. These different teachings are either rukhsa (easier way, facility) or 'azîma (difficult way). For more detail, see **The Sunni Path,** published by Hakîkat Kitabevi in Istanbul.

[2] Shâh Walî-Allah, **At-tafhîmât,** v. I, pp. 277-9.

Arabic knowledge and the lessons in the madrasa should be studied with the view of understanding them, not for other purposes!"[1] As it is seen, Shâh Walî-Allah, too, prohibited the scholars who were mujtahids from following another mujtahid and wrote that we ignorant people should follow one of the right madhhabs.

In the book **Endless Bliss,** Shâh Walî-Allâh's invaluable writings praising the four madhhabs in his works **Al-insâf** and **'Iqd al-jayyid**[2] are quoted in full length. Even the Turkish book **Ni'met ul-Islâm** clearly states that the madhhabs cannot be united and it is a heresy to be a mulfiq. In the fatwâ book **Fatâwâ al-Haramain** and Persian **Saif al-abrâr,** which were written in India, and in Hadrat 'Abd al-Wahhâb ash-Sha'rânî's preface to his **Al-Mîzân al-kubrâ,**[3] 'madhhab' is explained clearly, and it is proved with documents that the madhhabs cannot be united. To pioneer something which has been unanimously said to be **'impermissible'** for a thousand years means to turn Islam upside down. Are those who defend it Muslims or are they are enemies of Islam? It devolves on the readers to decide about it.

Shâh Walî-Allah explained and praised tasawwuf and the tarîqas throughout his Persian work **Hama'ât** (Pakistan, 1944), from which the following lines are borrowed:

"If the sâlik is not so learned as to study the hadîth books or the knowledge coming from as-Sahâba and the Tâbi'ûn, he should follow one of the four madhhabs. All the tarîqas are the same in respect of belief, of doing the commands and abstaining from the prohibitions. They have been different in doing the dhikr and supererogatory worship. If worldly thoughts come to one's mind while performing the dhikr, one should sit near an exalted person whose tawajjuh is strong and pay his tawajjuh to him. Or one should pay his tawajjuh to the souls of the mashâyikh al-kirâm, and, therefore, visit their graves and beg them to attract him towards themselves. If the dhikr causes vexation to the nafs, this has various reasons. One of them is lack of following the rules of âdâb towards the mashâyikh of the tarîqa one follows. If the sâlik cannot understand the reason, the shaikh will understand it with his tawajjuh and insight and will let him know of it. This faqîr

---

[1] Ibid, p. 283.

[2] These two Arabic books are reproduced photostatically in one volume by Hakîkat Kitabevi, Istanbul, 1395 (1975).

[3] These three books are reproduced in Istanbul.

[Walî-Allah ad-Dahlawî himself] paid my tawajjuh to the world of souls and understood that each tarîqa had a different relationship to it. Also i'tikâf in shrines will help one make progress. Speaking ill of the Salaf as-Sâlihîn is one of the reasons which block the way. It has often been seen that angels scatter blessings onto the gatherings of dhikr and that those who perform the dhikr are surrounded by light. If a person's soul is in relation with the pure souls of Prophets or of Awliyâ' or with angels, facts not taught to others will be taught to him. If he understands that someone is a Walî and loves him, his soul gets attached to the Walî's soul. Or, he loves his murshid or his pious ancestor and gets attached to his soul. He gets faid from him. Visiting the graves of Awliyâ', reading the Qur'ân and giving alms and sending its thawâb to their souls, and respecting their works and children will help one get attached to their souls. One will dream of them. Appearing in their own figures, they will help and rescue one at dangerous places. A person who gets benefit from the souls is called an Uwaisî. Because his attraction is very strong, Hadrat 'Abd al-Qâdir al-Jîlâni has the ability to be as beneficial as the alive Awliyâ. This faqîr paid my tawajjuh to the souls of the mashâyikh and attained many blessings. Five hundred years after the death of the mashâyikh, there is not any natural power left in their bodies and their effects on those who visit their graves become more powerful. Benefit by tawajjuh to the soul can be done in two ways: by thinking that the two souls are attached to each other, which is like seeing somebody in the mirror; or by visiting his grave and thinking of him, which is like opening one's eyes and seeing somebody facing him."

Walî-Allah ad-Dahlawî (rahmatullâhi 'alaih) further wrote: "It is permissible to gather the rukhsas of the four madhhabs only when it is not prohibited by the explicit nasses of the Qur'ân and Hadîth, by the ijmâ' of the Salaf as-Salihîn or by an explicit qiyâs."[1] As it is seen, Shâh Walî-Allah, let alone saying that the madhhabs should be united, states conditions even for picking their rukhsas.

Mawdûdî goes on attacking the Ahl as-Sunna scholars and again claims to quote from Shâh Walî-Allah's book **Musaffâ,** on the 91st page of his book **The Revivalist Movement in Islam:**

"Ijtihâd is necessary in every age. It is necessary to establish

---

[1] **Izâlat al-khafâ,** p. 522, Pakistan, 1386 (1966), original Persian and translated Urdu versions together.

new rules event if it may not agree with a certain madhhab. For it is a must to have divine responsibilities according to the peculiarities of every century. The books of the maddhabs that have been written up to now are inefficient and teem with differences. It is the only way out to remove these differences through the principles of Islam."

He attributes these exaggerations, which he likes very much and, his mouth watering, praises excessively, to Shâh Walî-Allah. He makes that great scholar a false witness for himself. These slanders reveal his real purpose and unmask his real motives. Hadrat Walî-Allah, however, wrote in the preface of his famous work **Izâlat al-khafâ:**

"Most of the rules declared in the Qur'ân are concise. They cannot be solved or understood without the explanation of the Salaf as-Sâlihîn. Most of those hadîths reported by one person cannot be documents unless they were reported by several Salaf as-Sâlihîn and unless the mujtahids derived rules from them. If those great people had not worked so hard, the hadîths that seemed to disagree with one another could not have been brought together. Likewise, unless all the branches of religious knowledge, such as **'ilm al-qirâ'a, 'ilm at-tafsîr, 'ilm al-'aqâ'id** and **'ilm as-sulûk,** come from those great people, they cannot be documents. In all these branches of knowledge, as-Sahâba were the source for the Salaf as-Sâlihîn and shed light on their way. The pillar to which the Salaf as-Sâlihîn held on is the cuffs of the Khulafâ' ar-râshidîn. The person who breaks this origin, this pillar, will be demolishing the entire religious knowledge."

Shâh Walî-Allah further wrote: "For being a mujtahid, it is necessary to know the majority of the detailed documentation from the Qur'ân, Hadîth, ijmâ', and from the qiyâs of the knowledge of fiqh. The mujtahid has to know the document of every rule and form a firm opinion about the documents. Being a mujtahid in this time requires being specialized in the following five branches of knowledge: 'ilm-i kitâb qirâ'atan wa tafsîran; 'ilm al-hadîth, that is, to know each hadîth together with its documents and to recognize the da'îf hadîth and the sahîh hadîth immediately; the third one is 'ilm al-aqâwîl as-Salaf, that is, to know what the Salaf as-Sâlihîn said about each matter so that you will not go out of ijmâ', so that you will not swerve to the third way if there were two different decisions on a matter; the fourth one is 'ilm al-'arabiyya, i.e., Arabic with branches of lughat, nahw, [mantiq, bayân, ma'ânî, balâgha,] etc; the fifth one is 'ilm at-turuq

al-istinbât wa wujûh at-tatbiq bain al-mukhtalifain. Such a profoundly learned scholar is called a mujtahid. Such a scholar ponders very hard on every small matter and observes each rule identical to it together with its documents. It should be known certainly that explaining the Qur'ân also requires being deeply specialized in these five branches. In addition, it is necessary to know the hadîths telling the reason for the revelation of the âyats. He should know what the Salaf as-Sâlihîn said about interpreting the Qur'ân. His memory and comprehension should be very strong. He should understand the siyâq, sibâq and tawjîh of âyats and the like."[1] Those people who attempt to do ijtihâd and to write Qur'ân commentaries, such as Mawdûdî, Sayyid Qutb and Hamidullah, should read these lines and realize the greatness and exaltedness of Islamic scholars. However, this realization is a great virtue. Hence, those who not only do not realize this themselves and also will not let others realize it are enemies trying to demolish Islam from the inside under the mask of Muslim scholars. May Allâhu ta'âlâ protect Muslims against believing such insidious enemies of Islam! Lest my dear readers should be taken in by wrong and very dangerous articles of anti-madhhabite people, I deem it proper to give additional information on ijtihâd in the following.

45 - IJTIHÂD: Today, many of the symptoms of the end of the world have appeared and spread far and wide. One of these symptoms is that the number of the ignorant will increase and men of knowledge will decrease. The ignorant will be authorities in the religion and mislead people. These symptoms are written in detail in the hadîths written in **Mukhtasar at-tadhkirat al-Qurtubî** and in al-Birgiwî's **Wasiyyat-nâma.** Then, Muslims should be vigilant. They should not believe every word. They should not believe those who do not mention the Ahl as-Sunna scholars and their books but extract meanings from âyats and hadîths according to their own minds in their khutba, books and papers. The non-madhhabite people are either heretics or unbelievers, both of whom have always disguised themselves as religious men and deceived and misguided Muslims. To learn the truth concerning the âyats and hadîths about which these heretics talk, we should search and find the meanings which the sholars of Ahl as-Sunna gave them. To do this, we should read the dependable **'ilm al-hâl** books. The Ahl as-Sunna scholars studied all the âyats

[1] **Izâlat al-khafâ,** p. 21.

and hadîths minutely, learned their true meanings by splitting hairs and wrote them in books. Today, ignorant people whose religious knowledge is only a smattering of Arabic assume themselves to be mujtahids. By saying, "We have graduated from the university; we have received diplomas," they despise Islamic scholars. However, if a teaching which the mujtahids of a period reported as **ijmâ',** that is, unanimously, is one of the fundamentals of the religion, that is, if it has spread everywhere so that even the ignorant know it, it is fard both to believe and to follow it. He who does not believe such an ijmâ' becomes an unbeliever. He who believes but does not follow it becomes a fâsiq. If a unanimously reported teaching is not one of the fundamentals of the religion, he who disbelieves it does not become an unbeliever. He becomes a heretic, a man of **bid'a.** He who does not follow it becomes a fâsiq, a sinner.

Ibn Malak wrote on ijmâ' in his book **Usûl al-fiqh:** "If the mujtahids of a certain era did not agree on how an action should be done and explained it differently, the scholars succeding them should follow the words of one of them and it is not permissible for them to offer an explanation that would not agree with any of those different explanations. This principle was established with an **ijmâ'**, i.e. with the consensus of all scholars." There is not a mujtahid in any part of the world today. 'Mujtahid' means 'an Islamic scholar who has attained to the grade of ijtihâd'. Not from ourselves do we say that there is no mujtahid on the earth today; all scholars have been declaring this, including Hadrat Shâh Walî-Allah ad-Dahlawî, whose name Mawdûdî tries to exploit as a false witness. For example, Ibn 'Âbidîn, while commenting on the statement, "Muadhdhin's crying very loud will spoil their salât," in **ad-Durr al-mukhtâr,** wrote: "Throughout the four hundred years following Rasûlullah's ('alaihi 's-salâm) death there has been no great scholar to do qiyâs, nor any **mutlaq mujtahid** to derive rules by comparing one affair to another." As declared in the Hadîth, profound scholars who would attain to the grade of ijtihâd would come every hundred years, but these people would be **mujtahids within a madhhab,** who would not undertake the task of doing qiyâs, that is, performing new ijtihâd, but they would try to restore the ijtihâd of the leader of the madhhab to which they belonged and to lead people to the right course, since there would be no need for new ijtihâd and their sole task would be to reinforce the teachings of the scholars of Ahl as-Sunna. A Muslim who is not a mujtahid is called a **muqallid** (follower). Today, we

all the Muslims on the earth are muqallids. No matter how much learned a muqallid is, he cannot do ijtihâd over a matter disagreeing with what the mujtahids have communicated before; this is understood from the unanimity quoted from Ibn Malak above. The hadîth, **"My umma will not agree on deviation,"** indicates that this unanimity of scholars is a means of salvation and is correct.

46 - Mawdûdî was one of the descendants of Khwâja Qutb ad-dîn Mawdûd al-Chishtî, a notable of the Chishtiyya tarîqa. Hadrat Mu'în ad-dîn al-Chishtî of Ajmar was Qutb ad-dîn's caliph, one of those whom he had ordered and given permission to guide the people who wanted to learn. Mawdûdî was born in Hydarabad in 1321 (1903). He died in the United States and was buried in Pakistan in 1399 (1979). He began to earn his living as a journalist. With his first book, **Holy War in Islam** (1927), he spread his revolutionary ideas. When it was translated into Arabic, it influenced Hasan al-Bannâ's thoughts and caused him to revolt against the government in Egypt and to be killed. Mawdûdî's inefficiency in knowledge has brought innumerable other Muslims to substantial and spiritual death, for no Islamic scholar has ever taken any interest in politics or thought of revolution. They have guided people to the right course through knowledge and advice. They have known that Islam will spread not through revolution but through knowledge, justice and morals. Mawdûdî strove to solve all the main principles of Islam with his own reason and always disagreed with Islamic scholars and Islamic knowledge. If you observe his books minutely, you will easly see that he was in a struggle of disseminating his own thoughts under the name of Islam. He put Islam into various shapes in order to adapt it to modern forms of government. He envisioned Islam's institution of caliphate in his imagination and attacked almost all the caliphs. The annihilation of Islamic scholars, and consequently of Islamic knowledge, by the British and their servants facilitated the spread of his aberrant ideas. The ignorant people who were not at a level to read and understand the books of Islamic scholars readily thought of him as a scholar, as a mujâhid. His political thoughts were considered extensive Islamic knowledge.

Mawdûdî managed to take advantage of this state of languor in Muslims. Rendering the religion a means for political purpose, he approached politicians. He interfered with the national movement of Indian Muslims. In order to appropriate the

accomplishments of vigilant Muslims and Islamic strugglers, he produced many articles in which he played the part of national leadership and inspiration. Acting very cleverly, he took the lead of the party. Yet the real heroes who suggested the idea of Pakistan's establishment and who worked for this purpose were numerous others led by Alî Jinnah. While Ali Jinnah was arousing in the Indian Muslims the idea of independence and inviting them to unity, Mawdûdî made demands for his personal advantages. In order to prevent disunion, a fatwâ was issued for his imprisonment. His instigation was suppressed and Pakistan became firmly established in 1366 (1947). He was freed in 1950. As the pure Muslims of the Ahl as-Sunna pursued the cause of Islam within the new state, Mawdûdî began to busy the minds with a false religion named "Qadîânism", and consequently in 1953, he was judged and imprisoned again; this time the term was twenty-six months. While he was in prison, a constitution defending Muslims was prepared and accepted in 1956, but as soon as he got out of the prison his articles imbuing with revolutionary ideas made a mess. He caused the constitution to be prohibited and martial law to be declared. In 1962, the new constitution was carried into effect. But Mawdûdî did not keep quiet. He caused the organization of **Jama'at Islam** to be closed. He was imprisoned again in the early 1964, but under the amnesty he was freed a little later. By shouting "human rights" and "justice", he fell for the idea of raising a rebellion. He opened way to tumults in Kashmir. Indians took advantage of this and attacked Kashmir. The government met horrible and difficult situations. Dissatisfied with all these eccentricities, Mawdûdî co-operated in an underhand way with those in Saudi Arabia. He was enrolled as a member of the assembly of consultation in Medina, which had been established in order to spread anti-madhhabism in every Muslim country. Yet the hadîth, **"Upon him who helps a cruel person, Allâhu ta'âlâ sends that cruel person to worry him,"** manifested and he was imprisoned by those whom he wanted to approach.

Muhammad Yûsuf Banûrî (d. 1397/1977), one of the prominent scholars of Islam in Pakistan, Director of the Karachi Madrasa and the Head of the Pious Foundations of the Pakistani Madrasas, wrote in detail in his book **Al-ustâd al-Mawdûdî** that Abu 'l-a'lâ Mawdûdî was anti-madhhabite and unqualified in Islam. Muhammad Yûsuf wrote:

"As an unfortunate coincidence in his youth, Mawdûdî

employed a mulhid named Niyâz Fathpûrî as his secretary, whose heretical ideas demoralized him. With the help of his secretary, he could give articles to various periodicals and make his living on writing. Then he somehow seized the directorate of the Jam'iyyat al-'Ulamâ' al-Hind, later editing the periodical **Muslim** with the help of Muftî Muhammad Kifâyatullâh and Shaikh Ahmad Sa'îd ad-Dahlawî. He started the periodical **Tarjumân al-Qur'ân** in 1352 (1933). Later the founded the Dâr al-Islâm with his four friends, namely Muhammad Mauzîr Nu'mânî, Abu 'l-Hasan 'Alî Nadwî Luknawî, Amîn Ahsan al-Islâhî and Mas'ûd 'Âlim an-Nadwî. At last he established Al-Jamâ'at al-Islâmiyya in 1360 (1941). He wrote many articles owing to his fluent style. He won the appreciation and praise of great scholars such as Shaikh Munâzir Ahsan al-Gailânî, Sayyid Sulaimân an-Nadwî and 'Abdulmâjid Daryâbâdî. Then he began to spread his ideas, which aroused doubts in the long-sighted men of knowledge. Against his book, Shaikh Munâzir Ahsan al-Gailânî was the first who wrote criticism under the heading "A New Khârijite" in the periodical **Sidq al-jadîd** which was edited by 'Abdulmâjid Daryâbâdî. Then Sayyid Sulaimân an-Nadwî and Husain Ahmad al-Madanî wrote refutations against Mawdûdî.

"The reason for the heresy of Mawdûdî was that he had learned religious information from the non-authority. He had not gained any skill in the Arabic sciences. He had not attained to the suhba of real religious scholars. He was not successful in reading, writing or speaking English and Arabic. All the Arabic books that he edited were written in Urdu originally, later being translated into Arabic by Shaikh Mas'ûd 'Âlim an-Nadwî and his disciples. Because Mawdûdî's name was written as the author on the covers of the books, the readers thought that Mawdûdî wrote them in Arabic.

"Mawdûdî is not a man of religion but a politician. He had a fluent style in the Urdu language, but the sins his books caused were much greater than their benefit. Their harm was much more. Their evils surpassed their good effects. He tried to blemish as-Sahâba especially in his Urdu books. He defamed 'Uthmân (radiy-Allâhu 'anh), the Khalîfat ar-râshid. He altered the terminology of Islam and blessed âyats. He insulted the Salaf as-Sâlihîn. All his writings openly revealed his desire for position and fame. The members of the Rabitat al-Alam al-Islami, which was founded by the lâ-madhhabî, and many men of religious post in the Najd and Riyadh all love him and spread his Arabic books

all over the world. Among them are Kusaimî, the author of **Sarrâ',** and Nâsir Albânî, a mudarris at the Jami'at al-Madîna. Muhammad Zakariyya, a Pakistani man of religion, liked Mawdûdî's writings at first, but later he wrote him a letter full of advice and published a booklet covering his heretical opinions when he sensed his heresy and deviation. Doctor 'Abdurrazzâq Hazârawî Pâkistânî translated this booklet into Arabic and published it adding his comments. Those who read it will clearly understand Mawdûdî's opinions. Some of his opinions are fisq (immorality); some are bida'; some are ilhâd (heresy); some reveal his ignorance in Islam; and others show that he has not understood religious knowledge well. His various writings contradict one another.

"Great Muslim scholars of India of every madhhab came together at Jam'iyyat al-'Ulamâ' in Delhi on the 27th of Shawwâl, 1370 (August 1, 1951) and reached the conclusion that Mawdûdî and his Al-Jamâ'at al-Islâmiyya caused subversive people misleading Muslims and published this fatwâ (decision) in a book and in papers."[1] And the scholars of Pakistan passed a resolution that Mawdûdî was a heretic who tried to make others heretics; this resolution was edited once again in the **Akhbâr al-Jam'iyya** in Rawalpindi on the 22nd of February, 1396 (1976).

A certain group in the Muslim world propagandize Muhammad 'Abduh, Mawdûdî and Sayyid Qutb's ideas which are against Islam, as if they were something ingenious. They introduce their rebellious ideas as a struggle of heroism. Lest the pure youngsters should fall for these tricky propagandas and false appraisals, we have conveyed the truth of the matter above. The greatest proof for the correctness of these writings, which have been derived from sources searched for a long time, and for the accurateness of the diagnosis is Mawdûdî's own words, which are incompatible with Islam's basic teachings and which are written in the paragraphs above. May Allâhu ta'âlâ protect Muslim children against being misled by heretical, aberrant ideas. Âmin.

47 - Before explaining the way taken by Sayyid Qutb, it will be useful to give some information about his adviser, Muhammad 'Abduh (1265/1849-1323/1905, Egypt). His articles in **Al-waqâyi' al-Misriyya,** an Egyptian paper of his time, in the magazine **Al-Manâr** and in the paper **Al-Ahrâm** reveal his heretical thoughts.

---

[1] **Al-ustâd al-Mawdûdî,** p. 7. Reproduced in Arabic by Hakîkat Kitabevi, Istanbul, 1977.

He had some activities in Beirut for a while, too, but the Ahl as-Sunna scholars perceived his evil purposes and he had to go to Paris. There, he cooperated with Jamâl ad-dîn al-Afghânî, who had been preparing the application of masonic plans against Islam, and they published the magazine **Al-'urwat al-wuthqâ.** Then he returned to Beirut and Egypt, and began to apply the decisions made in Paris and to misguide the youth. The government of Khidiw Tawfîq Pasha, seeing that his lectures and articles were harmful, employed him in one of the offices of the law-court. Yet he continued to write so as to sabotage Islam, which was a part of the masonic plans. With the help of freemasons he became the Muftî of Cairo. He began to attack the Ahl as-Sunna. As the first activity, he attempted to change the curriculum of the madrasa of Jâmi' al-Azhar, thus preventing the youth from valuable courses. He abrogated the graduate courses in the universities, so that they began to teach books that had been prepared for senior and junior high schools. Freemasons had already done the same thing in the Ottoman Empire; after the Tanzîmât (a turning point in the Ottoman history marked by the political reforms in 1839), scientific courses had been abrogated from the madrasas and the religious education had been deprived of high-level courses. All these were done because Islam was established upon knowledge, without which and without any real religious man left Islam would be doomed to extinction. When there is no cloud, to expect rain would mean to expect miracles. Allâhu ta'âlâ is able to make this, but His Divine Law of Causation is not so. Education of an Islamic scholar requires the reappearing and spreading of Islamic knowledge and the elapse of a hundred years. The enemies tried to extinguish the Islamic sun.

Hannâ Abî Râshid, chief of the masonic lodge in Beirut, wrote: "Jamâl ad-dîn al-Afghânî was the chief of the masonic lodge in Egypt, which had about three hundred members, mostly scholars and state officials. After him, the leading master Muhammad 'Abduh became the chief. 'Abduh was a leading freemason. No one can deny that he has spread the masonic spirit in Arab countries."[1]

Seeing the reforms made by Muhammad 'Abduh, many people suppose that he was an Islamic scholar. The Ahl as-Sunna scholars have written answers to his articles and torn up his mask. For example, Elmalılı Hamdi Beg, in his interpretation of the

---

[1] **Dâ'irat al-ma'ârif al-masoniyya,** p. 197, Beirut, 1381/1961.

sûrat al-Fil, displays some of his heresies, which can be outlined as follows:

1. Thinking that the wisdom and the religion were different from each other, he claimed to be the first man to unite them.

2. He said that the Islamic scholars before him had not studied logic, mathematics, history and geography, that it had been deemed as a sin to learn sciences, and that he would introduce these sciences into Islam. He denied that, for many centuries, these had been taught in every madrasa and that thousands of books had been written in these fields, thus he tried to put an end to the teaching of the Ahl as-Sunna books and to spread the irreligious propagandas written by the enemies of Islam under the name of philosophy in Muslim countries. When the professors of Jâmi' al-Azhar raised objections to these propagandas, he stigmatized them with "retrogression and enmity against knowledge, science and logic".

3. He attacked against marrying four women in the official paper in 1297/1880.

4. He said that, before him, thousands of Islamic scholars had introduced into Islam things which had nothing to do with Islam, that they had gone wrong in understanding the Qur'ân and Hadîth, and that he had been correcting them.

5. In his book **Islam and Christianity,** he wrote that all religions were the same with the exception of some minor façade differences, and recommended that Jews, Christians and Muslims support one another. He wrote to a priest in London, "I expect that the two great religions, Islam and Christianity, will shake hands and embrace each other. Then, by supporting one another the Torah, the Bible and the Qur'ân will be read everywhere and will be revered by every nation." He believed that Christianity was a right religion and awaited the time when Muslims would read the Bible.

6. He said that the believers had abandoned the right path and thereby lapsed into a pitiable situation, that the religion would shake hands with knowledge and then Allâhu ta'âlâ would complete His Light. To him, Allâhu ta'âlâ had not completed His religion in the time of our master Rasûlullah (sall-Allâhu 'alaihi wa sallam) and Islamic scholars had not shaken hands with knowledge.

7. He wrote in his book **Islam and Christianity,** "If a person is heard to say a statement which shows his unbelief in a hundred

respects and his belief in one respect, that person will be accepted as a believer. It is idiocy to think that any philosopher or man of idea would say a statement which does not show belief even in one respect versus unbelief in a hundred respects. Then, they all should be acknowledged as believers. The word 'zindîq' does not exist in Islam. It has been invented afterwards." Misrepresenting the rule, "One [sign of] belief in a statement of a Muslim who has not been seen openly to have a sign of unbelief will rescue him from unbelief," he accepted all unbelievers and philosophers to be believers. Because he himself was a zindîq, he did not like this word to be used. He denied the hadîth, **"Zindîqs among my umma will increase,"** which is written in **Kunûz ad-daqâ'iq** and ad-Daylamî's **Musnad.**

8. In the interpretation of the âyat, **"He who does goodness as heavy as a mote will get its reward certainly,"** of the sûrat az-Zilzâl, he wrote: "Whether a Muslim or an unbeliever, everybody who does good deeds will enter Paradise." This wrong, unjust claim, which would be sneered at by the most ignorant and most block-headed people, has been admitted neither by his admirers nor even by the simpletons who have been following him. Sayyid Qutb, one of his strict followers, in his interpretation of the 124th âyat of the sûrat an-Nisâ', had to say, "Master Muhammad 'Abduh does not ever remember the clearness of the âyats contradicting his thought. These âyats contradict 'Abduh's ideas." In fact, the dosage of the masonic opium which Abduh was made to swallow in Paris was so strong that his mind and conscience were too upset to see the relations between the âyats.

9. In the interpretation of the sûrat al-'Asr, he said, "Îmân does not mean an imitative belief in the things which mind and conscience cannot grasp. It is not îmân to memorize and say some words which one has heard from his parents. Islam is against imitation. It is of no value to have come before, so everything must be solved by one's investigation through reason." In his **Risâlat at-tawhîd**,[1] however, he wrote: "If reason cannot grasp something in the religion, it has to believe it," thus his words disagreed with each other.

10. Georgy Zaidan, the proprietor of the Hilâl Publications in Egypt and author of **The History of Islamic Civilization,** wrote

[1] A compilation of his propagandas directed to the students of Al-madrasat as-Sultâniyya in Beirut in 1885, published a year after his death.

about 'Âbduh, "Muhammad 'Abduh did not remain dependent upon the words of old scholars, nor did he esteem the rules put by them."

11. In the interpretation of the Fâtiha, he wrote: "The Qur'ân addressed the people living in that time [of its revelation] and it addressed them not because they were superior, but because they were human beings," thus he refused the hadîths about the superiority attained by as-Sahâba.

12. In an attempt to interpret the âyat, **"The deed-books of fâjirs are in Sijjîn,"** he wrote: "I have seen in some people's books that **'senjun'** means 'mud' in the Ethiopian language. This word has probably come to Yemen from Ethiopia. The âyat, then, means, 'The deeds of the fâjirs are like mud.' " Disliking the interpretations of Rasûlullah ('alaihi 's-salâm), as-Sahâbat al-kirâm and of the profound Islamic scholars, he interpreted âyats on a coincidental and presumptive basis.

13. When interpreting the sûrat al-Fîl, he wrote, "The birds of Abâbîl may be mosquitos, so the soldiers possibly died of small-pox or measles." I wonder how he would interpret it if he lived a hundred years later. Indeed, Rasûlullah ('alaihi 's-salâm) explained their meanings, and tafsîr scholars found these meanings and wrote them in their books.

14. In the interpretation of the sûrat an-Nâs, he wrote: "There is a devil in every person. But this means a power which bears the evil desires in man. It is an effect which is likened to genies." That wretched man, who knew nothing about the books and knowledge of Islamic scholars, came forward with the claim that it was necessary to follow only reason, knowledge and science, refused to follow a madhhab and attempted to adapt all the religious knowledge to the scientific discoveries and to philosophies of his time. Because he did not want to read the books of Islamic scholars and because he had not studied science, he wrote books on religion according to his short sight and to what he had heard. This shows that he knew nothing of kalâm, fiqh and tasawwuf and that he had not tasted Islamic flavour. If he had understood the greatness of Islamic scholars and escaped the talons of his nafs, and if he had comprehended the inner nature of the matter and the spirit, he would not have said such incongruous things.

15. He wrote a commentary on the book **Nahj al-balâgha** by Radî, who was the brother of 'Alî Murtadâ', a convert from the Jewish religion. This book, which caused faction among Muslims,

had been commented on first by Ibn Abi 'l-Hadîd 'Abd al-Hamîd al-Madâ'inî ash-Shî'î and then by another Shî'ite, Maisum al-Bahrânî. Abduh's commentary was printed in Beirut in 1301 (1885).

48 - Sayyid Qutb, one of the religion reformers of this century, too, announced his admiration for Ibn Taimiyya and Muhammad 'Abduh in almost all his books. In **The Future is Islam's,** for example, he praised only the word **'Islam'** but he did not explain what he understood from this word or in which madhhab he was. On its ninety-fourth page, he wrote:

"The spiritual leader struggling in the front row of those who protected Muslim countries against the Tatar invasions was Ibn Taimiyya."

If he meant the empire of Jenghiz by Tatars, Ibn Taimiyya had not been born yet when the Georgians (of Caucasus), the Persians and the Tatars in the army of Hulago, the notorious unbeliever, burned and ruined Baghdad and put hundreds of Muslims to the sword in 565 A.H. Ibn Taimiyya was born in Harrân in 661 A.H. It is written in the Turkish **Islam Ansiklopedisi** (volume V) that he was assigned to preach for jihâd against Mongols, and in 699, as a preacher, he was in the victory won against Mongols in Shaqhab in the vicinity of Damascus. It is written on the 137th page of the book **Mir'ât al-kâ'inât,** "Sultân Mahmûd Ghâzân Khân, Hulago's grandson, became the Mogul ruler in 694 A.H. That year, upon the advices of Amîr Nawruz, his vizier, he embraced Islam with 400,000 Mongols including his commanders, viziers and soldiers. He read the Qur'ân and fasted [in the Ramadân of] that year." And on the 930th page of **Qisâs-i Anbiyâ'** is written, "Ghâzân Mahmûd Khân wrote to Egyptian Sultân Nasser to cooperate with him and work fraternally for the cause of Islam. Nasser, who was the ninth Turkoman sultan, did not listen to him. Nasser's soldiers plundered the neighborhood of Mardin. Upon this, Ghâzân Khân came to Aleppo in 699 A.H. Nasser's army was routed in Homs. Ghâzân Khân left a commander named Kapchak and a number of fighters to capture Damascus and he himself went back home. Nasser recruited soldiers in Egypt and sent them to Damascus. Upon hearing this, Kapchak gave up besieging Damascus and returned." It is seen that Ibn Taimiyya, who is praised falsely to be a spiritual leader in the front row, in fact, incited the war between the two Muslim rulers and caused the shedding of fraternal blood and the death of thousands of Muslims. As for Ghâzân Khân, whom Sayyid Qutb

slanders in order to represent Ibn Taimiyya as a fighter for Islam, he had an unequalled, artistically invaluable mosque built in Tebriz and established twelve big madrasas, innumerable tekkes, inns and charitable deeds. He sent many gifts to Mecca and Medina and devoted many villages. He was a Sunnî Muslim. Shemseddîn Sâmî Beg wrote that he loved to establish justice and right and possessed many virtues and superiorities and that he was reverent to sayyids and scholars. If Ibn Taimiyya had preached to these two Muslim sultans and had told them that they were brothers by following the âyat, **"Reconcile your brothers!"** as the Ahl as-Sunna scholars had done, Ghâzân Khân and Sultan Nasser, who were goodwilled themselves, would have co-operated and, perhaps, he would have caused the establishment of a greater Islamic empire, which might have changed the course of history and the appearance of today's world. He did not perform this benevolent deed but set men of knowledge and rulers at loggerheads.

Long before Ibn Taimiyya when the Tatarian unbelievers ruined and burned Muslim countries and martyred millions of Muslims, not the men of bid'a like Ibn Taimiyya but the preaches and books of Burhân ad-dîn Shadîd, Fakhr ad-dîn ar-Râzî, 'Umar an-Nasafi, Sadr ad-dîn al-Qonawî, Shaikh Sa'dî ash-Shîrâzî and many other Ahl as-Sunna scholars and thousands of Awliyâ', who were educated by the spiritual masters such as Ahmad ar-Rifâ'î, Imâm al-Ghazâlî, Najm ad-dîn al-Kubrâ, Ahmad an-Nâmiqî Jâmi' and 'Abd al-Qâdir al-Jîlânî, protected Muslims' religion and îmân. These great 'ulamâ' and Awliyâ' both guided the peoples of many countries to the right course and performed jihâd in person against unbelievers as soldiers. Many of them attained martyrdom. The history is in the open.

49 - In the 42nd paragraph above, it is explained that Ibn Taimiyya deviated from the right path. There is no need even to think of how much his admirers may have to do with the right path. Sayyid Qutb did not neglect to show his attachment to him also in his book **As-salâmu al-'âlamiyya wa 'l-Islâm (World's Peace and Islam).** He wrote in this book:

"There is very little work done on the field of the policy of state control so far. This aspect of Islam has not been explained as well as necessary."

He means that this knowledge must be learned from his book. The laws, constitutions, fatwâs and documents in the archives of the six-hundred-year-old Ottoman Empire are so countless that it

might take a whole life-span to examine the thousands of books of Islam's policy of state control. The European orientalists and Israeli professors study them in Istanbul now in admiration.

In his book **Islam and the Problems of Civilization,** Sayyid Qutb wrote that he burned with the fire of Islamic Unity and Divine Way and quoted the false words of the western philosophers and the extensive ideas of keen-witted diplomats, which he had heard as a student, and thus he pretended to be a savior and a fighter for Islam. As he cleverly strived to imbue the youth with his heretical ideas, he wrote:

"In constructing Islamic society, the thing which we are bound to is not Islamic fiqh. Though we are not unfamiliar with this fiqh, the thing we are bound to is the way of Islam, Islamic principles and Islamic understanding."

According to him, books of fiqh and books on the policy of state control, which had been written thorughout centuries, were not illustrative of the Islamic way, and he was making Islamic principles with his own point of view and understanding. The books of Islamic scholars, the leaders of madhhabs, which had been based on the Qur'ân and the Hadîth, were to be abandoned and the philosopher Qutb's ideas were to be put in their place!

He wrote again in his book **World's Peace and Islam:**

"According to Islam, all human beings are a family bound with close bonds to one another. It commands a certain justice over all human beings without discriminating them with regard to race or religion."

Rasûlullah (sall-Allâhu 'alaihi wa sallam) declared in a hadîth sherîf quoted by al-Ghazâlî in his book **Kimyâ' as-sa'âda, "The basis and the most dependable symptom of having îmân is to love Muslims and to dislike unbelievers."** Allâhu ta'âlâ declared to Hadrat 'Îsâ ('alaihi 's-salâm) (Jesus), **"If you perform the worship of all the creatures on the earth and in skies, it will be no use unless you love those whom I love and be hostile against Mine enemies."** He declared in the last âyat of the sûrat al-Mujâdala, **"Those who believe in Allâhu ta'âlâ and in the Day of Resurrection hate the enemies of Allâhu ta'âlâ."** Allâhu ta'âlâ and His Prophet ('alaihi 's-salâm) commanded us to distinguish Muslims from unbelievers. To them, only Muslims are brothers, but Sayyid Qutb wrote that all people were brothers forming a family without the difference of religion.

50 - Again, in the same book, he wrote:

"Islam rejects a religious bigotry that bears the meaning of hatred against other religions."

He disgraced it with bigotry to dislike unbelievers. Hadrat Muhammad Ma'thûm wrote in the twenty-ninth letter of his **Maktûbât,** "It has been clearly commanded in the Qur'ân to dislike unbelievers, to be hostile against them by heart, to treat the people of dâr al-harb severely and to fight with them. There is no place for doubt in this. It is fard for us to adapt ourselves to the Qur'ân." We should do justice to dhimmîs, the unbelievers in a Muslim country, and we should not hurt them. Sayyid Qutb regarded the unbelievers in dâr al-harb like those in a Muslim country.

He wrote again in the same book:

"Islam is not a religion to be imposed upon people by force. It does not urge anybody to accept the religion by force."

On the contrary, jihâd is intended to make Allâhu ta'âlâ's human creatures accept Islam by annihilating cruel dictators who prevent them from becoming Muslims. Those who believe become real Muslims and those who do not become Muslims but surrender become dhimmîs. Allâhu ta'âlâ commanded the jihâd in order to force His human creatures to accept Islam and in order to rescue them from Hell by force. It is declared in the 94th âyat of the sûrat an-Nisâ', **"Those who perform jihâd against the enemies of the religion by sacrificing their wealth and lives in order to spread Allâhu ta'âlâ's religion are higher than those who sit and worship."** Jihâd and ghazâ are the two forms of **al-amru bi'l-ma'rûf** by using force against unbelievers. Jihâd is performed not by individuals but by the State.

Again, in the book **World's Peace and Islam,** Sayyid Qutb wrote:

"In no period has Islam's aim in war been to force people to admit Islam. It is impossible to see such a compulsion either in Islam's theoretical principles or in its historical process. Unlike what the ignorant who do not know Islam and the enemies of Islam suppose, Islam has never been disseminated through sword. War, which is not within the religion's nature, has never been used as a means for invitation to the religion."

Sayyid Qutb reversed the meaning of jihâd, which is openly ordered in the Qur'ân and Hadîth and unanimously defined in millions of books and countlessly exemplified in every Muslim nation's history. His description is as surprising as saying white to

be black and is never believable to any Muslim or to any educated person. It is said either by an uneducated, ignorant person, an idiot or by the persons of the false religion called **Qadîânism (Ahmadiyya),** which has been founded by the British in India and which has nothing to do with Islam.[1]

When explaining the seventy-third and following âyats of the sûrat an-Nisâ', he, too, had to write the truth as communicated by the Ahl as-Sunna scholars. He wrote: "A Muslim goes to war in order to fight in the way of Allah, to exalt Allah's Word and to make Allah's order prevail in the human life. Then he gets killed in this way and becomes a martyr. Jihâd is necessary all the time. It is an element that walks together with the Divine Invitation," and quoted the hadîths encouraging to perform jihâd. On the other hand, in the interpretation of the âyat, **"If they turn away from tawhîd and migration, catch and kill them wherever you find them,"** he again pushed his own ideas forward: "Non-Muslims shall not be forced to admit Islam. They shall never be disturbed on account of their religion. Islam does not invite non-Muslims to itself by force. This religion does not force others to admit it," thus slandering Islam and denying what he had written on the previous page. Interpreting the 100th âyat well, **"He who migrates for the cause of Allâhu ta'âlâ will find abundance and spaciousness on the earth. If he dies on the way, Allah will give him His reward,"** he wrote the truth that it was wâjib for those Muslims who remained in a country of unbelievers to migrate to dâr al-Islâm. It is understood that they should migrate to the Muslim country and should not incite sedition (fitna) by opposing the non-Muslim state. Sayyid Qutb calls this incitement "jihâd". However, 'jihâd' means 'the Islamic State's fighting with its army, with all its modern weaponry and methods of war against non-Muslim states to rescue people from unbelief and torture'. The jihâd of Muslims living in non-Muslim countries does not mean 'opposing individually the non-Muslim state's forces' but it is carried out, within the limits of the laws, by spreading Islamic knowledge by trying to tell everybody Islam's value and uses and by representing the beautiful morals of Islam.

Hadrat al-Imâm ar-Rabbânî wrote: "When going out to fight against unbelievers, one has to intend to spread the Name and Religion of Allâhu ta'âlâ and to weaken the enemies of the

---

[1] Please see **Endless Bliss**, II, 36 for detailed information about the **Ahmadiyya Movement** and other heresies.

religion. Muslims have been commanded this. And this is what jihâd means."[1]

Allâhu ta'âlâ declares in the twenty-eighth âyat of the sûrat at-Tawba, **"Fight against those who do not believe in Allâhu ta'âlâ and in the Last Day and who do not say 'harâm' about what Allâhu ta'âlâ and His Messenger (alaihi 's-salâm) said 'harâm' and who do not admit the religion of truth, until they accept to pay the jizya or become Muslims!"** When Hadrat 'Umar (radiy-Allâhu 'anh) became Khalîfa, he delivered a khutba to encourage the Sahâbat al-kirâm to jihâd and ghazâ, by saying, "O the Prophet's (alaihi 's-salâm) companions! Allâhu ta'âlâ has promised that He would give Muhammad's (alaihi 's-salâm) umma land and home in all parts of the world. Where are the heroes to conquer these countries promised and attain the booties in this world and the degrees of being ghâzî or martyrdom in the next world? Where are the fighters for Islam who will sacrifice their lives and heads to take Islam to Allahu ta'âlâ's human creatures and leave their home to attack the dictators, who are the enemies of Islam?" Upon this speech, the Sahâbat al-kirâm promised to go out for jihâd against unbelievers. Leaving their homes, they spread over the world. They performed jihâd till death. This jihâd continued in every century and Muslims progressed through the power of sword over three continents. The inhabitants of the places they conquered either became Muslims or, sheltering under Islam's justice by admitting to pay the tax called jizya and being given the freedom to worship according to their own religion but obeying Islam in mu'âmalât and 'uqûbât, they were legally considered as Muslims. They lived in comfort and peace.

Islam defines two kinds of countries in the world: **dâr al-Islâm,** the Muslim country, and **dâr al-harb,** the country of unbelievers. In dâr al-Islâm, Muslims and the unbelievers who pay the jizya live. These unbelievers are called **ahl adh-dhimma** or **dhimmî.** They live comfortably and peacefully in full possession of Muslims' rights and freedom. They perform their worship freely. They adapt themselves to Islam's justice and laws. As for the country of unbelievers, Islam never interferes with their justice, safety, comfort or peace; the only thing that Islam demands from them is either to have îmân and become real Muslims or to admit

---

[1] **Maktûbât, II,** 69th letter. A literal translation of the letter occupies the sixteenth chapter of the third fascicle of **Endless Bliss**.

the jizya and become Muslims theoretically. In order that they may attain one of these two, it commands Muslims to perform jihâd against the dictators who tyrannise over them. The jihâd by using power can be performed with the command of the head of the State or of the commandant appointed by him. One's attack against unbelievers by himself is not jihâd but incitement to sedition. It is surprizing that when beginning to interpret the sûrat al-Mâ'ida, Sayyid Qutb, too, explained these two kinds of country correctly, thus concealing his own point of view.

Imâm Muhammad ash-Shaibânî wrote: "The commandment of jihâd descended gradually. At the beginning of Islam, it was commanded not to meet the polytheists, to keep away from them and to treat them softly. Afterwards, the second command descended, saying, 'Communicate Islam to the unbelievers in soft, beautiful words! Respond to all Ahl al-kitâb (Jews and Christian) mildly and beautifully.' In the third command, it was only 'permitted' to fight with the unbelievers. In the fourth command, which said, 'When the disbelievers torment you, fight against them,' it became fard to oppose them. Fifthly, when the Islamic State was established in Medina, the command, 'Fight against them all the time except in the four months,' was revealed. In the âyat which descended sixthly it was commanded for the State, the army, to fight with the unbelievers all the time. Thus, jihâd became fard kifâya; if the State does not make preparations for it and does not perform it, all Muslims will be punished in Hell. It should always make preparations for jihâd, thus, the whole nation will escape punishment. At peace and when there is agreement, Muslims should not attack suddenly. First the unbelievers should be informed that the agreement has been broken. When they attack dâr al-Islâm, it is fard 'ain, fard for every Muslim, woman or man, to fight under the army's command, against those cruel people."[1]

Sayyid Qutb wrote correctly about jihâd in his book **Milestones,** similarly to what we wrote about it above. Yet, he could not help repeating his above quoted thoughts in this book, either. It is a sign of hypocrisy of him to explain Islam in this manner in one of his books and in that manner in his another book. Communists, too, represent themselves differently in different countries and conceal themselves.

---

[1] Translation of Imâm Muhammad ash-Shaibânî's **As-siyar al-kabîr,** p. 82.

Again in **World's Peace and Islam,** he wrote:

"Peace and order in Islam means the practice of Allah's Word (Will), which means the establishment of justice and safety among the entire humanity."

Islam provides for peace and order in dâr al-Islâm. For this, it is sufficient for Muslims and dhimmîs in dâr al-Islâm to obey Islam's commands and prohibitions, since peace and order can be maintained only by following the commands and prohibitions of Allâhu ta'âlâ. Those who do not follow them are brought to the right course with the chasticements which, again, are dictated by Islam. Muslims do not fight for the comfort, peace and ease of the unbelievers in dâr al-harb. In fact, unbelievers can attain peace and order not through war but by embracing Islam or by accepting to pay the jizya. Wherever the Qur'ân is obeyed, peace, ease and justice happen by themselves. It is for this reason that Allâhu ta'âlâ bestowed Islam on His human creatures. Muhammad's ('alaihi 's-salâm) prophethood is His compassion for all human creatures. Therefore, Muslims perform jihâd in order to make unbelievers attain peace and ease through this unique way. They sacrifice their lives and wealth in order that all the people on the earth may be honoured by being Muslims. Allâhu ta'âlâ declared that He has created all human beings so that they become Muslims. He commands all of them to become Muslims. He promises that He will give great blessings in the Hereafter to those who perform jihâd for this salvation of His human creatures. The spread of His Word means the spread of Kalimat at-tawhîd, thus jihâd means the spread of Kalimat at-tawhîd, that is, îmân. The only way of providing people with justice, peace, order and safety is the spreading of Kalimat at-tawhîd all over the world. World's peace can be established only by doing so. It was declared in a hadîth quoted in **As-siyar al-kabîr, "I was commanded to fight with people. I will fight until they say, 'Lâ ilâha illa'llâh,' "** Ibn 'Âbidîn wrote in **ad-Durr al-mukhtâr:** "Jihâd is intended to call all people to îmân, and for the state to fight against the dictators who prevent them from hearing and admitting this call. The individual's Jihâd is to help the Islamic army by praying and giving all sorts of material and mental support. Jihâd is fard kifâya. It is fard 'ain for all Muslims including women and children to help the State when the enemy attacks. If there is sufficient money in the State's treasury, collection of money or property from the people is makrûh tahrîma; if the State's money does not suffice, it is permissible to

ask for the people's help." Any help collected by force should be payed back later.

It is fard kifâya for Muslims to make and use in jihâd all kinds of weapons that unbelievers have. In the last decades of this century, unbelievers have been making cold war through every kind of publication and propaganda and ceaselessy attacking Islam, mainly for the purpose of misleading the young people. Muslim men should make atomic bombs, rockets, jet planes and electronic apparatuses on the one hand, and on the other hand they should stand against the psychological warfare conducted by unbelievers. They should teach the superiority, the uses of Islam to Muslims, to Muslim youngsters by means of books, magazines, newspapers, radios and motion pictures both within the country and abroad. For doing this, they should learn both religious and scientific branches of Islamic knowledge. Of old, scientific knowledge also used to be taught in Islamic madrasas. Those who want to render a service to Islam and to be able to thwart the mendacities and slanders of the enemies of Islam, should be well-learned at least in high school level knowledge and in the basic teachings of the Ahl as-Sunna today. Those who are inefficient in one of these two will be rather harmful than useful to Islam. The saying "A semi-scholar takes away one's faith," is well-known. These should be done by men. When men work, there will be no hard labour left for women to do. In every village the State should open courses for teaching the Qur'ân, and every child, regardless of sex, should be taught the Qur'ân and the fundamental teachings of Islam. Old men and women should undertake this task. Every Muslim should send his son to high school and to a university after teaching him religious knowledge. If Muslims do not educate their children, State affairs, administrative and commanding posts, media of propaganda and executive organs will be in the hands of unbelievers and apostates. They will spread disbelief and torment Muslims. For serving Islam, it is necessary for men to graduate from the university and to study even further. Islam and disbelief conflict every day. Certainly one of them will overcome the other. The idiots who do not take part in this warfare for survival and who heedlessly sit on the fence will suffer punishment in both this world and the next. Those who help the State that fights against the enemies of Islam as much as they can, will be rewarded for jihâd in the next world. By making jihâd against the fierce, unjust unbelievers who prevent the spread of Islamic knowledge, attack Islam with their papers, radios and

televisions, exploit their nations and spend all their income in their own enjoyment and amusement and in making people their slaves, we are commanded to rescue these innocent people from their talons and guide them to happiness. This order, this 'ibâda, can be done by helping the State, the army of jihâd. If it is done without the State's permission, it is not jihâd but fitna and anarchy. Allâhu ta'âlâ helps the working people. He dislikes and does not help those who sit idly.

It was declared in a hadîth quoted in al-Bukhârî's and Muslim's **Sahîhain** and explained in **Barîqa** and **Al-hadîqa** that those who would be called Muslims would part into seventy-three groups. These groups of different beliefs cannot unite with one another. First it is necessary to unify them in belief. Those who say, "Let's unify the various groups of Muslims," should be sincere in that they should be unified on the truth, for only what the Ahl as-Sunna scholars have taught is true among all of them. It was declared in the Hadîth that the remaining seventy-two groups would go to Hell on account of their heretical beliefs. The unification of Muslims on the truth requires for all of them to hold the same belief, the Ahl as-Sunna i'tiqâd. For accomplishing this, we should read the books, magazines and papers writing about what the Ahl as-Sunna scholars have reported and provide them for our acquintances. We should strive hard to spread this knowledge. We should check our children every evening when they are back from school, and if the teacher sabotages their moral values and tries to undermine their religious beliefs, we should report him to the Ministry of Education and transfer them to a school with conscientious, honourable, learned teachers who are men of Allâhu ta'âlâ. We should prevent our children from being dragged on to endless perdition and we should be quite vigilent lest they should fall into the traps of the enemies of Islam. We should send our children to the teachers of the Qur'ân before they reach the school-age. We should strive to illuminate their fresh brains and pure souls with the light of the Qur'ân al-kerîm. This is the only way of raising our children as Muslims. A country can remain Muslim only if the children are brought up as Muslims. These writings constitute the ideological jihâd, and this jihâd is fard like the jihâd through warfare.

51 - In his book **World's Peace and Islam,** Sayyid Qutb wrote:

"Zakât is collected from the main wealth in a ratio of two-and-a-half per cent every year. The state collects this tax as it collects any other tax. It is the state again which is in charge of its

expenditure. It is not a procedure that takes place between two individuals face to face. Zakât is a tax. The state collects it and spends it on certain places. Zakât is not an individual gift of alms that passes from hand to hand.

"If, today, some people divide the zakât of their property by themselves and distribute it with their own hands, this is not the way or system which Islam commands."

Sayyid Qutb, being unable to refrain from repeating Ibn Taimiyya's words on zakât, disagreed with the Ahl as-Sunna scholars also on this point. Mawdûdî and Hamidullah, too, write the same about zakât. The four madhhabs of the Ahl as-Sunna unanimously report that **'zakât'** means 'to give (tamlîk) a certain part of one's fully possessed **zakât goods** obtained in a halâl way to seven out of eight kinds of Muslims decribed in the Qur'ân al-kerîm'. In the Hanafî madhhab, it can be given even to only one of them. These seven kinds of Muslims are: faqîr; miskîn; 'âmil, the collector of the zakât of stock animals and that of farm products called 'ushr; one who is on hajj or ghazâ; one who is far away from his home or property; one in debt; the slave who is to be set free. It is commanded in the Qur'ân to give zakât also to the eighth class, i.e. people called al-muallafat al-qulûb who were some disbelievers, who were hoped to become Muslims or whose harm was to be prevented, or some weak Muslims who had newly embraced Islam. Rasûlullah ('alaihi 's-salâm) had given zakât to all these three kinds of people. But Hadrat 'Umar (radiy-allâhu 'anh) who was in charge of Bayt al-mâl during the time of Hadrat Abû Bakr (radiy-Allâhu 'anh), quoted an âyat-i-kerîma, which is recorded in Ibn Âbidîn, and a hadîth, which is known as the hadîth of Mu'âdh and which the same source reports to exist in all the (books of hadîth called) **Kutûb-i-sitta**,[1] and said that Rasûlullâh ('alaihi 's-salâm) had abolished the payment of zakât to al-muallafat al-qulûb. The Khalîfa and all the Sahâbat al-kirâm admitted this and came to an agreement, which is called **(ijmâ)**, on the fact that it had been abolished (by the Messenger of Allah), and therefore people in the eighth group were no longer paid zakât. Abolition (of a religious principle) could be done as Rasûlullah 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wa sallam' was alive, and **ijmâ'** (on

[1] Its lexical meaning is 'The Six Books'. In the Islamic terminology, it signifies the six most famous books of hadîth written by six great Islamic scholars. Detailed information is available in the sixth chapter of the second fascicle of **Endless Bliss**.

the fact that it had been abolished) could be done after his death. Those who cannot comprehened this delicacy suppose that Hadrat 'Umar (radiy-Allâhu 'anh) himself abolished it and they castigate the Sahâbat al-kirâm and fiqh scholars. As it is reported in **Badâyi'** and other books, it is always permissible to give goods or money to the enemy for the benefit of Islam and to prevent their harm, but it can be given not in the name of zakât but from another division of Bayt al-mâl. Then, it has not been prohibited to give something to the persons called al-muallafat al-qulûb, but it has been prohibited to pay them zakât.

There are four types of property of zakât: gold and silver; commercial goods; quadruped stock animals; crops. The zakât of the products growing from the earth is called **'ushr.** It is written in **Majma' al-anhur** and **Radd al-muhtâr,** "The State had been collecting every kind of zakât from the rich until Khalîfa 'Uthmân (radiy-Allâhu 'anh) left it to them to deliever personally the zakât of gold and silver and commercial goods. He did this so that the officials who collected the zakât should not torment the people or take zakât from the debtors. Thus he also protected the debtors from imprisonment. All the Sahâbat al-kirâm agreed with him and ijmâ' took place. When the possessors of these kinds of property pay their zakât, the State cannot demand it. If it demands, it will be opposing the ijmâ'." To say that one cannot pay the zakât himself means to disignore the ijmâ' of the Sahâbat al-kirâm of the time of Hadrat 'Uthmân (radiy-Allâhu 'anh). The Ahl as-Sunna scholars, having comprehended the greatness of the Sahâbat al-kirâm, did not follow their own points of view and understanding but adapted themselves to the jimâ' of the Sahâbat al-kirâm.

The Ahl as-Sunna scholars declare that the rich person has to hand his zakât to the poor. If a rich person nourishes an orphan under his guardianship with the intention of zakât, he has not paid the zakât by doing so. He should give the food to the child and the child should consume its own possession. If a rich person puts the gold on a table and a poor one takes it from the table, it will not be accepted as zakât; the rich person must see the poor or his representative take it. If he, with the intention of zakât, lets a poor person live in his house and if he does not charge him, it will not be accepted as zakât, for he has to give goods to the poor. Of the four types of property of zakât, the legal (mashrû') State collects the zakât of certain animals and crops and of the commercial property brought into the city from abroad. But the

State has to distribute what it has collected to poor Muslims, i.e., it collects it as the poor's proxy. The money of zakât cannot be spent for any of the charitable deeds such as building mosques, fountains, roads or dams or performing hajj or jihâd. Every type of zakât should be handed to one of the seven kinds of people or to his proxy. The State cannot use the zakât it has collected in other fields but gives to the seven kinds of people. It is more blessed for a rich person to give it to his poor relatives, poor pious Muslims and to the poor who study knowledge. The Hadîth says, **"O my umma! I swear by Allâhu ta'âlâ, who has sent me as the Prophet, that Allâhu ta'âlâ does not accept the zakât given to others while one has poor relatives,"** that is, it will not be rewarded in the next world. It cannot be given to mulhids, that is, to those men of bid'a who have become unbelievers like the Mushabbiha.

It is a revolution to overthrow and annihilate the State. Muslims who disobey the commands of a mashrû' State[1] are **bâghîs** (rebels). As it is written in Ibn 'Âbidîn's **Radd al-muhtâr,** if a Muslim who lives in dâr al-harb or under the oppression of bâghîs or of a cruel government has given them the zakât of animals and 'ushr and knows that what he gave them has been handed by them to one of the certain seven kinds of people, or if he himself has distributed them to the poor, a mashrû' State cannot take zakât and 'ushr again; but, if they have taken the zakât of gold and silver and commercial goods, the rich person has to repeat it by giving zakât to the poor. Some books considered bâghîs and cruel governments to be poor people if they were Muslims, and regarded it to be jâ'iz for them to collect every kind of zakât and spend them as they wished. This clearly tells that zakât has to be given to the poor.

In **Durr-i Yektâ,** one of the most valuable Turkish 'ilm al-hâl books, it is written: "Of the four types of property of zakât, gold and silver and commercial goods are called **al-amwâl al-bâtina** (covered possessions). It is not permissible to investigate covered possessions and to ask for their zakât. It has been left to their possessors to estimate the amount of such possessions and pay their zakât. The possessor is free to pay his zakât to any poor person he likes. The animals of zakât and farm products are called **al-amwâl az-zâhira.** It has not been left to the owner to estimate

[1] Mashrû' means legitimate. A state that is mashrû' is one that is legitimate according to Islam.

the amount of al-amwâl az-zâhira and to distribute its zakât to the poor. These will be done by the ‘âmil, the official sent by the imâm of Muslims.”

What men need and keep for use is a possession. A few seeds of wheat, a spoonful of soil, a draught of water are not possessions, since not all or some people keep them.

If paper money would not be used with the value written on them, they would be of no value, for these pieces of paper, when prohibited to be used as currency, would no longer be in circulation, become useless and would not be kept for use. Ibn ’Âbidîn wrote on “Sarf” in his **Radd al-muhtâr:** “If flûs (copper coin) is legal tender, it will be money worth the value written on it. If the value written on it is cancelled, it becomes worthless.” So is the paper money. He wrote on the thirteenth page, “The promissory note has two meanings; the value written on it and the paper’s own value. The value written on it indicates the possession which is **dain,** that is, one’s own possession which one does not have with oneself. The paper’s own value is very little.” He wrote on the sixteenth page that the values written on the notes or checks of salary that will be received from the State indicate one’s possessions that are dain. So are the values on paper money.

The zakât of one’s full possessions, that is, his property which he is permitted and able to save or use, should be given. If they are not his full possessions, their zakât need not be given. If the property of zakât is in his hands, it is called **’ain.** If someone else keeps it, it is called **dain.** In trade, property is ’ain or dain under different conditions. **Mabî’,** goods that have been bought, become one’s possesions after contract but it is not permissible to use them before delivery. For this reason, these goods are not one’s full possessions before delivery. They cannot be included in the calculation of zakât before delivery. Before the **saman** (exchange, payment) of sold property is paid, it can be given to anybody if it is ’ain in the agreement, that is, if it is sold for cash. If the saman is dain in the agreement, thait is, if it is sold on credit, it can be given only to the debtor (buyer). For this reason, the saman also will be included in the calculation of zakât before it has been received.

Whether ’ain or dain, one year after one’s full possessions of al-amwal al-bâtina reach the amount of nisâb (the border of richness), it is fard to set aside one-fortieth of it and dispense it as zakât. It is written in the book **Ad-durr al-mukhtâr** that its zakât is dispensed in five manners, as follows:

1) If some dain property is in a poor person's hands and if all or a part of it is donated to that poor person, the zakât of the property that has been donated will have been paid as dain, too. If dain property in a rich person's hands is donated to him, its zakât has to be paid to the poor as 'ain in addition by the donor.

2) The zakât of property which is 'ain should be given as 'ain. That is, in order to pay the zakât of a property which is present, the owner will separate one-fortieth of this property which is in his hands and give it to the poor.

3) The zakât of property which is dain cannot be paid as dain. It should be paid as 'ain, that is, the zakât of your property which someone else keeps must be paid out of your property which is present in your hands. If you have no property present, you ask for and take as much as the amount of the zakât of your property from the one who keeps your property and then give it to the poor.

4) It is not permissible to pay the zakât of property which is 'ain as dain, that is, it is not permissible to donate what you have lent to other poor people to a poor person as the zakât of your property which is present in your hands. But, it is permissible for you to command the poor person to get the debt which someone else owes you, as the zakât of your property which is in your hands, for it will become 'ain when the poor man takes the property or gold from the debtor, and thus the zakât of your property which is 'ain will have been paid as 'ain. The zakât of property which a poor person keeps as dain cannot be paid from that dain property, for the remainder will become 'ain when you take it from the poor person and the zakât of 'ain will have been paid as dain, which is not permissible.

5) If you donates a part of the dain which a poor person owes you to that poor person, the zakât of that part will have been paid. It will be necessary to pay the zakât of the remaining part separately as 'ain. You cannot count what you have donated as the zakât of the remaining part, for the remainder will become 'ain when you take it back and the zakât of 'ain will have been paid as dain, which is not permissible.

It is written in **Al-fiqhu 'ala 'l-madhâhibi 'l-arba'a,** which covers the teachings of fiqh according to each of the four madhhabs separately, that whereas it is necessary in the three madhhabs to pay the zakât of paper money, its zakât is paid when the gold or silver equivalent of it is obtained in the Hanbalî madhhab.

The zakât of paper money is paid not out of their own value but out of the values written on them, for their own value is very little and it cannot reach the border of richness. As already written above, the values on them indicate the property which is dain. Since the zakât of dain cannot be paid as dain, the zakât of paper money cannot be paid in paper money. It is necessary to pay it in 'ain, that is, to get the dain property into your hands and then hand it to the poor person. Moreover, any kind of debt must be paid from the property of zakât first. While there is property of zakât, that is, gold and silver or commercial goods, it is not permissible to pay the debt by giving other property, for example, rugs and pearls that are used in the house and whose zakât is not to be paid. The zakât of paper money, too, is a debt which one owes to the poor. One has to pay this debt from the property of zakât. Gold is the property of zakât of the person who is not a tradesman but who is rich only by possessing paper money, because paper money is the equivalent of gold. They are not the equivalent of silver. If a person has various kinds of property of zakât such as gold, silver, commercial goods and zakât animals, he has to pay his debt from gold and silver first.[1] The goods a person who is not a merchant buys are not his commercial goods. It is not permissible for him to buy something other than gold to pay the poor as zakât, for the goods that are not commercial for him cannot be paid as zakât. He has to buy gold and pay it.

In order to give the zakât of commercial goods, their buying price must be as much as the amount of nisâb in gold or silver money, and one-fortieth of the goods themselves or of their value will be given. Ash-Sharnblâlî says in the explanation of **d-Durar,** "If the metal coins called flûs are current, or if they are commercial goods, it is wâjib to pay the zakât out of their value." It is declared in a hadîth quoted in **Hidâya, "Calculating the value, five dirham of silver will be paid for two hundred dirham."** As it is seen, for the zakât of flûs and paper money, not they themselves but as much gold as their value must be paid. Those who are not merchants should pay the zakât of their paper money only in gold. Merchants may pay the zakât of their paper money either in gold or from the goods which they sell, but they cannot pay it from other goods.[2]

A person might come forth and say:

---

[1] **ad-Durr al-mukhtâr,** and **Radd al-muhtâr,** p. 8.

[2] For detailed information on zakât, see **Endless Bliss, V,** 1.

"It was in ancient times to pay zakât in gold. Today, gold is not used. Paper money is used everywhere. Now, to say that zakât has to be paid in gold is to arouse difficulty for Muslims. Allâhu ta'âlâ declares, 'Do not arouse difficulty, show easiness!' The use of paper money has become al-balwâ al-'umûmiyya. The scholars have given permission to use the thing which has become al-balwâ al-'umûmiyya. Then, why should not zakât be paid in paper money today?"

These words are not correct. They are both wrong and slanderous against Islamic scholars, for the following reasons:

'Do not arouse difficulty in the religion,' does not mean 'Look about for the easiest way of doing everything.' It means that one can do the easy way Islam allows. For example, when it is difficult for one to wash one's feet because of illness or very cold weather, one can rub (mas'h) his mests[1] lightly with wet hands, for Islam has permitted it. Yet you cannot put on your mests before washing your feet for easiness, because Islam has not permitted this easiness. The sick person can wash his feet with the help of someone else. If it is cold, he can use warm water and put on his mests after this. Islam has permitted this easiness also. It is not permissible to slight the words of religious scholars and exceed the easiness shown in fiqh books. Those who strive to change Islam according to their own reasons and points of view are called **religion reformers** or **zindîqs.** Such zindîqs have increased in Egypt and in Hijâz today. They explain Islam in the way they wish. The religion-merchants, who give these heretics and zindîqs such titles as 'profound religious scholar of the present century', 'mujtahid', 'mujaddid' and 'martyr' and who translate and sell their poisonous books and who earn money by demolishing the religion and îmân of the people, have been increasing in our country, too.

Our scholars have permitted **al-balwâ al-'umûmiyya,** that is, the things that are so widespread that it is hard to dispense with them, after having studied the books minutely and finding among various ijtihâds the easiest one even if it would be da'îf and reporting it to the people. When al-balwâ al-'umûmiyya is in question, it is permissible to give fatwâ according to the most da'îf words of mujtahids. But, no scholar in any century has ever said permissible about something which no mujtahid had said to be permissible, nor can he say. As for religion reformers who do not

---

[1] Light soleless shoes. See **Endless Bliss**, IV, 3.

belong to any madhhab, they write everything which comes to their minds. Both the worship and the faith of those who follow them will be corrupted.

It is very easy to pay zakât in gold. It is not difficult at all. It is not necessary to buy gold. A rich person who insists on distributing his zakât to the poor in paper money does as the books **Ashbâh** and **Radd al-muhtâr** write how a rich person can donate the debt a poor person owes him as his zakât to him: he borrows from his wife or somebody else some gold of the same value as the paper money which he wants to distribute and is less than the amount of nisâb. He says to a pious poor Muslim, "I will pay zakât to you and to some of my acquaintances. Our religion commands to pay zakât in gold. In order to make it easy for you to change the gold into paper money, I want you to appoint so and so **as your proxy to take your zakât and gift it to anybody he wants.** Thus, you will help me to follow Islam and, for this, you will be additionally rewarded in the next world!" A person whom the rich man trusts is appointed as the proxy. He gives the gold as zakât to the proxy when the poor person is absent. This proxy of the poor person takes the gold and, a few minutes later, presents it as a gift to the rich person. And the rich person distributes his paper money to that and other poor people, to schools for teaching the Qur'ân, to Muslims who render service to the religion or perform jihâd. If he distributes them to those whom it is not permissible to give and those who do not perform salât, he will not be rewarded in the next world though he will escape the punishment of not paying zakât. He returns the gold to the person from whom he has borrowed it. If he has to give more zakât, he repeats this procedure.

To a person with îmân, worshipping is not difficult but easy and sweet.

52 - Again, in the book **World's Peace and Islam,** Seyyid Qutb wrote:

"Some people say on behalf of the religion, 'The [money and any] property the zakât of which has been paid might not be considered as the property stocked, for the duty concerning property is zakât only. After zakât is paid there is nothing wrong in withholding property from circulation, [i.e. in not using it at all].' This is not true. The owner of personal property cannot withhold it from circulation or reserve it. In order to meet the need of Bayt al-mâl, the government may commandeer it, take the excess of it and distribute it to the poor."

This is not an expression of objective learning or understanding, but it is his own opinion and thought. He wanted to adapt Islam to his own point of view and political thoughts. Hadrat al-Imâm ar-Rabbânî, whom Mawdûdî also had to praise, wrote:

"He who wants to attain endless bliss should adapt himself to Muhammad (ʼalaihi ʼs-salâm). To become honoured by following him, it is not necessary to abandon the world altogether. When zakât, which is fard, is paid, the world will have been abandoned. The property will escape harm, for, the property the zakât of which has been paid becomes immune to harm. The remedy of rescuing worldly property from harm is to pay its zakât. Though it is better to give all property, paying its zakât is equivalent to giving all of it."[1]

The property of which zakât has been given does not harm its owner no matter how long it is kept in its owner's possession. It is not a guilt to withdraw a property from circulation if its zakât has been given. If the government commandeers this property, it will be cruelty. By that it is not a guilt, it is meant that the owner will not be judged and punished for it in the next world. However, he will not gain the rewards of having performed charitable deeds, of having used such property in commerce and arts, and of having helped Islam and Muslims; he cannot attain high degrees in the next world. Great scholar Hadrat ʼAbd al-Ghanî an-Nablusî wrote in his book **al-Hadîqa** that zakât protected property against harm. Rasûlullah (ʼalaihi ʼs-salâm) said, **"Protect your property from harm by paying its zakât."** This hadîth is written also in al-Manâwî's **Kunûz ad-daqâʼiq** with its source. When the âyat, **"There is very bitter punishment for those who conceal their golds and silvers and who do not distribute them in Allâhu taʼâlâ's way,"** descended, Rasûlullah (ʼalaihi ʼs-salâm) said, **"Zakât was commanded in order to purify Muslims' possessions. The property whose zakât is given will not be kanz, that is, it will not be considered as property which is stored."** A hadîth declares, **"There is very bitter punishment in the next world because of the property whose zakât has not been given."** Sayyid Qutb wrote as if he did not believe these hadîths. It is declared in a hadîth reported by at-Tabarânî and al-Manâwî, **"The property whose zakât has been given is not kanz."** Rasûlullah (ʼalaihi ʼs-salâm) said that the property whose zakât was given would not be

---

[1] **Maktûbât, I,** 165th letter.

considered as stored property, and Sayyid Qutb said that this was incorrect. This shows what kind of a person Sayyid Qutb was.

53 - Again in **World's Peace and Islam,** he wrote:

"The government takes not only the tax but also part of personal property as much as it needs free and not to be returned. It spends it on general needs of the society."

Jewdet Pasha, who put Allâhu ta'âlâ's commands into the form of law-articles, says in the 95th article of his **Majalla, "One cannot command anybody to use others' property."** For example, one cannot command anybody to give a certain person's property to another person. It is written on its 96th article and in **ad-Durr al-mukhtâr, "A person's property cannot be used without his permission."** Property is something which one possesses. A hadîth says, **"If a Muslim's property is taken without his consent, it will not be halâl."** This hadîth sherîf is written in the book **Kunûz ad-daqâ'iq** by Imâm al-Manâwî, in **Musnad** by Imâm Ahmad and in **Sunan** by Abû Dâwûd. This means that the state cannot take something illegitimately or more than the legitimate amount of something from the people. It cannot burden the people with illegitimate taxes, either. If it does, this will be usurpation and cruelty; it will have to return the property which it has taken by force and without a hearty consent, to their owners. It is peculiar to socialist countries for the government to commandeer or to usurp the people's property. There cannot be a socialistic government in Islam. In explaining the ninety-eighth article of **Majalla,** Haji Reshîd Pasha says that **ishtirâk amwâl** (collective ownership, communism) is never permissible in Islam. Nor is there a capitalistic system in Islam. The fard of zakât eradicates these two homes of cruelty which gnaw at humanity. There is social justice in Islam. Everybody gets the reward of his labour and of the sweat of his brow. Nobody casts covetous eyes on others' possessions. Neither the government nor the rulers may exploit the people. They cannot use the money of **Bayt al-mâl,** the treasury of the State, for their own pleasures.

The government carries out the duties which Islam commands and the services which the people need. It finances them by means of the public treasury called **Bayt al-mâl.** It is not permissible to take it from the people by force. The treasury of Islamic state is Bayt al-mâl, and the revenue of the state is the revenue of the Bayt al-mâl. The state should not exhaust the sources of Bayt al-mâl or waste them or spend them on illegitimate places. If the revenue of Bayt al-mâl does not suffice

for jihâd and for legitimate services, it will be permissible for it to borrow money justfully from the people. But, afterwards, it has to be paid back, unless the lenders agree to a waiver. If it does not run the sources of Bayt al-mâl and if it does not spend Bayt al-mâl on legitimate places, it will have done cruelty. There is extensive information on this subject in the fifth volume of **ad-Durr al-mukhtâr.** If the state provides sources of revenue for the Bayt al-mâl and uses them within the borders of legitimacy (drawn by Islam), it will suffice for all its duties and it will not have to ask for any help from the people.

In explaining the thirty-third article of **Majalla,** Haji Reshîd Pasha says that Islam does not permit to meddle with the property of anybody. Even a person who is in urgent need cannot encroach on others' rights. It has been permitted for a hungry person to eat someone else's bread without his permission, yet he has to pay for it later. His hunger or being in the danger of death does not cause someone else to lose his rights on his property. Even the property taken in case of urgent need from someone else must be paid for. That the necessities cause the forbidden things to be done cannot cause anybody to lose his right.

It is written in the book **Barîqa** that the word 'Muslims' in the hadîth, **"Allâhu ta'âlâ accepts the thing which Muslims consider to be good,"** means 'Muslims who are profound 'ulamâ', that is, mujtahids'. Things incompatible with what these scholars have reported are never acceptable.

In the explanation of the fifty-eighth article, he says that with the command of the government someone's property may be bought for its value and added to (a newly constructed) road. But unless its cost is paid it cannot be expropriated from him. When the government commands, he can be forced to sell it, but it cannot be taken without paying the money.

Communism is not something new. The lexicon **Burhân-i qâti'** quotes **Majdak,** the leading figure of the religion of fire-worshippers (Magianism, Zoroastrianism) who lived in the times of Persian Shah Kubad, as having said:

"Fire will be worshipped. Eveything is everybody's property. It is normal to exchange wives. The possessions and ways of life of all people are equal. Everybody lives in society and cannot have personal property. All people are equal and they are partners in everything. If someone asks someone else to give him his wives, he should give them. The rich should share their property with the poor and meet their need."

Because that so-called religion suited the purposes of lazy people, vagabonds and especially womanizers, it spread rapidly. Kubad Shah, too, was an evil person given to debaucheries. He also admitted communism. When his son Nûshirvân came into power, he put base Majdak and his eighty thousand men to the sword and exterminated the nuisance of communism. The justice of Nûshirvân Shah is praised in a hadîth-i-sherîf. It is obvious that those who prepared the communistic revolution in Russia in 1917 and caused thousands of citizens to slaughter one another and a big nation to be enslaved by a small savage minority followed the path of the idiots annihilated by Nûshirvân Shah.

The duty of the Islamic state is to protect the property, life and chastity of the people, to get back the rights of the oppressed from the cruel. The government can never violate the property, life and chastity of the people.

54 - Again in the book **World's Peace and Islam,** Sayyid Qutb wrote:

"Personal property cannot be made from plunder, robbery, usurpation, theft, bribes, deceit, interest, profiteering or ways which cause them. The state may add it to its treasury, wholely or partly, whenever it wants. Historical examples indicate that the state has been given this right entirely."

He is wrong once again. It is true that such unjust earnings cannot be halâl. The state has to get them back, not whenever it wants but immediately. But what the state takes back cannot be its own. It should transfer them to their owners. The duty of the state is to get the oppressed person's due from the cruel one. If the state, instead of giving them to the oppressed, adds them to its treasury, the state is cruel, too. In the section about giving salary to women from the Bayt al-mâl in the fifth volume of **Radd al-muhtâr,** Ibn Âbidîn wrote: "Property obtained in a harâm way, for example, that which is usurped, should be returned to its owner. Such property cannot be Bayt al-mâl's. It cannot be common property for all Muslims, either." Property expropriated illegally from the people, i.e. the usurped property, cannot be owned by the state. It should be returned to its owner or, if the owner is dead, to the inheritors. If the owner is unknown, it should be dispensed to the poor. It is harâm for those who know the owner to get or use it.

If a person, though he knows its owner, does not return the property harâm for him, and if he expects to be rewarded in the next world for using it in a charitable deed such as building a

mosque or giving alms, he becomes an unbeliever. And if others who know that the property was harâm for him say that he has earned thawâb, they also become unbelievers, for it is fard for him to give this property or, if it has been spoilt, its match or, if it does not have a match, its cost to its owner or to his inheritors, or, if he cannot find them, to dispense it to the poor with the intention that its thawâb be given to them. It is harâm to use it for something else. It is harâm for others also to buy (or accept as a gift, alms, etc.) and use this property if they know that it is harâm.

If a person mixes the property he has obtained in a way that is harâm with other property earned in a halâl or harâm way and gives alms from this mixture and expects thawâb from it, he does not become an unbeliever, for it becomes his own, yet foul, property when it is mixed. He owes its owner. Though it is harâm for him to use it before paying its cost, it is not harâm for someone else to buy and use it.

55 - Again in **World's Peace and Islam** Seyyid Qutb wrote:

"Muslims are revolutionists. They revolt against cruelty and injustice."

This idea of his does not conform with what the Islamic scholars reported. Muslims do not revolt. They do not arouse sedition and mischief. It is a sin to revolt against even a cruel government. It is not jihâd but fitna (mischief) to violate the laws and commands. Sayyid Qutb, Mawdûdî and those who have been deceived by them misinterpreted the thirty-ninth âyat of the sûrat al-Hajj, an offense that brought them destruction. This âyat states, **"Jihâd against the cruel who attack Muslims has been permitted."** When the unbelievers of Mecca oppressed, injured and killed Muslims, the Sahâba repeatedly asked for permission to fight against them, and their requests were turned down with a mollifying rejection. This âyat was revealed upon the migration to Medina, permitting the newly founded Islamic State to perform jihâd against the cruel in Mecca. This âyat does not permit Muslims to oppose their cruel government; it permits the Islamic State to make jihâd against the armies of cruel dictators who prevent their peoples from hearing about Islam and becoming Muslims. The hadîths quoted on the forty-first and seventy-first pages of the translation of **As-siyar al-kabîr** declare, **"Paradise is harâm for a person who revolts against the ruler,"** and **"Perform jihâd under the command of every ruler, just or cruel!"** Jihâd, as it is written in books means 'war against the unbelievers of other countries'. The hadîth given in the books **Radd al-muhtâr, Kâmil**

and al-Baihakî's **Shâ'b al-îmân,** declares, **"When you cannot correct something wrong, be patient! Allâhu ta'âlâ will correct it."** This hadîth commands not to oppose or revolt againt the laws but to advise through legitimate ways and to be patient. A hadîth quoted by al-Manâwî, at-Thirmidhî and at-Tabarânî declares, **"The most valuable jihâd is to make a statement guiding to the right way in the presence of a cruel sultan."** Scholars should advise the state officials as much as they can. But they should be very careful lest sedition should arise while performing al-amru bi 'l-ma'rûf; this means that Muslims neither revolt nor surrender to cruelty and injustice. They seek for their rights through legitimate ways. It is wâjib for every Muslim to obey the government's legitimate (mashrû') commands. No person's commands are to be carried out if they are harâm, yet one should not revolt against them and cause fitna.[1] One should not defy the cruel or dispute with them. For example, while it is one of the gravest sins not to perform salât, if a person's chief or commander is a cruel unbeliever and says, "Don't perform salât," he should answer, "With pleasure. I won't," and think of saying, "This will prevent the fitna. For it is harâm to cause fitna, which in effect would cause Muslims to be persecuted." However, he should perform salât in the absence of that cruel person.

'Abd al-Haqq ad-Dahlawî [d. 1052 A.H. (1642)], one of the great 'ulamâ' of Islam in India, wrote in the section captioned "Kitâb al-fitan" of his Persian commentary **Ashi'at al-lama'ât** to the invaluable hadîth book **Mishkat al-masâbih:** "Hudhaifa (radiy Allâhu 'anh), one of as-Sahâba said, 'I asked Rasûlullah (sall-Allâhu 'alaihi wa sallam) about the fitnas that will happen in the future for the evils that they imported terrified me. Keeping away from harmful things is more important than attaining useful things. 'Fitna', as used here, means 'confusion, fight among people'. Although a society wherein acts of harâm were running rife would be another source of fitna, there was no need to ask about this, since acts of harâm were commonly known. 'I said, "Oh Rasûl-Allah! We were bad people before becoming Muslim. Allâhu ta'âlâ, with your honourable existence, bestowed upon us the favour of Islam and perfections. Will there an evil time after

[1] Fitna means mischief, commotion, sedition, turmoil, chaos, instigation, etc. Any act, behaviour, statement, writing, article or attitude that would lead to harmful consequences is fitna, and therefore harâm, even if it is done with good intentions apparently.

these days of bliss?" **"Yes, there will!"** he said. I asked, "Will good days come again after that badness?" Again he declared, **"Yes, they will. But that time will be blurred."** That is, the good and the bad will be confused in those days. The hearts will not be as pure and clear as they were in the initial days. I'tiqâd's being sahîh, a'mâl's being sâlih and the leaders' justice will not be the same as those in the first century [of Islam]. Vices and bid'a will spread everywhere. The bad will go among the good, and bid'a will take place among the Sunna. I asked what 'blurred' meant. He declared, **"They are those who do not adapt my sunna and follow my path. They both perform 'ibâda and commit sins."** They do goodness and wickedness. They commit bid'a. I asked, "Will there come a bad time again after that good period?" He declared, **"Yes. There will be those who will call** [people] **to the doors of Hell. Those who will listen to them will be thrown into Hell."** I inquired, "O Rasûl-Allah! How will these people look like?" **"They, too, are human like us. They speak as we do,"** he said. That is, they will speak Arabic. Quoting âyats and hadîths, they will preach and give advice, but there will be no goodness or goodwill in their hearts. I said, "What do you command us to do if we reach their time?" He declared, **"Adhere to the Muslims' jamâ'a** (community) **and government."** I asked, "What shall we do if there is not a Muslim jamâ'a and government?" He declared, **"Get yourself into a corner. Never go among them. Live alone till you die!" '** He declared in a hadîth sherîf, **"After me, there will be such governments that will leave my path. Their hearts are the home of the Satan. Obey them, too! Do not revolt against them! Do not revolt even if you are beaten and your property is expropriated!"** That is, do not rise against the cruel government that attacks your property and lives; do not cause fitna; be patient and busy with your 'ibâdât; if you cannot protect yourselves against fitna in the town, take refuge in the forest; if you go into the forest and have to eat grass and leaves in order not to be among the holders of fitna, stay in the forest so you should not join them! He declared, **'Listen well and obey.'** This last command means that we should be very careful not to rise against the government and not to cause fitna." As it is understood from these hadîths and from the explanations of the 'ulamâ' of Islam, men of religious post should not get involved in the formation of the State and in law-making; they should not go into politics; they should not become tools in the hands of politicians; they should not advocate this or that form of regime.

The 'ulamâ' of Ahl as-Sunna obeyed this prohibition strictly and stated that religious men's getting involved in politics would be the same as holding burning fire.

It is idiocy to stand against power, to revolt against the government, since it is to throw oneself into danger, which is harâm. It is not permissible for a Muslim visiting non-Muslim countries to harm unbelievers' property, lives or chastity. One can receive benefit from unbelievers by pleasing them. It is more important to observe the rights of dhimmîs, unbelievers living in dâr al-Islâm, and of the harbîs, unbelievers coming as guests, tourists and merchants to the Muslim country, than it is to observe Muslims' rights. It is worse to attack or even to backbite and slander them than it is to attack Muslims. Muslims are never idle. They become powerful by studying religious and scientific knowledge hard. Thus, they become victorious and dominant. For a Muslim, jihâd does not mean to rise in rebellion against the government but to spread the religious knowledge.

Ibn 'Âbidîn wrote, "Certain sins become mubâh (permissible), and even fard (obligatory), under the oppression of a sultân or another cruel ruler who employs coercive methods, such as threats of death, imprisonment and torture, to get you to commit those sinful acts. It is sinful to disobey his commandments." It is written on the 91st page of **Berîqa,** "A hadîth says, **'Obey your commanders!'** Even if your commander is the most inferior one among you, it is wâjib to obey his orders agreeable with Islam. A sinful command should never be obeyed, regardless of whose command it is; yet it will be obeyed if disobedience causes fitna, for, as written in **Ashbâh,** it is permissible to commit minor harm in order to escape grave harm. It is wâjib to do the mubâh commanded by the ruler." 'Abd al-Ghanî an-Nablusî wrote on the 143rd page of **al-Hadîqa,** "It is not wâjib to obey a sultân's commands if they reflect his personal thoughts and predilections. If he is unjust, coercive and oppressive, however, it becomes a necessity to obey also his orders and prohibitions disagreeable with Allâhu ta'âlâ's rules. In fact, if the sultân commands that those who disobey him should be killed, it is not permissible for anybody to throw himself into danger. Detailed information on this subject is given in my commentary to **Hadiyyatu ibni 'l-'Imâd** and in the book **al-Matâlib al-wafiyya."**

Ibn 'Âbidîn wrote in the subject on 'Bâghî': "When Muslims freely perform 'ibâdât and live in peace in a country, it is not permissible for them to rebel against the government. If the

government oppresses and if opposing this oppression causes fitna, it is not permissible in this case, too. Helping such a ruler is a support given to cruelty. One should not help those who disobey him, either, for, one should not help in an action that is not permitted.[1] Those who rebel, for the purpose of seizing power, against the government that does not oppress people are called **'bâghîs',** and in this case Muslims should help the State against them. For a hadîth declares, **'May Allâhu ta'âlâ damn him who wakes fitna!'** If the rebels call the government and Muslims 'disbelievers' and attack Muslims' property and lives, they are called **'Khârijîs'.** Likewise, today, some people called **Wahhâbîs**[2] attack other Muslims and call them 'disbelievers' because they do not believe as they do. Since this behaviour is (one of those acts that are) definitely harâm, they themselves become disbelievers by doing so. Regardless of whether the **sultân** is fairminded or cruel, it is wâjib to obey his commandments agreeable with the Sharî'at. If the Khalîfa is a murtadd or insane or unable to practice Islam he is to be dismissed. If his dismissal would cause fitna and his staying in office would be less harmful, he is to be tolerated. If a Muslim assumes the office of Khalîfa by subjugation and force and seizes power, he is to be obeyed. A governor appointed by a non-Muslim government is obeyed if he practises Islamic rules. If he cannot put Islamic rules into practise, or if the governor is a kâfir, too, Muslims elect one from among them as muftî or head. The muftî practises Islamic rules. If this is not possible, either, which means a life of slavery, a possible fitna should be avoided. As it is understood from this passage, the fatwâ signed by Shaikh al-Islâm Hasan Hayrullah Effendi under duress for the dethronement of Sultân 'Abdul'azîz Khân and the fatwâ signed - when the fatwâ officer Hâji Nûrî Effendi refused to sign- by a bigot threatened with death for the dethronement of 'Abdulhamîd Khân II were not mashrû' (legal). It is written in the twelfth volume of **Türkiye Târîhi** (History of Turkey) that these fatwâs were not sahîh and were based on absolute falsehoods. Therefore, the two Sultans were the mashrû' Khalîfas till they passed away. And because of this turpitude, the Ottomans lost the wars of "93" (with Russia in 1877-1878) and "Balkan" and the

---

[1] The greatest cruelty is to prevent Muslims from performing 'ibâdât and from teaching religious knowledge to their children, to cause them to commit harâm and to spoil their îmân.

[2] Please see our publications **Advice for the Muslim, Endless Bliss, II, 34,** and **Confessions of a British Spy** for details about Wahhâbîs.

First World War; for, these three wars were started and directed not by Muslim governments but by secret revolutionists who had no connection with Islam.

56 - Sayyid Qutb, disguised in a hero of liberty, wrote in his book **Islamic Studies,**

"Those who do not stand and shout against the face of dictators and miscreants either commit a grave sin or behave in this manner because they are hypocritical in belief. Or they are utterly ignorant people who do not know real Islam." (Page 32)[1]

With statements of this sort he incited fitna among Muslims. As a matter of fact, a hadîth states, **"Fitna is asleep. May Allâhu ta'âlâ damn him who wakes fitna!"** and **"When you cannot correct something wrong, be patient! Allâhu ta'âlâ will correct it."** Hadrat al-Imâm ar-Rabbânî said that al-amru bi 'l-ma'rûf should be performed mildly. It was stated in a hadîth, **"He who cannot change the oppression of the cruel should migrate from there."**

"Islam is a struggle, an endless war. It is not Islamic to murmur prayers, to jingle the beads of rosary, to trust in the words, 'O my Allah, You protect us,' and to believe in that benevolence will rain from the sky." (Page 33)

The forty-seventh letter of the third volume of **Maktûbât**[1] by Hadrat al-Imâm ar-Rabbânî is a perfect answer to these writings of Sayyid Qutb and helps one understand immediately what kind of path Sayyid Qutb followed. Allâhu ta'âlâ commands to pray and to trust in Him, and He says He likes those who pray and trust in Him, but Sayyid Qutb made fun of those who prayed to and trusted in Allâhu ta'âlâ. The Qur'ân and the Hadîth command to tell beads. They praise those who tell their beads, but he denied this. It is common to Muslims and unbelievers to make preparations for war, to hold fast to the means and to make the most modern media of defence; however, there is the weapon of tawakkul and prayer in Muslims in addition.

Hadrat Ibn Hajar al-Makkî wrote: "A person who disbelieves in saying prayers, in fact, disbelieves in the Qur'ân al-kerîm and the Hadîth according to most Islamic scholars and, therefore, he is an unbeliever. The thing asked in prayers will either be accepted and given, or it will be given in the next world, or it will cause a

---

[1] Reference to the Turkish translation of Sayyid Qutb's **Islamic Studies.**

[2] For the translation of this letter, see **Endless Bliss, III, 18.**

sin to be forgiven. Allâhu ta'âlâ likes His human creatures to pray and beg Him. There are conditions for the prayers to be accepted. One of them is that what you consume and wear should be halâl, and another is to ask them from your heart, that is, sincerely. It is stated in a hadîth, **'Allâhu ta'âlâ likes those who pray very much. He who prays and does not give up hope will certainly attain one of the three things promised.'** It is a sunna to use rosary."[1] Sayyid Qutb's writing, "It is not Islamic," about these kinds of worship, which are stated in the Hadîth, shows what kind of a reformer he was.

"Islam never keeps in view to make war in order to convert anyone to the religion with coercive methods" (Page 33)

"The thing asked of the Prophet of Islam and his followers is to convert people to the religion by endeavouring and showing zeal with mild invitations." (Page 41)

We have proved in detail in the forty-ninth paragraph that these writings were wrong and slanderous. Muslims treat and advise (al-amru bi 'l-ma'rûf) everybody mildly. Muslims of dâr al-Islâm are commanded to get on well with the unbelievers of dâr al-harb.

"All the early conquests were intended to make Islam the single religion of mankind not by using force but through free invitation." (Page 43)

The hadîths that refute this idea have been quoted above.

"Islam commands everybody to bring justice into effect on the world." (Page 45)

He meant that the âyat, **"Reconcile Muslims!"** referred to all the people in the world. Islam does not command to practise justice in the non-Muslim countries. It commands Muslims to introduce îmân and Islamic justice into these countries.

"If we hold religious belief as a basis for moral education in order to achieve social solidarity in Arab countries, we will see that all the current religions in these countries -not only Islam- will help us." (Page 59)

Allâhu ta'âlâ declares in the Qur'ân, **"There is only the Islamic religion which is right."** As for this Egyptian writer, he held all the false, base religions equal to Islam. He could not realize that there was no need for false religions or ideas while there was Islam.

---

[1] **Al-fatâwâ al-fiqhiyya,** p. 149-50.

"Since property belongs to society, the individual is bound to lend his possession without interest to those in need." (Page 69)

Property belongs to society in socialist and communist countries only. In Islam, property is in the individual's possession, as we have proved at length in the fifty-second paragraph. In Islam, others cannot interfere with the individual's property. The society or the State cannot lay hands upon anybody's property. If it does, it will be oppression and usurpation. Nobody can be forced to lend anything to anybody.

"Zakât is a payment which is not left to the individual's conscience. The government collects it. Zakât is not a donation given from individual to individual." (Page 70)

We have told in the fiftieth paragraph that this writing of his is very wrong and absurd.

"Islam established its social order and overcame the world's orders not through force of arms but through force of ideas." (Page 75)

We have proved with documents in the forty-ninth paragraph above that these thoughts are not compatible with Islam. In the same paragraph, we have quoted him as writing in his book **World's Peace and Islam,** "There is very little work done on the field of the policy of state control so far. This aspect of Islam has not been explained in due manner," which contradict his own words, "Islam established its social order..." It has often been seen in every field of knowledge that those who are not learned enough like him write in a haphazard way.

"It will never suffice for us to invite them to Islam with brief or detailed teachings today, as the Prophet did in his days. Unlike today, there were not detailed social theories standing against the Islamic theory in those days." (Page 77)

He supposes Islam as a theory, a human thought. His writings indicate that he knows nothing about Islam. Islam is not a theory. Allâhu ta'âlâ and His beloved Prophet's (*'alaihi 's-salâm*) commands and messages make up Islam. Theories arising from man's short mind or thought can never stand against these commands and messages but rot, melt and fade away. They are always overcome. If Sayyid Qutb had read the books of the Ahl as-Sunna scholars and understood them a little, he would have known his place and behaved himself and perhaps refrained from offering his own thoughts and absurd words unconformable with Islam as Islam to the youth. To disseminate writings of this sort in

the name of Islam, which are incompatible with the knowledge derived from âyats and hadîths and written in the invaluable books by the Ahl as-Sunna scholars, means to attempt to spoil and demolish Islam from within.

"We invite all beliefs equally and to the same liberty. It is the Muslim government's duty to protect the freedom of belief. All the compatriots have equal dues from the sources of income. Personal possession is limited; it is society's right to get the extra propety." (Page 79)

These thoughts of his are also diametrically opposed to Islam. Above he said that Islam should be spread, and here, he wants every religion to be given freedom. His words do not make sense. In fact, he strives to change Islam into socialism and communism. We have already answered these words of his a few pages earlier.

"Whenever necessary, the government may get unconditionally from well-to-do individuals as much money as it needs for the protection of society." (Page 87)

We have given detailed answers to these wrong thoughts of his in the fifty-second paragraph.

"If zakât does not suffice to do these, the government gets the extra property which the rich have and hands it to the poor." (Page 92)

If Sayyid Qutb, instead of imputing these socialistic thoughts of his to Islam, propounded put them as his own, perhaps he would have been able to find a place for himself among the youth, who have already been confused amidst various currents. But, his disguising himself as a religious man and attacking the Ahl as-Sunna scholars and his misrepresenting his own thoughts as Islam disgrace him in both this world and the next, and make him a target for the vengeance of Allâhu ta'âlâ. Please read the fifty-second paragraph!

With the following words, he altogether stripped off his mask and displayed his abominable ideas:

"Islam is a force that runs to gift freedom to all people on the earth with no regard to the variety in their religious beliefs. When this force meets with aberrant forces, it is its duty to struggle and annihilate them." (Page 203)

He holds the unbelievers in dâr al-harb and Muslims equal and considers it as a duty to struggle so that unbelief, which Allâhu ta'âlâ calls foul and dirty, may spread and attain freedom. This is what he thinks of jihâd, which is done in the way of Allâhu ta'âlâ.

When a vessel leaks, only its contents come out. He who goes to the rose-garden smells like a rose, but the bitter apple which grows in the rubbish-heap certainly gives off an acrid smell. Our master Rasûlullah (sall-Allâhu 'alaihi wa sallam) said **"Do not smell flowers grown in a rubbishheap!"** To attain happiness in this world and the next, one should read Ahl as-Sunna scholars' books. These scholars wrote in them every kind of knowledge which individuals, families and societies need. A learned person will look for and find this knowledge. Those who are ignorant and heretics cannot find it and think that it does not exist. It is stated in the Hadîth that those who depart from the Ahl as-Sunna will go to Hell. May Allâhu ta'âlâ protect the youngsters from the harms and books of the false men of religion! Âmîn.

57 - Another book written by Sayyid Qutb, namely **Al-adâlatu 'l-ijtimâ'iyyatu fi 'l-Islâm (Social Justice in Islam)**, was translated from Arabic into Turkish and was pushed before the younger generation. In this book, Sayyid Qutb, whom the translators extol to the skies, stripped his mask off his face completely and exhibited clearly that he was an anti-madhhabite heretic. The following passages from this book show that he understood nothing from the writings of Islamic scholars:

"Who could assure us that an order which Islam brought in a century is applicable in all the following centuries despite so many conditions that have changed in contradistinction to that century?" (Page 27)

He wanted Islam's basis to change in every century. He supposed that we ignorant people could change Islam as we wished. He could not understand the fact that we, who are not mujtahids but muqallids, could not lay our hands upon or speak ill of Islamic knowledge. Islamic knowledge has two divisions: religious knowledge and scientific knowledge. Religious knowledge which is stated openly in the Qur'ân and the Hadîth cannot be changed by the great scholars who are mujtahids, either. Besides, there is no great scholar who is in the grade of ijtihâd today. It is not permissible to modify even those acts of worship pertaining to buying and selling, nikâh[1] and punishments in contempt of the conditions stipulated by Islam. Sayyid Qutb's attempts to change Islam was intended to bring French and socialistic laws in place of Allâhu ta'âlâ's commands. As a matter

[1] Marriage contract as dictated by Islam. Please see **Endless Bliss**, V, 12 for detail.

of fact, these wishes of his have been quoted and refuted in the preceding paragraphs.

"Islam is a whole. Its separated parts should be united, and the differences should be removed." (Page 35)

Religious knowledge in Islam is divided into two sections:

1) Facts that are to be believed through heart.

2) Things that are to be done with the heart or the body.

The knowledge to be believed through heart is certainly a whole and was taught by Rasûlullah (*'alaihi 's-salâm*) and conveyed by as-Sahâbat al-kirâm. Learning this knowledge from them, the Ahl as-Sunna scholars wrote this knowledge in their books. All Muslims have to read these books and unite in the same one îmân. Muslims should unite, and there should not be disagreement or faction. For achieving this, all Muslims should unite in the belief of Ahl as-Sunna, which is the only right path, and they should not deviate into the heretical groups prophesied by our Prophet (*'alaihi 's-salâm*). There cannot be another way for unity. It was necessary also for Sayyid Qutb to learn this knowledge of îmân and not to spread the absurd heresies born from his head and from the head of his notorious masonic master, Muhammad 'Abduh, under the name of religious knowledge and not to cause faction. But, with his above-quoted writing, Sayyid Qutb attacked the four true madhhabs. He wished the madhhabs to be abolished and a false religion in the name of Islam to be established. Also, all the anti-madhhabite people such as Jamâl ad-dîn al-Afghânî, 'Abduh and Mawdûdî and the zindîqs such as Qâdiânî (Ahmadî) and Bahâ'î were on the same path. As our Prophet (*'alaihi 's-salâm*) declared, the four madhhabs into which Ahl as-Sunna parted are Allâhu ta'âlâ's compassion, and as he commanded, the mujtahids had to perform ijtihâd. But heretics have wished the madhhabs to be abolished and a new religion, a collection of the laws of Christians, Jews and communists, to be invented. In order to deceive Mulims, they call this new religion "Islam" for the time being.

Allâhu ta'âlâ has not revealed openly and definitely all the teachings pertaining to 'Ibâdât, marriage, trade and human rights. He willed those teachings which were not detailed or clear to be explained by the Prophet Muhammad (*sall-Allâhu 'alaihi wa sallam*). And His Prophet explained them, but not completely, leaving those teachings he did not clarifiy to be explained and applied to daily events by the 'ulamâ' who were mujtahids. While

these 'ulamâ' did this duty, some differences arose among them. Thus the madhâhib came forth. In carrying out his 'ibâdât, every Muslim chooses and follows the madhhab which is suitable and easy for his country's social usages and customs, climate and his physical abilities. Existence of different madhhabs is a blessing and convenience for Muslims.

"Proprietorship can be established only with the confirmation and the prearangement of the shâri' (lawgiver of the Sharî'at). This right is something which the shârî', who is sort of the public's representative, has specially put into the individual's possession." (Page 156)

It is true that property becomes one's personal property with the permission of the shâri', but the shâri' (Maker of Islam) is Allâhu ta'âlâ Himself, that is, He is the One who orders and forbids. **Muballigh** (Messenger) who announced Islam was His Prophet ('alaihi 's-salâm). Not only property but also every right has been a right because Allâhu ta'âlâ has permitted it. Each person's property and rights have become property and rights because Allâhu ta'âlâ has permitted and ordered them. It is for this reason that nobody can take away one's property unless one gives it willingly.

"It is extravagance and harâm to build magnificent villas by spending millions of dollars in a country where millions of people are in need of simple dwellings and clothes." (Page 185)

It is never harâm for a person who has paid his zakât to the poor and who earns through halâl with the sweat of his brow to have villas built. It is halâl and blessed. It is harâm to sit idly, not to work and to remain poor, or to waste one's earnings for things that are harâm and then live in a simple dwelling. Why should the studious people be guilty because of lazy people who waste their possessions on the things that are harâm? It is halâl for those who pay their zakât to live in villas, to dress smartly and to utilize all the facilities attained by scientific inventions. Allâhu ta'âlâ declares, **"I like My human creatures to use the blessings which I have given them,"** and **"I will give the one who works."** It is worship to work and earn. It is not a sin to be rich. Allâhu ta'âlâ likes those rich people who thank Him. It is harâm to be conceited and to consider oneself superior to others because one is rich. It is written in **Qisâs-i anbiyâ':** "Hadrat Zubair ibn Awwâm (radiy-Allâhu 'anh)- one of al-Asharat al-Mubashshara, the ten people who were given the good news that they would go to Paradise, was a merchant. He became very rich, owning

enormous property and vast areas of land in Medina, Basra, Kûfâ and in Egypt. He had a thousand servants, but he used to distribute all his income to the poor. Also Hadrat Talha (radiy-Allâhu 'anh), another one of those who were given the good news of Paradise, was rich. He used to dress smartly and go about with beautiful suits on him. There was a precious ruby stone on his ring. Also Hadrat 'Uthmân (radiy-Allâhu 'anh) among al-Asharat al-mubashshara, was a very rich merchant. By contributing ten thousand gold coins and so many camels loaded with goods to the Ghazâ of Tabuk, he attained Rasûlullah's ('alaihi 's-salâm) prayers.

"Richness is not an imperfection. The hadîth ash-sherîf, **'It is happiness to be rich during the final ages of the world,'** is written in **Râmuz al-ahâdîth.** Such prophets as Ibrâhîm, Dâwûd and Sulaimân ('alaihimu 's-salâm) were very rich. Many of he poor among as-Sahâbat al-kirâm were reported to have said, 'The rich, in addition to worshipping as much as we do, are earning much thawâb by performing charitable deeds with their wealth,' thus longing for the situation in which the rich who thanked Allâhu ta'âlâ in this way were."

"Caliphate, after the four caliphs, turned into kingship which was passed from the father over to the son by way of inheritance. Public property was made mubâh (permitted) for the relatives and sycophants of these persons and harâm for meritorious people who were adherent to Islam. Umayyads' coming into power was harmful. Had Hadrat 'Umar remained in caliphate a couple of years longer, or had Hadrat 'Alî been the third caliph, or had Hadrat 'Uthmân been twenty-five years younger than he was when he came into power, the face of Islamic history would have been rather different. Hadrat 'Umar used to take away from the rich what was more than they needed of their property and distribute them to the poor equally." (Page 247)

With these writings of his, he misrepresents Hadrat 'Uthmân (radiy-Allâhu 'anh) as incompetent in administration. The hadîths telling about his superiority in administration and policy could hardly be tallied. Let us also quote the most famous one of them here: **"The highest of my companions is Abû Bakr. Then comes 'Umar. Then comes 'Uthmân. Then comes 'Alî** (radî-Allâhu 'anhumâ)**."** The superiority expressed in the Hadîth is a superiority in every respect. In Hudaibiya, at such a dangerous time as the enemy was making preparations for war, our Prophet ('alaihi 's-salâm) chose Hadrat 'Uthmân (radiy-Allâhu 'anh) as

the ambassador so that he would talk to the enemy and make an agreement. He was among the six persons whom Hadrat 'Umar (radiy-Allâhu 'anh), when he was about to pass away, considered worthy and capable of becoming Khalîfa after him. Our Prophet ('alaihi 's-salâm) stated, **"Allâhu ta'âlâ has put the true word on 'Umar's tongue."** 'Umar (radiy-Allâhu 'anh), who always spoke correctly and appropriately as noted in the hadîth, recommended him by saying, " 'Uthmân is worthy and capable for caliphate." But Sayyid Qutb said, "No, he was not worthy of it. Islam's progress came to a standstill because of him." His administrative, political and military accomplishments when he was Khalîfa are portrayed in detail in the Turkish book **Hak Sözün Vesîkaları,** (translated into English in 1992).[1]

Sayyid Qutb's likening Islamic Khalîfas to the kings of unbelievers and saying that they prohibited meritorius people who were adherent to Islam from public property is another slander against Islamic Khalîfas. I have given its answer detailedly in the forty-fourth paragraph. Pages of reasonably written histories and of the books of Islamic scholars are full with writings refuting these slanders of his.

"With a comparison to Hadrat 'Umar's disposal of prohibiting al-muallafat al-qulûb from being given zakât, we can do some similar disposals on the expenditures of zakât. We may, instead of giving them in cash or in gold, establish factories and industrial foundations for them. We can buy shares for them in some foundations and institutions. Thus they will be provided with a continual source of food and income far from the meaning of a temporary gifting, which is incompatible with today's civil requirements and which is sacrificed in vain." (Page 298)

All as-Sahâbat al-kirâm were profound scholars, mujtahids. Especially the Four Khalîfas were Rasûlullah's (sall-Allâhu 'alaihi wa sallam) counsellors when he was alive and representatives after his death. It is declared in a hadîth, **"Hold fast to my path and, after me, to the path led by the Four Khalîfas! Their path is the right path."** We have to follow the unanimity of as-Sahâbat al-kirâm. Of the teachings which they communicated unanimously, a person who disbelieves the ones that are widespread among Muslims becomes a disbeliever.

Sayyid Qutb thinks he is a mujtahid like 'Umar (radiy-Allâhu

---

[1] **Documents of the Right Word**, 480 pp., available from **Hakîkat Kitâbevi**, Fâtih, Istanbul, Turkey.

'anh). He attempts to change the list of people whom zakât will be given. Our religion has declared clearly to whom and how zakât will be given. For a thousand years no scholar has attempted to change this. Our religion has also explained very well how to establish a source of income for the poor with zakât. A Muslim who has well understood Islam will easily find out how to establish factories and industrial foundations and how to support jihâd and pious foundations in a way suitable with Islam with the money of zakât. The techniques of doing this are desribed in the book **Endless Bliss**, I, 7. Islam has shown how Muslims will work in each century and the ways of utilizing the inventions of the century. There is no reason or necessity for the anti-madhhabite people such as Sayyid Qutb to attempt to change Islam.

Of the four kinds of zakât goods, the zakât of crops and animals and the zakât which is collected from importers by the zakât official called **'âshir** are taken and delivered to proper people by Muslims' ruler. Individuals or institutions or non-Muslim governments have no right to collect these kinds of zakât or to deliver them. They cannot establish zakât banks or zakât ministry. The zakât given to them will not be acceptable. A Muslim who lives under the authority of a non-Muslim government should pay any kind of zakât to one of the persons described in the Qur'ân or to the person whom they have appointed to be their proxy, either in person or by proxy. We should perform our worship suitably with the books of the Ahl as-Sunna scholars.

He quoted the eighth âyat of the sûrat an-Nisâ', **"While the property of inheritance is divided, if any relatives, orphans and needy people** [who are not inheritors] **are present there, give them something** [out of it]," and commented:

"This âyat expresses clearly that the relatives, orphans and the poor will get a share from the property of inheritance. Naturally, some changes and appropriations can be made concerning the property of inheritance. Some shares can be allotted in accordance with the state of the inheritors and the society. The âyat says, 'If... present,' which means 'If ever exists.' " (Page 305)

Islamic scholars said about this ayat that it was an act not commanded but recommended because it deserved thawâb and blessings. Those scholars who said that it was a command also said that this âyat was abolished with the other âyats about inheritance that were revealed after it. It is written in **Tafsîr-i**

Husainî, "This âyat is about those who are present there while the property of inheritance is distributed. It is good to give a little share to the onlooking orphans and poor people who are present there as alms." Hadrat Sanâ'ullah ad-Dahlawî wrote in his **at-Tafsîr al-Mazharî,** "While the property of inheritance is divided and distributed, something is given to the relatives, to the orphans and to the poor people present there as alms. Sa'îd ibn Jubair and Dahhâk reported that this âyat was abolished when the âyat **"Yûsikumullah'** was revealed Some scholars said that it had not been abolished. Ibn 'Abbâs said that those inheritors who had reached the age of disretion and puberty would give something little from the property of inheritance that fell into their share. If the inheritors were small, their trustee or proxy would give it, or they would express regrets (for their hesitancy about acts of disposal concerning the inherited property) because it belonged to orphans. As Muhammad ibn Sîrîn reported, 'Ubaidat as-Salmânî divided the property of inheritance and distributed it to the orphans. Then he ordered them to slaughter a sheep. It was cooked and given to the people mentioned in the âyat and they ate it. And he said, 'If it weren't for this âyat, I would pay for the sheep.' It is not fard but mustahab to give something to these people." As it is seen, the inheritors will give as much as they want to. Nothing can be taken away from them by force. Sayyid Qutb changes the word 'present' in the âyat into 'existing at any place'. No Islamic scholar has made such a change up to now. The person who translated this book from Arabic might have understood Sayyid Qutb's error and tries to explain it away by saying that it is possible to take inheritance tax from the inheritors and give it to those who are not inheritors, thus changing the âyat altogether. It was quite a long time ago when the Islamic scholars predicted that one day the ignorant would be religious authorities and nothing would remain for the Devil to do.

In his book **Fî dilâl al-Qur'ân,** attempting to interpret the 33rd âyat of the sûrat al-Mâ'ida, Sayyid Qutb writes the ijtihâds of the four madhhabs and says, "In this respect, we consider Imâm Mâlik's opinion to be worth preference. We are in favour of his opinion." This writing of his again shows that he is not a member of any madhhab, that he thinks of himself as superior to the imâms of madhhabs and that he knows nothing of the knowledge of usûl al-fiqh. A few pages later, in the subject of punishing the thief, he gives the ijtihâds of the four madhhabs and says, "But

Imâm Abû Yûsuf opposes al-Imâm al-a'zam, and a third point of view, different from the other two, comes forward," and thus he uses indecent, irreverent terms against the imâms of the madhhabs and their ijtihâds. He thinks ijtihâds as mere thoughts and ideas. On the contrary, Islamic religion is a religion of good manners and beautiful morals. Islamic scholars have been the representatives of Islamic religion in good manners and beautiful morals, and they have introduced it to the world as such. Sayyid Qutb differs from Islamic scholars in this respect, too.

When interpreting the 93rd âyat of the sûrat al-Mâ'ida, he says, "About the context of this statement in the Qur'ân, I could not find a way of interpretation which relieves one's soul among the ones which the mufassirs mentioned. Among those which I read, I liked the one which Ibn Jarîr at-Tabarî mentioned best, though it is not in a capacity to relieve me sentimentally." However, for example, the Qur'ân commentary by al-Baidâwî, who has been loved and respected by all mufassirs, and also its annotation by Shaikh-zâda explain this âyat more clearly and satisfactorily. Hadrat Sayyid 'Abdulhakîm Arwâsî, a great Islamic scholar of profound knowledge and an expert in tasawwuf, explained this âyat at the Bâyezîd Mosque in Istanbul for many days, quoting from the annotation of al-Baidâwî's Qur'ân commentary and from the Qur'ân commentaries by Abussu'ûd and Ni'metullah, thus satisfying the souls of those cultured youngsters who listened to him in admiration. If Sayyid Qutb, too, had been honoured with attending the lectures and suhba of such a profound Islamic scholar who was perfect both in bâtinî and zâhirî knowledge, and if he had attained a few drops of his ocean of knowledge and ma'rifa, he would have understood something from the overt meanings, expressions, indications, denotations, necessitations and implications of âyats. Perhaps he would have perceived what tafsîr and mufassir meant. The faid of those lectures, softening and purifying the hearts that were hard like rocks and pitch-black, could make people distinguish the right from the wrong and tremble with feeling the greatness of Islamic scholars and of the Salaf as-Sâlihîn. Surely, they realized the highness of the scholars of Ahl as-Sunna so well that they fully believed that for attaining endless bliss there was no other way than following them. Hadrat al-Imâm ar-Rabbânî Ahmad al-Fârûqî repeatedly stated in his book **Maktûbât** that these scholars were the ones who were lauded in by the hadîths, **"They are the prophets' inheritors,"** and **"Their ink will weigh heavier than the**

blood of martyrs."

Sayyid Qutb's attempt to exploit an âyat from the Mâida sûra in order to authenticate his undervaluation of hundreds of scholars of Tafsîr, which he parenthesizes with a laudation of an equivocal name, Muhammad ibn Jarîr,[1] betrays the fact that he is a heretic without a certain madhhab. See how the famous book **Fat'h al-majîd,** too, praises Ibn Jarîr on its 294th page: "There has been nobody more learned than Muhammad ibn Jarîr ibn Yazîd at-Tabarî on the earth. He was one of the mujtahidîn. He did not copy (taqlîd) from anybody. He had many disciples educated in his own madhhab. He passed away in the year 310[A.H.]" It writes that Ibn Jarîr was a non-madhhabite. And Sayyid Qutb approves and praises only this person among the 'ulamâ' of tafsîr.

'Abd al-Ghanî an-Nablusî wrote: "Though it is permissible to hold an imitative belief (taqlîd) on what you hear concerning i'tiqâd, you will be sinful because you have not studied and examined. In a'mâl and 'ibâdât, it is permissible through unanimity of scholars to follow (taqlîd) a madhhab leader without research. Since there has not been any person for a long time to accumulate in himself the conditions for being a mujtahid, it is necessary to learn one of the four madhhabs. And this is possible only by reading a dependable book or by asking and learning from a pious scholar. There is no mujtahid mutlaq any more. But until the end of the world, there will be those mujtahids who are dependent on one of the four madhhabs and who can perform

---

[1] The following information is given under the entry **TABARÎ** 'rahmatullâhi 'alaih' in the biography section of the Turkish book **Seâdet-i-ebediyye**: "Abû Ja'far Muhammad bin Jarîr (224 [A.D. 839]-Tabaristân-310 [A.D. 923]-Baghdâd) was a great scholar profoundly learned in the branches of Tafsîr and Hadîth. Two of his most valuable works are **Jâmi'ul-bayân**, a book of Tafsîr consisting of twenty-three volumes, and **Târîh-ul-umam**, a masterpiece of history, which was abridged by a Shiite named Alî bin Muhammad Shimshâtî. This Shiite-laced abridgement, which was translated into Turkish and entitled **Taberî Târîhi** (History of Tabarî), misleads those who read it. It is written on the sixty-eighth (68) page of the book **Mukhtasar-i-Tuhfa-i-ithnâ ashariyya** by Alûsî that Muhammad bin Jarîr bin Rustam Tabarî is a Shiite. And that Muhammad bin Abil-Qâsim is another Shiite is written in **Asmâ-ul-muallifîn**. These people should not be confused with Hadrat (Abû Ja'far Muhammad) ibn Jarîr. On the other hand, a book of Tafsîr which is mistaken for the book of Tafsîr of Tabarî entitled **Jâmi'ul-bayân** is the Shiite book of Tafsîr entitled **Tabarsî**, a pseudo title for the book **Majma'ul bayân** by Fadl bin Hasan Tabarî (d. 548 [A.D. 1153], a member of the aberrant Shiite sect Imâmiyya.

ijtihâd and give fatwâ in matters within a madhhab. It is not permissible to learn religious knowledge only by reading any religious book or by asking and understanding from anybody who passes for a religious man. Among those who have been said to be religious men, ignoramuses, zindîqs, sinners and hyprocrites who have written their own thoughts as religious knowledge or who have tried to demolish Islam from within and also those who earned their living by serving them as their assistants have always existed. Being a real religious man requires possessing knowledge, 'amal and ikhlâs, i.e. taqwâ. For guiding men to happiness, a religious man should first of all have the i'tiqâd of Ahl as-Sunna, that is, he has to follow as-Sahâba and obey ijmâ' al-Umma."[1]

As for Sayyid Qutb; when observed with due attention, it will be seen that he is only an orator who brings the readers into raptures with his zealous and falsely adorned writings, which is the natural art of a journalist or a politician. Like a broker who puts a covered treasury up for sale, he only praises Islam and, instead of opening it and exhibiting the jewels in it, he tries to hush up Islamic scholars and their books from the youth and exhibits his own ideas as religious knowledge. While trying to enchant his readers with an actor's role, he is not aware that he has contradicted and denied himself various times. It is feared very much that his following writing, -which a student brought and showed us-, in the interpretation of the 115th âyat of the sûrat al-Mâ'ida may lead his readers to kufr: "The story of the Descent the Table set (with viands) is not mentioned in Christian books as it exists in the Qur'ân. In these gospels, which were written after Hadrat 'Îsâ's death..." On the other hand, he himself explained the âyat, **"They did not kill 'Îsâ** ('alaihi 's-salâm). **They did not hang him,"** detailedly before. The âyat-i-kerîmas never state that Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' was killed; they state that he was exactly taken up (tawaffî) to heaven. All his books shout out the fact that he was not a scholar of tafsîr or a religious man but a skillful writer with a strong Arabic, a keen intellect and extensive imagination. Politicians, in order to attain their desires, exploit the things that are loved and respected so well and give them such vividness that only those who know the matter closely can see whether they are sincere in their writings. Yet those who cannot sense their inner purposes, already vulnarable to the exploitation because of their admiration for the thing exploited, easily succumb to their plans,

---

[1] **Al-hadîqat an-nadiyya,** p. 460.

tag along behind them and accompany them to their disastrous destination. As a matter of fact, thousands of Egyptian youngsters enraptured by Sayyid Qutb's writings were led to torments in this world and the next. And now, with the apprehension that young people, who thirst for Islamic knowledge, may fall for those heretical and aberrant writings, -or for their all the more exacerbated mistranslations fudged by some false men of religion-, we feel deep pity and sorrow for them.

A strange malady is rife among ignorant and incompetent people: maligning the past and animadverting on the ancestry. Wahhâbîs and Sayyid Qutb evince the terminal cases of this malady. "After as-Sahâba, for many centuries Muslims made undestructible barricades between the Qur'ân and life. The Qur'ân became melodies at mihrâb and prayers at graves. Eventually, laying his finger on this great problem of Islam, Sayyid Qutb has written his book **Fî dilâl al-Qur'ân,**" they say. We would ask them: Who established those Islamic universities which spread the teachings and the light of the Qur'ân over the world and which founded the home of today's civilization? Our ancestors adapted their lives to the Qur'ân perfectly in knowledge, in jihâd, in science and in morals. Hundreds of thousands of books which they wrote and various Islamic civilizations which they established have been praised in world's annals. Sayyid Qutb's followers who make fun of our ancestors' reciting the Qur'ân for the dead should know well that our Prophet ('alaihi 's-salâm) commanded to visit graves and to recite the Qur'ân for the dead, and also he himself did so. Our ancestors, in order to obey this command, this sunna, visited the dead and recited the Qur'ân for their souls. Thus they held fast to the Qur'ân and to the Sunna in everything they did. Those who say, "Sayyid Qutb's book is not a series of narrations," think that they praise him, while in fact they betray his disgrace, for a religious teaching which is not narrated (riwâya) from Rasûlullah (sall-Allâhu 'alaihi wa sallam) or from as Sahâbat al-kirâm is called a "bida'". It is declared in a hadîth sherîf, **"All religious teachings which are not narrated from us but which have been fabled later are bida'."** Another hadîth declares, **"No worship of the inventors of bida' is acceptable. They will go to Hell."** These hadîths clearly show that the followers of Sayyid Qutb are very wrong and that only Ahl as-Sunna will be rescued, for Sayyid Qutb refuses the narrations coming from the Salaf as-Sâlihîn. On the other hand, Ahl as-Sunna hold fast to the narrations which the

Salaf as-Sâlihîn broght from Rasûlullah (’alaihi ’s-salâm). It is written in the commentary of al-Birghiwî’s **Wasiyyat-nâma,** “It is fard for every Muslim to learn the madhhabs of Ahl as-Sunna and the i’tiqâd reported by these scholars and to correct his belief in accordance with it. Everybody should learn this. They should not remain ignorant, for a belief which does not agree with Islam is very harmful. Recently bida’ have spread far and wide. There are very few people left who know the i’tiqâd of Ahl as-Sunnat wa ’l-Jamâ’a. Ignorance has covered the entire world. The words of those scholars whose deeds are suitable with their knowledge are dependable. There are many people who are deprived of knowledge but who have disguised themselves as scholars and become famous. We should not fall for their appearance and fame. There is the famous saying: ‘A semi-religious man will ruin one’s faith; a half doctor will ruin one’s body.’ Recently, many ignorant people using names such as shaikh, ’âlim or murshid have been deceiving Muslims and leading them to heresy. May Allâhu ta’âlâ protect Muslims from believing them! We should beware these heretics very much. We should not follow the books and the words of any person who passes for a religious man, who might cause us to fall into heresy. We should not follow those fatwâs and decisions which have not been derived from fiqh books and which have been given by modernists, and we should look for and find one who knows the matter and ask him and learn the truth of the matter.” Every Muslim should take this advice of Islamic scholars as a warning for himself, come to his senses and should not believe the deceptive advertisements and misleading propagandas of heretical books.

It is dismaying to know that there are people who look on Sayyid Qutb’s heretical thoughts as ‘sagacious tafsîrs’. We should hold fast not to the corrupt thoughts produced by Sayyid Qutb but to the teachings which Allâhu ta’âlâ’s Messenger (’alaihi ’s-salâm) understood and conveyed from the Qur’ân and to the real books of tafsîr which the Ahl as-Sunna scholars built up by gathering these teachings. Those who want to attain happiness by sheltering in the shade of the Qur’ân should believe not those books of tafsîr written by this person or that but the correct books of tafsîr written by the Ahl as-Sunna scholars. Those who will make one attain to happiness are not the inheritors of Sayyid Qutb, but they are the Ahl as-Sunna scholars, who are Rasûlullah’s (’alaihi ’s-salâm) inheritors:

Sayyid Qutb’s followers say that he was a Shâfi’î. However,

being in one of the four madhhabs requires belonging to the Ahl as-Sunna first. If a person dissents from the Ahl as-Sunna and dislikes Sunnîs, his claim to be in one of the four madhhabs is an attempt to deceive Muslims.

A Muslim who glances through Sayyid Qutb's tafsîr book enjoys reading the explanations of âyats, and his soul becomes exhilarated, for these explanations were taken from the Ahl as-Sunna scholars' tafsîr books. On the other hand, reading Sayyid Qutb's heretical writings, and their translations, which are incompatible with Islam's main sources, annoys a Muslim and blackens his heart. Sayyid Qutb's stunning mediocrity is perceived at once. It is seen that he attempts to explain îmân and islam with philosophical thoughts. It is for this reason that those reasonable Muslims who have read the Ahl as-Sunna scholars' books, which enliven the souls, and who can realize the greatness of these exalted scholars, read those real books of tafsîr today also and they not only reject Sayyid Qutb's books, but also try to protect the youngsters from reading them.

Though he interspersed his heretical ideas throughout his tafsîr book, **Fî dilâl al-Qur'ân,** it is deemed, in order to satisfy the readers, useful to be informative with a few of them briefly:

1) When beginning to interpret the sûrat al-Baqara, he says, "Each sûra has a peculiar musical effect and harmony." Our master Rasûlullah ('alaihi 's-salâm) said, **"Ghinâ (music) increases hypocrisy in the heart."** Does the Qur'ân ever have such an effect? It clears away the darkness caused by music. It illuminates the heart and the soul. It is written in the commentary of al-Birghiwî's **Wasiyyat-nâma,** "You should not listen to the things that are read melodiously. The men of tarîqa of our time are very ignorant and obstinate. They recite poems melodiously. They equate the sensual emotions stirred by music with the flavour inherent in the acts of worship. Such heretics who ignore the Book and madhhabs are the pioneers of the Dajjâl's soldiers. I advise the Believers not to believe them, otherwise you will go out of the religion! Do not deviate from the way of Sunna, Ahl as-Sunna! Do not listen to those who read the Qur'ân al-kerîm, call the adhân and say the dhikr and prayers melodiously! Silence them! The fatwâ book **Tâtârhâniyya** writes that there is unanimity of scholars on that it is harâm to do these (acts of worship) melodiously. The scholars of fiqh have put forward many evidences and documents showing that it is harâm."

2) “Migration to Medina was done under some compulsion,” he says. On the other hand, Islamic scholars report that the Hegira was done not under fear, trouble or compulsion but with Allâhu ta’âlâ’s decree and permission. It is written in **Al-mawâhib al-laduniyya,** “Rasûlullah (sall-Allâhu ’alaihi wa sallam) commanded his companions to go from Mecca to Medina. He remained in Mecca, awaiting Allâhu ta’âlâ’s permission. One day, Jabrâ’il (’alaihi ’s-salâm) came and said, ‘The unbelievers of Quraish will kill you. Do not sleep in your bed tonight.’ The next day he brought the âyat permitting him to migrate.” Islamic scholars said and wrote so decently about Rasûlullah (sall-Allâhu ’alaihi wa sallam).

3) “Various opinions have been put forward in interpreting the letters that exist at the beginning of some sûras of the Qur’ân. We take one of these opinions, which counts them as indicating that the Qur’ân is made up of these letters,” he says. The Ahl as-Sunna scholars say, “These letters are of the mutashâbihât; Allâhu ta’âlâ has concealed their numerous meanings. He has revealed some of them only to His beloved Prophet (’alaihi ’s-salâm) and to ’Ulamâ’ ar-râsihîn, who are his inheritors.” It is declared clearly in other âyats that the Qur’ân was sent down in Arabic letters. It is not something to be slighted that he gives such a meaning to these letters and is reluctant to write what Abû Bakr, ’Umar (radiy-Allâhu ’anhumâ) and the scholars of tafsîr said. This also betrays his crass ignorance of the mysteries in the Qur’ân and the Divine Ma’ârif which have been inspirations for the great men of tasawwuf.

4) “Scholars of tafsîr and tawhîd explained detailedly which one, the earth or the sky, had been created earlier. But they should have known the fact that being earlier and later are human terms. It should not be forgotten, again, that such terms have been used so that the infinite descriptions be comprehended by the limited human mind. The disputations which Islamic thinkers set about on these terms of the Qur’ân are nothing but the tragedy of mixing Greek philosophy and the religious controversies among Jews and Christians with the pure Arab mind and the brilliant Islamic intellect,” he says. See the terms which Sayyid Qutb uses against Islamic scholars and the Salaf as-Sâlihin! Could you imagine a Muslim whose heart would not feel sharp pain from these insults and impertinences which he does

against the scholars of tafsîr and kalâm? By saying, "They should have known," he attempts to give lessons to these exalted scholars. By saying, "It should not be forgotten," he imputes ignorance to the most prominent people of the auspicious century praised by Rasûlullah (*'alaihi 's-salâm*). This passage shows that he has not heard about the subtle knowledge in the books Islamic scholars wrote about time and space. If he had read and understood the books of Islamic scholars, he would not have spoken ill about Islam's most beloved personalities, and he would have known his place and behave himself. It is true that, like in his novels **The Thorns, A Child from the Village** and **The Magic City,** he gives the impression of being a scholar to the youth in his Qur'ân commentary which he wrote with a fluent style and deceptive words, thus attaching young minds to himself; but those who have woken up from unawareness by reading the blessed writings of Islamic scholars notice at once his poisonous ideas and aberrant attitude which he interspersed among these attractive writings of his.

5) Like in his statment, "To me, this experiment was made in order to train the person who would become the caliph of the world," he sees himself in a magnifying mirror by saying "to me" at many places of his tafsîr book. It is understood here that he is not ignorant, but vulgarly ignorant. If he had learned the zâhirî knowledge of the Qur'ân by reading al-Baidâwî's tafsîr and its annotation and **at-Tafsîr al-kabîr** and understood something from the mysteries in the Qur'ân by reading Ni'matullah's **Tafsîr** and the tafsîr book **Rûh al-bayân** by Hadrat İsmâil Hakkı of Bursa, he would have known his place and perhaps behave himself.

6) When interpreting the 117th âyat of the sûrat al-Baqara, he says, "The Creator does not have any match. And here the philosophy of Wahdat al-wujûd remains completely outside Islamic conception, and Islam refuses the concept of Wahdat al-wujûd of non-Muslims," thus showing that he knows nothing of tasawwuf. He supposes that the inspirations and kashfs of the great men of tasawwuf were only philosophy. He goes to an extreme in insolence by saying "non-Muslims" about the *'Ulamâ' ar-râsihîn*, for the teachings of Wahdat al-wujûd that had existed before Islam also had been put forward by the men of tasawwuf belonging to ancient revealed true religions. Greek philosophers

and the unbelievers of the Alexandria school had appropriated these teachings stealing them from the religious men of tasawwuf. The knowledge of Wahdat al-wujûd is not an invention of philosophers, but it is the ma'rifa and kashf of those believers who occupied high grades in the religion.[1]

7) In the tafsîr of the third âyat of the sûrat az-Zumar, he says, "One who has tawhîd and ikhlâs does not ask anything from somebody other than Allah. He does not trust in anybody who has been created. People deviated from the tawhîd preached by Islam. Nowadays, awliyâ' are worshipped in every country. People ask intercession of them just as the pre-Islamic Arabs worshipped angels and statues. There exists no intermediary or intercession between Allah and men in respect of tawhîd and ikhlâs revealed by Allah," With these words, he announces that he is a Wahhâbî.

8) This socialist writer thinks of himself as a scholar of tafsîr and misinterprets many âyats. For example, he says in his interpretation of the seventh âyat of the sûrat an-Nisâ', "Men have one share from what the parents and the close relatives left. Women also have one share from what the parents and the close relatives left. It is, little or much, one share, as prescribed..." On the other hand, Islamic scholars said about the same âyat, "Men have shares from what the parents and the close relatives left. Women also have shares from what the parents and the close relatives left. Whether the property left is little or much, they will be given their shares in the prescribed amounts." Its reason also has been explained in al-Baidâwî's tafsîr. Especially about the âyat following that one, he says, "We do not see any evidence of abolition here. To our opinion this âyat is explicit. It is fard as prescribed," and thus he does not feel shame to write that he interprets according to his opinion. However, the scholars of tafsîr, chiefly al-Baidâwî, said that this âyat was mustahab, though there were also those who said that it was wâjib. And it has been applied accordingly in all Islamic countries.

After quoting the preceding âyat, he says, "Allâhu ta'âlâ has distributed possessions and property to society. Society is obliged to use these possessions well. Society essentially owns all possessions. Heirs [trustees] have the right to use these

---

[1] For details on Wahdat al-wujûd, see **Endless Bliss, I,** chapter 40, and **III,** chapter 56.

possessions only with the permission of society," thus slandering Islamic religion and attempting to reform it. He struggles to imbue the younger generations with his socialistic ideas under the name of tafsîr.

9) In his books **World's Peace and Islam** and **Islamic Studies,** he says, "The zakât is a tax. The government collects this tax. It is not an interaction that takes place between two individuals face to face. It is not an individual gift or alms that is passed over from hand to hand. It is not a mode of order which Islam prescribes to separate the zakât of one's property with one's own hands and to distribute it with one's own hands. The word which says that the property of which zakât has been given cannot be counted as stocked property [kanz] is not correct. The government can lay hands on it." These words of Sayyid Qutb are not suitable with Islam, and they are his own wrong thoughts.[1] It is written in all the books of fiqh that the property of which zakât has been paid is not kanz and that the government can by no means lay hands on it. It is written in **al-Ahkâm as-sultâniyya** and also in many valuable books, " 'Zakât' and 'alms' are used in the same meaning in the Qur'ân. Nobody has any share from Muslim's property besides its zakât. A hadîth declares, **'There is no claim to** [others'] **property besides zakât.'** The possessions for which zakât has to be paid are of two kinds: al-amwâl az-zâhira and al-amwâl al-bâtina. **Al-amwâl az-zâhira** are the possessions that cannot be hidden. Examples of these are crops, fruits and the four-footed stock animals that graze in the field. **Al-amwal al-bâtina** are those possessions that can be hidden. Examples of these are gold, silver and commercial goods. The government cannot demand the zakât of al-amwâl al-bâtina. The owner has the right to pay their zakât. If he pays it to the government with his own wish, then the government takes it and distributes it to the kind of persons defined by Islam, thus helping the owner. The government's duty is only to demand the zakât of al-amwal az-zâhira and distribute it to the prescribed persons. The government's owning this right requires its being independent, Islamic and just and learned in those branches of religious knowledge concerning zakât. If the government is cruel in collecting zakât but just in giving it to the

---

[1] See the paragraphs 49-53 above, and **Endless Bliss, V,** chapter on zakât.

prescribed persons, it is permissible to pay it to the government though the owner may distribute it himself. If the government is just in collecting zakât but cruel in distributing it, it is wâjib not to pay zakât to the government; it is not permissible to pay it to such a government. If the government takes the zakât with the owners' wish or by force, zakât will not have been paid. It is necessary for the owners themselves to separate and distribute it to the prescribed people, again. Rasûlullah (sall-Allâhu alaihi wa sallam) used to distribute the collected zakât to the persons whom he deemed suitable. Then, Allâhu ta'âlâ declared the kinds of persons one by one whom zakât would be paid and commanded not to spend it at other places. It has been reported unanimously that an unbeliever should not be paid zakât."

It is written at the end of the section on kafâlat in **ad-Durr al-mukhtâr,** "At-Tarsûsî says that it is not permissible for the Sultan [the government] to expropriate anybody's property. Only, if the zakât-collecting officials of Bait al-mâl, governors and the clerks of Bait al-mâl oppress Muslims and misappropriate their property, the government can confiscate this illegally obtained property. So is the case with the clerks and officials of pious foundations. If they spend prodigally, lead a life of dissipation and revelry and build apartment houses for themselves, the government confiscates their property and dismisses them from office. It returns the property which they have obtained unjustly to the pious foundations. If it is not known for certain from what pious foundation they have taken them, it gives them to Bait al-mâl. Khalîfa 'Umar (radiy-Allâhu 'anh) sent Abû Huraira (radiy-Allâhu 'anh) to Bahrain as a governor to collect zakât. Later he dismissed him. He commandeered his possessions and took his 12,000 gold coins away from him. After a while, he wanted to assign him this same duty again but the latter refused it. This fact is reported by Hâkim and others." On this account, Ibn 'Âbidîn comments: "The government's commandeering the possessions of the officials of Bait al-mâl means its taking the zakât goods misappropriated by them back from them and giving them to Bait al-mâl, that is, putting them back to their place. The government cannot spend these possessions at other places. Abû Huraira (radiy-Allâhu 'anh) said, 'Hadrat 'Umar (radiy-Allâhu 'anh) sent me to Bahrain to collect zakât. Then he dismissed me from this duty and took away my twelve thousand gold coins. After a while

he wanted to give me this duty again. I refused it.' Upon hearing this, Abû Khâtam (radiy-Allâhu 'anh) said, 'Though Yûsuf ('alaihi 's-salâm) was an exalted prophet, much higher than you are, he wanted to do such a duty. Why did you not accept it?' He answered, 'He was Yûsuf ('alaihi 's-salâm). He was a prophet. He was a prophet's son, a prophet's grandson, and a prophet's great-grandson. As for me, I am the son of Umayya. I fear to say something which I don't know, to do something which I don't know, thus to be disgraced before my Allah and His human creatures and to cause my possessions to be commandeered.' It is understood that, according to Abû Huraira's (radiy-Allâhu 'anh) madhhab, it was permissible for the officials of zakât to accept presents, but it was not permissible in Hadrat 'Umar's (radiy-Allâhu 'anh) madhhab; so he acted in accordance with his own madhhab and took his possessions, which he had collected as presents, away from him." As it is seen, Hadrat 'Umar (radiy-Allâhu 'anh) did not lay hands on the possessions of the rich. On the contrary, he took the unjust earnings of those officials who laid hands on the possessions of the rich and gave them back. In Islam no one can lay hands on anybody else's possessions. Also in this respect, Islam differs from communism and socialism.

10) At various places of his tafsir book, Sayyid Qutb quotes the hadîth, **"The poor have rights also in the property besides zakât,"** and says that the government will take the zakât by force and that, in addition, the government may commandeer the excessive possessions of those who do not give alms. He leads the matter down to communism. In order to make them evidences for these ideas of his, he misinterprets the âyats and hadîths, His attempt to be of service causes disservice, instead. The above hadîth does not show that giving alms is fard like giving zakât, but it shows that it is worthy of much more thawâb than other supererogatory kinds of worship, for it has been declared that those who do not give the poor their due, which is called zakât, will be tormented in Hell. No torments has been mentioned for those who do not give the right called alms, but it has been said that it is very much blessed. Likewise, Islamic scholars have reported unanimously that the rights of **"saluting, visiting the sick and going to the place where one is invited,"** which are declared in the hadîth **"A Muslim has five rights upon another Muslim,"** are not fard. On the other hand, the following hadîths quoted

from **Zawâjir** show clearly that the case in not so with zakât: **"Protect your property by giving zakât! Cure your sick relatives by giving alms! Protect yourselves from calamities by praying"; "The property of which zakât has been paid cannot be counted as kanz,** (treasury cursed by Allâhu ta'âlâ) **even if it were buried under the ground. The property of which zakât has not been paid becomes kanz even if it were left in the open"; "Stinginess and îmân do not stay together in a Believer's heart!"** Hadrat Ibn Hajar al-Makkî explained the 'stinginess', which is censured in the hadîths, as 'not paying zakât'.

11) Though the âyat, **"We told them to become low monkeys,"** informs clearly that those Jews who had fished on Saturday were metamorphosed into monkeys, he has attempted to change this âyat by saying, "They were reduced to the low grade of monkeys. They must not have become monkeys physically," supposing himself to be a mujtahid like Imâm Mujâhid. Great scholar 'Abd al-'Azîz ad-Dahlawî writes in his Persian **Tafsîr-i 'Azîzî** detailedly that their figures and appearances turned into monkeys and that they died after living three days, thus answering those who say like Sayyid Qutb.

12) Again in his tafsîr book, he says, "No rule has been mentioned in the Qur'ân about making the captives slaves. Islam has eradicated slavery." Realizing that this opinion of his is wrong, he changes his tone and says, "Islam eradicated slavery, except for the legitimate captives of war, for, in those days, it was not powerful enough to force society to admit a rule which was against traditions." Through this absurd logic, he tries to cover his error. He cannot deny the fact that, in the year 7 A.H., Rasûlullah ('alaihi 's-salâm) distributed the captives which he had captivated in the Ghazâ of Khaibar to his companions as slaves and jâriyas and this has been practised for centuries in Islamic states. But, as if Islam had brought rules for societies of unbelievers -he supposes so- he puts forward a very horrible idea: "Islam was not powerful enough to have its rules admitted." He could not think that this lack of power would refer to Allâhu ta'âlâ and would cause unbelief. Indeed, Islam has not brought any rules, that is, commands and prohibitions, to unbelievers. Islamic rules are for Mulims and Muslim societies. Islam demands one single thing from unbelievers: To have îmân. The reason why the dhimmîs have to obey mu'âmâlât is because they are counted as Muslims

legally.

13) Sayyid Qutb puts forward his own point of view also on marrying those women who are disbelievers with holy books and attempts to compete with mujtahids. His only stock for interpreting, writing religious books is his knowledge of Arabic, which is concomitant with his nationality. The most serious error of this writer, whose single art is being a good translator, is that he has not realized that he has to be a muqallid in religious knowledge. As a matter of fact, only mujtahids' opinions are worth being followed on the interpretations of explicit âyats and hadîths and in those teachings about which there is no explicit âyat or hadîth. The opinions of non-mujtahids, i.e. muqallids like us, cannot be religious knowledge. Those religiously ignorant people who put forward ideas disagreeing with mujtahids' opinions are called **"religion reformers"** or **"zindîqs"**. These are the people who want to demolish the religion from behind the cover with which they disguise themselves as religious men. The true man of religion means the true Muslim who learns the explanations and opinions of mujtahids after years of lucubration and who conveys them to the people of his time in a way they can comprehend.

Sayyid Qutb, knowing Arabic well due to his nationality, attempted to compare the socialistic teachings he had studied and defended in admiration for forty years with the Qur'ân. Not having read the books of Islamic scholars and being influenced by Muhammad 'Abduh, chief of Egyptian freemasonic lodge, he began to write his books advocating anti-madhhabism and Wahhâbism in the final years of his life. His book **Social Justice in Islam,** published in 1948, teems with his subversive, heretical ideas. Saying that we should hold fast to the Qur'ân, he towed the youth behind his heretical thoughts. I wish he had read the writings of those mujâhids who had studied and understood Islam well, such as 'Abd al-Qâdir Udah and Ahmad al-'Adwî al-Azharî who were contemporary with him; thus he would have learned the superiority of the Ahl as-Sunna scholars and attained the fortune of holding fast to their path, which is the only path to salvation. In fact, even those who said that he was an Islamic scholar could not refrain from saying, "His research into knowledge and philosophy has gifted him an unfaltering îmân," meaning that his îmân was heretical and was based not on Islamic teachings but on

philosophical thoughts.

Some people who occupy religious posts and pass themselves off as religious authorities, besides getting decieved by the modernist, heretical ideas of Sayyid Qutb, strive to disseminate his un-Islamic ideas among the youth. And some others try to exploit this situation by mistranslating his tafsîr and some parts of his other books and publishing them for high prices. They attack our books because they reveal the facts, awaken the youth and thereby pose a hindrance to their exploitation. Because they cannot afford criticisms based on knowledge and documentation, they have recourse to lies and slanders. These liars cannot give any evidence for their accusations when they are defied to do so.

The following fatwâ of Hadrat Ahmad ibn Hajar al-Makkî, a prominent Islamic scholar, is sufficient to understand how heretical and harmful Sayyid Qutb's tafsîr, **Fî dilâl al-Qur'ân,** is:

"The law courts should take preventive measures against those who, instead of quoting from the tafsîrs of Islamic scholars, write their own ideas as tafsîr and offer such tafsîrs to the people. Such tafsîrs are heretical and superstitious. Men of religious posts who publish them are heretics endeavouring to mislead others away from the right path."

A Muslim who reads this fatwâ, which is quoted from **al-Fatâwâ al-hadîthiyya,** should not be deceived by the writings of ignorant, heretical men of religious posts, should hold fast to the Ahl as-Sunna books, which those heretics try to defame, and should not buy or read the false, poisonous books of other heretics whom they praise highly and systematically.

58 - There is a group of people who have been visiting Islamic countries and preaching and advising Muslims under the name **Tablîgh jamâ'at.** Leaving India and Pakistan in gangs of three to five persons, these people have been going all over the world. They say that they try to spread Islam. They claim to be in the path of as-Sahâba. Some of them also say that they follow the Hanafî madhhab and admire Ibn Taymiyya. Although most of what they say is useful and true, the fact that they never mention the names and words of Islamic scholars and seem to conceal part of the Ahl as-Sunna knowledge arouses suspicion and anxiety. In the following, the writings of some of the religious authorities

living in India and Pakistan about them is given:

"They are heretics. They call themselves **Jamâ'at at-tablîgh.** Their centre is in Delhi [with large branches in Karachi and Lahore in Pakistan.] Wherever they go, they lay very much stress upon performing salât. They give useful and necessary religious information. They call these activities of theirs **'kast'** in Urdu language. It is said that their organization was founded by an Indian named Mawlânâ Muhammad Ilyâs. This man was born in Kandla in 1303 A.H. (1886). He was Rashîd Ahmad Gangohî's disciple. It is written on the 43rd and 49th pages of the book **Mawlânâ Ilyâs Urankî dînî Da'wat** by one of Ilyâs's close disciples that he stayed with him for ten years. When Rashîd Ahmad died in 1323 (1905) he was taught by Khalîl Ahmad Sahâranpûrî. In his Urdu book, Khalil Ahmad [d. Medina, 1346 (1928)] says that the Devil is more learned than Rasûlullah ('alaihi 's-salâm). Rashîd Ahmad said on the 51st page of **Barâhin-i qâti'a** that Khalîl Ahmad's book was a blessed one and kept it at the place called **'Bait-i 'ain-i Islâm.'** Rashîd Ahmad was the khalîfa of Hâji Imdâdullah al-Madanî [d. Mecca, 1317 (1899)], and was first taught by Ismâ'il Dahlawî, who wrote on the 38th page of **Taqwiyat al-îmân** which is the Urdu translation of Ibn 'Abd al-Wahhâb's **Kitâb at-tawhîd,** 'Rasûlullah ('alaihi 's-salâm) died and rotted away. He became soil. He who believes that he will intercede in Resurrection becomes a polytheist.' Another tutor of Ilyâs was Ashraf 'Alî Tahanawî who also was a khalîfa of Hâji Imdâdullah of the Chishtiyya tarîqa. In the first part of his Urdu book **Hifz al-îmân,** he writes very loathsome things which reduce the high grade of Rasûlullah ('alaihi 's-salâm) to the low degree of a child, of a mad person or of animals. All the four tutors of Ilyâs became unbelievers because of such writings of theirs in their books. Ilyâs praises, exalts and excessively respects these unbelievers. He says that they were the most eminent awliyâ' of their time. The 114th page of the book **Malfûzât-i Hadrat-i Mawlânâ Ilyâs Rahmatullâhi 'alaih** is full with such praises. He says about his shaikh Rashîd Ahmad, 'Had not I seen him, my heart would not have attained tranquility. Whenever I woke up at night I would go to his room, look at his face and then come back and go to sleep. His love, like the blood in my veins, has penetrated everywhere in me.' (pp. 44, 49, **Mawlânâ Ilyâs Urankî**). Allâhu ta'âlâ declares in the last âyat of the sûrat al-

Mujâdala, **'Those who believe in Allâhu ta'âlâ and the Day of Resurrection will dislike those** [unbelievers] **who do not obey Allâhu ta'âlâ and His Messenger ('alaihi 's-salâm). Allâhu ta'âlâ will fill with îmân the hearts of those who dislike unbelievers even though they are their fathers, sons, brothers or relatives.'** All the members of Tablîgh jamâ'at exaggerate and praise Ilyâs and his teachers very much and say 'rahmatullâhî 'alaih' when they mention or hear their names. They spread their above-mentioned books everywhere.

"The Ahl as-Sunna scholars wrote many books in order to refute the Tabligh group and to reveal the fact that they were heretics. They could not answer these books at all. Hadrat Mawlânâ 'Abd al-'Alîm Siddîqî wrote that Ilyâs's teachers were in an endeavour to demolish Islam from within."[1]

When Ilyâs died in 1363 (1949) the successor was his son, Muhammad Yûsuf Kandhlavî [b. Delhi, 1335 (1917); d. Lahore, buried Delhi, 1394 (1974)]. Yûsuf's three-volume book, **Hayât-us-Sahâba,** was translated into Turkish and published in 1395 (1975). Because as-Sahâba are praised much in this book it arouses admiration in the reader. However, there is a famous saying: "Judge a man by his actions, not by his words." One who believes in the superiority of as-Sahâba and loves them has to follow in their path, which is the path shown by the Ahl as-Sunna scholars. The sign of love for as-Sahâba is to learn the fiqh books of one of the four Ahl as-Sunna madhhabs, to endeavour to disseminate their teachings and to lead a life in conformity with them.

Muhammad Yûsuf was succeeded by his son, Shaikh In'âm al-Hasan, who was a hadîth teacher at Mazâhir-i 'Ulûm Madrasa in Saharanpur, India. Abu 'l-Hasan 'Alî Nadvî, the director of Nadwat al-ulamâ' [founded in Lucknow, India in 1310 (1891)], praises al-Imâm ar-Rabbânî Ahmad as-Sirhindî and his services in his book **ad-Da'wat al-Islâmiyya** [Lucknow, 1395 (1975)], but adds his praises for Ismâ'îl Dahlawî (killed in 1246), Nadhîr Husain Dahlawî (d. 1320), the madrasa in Diobend which was founded by Muhammad Qâsim Nanawtawi [d. 1317 (1899)], one of the Khulafâ' of Imdâd-ullah, in 1288 (1871), Ashraf Alî Tahanawî (d.

---

[1] This is written in detail also in the books **Al-mustanad, Usûl al-arba'a fî tardîd al-Wahhâbiyya, Ad-dawlat al-Makkiyya** and **Hediyya-t-ul-Mehdiyyîn,** which were reproduced in Istanbul in 1395 (1975).

1362), the Tablîgh group and its founder, Muhammad Ilyâs. This faqîr, the author, has read the book **Taqwîm al-bayân,** Persian translation of Ismâ'il Dahlawî's **Taqwiyat al-îmân** [Pakistan, 1396 (1976)] and come to the conclusion that Ismâ'îl is not only a sheer ignoramus but also a non-madhhabî idiot who strives to decry the right by alloying it with the wrong. May Allâhu ta'âlâ protect Muslims from reading and believing such heretical writings and falling into endless calamity! Âmin!

In the Shawwal 1399 A.H. (1979) and following issues of the monthly periodical **al-Muallim** which is published by the Jamiyat al-'ulamâ' called "Samasta" located in the Malappuram City of the Kerala State, South India, Mawlawî Abû Ahmad, one of the Ahl as-Sunna scholars, wrote under the heading 'Disclosure of the Suspicions about Jamâ'at at-Tabligh':

"Various groups of people have appeared in North India who say that they will renew the religion and disseminate it everywhere. Many people, judging them only by their ostensible statements, follow them without investigating their and their founders' faith. Upon seeing their inner nature, many of them have departed and expose their lies and tricks. History has witnessed many such heretics, who are slaved by their nafs and vicious thoughts. They have interpreted the documents of Islam wrongly. They dissent to the rotten principles of Ibn Taimiyya and Muhammad ibn 'Abd al-Wahhâb an-Najdî. Those who know little about religious knowledge think that they are on the right path and believe that they serve Islam. One of these heretical groups is that which follow the path invented by Mawlânâ Ilyâs. They call themselves **'Jamâ'at at-tablîgh.'** They travel around the world. With their worship, attractive speech and attire, they look like religious, pious people. They never speak about their beliefs and the path they follow. They began to spread their seed in Kerala, too. The 'ulamâ' of Samasta Kerala have opened jihâd against them by displaying their heretical books, beliefs and background and their founders' life-stories and path. Studying them, they understood their artifice and that they were ahl al-bid'a. They issued the fatwâs that they had dissented from the righteous path of Ahl as-Sunnat wa 'l-Jamâ'a and that they were on the route of bid'a and dalâla (heresy). These fatwâs of the 'ulamâ' of southern and northern India and Ceylon Island became an ijmâ'. And we, with the guidance of Allâhu ta'âlâ and by keeping on the

footsteps of the Salaf as-Sâlihîn, will explain their vicious beliefs and heretical path:

"The founder of this heretical path was Muhammad Ilyâs ibn Ismâ'il, who was born in 1303 A.H. (1886) and died in 1363 (1944). He formerly taught at Mazâhir al-'ulûm Madrasa. When he became unsuccessful there, he started to live as a shaikh. He made his living by writing amulets and prayers for ignorant people. Meanwhile, he established the tarîqa of 'Tablîgh'. Jamâl Muhammad Sâhib, Director of the madrasa called 'Kulliyat-i kaid-i millat' in Madras, gave extensive information about this movement in the July 24, 1976 issue of the paper **Jandaraka.**

"Head of Jamâ'at at-tablîgh, which is located in Delhi, and his friend Muhammad Idris al-Ansârî explain the causes of the establishment of this path in the booklet **Tablîgh-i Dustûr al-'amal** (published by the Jamal printing house in Delhi) in this way: 'If thought well and the history is studied, it will be seen that men could not attain to peace and bliss with the four fundamental usûl. This is understood from the 139th âyat of the sûrat Âl 'Imrân which states "You are more honourable and superior than them, for you have belief." Firstly, the aim of Islam is to change the bâtin (internal aspect), that is, the heretical beliefs and habits. Secondly changing them is possible only through the way chosen by prophets. Thirdly, the works done up to now by Muslims either singly or wholely have not been for this aim, and they did not follow the way of prophets. Fourthly, for this reason, it is necessary to establish a sâlîh jamâ'a (pious community), that is, Jamâ'at al-Islâmiya, which must work according to the way shown by Islam. Now, this job is done by Muhammad Ilyâs, one of the sâlih servants of Allah. Gathering the ones who want to work in the way of Islam, he formed a new community called the **Jamâ'at at-tablîghiyya.'**

"Look at these words! According to the leader of the Jamâ'at at-tablîghiyya, the works done by al-Ummat al-Muhammadiyya, singly or wholely, for fourteen hundred years were not in the way of prophets ('alaihi mu 's-salâtu wa 's-salâm) and were not aimed at changing the heretical beliefs that had spread among human beings; therefore, it has become a must to establish a new jamâ'at! Those who have wanted to separate al-Ummat al-Muhammadiyya and to start a new heretical movement against Ahl as-Sunna have always come about by saying such words;

claiming that the whole Ummat Islâmiyya has deviated from the right path and dissented from the way of salvation, they have founded new paths. They have put their invented, corrupt, heretical ideas forth in this way.

"Another similar one, Abul Ala Mawdûdî, recently founded an organization called Jama'at Islami in Pakistan. On the fifteenth page of his Urdu booklet **Min Musliman ur mawjûduhû sîyasî,** he explains the cause of his founding this organization in this way: 'I have investigated and studied much. I decided to take the present Islamic ring off my neck. If I did not do so, I, too, would be in the footsteps of the irreligious called ilhâd and dahriyya [he calls the religion of his ancestors as 'ilhâd and dahriyya'.] Therefore, I have put forth a new religion conformable to the meaning of kalimat at-tawhid.' He claimed to be the first true Muslim of his time and called everybody, Muslim or not, to this new religion.

"Muhammad Ilyâs said the same, claiming that what the Ummat al-Muhammadiyya had done for centuries were not conformable to the way of prophets. Muhammad Manzûr an-Nu'mânî, on the twelfth page of his booklet **Malfûzât,** quotes him: 'All of what the Ummat al-Muhammadiyya do now are rites and customs. Those who taught religion and directed religious affairs depended on rites and customs.' Muhammad Hasan Khân, one of the leaders of Jamâ'at at-tablîgh, wrote in the preface to **Miftâh at-tablîgh,** 'Because religious affairs are misdirected at the present time, many people are caught by the current of shirk, kufr and ilhâd. Pitying at this situation of men, Allâhu ta'âlâ sent Shaikh Muhammad Ilyâs as a mu'jiza to awaken Muslims from unawareness and to initiate them into the spirit of religion. This mujâhid endeavoured to awaken people in the Mivat town, south to Delhi, as possible as the conditions of his time permitted.' It would not be easy for them to answer the question, from where did Ilyâs find the right path while the whole Umma was in kufr and dalâla?'

"In summary, the group of Jamâ'at at-tablîgh, like their other upstart colleagues, say that the Ummat al-Muhammadiyya has fallen for dalâla, dissented from the right path. These words are exactly opposite to what our Prophet (sall-Allâhu 'alaihi wa sallam) had conveyed, for he said in a hadîth reported by at-Tirmidhî, **'My umma do not agree on deviation.'** This hadîth

absolutely tells that the knowledge on which the mujtahidîn, that is, Muslim scholars agreed are always right. Not only scholars, but also every sane person will immediately understand this.

"In the following, the establishment of the Jamâ'at at-tablîghiyya will be detailed:

"Abu 'l-Hasan Alî Nadvî, famous authority on religion and history in India, quotes the founder of the Jamâ'at at-tablîghiyya, Ilyâs, as saying, 'I started this job when I was in Medina in 1345 A.H. (1926). I was given the good news that realization of this movement would be through my hands.' These are written in Urdu on the 77th page of the book **Mawlânâ Ilyâs Urankî dîni Da'wat.** On the next page, it is written that he began to call people to religion after his return from Medina to India. From the two lines quoted from him, it is understood that he claimed to begin this invitation upon the command and good news of Allâhu ta'âlâ. The inner aspect of this movement is written in detail in **Malfûzât al-Ilyâs.** On page 50 of this book, his pupil Muhammad Manzûr an-Nu'mânî gives this good news of his master to his friends: 'Ru'yâ (dream) is one of the 46 parts of prophethood. Promotions (taraqqî) that cannot be obtained through riyâda and mujâhada can occur to some selected men in ru'yâ. Teachings that dawn upon them in ru'yâ are parts from prophethood. Won't promotion come about with these? Knowledge increases ma'rifa. And ma'rifa makes one closer to Allah. Therefore, Allâhu ta'âlâ commanded us to say, **"Oh Allah! Increase my knowledge!"** Man is given sahîh knowledge in ru'yâ. Therefore, pray so that this leader of yours shall sleep much. When I sleep little because of getting angry, I resort to a physician and use the medicines he gives me to increase my sleep. This way of invitation through tablîgh was shown to me in ru'yâ. The interpretation of the âyat, **"You are the best umma. You have been created for the welfare of human beings. You command the goodness to be done and prohibit the wrong,"** was told to me in ru'yâ. Like prophets, I have been created for the invitation of the people. The phrase 'You have been created' in the âyat indicates that this invitation will not be completed by doing it at one place or city, that it is necessary to get out of one's place to go to other cities and to visit houses.' Look at these words! The Qur'ân is interpreted in dream, he claims, and sahîh knowledge was given to him in dream, and it cannot be obtained through riyâda or mujâhada. From the word

'Ukhrijat' in the âyat, he derives a meaning which has not been reported by any mufassir. He tells his followers to endeavour to sleep much and teaches many other things as understood from his writings. Are not these the examples of interpreting the Qur'ân according to his own point of view? Our Prophet prohibited and frightened Muslims against such interpretation with the hadîth, **'Let Hell fire be the residence of who interprets the Qur'ân according to his own view.'** This hadîth was reported by at-Tirmidhî. Those who cannot differentiate their left side from the right or recognize fard and sunna travel to carry out tablîgh just because of this interpretation in ru'yâ. After the spread of Islam everywhere from the East to the West, their going from house to house to complete al-amru bi 'l-ma'rûf, too, was all commanded in dream! 'Allâma ibn Jarîr at-Tabarî and many mufassirs among the Salaf as-Sâlihîn interpreted this âyat, and 'Allâma Imâm as-Suyûtî reported them in his book **Durar al-mansûr.** On the 64th page of the second part of this work, it is written, ' 'Abd Ibn Hamîd, Ibn Jarîr at-Tabarî and Ibn al-Munzir reported from Imâm Mujâhid that, in the âyat, **"You are the beneficial umma. You have been created for the welfare of human beings,"** 'human beings' were the people other than the Arabs, while the 'beneficial umma' were the Arabs.' It is apparent that none of the scholars of tafsîr had interpreted this âyat as Ilyâs did. Then, his movement of tablîgh is not in conformity with the path of the Qur'ân, Hadîth and Salaf as-Sâlihîn. It is based on an interpretation done in a dream, in sleep. And this is ibtidâ' in Islam, that is, inventing a bid'a. Our Prophet (sall-Allâhu 'alaihi wa sallam) declared, **'Reject it when a thing absent in Islam comes up in our religion.'** This hadîth as-sherîf is quoted in the **Sahîhain** of al-Bukharî and Muslim.

[An-Nablûsî, too, gives extensive explanations concerning this subject on the 128th page of **al-Hadîqa**.[1] He writes on its 168th page, "Dreams seen in sleep, like spiritual inspiration (ilhâm rûhânî), cannot be reasons that disclose the rules of Islam." On its 170th page, he writes, "It is possible (jâ'iz) that Allâhu ta'âlâ opens and fills with ma'ârif and haqîqa the heart of someone who has not read any book. When this person hears an âyat or a

[1] The first volume of **al-Hadîqat an-nadiyya** has been reproduced by Hakîkat Kitabevi in Istanbul.

hadîth, he interprets it and bewilders 'ulamâ'. But adapting oneself to him is not sahîh. He is a Walî but not an imâm or murshid. To be a scholar of Islam, one has to have a full understanding of the ahkâm of the hadîths." He says on the 187th page, "Forgetting about Islam, that is, Islam's becoming like customs, or following not Islam but reason and one's own views, stems from four things: firstly, not to do what one has learned; to do without knowing, that is, instead of learning Allâhu ta'âlâ's commands, to follow one's own intelligence and views, to try to make everybody to do the same way, and to believe in their righteousness and benefits, while bearing hostility against those who do not like them; thirdly, not to learn beforehand the ahkâm (Islamic rules) of the things one will do; to prevent people's learning religious teachings and to slander at those who want to learn or teach them to the youth by calling it old-fashioned or retrogressive. The superiors of tasawwuf, awliyâ' and murshids, have always followed Islam. They attained to high degrees in this way. Following Islam means to follow its four guides which are the Qur'ân, the Sunna, ijmâ' al-Umma and qiyâs al-fuqahâ'. Those who adapt themselves to things other than these four references will be taken to Hell torment. They are the liars who show the wrong as truth and block the way to endless bliss."]

"Hafiz Ibn Hajar al-Askalânî said, 'Dreams of people other than prophets do not communicate the rules of Islam, which are understood through wahî and ijtihâd.' Then, how can an âyat be interpreted through a person's dream? How can people be ruled through dreams? Depending on a dream, how can people be sent to every part of the world? Aren't the rules of Islam altered by this. Even one who has little religious knowledge understands this exactly.

"Allâhu ta'âlâ has declared that He sent the Qur'ân to be explained to people. The leader of Jamâ'at at-tablîgh, however, says that the Qur'ân was interpreted to him in his dream. According to him and as it is claimed in **Tanbîhât** by Abul Ala Mawdûdî, who had the same views with him, explanation of the Qur'ân through the known tafsîr books is not necessary, while Arabic dictionaries are sufficient to understand what is shown in dream. These two reformers of religion, like every man of bid'a, give meanings to the Qur'ân according to their own views, while they still claim to follow the Qur'ân and the Sunna; this, however,

is an open lie.

"It is said in their booklet **Dustûr al-'amal,** 'The aims and beliefs of the members of Jamâ'at at-tablîgh are three:

1. to highten Allah's Word,

2. to spread Islam,

3. to unite those who have these beliefs. To reform the madhhab, ethics and education.' To understand their beliefs better, it was necessary to study their books. Some of their beliefs are discussed in the following:

"Muhammad Ilyâs, the head of the Tablîgh movement said, 'Our aim is to teach what Rasûlullah had taught to as-Sahâba. It is the first step of this movement to go around every country to tell about salât and give advices,' (**Malfûzât,** p. 31) These words mean that they tell Rasûlullah's teachings according to their own understanding of them and according to their view point. He said to his friend Zâhir Hasan, 'Our movement is supposed to be a group teaching only salât. I swear by Allah that our movement is not aimed at teaching salât. We bring up a new nation.' (**Dîni da'wat,** p. 205) These words openly displays his aim. It is apparent that the followers of Ilyâs are not sincere in trying to make everybody perform salât. This behaviour is a beginning, a trap to make everybody join themselves. As a matter of fact, the statement, 'To this humble person myself, our Tablîgh is composed of Islam, tarîqa and haqîqa,' (**Makâtîb,** p. 66) shows that this community, which was established on a dream of Ilyâs, included in itself a new Islam, and tarîqa. In fact 'dîn' (religion) is made up of these three fundamentals. Masked under the name of Islam, a new religion based on a dream is introduced. It is apparent that their above statement is of bid'a and dalâla.

"Muhammad Idris Ansârî, one of the followers of Ilyâs, said, 'The belief of this community is "Lâ ilâha ill-Allah Muhammadun Rasûlullah" ' (**Dustûr,** p. 4) This is Islam's fundamental belief. Qâdiânîs (Ahmadîs) and Bahâîs, who were unanimously ruled out as non-Muslims, also claimed this belief, and these, too, started new groups of bid'a by claiming the same. By saying, 'In order to do a task or an 'ibâda or to prohibit something, it should have been declared by Rasûlullah. No other document is needed,' (**Dustûr,** p. 5) Ilyâs denied ijmâ' and qiyâs among al-adillat ash-Shar'iyya. Nevertheless, he did not claim to be a mujtahid mutlaq;

if he had done so, he would not have been believed by anybody among those who had known his background and knowledge.

"One's joining this community is explained in the book **Dustûr al-'mal** as such: 'Anybody who says and believes the meaning of kalimat ash-shahâda becomes a member of this community. The group, nation or country he belongs to has no effect in this.' (p. 5) This passage shows that anybody who says he is a Muslim, whether he be a Qâdiânî or a member of other groups of bid'a, e.g. one of the heretics of Khârijîyya, Qadariyya, Mu'tazila or Mawdûdiyya, may become a partner to this group and do his worship depending only on hadîths. They do not pay attention to what the Salaf as-Salihîn had done and to ijmâ' and qiyâs. They do not follow one of the four madhhabs. On the other hand, they claim to adapt themselves to Islam, tarîqâ and haqîqa wholely. This, however, is an apparent dalâla, a heretical confusion. This movement as named Jamâ'at at-tablîgh resembles the heretical group called Jamâ'at Islami of Abul Ala Mawdûdî.

"He comments on the selection of the Jamâ'a's leader, 'In Islamic order, the status of amir (head, leader) is very important. The Amîr selected from among Jamâ'at at-tablîgh means the Ulu 'l-amr defined by Islam. It is fard for everybody to obey his known commands just as the commands of Allah and his Rasûl are obeyed (p. 6)... It is wajib to obey without objection those commands of the Amîr which are conformable to Islam. It is not permitted to investigate the Amîr's documentation. It is a grave sin not to carry out his command and to do what is opposite to his will: it brings about Allah's punishment and torment.' (p. 7) As is seen, they promote their amîrs to the status of prophethood. On the eighth page, it is said, 'Before the Amîr will give a command, it is wâjib for him to consult with the prominent of the Jamâ'a, and later with the members of the High Council. If their opinions fall apart, he prefers the one he wishes, and commands it.' As it is stated, they obey only hadîths and their amîr, as if the Qur'ân commanded obeying only their amîr as a fard and, to them, Allâhu ta'âlâ will revenge those who do not follow him. They confess that obedience to the amîr is compulsory even if he does not conform to what the members of the council say. The leaders and members of this council and the amîr will be from among themselves, that is, among those who have come together just upon saying kalimat ash-shahâda without investigating their cult

or knowledge or looking for any other condition. However, the Salaf as-Sâlihîn, that is, the scholars of Ahl as-Sunna, have defined the characteristics of the person to be 'Ulu 'l-amr. Allâma Abu 's-Su'ûd Effendi said, 'Ulu 'l-amr are the commanders who follow the Divine Path and the judges who are just. They are the Khulafâ' ar-râshidîn, the four caliphs, and those who follow in their footsteps.' Imâm al-Karkhî said, 'They are the commanders of the time of Rasûlullah (sal-Allahu 'alaihi wa sallam) and those who come later. Judges and military leaders are similar.' To some, however, Ulu 'l-amr means the 'ulamâ' of Islam. It is apparent that the amîrs of Jamâ'at at-tablîgh, whom they choose from among themselves, cannot be included. Also, it is without foundation that it is a wâjib to obey and a grave sin to disobey their amîrs' commands.

"While telling about what will happen to his umma, Rasûlullah ('alaihi 's-salâm) declared, **'The Sons of Isrâ'il parted into 72 nations. And my umma will part into 73 groups. Of them, only one will be saved, and all others will go to Hell.'** As-Sahâbat al-kirâm upon hearing this, asked, 'O Rasûl-Allah! Which is that?' He declared, **'They are those who follow my and my Sahâba's path.'** This hadîth sherîf was reported from 'Abdullah ibn 'Umar (radiy-Allâhu 'anh). As reported from Mu'âwiya (radiy-Allâhu 'anh) by Imâm Ahmad and Abû Dâwûd, Rasûlullah ('alaihi 's-salâm) declared, **'Of them, 72 are in Hell, and the remaining one is in Paradise. And this is one jamâ'a.'** This hadîth sherîf is also quoted in the chapter on 'I'tisâm' of the book **Mishkât.** O Muslims! We must search and find this single community of salvation mentioned in this hadîth and their beliefs which cause entrance to Paradise and should beware of heretical groups who oppose these beliefs! In this way, we shall endeavour to get saved from the Hell fire and flame! Hadrat Ghawth al-a'zam 'Abd al-Qâdir al-Jîlânî explained the former hadîth and the word 'jamâ'a' in the latter hadîth in these words: 'The Believer (Mu'min) should adapt himself to the Sunna and to the Jamâ'a. The Sunna is the way shown by Rasûlullah ('alaihi 's-salâm). The Jamâ'a is composed of the things done unanimously by as-Sahâbat al-kirâm who lived in the time of the four caliphs called Khulafâ' ar-râshidîn. A Muslim must prevent the multiplication of the men of bid'a and be away from them and should not greet them. Ahmad Ibn Hanbal, the imâm of our madhhab, said that greeting a man

of bid'a meant loving him since it had been declared in a hadîth ash-sherîf, **"Disseminate** [your] **greeting** (salâm)**! Love one another in this way!"** ' These are written on the 90th page of **Ghunyat at-tâlibîn.** Great 'âlim Ahmad ibn Hajar al-Hîtamî, the last muhaqqiq, wrote on this subject in detail on page 149 of his work **Sawâ'iq al-muhriqa,** where he said, 'Those who dissent from the Ahl as-Sunna faith are called **mubtadi'.** They began to appear in the first century [of Islam].'

"Hadrat Ibn Hajar al-Hîtamî said in his work **Fat'h al-jawâd,** '**Mubtadi** is the person who does not have the faith (i'tiqâd) conveyed unanimously by Ahl as-Sunna. This unanimity was transmitted by the two great imâms Abu 'l-Hasan al-Ash'arî and Abu Mansûr al-Mâturîdî and the 'âlims who followed their path.' On the 205th page of the book **Al-fatâwâ al-hadîthiyya,** it is written, 'Man of bid'a means one whose beliefs are different from the Ahl as-Sunna faith. The Ahl as-Sunna faith is the faith of Abu 'l-Hasan al-Ash'arî, Abu Mansûr al-Mâturîdî and those who followed them. One who brings forth something which is not approved by Islam becomes a man of bid'a.' Shâfi'î 'âlim Ahmad Shihâb ad-dîn Kalyûbî al-Misrî wrote on the fourth volume of his marginalia to the book **Kanz ar-râghibîn:** 'One who departs from what Abû 'l-Hasan al-Ash'arî and Abu Mansûr al-Mâturîdî reported is not **Sunnî.** These two imâms followed the footprints of Rasûlullah ('alaihi 's-salâm) and his Sahâba.'

"From the foregoing passages, it is understood that only one of the seventy-three groups that have come out of the partition of this umma will be saved against Hell. It is wâjib for every Muslim to search for, to find and to adapt himself to this group, members of which follow the path of Abu 'l-Hasan al-Ash'ârî and Abu Mansûr al-Mâturîdî. How could it be correct of one who comes afore by establishing a new group in this age sees saying **'Lâ ilâha illa-Allah Muhammadun Rasûlullah'** sufficient and stays away from the faith of Ahl as-Sunnat wa 'l-Jamâ'a? The speeches and writings of the upstart group called Jam'at at-tablîgh show that uttering 'Lâ ilâha ill-Allah Muhammadun Rasûlullah' is the only condition necessary for admission to this group. Any person, whether he belongs to a heretical group or disobey everybody except Rasûlullah, immediately becomes a member of this group upon this utterance, even if he would

disobey as-Sahâba and mujtahids. People representing Qâdiânism, Nîjarî, Wahhâbism, Mawdûdism and various non-Muslim movements are witnessed to belong to this jamâ'a. What else would it be if this behaviour of theirs isn't a proof of their intention to disunite the Umma?

"Do they correct the heretics after accepting them into their group? The opposite of this is seen in their books and behaviour. They prohibit speaking on the madhhabs. They give freedom to everybody in his beliefs. On the 16th page of **Dustûr al-'amal,** it is written, 'Disunionist, unnecessary subjects should not be spoken on. The essence of tawhid and fundamental of Islam shall be studied.' The same is written on page 218 of **Miftâh at-tablîgh.** Their leader Muhammad Ilyâs wrote on the 116th page of **Malfûzât:** The basis of our movement is to strengthen îmân. It is not correct to widen the knowledge concerning beliefs (aqâ'id). If we do so, there will arouse sedition in hearts and suspicions in minds.' He says on the 142nd page of **Makâtîb,** 'Sometimes you use the word **bid'a.** Do not utter such words! Such words cause disunion among people.'

"In conclusion, they do not have the Ahl as-Sunna faith. All of the seventy-three groups may come together among them freely; moreover, non-Muslims, too, may join them. They do not deal with the knowledge of faith; they even prohibit learning it. They say that they follow only the Prophet. They do not study the single right path which was stated in the hadîth. They say that it will cause disunion if studied. They do not use the word 'bid'a' or similar ones, which, they claim, cause sedition. Despite all these heretical behaviours, they claim to belong to Ahl as-Sunnat wa 'l-Jamâ'a. However, in view of the followers of this path of truth, there is no doubt about their heresy.

"The 'ulamâ' of Islam prohibited Muslims from friendship with men of bid'a. Hadrat Qutb al-aqtâb 'Abd al-Qâdir al-Jilânî said that it was much reward-deserving (thawâb) to believe that the madhhab of people of bid'a was corrupt, and not to follow them and to bear hostility against them. Our Prophet (sall-Allâhu 'alaihi wa sallam) declared, **'Allâhu ta'âlâ fills with amân** (courage) **and îmân the heart of the person who stare with enmity at the man of bid'a. The one who knows the man of bid'a as wicked is saved by Allâhu ta'âlâ against the fear of the Day of Resurrection.** [Rank of] **a hundred degrees is bestowed by Allâhu**

ta'âlâ in Paradise upon him who insults the man of bid'a. One who meets the man of bid'a with smiling face or does goodness to him will have disliked Islam sent to Muhammad ('alaihi 's-salâm) **by Allâhu ta'âlâ.'** A hadîth ash-sherîf reported by Mughîra from 'Abdullah ibn 'Abbâs (radiy-Allâhu 'anhumâ) says, **'Unless a man of bid'a gives up his bid'a, Allâhu ta'âlâ will not accept any of his acts of worship.'** Fudail ibn 'Iyâd said, 'Allâhu ta'âlâ destroys the 'ibâdât and takes the light of îmân out of the heart of the one who loves the man of bid'a.' Even in case the 'ibâdât of the one who does not love the man of bid'a is limited, it is hoped that his sins will be forgiven. In order not to meet a man of bid'a, change your direction! The above-given hadîths and advices are written on the 90th page of the book **Ghunyat at-tâlibîn.** The followers of Jamâ'at at-tablîgh, who call themselves Muslim and introduce themselves as Ahl as-Sunna, accept heretics of every kind into their community. Whether of Ahl as-Sunna or ahl al-bid'a, any Muslim can join their movement. Despite this confusion, they claim to be on the right path. This situation resembles the state of keeping two opposite things, like fire and powder, together, which is impossible.

"While the founder of Jamâ'at at-tablîgh, Muhammad Ilyâs, was putting forth what he had seen in dream as a new religion, he was also inoculating the evil germs injected to him by the non-madhhabite. On page 90 of **Makâtîb,** he says, 'It is certainly good to attend at the gatherings of hatm al-Qur'ân and dhikr. The prominent people of the religion said so. However, because there is the risk of being like the men of bid'a, it is better to refrain from attending at such places. There is the same danger both in saying salât and salâm upon the Prophet with the thought in mind that he is present and sees, and in saying salât and salâm as the men of bid'a [?] say. Yes, though it is permitted to say it unconsciously out of extreme love, the Satan may intervene and spoil îmân. And this is a greater danger.'

"Look at these words! He does not permit saying salât and salâm upon this great Prophet with the thought of his being present and seeing, even if it would be done unconsciously out of extreme love for him! This is a Wahhâbite belief. His prohibiting it even in case of extreme love is a heresy that surpasses that of the Wahhâbîs. One who is Muslim does not prohibit it. What does he think about all Muslims' saying, 'As-

salâmu ‘alaika ayyuha ’n-Nabiyyu,’ in salât? See what the ‘Document of Islam’ (Hujjat al-Islam) Imâm al-Ghazâlî (rahmat-Allâhu ’alaih) wrote in his work **Ihyâ al-’ulûm:** ‘At first, bring to your heart the holy figure of Rasûlullah (’alaihi ’s-salâm). Then recite **As-salâmu ’alaika ayyuha ’n-Nabiyyu** and believe that he will hear you and answer you.’ (First volume, p. 129) Ottoman ’âlim Muhammad Hakkı Effendi (d. Mecca, 1301 A.H.)/1884) wrote in the first article on page 166 of his **Hazînat al-asrâr,** ‘The Muslim should think of himself as being in the presence of Rasûlullah (’alaihi ’s-salâm) and, showing honour, respect and manners and keeping in mind that he is the intercessor, wasîla and saviour between him and Allâhu ta’âlâ, say salât and salâm. At this holy place, the most suitable is to say, **As-salâmu ’alaika ayyuha ’n-Nabiyyu.’**

“Al-’ârifu bi ’llâh Sayyid Muhammad ’Uthmân al-Mirghânî al-Makkî al-Hanafî (d. Mecca, 1268 A.H./1852) said on page 14 of his work **Akrab at-turuki ila ’l-haqq:** ‘Think of Rasûlullah’s (’alaihi ’s-salâm) presence facing you, his seeing and hearing you! Even if you are far away, Allâhu ta’âlâ makes your voice be heard and displays you. Here, being near or distant is the same.’ All these passages show that Rasûlullah (’alaihi ’s-salâm) sees and hears those who think of facing him. The founder of Jamâ’at at-tablîgh does not believe in this. He prohibits it even if it would be out of extreme love and says that the Prophet does not see or hear those who think of him. This word of his, however, stems from the basic Wahhâbite tenet that states, ‘The dead do not hear.’ The most correct comment on this subject is the following fatwâ of Ahmad ibn Hajar al-Hîtâmî, the last of profound ’ulamâ’, which is written on the ninth page of the second volume of **Fatâwâ al-kubrâ:**

“**Question:** ‘Does a person, when he commends his soul, see Rasûlullah (sall-Allâhu ’alaihi wa sallam)? It is said that, when he is seen, he is asked what he would say about that person. “That person” is used for the person who is at his presence. Many people die at the same time. Since the words “that person” is used for all of them, it is understood that he is seen at many places at the same time. How can this happen?’

“**Answer:** ‘It is true that Rasûlullah (sall-Allâhu ’alaihi wa sallam) is seen by everybody who is about to die, and he is asked, “What would you say about that person?” This shows the

Supremacy of Allâhu ta'âlâ's Power. The word **that** is used for pointing to the person who is at his presence. This word is the answer to the person who does not believe that Rasûlullah (*'alaihi 's-salâm*) can be seen in various ways at various places at the same moment. In fact, this can be believed through intellect, too: his adh-dhât ash-sherîf (honourable person) becomes like a mirror, and everybody sees the image of his own beauty or ugliness in this mirror. No change takes place in the beauty of the mirror. Life in grave and that in the hereafter do not resemble to worldly life. Each person has a single figure in the world. It has been witnessed many times that Awliyâ' have taken various figures in this world, too. It is famous that Kadîb al-bân Hasan al-Mûsûlî and others have been seen as such.'

"He wrote in the first fatwâ on the 29th page: 'The dead recognize those who visit them. The hadîth reported by Ibn Abî 'd-dunya says, **"When one visits the grave of a brother-in-Islam and sits** [at the side]**, the dead person recognizes him and responds his greeting."** Another hadîth says, **"When a person passes by the grave of a Muslim brother of his acquaintance and greets the dead person recognizes him and acknowledges his greeting."** ' He writes in the second fatwâ, 'The dead hear the voices of the alive. The hadîth reported by Imâm Ahmad states, **"The dead person recognizes those who wash him, carry him and put him in grave."** ' Hadrat Sayyid 'Abdulhakîm-i Arwâsî, the profound 'âlim and great Walî who passed away in Ankara in 1362 A.H. (1943), said, 'Ibn Hajar al-Makkî was one of the most superior 'ulamâ' of Islam. His every word is documented and is a document.'

"How come one can suspect of Rasûlullah's (*sall-Allâhu 'alaihi wa sallam*) becoming present and seeing? The status of prophets, even of Awliyâ', is promoted after their pure souls leave their bodies; they become possessors of full tasarruf (disposal, effect) like angels. This has been reported unanimously by the 'ulamâ' of Ahl as-Sunna and has been denied only by Muhammad ibn 'Abd al-Wahhâb who was left in heresy by Allâhu ta'âlâ. And Ilyâs, the head of Jamâ'at at-tablîgh, was caught by his heretical current. The following is another example from the words of 'ulamâ' to brighten the eyes of those who believe him and to disgrace the faces of mulhids:

"Shâh Walî-Allâh ad-Dahlawî, one of the great 'ulamâ' of

India, wrote in his work **Hujjatu 'Illâhi 'l-bâligha** (vol. I, p. 35), 'When a human being passes away, no relation is left between his soul and the world of matter. The souls return to their origin, become like angels, and, like them, give inspirations and help to men. They help in the dissemination and strengthening of Allâhu ta'âlâ's religion. They rush to help those who work for this path. It has been witnessed that they come to help in groups.' This passage tells that blessed souls do work as angels do. Are these words not sufficient for the correction of those who do not believe that Rasûlullah (sall-Allâhu 'alaihi wa sallam) becomes present and hears? The 'ulamâ' of Islam have unanimously reported that he is the cause of all beings and the unique means of attaining closeness to Allâhu ta'âlâ.

"In his work **ar-Rawd an-nadîr,** 'Allâma 'Abd ar-Ra'ûf al-Manâwî wrote: 'After pure souls depart from this life and are promoted to their places, nothing is a curtain before them. They see, or learn from angels, everything. This is so mysterious that only few people are informed with it. While blessed souls are such, one should ponder and realize very well how the most superior of them is should!'

"Hadrat Ahmad Zainî Dahlân says on page 58 of **Taqrîb al-usûl:** 'Most of th 'ârifs said that, after a Walî passes away, his soul's connection to his murîds continues. With the soul's baraka, nûrs and faids come about. This is explained detailedly by Hadrat Qutb al-irshâd 'Abdullah al-Haddâd, who said in summary: "After a Walî passes away, he keeps his concern with his immediate acquaintances. This concern is more than that when he was alive. For, he was busy in this world also with his duties of being Allâh'u ta'âlâ's slave; sometimes these duties busy him more. It is usually in this manner especially in these times. When the elect die, their forms and bodies vanish, but their haqîqa (reality) continues to exist. They are alive in their graves. Because the Walî is alive in his grave, his knowledge and intellectual and spiritual powers do not change at all. In fact, they all increase further after death." ' While the case is as such with all Awliyâ', it should be estimated how it is with prophets, especially with the most superior of them. This apparent reality could be denied only by those who have been corrupted by non-madhhabite poison and those who have been caught in the trap of mulhids and dissented from Islam. May Allâhu ta'âlâ protect all Muslims against this

grave disaster! Âmin."[1]

59 - Ahmad Ridâ Khan Barilawî, a great scholar of India, in his fatwâ book **Fatâwâ 'l-Haramain,** answers twenty-eight questions. All of these fatwâs are in conformity with the teachings of the Ahl as-Sunna 'ulamâ'. Ten of these fatwâs are given below for their auspiciousness:

Question 1: "The British spies in India, who call themselves 'Nayâshira', believe that Jabrâ'il ('alaihi 's-salâm), angels, genies, the Satan, heavens, the mu'jiza of Mi'râj, Hell and Paradise exist and that bodies will get alive again as Muslims believe. Yet they give false meanings to the âyats that deal with these subjects, as some of the people called **Bâtiniyya** do. They say that these things are not made of matter but they are conceptual and imaginative. They say that nothing can exist beyond customs and physical laws. Thus they deny that Allâhu ta'âlâ can create many things beyond the laws of nature. They do not believe in mu'jizât, and they explain them away according to what they see and learn in nature. They say that it is harâm and cruelty to use as slaves the captives taken from among non-Muslims in the jihâd performed for spreading Allah's religion and that it is something done by the savage. Though it was defined in all heavenly religions, they claim that Allah has not commanded it. They do not believe any of the tafsîr and hadîth books. They claim that all their contents have been invented by 'ulamâ. They say, 'The Qur'ân remains the sole truth in our hands. We interpret the Qur'ân according to our new information. We do not believe what the early Muslims understood from it or what has reached us from them.' Can those who say so be called **'Muslims'** or **'Ahl al-Qibla'** even if they say that they are Muslim, utter kalimat ash-shahâda and perform salât towards the qibla? Moreover, these spies claim that they themselves are the real Muslims and that what they tell is the pure Islamic religion. Shall we call them 'Muslim' or 'non-Muslim'? Shall we consider their words as wrong and falsified?"

Answer 1: They are not sincere at all. I swear by Allah that they have no connection with Islam. They are enemies of Islam fed by the British. They are the worst of non-Muslims and

---

[1] **Al-Mu'allim,** monthly periodical; see above, p. 233. The Arabic original of the passage is published together with the book **al-Ustâd Mawdûdî** in Istanbul.

murtadds, because they deny Islam's basic tenets. Their saying kalimat ash-shahâda and professing that the Ka'ba is the qibla do not show their being Believers or Ahl al-qibla. None of the 'ulamâ' and books of i'tiqâd and fiqh has permitted alteration of the indispensable, apparent and open religious teachings.

Question 2: "It is understood that they are British spies. What would you say about those who, although they know their teachings and identify their heresy, call them Muslims, and even regard them as 'ulamâ' of Islam and religious authorities, or praise them with the terms that have not been used for the superiors of Islam yet, and, by mentioning their names, they say, 'They are the elect of our time. Their books are invaluable for the youth. Their writings prove their quality of perfection. They are the pillars of our religion and the guards of Islam.' What would you say about those who praise them in this manner, write, publish and advertise their books as the 'books of superiors of religion'?"

Answer 2: One who does not believe in one of Islam's basic tenets becomes a kâfir. Moreover, a person who doubts the fact that such people are kâfirs and will suffer eternal burning in Hell becomes a kâfir, too. That the latter, too, is a kâfir is openly written in the books **Bazzâziyya, ad-Durr al-mukhtâr,** Qâdî Iyâd's **Shifâ,** Imâm an-Nawawî's **Rawda** and Ibn Hajar al-Makkî's **al-A'lâm.** It has been unanimously declared by the 'ulamâ' of Islam that it also makes one kâfir to doubt that it is kufr if somebody does not regard a Christian, a Jew or a dissenter from Islam as a kâfir. This unanimity is written in the above-mentioned books. Now that doubt alone concerning a person's being a kâfir would make one a kâfir, too, it should be imagined how worse a curse would be incurred by considering that person a Muslim, not to mention the titles of praisal reserved for the Islamic scholars squandered in extolling him. These words of ours describe well the situation of those who consider such people as 'ulamâ' of Islam and praise and spread their speeches and writings teeming with kufr. Praise or effort to disseminate or to advertise shows approval and love. Approval of kufr causes kufr. Approval of kufr does not mean to want the kâfir to remain in kufr but to like his kufr.

Question 3: "What does 'ahl al-bid'a' mean?"

Answer 3: If the cause of an innovator's dissent from Ahl as-Sunna is his belief in the superiority of 'Alî over Abû Bakr and

'Umar (radiy-Allâhu 'anhum), he is of **ahl al-bid'a** as it is written in **Hulâsa, Hindiyya** and many other invaluable books. A person who does not believe in the khilâfat (caliphate) of one or both of the latter two Khalîfas was said to be a kâfir by the 'ulamâ' of fiqh and to be a man of bid'a by the 'ulamâ' of kalâm. For the sake of precaution, the term 'man of bid'a' should be used for them. A person absolutely becomes a kâfir if he says that Allâhu ta'âlâ is a creature, or that the present Qur'ân al-kerîm is deficient and contains alterations made by as-Sahâbat al-kirâm or (by others) later, or that 'Alî (radiy-Allâhu 'anh) or one of the Twelve Imâms is superior to prophets. It is written in **Hindiyya, Zahiriyya, al-Hadîqat an-nadiyya** and in fiqh books that he will be treated as a murtadd. There is detailed information on this subject in the book **Makâlat al-mufassira an ahkâmi 'l-bid'ati 'l-mukaffira.**[1]

Question 4: "What would say about those who praise the people called 'Bâtiniyya' with the words the 'stars of knowledge,' 'suns of 'ulamâ',' 'great scholars of our time,' or 'guides of the century' and about those who believe these words?"

Answer 4: If they know that they praise those declared to be murtadds, they also become murtadds. Even if those praised are not murtadds, it is apparent that it is ugly and bad to praise them. The hadîth as-sherîf reported through Anas ibn Mâlik (radiy-Allâhu 'anh) by Ibn Abî 'd-dunyâ, Abû Ya'la and al-Baihakî and through Abû Huraira (radiy-Allâhu 'anh) by Ibn 'Adî says: **"Praising a fâsiq** (sinner) **arouses our Rabb's indignation."**

---

[1] Ibn 'Âbidîn wrote on 'unlawful nikâh in **Radd al-muhtâr:** "If one worships 'Alî (radiy-Allâhu 'anh) or says, 'Jabrâ'il was ordered to reveal the Qur'ân to 'Alî, but he made mistake and revealed it to Muhammad,' or 'Abû Bakr was not a Sahâbî,' or 'Hadrat 'Â'îsha committed adultery,' he becomes a kâfir. If he says that 'Alî (radiy-Allâhu 'anh) was superior to the two caliphs (Abû Bakr and 'Umar 'radiy-Allâhu 'anhum'), or curses or slanders a Sahâbî, he becomes a man of bid'a." In the third volume, he wrote: "If one curses at or damns the two caliphs, be becomes a kâfir. Though those people caled Durzîs, Mulhids and Ismâ'îlîs practise the five fundamental duties of Islam, they become kâfirs because of their belief in transmigration of the soul and by regarding wine and intercourse as halâl and giving false meanings to âyats." Ibn 'Abidîn, in his book **Uqûd ad-durriyya,** quoted Shaikh al-Islam 'Abdullah Effendi's extensive fatwâ about the Shî'ites and names the groups that fell into kufr among them.

Permitting such praises or disseminating or advertising them shows consent to them. Consent to evils is also evil.[1]

Question 5: "What would you say about some people's saying that Allâhu ta'âlâ and His Prophet ('alaihi 's-salâm) may lie?"

Answer 5: Lying is a deficiency and ugliness. It has been unanimously declared that there is nothing ugly attributable to Allâhu ta'âlâ or His Rasûl ('alaihi 's-salâm). This is dealt in detail in my book **Subhâna 's-subbûh an 'aybi kazbin makbûh,** wherein I provided documents from the 'ulamâ' of kalâm and tafsîr. In many books by Arab and Persian 'ulamâ', it is written that those who say so have dissented from the right path and that they are heretics. The book **ad-Durar as-saniyya** by Hadrat 'Allâma Ahmad ibn Zain ibn Dahlân al-Makkî, who was one of my masters in hadîth, tells in detail about their heresies and quotes passages refuting them from Hadrat Mawlânâ Abu 's-su'ûd, the muftî of al-Madinat al-munawwara. They have been caught up in the Satan's current and become the Satan's soldiers. The Satan's soldiers will certainly be ruined.

Question 6: "Recently there have appeared a group of people called **'Ghayr al-muqallidîn'**, i.e. people not affiliated with a certain madhhab. They neither follow any of the four madhhabs nor let anybody follow one of them. They call themselves **ahl al-hadîth.** They say that they follow only the Hadîth. We see that some ignorant people, who are deprived of religious education and cannot differentiate the truth from the wrong and the straight from the crooked, pass themselves for authorities on religion after learning some Arabic in Egypt, the Hijâz, Iraq or in Damascus and write books on religion. What would you say about them and their books?"

Answer 6: In the subject on 'Zabâyih' in the marginalia of **ad-Durr al-mukhtâr,** 'Allâma Sayyid Ahmad at-Tahtâwî, one of the 'ulamâ of the Hanafî madhhab, writes: "One who departs from the path of the 'ulamâ' of fiqh, from as-siwâd al-a'zam, will have directed himself to Hell. O Muslims! Therefore, hold fast to the

---

[1] It is heard that some people admire the religious and political movement of Homeini of Iran and extoll his personality, despite the known fact that he was hostile to the Sahâba and to all the Sunnîs. They should carefully read this hadîth and fatwâ, learn from them and wake up from unawareness.

path of **Ahl as-Sunnat wa 'l-Jamâ'a** which is called **'al-firqat an-nâjiyya'** (group of salvation), the unique group reported by our Prophet ('alaihi 's-salâm) to be saved from Hell! For, Allâhu ta'âlâ will help, protect and guide to happiness only those who are on this path. Allâhu ta'âlâ's Ghadab (Wrath) and adhâb (torture) are for those who dissent from this path. Today, this firqat nâjiyya (group of salvation) have gathered in the four madhhabs, namely, Hanafî, Shâfi'î, Mâlikî and Hanbalî. One who does not belong to any of these four madhhabs is a man of bid'a or a man for Hell [heretic or unbeliever]." Great Imâm Sufyân ath-Thawrî (radiy Allâhu 'anh) said, "If one who is not an 'âlim in fiqh tries to adapt himself to hadîths, he leads himself to heresy." Great Imâm Ibn al-Hajj al-Makki said the same in his work **al-Mad'hal.** My fatwâs about and articles on the lâ-madhhabî are available in my book **Al-bârîkat ash-shârika 'alâ mârikat al-mushârika.**

Question 7: "Some people say, 'The lâ-madhhâbî belong to Ahl As-Sunna and are even licensed authorities on religion. They differ from Ahl as-Sunna only in insignificant teachings, and this difference is beneficial like that between the Hanafî, Shâfi'î and Mâlikî madhhabs; thereby they help the religion of Islam. Should not the lâ-madhhabî, therefore be considered like those in the Hanafî and Shâfi'î madhhabs and should not we know them as Muslim brothers and love them heartfully and respect them? Isn't it the way of people intoxicated with love for Allâhu ta'âlâ to do one's affairs according to hadîths though one is not a mujtahid? Didn't Abû Dharr al-Ghaffarî (radiy-Allâhu 'anh), a Sahâbî, act upon the hadîth, **"Do not stock your property to make it kanz, a treasure"?'** What would you say about those who say these about the lâ-madhhâbî?"

Answer 7: These words are not correct at all. The person who says so becomes one among them, even one worse than them. How could a man of bid'a be respected? A hadîth reported through 'Abdullah ibn Bashîr (radiy-Allâhu 'anh) by at-Tabarânî says, **"One who respects the man of bid'a will have helped in the annihilation of Islam."** Another hadîth, reported through Mu'âdh (radiy-Allâhu 'anh) in **Kabîr** by at-Tabarânî and in **Hilya** by Abu Nu'aim, says, **"One who walks to show respect to the man of bid'a has helped in destroying Islam."** There are many similar hadîths. It is dalâla, heresy, for those not promoted to the status of mujtahid not to follow one of the four madhhabs but to

do their worship and affairs according to what they understand from hadîths. It is dissention from the Believers' path. Allâhu ta'âlâ declares in the 43rd âyat of the sûrat an-Nahl, **"Ask what you do not know from the people of dhikr!"** A hadîth reported through Jâbir ibn 'Abdullâh (radiy-Allâhu 'anh) by Abû Dâwûd says, **"Ask what you do not know. Medicine for ignorance is inquiry."** The âyat and hadîth presently quoted command those who do not know to learn by asking those who know. Hence, those who speak about the lâ-madhhabî as quoted above or who admit and believe their words, in fact, belong to the lâ-madhhâbî, being their accomplices in heresy.

Question 8: "In the last two years, the number of this group of people has increased in India. An organization named **'Nadwat ul-ulama'** has been founded in claim of service to Islam and awakening Muslims. Here, every kind of people and those with heretical beliefs have gathered, and lâ-madhhabî people, including a few belonging to Ahl as-Sunna, have taken hold of high chairs. What would you say about this?"

Answer 8: Their behaviour is harâm and heretical. It is intended to estrange Muslims with little knowledge from their madhhabs. Such Muslims, upon seeing heretical men of religion in cooperation with Ahl as-Sunna scholars all sitting at the same line of chairs, think of those heretics also as respectful and beneficial. They begin to show respect to them, which is sinful. Islamic religion commands humiliation and severe treatment of men of bid'a and forbids showing respect to them. In 'aqâ'id books, e.g. in **Sharh al-maqâsid,** the 'ulamâ' of Islam wrote, "It is necessary to treat severely, to humuliate, to refute and to expel men of bid'a." When Muslims see them at high ranks, their hearts incline to listen to them and, with the Satan's cheating, begin to love them. In actual fact, those who cooperate with men of bid'a cause them to deviate from the right path. Gathering of people with different beliefs results in the destruction of the religion. Those who say that they will wake up Muslims, in fact, try to poison them and lead them to disaster.

Question 9: "The aim in the establishment of this organization, Nadwa, has been asserted to be the abolition of the difference between the Sunnî and other groups of bid'a. 'They should not refuse one another's beliefs, but live brotherly. 'Ulamâ' should not speak or write on the discordant beliefs among themselves.

Or else, they set a bad example to be copied by all Muslims and their disciples. Difference and argument cause perishing and stem from the desires of nafs and self-esteem,' they say. Are these words right or wrong or excessive?"

Answer 9: When a bid'a gets spread, it is fard to refute it and to try to disseminate its harmfulness and wickedness. That this is fard has been unanimously declared by the 'ulamâ' of Islam. Salaf as-Sâlihîn and the 'ulamâ of all times up to now have always opposed bid'a in this way. One who does not refuse men of bid'a but leave them to themselves will have dissented from Muslims' unanimity, got away from the Islamic jamâ'a and loved bid'as and holders of bid'a. And this means to discredit the Ahl as-Sunna madhhab and the Muslims of this right path; to forbid the established reason and to command the prohibition; to lead Muslims to Allâhu ta'âlâ's damnation. Great 'âlim Hadrat Ahmad ibn Hajar al-Makkî, the imâm of Muslims, said in the preface to his work **as-Sawâ'iq al-muhriqa,** "Though I do not have the profound knowledge to comprehend the reality and essence of the writings in this book, I was inclined to write because of the following hadîth ash-sherîf reported in **Al-Jâmi'** by Khatîb al-Baghdâdî: **'When seditions and bid'as spread and my Sahâba are slandered, those who know the truth should declare what they know! May those who do not declare what they know be damned by Allâhu ta'âlâ, by angels and by all people! Allâhu ta'âlâ does not accept any of their 'ibâdât and goodness.' "** The statement, "Telling what one knows causes disunion, is sinful and is self-destruction," is a slander against Allâhu ta'âlâ and Islamic 'ulamâ', dissention from the Ahl as-Sunna madhhab and denial or prohibition of an important fard.

Question 10: "They say, 'The most important aim of Nadwa is to annihilate the differences among Ahl al-qibla; to unite Muslims of different faith of Ahl as-Sunna and ahl al-bid'a; to do away with disagreements; to bring them all into a state of benefaction and sweet taste like milk and sugar; to render the simultaneous beat of hearts and the sharing of one another's sorrow and loss; to make known that all who say kalimat ash-shahâda are brothers even if their beliefs would be different. This is aimed on account of the command in the hadîth, **"Oh Muslims! Be brothers to one another!"** Disagreement on anything or speaking ill of one another is unnecessary. Such unity is a command, a fard, of

Allâhu ta'âlâ. The salât, fast and tâ'a of only those who unite in this way are acceptable. Those who do not unite in this way will not attain to happiness in this and the next worlds. Moreover, unless Ahl al-qibla do not love one another, they cannot possess îmân and enter Paradise. Though men's every kind of sins may possibly be forgiven, discord and enmity among them will not be forgiven.' "

Answer 10: Not all of the above statements are in conformity with Islam. They are harmful to Muslims and lead them to heresy. Many hadîths and the words of Islamic imâms support this. Let's quote some of the hadîths that forbid friendship with men of bid'a and command keeping away from them: the hadîth reported in the **Sahîh** of Muslim from Abû Huraira (radiy-Allâhu 'anh) says, **"Run away from them!** [So] **they shall not lead you to heresy, throw you into discord!"** The hadîth reported from 'Âbdullah ibn 'Umar (radiy-Allâhu 'anh) by Abu Dâwûd says, **"Do not visit them when they get sick!"** The hadîth reported from Jâbir by Ibn Mâja (radiy-Allâhu 'anh) states, **"Do not greet them when you encounter them!"** The hadîth reported by 'Ukailî from Anas ibn Mâlik (radiy-Allâhu 'anh) says, **"Do not keep company with them! Do not eat or drink with them! Do not intermarry with them!"**[1]

The hadîth ash-sherîf reported by Ibn Hibbân says, **"Do not perform their funeral prayers! Do not perform salât with them!"** The hadîths reported from Ma'âdh (radiy-Allâhu 'anh) by ad-Dailamî say, **"I am not of them. And they are not of me. Jihâd against them is like jihâd against disbelievers."** The hadîth ash-sherîf which was reported through the ancestral succession of

---

[1] This hadîth forbids friendship, eating and marrying with ahl al-bid'a. It is written in **Hindiyya** and **Bahr ar-râiq,** "Zindîqs, Bâtînîs, Ibâhîs and all the groups with beliefs that cause kufr are mushriks (polytheists) like idolaters and worshippers of stars. Marriage with such mushriks or intercourse with their females as jâriyas is harâm."

The above writings conclude that, if the belief of those who do not belong to one of the four madhhabs, i.e. those who are not of Ahl as-Sunna, causes kufr, they become mushriks. Marriage with them and eating the carcass they have slaughtered are harâm. Of them, those whose belief does not cause kufr are ahl al-bid'a, and marriage with them is not harâm; though the nikâh would be sahîh, not with them but with Al as-Sunna should Muslims get married, because living with them and even greeting them are forbidden by hadîths.

Imâm 'Alî (radiy-Allâhu 'anh), Husain, Zain al-'Âbidîn 'Alî, Muhammad Bâkir and Imâm Ja'far as-Sâdiq and which was said to Abû Umâma states: **"Do not have relation with those in the groups of Qadarî, Murji'î and Khârijî! They will spoil your religion. They betray as did the Jews and Christians."** The hadîth reported from Anas ibn Mâlik (radiy-Allâhu 'anh) by Ibn Asâkir states, **"When you meet the man of bid'a, treat him harshly! Allâhu ta'âlâ is hostile to all men of bid'a. None of them will be able to pass the Sirât bridge; they will fall in Hell fire."** The hadîth reported from Hadrat 'Umar (radiy-Allâhu 'anh) by Abu Dâwûd and Hâkim says, **"Do not be in company with people of the Qadariyya group! Do not consult them your affairs."** The hadîth reported from 'Abdullâh ibn Mas'ûd (radiy-Allâhu 'anh) by Ahmad ibn Hanbal, Abu Dâwûd, at-Tirmidhî and Ibn Mâja and from Abû Mûsâ 'l-Ash'arî (rahmatullâhu 'alaihim) by at-Tabarânî says, **"The Sons of Isrâ'il committed sins. Their scholars advised them; they did not listen. Their scholars later talked with them. They ate and drank together. Allâhu ta'âlâ introduced enmity among them; He condemned them through the mouths of Dâwûd ('alaihi 's-salâm) and 'Îsâ ('alaihi 's-salâm)."**

At-Tirmidhî, Abu Dâwûd and Ibn Mâja reported from Nafi' that a man conveyed someone's salâm to 'Abdullah ibn 'Umar (radiy-Allâhu 'anhumâ), who said, 'I have heard that he has become a man of bid'a. If he is so, do not take my salâm to him." Hasan al-Basrî and Muhammad ibn Sîrîn said, "Do not come together with men of bid'a." Ayyûb as-Sahtiyânî said, "I and Talaq ibn Habîb were sitting together. Sa'îd ibn Jubair, passing by, said to me, 'Do not sit with him! He is a man of bid'a.' " As Asmâ ibn Ubaid told, two men of bid'a came to 'Alî Sîrîn and said that they wanted to ask him about a hadîth; "No, don't ask," he said. When they said that they will ask him about an âyat, he said, "No! Get out of here or I will go!" The two men left. Those who were there said, "What if you spoke on an âyat from al-Qur'ân al-kerîm?" He replied, "I feared that they would read the âyat after altering it and that this alteration might make place in my heart." Salâm ibn Abî Muti' told that, when a man of bid'a said to Ayyûb that he would ask him a word, he said, "I wouldn't listen even a half word from you." Someone asked something to Sa'îd ibn Jubair, who gave no answer; when the reason was asked, he said, "He is a man of bid'a, so shouldn't be talked with." Abû Ja'far

Muhammad Bâkir said, “Do not stay near those who dispute. They give meanings to âyats as they wish.” In the explanation of **Mishkât,** Imâm Ahmad ibn Hajar al-Makkî comments on ’Abdullah ibn ’Umar’s (radiy-Allâhu ’anhumâ) saying, “Do not say my salâm to...” and adds, “Because, we are ordered to keep away from men of bid’a.” In the explanation of the hadîth, **“Do not be in company with people of the Qadariyya group,”** in the book **Mirkat,** it is said, “Because, keeping company of enemies leads one to ruin and disaster.” It is written in the book **Shir’at al-Islâm** that Salaf as-Sâlihîn did not get close to men of bid’a since a hadîth said, “Do not stay with men of bid’a! Their vices are as contagious as scabies.” Another hadîth says, “Do not greet people of the Qadariyya group! Do not visit their sick people! Do not attend their funeral! Do not listen to their words! Give them answer sternly! Humiliate them!” Another hadîth says, **“Allâhu ta’âlâ fills with îmân the heart of him who gives stern answer to the man of bid’a; He protects him against terrible things. One who disesteems the man of bid’a will be saved by Allâhu ta’âlâ against the fears of Resurrection.”** It is written in the book **Irshâd as-sârî sharhu sahîh al-Bukhârî** that, unless it is understood that a man of bid’a has vowed for repentance, it is necessary to keep away from him.

I, the poor slave [that is, Ahmad Ridâ Khân], am preparing a booklet on this subject now. With documents from al-Qur’ân al-kerîm and hadîths, I explain the necessity of keeping away from the men of bid’a and treating them severely. I additionally give the comments of the ’ulamâ’. This work will be the light for the eyes, and the remedy for the hearts.

While the harms of being together with men of bid’a are that many, it should be estimated how much worse the harms of loving and praising them are. A hadîth says, **“One is with those whom one loves.”** Another hadîth quoted by Imâm ’Alî (radiy-Allâhu ’anh) and others, says, **“I swear that Allâhu ta’âlâ will resurrect a person with those whom he loves.”** The hadîth reported by at-Tabarânî says, **“Allâhu ta’âlâ will resurrect a person among those whom he loves.”** A hadîth reported from Abû Huraira (radiy-Allâhu ’anh) by Abû Dâwûd and at-Tirmidhî says, **“Man’s religion is similar to his friend’s religion. Everybody should be mindful of the company they keep!”** Extensive explanation about the foregoing hadîths is given in my book **Fîh an-Nasrîn bi jawâbi**

'l-as'ilati 'l-ishrîn.

The aim of Nadwat al-'ulamâ' is the same as that of the damned Satan. They endeavour to misguide Muslims with little knowledge from the right path. They introduce a new religion with their statement, "It is fard to unite Muslims." Their saying, "Their 'ibâdât will not be accepted. They will not attain blessings and happiness," is a slander against Allâhu ta'âlâ. Their words, "Dispute with and hostility towards men of bid'a are sinful. This sin will not be forgiven. Pardon of it is impossible," show that they have dissented from the right path of Ahl as-Sunna wa 'l-Jamâ'a and that they deny the âyats which say, **"Allâhu ta'âlâ forgives all the sins but shirk of whomever He wishes,"** and **"Allâhu ta'âlâ certainly forgives all sins."** Their saying, "Pardon of this sin is impossible," shows that they deny these âyats. Also, they misinterpret the hadîth, **"Allâhu ta'âlâ's slaves! Be** (one another's) **brothers!"** This hadîth's meaning, as reported in **Umdat al-Kari** and other books, is, 'Do the things that will help you become brothers of one another.' Accordingly, in order for the men of bid'a to become brothers to the Muslims of the right path, they should give up their bid'as and accept the Sunna. Their calling Muslims of Ahl as-Sunna to become brothers for themselves despite their persisting in committing their bid'as is a blatant heresy and an ugly deceit.[1]

60 – When religion reformers want to annihilate a commandment of Islam, they attack hadîths as a last resort. They say that the hadîth which that command is based on is mawdû'. Upon finding out that they cannot make believe, they say, "It is a da'îf hadîth, if not mawdû'; a da'îf hadîth cannot be depended upon for a judgement." For example, it is harâm for men to wear gold rings. Religion reformers say that the hadîth telling this is da'îf and gold ring is not harâm. Their words contradict themselves, for, since a da'îf hadîth cannot be depended upon for a judgement, the hadîth from which the judgement, "Gold ring is harâm," was derived must be sahîh, which is the truth of the matter. The Ahl as-Sunna scholars studied the hadîths meticulously and sifted out all mawdû' hadîths. They derive the

[1] The Arabic work **Fatâwâ 'l-Haramain,** from which the foregoing ten fatwâs are translated, has been reproduced in by offset process in Istanbul. The author, Ahmad Ridâ Khân Barilawî, passed away in India in 1340 A.H. (1921).

fard, halâl and harâm only from sahîh and mashhûr hadîths. In the commentary of the book **Manâr,** Ibn Malak states this fact clearly: "A da'if hadîth cannot necessitate or make wâjib. A religious deed cannot be performed according to a hadîth which cannot be understood whether it its sahîh or not." In the section on wudû' in **Radd al-muhtâr,** is commentary to **ad-Durr al-mukhtâr,** Ibn 'Âbidîn says, "It is not necessary for the muqallid to search for the proofs, documents of the decisions which the mujtahids have made."

A person who attacks the Ahl as-Sunna scholars and who is irreverent towards fiqh books belongs to none of the four madhhabs. 'Abdullah ibn 'Îsâ San'ânî, in his book **Saif al-Hindî fî ibânati tariqati 'sh-shaikhi 'n-Najdî** (ed. 1218 A.H./1803), proves with documents that those who say "mawdû' " for sahîh hadîths are in no madhhab and that they strive to demolish Ahl as-Sunna. Mudarris Sayyid 'Abdullah Effendi, in his book **Irsâl al-makal,** answers those who speak ill of hadîths by saying that they are da'îf or mawdû', and he refutes Ibn Taimiyya and ash-Shawkânî, the leaders of this mischief.

There is a separate branch of knowledge called **usûl al-hadîth,** in which 'mawdû hadîth' does not mean 'made-up hadîth'. Today, those who know nothing of this knowledge think of its lexical meaning and suppose that it means 'made-up hadîth.'[1]

The book **Usûl al-hadîth** by the great scholar Imâm Muhammad al-Birghiwî is very valuable. Dâwûd al-Karsî wrote a commentary to this book in 1251 A.H. (1835) which was commented again by Yûsuf Effendî of Harput in 1292 (1875) and was printed in Istanbul a year later. The following passage is translated from that Arabic work:

"All the hadîths reported by a person who was known to have lied when reporting any hadîth are called **mawdû'** or **muftarî** hadîths, for there was the probability that all the hadîths he reported were made-up, slanderous. As it is seen, in usûl al-hadîth, a hadîth called mawdû' does not have to be made-up, for, even if the person who was caught in his lying with one hadîth repented and became pious, all the hadîths he reported would still be said to be mawdû'. The book **Tadrîb** by Imâm as-Suyûtî

---

[1] For more detailed information on this knowledge and on mawdû' hadîths, see the fifth chapter in the book **Endless Bliss, II.**

and also many of the hadîth scholars say that this is so. The heretical groups, in order to lead Muslims out of the right path, and apostates, in order to trick Muslims, invented hadîths. And some tekke shaikhs invented hadîths in order to encourage to worship and to frighten against sinning. It is harâm to invent hadîths with such good intentions, and it is kufr if it is intended to trick Muslims. The hadîths praising the sûras in the tafsîr books of as-Sa'labî, al-Wâhidî, az-Zamakhsharî, al-Baidâwî and Abû 's-Su'ûd are claimed to be mawdû' by some ignorant people. It is obvious that the hadîths that praise the sûras al-Fâtiha, al-An'âm, al-Kahf, Yâ Sîn, ad-Dukhân al-Mulk, az-Zilzâl, an-Nasr, al-Kâfirûn al-Ikhlâs, al-Falaq and an-Nâs are sahîh. The authors of these books quoted in their books the hadîths that were claimed to be mawdû' because they considered them as sahîh, hasan or at least da'îf, or because they had conveyed them just as they were from the hadîth scholars whom they depended on, or because they would not admit that they were mawdû'. With the help of the fairly certain presumption, it can be decided if a hadîth is sahîh; it cannot be known for certain. There are many hadîths which the majority of hadîth scholars said to be sahîh but which other scholars of this branch did not say so. Many others were not able to understand whether they were sahîh or not, for it was very difficult to understand if a hadîth was sahîh. It could be understood only with presumption; it could not be understood certainly. In order to make sure that a hadîth is made-up, one of its narrators had to say, "I invented this"; or it should have been known for certain that the person who, he said, had told it to him had died before he was born; or the saying which was said to be a hadîth should have been incompatible with Islam, with reason, with calculation or with experience, and it could not have been explained away differently. Only the hadîth scholars can understand all these. These profound scholars also may be mistaken in understanding them. It is for this reason that there have been scholars who said 'sahîh', 'hasan' or 'da'îf' about many of the hadîths for which Abu 'l-faraj ibn al-Jawzî said 'mawdû' in his book **Mawdû'at.** Imâm az-Zahabî said that the majority of the hadîths written in that book were dependable and beautiful hadîths. We have derived what we have written up to here from the books **Taqrîb** by Imâm an-Nawawî, **Tadrîb** by as-Suyûtî and **Nukhba** by Shaikh

al-Islâm Ibn Hajar al-Askalânî."[1]

It would be extremely insolent, unfair and unreasonable to suppose that the greatest scholars like al-Baidâwî, Imâm al-Ghazâlî, Jalâl ad-dîn as-Suyûtî, Sadr ad-dîn al-Qonawî and Sanâ'ullâh Pâniputî were too ignorant to distinguish a sahîh hadîth from a made-up hadîth, or to suppose that they were as irreligious as not to protect their religion or not to feel pangs of conscience in recording made-up hadîths as sahîh hadîths. We have told at length in the seventh and eighth paragraphs of our book how strictly Islamic scholars studied hadîths. An intelligent and reasonable person who reads those writings will certainly realize that a religion reformer, who shows so much effrontery as to say that there are concocted hadîths in the books written by such a great scholar as Imâm al-Ghazâlî, would have deserved it if his tongue were cut off or his books were burned to ashes. To say that those exalted scholars could not understand the hadîths while their successor Ibn Taimiyya could is a fallacy that would ill befit anyone with the exception of the enemies of the Ahl as-Sunna scholars. Those who cannot comprehend the greatness of Islamic scholars suppose that those exalted leaders also wrote with their short reasons and aberrant thoughts, like these people do. Their sophistry stoops to such low levels as to say, "Al-Ghazâlî's discernment was obscured under the bad influence of social ideas." They cannot realize that each of his writings is an explanation of âyats and hadîths. If a person who praises al-Imâm ar-Rabbânî is sincere in his word and if he likes that exalted leader's writings, he should follow these writings and love the Ahl as-Sunna scholars, whom al-Imâm ar-Rabbânî praises highly, and he should not be disrespectful towards them. One should be a scholar to appreciate the value of another scholar. Not to realize the value of the Ahl as-Sunna scholars, or to strive to blemish and criticize those blessed persons, causes one to depart from **al-firqat an-nâjiyya** (the Group of Salvation), and he who departs from Ahl as-Sunna becomes either a heretic or an unbeliever.[2] As it is written on page 65 of the book **Hidâyat al-muwaffiqîn** by Abû Muhammad Viltorî, one of the 'ulamâ' of India, 'Allâma Ahmad

---

[1] Imâm Muhammad al-Birghiwî, **Usûl al-hadîth,** p. 91.

[2] Mawlânâ Hamd-Allah ad-Dajwî, **al-Basâ'ir li-munkirî't-tawassuli bi-ahl al-maqâbir,** Pashawar, Pakistan, 1385, p. 52.

Sâwî al-Mâlikî said on the âyat "Idhâ nasîta" of the sûrat al-Kahf in the marginalia of Jalalain's tafsîr: "It is not permissible to follow a madhhab other than the four madhhabs. One who does not follow one of the four madhhabs is in heresy (dalâla) and also leads others to heresy. Some of such people become kâfirs because one of the things that cause kufr is to attempt to derive rules from âyats and hadîths."

61 - The following passage is translated from an-Nablusî's **al-Hadîqat an-nadiyya:**

"1) The hadîth sherîf reported by al-Bukhârî and Muslim declares, **'If something that does not exist in this religion which I have revealed, is invented with the hope of thawâb, this thing must be refused.'** This hadîth points out that it is not a bid'a to bring forth something that does not concern the religion or worship. The improvements, changes made in eating, drinking, dressing, building houses and in transportation are not bid'a.

"2) A hadîth reported by at-Tabarânî says, **'If Muslims, after their Prophet ('alaihi 's-salâm), make a bid'a, an innovation in the religion which he revealed, a sunna which is similar to it dissappears from among them.'** This hadîth points out that it is not bid'a to make an improvement or a change in worldly affairs and customs, which is done without expecting thawâb.

"3) It is declared in a hadîth reported by at-Tabarânî, **'Until a man of bid'a gives up his bid'a, Allâhu ta'âlâ does not accept his repentance.'** It is necessary to repent after every sin committed. There are three conditions for the repentance to be correct: to put an end to sinning, to repent what one has done and to resolve upon never to do it again. If one has any debt or duty to other people, one has to pay it back and have oneself forgiven. By 'man of bid'a' is meant one who brings forth a bid'a or who commits a bid'a that has already been brought forth. **'Bid'a'** means 'inventing a belief, a deed, a word or a moral habit that does not exist in the religion, or spreading such an innovation, and expecting reward for it in the next world'. If a person who commits a sin continuously repents for another kind of sin, his repentance will be accepted. A man of bid'a expects thawâb from his bid'a and thinks that he is doing something good. Therefore, he does not think of repenting.

"4) It is declared in a hadîth recorded by Ibn Mâja, **'Unless the**

man of bid'a gives up his bid'a, Allâhu ta'âlâ does not accept any of his acts of worship.' Even the correct worship of an innovator in the religion, who changes a belief, worship, word or a habit in the religion, will not be accepted. That is, he will be deprived of reward for worship in the next world. He has to give up his bid'a.

"5) It is declared in a hadîth reported by Ibn Mâja, **'Even if a bid'a does not cause unbelief, its inventor's fast, hajj, 'umra, jihâd, repentance or any goodness will not be accepted. It is as easy for this person to go out of the religion as pulling out hairs from the butter.'**[1] Though the kinds of fard and supererogatory worship which he does suitably with the rules will be valid (sahîh) and he will be absolved from the debt of worship, his worshipping will not be accepted (maqbûl), that is, he will not be rewarded in the next world. If his bid'a gives way to unbelief, that is, if he utters a word, uses something or does something which causes unbelief, his îmân will disappear and his warshipping will not be valid. A mand of bid'a considers his bid'a good and thawâb-deserving. Therefore, he gets out of the religion easily. The person who commits a bid'a supposes that it is an act of worship and expects reward for it in the next world. As for the person who commits a sin, he knows that his sin is a guilt, and he feels ashamed towards his Allâhu ta'âlâ and fears His punishment. Bid'as are grave sins, but not every sin is a bid'a.

"**Bid'a** is an Arabic word. It means something that did not exist formerly and which has been invented later. In this respect, the changes, reformations done both in customs and in worshipping are bid'a. **'Âdat** (custom) is an action which is done for its worldly benefits alone without expecting any reward as a recompense in the next world. In contrast, **'ibâda** (worship) is the action as a recompense of which reward is expected in the next world. Since everything which had not existed in the times of the Sahâbat al-kirâm and the Tâbi'ûn and appeared later is a bid'a, scholars have divided bida' into such groups as mubâh, wâjib, mustahab and harâm. They have called that which is mustahab or wâjib a bid'at hasana.

"In view of the religion, however, **bid'a** means an addition or

---

[1] For the originals and explanations of these five hadîths, see an-Nablûsî's Arabic book **al-Hadîqat an-nadiyya** published by Hakîkat Kitabevi.

reduction that has been made in the religion and against the Prophet's ('alaihi 's-salâm) consent after as-Sahâbat al-kirâm and the Tâbi'ûn; in other words, it is a change made in the name of worship and presumed to be thawâb-deserving. And reform in the religion means bid'a in the religion. Changes that are made in customs are outside of this kind of bid'a. The ones that are declared to be evil in the Hadîth ash-sherîf are the bida' in the religion. These reforms do not help worship. They all spoil worship.

"The reforms in the religion part into two groups: the bida' in belief and those in 'ibâda. The reforms in belief are either made with ijtihâd, that is, they are derived from the Qur'ân and the Hadîth, or they are the fruits of predilection, reasoning or deducing. Ijtihâd requires to be done by a profound scholar, that is, **a mujtahid.** If a mujtahid makes a mistake in doing ijtihâd in belief, he will not be pardoned. He will be guilty. If the thing concerning belief, which he has misunderstood, is declared clearly in the religion and is so widespread that even the ignorant have heard about it and know it, this mujtahid and those who believe him will become unbelievers. A person who is understood to be an unbeliever cannot escape unbelief unless he repents this misbelief of his, even if he says he is a Muslim and spends all his life worshipping. If the thing concerning belief was declared openly but is not the kind everybody has heard of, or if it was not declared openly, he will become not an unbeliever but a man of bid'a or a heretic. This wrong belief of his is a sin which is worse even than the grave felonies such as murder and fornication. It was declared in hadîths that there would be seventy-two groups of bid'a and that they would all go to Hell.

"If something related to belief is put forth in a wrong form by non-mujtahid men who think of themselves as mujtahids and attempt to interpret âyats and hadîths or speak according to their own points of view, those who believe it will become unbelievers even if it is not a clearly declared or widespread teaching. For example, a mujtahid who disbelieves, as a result of his ijtihâd, in Rasûlullah's ('alaihi 's-salâm) Ascension (Mi'râj) or in the questioning in grave becomes a man of bid'a, i.e. a heretic, while a non-mujtahid man of religious post who, as a result of his own reasoning or opinion, disbelieves in them becomes a non-Muslim because of having slighted Islam's teachings.

"Islamic scholars who have not gone wrong in their ijtihâd in the belief and the Muslims who believe the truth like them are called **Ahl as-Sunna** or **Sunnî.**

"The worship of the seventy-two groups of bid'a is not acceptable even if they worship correctly. Their bid'a in their worshipping is an additional guilt, even if they call it ijtihâd.

"The ijtihâds deduced by the Ahl as-Sunna scholars in the knowledge concerning 'ibâdât are not bida'. Their mistakes in finding out this knowledge will not cause them to be guilty. Leaders of the four madhhabs derived this knowledge, with the permission of the Prophet ('alaihi 's-salâm) who announced Islam, from the sources which Islam prescribed. This knowledge has not changed Islam, but it has helped Islam. Ijtihâd cannot be employed on the things that are declared clearly in the Qur'ân and the Hadîth. They should be admitted as they are. It is not a guilt to go wrong in searching for the proof of something that has not been declared openly. But, if the proof stating the right way is clear and if the mujtahid goes wrong in finding out the proof, or by following his own mind without deriving from a proof, an 'ibâda based on this deduction is a bid'a and heresy. If such a reform causes a sunnat muakkada to disappear, it will be a worse sin.

"The action Rasûlullah ('alaihi 's-salâm) used to perform as an 'ibâda and omitted from time to time is called **sunnat hudâ** or **sunnat muakkada.** It has not been declared that those who sometimes omit them will be punished. An action which he never neglected and he said that those who would neglect it would be punished is called **wâjib.** That which he performed at times is called **mustahab.** An action which he used to do not as an 'ibâda but as a custom is called **sunnat zawâid** or **adab.** It is adab to begin with good things on the right and with bad things on the left and to use the right and left hands, respectively.

"It is not a bid'a to make changes in customs. It is better for men of wara' not to do it. It is declared in a hadîth, **'Hold fast to my sunna and, after me, to the sunnas of al-Khulafâ' ar-Râshidîn.'** The word sunna, when used alone, means everything that Islam declares. Muhammad ('alaihi 's-salâm), who taught Islam, did not declare anything on customs, for he came in order to preach the religion, not to teach people how to do the things they needed in the world. It is declared in a hadîth, **'You know better how to do**

your worldly affairs,' meaning that there was no need to tell them how to find and do the things that were useful for their world and that they should learn from him the religion and worship which they could not know. For this reason, customs remain outside of Islam. Changes that are done in the things outside of Islam are not bida'.

"Minarets, schools, books and the like which have been invented later are not bida' or reforms in the religion. These are things which help the religion. Islam has permitted and even commanded them. Things of this sort are called **sunnat hasana.** It is called **sunnat sayyia** to invent things which Islam has prohibited. Bida' are sunnat sayyia. The reason why the sunnat hasana were not done in the time of as-Sahâba and Tâbi'ûn was because they did not need these useful things. They were performing the jihâd against unbelievers, conquering lands and spreading Islam over the world. In their time, men of bid'a had not appeared or increased. It is permissible and thawâb to invent sunnat hasana until the end of the world.

"In 'ibâdât it is worse to commit a bid'a than to neglect a sunna. It is harâm to commit a bid'a while it is makrûh to neglect a sunna without an 'udhr.[1] If one supposes that it is thawâb to neglect a sunna without any 'udhr, it will be bid'a for him to neglect a sunna. When it is unknown if a belief, a deed or a word is a sunna or bid'a, it is necessary not to perform it, for it is necessary not to do the bid'a, and it is not obligatory to perform the sunna. If something not obligatory is omitted, it will not be performed afterwards. Therefore, the omitted sunnas of salât will not be performed afterwards. It is more blessed than all the worship of human beings and genies not to commit the most venial of the acts which Allâhu ta'âlâ has prohibited. For this reason, a wâjib also can be omitted where there is difficulty. But it has been said by scholars that harâm cannot be committed. For example, one cannot clean, in the presence of others, the parts of his body that have to be covered.

"Unanimity of the mujtahids who lived in the same century is called **ijmâ'.** Ijmâ' has to be based on a proof, a document. This proof is an âyat or a hadîth even if only one person has reported

---

[1] 'Udhr means an excuse, a hindrance which Islam recognizes as a good reason for not doing a religious duty.

it, or it is a qiyâs based upon them. **Qiyâs** is the explanation of something that has been declared indistinctly in the âyat and in the Hadîth. Hadrat al-Imâm al-a'zam Abû Hanîfa performed ijtihâd by way of qiyâs.

"A person may become an 'ârif or a Walî without reading any books. He might interpret âyats but cannot be a guide. One cannot attach his heart to him. A perfect guide has to have reached the grade of ijtihâd in knowledge and the grade of Wilâyat khâssa al-Muhammadiyya in ma'rifa. A perfect guide's every behaviour, every manner, every word is compatible with Islam. This means to say that he follows Rasûlullah ('alaihi 's-salâm) in every respect. For this reason, Allâhu ta'âlâ loves him. Muslims, since they love Allâhu ta'âlâ, love also the person whom Allâhu ta'âlâ loves. Loving the perfect guide arises from loving Allâhu ta'âlâ and Rasûlullah ('alaihi 's-salâm). This love is called **al-hubbu fi'llâh.** It has been declared in a hadîth that the most valuable worship is al-hubbu fi'llâh. To perform the commands of a perfect guide means to obey Islam, for a perfect guide's every word and every deed communicates Islam. The real person who presents knowledge on the earth is the perfect guide. Hence it can be understood that the words of the enemies of religion, 'Instead of Allâhu ta'âlâ, they love a human being. Abandoning Islam, they worship a human being,' about Muslims, are ignorant and base slanders.

"Following as-Sahâbat al-kirâm is wajib. It is not permissible to make qiyâs on something which they already explained. Yet, it is not permissible for us the muqallids, that is, the persons who have not reached the grade of ijtihâd, to (directly) follow their words. Their words and action indicate the Nass (the Qur'ân and the Hadîth) and their own ijtihâds. Only the profound scholars who have attained the grade of ijtihâd can understand them. Our madhhab leaders have understood them and communicated them to us in a manner that we can comprehend. This means to say that those who want to adapt themselves to the Sahâbat al-kirâm have to follow the Ahl as-Sunna scholars.

"It is declared in a hadîth reported by al-Bukhârî, **'Allâhu ta'âlâ declared, "My human creature cannot approach Me with anything else as close as he approaches by performing the fard actions. I love My human creature who approaches Me through supererogatory worship."** This hadîth indicates that the kind of

worship which Allâhu ta'âlâ likes best consists of the fard actions. The supererogatory worship mentioned in the hadîth is the worship done in addition to the fard. It means that Allâhu ta'âlâ loves those who perform the fard and also the supererogatory worship.

"Allâhu ta'âlâ says in sûrat al-Mâ'ida as ma'âl, **'Look for a wasîla** (cause) **to approach Me.'** 'Ma'âl' means 'according to what the scholars of Islam understood'. The Wahhâbîs say, ' 'Ibâdât are the causes. In order to attain Allâhu ta'âlâ's approval and love, the 'ibâdât that are fard and nâfila should be performed. Entering a tarîqa, following a shaikh or entreating dead or living persons does not make one approach Allâhu ta'âlâ; on the contrary, one gets far away.' The scholars of Ahl as-Sunna, however, say, 'It is true that 'ibâdât are the causes. Yet, the 'ibâdât that are sahîh, correct and khâlis can be causes. 'Ibâdât are sahîh if one has correct îmân and pure morals and performs them in accordance to their conditions. For the salât to be sahîh, for example, ablution, using clean water, performing it in due time and towards the qibla, reciting the âyats, tasbîhs and prayers in salât correctly and knowing many other conditions and causes are necessary. Every 'ibâda has such conditions and causes. These are learnt by working for years, not by thinking or dreaming of them. They are learnt by hearing them from the 'ulamâ' who believe, know and practise them or by reading their books, as scientific knowledge is learnt through professors in a long time. Such real scholars of Islam with pure îmân and heart are called 'mudarris' (professor), 'mu'allim' (trainer) or 'murshid' (guide). 'Murshid' does not mean 'one who walks on the water surface, flies in the air, knows where a lost thing is and cures sick people by praying and blowing', but it means 'the scholar of Ahl as-Sunna who knows, practises and teaches to others the Sharî'a, that is, the 'ibâdât performed with the heart, soul and body'. To carry out the order in sûrat al-Mâ'ida, every Muslim should look for such a murshid or for his books and should learn all fard and nâfila 'ibâdât from him.'

"We should not fall for the wrong words of the ignorant men of religion, who do not know Islam, or for the fallacies of the evil-minded people, who have not read the books of the Ahl as-Sunna scholars, or for the deceitful, false articles of those who follow the unsound minds of the deviated people who have gone astray and who lead everybody astray. Scholars of Islam have derived their

konwledge from the Qur'ân and the Hadîth. As for those deviated people, they write and speak following their own short sight. Shame on these reformers and those who fall for their words and books supposing them to be scholars! They are the thieves of faith and belief. They change the halâl and the harâm. They spoil Islam."[1]

In the section on the things that invalidate salât, Ibn 'Âbidîn wrote: "It is makrûh tahrîmî to accept the blameworthy, loathsome ones of the bid'as in customs, such as eating, drinking, dressing, from the disbelievers, and to accept and to use, in order to resemble them, the ones that are not bad. It is not makrûh to do and to use the ones that are not bad or harmful without trying to be like them. Rasûlullah (sall-Allâhu 'alaihi wa sallam) had his shoemakers make a pair of shoes, which priests wore, and he wore them."

Is it bid'a or not to recite the sûrat al-Fâtiha after salât and praying? Hadrat Hâdimî writes its answer detailedly on the hundred and thirty-seventh page of the book **Berîqa.** Let's explain briefly: there have been those who considered it bid'a and those who said the opposite. According to many of them, it is better to recite the Fâtiha at places where it was declared to recite prayers. Moreover, it has been declared in a hadîth to recite prayers after salât. 'Bid'a' means 'the 'ibâda that is performed without Muhammad's ('alaihi 's-salâm) permitting it.' The sûrat al-Fâtiha descended in order to reveal the best of prayers. No one has said it would be a bid'a to recite it after salât or prayers. It is forbidden for the entire congregation to recite it loud altogether. When the imâm says "Fâtiha", it is good that everybody recite it silently. For it is mustahab to do hamd after prayers. And the best hamd[2] is to recite the Fâtiha. It is makrûh to recite it between fard and sunnat and in order to attain what one desires.

It is bid'a to read (or recite) the Qur'ân al-kerîm or to call the azân (adhân) through a loud-speaker. For, lifeless objects used for producing sounds are called **mizmâr**, musical instruments. Thunder, cannons, rifles, owls and parrots are not musical instruments although they produce sounds. Merry-making instruments that produce sounds, bass-drums, side-drums,

---

[1] An-Nablûsî, **al-Hadîqa.**

[2] Thanking and lauding Allâhu ta'âlâ.

cymbals, flutes, pipes and loud-speakers are all musical instruments. Musical instruments do not produce sounds by themselves. In order for them to produce sounds, or, in other words, in order to use them, you have to strike the tightly stretched leather with the stick of the drum, blow into the reed, and say into the pipe or the loud-speaker. The sound coming out of these instruments is the sound they produce. It is not the voice of the person blowing or saying into them. The sounds of Qur'ân al-kerîm or adhân heard from the loud-speaker are all sounds produced by the loud-speaker. They are not the voices of the muadhdhins or imâms. The muadhdhin's voice is the adhân. From scientific, technical, religious and canonical points of view, the sound coming out of the instrument is not the muadhdhin's voice; in other words, it is not the adhân. Because it is homophonic with the adhân, it is taken for the adhân. What is called the adhân has to be the muadhdhin's own voice, with the additional proviso that he be a sâlih (true and pious) male Muslim. Regardless of any degree of similitude, a woman's or a child's voice homophonic with his or the sound produced by a loud-speaker is not the adhân. It is some other sound. Different musical instruments produce different sounds. The sound produced by a loud-speaker, despite its close resemblance to human voice, is not human voice. It is like an imâm's photograph in a book or his image on a television screen. These appearances are not the imâm himself, although they are his exact images. You cannot perform the namâz conducted by him, even if you see his actions on the screen and hear his voice.

62 - An article by an Egyptian named Muhammad Qutb appeared in a Turkish religious magazine. The article, headlined "The Line of Deviation" was translated from Arabic. If the translation was done correctly, it immediately strikes the eye that its writer has not a say in the religion. See the derision his balderdash provokes:

"The victories which the Turks gained in battefields honoured Islam. Yet it is a reality as well that Islam lost much of its meaning in the Turks' hands. In the hands of the Turks, Islam was frozen insubstantially and its improvement was stopped. The Ottomans froze and maltreated Islam in all the fields except in military. For example, they didn't lay on knowledge as much stress as necessary. They stopped ijtihâd and the knowledge of fiqh

became fixed.

"Eventually, Islam won its independence getting rid of the damning restriction of the Ottomans, and began to rush forward. This rushing is seen especially in Wahhabite movement in Hedjaz and in the movement of Mahdism led by Mahdi in Sudan. These two movements have been effective enough to make Islam recover its own power and its tendency towards improvement. Seeing this happy improvement in Islam, the imperialistic crusaders came into play."

The service the Ottoman Turks rendered to Islam is a masterpiece, a monument. One has to be blind or a turkophobe not to see this gigantic monument that has been erected on the square of history. What was the source of this dynamism, this morals, this patience, this heroism, which led the Ottoman Turks from one victory to another, as this Egyptian writer has to acknowledge? Was it not Islam? One cannot honour Islam. One can be honoured with Islam. Hadrat 'Umar (radiy-Allâhu 'anh), the honourable Amir of Muslims, said, "We used to be contemptible, low people; Allâhu ta'âlâ honoured us by making us Muslims." The ignorant, who do not know that Islam is the source of every kind of virtue and honour, suppose that Islam is to be honoured.

The Islamic army advancing towards Vienna from Istanbul made a halt near a source of water in the neighborhood of Belgrade. The fountain was crowded with soldiers performing ablution and filling their containers with water. The priest of a church nearabouts made up and dressed beautiful girls. He gave them a bucket each and sent them to the fountain. The priest watched secretly from behind the window. As soon as the girls approached the soldiers moved aside. The girls filled their buckets easily and went back to the church. The priest, upon seeing this beautiful moral behavior, virtue, decency and mercy of the Islamic soldiers, sent a message to the crusaders' commandant, saying, "This army will never be overcome. Don't shed your blood in vain!" I wonder if this Egyptian writer makes a mistake by supposing that the Ottoman victories were barbarian invasions like those of the armies of Attilla? If he had read the British Lord Davenport's book, he would know about the truth: "Islamic armies took with them justice, virtue and civilization whereever they went. They met the defeated enemy who would surrender

always with forgivingness," and he would be a little well-behaved in his writings. Those who made Islamic caliphs lead a dungeon life and who usurped their rights of caliphate from them after 'Abbâsids were shameless enough to call themselves "Sultân al-Haramain" in khutba. When Sultan Yavuz Selim Khan conquered Egypt and rescued the caliphate from slavery in 923 A.H. (1517), he silenced the orator who also called him "Sultân al-Haramain" in khutba customarily, and said, "For me, there cannot be a greater honour than being a slave of those blessed places. Call me **Khâdim al-Haramain!"** It is written in history books. It may be understood now whether the Egyptians or the Ottomans froze Islamic morals. During the reign of (the Ottoman empire) Sultan Abdulhamîd Khan II, a secretarial position in the royal palace was reserved to be awarded annually to the best of the graduates in Political Sciences. The Sultan had established this to encourage youngsters to work and study. Es'ad Bey, who was assigned as a clerk, says in his book **Hâtirât-i Abdulhamîd Khân Thânî,** "At a midnight I enciphered a message and took it to the Sultan's room for his signature. I knocked at the door. It was not opened. I knocked once again. It was not opened this time, either. I was about to give it a third try, when the door was opened and there was the Sultan, drying his face with a towel. 'My son,' he said. 'I'm sorry for keeping you waiting! I was up with your first knocking. I knew you were here for an important signature, at this time of night. Yet I did not have an ablution. I have never signed a paper concerning my nation's matters without an ablution. I am late because I was making an ablution. Now read it for me please.' After I read it, he said the Basmala[1] and then signed it, adding, 'Inshâ-Allah, let's hope for the best.' " The Ottoman Sultans were that much attached and that much respectful to Islam. Eyyub Sabri Pasha says in his book **Mir'ât al-Haram-Ain,** "Sultan Abdulmejid Khan, upon learning that Mustafa Reshid Pasha was a freemason and had chosen a path not compatible with Islam, became ill with anxiety and sorrow. He could not sit on the bed; he always lay. Only important papers were being read to him in order to take the imperial rescript. About a paper which had been awaiting its turn, he was said, 'An application of the inhabitants of

---

[1] Bism-Illâh-ir-Rahmân-ir-Rahîm. (In the name of Allah, the Most Merciful and the Most Compassionate.)

Medina will be read.' 'Hold on! Don't read! Help me sit!' he said. He was helped to sit putting a pillow behind him. He said, 'They are our Master Rasûlullah's ('alaihi 's-salâm) neighbors. I would be ashamed to listen to their application lying down as I was. Do at once what they wish! But read so that my ears may be blessed!' He passed away the following day." Here are the morals, decency of the Ottoman Turkish Sultans and their reverence to Islam.

Can this reverence, this well-behavior of the Turks towards Islam be the same as the disrespectfulness, the indecency of the Wahhâbîs who lie down like carcasses in Masjid as-Sa'âda with their foul feet pointing towards the Qabr as-Sa'âda?

In the words, "Islam's improvement came to a halt in the time of the Ottomans," there smells the noxious scent of insidious hostility towards Islam. Fenârî, Molla Khusraw, al-Hayâlî, al-Galanbawî, Ibn Kamâl, Abussu'ûd, 'Allâma al-Birghiwî, Ibn 'Âbidîn, 'Abd al-Ghanî an-Nabulusî, Mawlânâ Khâlid al-Baghdâdî, as-Suwaidî, 'Abdulhakîm-i Arwasî and 'Allâma Mustafa Sabri, -who disgraced 'Abduh,- and many a scholar of fiqh and kalâm, and calligraphers, Mimar Sinan (architect), Sokullu and Köprülü: in which State were all these great men educated? Weren't they educated by the Ottomans? Hundreds of thousands of books of knowledge written by the Ottoman scholars fill up the national libraries in every city. Their catalogues are in the open. Weren't they the Ottoman Shaikh al-Islâms who gave fatwâ to the entire Muslim world for six hundred years and who solved every kind of problem and who were remedies for Muslims' cares and who disgraced Christians and heretical groups by writing refutations to them? Al-Hayâlî's commentaries of 'ilm al-kalâm books, Molla Khusraw's **ad-Durar,** al-Halabî's **Multaqâ,** Ibn 'Âbidîn's **Radd al-muhtâr,** Abussu'ûd's tafsîr and Shaikhzâda's commentary to al-Baidâwî's tafsîr shed lights upon the entire world today. Didn't the Ottomans educate these exalted scholars and Awliyâ? Today also, those who want to learn their faith correctly should read these valuable books. The most valuable Qur'ân commentaries are those written by Shaikhzâda and Abussu'ûd. He who wants to be useful to Muslims should translate these books into Turkish. The Qur'ân commentaries of reformist writers are not so, because, with their short sights and inefficient knowledge, they have inserted into these books whatever occured to their minds under the name of tafsîr, thus

adding rotten rings to the chain. He who relies on a chain with rotten rings and descends on the sea by holding on to it, will certainly err and drown. Therefore, one should not read the translations of such concocted books of tafsîr. The six-hundred-year-old guardians of Islam and the Sources of Islamic knowledge were always the Ottomans. Hundreds of fatwâ books like **Bahjât al-fatâwâ,** in which it is written that the printing-press should be founded, showed solutions according to the requirements of each century and opened ways to improvements. As for **Mejelle,** the masterpiece of the last century; it became a monument of laws, having no equal in the world. If the Ottoman morals, knowledge and culture survived today, no defeat would have been suffered against a handful of Jews, and the war plans of Muslims would not have been sold for a few thousand dollars by the people in charge to the Israelite spies in London; nor would the Arabic unity have been disgraced before the entire world.

The fearless, shameless aggression of the Egyptian writer Qutb to the Sahâbat al-kirâm and then to the true Muslim administrators of the Umayyads, Abbâsids and Ottomans, is not without its purpose. He himself explains its reason. The gypsy boasting of his courage tells of his theft. He lets out what he has hitherto kept back and says, "Wahhabism rescued Islam from slavery." Yes, in order to praise the lâ-madhhabî, he speaks ill of Islamic Khalîfas and Islamic scholars. The plans and the policy of Mawdûdî, Sayyid Qutb, Muhammad Qutb and 'Abduh are based on this fundamental. They all attack the early Muslims. They slander the Ahl as-Sunna scholars. On the other hand, they misrepresent Ibn Taimiyya and the heretics like Jamâl ad-dîn al-Afghânî as saviors. What on earth could be so good about the lâ-madhhabî people that they praise them? That they attach no value to religious facts and scientific teachings ultimately becomes tangible in their immoralities well below zero, a fact which Sa'ûd, -dethroned in 1384 [A.D. 1964] and dead in 1388 [A.D. 1968]-, showed to the entire world by leading a debauched, dishonest and indecent life and spending millions of pounds for his pleasures and dissipations in Europe. We wonder if the Egyptian writer does not blush when he sees and hears that the adulteries, fornications, immoralities in Cairo and Riad palaces are broadcast over the world through radios? They are not ashamed to take bribes, which is hundreds of pounds, from each of the millions of

hadjis coming from the Muslim world. They do not let their brothers-in-Islam perform their duty of hajj unless they give them hundreds of pounds. On the other hand, it is written in the Ottoman book **Radd al-muhtâr** that it is harâm to charge Christians who come to visit Jerusalem. Ottomans did not ask any money even from disbelievers. But these people demand it from Muslims. If they do not pay it, they prevent them from worshipping. Allâhu ta'âlâ declares in the one hundred and fourteenth âyat of the sûrat al-Baqara, **"No one can be more cruel than he who prohibits to mention Mine Name in Mine mosques."** Hadrat 'Atâ is quoted in **Tafsîr at-tibyân,** "This âyat descended because, on the Day of Hudaibiya, the disbelievers of Mecca would not let Muslims into the Masjid al-Harâm and perform hajj. In the Qur'ân, unbelievers are called 'the cruel', too." This âyat clearly describes those who do not let Muslims who cannot pay money into the Masjid al-Harâm and those who praise these heretics. There were the Ottoman Muslims, whom they blame, and here are the enemies of Ahl as-Sunna whom they praise!

Furthermore, his word "The Ottomans stopped ijtihâd," is a lie. This word has become a loathsome gossip in the mouths of the enemies of Islam. The Ottomans did not close the way to ijtihâd. They prevented the ignorant like Sayyid Qutb, Muhammad Qutb and 'Abduh, who were the enemies of Islam, from inserting their dirty pens into Islam's chastity. If the Ottoman Turks had not protected Islam against the aggression of ignorant people like these, Islam also, like Christianity, would have been an altogether mixed-up, impure religion. It is, however, a lamentable fact that Islam has been injured and made a plaything in the hands of the heretics in Mecca and Egypt. Today, true Islam, as Rasûlullâh ('alaihi 's-salâm) left it, has remained in Turkish people with all its cleanliness and purity.[1]

63 - An Indian named Muhammad Hamidullah also spreads,

---

[1] For those who want to learn in detail the real purposes of Ibn Taimiyya, the leader of the anti-madhhabite, and of those who are excessive in anti-madhhabism, Indian scholar Muhammad Hamd-Allah ad-Dajwi's Arabic work **al-Basâ'ir li-munkiri 't-tawassuli bi-ahl al maqâbir** and Muhammad Hasan Jan al-Fârûqi al-Mujaddidi as-Sirhindi's Persian work **al-Usûl al-arba'a fî tardîd al-Wahhâbiyya** (both were first printed in India and later reproduced in Istanbul, 1395/1975) are recommendable.

under the name of Islamic knowledge, his thoughts in contradiction to what the Ahl as-Sunna scholars have conveyed. The heretical writings of this man, who is assumed to be an Islamic scholar because he has received professorship in Islamic knowledge in France, are translated into Turkish and offered to the young generation in order to misguide Muslims. We were appalled to read the following lines on the thirty-fourth page of the Turkish translation of his book **The Prophet of Islam:**

"We see him [Muhammad 'alaihi 's-salâm] again in Hubeshâ [Yemen] and in the country of the Abdulgaises [Eastern Arabia, Bahrain, Oman] as a merchant. It may even be thought that he went to Ethiopia, perhaps by sea. All these journeys provided him with the acquirement of the commercial and administrative traditions and laws of Byzantium, Persia, Yemen and Ethiopia. In his age of maturity, this experienced man of forty attempted to reform his nation."

On the contrary, Muslim historians say unanimously that Rasûlullah ('alaihi 's-salâm) was suckled by his mother for three days, then by Abû Lahab's jâriya named Suwaiba for 40 or 120 days and then by Halîma Khâtûn until he was five years old. At his age six, his blessed mother, Âmina Khâtûn, took him to Medîna to see his maternal uncles. After having stayed there for a month, she passed away on the way back, near the place named Abwâ, when she was twenty. He came to Mecca with Umm Ayman, a jâriya, whom he had inherited from his blessed father, 'Abdullah, and stayed with his blessed grandfather, 'Abd al-Muttalib. When he was eight, his grandfather passed away and he stayed with his eldest paternal uncle, Abû Tâlib.

He was amongst those who went to Damascus once with Abû Tâlib when he was nine or twelve years old, once with Abû Bakr (radiy Allâhu 'anh) at his twenty, and once with Khadîja's (radiy-Allâhu 'anhâ) caravan at his twenty-five. In all these three expeditions, when they came to a place named Busrâ,[1] the priests of the local church, Bahîra and then Nastûra, saw in him the signs of the Last Prophet ('alaihi 's-salâm), whom they read about in the Injîl, and they said, "Don't go to Damascus! Jews in Damascus will recognize and kill this boy." So, they traded there

[1] Busrâ is located 90 km southeast of Damascus and 130 km northeast of Jerusalem.

and returned. When he was fourteen or seventeen years old, his uncle Zubair, who was going to Yemen, took him along so that his trade be blessed. After twenty years of age, he began to live on tending sheep. There is not any dependable information about his going to Bahrein; nor has anyone, besides those who disbelieve his prophethood, thought of his having travelled to Ethiopia. Those who say, "He was heard speak Ethiopian language. This makes one think that he may have gone to Ethiopia," are wrong. For, he answered the foreigners who came to him in their own dialects of Arabic, which was more difficult than speaking foreign languages. This speaking of his was one of the innumerable mu'jizas which Allâhu ta'âlâ bestowed upon him. None of the three or four expeditions mentioned above did he join out of personal concerns; he was taken in order to get blessed with his honourable existence. In the last expedition to Damascus, Maisara, leader of the caravan, wanted to send him to Khadîja (radiy-Allâhu 'anhâ) to give her the good news. But Abû Jahl, who was in the caravan, said, "Muhammad is young yet. He is inexperienced. He has never travelled to any place. He may lose his way. Send someone else." This indicates that Hamidullah's mentality is wrong and eccentric. To say that he went to Byzantium, Persia, Ethiopia and Yemen and attempted to reform his nation by exploiting what he had learned in these places, and to behave insolently towards Rasûlullâh (sall-Allâhu 'alaihi wa sallam) by saying "this experienced man" are not what a Muslim would do.

It is written on page 391 of **Qisâs Anbiyâ'** that Rasûlullah (sall-Allâhu 'alaihi wa sallam) was ummî, that is, he had not learned anything from anybody. He did not use to write or read. He had grown up amongst illiterate people. In Mecca, there was not a scholar who knew the history of old peoples. He had not gone to other places to learn anything from anybody. He had not started a job for earnings. So as he was, he communicated the knowledge in the **Tawrâ,** in the **Injîl,** and in all other books that had descended from heaven and the facts about past people. In those days, historical knowledge had been interpolated and defiled. There were very few people to distinguish the correct from the incorrect. He responded to men of every religion and silenced them all. These accomplishments show that he was and is the Prophet ('alaihi 's-salâm) sent down by Allâhu ta'âlâ. Though he defied

the literary men and the poets of his time, none was able to express even a line like the Qur'ân he revealed. Indeed, the Meccans were interested in reading poems and making speeches and strove hard and competed with one another in this way. They took pride in speaking coherently. The Qur'ân beat all the poets. They could not compete against the Qur'ân. In desperation, they threw their swords into the scale, which would mean 'to fight' and, if necessary, 'to die'. Unais, Abû Dharr's brother (radiy-Allâhu 'anhumâ) was a famous poet who had outdone twelve poets. As soon as he heard the Qur'ân, he understood that it was Allâhu ta'âlâ's word and embraced Islam. The 48th âyat of the sûrat al-Ankabût says, **"You had not read any book before the Our'ân descended; you had not written. If you had been literate, they would have said that you had learned it from others."** Seeing these witnesses of Allâhu ta'âlâ and of Islamic scholars anybody with îmân and reason will not have difficulty in deciding definitely about Hamidullah's writing above. On the fortieth page, he says:

"For an unknown reason he bit his foster-sister's shoulder so severely that its scar remainded all through her life. In a holy war, his foster-sister Shaimâ, too, was amongst the slaves captivated. When she told him the event and showed him the scar, Rasûlullâh recognized her."

The enemies of Islam fabricated many slanders about Rasûlullah ('alaihi 's-salâm). They said he was black. In order to alienate youngsters from him, they called black dogs "arab". Hamidullah goes even further and attempts to misrepresent that exalted Prophet ('alaihi 's-salâm) as a cannibal to youngsters. On the contrary, Halîma Khâtûn always kept him with her and would not let him go far away. One day, he somehow slipped out of her attention for a moment. He went among the lambs with his foster-sister Shaimâ. Halîma, when she noticed his absence, looked for him and found him. She asked Shaimâ, "Why did you go out? It is so hot." Shaimâ said, "Mummy! A cloud keeps over my brother's head. It always shades him." Let alone complaining about him, she praised him. Everybody who stayed with him, young or old, praised and liked him. No one said to have been hurt by him. He never hurt his foster-sister. He respected her rights and even her milk and he did not suck the teat which she sucked. Halîmah said, "When he sucked, my own son respected him and did not suck." This indicates that his foster-brother and sister were never hurt by

him and they liked and respected him. "As he sucked his milk, (his beautiful face commanded such strong admiration that) I could not endure looking at his beautiful face. He began to talk by uttering the words of the **Kalimat at-tawhîd** first. When he held something, he said **'Bismi'llâh'.** He did not join in children's playing. He said, **"We were not created for playing.'** He never cried or hurt anybody." In the eighth year of the Hegira, after the Hunain Ghazâ, a woman named Shaimâ amongst the captives said, "O Rasûl-Allah! I am your foster-sister," and told some of what had happened in those days. He listened to Shaimâ's words. He recognized her and gave her many gifts. When he was only a child, so many mu'jizas and wonderfully beautiful manners were seen in him that they have been written in very many books. Instead of doing an honourable service such as writing about those superiorities, which make the readers love him, and finding and adding those that have remained unknown, does it befit a professor of Islam to write in his book a thing which may happen among children, under the title of "The Life of the Prophet of Islam"? And can the man who selects and narrates an ugly slander which was invented afterwards be regarded a real Muslim? Does such an attitude indicate a service to knowledge, or an effort in fault-finding? Every Muslim should tremble not to allow anything to be said against his Prophet ('alaihi 's-salâm), whom he believes and whom he loves more than himself.

On the forty-eighth page, he says:

"In order to protect himself from the burning heat of noon, he would shelter under the shade of 'Abdullah ibn Jud'a's arch [or wall]."

All Siyar books write that a cloud kept over Rasûlullah's (a'alaihi 's-salâm) head and moved with him and shaded him, thus protecting him against the sun until nubuwwa (the time when he was informed with prophethood). To say that he used to shelter a shade, means to disbelieve this mu'jiza. He may have sat there not in order to sit in the shade, but in order to guide those who sat in the shade. On the forty-eighth page, he says:

"Ibn Kalbî narrates that Muhammad himself has sacrificed a dark sheep before an idol."

These writings display clearly that the writer observes Islam from bird's eye view, from far away, and that he knows nothing

about Imân and Islam. It is written in every book that he would not let idols' names be mentioned and that he expressed his hostility against them when very young yet. Hamidullah himself wrote on page 67 that Rasûlullah ('alaihi 's-salâm) hated idols. Every Muslim should believe that no prophet has ever committed anything that is forbidden in any religion, in any stage of his life. It is written in the books **Tuhfat al-ithnâ 'ashariyya** and **Asmâ al-mu'allifîn** that Ibn Kalbi, whom Hamidullah puts forth as a reference in order to mislead Muslims, is an insolent lâ-madhhabî person. Yes, Rasûlullah ('alaihi 's-salâm) sacrificed a dark sheep, but he sacrificed it on the 'îd al-adha in Medina. On the fifty-eighth page, he says:

"He admitted a delegation from the Abdulqais clan. He told them that he had visited their country before Islam."

Many books like the **Sahîh** of al-Bukhârî and **al-Mawâhib al-ladunniyya** provide detailed information about the messengers who came from the Abdulqais clan in Bahrein. None of them reports that Rasûlullah ('alaihi 's-salâm) had been to the country of the Abdulqais clan. To claim on the one hand that he had gone to distant places and to commercial centers and learned many facts, and on the other hand to narrate Islam's basic beliefs in a manner as if they were pieces of historical knowledge! It makes one think that insidious and base plans are being put into practice.

On the fifty-fourth page, he says:

"His eyebrows extended to his nose and were curved. His legs were thin."

With such impudent words, he tries to liken Rasûlullah ('alaihi 's-salâm) to an ogre. On the other hand, it is written in **Qisâs-i Anbiyâ'**, "Allâhu ta'âlâ collected all kinds of beauty in His beloved Prophet ('alaihi 's-salâm). His blessed arms and legs were big and thick. He had crescent eyebrows, a well-shaped nose and long eyelashes." It is written in **al-Mawâhib al-ladunniyya,** "His blessed eyebrows were thin. His blessed hands and feet were big." Each of his companions told about the symmetry in his blessed limbs, and his beauty and lovableness have been a general topic of conversation. It is written in books that so many people loved his beauty at first sight and converted to Islam without searching for anything else. Those who loved him as soon as seeing his beauty tried to describe it as well as they could and said that human sense

would not be able to portray his beauty. Some of the eulogies delivered by those lovers are provided in the first part of **Se'âdet-i ebediyye**. Those who read them will immediately realize that Allâhu ta'âlâ created His beloved Prophet (*'alaihi 's-salâm*) in an inconceivable proportion and a beauty which one would not become tired of looking at; they will begin to love him without seeing him. Those who love Habîb-Allah (*sall-Allâhu 'alaihi wa sallam*) feel the taste of his love in the coolness of air which goes into their lungs with each inhaling. Whenever they look at the moon, they get the pleasure of looking for the reflections of the rays that have come from his blessed eyes. Each mote of those who have attained one drop of the ocean of his beauty says:

"Who knows thy lovely cheek will never look at the rose!
Who melts in thy love will not search for repose!"

Hadrat Mawlânâ Khâlid al-Baghdâdî, one of those who loved him without seeing him, in his Persian divân (collection of poems), wrote about his beauty, his greatness, which the human mind cannot comprehend and which the human imagination cannot reach, very laconically and beautifully through the words coming out of his sensitive soul and his great literary skill. Those who read and can understand them admire them. In its translation into English, it is impossible to express that fine art, those deep meanings. Yet, let us render our book valuable by writing the translation of a few of the couplets which he said when visiting Qabr as-Sa'âda:

"O the most beautiful of the beautiful, you burn me with your love!
I care nothing; always with your dream is my mind!

You are the Shah of "Ka'ba Qawsain", and me a disobedient slave,
How can this confused speak of being a guest of you?

When you glanced once with pity, you enlivened dead hearts,
Refuging your endless mercy, I knocked at your door.

The source of goodness, the ocean of pity you are!
Favour me a drop, I am at a loss of remedy!

Everybody comes to Mecca, Ka'ba, Safâ and Marwa.
As for me, for you I passed over mounts and hills.

Last night I dreamt of my head touching the skies,
I felt as if your servants had stepped on my neck.

O Hadrat Jâmi, the nightingale of my darling!
From amongst your poems, I selected this couplet:

'Like mangy dogs, with tongues hanging down,
Hoping a tiny drop, to your ocean of favour I came'."

In another poem of his, he expresses as follows:

"O the shelter of sinners, to take refuge in thee I come!
I committed many guilts, here to beg thee I come!

I deviated into dark places, I got stuck in bogs,
To the source of light, the illuminator of right path I come.

I have only a life left to lose, O the life of all lives!
Will it be proper to say 'to sacrifice my life I come'?

You are the healer of the sufferer, and me is a sick at heart,
For the remedy of my heart's sore, to knock at your door I come?

It is improper to take something to the door of the generous,
To kiss the honoured earth which you have trodden on I come.

My sins are a lot like mountains, my face black like tar,
Entirely to get rid of this burden, this darkness, I come.

A drop of your ocean of favour will certainly clean all,
Although with my deed-book as black as my face I come.

If I can only kiss the soil of your door, O darling dearer than my life!
Works impossible with water arises from that soil!"

On the eighty-second page, Hamidullah writes that it was historians who wrote about the dividing of the moon into two. He does not write that it was written in the Qur'ân and the Hadîth.

Furthermore, he does not say if he believes it or not. He says:

"First his wife, and then his uncle passed away. The majority of Muslims were in Ethiopia. He did not have anybody besides Allah to depend on."

Rasûlullah ('alaihi 's-salâm) and his companions and every Muslim trusted only in Allâhu ta'âlâ in everything they did. Yet, they held on to the causes because He commanded so. They did not depend upon the causes. They believed that the causes were intermediaries rather than makers. On the ninety-second and third pages, he says:

"The Mi'râj is a state of mood. It was done when he forgot about his body and when his soul was dominant. The sûra Isrâ says that one night Hadrat Prophet was taken from the holy center on earth to the holy center in the sky (Masjid Aqsâ). The distant masjid cannot be thought to be in Jerusalem. For there was not a masjid in Jerusalem then. The sûra Rûm declares that Palestine is the nearest place. A masjid which is far away cannot be a place which is near. Allâhu ta'âlâ consoles him by reminding him of the history of the ancient prophets."

Allâhu ta'âlâ declares, **"I took My 'Abd from the Masjid al-Harâm to Masjid al-Aqsâ at night."** Man is called " 'Abd" (human creature). It is not his soul or state of mood which is called " 'Abd". It is written in the long Hadîth in the **Sahîh** of al-Bukhârî, in the Qur'ân commantaries of the Ahl as-Sunna scholars and in all the books dealing with the Mi'râj that Rasûlullah (alaihi 's-salâm) said, **"I went to Masjid al-Aqsâ in Jerusalem and saw it."** In those days, Masjid al-Aqsâ existed in Jerusalem. Long ago, Sulaimân ('alaihi 's-salâm) had had it built. Later it had come into the possession of Persians and Greeks. After 'Îsâ's ('alaihi 's-salâm) Ascension to Heaven,[1] it came into the Romans' possession. It collapsed and was repaired several times. Lastly, 'Umar (radiy-Allâhu 'anh) had it repaired. Palestine is a neighbor to Arabia. Since it was nearer than other countries, it was called "the Nearest Place". Amongst the masjids on earth Masjid al-Aqsâ was the one farthest to Mecca then. Therefore, it

[1] It goes without saying that Allâhu ta'âlâ lifted Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' to heaven, alive as he was. This truth belies the Christian superstition which instructs that he was 'crucified and interred, and then somehow ascended to heaven'.

was called “the Farthest Masjid”. Why should not the farthest masjid be at the nearest place? For sixteen months after the Hegira, Muslims had performed salât towards Masjid al-Aqsâ. If a masjid had not existed in Jerusalem then, would it have been commanded to perform salât towards there? Would Rasûlullâh (’alaihi ’s-salâm) have said that he had performed salât in Masjid al-Aqsâ? Since Hamidullah’s intellect, thought and scientific understanding cannot comprehend that Rasûlullah (’alaihi ’s-salâm) was taken to Jerusalem and thence to heaven with his blessed body, he cannot believe it. He means that the Mi’râj was a state of spirit. Therefore, he misinterprets the Qur’ân. He strives to prove his thought to be right by evasive words. If the Mi’râj had been a state, none of those who had heard of it would oppose it. Nor would the disbelievers say anything against it. Because he said, **“I went in body,”** many people denied it. It is declared unanimously by Islamic scholars that he who does not believe that Rasûlullah (’alaihi ’s-salâm) was taken to Jerusalem from Mecca will be kâfir. And he who does not believe that he was lifted to heaven, will be a man of bid’a, a heretic.

The books written by Indian scholars contain apposite answers to this writing of the Indian Hamidullah who has dived so deep into disbelief. Hadrat ’Abdulhaq ad-Dahlawî, a great scholar of the Hadîth, says in his Persian **Madârij an-nubuwwa:** “One of the most honourable blessings of Allâhu ta’âlâ on Muhammad (’alaihi ’s-salâm) is His lifting him up to heaven in the Mi’râj. He has not given this miracle to any other prophet. It is declared clearly in the Qur’ân that he was taken from Mecca to Masjid al-Aqsâ; he who does not believe this becomes a disbeliever. Mashhûr hadîths inform with the fact that he was taken up to heaven from Masjid al-Aqsâ; a person who denies this becomes a man of bid’a, a sinner. The majority of the Sahâbat al-kirâm, of the Tâbi’ûn, of the scholars of the Hadîth, of the scholars of fiqh and of the scholars of kalâm communicate that the Mi’râj happened as he was awake and physically. Also sahîh hadîths communicate that this happened so. Mi’râj took place many times. One of them was when he was awake and in body. Others happened spiritually only. ’Âisha (radiy-Allâhu ’anh) told about one which happened spiritually in his dream. This narration of hers does not necessarily show that the Mi’râj which happened when he was awake and physically was untrue. Nevertheless,

Islamic scholars communicate unanimously that prophets' dreams were wahî. There is no way for doubt in these. While their eyes were closed, their blessed hearts were awake. Those which happened spiritually before were intended to prepare him for the Mi'râj that would happen physically. Because the disbelievers would not believe in the Mi'râj and asked for information about Masjid al-Aqsâ in order to test him, it was declared clearly in the sûrat al-Isrâ that he was taken to Masjid al-Aqsâ. In this sûra, the âyat, **'I took him to show Mine Âyat,'** shows the fact that he was taken up to heaven. The sixtieth âyat of the same sûra purports: **"We have made the dream which We showed you a fitna for people.'** The dream mentioned here denotes the Mi'râj. Some scholars said, 'It was the dream in which he saw that he would go to Mecca and perform tawâf (hajj) together with as-Sahâba. Because they did not go into Mecca but turned and went back from Hudaibiya in the year when he communicated this dream to as-Sahâba, the munâfiqs aroused fitna.' However, he did not have that dream that year; why should it have caused fitna, then? Many of the scholars of tafsîr have informed that the word 'ruyâ' (dream) is used in the sense 'seeing while awake at night' here, and they have put forward examples for this from the **Dîvân** of the poet Mutanabbî. The Bâtinîs, i.e., members of the Ismâ'îlism, have said that the Mi'râj was not a journey in body, but it was the soul's getting exalted passing beyond the ecstasies and ranks; this argument of theirs is kufr and ilhâd, that is, it is something which makes one a zindîq; it is enmity against Islam." Hamidullah's writing shows that he belongs to the Ismâilî group. The fact that he is from Hyderabad, center of the Ismâîlîs, corroborates this belief of ours. Most of the Sahâbat al-kirâm reported the hadîth about the Mi'râj. It is written with details by al-Bukhârî and Muslim. Those who have îmân should also believe the mu'jiza of the Mi'râj.

It is seen that Hamidullah, in all his books, tries to explain Islam in two different points of view; one according to history and one according to his own understanding. The majority of the facts that he derives and communicates from history books narrate the events correctly. But his own heretical points of view and corrupt beliefs, which he has secretly inserted among the former, undermine the îmân of those who read and believe them and annihilate their respect and love towards Rasûlullah ('alaihi 's-

salâm) and their trust in the Ahl as-Sunna scholars.

64 - In order to spread Christianity, the British sent Protestant priests to India in 1270 [A.D. 1853]. The great scholar Rahmatullah Efendi contended against them for days, eventually defeating them so decisively that they could no longer answer him. One night they made a swift exit and went to London. Rahmatullah Efendi gives a detailed account of this victory in his book **Iz-hâr-ul-haqq**. In revenge for this rout, the British government declared war on India, martyring thousands of Muslims, in 1274 (A.H.). This catastrophic event is written in detail in our books **Confessions of a British Spy** and **Could Not Answer**. When their weapons also proved useless in their efforts to annihilate Islam, they pursued a policy to break it from within. In 1296 [A.D. 1880], they helped a person named Ahmad Qâdiyânî to establish a new religion in India. This religion, which was called **Qâdianism** or **Ahmadiyya**, was propagated as an Islamic religion. The Islamic scholars in India wrote books proving that votaries of that religion were disbelievers. Formerly the British had supported the Wahhâbî religion for the same purpose. Abd-us-salâm, who made fame by winning the Nobel Prize for physics, is a Qâdiyânî. Ahmad Didad, a man of religion who struggled against Christians and routed them, is not a Sunnî Muslim, either. These people, on the one hand, and the Wahhâbîs and Shiite men of religion, on the other, are misinforming those Christians who have newly converted to Islam, attracting them into their heretical sects, and thereby preventing them from attaining true Islam. Indeed, the British policy causes severe harm to humanity and to Islam.

Nowadays, everybody who knows a little Arabic and who is capable of expressing himself in writing has been attempting to write religious books. By disguising as a religious man and getting a diploma, each of them has been writing different things. All of them have been demolishing Islam and defiling the belief of Muslims. Pure-hearted young people are at a loss as to what book to read and whom to believe.

Those who want to learn Islam, which Allâhu ta'âlâ likes, and to attain repose and happiness in both worlds by holding fast to Rasûlullâh's ('alaihi 's-salâm) religion should read **'ilm al-hâl** books, which are the selections from the books that the great men of tasawwuf wrote after the Ahl as-Sunna scholars. Only the Ahl

as-Sunna scholars have comprehended the real meaning of the Qur'ân and communicated it by writing thousands of books. They are the apples of the eyes of Islam and are praised in the Qur'ân and the Hadîth. One should not read the misguiding and concocted articles of upstart men of religion, of false shaikhs or of insidious enemies of Islam, or fall for their words and lectures. One should look for the correct books prepared by real Muslims, who adapt themselves to Islam and who make their children live compatibly with Islam, i.e., who perform every kind of 'ibâdât and abstain from the harâm.

65 - Hadrat al-Imâm ar-Rabbânî al-Mujaddîd al-alf ath-thânî Ahmad al-Farûqî 'rahmatullâhi ta'âlâ 'aleyh' [d. 1034 (A.D. 1624), in Serhend city, India] wrote as follows in the twenty-third letter of the third volume:

"Allâhu ta'âlâ sent prophets as a compassion and favour to all creatures. Allâhu ta'âlâ made known His existence and Attributes to us, His weak-minded, short-sighted creatures, through these great prophets of His. Through the agency of them, He declared the things He liked and what He disliked. Through their mediation, He separated the things that would be useful to men in this world and the next from the harmful ones. If these honourable prophets had not been sent, the human mind could not have realized that Allâhu te'âlâ exists and could not come to comprehend His greatness. In fact, the ancient Greek philosophers, who presumed themselves to be very intelligent, were not able to comprehend Allâhu ta'âlâ's existence. They denied the Creator. Their limited intellects supposed that time had been making everything. Everybody knows about the struggle between Nimrod, who was the king of the world, and Ibrâhîm ('alaihi 's-salâm) which is narrated in the Qur'ân. Also the ominous Pharaoh said, 'You do not have any other god besides me.' In fact, this idiot tried to dishearten Mûsâ ('alaihi 's-salâm) by saying, 'If you believe in any other god besides me, I will imprison you.' So, men's short intellects could not comprehend this greatest blessing [of realizing Allâhu ta'âlâ's existence]. Unless the exalted prophets existed, they attain this endless bliss.

"When the Greek philosophers heard from prophets that the earth and the skies had one creator and thereby realized that they themselves had been in a wrong and evil way, they had to affirm

that Allâhu ta'âlâ existed. They said that all the things had one creator. A glitter of the lights which prophets spread illuminated their darkened hearts. Remnants from the open dining-tables of those great people became medication for these deadly ill people. Likewise, what prophets revealed, such as that Allâhu ta'âlâ has Superior Attributes, that He has sent prophets, that angels are innocent, that there will be Rising after death and that there are infinite blessings, favours in Paradise and torments in Hell and many other things which Islam declares, cannot be comprehended through reasoning. Unless these are heard from prophets, they cannot be explored with men's short minds.

"Ancient Greek Philosophers said that reason never went wrong and it comprehended the truth of everthing and was without a limit. They tried to solve by reasoning what reason could not comprehend. On the contrary, reason goes wrong even in worldly knowledge. And it can never comprehend the knowledge pertaining to the next world. As reason can explore the things that cannot be comprehended through the senses, so the things which reason cannot comprehend will be understood through prophets' revelation. As reason is above the sense organs, so prophethood is above the power of reason. The things which the power of reason cannot reach will be learned through prophets' revelation. To believe that Allâhu ta'âlâ exists and is one only through the comprehension and admission of reason and to say that it cannot be comprehended or believed in another way, will mean to deny in prophets, which is like denying the sun.

"Allâhu ta'âlâ is the One who has created men and sends every blessing which is necessary for their maintenance in existence. Everybody knows that he who does favours should be thanked. And again, prophets are necessary for knowing how to thank for His blessings. Thanks and respect which they have not revealed are not worthy of Him. Man cannot know how to thank Him and he may suppose something which is disrespect towards Him to be thanks and respect. While meaning to thank, he may be disrespectful. It can be understood how to thank Allâhu ta'âlâ only by prophets' revelation. The information called **'inspiration',** which occurs to the hearts of the Awliyâ', happens only by following prophets. If inspiration happened through reasoning, the ancient Greek philosophers, who followed only their reason, would not have deviated from the right path. They would have

comprehended Allâhu ta'âlâ better than anybody did. However, in comprehending Allâhu ta'âlâ's existence and Supperior Attributes, these philosophers have proved to be the most ignorant. A few of them mortified their flesh and endeavoured and shined their nafs by subduing it with methods that they had learned from prophets 'alaihim-us-salawât-u-wa-t-taslîmât' and from Muslim men of Tasawwuf, thereby attaining a few facts; they did not know, however, that purifying and shining the nefs, and anything attained in this manner, would be aberration. It is the heart that must be purified and shined. Purification of the nafs begins after the heart has become purified. The nûrs (spiritual lights) will make their entrance from the heart. Purifying the nafs before the heart has been purified is like providing the enemy with a light to support its night attack. The enemy whom the nafs helps is the devil. Yes happiness and truth can be attained also by starvation, by denying physical desires, by subduing the nafs and by reasoning. But this may be possible only after having believed in prophets and what they have brought from Allâhu ta'âlâ. For, all the statements made by prophets were reported by unerring angels. The devil cannot meddle with these teachings. As for those who do not follow these great persons, they cannot escape the devil's deceit. Plato, one of the great ones of philosophers, attained the honour of being contemporary with 'Îsâ ('alaihi 's-salâm). Yet he was vulgarly ignorant and presumed that he did not need to learn anything from anybody. He deprived himself of the divine blessing that he would have attained through that exalted prophet.

"It is surprising that philosophers, i.e., those who suppose that reason never errs, deny not only Allâhu ta'âlâ but also the Last Judgement. They say that matter never stops existing and that everything goes on as they have come."

[Scientists' words that are not based on experimentation and calculation incite this aberration. When French chemist Lavoisier[1] saw that matter did not cease to exist in chemical reactions, he said with his short mind that matter would never cease to exist. Upon hearing this, the progressives, being unable to think that Allâhu ta'âlâ's Infinite Power could go beyond the laws of physics and chemistry, readily took his word for granted;

[1] Antoine Laurent Lavoisier (1743-94), French chemist and physician.

which did not conform with experiments or calculations. But when it was found out that matter ceased to exist and turned into energy in atomic fissions, in radioactive events and in nuclear reactions, those who believed Lavoisier were stupefied. It was understood that the progressives, who, being unable to comprehend that Lavoisier's conclusion applied only to chemical reactions, said that nothing would cease to exist in nature, were wrong. It is a shame that thousands of imitators had been blindly tagging along behind this wrong belief until the truth revealed itself. Presuming Lavoisier's words to be scientific, although they were merely expressions of a surmise mistaken for truth, they denied the the belief in Rising After Death, which caused them to die without îmân and drag into endless disasters only after imbuing many other people with their harmful ideas. Those who trusted the Ahl as-Sunna scholars and held to 'ilm al-hâl books did not fall for progressives, thereby saving their belief.

The lessons taught in high school, university and the teachings pertaining to mathematics, matter and science are certainly useful. They protect intellect from erring in matters within its own limits. They help in discovering new things that provide people with a comfortable life and facilities in doing their work in the world. These branches of knowledge are utilized in worldly affairs and the things that can be discovered through intellect. By means of them, television, computer, radio, ultrasonic airplane, nuclear submarine, spy satellite, travel to moon and many other accomplishments can be achieved. These things are not against Islam; they are parallel to Islam and strengthen îmân. For, Islam conforms with science in all the branches of knowledge within reason. Reason, because it is able to find out the truth in these branches of knowledge, is compatible with Islam. Muslims should learn and utilize these things.]

"It is a disgrace for men to utilize scientific findings in worldly affairs and, instead of utilizing them also in comprehending the teachings pertaining to Allâhu ta'âlâ and the Hereafter, to be complacent about these findings, to consign themselves to their sensuous indulgences and mental preferences, to try to solve the teachings pertaining to the Hereafter within their mental precincts, and to consequently deviate from the Islamic path. This case is like that of a person who prepares for war and goes into much labour and expense and who, when the time for war comes,

revolts and rises against his own legitimate government. Hence, all the scientific teachings are practicable in things which reason can comprehend. It is wrong to base something that will either bring eternal felicity or incur endless torment on these teachings, or to attempt to solve the matters pertaining to the next world within these teachings. These most important matters are beyond the limits of reason and scientific knowledge. Not to learn this most necessary knowledge from prophets and to try to solve it with worldly knowledge will mean to pass the time on trivial and even absurd things. For, worldly knowledge is not useful in matters which the reason cannot comprehend and which can be comprehended only through prophets' revelation. Al-Imâm al-Ghazâlî says in his **Al-munqidh min ad-dalâl,** 'Ancient Greek philosophers stole medical and astronomical knowledge from the books of ancient prophets. And they learned moral and educational methods by seeing them in the men of Tasawwuf among ancient ummas."

"Philosophers, whose religious talks are based on their personal reasoning, materialists and those who have deviated from the right course by trying to solve the knowledge pertaining to the next world with their own mind are regarded as scholars by many people. By attributing to them gilted, false titles such as reformer, mujtahid, advanced man of religion or martyr, they suggest their destructive words and books to the youngsters. In fact, they regard their corrupt and mendacious words superior to the teachings which the Ahl as-sunna scholars have derived from the Qur'ân and the Hadîth. May Allâhu ta'âlâ protect Muslims from their harms! It is a fatal mistake to look on religion reformers as religious scholars.

"Knowledge and science are procedures followed to learn the inner essence of things. Statements which spoil Islam and which cannot assess the value of Islamic knowledge cannot be said to be of knowledge and science. Something which causes the denial of prophets cannot be knowledge. The discoveries and the branches of knowledge and science in the twentieth century do not cause the denial of those Islamic teachings that are within mind's grasp. They strengthen Islam. It is harmful to use knowledge and science against religious knowledge, which is beyond mind's grasp. This subtlety should be comprehended well. The ignorant people, egoists and people hooked on their lusts and pleasures use

knowledge and science as a cloak under which to attack Islam. They disguise their heretical ideas as scientific knowledge. They attempt to blame the religious knowledge only because it does not conform with their heretical ideas. Or, by taking those religious teachings that are beyond mind's grasp and by saying that they cannot be solved by means of science, they say that Islam consists of a medieval system of beliefs that are incompatible with reason and science and that therefore it is retrogression. Muslims should learn the knowledge and science well enough not be deceived by these mendacious, base people."[1]

[1] **Maktûbât,** III, 23rd letter.

WHAT IS A TRUE MUSLIM LIKE?

The first piece of advice is to correct the belief in accordance with the tenets which the Ahl-i sunnat savants communicate in their books. For, it is this madhhab only that will be saved from Hell. May Allâhu ta'âlâ give those great people plenty of rewards for their toil! Those scholars of the four madhhabs who reached up the grade of ijtihâd and the great scholars educated by them are called **Ahl as-sunna** scholars. After correcting the belief (îmân), it is necessary to perform the acts of worship taught in the branch of **fiqh,** i.e. to do the commands of the Sharî'at and to abstain from what it prohibits. One should perform namâz five times each day without reluctance and slackness and in compliance with its conditions and ta'dîl-i arkân. He who has as much money as nisâb should pay zakât.[1] Imâm-i a'zâm Abû Hanîfa says, "Also, it is necessary to pay the zakât of gold and silver which women use as ornaments."

We should not waste our valuable lives even on unnecessary mubâhs. It is absolutely unwarrantable to waste it on harâm. We should not busy ourselves with taghannî, singing, musical instruments, or songs. We should not be deceived by the pleasure they give our nafses. These are poisons mixed with honey and covered with sugar.

We should not commit **giybat.** Giybat is harâm. [Giybat means to talk about a Muslim's or a Zimmî's secret fault behind his back. It is necessary to tell Muslims about the faults of the Harbîs, about the sins of those who commit these sins in public, about the evils of those who torment Muslims and who deceive Muslims in buying and selling, thereby helping Muslims to beware their harms, and to tell about the slanders of those who talk and write incorrectly about Islam; these are not giybat. **Radd-ul-Muhtâr: 5-263**)].

We should not spread gossip (carry words) among Muslims. It

---

[1] Please see **Endless Bliss**, V, 1, for **zakât**.

has been declared that various kinds of torments would be done to those who commit these two kinds of sins. Also, it is harâm to lie and slander, and must be abstained from. These two evils were harâm in every religion. There will be very heavy punishments for them. It causes great blessings to be secretive about Muslims' defects, not to spread their secret sins and to forgive them their faults. One should show compassion for one's inferiors, those under one's command [such as wives, children, students, soldiers] and the poor. One should not reproach them for their faults. One should not hurt or beat or swear at those poor persons for trivial reasons. One should not violate anybody's property, life, honour, or chastity. Debts to everyone and to the government must be paid. Bribery, accepting or giving, is harâm. However, it would not be bribery to give it in order to get rid of the oppression of a cruel one, or to avoid a disgusting situation. But accepting this would be harâm, too. Everybody should see their own defects, and should every hour think of the faults which they have committed towards Allahu ta'âlâ. They should always bear in mind that Allahu ta'âlâ does not hurry in punishing them, nor does He cut off their sustenance. The words of command from our parents, or from the government, compatible with sharî'a, must be obeyed, but the ones incompatible with sharî'a should not be resisted against so that we should not cause fitna. [See the 123rd letter in the second volume of the book **Maktûbât-i Ma'thûmiyya.**]

After correcting the belief and doing the commands of fiqh, we should spend all our time remembering Allâhu ta'âlâ. We should continue remembering, mentioning Allâhu ta'âlâ as the great men of religion taught. We should feel hostility towards all the things that will prevent our heart from remembering Allâhu ta'âlâ. The more you adhere to the Sharî'at, the more delicious it will be to remember Him. As indolence, laziness increase in obeying the Sharî'at, that flavour will gradually decrease, being thoroughly gone at last. What should I write more than what I have written already? It will be enough for the reasonable one. We should not fall into the traps of the enemies of Islam and we should not believe their lies and slanders.

TRANSLATION of 110th LETTER

The hundred and tenth letter of the second volume, which Muhammad Ma'thûm 'rahmatullâhi aleyh' wrote to one of his disciples, translates (into English) as follows: You should avoid talking with a person holding a heretical belief and keeping an aberrant conduct in his religious practices and should beware the company of holders of bid'at. Yahyâ bin Mu'âdh Râdî passed away in 258 [A.D. 872]. He warns: "Do not go into sohbat with three categories of people: Those scholars who are unaware; those hâfizes who think of worldly advantages; those shaikhs who are unlearned in Islam." If the words, actions and behaviours of a person passing as a shaikh do not conform with the Sharî'at, keep as far away from him as you can! In fact, flee from the town or village wherein he lives! He is a covert, sly thief. He will steal your faith and belief. He will lure you into the enemy's trap. Even if he displays wonders and miracles and seems to be indifferent towards worldly concerns, beware from him with the same fright as you would run away from a lion. Junayd-i-Baghdâdî, one of the masters of the spiritual paths called Tasawwuf, passed away in 298 [A.D. 910]. He states, "There are many people who claim to be men of Tasawwuf. The true ones among them are only those who adapt themselves to (the way guided by) the Messenger of Allah." He said on another occasion, "If a person does not obey the Qur'ân al-kerîm and hadîth-i-sherîfs, do not look upon him as a man of Allah!" He stated at another time, "The way that will guide a person to love and approval of Allah is the way followed by those who adhered to the Book (Qur'ân al-kerîm) and the Sunnat (the way taught by Rasûlullah)." If a person's words, deeds and moral conduct do not conform with those of the Messenger of Allah, [if he has not adapted his family, e.g. his daughters, to a life-style agreeable with these teachings], do not consider him as a man of Allah. Jews, Christians and Indian priests called Brahmins also use a very elegant language and apparently keep away from vices. You should not yield to the charms of their diction and appearance. Every statement, every behaviour which is counter to the Sharî'at is harmful. Tasawwuf means to endeavour to adapt yourself to the Sharî'at. The sole criterion whereby to distinguish the true and the false ones is whether the people concerned are following the Messenger of

Allah. The zuhd, the tawakkul, the sweet language, if they are not in conformity with his teachings, are all for naught. Dhikrs, fikrs (meditations, thoughts), zawks and karâmats that do not fit the Sharî'at are quite useless. [Abdullah-i-Dahlawî 'quddisa sirruh' passed away in Delhi in 1240 [A.D. 1824]. He states in his twelfth letter, "If a person who has joined (one of the orders of) Tarîqat does not carry out the duties assigned to him, he will have left the Tarîqat."] Karâmats (wonders) occur also on people who subject themselves to hunger and other mortifications. This does not show that they are Awliyâ. Abdullah ibni Mubârak passed away in 181 [A.D. 797]. He states, "A person who fails to observe the âdâb of the Sharî'at will be deprived of following Rasûlullah's sunnats. A person who is slack in following the sunnats will in turn be deprived of observing the fards. And he who is remiss in observing the fards and harâms cannot be a Walî." It was stated in a hadîth-i-sherîf: **"Insistence on** (committing) **harâms will produce disbelief."** Abû Sa'îd-i-Abu-l-khayr passed away in 440 H. When they said to him, "So and so is walking on the surface of water," he answered, "It is not something significant. Chips and straws float on water, too." When they said, "So and so is flying," he replied, "So do crows and flies." And when they said, "So and so is travelling through various cities in an instant," this time his answer was: "The devil also does so. These things do no signify virtue. A man of dignity will go shopping like an average person, get married and have children. Yet he will not forget his Allah even for an instant." Abû Alî Ahmad Rodbârî, a great Walî, passed away in Egypt in 321. They said to him, "So and so listens to musical instruments and asserts that listening to musical instruments and voices of songstresses will not harm him because he has reached a high grade in Tasawwuf." He said, "Yes. He has reached Hell." Abû Suleymân Abd-ur-Rahmân Dârânî passed away in Damascus in 205 H. He stated, "Many things, which I consider to be good, come to my heart. I do not attach any importance to them unless I assess them with the criteria of the Sharî'at."

[Imâm-i-Rabbânî 'quddisa sirruh' states as follows in the eighty-second letter of the second volume: "Do not hold fast to the world's sequinned pleasures, and do not fall for its easily exhaustible beauties! Do your best so that all your words and

deeds be agreeable with the Sharî'at! First, align your belief with the tenets taught in the books written by the scholars of **Ahl as-sunna!** Then be sure that all your behaviours and acts of worship be in congruity with the teachings in the books of **Fiqh** written by those scholars! It is very important to observe the halâls and harâms. Supererogatory worships are of no value when compared with those worships that are fard. The thawâb for giving one lira in the name of zakât, (which is fard), is very much more than the thawâb for giving hundreds of thousands of liras as alms, which is supererogatory. To be secure against worldly harms and to attain the infinite blessings of the Hereafter, there is no other way than [becoming a Muslim. That is,] first having îmân and then obeying the Sharî'at." Islam is to have îmân with the heart and to obey the Sharî'at with the body. Commandments of Allâhu ta'âlâ are called **Fard.** His prohibitions are called **Harâm.** Collectively, they are termed **Sharî'at.** Male or female, it is fard for every Muslim to learn immediately the six tenets of belief and those teachings of the Sharî'at which are so widespread and commonly known that they have become parts of one's daily chores, such as performing namâz and reciting the sûra Fâtiha in namâz, and to lead a life in harmony with these teachings. And it is fard for parents to teach them to their children. If a young Muslim who has reached the age of marriage or a new Muslim slights the fact that one should learn and adapt oneself to these things, he becomes a disbeliever. He is called a **Murtad** (renegade, apostate). A murtad is worse than a disbeliever who has not become a Muslim yet. The source of the teachings of the Sharî'at is the Qur'ân al-kerîm and hadîth-i-sherîfs. Every utterance of Muhammad 'alaihis-salâm' is termed a **Hadîth-i-sherîf.** The Qur'ân al-kerîm and hadîth-i-sherîfs are in Arabic. Only Muhammad 'alaihis-salâm' understood the meanings purported in the Qur'ân al-kerîm, and he explained all these meanings to his Sahâba. Islamic scholars learned these meanings from the Sahâba and wrote them in books. These books are called books of **Tafsîr.** And these honourable scholars are called the scholars of **Ahl as-sunna(t).** Those highest of the scholars of Ahl as-sunna compiled the teachings of the Sharî'at existing in the books of tafsîr and wrote them in other books, which have been termed books of **Fiqh.** Afterwards, some religiously ignorant people and enemies of

Islam appeared, and these people wrote books of tafsîr and fiqh, which were no more than a product of their mentalities and reflected only the scientific teachings of their time and which, subsequently, misguided the younger generation. Those who were misguided are called holders of **Bid'at,** if they did not lose their îmân. Those who lost their îmân are called Murtad. A person who reads these heretical books will learn not the Islamic religion, but the ideas and opinions of their authors. These books are destroying Islam from within and annihilating the true Muslims called **Ahl as-sunnat.** Jews and the British are the leaders of this enmity against the religion. Those who were misled by books of Jewish origin are called **Shi'î** (Shiite). Those who were misled by British spies are called **Wahhâbî.** How the British established the Wahhâbî sect is related in our book **Confessions of A British Spy,** and how the British founded the Wahhâbî Saudi government is detailed in the encyclopedic dictionary **Munjid,** within the entry 'Lawrence'. Shiites and Wahhâbîs, in order to fix the heretical writings in their books in the name of truth into young minds, intersperse âyats, hadîths, and statements made by the Sahâba and the Salaf as-sâlihîn among them. Misinterpreting these additions as it suits their purpose, they attempt to prove that their books are correct. They confuse young people. It is sometimes difficult to distinguish their books from books of the Ahl as-sunnat. However, a person who has learned their wrong creed will recognize it in any one of their books and realize that the book means mischief, thus saving himself from falling into their trap.

Allâhu ta'âlâ created everything in a certain order and harmony. He declared in the Qur'ân al-kerîm that everything is in an order and well calculated. Today we give this order names such as laws of physics, chemistry, biology and astronomy. He maintains this order by creating everything through a law of causation. As He has made substances causes for one another's creation, likewise He has made man's will and power a cause. Sometimes He creates without any causes extraordinarily, that is, in a manner contrary to His law of causation. His creating without a cause as a result of a Prophet's invocation is called **Mu'jiza.** His creating without a cause as an acceptance of the invocations offered by (those people who are called) Awliyâ (and) who have purified their hearts and nafses by obeying the

Sharî'at, is called **Karâmat.** The devil cannot delude these people. His creating without a cause the wishes of those sinners and disbelievers who have subjected themselves to hunger and various other mortifications and thus subdued their nafs into a state wherein it cannot deceive their heart any more, is called **Istidrâj** or **Sihr** (magic). If a person performing extraordinary events without causes, e.g. informing about the places of lost property or about future events or communing with genies, is at the same time a person who leads a life of obedience to the Sharî'at, it will be concluded that he is a Walî. If otherwise, it will be understood that he is a disbeliever and that he has purified and polished his nafs. His heart has not been purged from love of creatures and his nafs has not desisted from its enmity against Allâhu ta'âlâ. The devil never leaves such people alone.

A Muslim who has a wish to attain, applies Allâhu ta'âlâ's law of causation. He follows the procedure that will cause the creation of his wish. For instance, a person who wants to earn money goes into a business such as arts and trade. He who is hungry eats something. He who becomes ill runs to a doctor and takes medicine. He who wants to learn his religion reads books written by scholars of Ahl as-sunna. Using a medicine prescribed by an uneducated person may bring about death instead of restoring health. By the same token, if a person reads a heretical and fallacious book written by a non-Sunnite, miscreant and lâ-madhhabî person, his îmân will become blurred. Allâhu ta'âlâ has preordained that saying prayers should be a means for attaining one's worldly needs as well as one's wishes pertaining to the Hereafter. Yet the acceptability of a prayer requires one's being a Sunnite and devoted Muslim, that is, endeavouring to attain Allâhu ta'âlâ's love. And this, in its turn, depends on not earning one's living by working on a way that is harâm or by infringing others' rights, and on invoking Allâhu ta'âlâ alone. A person who cannot fulfil these conditions asks a person who fulfils them, i.e. a Walî, to invoke a blessing on him. The Awliyâ will hear after death, too. They will ask a blessing on those people who visit their graves and beg them.

Our Prophet 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wa sallam' stated, **"When you get confused in your problems, ask people in graves to help you!"** Shaikh-ul-islâm Ahmed ibni Kemâl explains this hadîth-i-sherîf in his book **Hadîs-i erba'în tercemesi.** It is also explained in

detail in the books **Al-tawassul-u-bi-n-Nabî wa bi-s-Sâlihîn** (in Arabic), **Radd-i-Wahhâbî** (in Persian), and **Kıyâmet ve Âhiret** (in Turkish). Abdullah-i-Dahlawî's eighth and twenty-eighth and thirty-fifth letters are powerful documents in this respect. He writes the following distich in his thirty-third letter:

Allah has given the Awliyâ so much puissance:
Be it a fired bullet, they'll send back a nuisance.

Wahhâbîs, who have been misled by British spies, deny this fact. Books published by **Hakîkat Kitâbevi** refute Wahhâbîs.]

It was stated in a hadîth-i-sherîf, **"Holders of bid'at will become dogs for the people of Hell."** [In other words, they will be made into dogs and flung into Hell]. It was stated in another hadîth-i-sherîf, **"The devil will tempt holders of bid'at to do acts of worship. As they worhip they will weep** (from fear of Allah)**."** In another hadîth-i-sherîf: **"Allâhu ta'âlâ will not accept the namâz, the fast, the alms, the hajj or 'umra, the jihâd or any other sort of fard or supererogatory worship performed by holders of bid'at. They go out of Islam like a hair picked out of butter fat."**

If you commit a sin, you should immediately make tawba [with your heart] and say istighfâr [with your tongue]. The tawba must be performed secretly for a sin committed secretly, and publicly for a sin committed publicly. You should not delay the tawba. When a person commits a sin, the angels do not record it for three hours. If he makes tawba within this period, the sin will not be recorded at all. If he does not make tawba, one sin will be recorded. It is a graver sin to postpone the tawba. The tawba is acceptable until one dies. You should make a habit of taqwâ [avoiding the harâms] and wara' [avoiding the doubtful acts]. Avoiding a prohibition is more important than doing a commandment. For it is more progressive and more beneficial in this way, [that is, in purifying the heart and subduing the nafs], to avoid the prohibitions than to do the commandments. Good deeds can be performed by sinful people as well as by good ones. Yet it takes being a siddîq and having a strong îmân to avoid the prohibitions. Ma'rûf-i-Kerhî was Sirrî-i-Seqatî's master. He passed away in Baghdâd in 200 H. He used to say, "Do not look at women or girls, or even at a female sheep." It was stated in a hadîth-i-sherîf, **"On the Rising Day, people of wara' and zuhd**

will be ahead of all those people blessed with Allâhu ta'âlâ's grace." [Zuhd means to abstain from property that is more than necessary even if it is halâl]. It was stated in a hadîth-i-sherîf, **"A namâz performed behind an imâm who holds wara' will be accepted. A present given to a person of wara' will be accepted. It is an act of worship to sit with a person of wara'. It is alms to talk with him."** [It means that it will be accepted and will produce much thawâb]. It was stated in a hadîth-i-sherîf, **"Two rak'ats of namâz performed with an imâm who holds wara' is more blessed than a namâz performed with a fâsiq."** [The word 'efdâl', (which is used in the hadîth-i-sherîf and which we translated into English as 'blessed'), means 'that which brings more thawâb.'] If your heart does not feel easy as you do something, [if your heart feels uneasy and palpitates], stop doing it! Make your heart a muftî (religious guide) in doing actions about which you feel doubt! It was stated in a hadîth-i-sherîf, **"Actions about which your heart feels calm,** [is easy about and likes], **and with which the nafs feels annoyed** [and dislikes]**, are beneficial. An action about which only the nafs feels calm is a vice."** It was stated in another hadîth-i-sherîf, **"Things that are halâl and those which are harâm have been declared openly. Beware from doubtful things! Follow those which have been declared openly!"** It was declared in another hadîth-i-sherîf, **"Allâhu ta'âlâ declared the halâls and the harâms openly. He will forgive concerning those which He did not declare** (openly)**."** When you meet with something doubtful, put your hand on your chest [heart]! Do it if your heart does not palpitate. It was stated in a hadîth-i-sherîf, **"Put your hand on your heart! The heart will be calm** [feel easy] **as you do something halâl."**

Deem all your prayers and acts of worship as deficiently performed! Be anxious to perform them in due manner! Abû Muhammad bin Manâzil stated, "Allâhu ta'âlâ praises in the seventeenth âyat of Âl-i-'Imrân sûra those who are patient, those who are faithful (sâdiq), those who perform namâz, those who pay zakât and those who say istighfâr at the time of seher (early morning). His mentioning the saying of istighfâr last implies that a person should consider all his acts of worship as faulty and should always say the istighfâr." Ja'fer bin Sinân 'quddisa sirruh' stated, "Worshippers' complacency is worse and more harmful than sinners' offense." Imâm-i-Murtaish used to perform i'tikâf in a

mosque after the twentieth of the blessed month of Ramadân. People saw him outside and asked him why he had left the mosque. He said, "I saw the hafizes' selfsatisfied demeanours and ran away from them."

It is permissible to work for your and your family's living. A hadîth-i-sherîf praises people who work so. The Salaf as-sâlihîn found a way of living for themselves. It is good as well to have tawakkul and not to work. Yet this entails the condition that you should not expect anything from anybody. Muhammad bin Sâlim Hamâda was a qâdî in the Shâfi'î Madhhab. He passed away in 697 H. When some people asked him whether they should work and earn or sit and have tawakkul, he stated, "Tawakkul is a state of the Messenger of Allah. Kasb, on the other hand, is his sunnat. It is sunnat for a person who cannot have tawakkul to work and earn. If a person manages to have tawakkul it is mubâh for him to work only for the cause of Islam and serve Muslims. A better way in any case is to combine kasb [working] and tawakkul (putting one's trust in Allâhu ta'âlâ)." You should not eat too much or too little. You should be moderate in eating. Eating too much will cause indolence and inertia. And eating too little will hinder you from work and worship. Khwâja Muhammad Bahâuddîn Naqshiband 'quddisa sirruh' passed away in 791 [A.D. 1389], in Bukhâra. He used to say, "Eat until you are fully satisfied, and then do your worship well!" [You should not eat before you become hungry or after you become fully satisfied.]. The important thing is to perform the worships well and enthusiastically. Everything conducive to this purpose is blessed. And anything obstructive is forbidden.

You should make a niyya (intention) in everything you do. You should never begin an act of worship unless you intend with a true heart [because it is a command of Allâhu ta'âlâ]. You should not spend time doing useless things, [especially if they are harmful]. [A person who cannot find pious Muslims whose belief is agreeable with the teachings of the scholars of Ahl as-sunna and who have learned the Sharî'at and adapted their life-styles to these teachings], should seclude himself, [that is, he should utilize his time working, earning halâl property, and reading books written by scholars of Ahl as-sunna. You should not make friends with those who lead a religious life of their own instead of learning Islam from these books or those

uneducated people who have fallen prey to the books written by such lâ-madhhabîs. You should not allow into your home those radio and television broadcasts that spread viruses of irreligiousness, disbelief, Christianity, Judaism and immorality]. It was stated in a hadîth-i-sherîf, **"Hikmat** [beneficial things] **consists of ten components. Nine of them are in seclusion and** (the remaining) **one is in taciturnity."** You should see your friends as long as to teach and learn necessary things and spend the rest of your time doing acts of worship and things that will purify your heart. You should treat everybody with a smiling face and a soft language, friend and foe alike, and should avoid situations that will lead to a quarrel. You should accept everybody's excuse, forgive them their faults, and never revenge yourself for the harms they have done to you. Abdullah Belyânî states, "Being a dervish does not only consist in namâz, fast and spending your nights worshipping. These things are everybody's duties as a born slave. Being a dervish means not to hurt hearts. A person who can do this will attain Allâhu ta'âlâ's love. [He becomes a Walî]." They asked Hadrat Muhammad Sâlim, "How should it be known that a certain person is a Walî?" He said, "It will be known from his sweet tongue, beautiful moral behaviour, smiling face, generosity, not quarrelling with anybody, accepting others' excuses, and having mercy on everybody." [A Walî means a person who has attained Allâhu ta'âlâ's love.]. Abdullah Ahmad Maqqarî Mâlikî passed away in 1041 H. He states, "Futuwwat [bravery] means doing favours to someone who behaves inimically towards you, being generous to someone who does not like you, and talking softly to someone you do not like." You should talk little, sleep little, and laugh little. Loud laughter is ruinous to the heart. [It makes you forget about Allâhu ta'âlâ]. You should trust to Allâhu ta'âlâ in every matter. [That is, you should hold fast to causes. Yet you should rely on Allâhu ta'âlâ for the effectiveness of causes]. You should not miss or postpone any fard. Junayd-i-Baghdâdî states, "The medicine for getting rid of your needs is to give up the thing you need. Whatever you need, you should expect [the cause that will bring about] your need from Allâhu ta'âlâ." It was stated in a hadîth-i-sherîf, **"If a person trusts to Allâhu ta'âlâ for his needs, He will bless him with** [the causes that will bring about] **his needs."** For instance, He will make other people have mercy on

him and serve him. Yahyâ bin Mu'âdh Râdî passed away in Nîshâpûr in 258 H. He states, "Others will love you as much as you love your Allah. They will fear you as much as you fear Allah. They will obey you as much as you obey Allah." He stated at another time, "Others will serve you as much as you serve Allâhu ta'âlâ. In short, whatever you do, do it for His sake! Otherwise, nothing you do will be useful at all. Do not think of yourself all the time! Do not put your trust in anyone except Allâhu ta'âlâ!" Abû Muhammad Râshî[1] states, "The greatest curtain [hindrance] between yourself and Allâhu ta'âlâ is to think of yourself only and to put your trust in someone who is as incapable as you are. To be a sôfî does not mean to go whereever you like, to rest in the shade of clouds, or to be revered by others. It means to keep a continuous confidence in Allâhu ta'âlâ." You should always be affable and cordial towards your children and family. With them also you should stay as long as necessary, only until you have paid them their dues. Being among them should not last long enough to make you forget about Allâhu ta'âlâ. Do not tell everybody about the states you have attained! Do not see high ranking or wealthy people very often! In everything you do, try to act in conformity with the Sunnat and to avoid bid'ats! At times of trouble, do not give up hope from Allâhu ta'âlâ, and do not even feel worried at all! The fifth âyat of Inshirâh sûra purports, **"After every distress there is relief and ease."** Do not let times of distress or comfort change your attitude! Or, rather, increase your joy at times of paucity and feel more anxiety at times of well-being! When Abû Sa'îd-i-Arabî was asked how a person could be a faqîr [dervish], he described, "They are serene at times of poverty and anxious, distressed at times of prosperity, and they expect trouble from comfort. Changing of events does not distract their moral conduct. They overlook others' faults. They always see their own faults and mistakes. They never deem themselves superior to any other Muslim. They always hold them in a higher esteem than themselves." Sirrî Seqatî was Junayd-i-Baghdâdî's spiritual guide. He passed away in Baghdâd in 251 H. He used to say, "I am not superior to anybody." When they asked, "Not even to a sinner who commits sins overtly," his answer was: "That's right."

---

[1] Râshî means 'from the Syrian town Râsia'. It does not mean 'briber'.

Whenever you see a Muslim you should think: "My attaining happiness may depend on pleasing his heart and wooing him into invoking a blessing on me." You should look on yourself as a slave of those people who have rights on you. It was stated in a hadîth-i-sherîf, **"A person who does** (the following) **three things is a perfect Believer: A person who serves his wife, keeps company with poor people and eats with his servant is a perfect Believer. These are the distinguishing features of a Believer which Allâhu ta'âlâ declares in the Qur'ân al-kerîm."** You should always read about the behaviours of the Salaf as-sâlihîn and visit the gharîb (lonely, destitute) and poor people. You should never backbite or gossip about anybody, and should prevent anyone who attempts to do so. You should not miss any occasion that offers an opportunity to perform amr-i-ma'rûf and nahy-i-munker, that is, to give religious advice to people. You should help the poor and mujâhids (people who try to serve Islam) with your property. You should perform pious and charitable deeds. You should avoid committing sins. When Muhammad bin Alyân was asked about the signs indicating that Allâhu ta'âlâ loves a born slave of his, he answered, "His feeling pleasure in worships and abstaining from sins." It was stated in a hadîth-i-sherîf, **"He who hates sins and enjoys worships is a true Believer."** You should not be stingy for fear of poverty. The two hundred and sixty-eighth âyat of Baqara sûra purports, **"The devil will threaten you with poverty and entice you into committing debauchery."** A poor person should not feel sad about his poverty, so that Allâhu ta'âlâ might as well have blessed him with a fortune. The real fortune is to enjoy the luxury of the Hereafter. Worldly distresses will cause one to be comfortable in the Hereafter. It was stated in a hadîth-i-sherîf, **"A person who has a crowded family but a low income and yet who performs his prayers of namâz properly according to its accepted standards and does not backbite other Muslims, will be kept with me at the place of gathering on the Rising Day."** It was stated in another hadîth-i-sherîf, **"How lucky for those who die on their way to** (perform) **hajj and those who perform ghazâ** (holy war)**! Also, a person who has a crowded family but a low income and yet who does not complain about this situation but enters his home with joy and leaves happily, is among the hadjis and ghâzîs."**

A distich:

If Haqq ta'âlâ wishes, He makes everything easy;
Creating its causes, He gives it in a jiffy.

You should serve poor people and all your brothers in Islam. Ja'fer Huldî, one of the companions of Junayd-i-Baghdâdî, passed away in 348 H. He states, "Our superiors worked and earned in order to help their brothers in Islam, not for their own nafses." Muhammad Abû Abdullah bin Hafîf passed away in 371 H. He related, "One day I had a brother in Islam of mine as a guest in my home. (During his stay) he had a stomach disorder. With a container (full of water) and a basin, I served him until morning. Sometime I fell asleep (against my will). (When I woke up), he said, 'Were you asleep? My Allah curse you!' " The people listening to him asked, "How did your heart feel when he cursed?" He said, "I was as happy as if he had said, 'May Allah have mercy on you!' " Abû 'Umar Zujjâjî states, "If a person implies (to have attained) a high grade which he has not actually attained, his words will arouse fitna and prevent him from ever attaining that grade."

Try to observe the rules of adab in the sohbat [presence] of your murshid! It is only people with adab that will benefit from him. **"Adab is the essence of tarîqat."** A person without adab cannot attain Allâhu ta'âlâ's love. My blessed father, i.e. Imâm-i-Rabbânî, wrote detailedly on the âdâb of this path. In short, you should leave aside existence, become like earth, and run for the service and sohbat of those great people. Otherwise, there is no reason for being anxious to attend the sohbat of the Awliyâ. It may, let alone being useful, give harm. Abû Bakr Ahmad bin Sa'dân states, "A person who wishes to attend the sohbat of the Sôfiyya-i-aliyya should not think of himself, his heart or his property. If he thinks about these things, he will not attain his goal. Do not loiter on your way towards Allâhu ta'âlâ's ma'rifat [love]! Abû Bakr as-Siddîq 'radiy-Allâhu ta'âlâ 'anh' stated, "Ma'rifat of Allâhu ta'âlâ [to know him] means to realize that He cannot be known. Imâm-i-a'zam Abû Hanîfa's asseveration, "I have known Thee," means, "I have realized very well that Thou couldst not be known." Abû Bakr-i-Tamstânî states, "Tasawwuf means to suffer troubles. There cannot be tasawwuf in ease and comfort." This means to say that the lover should always struggle

and strive to look for the darling, and should not be in a state of repose with anyone except the darling.

A distich:

How can I see or think of anything else?
My heart Thinks of thee, my eyes see thee, none else.

The murîd has to fulfil the qualifications described in the hundred and eighteenth âyat of Tawba sûra, which purports: **"The earth, which is actually vast, becomes narrow for them. Their hearts no longer feel calm with anything. They have realized that security against Allâhu ta'âlâ's wrath is possible only by committing yourself to His protection."** If one's love for Allâhu ta'âlâ reaches this perfection and the earth becomes narrow and dark, it is hoped that the ocean of (His) Compassion will come into motion, its drops will fall on this gharîb, and thus he will be admitted into the privacy of Wahdat.

A distich:

I have given thee the key to the treasure;
Though we have not, you may attain the pleasure.

Another distich:

The curls of the Darling's hair is so far away.
To attain Him we are still looking for a way.

GLOSSARY

BI, SP, AM, AEI and EB (I-V) refer to our books **Belief and Islam, The Sunnî Path, Advice for the Muslim, Answer to an Enemy of Islam** and **Endless Bliss** respectively for further information about the entry. The tasawwuf terms can be learned best from Hadrat Ahmad al-Fârûqî as-Sirhindî's **Maktûbât,** which is translated partly and literally in our books.

ahl: people; **Ahl al-Bait (an-Nabawî),** immediate relatives of the Prophet ('alaihi 's-salâm) AM; **ahl-al-bid'a, Ahl as-Sunna (t wa'l-Jamâ'a).**

'âlim: scholar trained in Islamic knowledge and his contemporary science.

Allâhu ta'âlâ: Allâhu ta'âlâ to whom all superiority belongs.

'amal: (p. **a'mâl**) deed; practice of, living up to, **'ilm; 'ibâda.**

Âmantu: the six fundamentals of îmân.

âmîn: "accept my prayer, my Allâhu ta'âlâ the Greatest".

-amru bi 'l-ma'rûf wa 'n-nahyu 'ani 'l-munkar: duty to teach Allah's commands and to prevent or to disapprove other's committing His prohibitions.

-'Arsh: the end of matter bordering the seven skies and the Kursî, which is outside them and inside the 'Arsh.

'azîma: difficult way of doing a religious act or matter: **taqwâ.**

Basmala: the phrase "Bismi'illâhi 'r-rahmâni 'r-rahîm" (In the Name of Allâhu ta'âlâ the Compassionate, the Merciful).

bâtinî: ('ilm) of heart and soul; Bâtinî, a heretic of Bâtiniyya (EBII).

bid'a: (pl. **bida'**) false, disliked belief (see **ahl**) or practice that did not exist in the four sources of Islam but has been introduced later as an Islamic belief or **'ibâda** in expectation of **thawâb;** heresy. SP.

da'îf: (considered to be) reported not as genuinely as **sahîh;** a kind of hadîths.

faid: outpouring that flow from the guide's heart to a heart, which thus gains motion, cleanliness and exaltation; **ma'rifa.**

faqîr: i) form of introduction of oneself, meaning poor, humble slave in need of Mercy; ii) poor Muslim who has more than his subsistence but less than **nisâb.**

fard: (an act) that is commanded by Allâhu ta'âlâ in the Qur'ân al-kerîm; **fard 'ain,** fard for every Muslim; **fard kifâyâ,** fard that must be done at least by one Muslim.

fâsiq: sinful believer, sinner.

ghazâ: battle against non-Muslims; **ghâzî,** one engaged in ghazâ.

hadîth: a saying of the Prophet; the **Hadîth,** all the hadîths collectively; science, books, of hadîths, SP. (For kinds of hadîths, see EBII).

haid, nifâs: menstrual, puerperal period.

-Hajaral-aswad: a stone in the wall of the **Ka'ba,** touched and kissed by the Prophet, so very estimable.

hajj: fard pilgrimage to Mecca BI.

halâl: (an act, thing) permitted.

hamd: glory, glorification.

harâm: (an act, thing) forbidden.

hodja: master (esp, in a religious school).

'ibâda: (pl **-ât**) worship, rite:

'îd al ad'hâ: festival of sacrifices and hajj.

ikhlâs: (quality, intention or state of) doing everything only for Allâhu ta'âlâ's sake; sincerity.

'ilm: knowledge, science, **'ilm al-'aqâ'id** or **-kalâm = 'ilm al-fiqh = fiqh; 'ilm** al-hadîth, science of **hadîths; 'ilm al-hâl,** (books of Islamic teachings of one **madhhab**) ordered to be learned by every Muslim; **'ilm al-qirâ'a,** science of the Qur'ân; **'ilm as-sulûk** = tasawwuf.

imâm: i) profound **'âlim;** founder of a **madhhab;** ii) leader in congregational **salât;** iii) caliph.

inshâ-Allah: 'if Allâhu ta'âlâ wills'.

i'tikâf: retreat, religious seclusion during Ramadân.

i'tiqâd: faith, **îmân.**

junub: state of a Muslim needing ablution of his whole body; EBIV.

-Ka'ba: the big room in **al-Masjîd al-Harâm.**

kâfir: non-Muslim; one guilty of kufr.

kalâm: (the knowledge of) **îmân** in Islam.

kalimat at-tawhîd: SP.

karâma: (p. **-ât**) miracle worked by Allah through a **Wâlî;** AM.

kashf: revelation; AM.

khalîfa: (p. **khulafâ'**) caliph; **Khulafâ' ar-Râshidîn,** the Prophet's immediate four caliphs.

Khawârij: (Khârijîs) those heretical Muslims hostile to **Ahl al-Bait.**

khutba: the preaching delivered at mosque; SP.

kufr: (intention, statement or action causing) infidelity, unbelief.

-kutub as-sitta: the six great, authentic books of the Hadîth; EBII.

ma'ârif: pl. of **ma'rifa.**

madrasa: Islamic school or university.

mahram: within the forbidden **(harâm)** degrees of relationship for marriage **(nikâh).**

makrûh: (act, thing) improper, disliked and abstained by the **Prophet: makrûh-tahrîma,** prohibited with much stress; AM.

ma'rifa: knowledge about Allâhu ta'âlâ's Dhât (Essence, Person) and Sifât (Attributes), inspired to the hearts of **Awliyâ'.** See **Walî.**

ma'rûf: good acts approved by Islam.

mashhûr: 'well-known' among **'ulamâ';** a kind of **hadîths.**

masjid: mosque: al-Masjid al-Harâm, the great mosque in Mecca.

mawdû': a kind of **hadîths.**

mihrâb: niche of a mosque indicating the direction of Mecca.

mubâh: (act) that is neither ordered nor prohibited; permitted.

mudarris: professor at **madrasa.**

mufassir: expert scholar of **tafsîr.**

muftî: 'âlim authorized to issue **fatwâ.**

mujâhid: a Muslim who tries to spread Islam by means of publication, speech or struggle.

mu'jîza: (pl. **-ât**) miracle worked by Allâhu ta'âlâ through a prophet; AM.

munâfiq: hypocrite in the disguise of a Muslim though he believes in another religion.

nafs: a force in man which wants him to harm himself religiously; **an-nafs al-ammâra,** AM.

nass: (general term for an **âyat or a hadîth.**)

nikâh: Islamic contract for marriage.

nisâb: minimum quantity of specified wealth which makes one liable to do some certain duties; EBV.

-Qabr as-Sa'âda: the Prophet's shrine.

qadâ: the instance of happening or creation of what is predestined; **qadar,** predestination of everything as Allâhu ta'âlâ has decreed from eternity; BI.

qibla: direction towards the **Ka'ba.**

qiyâs: (of a **mujtahid**) to resemble, to compare, an affair not clearly stated in the Qur'ân, **Hadîth** or **ijmâ'** to a similar one stated clearly; conclusion drawn from such comparison; **ijtihâd;** SP.

qutb: a Walî of highest degree; AM.
Rabb: Allâhu ta'âlâ as the Creator and 'Trainer'.
rak'a: unit of **salât;** AM.
Rasûlullah: Muhammad, the Prophet of Allâhu ta'âlâ: BI.
ribâ: charging or paying interest.
ru'ûs: final exam at the university level madrasa.
Sahâbî: (pl. **as-Sahâba**) Muslim who saw the Prophet at least once; a companion of the Prophet.
sahîh: i) valid, lawful; ii) **(hadîth)** authentic, soundly transmitted.
Salaf as-sâlihîn: as-Sahâba and the distinguished ones among the **Tâbi'ûn** and their companions; AM.
sâlih: one who is pious and abstains from sins.
sâlik: one who is on a certain way in **tasawwuf;** AM.
shafâ'a: intercession; SP.
shirk: (statement, action causing) polytheism; ascribing a partner to Allâhu ta'âlâ.
suhba (sohba)**:** companionship; company of a prophet or **Walî.**
sulahâ: pl. of **sâlih.**
sultân al-Haramain: ruler of Mecca and Medina; **Khâdim al-Haramain,** one who serves Mecca and Medina.
sunna: an act (done and liked by the Prophet as an **'ibâda**) for which there is **thawâb** if done, but sinful if continually omitted and **kufr** if disliked; the **Sunna,** i) (with **fard**) all sunnas collectively; ii) (with the Book) the **Hadîth;** iii) (alone) the **Sharî'a.**
sûra (t): a chapter of the Qur'ân.
tâ'a: those acts that are liked by Allâhu ta'âlâ; AM.
ta'addud az-zawjât: (permission for) a Muslim man's marrying up to four women.
-Tâbi'ûn: successors of **as-Sahâba,** AM.
tafsîr: (a book of, the science of) explanation of the Qur'ân.
taqwâ: fearing Allâhu ta'âlâ; abstention from **harâms,** practising **'azîmas.**
tarîqa: paths or schools of **tasawwuf,** defined by Islamic scholars; AM.
tashaffu': asking **shafâ'a.**
tawakkul: trust in expectation of everything from Allâhu ta'âlâ.
tawâtur: state of being widespread, which is a document for authenticity and against denial.
tawhîd: (belief in) the Oneness, unicity, of Allâhu ta'âlâ.
thawâb: (unit of) reward in Paradise.
'ulamâ': pl. of **'âlim; 'ulamâ' ar-râsihîn,** those learned in both **zâhirî** and **bâtinî** sciences.
umma: the community, body of believers, of a prophet.
'umra: minor (not **fard** but **sunna**) pilgrimage to Mecca; AM.
usûl: i) methodology or fundamentals of a religious science; ii) methodologies of basic Islamic sciences; SP.
wahî, wahy: the knowledge revealed to the Prophet from Allâhu ta'âlâ, AM.
Walî: one loved and protected (by Allâhu ta'âlâ). pl. **Awliyâ**.
waqf: a pious foundation.
wara': abstention from mushtabihât (doubtful things); AM.
wilâya: state of being a **Walî;** AM.
zâhid: a man of **zuhd;** ascetic.
zâhirî: antonym of **bâtinî;** AM.
zindîq: an antheist who pretends to be a Muslim.
zuhd: not setting one's heart on worldly things, even **mubâhs;** AM.

BOOKS PUBLISHED BY HAKİKAT KİTABEVİ

ENGLISH:

1– Endless Bliss I, 304 pp.
2– Endless Bliss II, 400 pp.
3– Endless Bliss III, 336 pp.
4– Endless Bliss IV, 432 pp.
5– Endless Bliss V, 512 pp.
6– Endless Bliss VI, 352 pp.
7– The Sunni Path, 128 pp.
8– Belief and Islam, 128 pp.
9– The Proof of Prophethood, 144 pp.
10– Answer to an Enemy of Islam, 128 pp.
11– Advice for the Muslim, 352 pp.
12– Islam and Christianity, 336 pp.
13– Could Not Answer, 432 pp.
14– Confessions of a British Spy, 128 pp.
15– Documents of the Right Word, 496 pp.
16– Why Did They Become Muslims?, 304 pp.
17– Ethics of Islam, 240 pp.
18– Sahaba 'The Blessed', 384 pp.
19– Islam's Reformers, 320 pp.
20– The Rising and the Hereafter 112 pp.
21– Miftah-ul-janna, 288 pp.
22– Book of Namâz, 240 pp.

DEUTSCH:

1– Islam, der Weg der Sunniten, 128 Seiten
2– Glaube und Islam, 128 Seiten
3– Islam und Christentum, 352 Seiten
4– Beweis des Prophetentums, 160 Seiten
5– Geständnisse von einem Britischen Spion, 176 Seiten
6– Islamische Sitte, 288 Seiten

EN FRANÇAIS:

1– L'Islam et la Voie de Sunna, 112 pp.
2– Foi et Islam, 160 pp.
3– Islam et Christianisme, 304 pp.
4– L'évidence de la Prophétie, et les Temps de Prières, 144 pp.
5– Ar-radd al Jamil, Ayyuha'l-Walad (Al-Ghazâli), 96 pp.
6– Al-Munqid min ad'Dalâl, (Al-Ghazâli), 64 pp.

SHQIP:

1- Besimi dhe Islami, 96 fq.
2- Libri Namazit, 208 fq.
3- Rrefimet e Agjentit Anglez, 112 fq.

ESPAÑOL:

1- Creencia e Islam, 112

ПО РУССКИ:

1- Всем Нужная Вера, (128) стр.
2- Признания Английского Шпиона, (144) стр.
3- Китаб-ус-Салат (Молитвенник) Книга о намазе, (224) стр.
4- О Сын Мой (256) стр.
5- Религя Ислам (256) стр.

НА БЪЛГАРСКИ ЕЗИК:

1- Вяра и Ислям. (128) стр.
2- НАМАЗ КИТАБЪ (256) стр.

BOSHNJAKISHT:

1- Iman i Islam. (128) str.
2- Odgovor Neprijatelju Islama, (144) str.
3- Knjiga o Namazu, (192) str.
4- Nije Mogao Odgovoriti. (432) str.
5- Put Ehl-i Sunneta. (128) str.
6- Ispovijesti Jednog Engleskog Spijuna. (144) str.

اسماء الكتب الفارسية التي نشرتها مكتبة الحقيقة

اسماء الكتب	عدد صفحاتها
١ – مكتوبات امام رباني (دفتر اول)	٦٧٢
٢ – مكتوبات امام رباني (دفتر دوم وسوم)	٦٠٨
٣ – منتخبات از مكتوبات امام رباني	٤١٦
٤ – منتخبات ازمكتوبات معصومية ويليه مسلك مجدد الف ثاني (با ترجمه اردو)	٤٣٢
٥ – مبدأ و معاد و يليه تأييد اهل سنت (امام رباني)	١٥٦
٦ – كيمياي سعادت (امام غزالي)	٦٨٨
٧ – رياض الناصحين	٣٨٤
٨ – مكاتيب شريفه (حضرة عبدالله دهلوى) ويليه المجد التالد ويليهما نامهاى خالد بغدادى	٢٨٨
٩ – در المعارف (ملفوظات حضرت عبد اللّه دهلوي)	١٦٠
١٠ – رد وهابي و يليه سيف الابرار المسلول على الفجار	١٤٤
١١ – الاصول الاربعة في ترديد الوهابية	١٢٨
١٢ – زبدة المقامات (بركات احمدية)	٤٢٤
١٣ – مفتاح النجاة لاحمد نامقي جامي ويليه نصايح عبد الله انصاري	١٢٨
١٤ – ميزان الموازين في امر الدين (در رد نصارى)	٣٠٤
١٥ – مقامات مظهرية و يليه هو الغني	٢٠٨
١٦ – مناهج العباد الى المعاد و يليه عمدة الاسلام	٣٢٠
١٧ – تحفه اثنى عشريه (عبد العزيز دهلوي)	٨١٦
١٨ – المعتمد في المعتقد (رساله توربشتي)	٢٨٨
١٩ – حقوق الاسلام ويليه مالابدّ منه ويليهما تذكرة الموتى والقبور	٢٧٢
٢٠ – مسموعات قاضى محمد زاهد از حضرت عبيد الله احرار	١٩٢
٢١ – ترغيب الصلاة	٢٨٨
٢٢ – أنيس الطالبين و عدّة السالكين	٢٠٨
٢٣ – شواهد النبوة	٣٠٤
٢٤ – عمدة المقامات	٤٨٠
٢٥– اعترافات جاسوس انگليسى به لغة فارسى ودشمنى انگليسها به إسلام	٤٨٠

الكتب العربية مع الاردوية والفارسية مع الاردوية والاردية

١ – المدارج السنية في الرد على الوهابية ويليه العقائد الصحيحة فى ترديد الوهابية النجدية	١٩٢
٢ – عقائد نظاميه (فارسي مع اردو) مع شرح قصيدة بدء الامالي ويليه احكام سماع از كيمياي سعادت ويليهما ذكر ائمه از تذكرة الاولياء ويليهما مناقب ائمهٔ اربعه	١٦٠
٣ – الخيرات الحسان (اردو) (احمد ابن حجر مكي)	٢٢٤
٤ – ہر کسی کیلئے لازم ایمان مولانا خالد بغدادیؒ	١٤٤
٥ – انگریز جاسوس کے اعترافات	١٦٠

اسماء الكتب	عدد صفحاتها

٤٤ – النعمة الكبرى على العالم في مولد سيد ولد آدم ويليه نبذة من الفتاوى الحديثية ويليهما كتاب جواهر البحار ٣٢٠
٤٥ – تسهيل المنافع وبهامشه الطب النبوي ويليه شرح الزرقاني على المواهب اللدنية ويليهما فوائد عثمانية ويليها خزينة المعارف ٦٢٤
٤٦ – الدولة العثمانية من الفتوحات الاسلامية ويليه المسلمون المعاصرون ٢٧٢
٤٧ – كتاب الصلاة ويليه مواقيت الصلاة ويليهما اهمية الحجاب الشرعي ١٦٠
٤٨ – الصرف والنحو العربي وعوامل والكافية لابن الحاجب ١٧٦
٤٩ – الصواعق المحرقة ويليه تطهير الجنان واللسان ٤٨٠
٥٠ – الحقائق الاسلامية في الرد على المزاعم الوهابية ١١٢
٥١ – نور الاسلام تأليف الشيخ عبد الكريم محمد المدرس البغدادي ١٩٢
٥٢ – الصراط المستقيم في رد النصارى ويليه السيف الصقيل ويليهما القول الثبت ويليها خلاصة الكلام للنبهاني ١٢٨
٥٣ – الرد الجميل في رد النصارى ويليه ايها الولد للغزالي ٢٢٤
٥٤ – طريق النجاة ويليه المكتوبات المنتخبة لمحمد معصوم الفاروقي ١٧٦
٥٥ – القول الفصل شرح الفقه الاكبر للامام الاعظم ابي حنيفة ٤٤٨
٥٦ – جالية الاكدار والسيف البتار (لمولانا خالد البغدادي) ٩٦
٥٧ – اعترافات الجاسوس الانكليزي ١٩٢
٥٨ – غاية التحقيق ونهاية التدقيق للشيخ السندى ١١٢
٥٩ – المعلومات النافعة لأحمد جودت باشا ٥٢٨
٦٠ – مصباح الانام وجلاء الظلام فى رد شبه البدعى النجدى ويليه رسالة فيما يتعلق بادلة جواز التوسل بالنبى وزيارته صلى الله عليه وسلم ٢٢٤
٦١ – ابتغاء الوصول لحبّ الله بمدح الرسول ويليه البنيان المرصوص ٢٢٤
٦٢ – الإسلام وسائر الأديان ٣٣٦
٦٣ – مختصر تذكرة القرطبي للشعراني ويليه قرة العيون للسمرقندي ٣٥٢

اسماء الكتب	عدد صفحاتها

٢٢ – الحبل المتين ويليه العقود الدرية ويليهما هداية الموفقين ١٣٦
٢٣ – خلاصة الكلام في بيان امراء البلد الحرام ويليه ارشاد الحيارى في تحذير المسلمين من مدارس النصارى ويليهما نبذة من الفتاوى الحديثية ٢٨٨
٢٤ – التوسل بالنبي وبالصالحين ويليه التوسل لمحمد عبد القيوم القادري ٣٣٦
٢٥ – الدرر السنية في الرد على الوهابية ويليه نور اليقين في مبحث التلقين ٢٢٤
٢٦ – سبيل النجاة عن بدعة اهل الزيغ والضلال ويليه كف الرعاع عن المحرمات ويليهما الاعلام بقواطع الاسلام ٢٨٨
٢٧ – الانصاف ويليه عقد الجيد ويليهما مقياس القياس والمسائل المنتخبة ٢٤٠
٢٨ – المستند المعتمد بناء نجاة الابد ١٦٠
٢٩ – الاستاذ المودودي ويليه كشف الشبهة عن الجماعة التبليغية ١٤٤
٣٠ – كتاب الايمان (من رد المحتار) ٦٥٦
٣١ – الفقه على المذاهب الاربعة (الجزء الاول) ٣٥٢
٣٢ – الفقه على المذاهب الاربعة (الجزء الثاني) ٣٣٦
٣٣ – الفقه على المذاهب الاربعة (الجزء الثالث) ٣٨٤
٣٤ – الادلة القواطع على الزام العربية في التوابع ويليه فتاوى علماء الهند على منع الخطبة بغير العربية ويليهما الحظر والاباحة من الدر المختار ١٢٠
٣٥ – البريقة شرح الطريقة (الجزء الاول) ٦٠٨
٣٦ – البريقة شرح الطريقة ويليه منهل الواردين في مسائل الحيض ٣٣٦
٣٧ – البهجة السنية في آداب الطريقة ويليه ارغام المريد ٢٥٦
٣٨ – السعادة الابدية فيما جاء به النقشبندية ويليه الحديقة الندية ويليهما الرد على النصارى والرد على الوهابية ١٧٦
٣٩ – مفتاح الفلاح ويليه خطبة عيد الفطر ويليهما لزوم اتباع مذاهب الائمة ١٩٢
٤٠ – مفاتيح الجنان شرح شرعة الاسلام ٦٨٨
٤١ – الانوار المحمدية من المواهب اللدنية (الجزء الاول) ٤٤٨
٤٢ – حجة الله على العالمين في معجزات سيد المرسلين ويليه مسئلة التوسل ٢٨٨
٤٣ – اثبات النبوة ويليه الدولة المكية بالمادة الغيبية ١٢٨

اسماء الكتب العربية التي نشرتها مكتبة الحقيقة

اسماء الكتب	عدد صفحاتها
١ – جزء عم من القرآن الكريم	٣٢
٢ – حاشية شيخ زاده على تفسير القاضى البيضاوى (الجزء الاول)	٦٠٤
٣ – حاشية شيخ زاده على تفسير القاضى البيضاوى (الجزء الثانى)	٤٦٢
٤ – حاشية شيخ زاده على تفسير القاضى البيضاوى (الجزء الثالث)	٦٢٤
٥ – حاشية شيخ زاده على تفسير القاضى البيضاوى (الجزء الرابع)	٦٢٤
٦ – الايمان والاسلام ويليه السلفيون	١٢٨
٧ – نخبة اللآلي لشرح بدء الامالي	١٩٢
٨ – الحديقة الندية شرح الطريقة المحمدية (الجزء الاول)	٦٠٨
٩ – علماء المسلمين وجهلة الوهابيين ويليه شواهد الحق ويليهما العقائد النسفية ويليها تحقيق الرابطة	٢٢٤
١٠ – فتاوى الحرمين برجف ندوة المين ويليه الدرة المضيئة	١٢٨
١١ – هدية المهديين ويليه المتنبئ القادياني ويليهما الجماعة التبليغية	١٩٢
١٢ – المنقذ عن الضلال ويليه الجام العوام عن علم الكلام ويليهما تحفة الاريب ويليها نبذة من تفسير روح البيان	٢٥٦
١٣ – المنتخبات من المكتوبات للامام الرباني	٤٨٠
١٤ – مختصر (التحفة الاثني عشرية)	٣٥٢
١٥ – الناهية عن طعن امير المؤمنين معاوية ويليه الذب عن الصحابة ويليهما الاساليب البديعة ويليها الحجج القطعية ورسالة رد روافض	٢٨٨
١٦ – خلاصة التحقيق في بيان حكم التقليد والتلفيق ويليه الحديقة الندية	٥١٢
١٧ – المنحة الوهبية في رد الوهابية ويليه اشد الجهاد ويليهما الرد على محمود الآلوسي ويليها كشف النور	١٩٢
١٨ – البصائر لمنكري التوسل باهل المقابر ويليه غوث العباد	٤١٦
١٩ – فتنة الوهابية والصواعق الالهية وسيف الجبار والرد على سيد قطب	٢٥٦
٢٠ – تطهير الفؤاد ويليه شفاء السقام	٢٥٦
٢١ – الفجر الصادق في الرد على منكري التوسل والكرامات والخوارق ويليه ضياء الصدور ويليهما الرد على الوهابية	١٢٨