
ISLAM'S REFORMERS

DISCLAIMER:

About the BOOKS

April 1998 Copyleft © Hakikat Bookstore, Istanbul.

Permission to reprint & distribute is granted only if this heading included, and the text is not modified in any way, shape or form to alter the intended meaning. HAKIKAT BOOKSTORE

About the SITE & Online Books

All content included on this site, such as text, graphics, logos, button icons, images, audio clips and software, is the property of HizmetBooks or its content suppliers and protected by U.S. and international copyright laws. The collection, arrangement and assembly of all content on this site is the exclusive property of HizmetBooks and protected by U.S. and international copyright laws.

YOU MAY NOT:

Distribute the text or graphics to others without the express written permission of HizmetBooks.

"Mirror" this information on your own server without the express written permission of HizmetBooks.

Modify or reuse the text or graphics on this system.

You may:

Print copies of the information for your personal use.

Store the files on your own computer for your personal use;

Reference this server from your own documents.

HizmetBooks reserves all other rights.

If you are in the North or South America:

Hizmet Books

P O Box: 916

SADDLE BROOK, N.J. 07663

admin@hizmetbooks.org

If you are outside the North or South America:

HAKIKAT KITABEVI

Darusefaka Cad. No: 57/A P.K.35

34262-Fatih ISTANBUL, TURKEY

hakikat@ihlas.net.tr

Bismi'llahi 'r-rahmani 'r-rahim

ISLAM'S REFORMERS **(THE BIGOTS OF SCIENCE AND OF RELIGION)**

PREFACE

Allahu ta'ala has compassion on all the people on the earth. He sends useful things to everybody. In the next world, He will do the favor 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 myself to the honorable name of Allahu ta'ala, we begin to write this book.

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

The measurement of intelligence, using the testing methods, was done first by the Ottomans. As written in American literature, the European states were very much bewildered when the Ottoman Armies came to Vienna. They were terribly bewildered with the fear that Islam was spreading over Europe and Christianity was perishing. They endeavored 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 ' Enderun' 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 Koprulu all had grown up from among those keen-witted children brought up in this manner. For stopping the Ottoman attacks, it is necessary to demolish these Enderun 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 was regarded as being right 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. The youth 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 freemasons, were made to take the lead in the Ottoman State. For example, Mustafa Rashid Pasha, Fuad Pasha and the like removed scientific courses from madrasas, while Mithat Pasha and Talat Pasha decreased religious courses. In the time of Fatih Sultan Muhammad Khan

(Mehmed the Conqueror) the religious and scientific knowledge taught in madrasas had been very advanced. But after Tanzimat (the political reforms of Abdulmajid in 1839), especially in the time of the Union Party, it became very low. The enemies of Islam became successful by acting very insidiously and hypocritically. Especially Mithat Pasha had been prepared to attack mercilessly against Islam and the Qur'an through dishonest plans. If the strong iman and the keen intellect of Sultan Abdulhamid Khan It had not stood stiff like a steel shield against this poisonous dagger intended to be trusted through Islam, the enemy plans of destruction would have crushed Muslims. There are many evidences of this in the twelfth volume of *Turkiye 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, loathsome 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'an 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 favor and to disembarass other Muslims and even non-Muslim fellow-countrymen, foreign businessmen and tourists. Rasulullah ('alaihi 's-salam) 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. And for this, 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. And this evil offense has been committed for the pleasure, amusement and fun of a handful of passion-blinded, stone-hearted group. May Allahu ta'ala rescue people from this very ominous, grievous disaster; Amin! 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 "Baghi", Ibn 'Abidin wrote: "The Kharijis explained away (tawil) the inexplicit documents (dala'il), that is, they attributed unclear, unusual meanings to some ayats and mutawatir hadiths. Those who departed from Hadrat 'Ali's (radi-Allahu 'anh) soldiers and fought against him acted this way. They said, 'The judge is Allah only. Following the decision of two arbitrators, Hadrat 'Ali left the caliphate to Muawiya (radi-Allahu 'anhuma) and committed a grave sin.' This wrong explanation caused them to fight against him. They said 'disbelievers' for those who did not believe as they did. And now, those who follow Muhammad ibn 'Abd al-Wahhab, who came forth in the Najd, claim that

solely they themselves are Muslims. They say 'polytheists' for those who do not believe as they do, and they regard killing them and taking away their property and women as halal. The 'ulama' of fiqh, the mujtahids, did not say 'kafir' for those who, like the Kharijis and Wahhabis, departed on account of inexplicit documents, but said 'Baghi', 'asi' or 'ahl al-bidat', that is 'non-madhabite' or 'heretic'. One becomes a kafir if he explains away wrongly and does not believe a dalil with the single meaning which is openly understood. As such is disbelieving that the universe will be annihilated and that the dead will come to life again. However, one does not become a kafir by slandering at or disbelieving in the caliphate of Hadrat Abu Bakr and Hadrat 'Umar (radi-Allahu 'anhuma) if he concludes this out of his attributing an uncommon meaning to a document. He who says, "Ali is God. Jabrail went wrong in bringing the wahi," becomes a kafir, because, such words cannot be deduced from tawil or ijihad but stem from following the nafs. One becomes a kafir, too, if he attributes adultery to Hadrat 'Aisha (radi-Allahu 'anha) or disbelieves that her father was a Sahabi, for both claims show the denial of the open dalil declared in the Qur'an al-karim. One also becomes a kafir by saying, without a tawil, that it is halal to attack Muslims' property and lives; he would not become a kafir, if he, supposing himself to be following Islam, said it upon the tawil of an inexplicit dalil from the Qur'an or Hadith."

As it is seen, if a person who carries out his 'ibadat and calls himself a Muslim or ahl al-qibla holds a belief unconformable to Ahl as-Sunnat, and if his belief is the denial of an explicit dalil, this belief is a kufr whether it was based on a tawil or not. If it is the denial of an inexplicit dalil and if he has a tawil, it is not a kufr. If it comes out of following the nafs and is intended for worldly advantages without a tawil, it is also a kufr. One also becomes a kafir 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 dala'il away. He is called a 'zindiq'. Belief held by following (taqlid) a man of bidat but without knowing about the tawil is also kufr, for his taqlid of someone in the things to be believed is invalid if the dala'il are not known. One who says that the ijma' is not a dalil does not become a kafir. He becomes a man of bidat. His words unconformable to the ijma' 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 little service of writing down the deceptive attacks of some foreign, religiously ignorant people, who advocate reform in the religion, and of 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 shorts sight; the answers are collected from the Ahl as-Sunnat scholars' books, and a letter from the book Maktubat by al-Imam ar-Rabbani Ahmad al-Faruqi as-Sirhindi, the great scholar and exalted guide of Muslims, is added at the conclusion of the book. Also a glossary to look up for the words foreign to the English reader is appended at the end. Now the ninth English edition is presented to the youth.

May Allahu ta'ala make us all attain the worldly and heavenly felicity! May He protect us against harming ourselves and others! Amin.

WAQF IKHLAS

Miladi (1995) Hijri Shamsi (1373) Hijri Kamari (1415)

ISLAM'S REFORMERS (THE BIGOTS OF SCIENCE AND OF RELIGION)

1-Answers to 1-30th wrong beliefs of Reformers

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 corrupted 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. [Please see page 189 in the Turkish book Faideli Bilgiler (Useful Information).]

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 corrupts. 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 Rasulullah (sall-Allahu 'alaihi wa sallam) and the knowledge coming from his Sahabis. 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 defect or stain to these fundamental books of Islam.

To attempt to alter these fundamental books in accord with the fashion and situation in each century means to make up a new religion for each century. Attempt to make such alterations as if by depending on and adapting them to the Qur'an al-karim and the Hadith ash-Sharif is a sign of not knowing the Qur'an al-karim and the Hadith ash-Sharif, of misconception of Islam. To presume that the commands and prohibitions in Islam will change in accordance with the time means to disbelieve the reality of Islam. The Qur'an al-karim says, "Muslims command the things that are maruf." Ziya Gokalb and similar ferocious reformers, who attacked the Qur'an al-karim and Islam impudently, attempted to alter Islam according to customs and fashion by saying 'convention and custom' for the word 'maruf', thus ingratiating themselves with their freemason masters and capturing posts. In order to get what was mundane, they sold their faith. Ziya Gokalb was given the membership of the Central Committee of the Union Party as a recompense for this service of his. If Islam, as a 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 so far as into the Kaba.

Islamic religion is built upon knowledge and is conformable to reason in every respect. On affairs declared inexplicitly in the Qur'an al-karim and the Hadith ash-Sharif, to pass new rules compatible with reason and knowledge, that is, to make qiyas or ijihad, is one of the main sources of Islam. Yet this is the job of the one who is 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 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 knowledge 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 conformity 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 knowledge of Islam of no account and making fun of it, they get angry when they are told that they have dissented from Islam. They want Islam to be attacked and the attacker should not be told that he attacks Islam and becomes a disbeliever; it will 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 knowledge and books of Islam and to adapt them to the present time will be the defilement of Islam. A Muslim is the person who believes and reveres this basic knowledge and who has promised not to attempt to alter it. 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. But 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-Sunnat scholars. There are superstitions amongst the ignorant of Islam. And for clearing these off, it is necessary to disseminate the Ahl as-Sunnat books and teach them to the youth. When the reforms these bigots want in Islam seem harmful to basic knowledge of Islam, we should rebut them showing proofs among ayats and hadiths 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 knowledge of Islam and on the Muslim scholars who collected it and spread it all over the world. Musa Jarullah Baykiyev of Kazan, Russia, who appeared under the masks 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. The 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 iman of Muslims was all mixed up with gossips called 'ilm al-kalam. Thus, social, economic and civil studies ceased. In mosques, madrasas, houses and everywhere, time was passed with trivial, useless theories and thoughts. Books of kalam slandering the positive science were disseminated everywhere. Useless thoughts, unnecessary articles were considered as of Islam. Is there a world of value a useful idea in al-Ghazali's book Tahafut or in the philosopher Ibn ar-Rushd's answer to it? Who will ever mention or write today the deliriums in the books of Nasir ad-din at-Tusi, 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 Ashari madhhab telling about Allah's attributes and deeds and human will, or in the shameless criticisms between Shiites and Sunnis? Is there anything of reason, of idea or of Islam in at-Taftazani's books or in their world-wide commentaries and annotations or in the books of fiqh, kalam, mantiq, usul, tafsir, nahw, sarf, hikma?"

These mendacities of the Russian Baykiyev have been written down 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 of 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 this sort of statements of theirs, 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 the mankind 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, mujiza, karama 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 Allahu ta'ala 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 will be 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 put their affairs in order, is made divine and its divinity spread, it remains weak.

Some others want to establish morals through knowledge, too. Knowledge presents morals as a virtue. But this has not proved to be more than theoretical and is not as effective as the hadith. "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 illogical, like taking 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 made up by people? Are people to depend on the religion or is the religion to be made up by people? People's worshiping the things which they themselves have made up is heretical. Such heresy was present among the people who worshiped idols before Islam and it was the evidence 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 existed."

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 words of reformers that religion will correct the morality of the common people, who will be made to believe in not superficially but truly; 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 mold 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. So it happened."

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 hadith, "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. The law of Islam is Divine. 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-Faruq (radi-Allahu 'anh), the Caliph, who was questioned on his excess fabrics which in fact he took from his son's share in the equally distributed booty taken in war, and Hadrat 'Umar ibn Abd al-'Aziz, 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 (marriage settlement) and alimony and go," were the precise exemplars of Muslim rulers. 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 'Ali fought for the caliphate, the Qur'an, the Holy Book of Allah, on the points of the spears of his opponents was used as a trick in the war. The Qur'an, 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 fulfillment of the commands of Islam. And unlike what the reformer says, the Qur'an was not used as a means for winning the war or 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 'Ali (radi-Allahu 'anh were not sinful. 'Sin' means 'guilt committed against Allahu ta'ala', that is, 'breaking the rules of Islam.' They had not elected Hadrat 'Ali to be the Caliph.

Because they (radi-Allahu 'anhum) did not regard him the Caliph, they took up swords. If they had elected him it would have been a sin for them to oppose the Caliph. It was true that they erred even though they had put forth the religious proof of not selecting him the Caliph; yet it was an error of ijtiḥad 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: 'Ali's (radi-Allahu 'anh) Muslim opponents followed but erred in following Islam. bloodshed was the result of not following Islam but of the mistake they did when following Islam. Likewise, in the Battle of Uhud, many of the forty of the Prophet's ('alaihi 's-salam) companions whom he had ordered to block a pass had been martyred. Their death was not caused by their following Rasulullah'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 'Ali 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 ijtiḥad was not sinful but thawab-deserving. It was more thawab-deserving 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 interest, for procuring what is mundane and the sentimental stories written by babas in Iran, the youth cannot comprehend 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 Sozun Vesikalari and Ashab-i Kiram 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 one another. We think it would be proper to give some information here, too. Hadrat Qayyum ar-Rabbani Muhammad Mathum al-Faruqi as-Sirhindi (rahmat-Allahi 'alaih), the great Muslim scholar respected by and the qutb of the awliya' of his time, wrote in the twenty-second letter of the first volume of his Maktubat:

"Sonny! 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

sunnat and annihilate a bidat is urgently needed. Unless we are illuminated with the light of the Sunnat of Rasulullah (sall-Allahu '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 Allahu ta'ala, the happiness of advancing in the way of tasawwuf and love for Allahu ta'ala cannot be attained. Allahu ta'ala in the thirty-first ayat of the surat al 'Imran, 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, 'ibadat , 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. Allahu ta'ala 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-Sahabat al-kiram 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 out of the love for 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 consent of Allah; they got promoted and became the most exalted, superior and respected human beings, since the major ta'at is to love the dears and dislike the enemies. Those who say that they love Allahu ta'ala have to be like the Sahabat al-kiram. One should also love those whom his dear loves, and feel hostility towards the enemies of his dear. This love and hostility does not happen out of one's desire for them. They result naturally. He is somewhat crazy in his love and hostility. For this reason it was said, 'Unless one is said to be crazy, his iman is not complete!' 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 'Ali (radi-Allahu 'anh), it is necessary to bear hostility towards the greatest ones among the Sahabat al-kiram 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 with his friends is unnecessary. Allah declares in the surat al-Fat'h that the Sahabat al-kiram were rahim to one another, that is, they loved one another. 'Rahim' means 'extremely and continuously merciful and mutually loving.' This ayat reports that the Sahabat al-kiram loved one another very much. In Arabic grammar, 'rahim' is a 'sifat mushabbaha', an adjective with a sense of continuity. For this reason, it is understood that this mutual love of great extent among the Sahabat al-kiram was continuous. This ayat shows that such evils as resentment, envy and hostility, which are incompatible with mercy and mutual love, could not exist among the Sahabat al-kiram. 'Among my umma, the most merciful to my umma is Abu Bakr,' was said in the Hadith ash-Sharif. 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 Hadith says, 'Allahu ta'ala asked Musa ('alaihi 's-salam), "What did you do only for Me?" When he answered, "O Allah! For Thee, I performed salat, fasted, gave zakat and said dhikr," Allahu ta'ala said, "The salat you performed is the way leading you to Paradise; it was your duty as a human servant. Your fast will protect you against Hell. The zakat you gave 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!" Allahu ta'ala declared, "O Musa! Did you love those whom I loved and did you bear hostility against My enemies?" Musa ('alaihi 's-salam) realized that the most valuable thing to be done for Allahu ta'ala was al-hubbu fi'llah wal-bughdu fi'llah.' " It was true that in the Battle of Siffin Hadrat Muawiya (radi-Allahu 'anh) had the Qur'an al-karim 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 'Ali (radi-Allahu '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. Qisas-i Anbiya says, "In the 'Camel' Battle, there were twenty thousand people on the side of Hadrat 'Ali and thirty thousand of the opposite side. When they were about to come to an agreement, 'Abdullah ibn Saba', Malik Ashtar and other leaders of those who had martyred Hadrat 'Uthman (radi-Allahu 'anh), assembled one night and planned to commence the battle. They unexpectedly assaulted the opposite side. Those who were on the side of Hadrat 'Aisha (radi-Allahu 'anha) were bewildered at this sudden attack. Ashtar and his friends told Hadrat 'Ali (radi-Allahu 'anh) that the opposite side assaulted and they resisted." It is seen that 'Abdullah ibn Saba', a Jew, and his friends were the ones who incited both the battles and broke the agreements. In Siffin, Hadrat 'Ali attacked the Damascenes with all his soldiers and much blood was shed in few days. Selecting ten thousand people, he attacked again. Hashim, who carried his flag, attacked, too, continuously saying, "Oh 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, Muawiya and 'Amr ibn 'As (radi-Allahu 'anhuma), 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 'As said, "Let's show them the Qur'an to tell them that Muslims are brothers." Hadrat Muawiya commanded to attach copies of the Qur'an on the points of spears. His soldiers cried out. "We call you to Allah's book," and the opponent soldiers saw the Qur'an and gave up fighting. Hadrat 'Ali 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'an on the points of spears prevented the shedding of the blood of thousands of Muslims. The great fire of instigation among Muslims was thus put out.

4 - The reformer says:

"The combats for sovereignty caused the splitting into the madhhabs, Muslims' parting into groups!"

Attribution of the splitting into the madhhabs 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'an was creature or not extirpated the basis of Islam."

The reformer also gives an example of mixing the madhhabs with politics; Caliph Mamun oppressed the scholars who did not regard the Qur'an 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 Mamun applied his tortures for political purposes, then irreligiousness, rather than the religion, was mixed politics. The reformer attempts to impute the guilt of irreligiousness to the religion.

6 - The reformer says:

"As years elapsed, the Qur'an and the Hadith, in the power of those who wished to be rulers rather than the men of religion, changed shape like the tricks of magicians. Being unable to overcome the enemy with word, they interpreted the Qur'an as they wished and made up hadiths 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 tafsir. On the parts which the writers of those books wrote through ijihad, everyone has the right to enter into discussion provided he 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'an, to slander az-Zamakhshari's tafsir.

7- The reformer says:

"False hadiths were made up. Everybody knows that there are many mawdu' hadiths."

Nobody can be so unjust as to speak ill of the knowledge of hadith which was based not on reason or experience but on relation and narration. I wonder how many hadiths the reformer knows to speak like that. Can he say a single hadith with its documentary references? He only knows the word mawdu' that he has heard by chance. The great scholars of Islam have written thousands of books not only on the knowledge of hadith but also on how to find out mawdu' hadiths among the sahih ones. If they had not written these books, the reformer would not even know the word mawdu'. The scholars of hadith very strictly forbid to say "a hadith" for a saying if it was not for certain that Rasulullah ('alaihi 's-salam) 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 hadiths. 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 mawdu' hadith? Muslim scholars have accomplished such a delicate and difficult study of recognizing hundred thousands of hadiths together with their narrators and evaluating the soundness of each. As for the reformer, he confuses those who have made up hadiths with those who have found out and discarded the made-up hadiths, arouses suspicion among Muslims by talking ill of all of them and tries to shock the confidence in the Hadith. The harm caused by those who made up hadiths has not been greater than that caused by the clamors of reformers. By putting forth the harm of making up hadiths 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 hadiths, Hadrat al-Bukhari traveled through Islamic countries in Asia and Africa for many years. At nights, he used to get up ten or fifteen times and record the hadiths which he remembered together with their narrators. He is said to have

memorized three hundred thousand hadiths two hundred thousand of which were not sahih. He understood that only seven or eight thousand of the six hundred thousand hadiths which he had gathered were sahih. This fact shows how wholly religious knowledge is mixed up. Observing al-Bukhari's way of study, some European scholars say that even the hadiths he selected [as sahih] are doubtful. You can imagine how other hadith books are."

By starting with six hundred thousand and reducing the number of sahih hadiths to seven thousand and then even to zero, this reformer shamelessly copies this idea from Europeans. If, instead of taking information about hadiths from Europeans, he had taken it from the specialists of this knowledge, for sure he would not have said so. The knowledge of hadith, 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 innumerable proofs showing that Islam is the right and glorious religion, the dumbfounding work of the scholars of 'ilm al-hadith 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 ikhlas and specialization that has attained Allahu ta'ala's help. The intellect and mind of reformers, who run after material advantages and temporary, loathsome pleasures, cannot comprehend the sublime cause of this effort. The study of hadiths and their narrators was dependent upon so subtle and so numerous principles that a special branch of knowledge called *usul al-hadith* was established. In order to be able to write a hadith down in a book, it had to be heard from a person who had an entirely dependable reason, powerful memory, righteousness and honesty, and he had to have heard it from such another person, and thus it had to have been heard every time from dependable, trustworthy narrators back to Rasulullah ('alaihi 's-salam). Above each hadith its narrators were listed one by one. Do Ibn Taymiyya, 'Abduh, Mawdudi and the like, who cannot comprehend the superiority of the Ahl as-Sunnat scholars, and ignorant modernist reformers, who cannot comprehend Islam, presume that such dependable hadith books are like history books? The hadith scholars knew, as it were a miracle, that modernist reformers would later spring up to attack the Hadith, and they wrote in detail the biographies of all as-Sahaba (radi-Allahu 'anhum) and many of the Tabiin who had reported hadiths. *Usud al-ghaba*, *Al-isti'ab*, *Al-isaba* and similar great books of biographies hold places in libraries all over the world. Can another person be shown besides Muhammad ('alaihi 's-salam) 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 honor, 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 'Abbasis. 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 hadiths under suspicion. I wonder what they would say about the Qur'an. 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 kalam 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 kalam examined those new ideas and answered them one by one. Thus, they protected the Ahl as-Sunnat belief against a shock. Also today it is an honorable 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 blindly endeavor, 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, 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-kalam."

This quotation from the Russian reformer Baykiyev's book is an obvious evidence of his ignorance of Islam. How 'ilm al-kalam 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 random words. The bigots of science always attack 'ilm al-kalam 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 scientific knowledge. 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 understands through his feet?

11 - The reformer says:

"When fiqh books were written, 'adhab (torture in Hell) and thawab (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 called "Islam". Following Islam is called 'ibada (worship). Muslims worship because Allahu ta'ala commanded it to be their duty. The commands and prohibitions of Islam are much useful in many respects for men in this world and in the next world, but one should intend to worship because it is Allahu ta'ala's command and his duty as a human creature. Something done without thinking in this manner will not be worship. It will be an average action having no connection with the religion. For example, if a man performs salat without intending to carry out Allahu ta'ala's command and his human duty, but with the intention that salat is an exercise of physical training, his salat will not be sahih. He does not worship but he merely takes physical exercises.

Also, if one fasts with the thought of resting his stomach and for dieting, his fast is not sahih and maqbul. And a Muslim who fights and risks his life not for strengthening Allahu ta'ala's religion, for spreading Islam or for harming the enemies of Islam but for fame, honor, property or rank does not worship at all. He will not be rewarded for jihad. He does not die a martyr if he loses his life. A man who quits alcohol just 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 gonorrhoea 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 Allahu ta'ala, worship performed by merely thinking about Paradise and Hell would not be acceptable, either. The great men of tasawwuf, al-awliya' al-kiram, have not thought of them in worship; they have thought of only Allahu ta'ala's command and consent. 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 Allahu ta'ala for advantages pertaining to the next world, are of worship. Actions done for worldly 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 sahih and maqbul and becomes a worldly affair. When something worldly is done for advantages pertaining to the next world, it becomes worship. A Muslim gains thawab even for putting a morsel to his wife's mouth. If one takes this hadith into consideration, purifies his thought and corrects his intention, he does not miss the opportunity of gaining thawab 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 worldly advantages and material profit in every affair and even in worship. Whereas, Islam demands the suppression of such evil desires of the nafs, self-sacrifice against materialism, abhorring 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 ayats and hadiths show this fact: The twentieth ayat of the surat ash-Shura declares, "We increase the earnings of those who work for winning the next world. And to those who work for worldly advantage, we give what is of it. But they will not obtain anything in the next world." The eighteenth and nineteenth ayats of the surat al-Isra declare, "Among those who wish for this world, the favors and flavors of which last little and end soon, We give whom We want what We wish. The rewards for those who work for the favors of the next world are plentiful."

The sixteenth ayat of the surat Hud declares, "We abundantly give for the labor 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 labor will come to nothing in the next world. For the work they do only for this world, there is no reward in the next world."

A hadith declares, "It will be said, 'The recompense of anything done for someone besides Allahu ta'ala should be asked from him.' "

Another hadith declares, "For the good actions done for the next world, Allahu ta'ala' gives reward in this world, too. But He never gives reward in the next world for the things done only for this world."

The hadith written firstly in the Sahih of al-Bukhari 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 *usul al-fiqh* books contrary to the reformer's view. Fiqh teaches religious duties of people, and *usul 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 defense and competition against the enemies of Islam rather than against Muslims. Although it is very useful for Muslims to know the worldly usefulness of the rules of Islam, they shall only know it and not go as far as to establish their worship on the basis of worldly usefulness. Otherwise, worship is spoilt. However much worldly usefulness there is in the duties which Islam commands, one should do them only to carry out Allahu ta'ala'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 a sign of the disease of disbelieving the religion. When due attention is paid, the symptoms of that hidden disease will be seen in the speech and writings of religion reformers. Otherwise, anybody who has little religious knowledge or even 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 much painful, endless disasters in the next world, the temporary pleasures and sorrows of this world are worth nothing. If the reformers, who pretended 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 four madhhabs and to give freedom to reason." And Jalal Nuri, another reformer, writes in his book *Tarikh-i Tedenniyyat*, "

'The gate of *ijtihad* has been closed,' they say. Nonsense! The Ottomans remained fastened upon wrong, coarse laws. On the other end of the world, social conditions had already improved. The Ottomans did not follow them. They remained 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 much as it considered 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:

"The laws of Islam 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 firm."

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 to 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 Allahu ta'ala. 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 everything 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 Allahu ta'ala. 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, ijthihad 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 'haram' about the interest in banks. Whereas, 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. Whereas, this exploitation of capitalists has given birth to communism. By prohibiting the charging and paying interest and commanding zakat, 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 nonsense as refreshing an obsolete 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. Rasulullah (sall-Allahu 'alaihi wa sallam) divided Islamic knowledge into two groups as 'ilm al-abdan, the knowledge of matter and

science, and 'ilm al-adyan, the religious knowledge. Religious knowledge can be understood only through narration. These sources are the Qur'an al-karim and the Hadith ash-Sharif.

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

Four kinds of knowledge are declared in the Qur'an: iman, ahkam, qisas and akhbar. Iman, 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. Ahkam, Allahu ta'ala'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 akhbar tells '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 akhbar. And if some religious teachings seem to contradict one another, they cannot be adapted to reason, either. They will be adapted to one another. Such a teaching that has several meanings should be understood so as not to contradict another 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 perceptive 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 reason finds out can be relied on; when there is contradiction between narration and scientific knowledge, reason will be followed, that is, narration will be explained compatibly with reason. And the hadith 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 reason very highly, one of them, Hadrat Shaikh-i Akbar Muhyiddin ibn al-'Arabi, regards narration superior to reason in his book Al-futuhah. While Baykiyev, the Russian master of reformers, who clamors that reason 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 awqaf. The rule 'Shart-i waqif is just like nass-i shari,' (The conditions laid down by the waqif, who grants property to a religious foundation, are just like the commands in the Qur'an and the Hadith) is one of the main principles in the fiqh books."

Properties and goods granted to awqaf belong to the waqif 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 awqaf is not because of pioussness 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 Darwish 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 awqaf 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 amounts to almost half of the State's budget has 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 labor, madrasas, imarats (food-kitchens for the poor) and Darwish lodges get filled by millions of lazy, so not useful but harmful, people."

It is an ayat in the surat an-Najm which declares that man has no profit other than his labor. Religion reformers mention this ayat very frequently but they understand its meaning little. Those who know the preceding and following ayats easily comprehend that this ayat 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 ayat 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 'ibada, a religious duty. In urging people to work, it is out of place to interpret this ayat wrongly.

It is surprising that the reformer regards students as parasites and the imarats 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 imarats 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 devsirime (recruiting boys to be brought up as Janissaries) and through concubines, the Ottoman spirit deteriorated. Their genius increased but their morals were spoiled."

Gustave Leubon said, "Of the mixed races, the minority will die, their blood changing after a few generations." Because the majority was Turk in the Ottoman Empire, the Turks did not vanish but they increased in number and got 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 remain behind. There is not a pure race in the United States, where mixture of various

races has not prevented advancement in civilization. If they were honored 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, yet very funny, to regard the mixing of races as the reason for the immorality or corruption which caused calamity upon the Ottomans. 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 very much more 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. Upon one signal of them, wealth, honor and even life would be annihilated. 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 [are ordered for Muslims to commit what] Islam prohibits should not be obeyed." The rulers presiding Muslim countries, whether they be called a caliph, a sultan or some other, 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 limits within which Islam put also the rulers were always known by all the Muslim nations. Long before Europeans' declaration of human rights, 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 not follow 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 cannot do anything and who looked resigned because of the idea of qada' and qadar lived under fear for centuries and became obedient, contemptible, 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 qada', 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. Qada', 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 has made people lazy. And since it is too simple to be a Muslim, none of the modern and moral qualities

has been regarded necessary for being a Muslim, and it is considered that Muslims can do every evil; as a result, laziness and immorality have been given birth."

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

26 - The reformer says:

"Muslim believes that what happens, whether be 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 wants to shock the basic beliefs of Islam.

All the Islamic beliefs stated in the last paragraph are correct. Like the ignorant people who misunderstand qada' 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 worshiping, 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 'ibadat including salat 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 qada' 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 endeavor and self-sacrifice for ensuring sweeter life and continuous comfort in Paradise. Then, it is a very unjust, out of place 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. The person who puts his trust in Allahu ta'ala, that is, 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 Allahu ta'ala simply does not humiliate himself in front of creatures. He will not flatter anybody. Whereas those who disbelieve qada' and qadar and rely only on intermediaries, especially on illegal, evil intermediaries, will do so. Also it is out of place to ask, "What demoralize Muslims are 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 opposite 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 disbelief in 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-'alam (sall-Allahu 'alaihi wa sallam) said in the Hadith ash-Sharif:

"Fear Allahu ta'ala and cling to good intermediaries in order that you may obtain the things you wish. Do not cling to evil intermediaries! I swear by Allahu ta'ala 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." Whereas, 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 looking for food, 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 Allahu ta'ala and not to be slack in working and thus to add a spiritual power to one's own power.

Question: "Having misunderstood qada', 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 spring up in some Muslims, they will wholly forget about qada', qadar and tawakkul. Then what must be done is not to correct their understanding but to make them to 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 practice tawakkul because it is ordered by Islam. Islam, while commanding tawakkul, prohibits laziness. The ayats, "Endeavor in the way of Allahu ta'ala, 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 hadith, "Allahu ta'ala 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, 'Allahu ta'ala's help is sufficient for me!' " are the evidences for this fact. The hadith, "Fasten your camel and put your trust in Allahu ta'ala!" 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 ayat, "When you begin any work, have tawakkul in Allahu ta'ala, trust in Him!" This ayat points out that, besides tawakkul, not only labor but also determination, which is above labor, 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 event by chance. 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 of 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. The religion 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. Even, their fault is greater 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 Allahu ta'ala and expecting the reward of our work from Allahu ta'ala; we further need to have a second tawakkul so that we shall not forget Allahu ta'ala 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 Allahu ta'ala since the real, inexhaustible, unconquerable power can be attained by not forgetting Him. Despite the ayats, "If Allahu ta'ala helps you, no one can overcome you. If He does not help you, no one can help you. Then, Muslims should trust in Allahu ta'ala!" and "O My Beloved Prophet! Tell them, 'Unless Allahu ta'ala wills, I am not able to be of any use or harm to myself,' " and many other ayats, 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 Allahu ta'ala, 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 the fist blow of another 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 Allahu ta'ala might seem equally powerful to win superiority, but the one who believes his justness also believes that the other will not utilize tawakkul. When they depend on their self-

reliance, however, there is no reason for such belief, and though one may say, "Allahu ta'ala 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 knows his being wrong. It shows that it cannot be used for evil purposes as self-reliance is used.

Since in tawakkul there is the belief of working without trusting in others' help but with trusting in Allah alone, 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 remains idle, nor the one who has self-reliance just trusts in himself and remains idle. 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 Allahu ta'ala besides his own labor, 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 labor into a shape suitable with reason and logic and embellishes it with modesty. What is expected from self-reliance is provided by tawakkul more decently and more desiredly.

28 - The reformer says:

"Disappearance of high realities among many superstitions has been caused by the contentment, tawakkul and resignation of Muslims. The hadith telling that contentment is an inexhaustible treasure has been understood in such a manner 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 labor and not casting envious 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 mujahids. 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 iman. Those who followed the Prophet's companions were called 'Ahl as-Sunnat'. Those who departed from this path were called ahl al-bidat. Ahl al-bidat parted into seven groups. Today's Muslims have chosen the way of Jabriyya among these ahl al-bidat groups. Those who claim to be Ahl as-Sunnat 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-Sunnat 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 inquiring in children with crushing, 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 children'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 worshiping. Parents' crushing 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, and these resulted in 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 down are, in actual fact, imputed to the religion, especially to the teachings of qada' and qadar and to the unquestionableness of religious knowledge.

It is never right to blame Islam and its scholars by putting forth the idea that graves are intermediaries between Allahu ta'ala and men. All Islamic scholars refute this idea. The Ahl as-Sunnat scholars have unanimously prohibited Muslims from worshiping anybody besides Allahu ta'ala. 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 impute to Islam the harm of bizarre wish to please our children, to keep them away from any inconvenience and to encourage them in laziness, since 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 principle groups having different views concerning the effect of man's will on his actions: the Mutazila, Jabriyya and Ahl as-Sunnat.

According to the Mutazila, Allahu ta'ala 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 Allahu ta'ala would be unjust for rewarding for goodness and torturing for evils. They put forth the ayats, "Allahu ta'ala 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 Allahu ta'ala'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 ayat of the surat ar-Rad says, 'Allahu ta'ala is the Creator of everything.' Allahu ta'ala is the One who creates man, who gives man power and will, and who creates all his actions."

Muhammad Mathum al-Faruqi (rahmat-Allahi '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 swinging to and from by 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 they themselves but by Allah who compels men to do them.' These words cause disbelief, too. Allahu ta'ala said in the twenty-fourth ayat of the surat as-Saffat, 'They will be questioned on their belief and on what they have done.' The hadith 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 and raising the hand optionally are different. 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'an that the followers of the Jabriyya are in the wrong path. Allahu ta'ala declares in the fourteenth ayat of the surat al-Ahqaf, 'They will be rewarded for the good they have done.' He declares in the twenty-ninth ayat of the surat al-Kahf, 'You may believe or not. We have prepared fire for the cruel (disbelievers).' And it is declared in the thirty-third ayat of the surat an-Nahl, 'Allahu ta'ala did not torment them. They tormented themselves by disbelieving and sinning.' If there were no option or power of choosing in man, Allahu ta'ala would not say, 'They tormented themselves,' in this ayat. 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. Whereas, Allahu ta'ala 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 Allahu ta'ala is All-Bounteous and All-Merciful, He has not commanded men things that are not within their power. He has wanted them to do things which they are able to do. The last ayat of the surat al-Baqara, declares, 'Allahu ta'ala 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 these who do not listen to them and who annoy them. They take every 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, Allahu ta'ala 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. Allahu ta'ala says in the seventh ayat of the surat at-Tur, 'The day on which Allahu ta'ala 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 sin willingly. The Jabriyya group departed from the right path by saying that man did not have option and the Mutazila group deviated because they disbelieved qada' and qadar. They became ahl al-bidat. They went wrong. It has been the lot of the Ahl as-Sunnat scholars to find the right path which is between these two paths. It is reported that al-Imam al-azam Abu Hanifa asked Imam Jafar as-Sadiq (rahmat-Allahi 'alaih) 'O the grandson of Rasulullah! Has Allahu ta'ala left the affairs to men's wish?' He said in response, 'Allahu ta'ala does not leave the attribute of being Rabb (Creator) of His human creatures.' Abu Hanifa 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.' Allahu ta'ala

said in the one hundred and forty-eighth ayat of the surat al-Anam, "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 ayat, disbelievers and polytheists say that Allah has willed them to have disbelief and polytheism. Allahu ta'ala will not admit this pretext of theirs. Such words show their ignorance and foolishness.

"Question: The Ahl as-Sunnat scholars have said that every good and evil thing happens as predestined, willed by Allahu ta'ala. 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 everything 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.' Allahu ta'ala says at the end of the above-quoted ayat, '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 just guess and lie." ' Allahu ta'ala declares in the Qur'an 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 like for it. It is for certain that Allahu ta'ala 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'an expresses this clearly. These words of disbelievers agree with the Jabriyya belief. They said that they did not have option in their actions, and Allahu ta'ala 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 to ridicule but not to show their belief, for they do not regard their situation bad. They believe that they are good and say that Allahu ta'ala approves and likes their conduct.

"Question: 'Everything men do happens with Allahu ta'ala's will. good and evil things have been predestined and written down 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, Allahu ta'ala would act without option in what He creates or makes every day, and He would be compelled to do so, for Allahu ta'ala creates everything in accord with the eternal predestination. Allahu ta'ala is autonomous. He wills, opts and creates what He wills and opts." [Maktubat vol. I, 83 rd. letter.]

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

In Islam, like in all other heavenly religions, everything happens according to the predestination, the will of Allahu ta'ala. And, since man does not know how an action has been predestined in eternity, he has to work in accordance with Allahu ta'ala's command. Qada' and qadar are not obstacles against man's working. Men should think about qada' and qadar not before doing something but after doing it. The twenty-second ayat of the surat al-Hadid says, "Everything that would happen in the world was written in Lawh al-mahfuz 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 Allahu ta'ala has given you. Allahu ta'ala dislikes the arrogant." This ayat shows that a person who believes in qada and qadar will never fall into despair, hopelessness or self-esteem. Belief in qada' and qadar does not prevent man from working. It incites him to work. The hadith, "Work! Everybody will attract himself to what has been predestined from him," tells that man's work will show how qada' and qadar will happen, that there is a strong relation between work and qada' 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 qada' and qadar and to know that all the good and evils are from Allahu ta'ala, so it is their duty to do good and strive to abstain from bad actions. That Allahu ta'ala knows how something will happen before it happens or that He destines and decrees according to that 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 Allahu ta'ala knew in eternity that that thing would be done, and predestined it according to His knowledge. Allahu ta'ala'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. Allahu ta'ala 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 qada' and qadar in eternity. That is, man will wish to do that work not because Allahu ta'ala knew and predestined in eternity that work to be done so. Allahu ta'ala 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 Allahu ta'ala 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. Allahu ta'ala with His predestination makes man wish to do action. The Ahl as-Sunnat differ on this from the Mutazila and their followers, the Shiites, who say, "Allahu ta'ala creates men and gives them power and will, and further than that He is not concerned." As for the Ahl as-sunnat, who follow the ayat, "Allah is the Creator of you and of the things you do," say that every movement, every work of man happens from Allahu ta'ala'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 "iradat juz'iyya" (partial free will) or "kasb" (acquirement), belongs to man and Allahu ta'ala does not create or invent it. Because, it is not a material being. Creation and invention happen in the beings which are not thought or imagined but which exist outside (kharij) 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 succeed 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. Allahu ta'ala 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. Allahu ta'ala 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 unnecessary 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-Sunnat 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 Imam al-Ghazali. Hadrat Imam said, "Can you wish what you wish?" Hadrat Abu 'l-Hasan al-Ashari interpreted the ayat in the surat ad-Dahr of the Qur'an as, "You wish only what Allahu ta'ala wills!" [There is detailed information about qada and qadar in Endless Bliss, II, III.]

Allahu ta'ala declares: "Your Rabb creates what He wishes. He alone opts, chooses. They do not have will and option" (surat al-Qasas, 68); "Know for sure that Allahu ta'ala gets between the man and his own heart" (surat al-Anfal, 24); "You cannot bring whomever you love to the right course. Allahu ta'ala brings to the right course whomever He wishes" (surat al-Qasas, 56); "Even if We sent down angels to them and make the dead talk in front of them and We gave them everything they wanted, they would not believe unless Allahu ta'ala willed so" (surat al-Anam, 111); "Whomever Allahu ta'ala 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 sky," (surat al-Anam, 125) and "Even if I want to advise you, it will not avail if Allahu ta'ala has willed that you remain in deviation." (surat al-Hud, 34) The Mutazila who disbelieve qada' and qadar and those who follow them are astonished at these ayats.

The conversation between Musa (Moses) and Adam ('alaihima 's-salam) about qada' and qadar is narrated at length in a hadith. [For its explanation, see Endless Bliss, III, Chapter 38.]

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 courts of the law all over the world and even everyone's conscience do not want a cruel man who hurts others to be forgiven. Even a 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 qada' and qadar! If he says, 'What are you doing!' tell him that qada' 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 ayats of the surat az-Zilzal in the Qur'an, "He who does favor in the slightest degree will attain its rewards, and he who makes harm in the slightest degree will attain its retribution."

Allahu ta'ala declares in the hundred and forty-eighth and following ayats of the surat al-Anam, "The polytheists will say, 'If Allah willed, we would not be polytheists'... Tell them: 'Final decision belongs to Allahu ta'ala; He would have guided all of you to the right path if He had willed.' " This ayat 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 Allahu ta'ala 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 ayat, "He would have guided all of you to the right path if He had willed." It is declared in the hundred and seventh ayat of the surat al-Anam, "If Allahu ta'ala 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 ayat for this reason. As Allahu ta'ala 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, Allahu ta'ala 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 being content, from liking. These two should not be mistaken for each other. It can be easily understood that Allahu ta'ala may have forbidden men to do an action though He might will that action to be done.

Also the eighth ayat of the surat al-Balad and the eighth ayat of the surat ash-Shams openly declare that Allahu ta'ala has given men material and spiritual power and showed the good and evil paths and that responsibility will be of man.

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-Iradat al-Kulliyya (Total Free Will) that does not let 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 Abu Mansur al-Maturidi interprets the ayat, "You wish only what Allahu ta'ala wills," as "Allahu ta'ala's Will united with your will. When you will you find His Will present." According to al-Ashari, this ayat does not unite but relates Allahu ta'ala'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 Allahu ta'ala's permission. The ayat, "They do not have will and option," was said about the disbelievers of Quraish who said, "That Qur'an 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 ayat, "Allahu ta'ala gets between the man and his own heart," was revealed in order to declare, as it is explained in the Qur'an commentary by al-Baidawi, that Allahu ta'ala sees and knows the secrets in the hearts.

As for the hadith reporting the conversation between Adam and Musa ('alaihima 's-salam) and the former's victory, according to the Ahl as-Sunnat scholars, in the disliked action of Hadrat Adam, kasb (acquirement), qada' and qadar and tawba (repentance) came together. Repentance and acquirement canceled each other like two opposite electric charges. There only remained qadar, and it is said that no one could be blamed for qada' and qadar. After the part concerning Hadrat Adam 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 ayats about that deeds happen only from Allahu ta'ala's will are meant for cases when qadar turns into qada'. Man begins to do the action predestined in qadar with his own will, and after Allahu ta'ala wills it also, the action turns into qada', that is, it happens. Then,

when the actions in qadar turn into qada', man's will cannot change it; felicity and misfortune cannot go back. The ayat, "We have barricaded them on their front and back. We have put a blind in front of their eyes; they will not see any more," in the surat Ya Seen, and the ayat, "Allahu ta'ala sealed their hearts and put a covering over their ears and eyes," at the beginning of the surat al-Baqara refer to this fact. These ayats indicate in addition that those who somehow attain love of Allahu ta'ala 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 Allahu ta'ala. Before the actions in qadar turn into qada', 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, Allahu ta'ala's will and option also would get out of order. 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 gives more. If someone happens to anger him by saying, "You cannot sell it to the one who pays less", he may have to sell it out of different reasons and new evaluation.

Allahu ta'ala, through the religions He has revealed, has declared to men good and evil deed and His blessings and punishments, which are retribution 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 Allahu ta'ala 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 Allahu ta'ala 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, Allahu ta'ala has put religious and moral rules and commanded strictly to follow them. On the other hand, He has created an-nafs al-ammara, 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 try him.

The religious scholars have not left to Muslims the trouble of dealing with such subtle teachings, which exhausts the 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, speak ill of 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 qada' and qadar, Hadrat Shaikh-i Akbar Muhyiddin ibn al-'Arabi had a different comment, and Shihab ad-din Mahmud ibn 'Abdullah al-'Alusi, Mufti of Baghdad, followed him. According

to them, willing the good or evils is a peculiarity in man and Allahu ta'ala does not create such peculiarities. For example, they say, "Allahu ta'ala did not make the apple to be apple. He only created it." Al-Alusi (1217-1270 A.H., Baghdad), in *Ruh al-Ma'ani* (his nine-volume tafsir printed in Egypt), interprets the ayat, "Final decision belongs to Allahu ta'ala," (al-Anam, 149) in the same viewpoint. In this respect, his thoughts are incompatible with the explanation of the Ahl as-Sunnat 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 Allahu ta'ala, 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 Allahu ta'ala's compulsion, they will go under nature's compulsion. Even if it is not cruelty to punish men who are under another compulsion, without Allahu ta'ala'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, saying that Allahu ta'ala does not create peculiarities is an approach to naturalism and materialism.

Islamic scholars' writing many books about qada' 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 big slander and irreverence for them to say about Islamic scholars that they mixed genies and fairies with the fancies of vampires. The origin of fancies and fables which are often told by women, ignoramuses 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. But it is wrong to take illusions and fancies as genies.

Nobody has the right to distort Muslims' belief in qada' and qadar as if it were an obstacle against working and progress. These slanders leak out from communists and freemasons. Belief in qada' 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 successful 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 attacks 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 that man believes in qadar in insignificant affairs and disbelieves it when he is in great danger or need.

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

2- Reformer's attacks on belief and matters relating to women in Islam

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 between 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 remained behind was not their being orientals or the climate of the country. The reason was in the religion and in the concept of qada' and qadar."

Even if it would be admitted for a moment that the Ottomans misunderstood qada' 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 deceiving 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 there would not be any difficulty to prevent progress. 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 certainly 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 bad 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 sprung up later.

32 - The reformer says:

"We should reform the religion. We should begin with iman first. Iman could not be mere belief by the heart and affirmation by the tongue. The religion distinguishes good from bad, beautiful from ugly. goodness should be the fundamental of iman and evil should be the cause of disbelief. As a fard has various fundamentals, so iman should have fundamentals such as justice, direction, patriotism, honor and honesty. The six fundamentals of Amantu could not be Islam. Islam, which is a perfect social religion, causes misery just for this reason. Iman should be corrected in such a manner as to value the Muslim."

Is iman solely to believe or should it include beautiful a'mal (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-Sunnat, iman is only to believe with the heart, and if one cannot express it with the tongue, he will be forgiven. The Mutazila and especially the Khawarij, said, "Iman could not be apart from deeds; he who commits a big sin loses his iman." However, the disagreements between these groups were always based on the knowledge they understood from the Qur'an and Hadith. As for religion reformers, who know nothing about religious knowledge, they attempt to change iman with their defective minds and corrupt intentions. They try to inoculate the youth with this idea, which sounds very right but which in fact bears a very secret danger. By pretending to compare a Muslim who both believes in Allahu ta'ala's religion and follows it with the Muslim who only believes in it but does not follow it, they try to make iman 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 in comparison to 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 iman, which is peculiar to Muslims. The excessive reformer tries to inoculate 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-salam) but not as a religion sent by Allahu ta'ala.

The above-mentioned idea of reformers that good conduct must be added to iman is not intended to reveal the knowledge discussed by Muslim scholars for centuries but to hold good deeds superior to iman, that is to shape Islam in a new form by discarding the religious fundamentals of iman and 'ibadat and pushing forth only their uncertain good conduct and beautiful morals that will be taught with the training methods of the present century. But this new system will be a religion believed just for the sake of this world.

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 morality. They want deeds to be a part of iman, but they cannot show any naqli (narrated, traditional) or 'aqli (mental) document for this. They only utter words having nothing to do with knowledge and reason but sensations fit for the understanding of the ignorant, such as, "What's the use of iman without a'mal? By excluding a'mal from iman, the scholars of kalam 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 in front of their reason. Because they know nothing about the books of the scholars of kalam, they attack Islam under the pretext of criticizing the immoralities which they witness in those carrying the name of Muslim. In order to expose to view how much unright and immoral they themselves are, the words of the Ahl as-Sunnat scholars, especially of the specialists of kalam, are explained briefly in the following:

According to the Ahl as-Sunnat, he who commits a big sin does not lose his iman, that is, he does not become a disbeliever. A Muslim who commits a sin is called "fasiq" (sinner). Sinners with sound iman or itiqad 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 Allahu ta'ala and in all the rules, that is, the commandments and prohibitions which were brought by Allahu ta'ala's Prophet Muhammad ('alaihi 's-salam) certainly from Him. Though it is not a condition of iman to carry out the commands and to abstain from prohibitions, belief in the necessity of doing the commands and not doing the prohibitions is a condition of iman. He who does not believe as such is not a Muslim and is called "kafir". However good work and inventions useful to humanity disbelievers may do, they will not escape punishment in the next world. 'Ibadat and all good deeds, valuable as they are, remain secondary in comparison to belief in them. Iman is essential and all good deeds are accessory. Iman and the deeds done by one who has iman are useful to him both in this world and in the next world. They make man attain salvation. good deeds done without having iman 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 the iman. In the book Kavm-i Jadid (Modern People), which was published in the time of the Party

of Union, real Muslims, having iman and good deeds are called "Kavm-i Atik" (Ancient People). It ridicules Muslims and says, "They say that a man who has iman will be rescued in the next world, no matter how much evil he commits, and the person without iman will get no good in the next world, even if he does every kind of goodness in the world." However, Allahu ta'ala 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 Allahu ta'ala 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" (surat an-Nur, 19); "The good deeds of those who disbelieve in Allahu ta'ala are like ashes blown about by the wind on a stormy day. In the next world, they get no use from those deeds" (surat Ibrahim, 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," (surat al-Furqan, 23) and "Shall we declare those whose labors prove most vain? They suppose they do good actions in the world. Whereas, they are the people who strive in vain. They have not believed the ayats of their Rabb and that they would enter His presence in the Judgement. We annihilate their favors. We do not neutralize their evils with their favors." (surat al-Kahf, 103-4) These ayats show that the Ahl as-Sunnat belief is right.

Although the ayats stating the worthlessness of the favors done by disbelievers in this world show that they will be given no reward, they will cause the punishment to be lightened according to some Islamic scholars. For the ayat, (Their punishment will not be lightened," (surat al-Baqara, 86; surat al 'Imran, 88) these scholars said, "It will not be lightened in respect of time; they will be tortured eternally." These scholars based their view upon the ayats, "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." (Surat al-Anbiya, 47) and "He who does goodness in the slightest degree will get its reward." Furthermore, there are the hadiths stating that Hatim Tai who was very generous and Abu Lahab who emancipated his jariya Suwaiba, who had given him the good news of the Prophet's birth, will be tortured lightly. And the hadith reporting that the punishment of Abu Talib, who loved the Prophet ('alaihi 's-salam) very much, will be light is very famous. Disbelievers living in dar al-Islam have to follow the muamalat part of Islam, and following Islam causes one to earn reward or one's punishment to be lightened. Since there is no reward for disbelievers in the next world, it is probable that their punishment will be lightened. Moreover, one who embraces Islam will attain the rewards of the good deeds he has done before becoming Muslim. As it is reported in the Sahihain of al-Bukhari and Muslim, Hakim ibn Hazam, when he embraced Islam, asked the Prophet ('alaihi 's-salam) about the good deeds he had done before embracing the true faith. The Prophet said, "You became 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. [And he becomes absolutely pure. Therefore, we should try to win his prayer for us by showing respect and affection.] Similarly, when a Muslim (Allah forbid!) loses his iman and becomes an apostate, all the favors he has done become vain.

The Qur'an al-karim and the Hadith ash-Sharif show that iman is the belief within the heart, that is, its affirmation by the heart.

The ayats "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 iman, 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 ayat, "When two groups of Muslims

fight each other, reconcile them," (surat al-Hujurat, 9) those Muslims who commit sins, like fighting each other are still called "Muslims". The ayat, "Certainly Muslims are brothers. Reconcile your brothers!" (surat al-Hujurat, 10) declares that they are believers. Allahu ta'ala says, "Certainly Allah does not forgive polytheism. He forgives the sins except polytheism of whomever He wills," (surat an-Nisa, 47, 115) and the hadith says, "Hadrat Jabraail (Gabriel) came to me. He brought the good news; he who dies without having attributed anything as a partner to Allahu ta'ala, 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 above ayats and hadiths indicate that belief and practice are different from each other. The Mutazila and the Khawarij, who said that practice was a part of belief, put forth as documents the ayats, "If one becomes a disbeliever, it does not harm Allahu ta'ala who needs nothing," (al 'Imran, 97) and "Allahu ta'ala made you love iman. He placed it into your heart and He made disbelief, sins and disobedience seem ugly to you." (al-Hujurat, 7) They further said that the following words of 'Umar (radi-Allahu 'anh) also emphasized the meaning they understood from the former ayat: "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." Whereas, the word 'disbelief' in the ayat and in this quotation means the 'denial of hajj'. In the last ayat, iman and sins are classified in different classes, but it does not mean that they are opposite. There are many a thing which may be together though they differ in respect of beauty and ugliness. The ayat, "What a bad quality it is to be sinful after having believed," in the same sura very openly defines the places of iman and sins. It tells that sinfulness is a bad quality unbecoming to Muslims and that the sinner has iman. The latter is understood from here, because real evil and misuse is in bringing iman and sinning together, hence a believer's sinning is worse than a disbeliever's sinning.

A Muslim, who affirms the Existence and Oneness of Allahu ta'ala 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 Allahu ta'ala and His Prophet ('alaihi 's-salam) and does goodness not as a command of Allahu ta'ala but for some other reason does not even accept to be a human creature to Allahu ta'ala. Allahu ta'ala's treatment of these two surely will not be the same. A lazy son useless to everybody 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 nothing 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. Iman, 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 iman, every sinner would be a disbeliever. There would be no Muslim in the world. In the Hadith, some good acts were connected with iman and some evils with disbelief, but such analogies were intended to tell about the extent of goodness or badness of those good acts and evils. Other ayats and hadiths show that they are apart from iman and disbelief. The hadiths, "Modesty is a branch from iman"; "Cleanliness is half of iman"; "Iman is salat"; "A Muslim is a person in whom people will trust"; "A Muslim does not commit adultery while being 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, salat, trustworthiness, chastity and rectitude and the existence of the evils such as mendacity, perfidy

and adultery to the absence of iman, these hadiths point out their importance. By esteeming some actions as highly as iman, their importance is emphasized. For the religion reformers who say, "How can the Ahl as-sunnat scholars separate from iman the things which the Prophet included in iman?" the hadith, "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 ayat, "Men will not be freed after just having said, 'We believe,' but it will be understood from their enduring the troubles they meet on the way of religion whether their word, 'We believe,' is true or false" (surat al-Ankabut, 2) points out the great importance of enduring troubles.

The 18th ayat of the surat al-Ahzab declares that the people who prevented others from going to jihad with Rasulullah ('alaihi 's-salam) and who, in the battles in which they occasionally took part pretendedly, 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 actions were not Muslims. It is meant that the people of real and firm iman would not be so and that all the worship and useful deeds of those who did so were unacceptable. Hadrat Hasan al-Basri, one of the distinguished among the Tabiin, 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 Allahu ta'ala 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 iman 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, iman 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 was told he would be given certain sum of money if he inserted his hand, perhaps then he would follow his nafs and insert his hand.

Deficiency in 'mal (deeds) does not cause man to depart from the religion. When a sin destroys iman in the heart, for example, if the sinner disbelieves 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 "zunnar" worn by Christian priests and worshiping idols have been regarded as signs indicating denial and removing iman from the heart. The religion reformer say, "Why should a Muslim become disbeliever just because of using a thing? Why should an action done with the hand, foot or head take away iman from the heart?" These actions themselves are not disbelief, but they are signs indicating that iman in the heart is corrupt. Throwing the Qur'an 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 they themselves cause disbelief.

When the religion reformers who want good deeds to be included in iman are observed carefully, there is next to none among them who performs salat, 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 do good actions but to demolish iman. If also good actions or conduct were a condition of iman, all of those who do evils had to 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 condition of iman, 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 zakat and salat, and indeed they do not regard observance of these as conditions of iman. They probably do not know that Islam has punishments for many crimes also in this world, and it urges people to do good; it is fard to exercise al-amru bi 'l-maruf wa'n-nahyu 'ani 'l-munkar, that is, to give advice, for the 'ulama' to the cruel and for ordinary Muslims to one another. While Islam provides for the performance of good deeds and the abstention from evil things in this manner, reformers do not regard this sufficient, or, to be more exact, they want none of the Islamic commands but some other concepts to be fundamentals of iman so they may call most of Muslims disbelievers; what might be the purpose of such an attempt?

Islam considers wearing rope girdle worn by Christian priests and worshiping 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 iman in his heart may be thought of having been shocked. Hadrat al-Imam-al-azam Abu Hanifa said, "One may go out of Islam through the way through which he enters Islam." Here, the 'way' means 'believing of the heart', that is, when iman goes into the heart one becomes Muslim, and when iman goes out the heart one departs from Islam.

A person who says he is 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 honor 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 iman in the heart?" Because, 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 big sins are committed frequently, iman 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 by the heart is not only the basis of Islam but it is also the highest worship. As it is written in the Sahih of al-Bukhari, when Rasulullah (sall-Allahu 'alaihi wa sallam) was asked which was the highest deed, he said, "It is to believe in Allahu ta'ala and His Messenger." and he recited the Amantu.

That iman is essential in Islam does not reduce the importance of deeds (a'mal, 'ibadat), for it is iman that causes the performance of deeds. Strong means secures the result. A Muslim whose iman is strong lays more stress on the importance of a'mal. Since Muslims have to believe every duty to be a duty separately, those who commit sins fear that their iman may be shocked 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'mal to iman, can realize the importance of a'mal that well? Those who say that one cannot become a Muslim only by believing with the heart but he must have good actions think of such deeds not to be for love of Allahu ta'ala and for attaining the next world but to be 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 can make you in more ease; then either perform them or not," since he who slights these commands and prohibitions becomes a disbeliever.

Iman means believing by 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 iman, 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. Iman 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. Especially the attainment of worldly happiness is possible for them by carrying out these rules. Deed is an essential part of not iman but of the maturity of iman. In one respect, iman 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 iman, which is based on strong knowledge? Iman, 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 poor people who have not been honored by attaining it.

While people deliberate much about and try hard for worldly advantages, they do not pay attention to the fact that they are near an endless happiness or calamity. They never think about this. Allahu ta'ala has given men reason and imposed useful duties on them. In order to make them known, He sent prophets ('alaihi 's-salam). 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, though known, not to follow the religious laws pertaining to the next world, the laws which were put and commanded by Allahu ta'ala more importantly. As such questions as "Why did He create the miserable and the destitute? 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 Allahu ta'ala's laws pertaining to this and the next worlds. 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-salam) from books written correctly, they would love his intellect, beautiful habits and accomplishments. The events showing that hundred 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 histories 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 Allahu ta'ala's Prophet ('alaihi 's-salam). 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. Disbelieving the words of this exalted Prophet ('alaihi 's-

salam) is the denial of 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 want 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 Rasulullah ('alaihi 's-salam) 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 Abu Lahab and Abu Jahl did not believe him though they saw him and the Byzantine Emperor Heracles and Persian Shah Perviz did not believe him though they read his letters. Their disbelieving 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 very behind. Christians would kneel in front of 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 supplicate to these idols whom they regarded messengers between Hadrat 'Isa (Jesus) and themselves. Likewise, as the hodjas read the Qur'an, Muslims of every race listen to this thing without understanding 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 at as God's representatives, began losing their value. The Luther of Islam has now come forth in Asia: Musa Baykiyev of Kazan translates the Qur'an 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 as the time elapses. As it is declared in the Qur'an, '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'an. 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 ijihad of the four leaders does not mean the religion. As these learned and superior men derived religious rules from the Qur'an and Hadith, so every Muslim who has reached the grade of a mujtahid may very well derive new rules from these two sources."

The reformer takes up translation of the Qur'an al-karim first. Today, majority of those who say they are Muslims complain that the Qur'an 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'an. This complaint is quite wrong. Islamic scholars have not attempted to translate the Qur'an into another language, for they have thought of themselves as incapable of translating Allahu ta'ala's Word without spoiling the expression, eloquence and perfection in its own language. However successful the translation might be, it has been concluded that it is impossible to reach the deep meanings of Allahu ta'ala's Word. The Qur'an 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 left all of them behind. Translation of such a book must have the same quality, which is impossible. Accomplishing a translation worth the Qur'an, which has an eloquence above man's ability, necessitates having ability above the human ability. This is a problem of ability, that is, it is a matter of protecting the superiority of the Qur'an. Those who want to taste the flavor of eloquence and deep meanings in the Qur'an have to learn Arabic literature and many a branch of Islamic knowledge such as tafsir, usul al-fiqh, and then they can enter the holy presence of the Qur'an. They must not expect the Qur'an to come to them.

Writing a Turkish commentary (tafsir) of the Qur'an and translating it into Turkish are different. Its translation is more difficult than commenting. It is not true that it has not been translated into or commented in Turkish. It has been, but it has not been liked by expert scholars. Religion reformers are wrong in that this is attempted for the first time by the 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 commentaries such as Mawakib and Tibyan were not utterly ignorant in ethics and religious knowledge like those who attempt to translate 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 commentaries 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'an by all Muslims, and religion reformers will call a haphazard Turkish translation of the Qur'an "the Qur'an" and have the Turks perform salat reciting such a Turkish "Qur'an". The real danger endangering one's being Muslim, probably, is to attempt to recite any translation instead of the Qur'an in salat, rather than translating the Qur'an. The Divine Word in the Qur'an 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 Allahu ta'ala. 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'an.

The ayats of the Qur'an were given different meanings in different ijthahs by the religious leaders, and a rule was derived from each of them by each leader, and madhhabs formed by these rules, yet the compact unity of the Qur'an was maintained. If the Qur'an were translated according to the rules of each madhhab, what the Hanafis, for instance would recite in salat would be different from what the Shafi'is 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'an to be translated so Islam would fall into such a state? In order to protect the unity of the Holy Book of Muslims and to keep Allahu ta'ala's Book away from the smallest doubt, Muslim scholars have declared to preserve the Qur'an as it came from Rasulallah (sall-Allahu 'alaihi wa sallam). Moreover, because few ayats recited by some of the prominent Sahabis, such as Abdullah ibn 'Abbas, Abdullah ibn Masud and Hadrat 'Ali (radi-Allahu 'anhum) were very slightly different from the Qur'an which we possess today and which was authorized unanimously by the majority of the Prophet's companions, they were called qira'at shadhda (exceptional pronouncing) and, though they have been documents for the scholars of fiqh and used in commentaries of the Qur'an, they have never been permitted to recite in salat. 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'an in salat? No Muslim scholar has

permitted it. Al-Imam al-azam Abu Hanifa was reported to have said once that the Qur'an could be read in Persian in salat, yet Nuh ibn Mariam said that the Imam had changed this ijtiḥad of his and the scholars of usul opposed reciting it even in Persian.

Reading the Qur'an even without understanding its meaning will be given thawab. This is for protecting the Qur'an, which stands for Islam's constitution, from being altered. Turkish commentary or translation of the Qur'an can be and has been written, and Islamic scholars have not forbidden this, yet it can neither bear the eloquence of the Qur'an nor convey the Divine Purpose. Muslims who want to understand the Qur'an and the subtleties in it and to taste the flavor 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 Mahmud Baqi, so it is very wrong to attempt to understand the eloquence and subtleties of Allah's Word without laboring to learn the necessary knowledge to understand it. Reading anything, even if in Arabic, other than those words which Archangel Jibrail ('alaihi 's-salam) brought to our Prophet (sall-Allahu 'alaihi wa sallam) does never mean reading the Qur'an. Reading the Qur'an when one is junub, for example, is haram, though reading others is not haram.

Religion reformers say that one should understand what one recites and what one asks from Allahu ta'ala in salat. Such words indicate that they have not comprehended what 'ibada means; the one who has prescribed salat for man is not the man himself but Allahu ta'ala who has declared to His Prophet ('alaihi 's-salam) how salat and the other kinds of 'ibadat are to be performed and what is to be recited during performance. Hadrat Prophet ('alaihi 's-salam) himself performed them and told them to his companions just as he had been taught. Even Hadrat Prophet ('alaihi 's-salam) might not and did not change the fard, wajib and haram. Our religious leaders have understood all of these by seeing and hearing them from the Prophet's companions (radi-Allahu 'anhum), and they have written them in their books. These profoundly learned scholars have reported that the Qur'an al-karim to be recited in salat has to be in Allahu ta'ala's Word. The duty will have been done only in this way. Those who want to understand the meanings of what they recite in salat 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 salat, a Muslim can pray to Allahu ta'ala in his own language. He can learn the meaning of the ayats he recites in salat from the books of the Ahl as-Sunnat 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 be in vain.

In order to learn and teach the meanings in the Qur'an and the religious knowledge correctly and to perform salat easily and enjoyably, Muslims all over the world use Arabic as the religious language. Muslim men have to perform the five times of salat in a day in congregation of 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 salat together. The same danger arises if the khutba is translated. If it is read in various languages, Muslims will part into separate mosques for salat on Fridays and festivals, which will result in the danger of the breaking the unity of Muslims.

Reformers try to rebut the ijtiḥads of our madhhab leaders in order to distort Islam. It is right neither for a reasonable friend nor for even an ignorant, slanderous enemy to say, or even to think, that Islam had been 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 were spoilt one thousand three hundred years ago? If it had been spoilt, these reformers' efforts to correct the religion, to make "true" ijtihads, 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 ijtihad under their masks not by depending on the Qur'an and Hadith 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 try to belittle the four madhhabs by saying, "How could all the four be right?" Further, their idea that ijtihad should be free, that progressives, too, may make ijtihad, is an attempt to break the truth into pieces. While each of them likes what he himself understands or thinks and blames the conclusion of others, and while they try to open the gate of ijtihad, they do not even noticed that they close it. Contrary to their nonsense, Islam has not limited the right and authority of making ijtihad to four people. Each of the Prophet's companions made ijtihad, yet, because we do not possess today their collections of their ijtihads, their madhhabs have been forgotten. Only the books of four madhhabs survived. Ijtihad, like commentating or translating the Qur'an, 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 have been Islam today. But ending up all the affairs by 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 the 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 sees the fear of Allahu ta'ala 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 hadiths, "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 to the cruel 'the cruel,' Allahu ta'ala 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 Allahu ta'ala 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. Allahu ta'ala'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 Allahu ta'ala'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 a cause for shaking one's honor and esteem. Whereas, those who are exalted in Islam deem it the greatest honor to humiliate themselves before Allahu ta'ala. This very difference is the subtle point which make fear valuable. As the 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 Allahu ta'ala through fear changes whenever he finds an opportunity. Whereas, not even for a moment can man find an opportunity against Allahu ta'ala, who sees and knows all his secret and public behavior and who is never mistaken. The hadith, "What a good human being Suhaib ar-Rumi is. He wouldn't commit any sin even if he didn't fear Allahu ta'ala," provides for unity and indicates that fear is a strong means. Reformers suppose that the fear of Allahu ta'ala and love for Allahu ta'ala are different, and they like the latter and are against the former just because they are foreign to the religious knowledge and documents of Islamic religion.

Men are advised to fear Allahu ta'ala in the ayats, "Those who have much knowledge fear Allahu ta'ala much" (surat al-Fatir, 28); "There are two heavens for the person who fears the greatness of his Allahu ta'ala" (surat ar-Rahman, 46); "They alone are the believers whose hearts feel fear when Allahu ta'ala is mentioned," (surat al-Anfal, 2; surat al-Hajj, 35) and "Those who obey Allahu ta'ala and His Prophet and those who fear Allahu ta'ala and who are cautious of Him are the ones that will be saved on the Day of Judgement." (surat an-Nur, 52) It is easy to understand now why the reformers who know nothing about these ayats do not have any right to speak, by saying that they will reform the religion, ill about the religious scholars who have placed the fear of Allahu ta'ala into Muslims. If it were bad to place the fear of Allahu ta'ala in Muslims, it would be necessary (Allah forbid!) to impute this to the Qur'an. Almost every page of the Qur'an invites Muslims to the fear of Allahu ta'ala with the command, "O you who believe! Fear Allahu ta'ala!" It is declared in the thirteenth ayat of the surat al-Hujurat, "To Allahu ta'ala the most valuable of you is he who fears and is cautious of Him." 'Itiqa' in these ayats means 'to fear'. It arises from their imitating European Christians that reformers want to eradicate the fear of Allahu ta'ala in Muslims and to replace the thought that Allahu ta'ala is only benevolent, merciful and protective for the care and distress of His human creatures, as Christians believe. To love Allahu ta'ala considering Him only as merciful, bounteous 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 the way of tasawwuf, when they are in His attribute of Jalal (Severity), could not think of the Divine Mercy or of the love of Allahu ta'ala, and when His attribute of Jamal (Beauty) surrounds them, they forget about the torture in Hell and the fear of Allahu ta'ala; in these states called ecstasy of tasawwuf, they utter words slighting love or fear, but when they recover, they repent of such words. The ayats "Those who work should work for these very happiness!" (surat as-Saffat, 61) and "Those who compete one another should compete for this," (surat al-Mutaffifin, 26) order to work willingly for the blessings in Paradise. Ahmad Mithat, one modernist reformer in his book *Niza-i 'Ilm ve Din (The Disputes Between Knowledge and Religion)* tries to disesteem the belief in the Resurrection, which is fundamental of iman, while he indicates each of the blessings of Paradise such as food, drinks and houris as concepts pleasing one's greed and materialistic

desires. It is the clear evidence of their intention to blemish Islam that religion reformers run after worldly pleasures, say that men should perform 'ibadat only to get worldly pleasures that are more attractive, sweeter and more pleasing than everything else, deny the existence of any pleasure in Paradise and speak ill of the religious scholars who does not teach religious duties as to be performed for worldly pleasures. Such unpleasant allusions to Islamic scholars, who struggled to get Muslims absorbed in performing 'ibadat in order that they might attain the blessings of Paradise and escape punishment in Hell, have been seen so often. For example, a Baktashi said:

"Whenever a zahid mentions Paradise,
He talks about eating and drinking."

Such words direct unpleasant allusions to the eighteenth ayat of the surat al-Waqi'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 for Allahu ta'ala. Whereas, one's performing 'ibadat for them does not indicate that he does not love Allahu ta'ala. Those whom Allahu ta'ala loves are in Paradise and Allahu ta'ala is pleased with those who are in Paradise. Indeed, the greatest felicity is to attain His consent. But by ridiculing the blessings in Paradise which Allahu ta'ala praises and tells Muslims to strive to attain, one does not attain Allahu ta'ala's consent. Because religion reformers want 'ibadat 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 Allahu ta'ala's consent.

Love for Allahu ta'ala 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 Allahu ta'ala insignificant and unnecessary, although it is the source of every sort of happiness, is a clear sign of knowing nothing about the Qur'an al-karim and Hadith ash-Sharif. Hadrat Muhammad ('alaihi 's-salam), the most exalted of men in every respect, said, "It is me who, among you, fears and shows caution towards Allahu ta'ala most!" This hadith and the preceding one about "Suhaib" point out that the fear of Allahu ta'ala is necessary. Fearing Allahu ta'ala 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.

The fear of Allahu ta'ala and love for Allahu ta'ala are like two wings taking people to salvation and happiness. The Prophet (sall-Allahu 'alaihi wa sallam) said, "If one fears Allahu ta'ala, everything fears him. If he does not fear Allahu ta'ala, he fears everything," and "The extent of one's intellect will be evident in the extent of his fear of Allahu ta'ala." A person who fears Allahu ta'ala 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 of his faults. He is a man of his word. He does every goodness for Allahu ta'ala'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 favors to everybody. He abstains from doubtful things (between haram and halal). He never flatters the occupiers of high posts or the cruel. He respects the 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 honor 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 favors to everybody by means of it. He does

not behave hypocritically. He is not arrogant. Thinking that Allahu ta'ala 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 Allahu ta'ala are useful to their country and countrymen.

35 - The reformer says:

"Because the Ottoman state was based on the principles of the religion it began everything with madrasa education. In madrasas today, Arabic, sarf, nahw, logic, fiqh, badi', bayan, ma'ani are taught. They teach them in order to understand the religious books which are in Arabic correctly. They say that the gate of ijtiḥad have been closed. The majority of those who got education in the madrasa have remained on the first steps of these branches of knowledge. [Even] one out of a hundred hodjas does not know 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'an, 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, at the beginning of the programs of which it is written 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 to 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 Vahiddedin Khan, many of the subjects that are taught in today's high schools were introduced into 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 Fanari, Molla Husraw, Abussuud, Ibn Kamal, Gelenbevi and many others. Freemasons had not only deprived the madrasas of knowledge and money 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 exaltation 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 honor, while some others, taking no notice of the insults, have adhered to their religious and national customs and continued living in an endeavor against nafs. It is obvious that those who graduated 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-maruf 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 Koprulu Fuad, Izmirli Ismail Hakki, Sharafaddin Yaltkaya, Mehmed Ali Ayni 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 worshiping should be Turkish, and the Qur'an and the khutba should be read in Turkish. Musical instruments should be placed in mosques. The khutba should be delivered not by imams but by religious philosophers. The Qur'an should be studied not with the view-point of kalam 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 and 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 iman attained at home, but they strengthen it. Islam commands learning the latest scientific knowledge with the intention of making iman conscientious and firm, living comfortably and being ready to oppose 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 iman deteriorates. Those who prepared the curriculum 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 for the establishment of new morals and belief, yet, since there is not a leader to establish them, it easily makes them immoral or subjects for any influence. Let us compare incomplete knowledge of a student with the religious and moral knowledge and belief on 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 do not like the morals and customs of their country. They admire Europeans but they cannot get their morals, either. What they learn from Europeans is no more than being imitative."

Here the religion reformer seems to have perceived the facts and to be rather reasonable. But, if due attention is paid, he implies that the lessons taught in high schools harm iman and morals. This is very wrong. Knowledge, whether it is much or less, is not harmful, but it is useful. The harmful thing is to place ignorance and evils into the heads as if they are 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 fresh 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 and thus their morals are spoilt and iman shaken. In communist countries today the youth is deceived out of their faith in this manner.

It is understood from his writing that this reformer, too, had received pure family education in his family home and later fell into the paw of a vicious teacher hostile to Islam and was inoculated and deceived. When he heard 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. Whereas, 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 but as 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 opposing 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 Qamus, he would not write ill of Allahu ta'ala's Messenger ('alaihi 's-salam) in such a manner now. It is estimated today that when this hadith ash-Sharif was said 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-salam) held out his blessed sword and said, "My Allahu ta'ala 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 'dunya' (world) is a noun. One of the infinitives derived from this word is 'adna', which means 'to subsist' as it is defined in Qamus. 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-salam) said so. He signified that the villager should plough his field. This hadith might have various

meanings, but we should not fall into the calamity of disbelieving or doubting it by interpreting it with our short sight and limited knowledge.

Religion reformers frequently recommend national bonds in place of religious bonds in order to unite and improve individuals. Whereas, the original meaning of the word 'milla' is 'din' (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 details about religion and nation.

Din al-Islam, the religion of Islam, is the belief in Allahu ta'ala, in His Oneness and in all His prophets ('alaihimu 's-salam).

Allah is the Being who creates everything, whose existence has no end or limit and whose state cannot be comprehended through intellect, but whose attributes forming His Divinity and Creativeness only are known. He exist 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. Whereas, 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 to be existent before itself, that is, to have existed always; everything had to be wajib al-wujud (indispensable being). If it were so, it would not come into existing for some time. Whereas, every creature comes into existence after it has been nonexistent, and it later ceases to exist. Then, it is obvious that no creature is wajib al-wujud. Besides, coming into existence by oneself is not easily understandable to reason. Wajib al-wujud has to be single. The Single Being who creates all beings except Himself is necessary. If the existence of the single wajib al-wujud 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 has made so," or "Natural forces have made it." Thus, without realizing, they explain that creatures do not come into existence by themselves, but there is One Maker. But they refrain from accepting 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 disbelieving 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. Because, 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 world 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 possess 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 exist would have to be nonexistent, for it would also need something else which has to exist before itself, but which in reality does not exist, for it would also need something else to exist before itself. It is the same with the third, the fourth, the fifth... it is always the same. The existence of Hadrat Adam can easily be understood after this discussion. If Hadrat Adam 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 had to exist.

It is very important to believe in the next world, like believing in Allahu ta'ala. 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 certainly 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 Allahu ta'ala through science, think over morals and accept His existence unanimously. To comprehend the existence of Allahu ta'ala 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 despite 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 Allahu ta'ala 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 Allahu ta'ala 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 what one of them would want happened, the other would be impotent. The impotent cannot be creative. If what they both would want were alike, they would again be impotent, because they would be forced to come to 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-tawhid. 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 Tawfik Fikrat, one of the religion reformers in our country, ridicules Islam and Muslims in his poem "Tarih-i Qadim", but he could not help expressing the need of having iman 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 Onesses of the Creator whose existence is necessary can also be explained in this way: if there were more than one creator, their combination would not be wajib al-wujud (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 wajib al-wujud. The combination of the parts whose existence is necessary would be neither indispensable (wajib) nor dispensable (mumkin), for the dispensable being would not exist by itself and needs creator. Accepting the existence of this creator distinct from the combination would be contrary to the combination's being wajib, 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 wajib al-wujud (the Necessary Being) cannot be more than one, rebuts the naturalists who say that everything exists by itself and is wajib al-wujud. Whereas, as explained above, let alone that everything exists by itself as a wajib al-wujud, it is impossible even for a creature to be a wajib al-wujud.

The irreligiousness which has been propagated by the progressives imitating Europe up to now has been in the nature of disbelieving Allahu ta'ala. For instance, many have said, "The problem is Allah's existence. If there were Allah, I would 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 Allahu ta'ala, they have begun to speak ill of prophets ('alaihimu's-salam). 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." Whereas, a person who believes in the next world has to believe in prophets, too. It is very illogical to leave the knowledge of blessings and punishments of the next world to reason. Especially the ignorant people can never reason

them out. Islam commands to believe in all prophets. Jews and Christians never believe in Muhammad ('alaihi 's-salam), the Prophet of Islam. They speak ill of this exalted Prophet. As for Islam, which was preached by Muhammad ('alaihi 's-salam), it expels those who disbelieve in Musa (Moses) and 'Isa (Jesus) ('alaihi 's-salam) and utter words humiliating them from Islam. 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 does 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 accept 'Isa and Muhammad ('alaihi 's-salam) as prophets. While Musa ('alaihi 's-salam) was Allahu ta'ala's prophet, how was it 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-salam). This wrong belief of Jews and Christians is not based on a scientific observation. It is nothing but being fixed to the old, refusing the new just because of newness, that is, being reactionary.

'Isa ('alaihi 's-salam) 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 Nasira. He was revealed to be the Prophet when he was thirty years old. Three years later, Jews wanted to kill him. Allahu ta'ala took him to heaven alive. Yuda Sham'un, a hypocrite who resembled him, was crucified. Because 'Isa ('alaihi 's-salam) 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, they would have to worship Adam ('alaihi 's-salam) more, because he was created both without father and without mother. Hence, Christians have spoilt their revealed religion and driven it into an illogical state.

Jews disbelieve 'Isa ('alaihi 's-salam) 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 Allahu ta'ala'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 they are in refusing the new religion, but also they have distorted the old one. Forty years after 'Isa's ('alaihi 's-salam) 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 Injil (the heavenly book revealed to him) got lost. Later new books were written under the name of the Injil. 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 'Isawi religion, the true religion of 'Isa ('alaihi 's-salam) was driven into a form which he could not recognize if he saw it. Thus, Christianity was born. This retrogression did not stop until the nineteenth century, when many of them became irreligious.

As the prophethood of Musa ('alaihi 's-salam) and 'Isa ('alaihi 's-salam) was evident through miracles, so the prophethood of Muhammad ('alaihi 's-salam) is obvious through miracles. In the time of Musa ('alaihi 's-salam) magic was very much advanced; medicine in the time of 'Isa ('alaihi 's-salam) and poetry and eloquence in the time of Muhammad ('alaihi 's-salam) were very much advanced. Allahu ta'ala 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-salam), like 'Isa ('alaihi 's-salam), resuscitated the dead and that the disbelievers of Quraish called

Muhammad ('alaihi 's-salam) a magician, as the Pharaoh and his men had called Musa ('alaihi 's-salam) a magician.

Muhammad ('alaihi 's-salam) was ummi, 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'an, full of historical, scientific, moral, political and social knowledge. He caused rise of emperors who spread justice all over the world just by following that book. The Qur'an is his greatest miracle. In fact, it is the greatest miracle of all prophets. This miracle was given only to Muhammad ('alaihi 's-salam). 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 Kaba for many years and that had made each of their writers a genius, a hero, were torn down and their writers submitted themselves to the ayats that could never be the result of few minutes' conversation with a priest! Today, there is no need to attempt again to understand the eloquence of the Qur'an. 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-salam), there was next to no one who did not see and believe the divine superiority in the eloquence of the Qur'an.

He did not appropriate such an honor and perfection which, in an art that was considered as the most exalted skill in his time, made everybody admit to its superiority, but he said that it came from Allahu ta'ala whom no one knew, and through this honor and superiority he tried to introduce not himself but that unknown person. This is surprisingly incompatible with 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 marifa are those who cannot appreciate the value of knowledge and marifa. A poet will not change even his one poem that proves 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-salam) said that he was not a president and, instead of sovereignty and pomp, he lived moderately like everybody. To his daughter Hadrat Fatima (radi-Allahu 'anha), when she asked for a little thing, 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 has to be muddle-headed and one's conscience darkened to suppose that such a person was after sovereignty. The probability of being a liar (Allah forbid!) for that exalted Prophet ('alaihi 's-salam) who came forward saying, "I do not say these words from myself. I declare Allahu ta'ala's commands. I am a man like you," is so remote, so wrong that European and American men of idea have had to admit to 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 (Allah forbid!) in which he supposed that an angel came 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 nonsense which they say out of the illness of denial that has covered their minds, because one part of their words proves the other to be a lie. That is, communists refute themselves with their own words.

Literary men understand the writer of a poem from the literary style of the poem without looking at his signature. The specialists in literature examined the Hadith ash-Sharif, which are

Rasulullah's ('alaihi 's-salam) saying, and the Qur'an al-karim 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'an is different from and superior to the Hadith 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'an, their being pronounced in long, short, open, closed, deep or thin voice has remained as Rasulullah ('alaihi 's-salam) revealed and pronounced them. One could not help being bewildered at the science called "ilm al-qira'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'an later, for Muslim scholars have put a very strong principle lest the Qur'an be injured, lest even a small doubt approach it: that the Qur'an must be conveyed through unanimity in every century. In every century from the Prophet's ('alaihi 's-salam) companions up to today, it has come to us through hundred thousands of persons who have memorized the Qur'an 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 Allahu ta'ala's book, thank 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-salam) but were not accepted unanimously, have not been considered to be of the Qur'an. For example. Hadrat 'Abdullah ibn Masud (radi-Allahu 'anh) conveyed the ayat "fasting for three days", which defined the atonement (kaffara) 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 Masud (radi-Allahu 'anh) was one of the great ones of the Prophet's ('alaihi 's-salam) companions and a very dependable person, the word mutatabi' (consecutive) was not included to the Qur'an, because he was left alone in his word. As a precaution, only the meaning of his word was taken and, again as a precaution, it was not put into the Qur'an. These are called "qira'at shadhha".

Rasulullah's ('alaihi 's-salam) own sayings are called al-Hadith ash-Sharif. Surprisingly cautious labors have been done in learning and preserving the Hadith. Every saying of Fakhr al-'alam (the 'Honor of all creatures', Prophet Muhammad) was memorized by his companions and conveyed to those who did not hear it or who came later. Thus, 'ilm al-hadith, which is like an infinite sea, was established. Despite the Qur'an, the evident, unequalled miracle, why should not Muhammad ('alaihi 's-salam) whose life and sayings are minutely obvious and each action was a proof of his prophethood, be a prophet, while believing in Musa and 'Isa's ('alahimu 's-salam) being prophets by depending on complicated and obscure histories? We are surprised at and regret Jews and Christians' this denial and obstinacy.

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 favor gained from birth without working for it. One should be thankful to Allahu ta'ala who has endowed this favor upon him. And one is thankful by endeavoring 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, ghazis and martyrs who has left this favor to them. They should love and regard 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 happiness, and they should pay their taxes willingly. For those who love one another as such, not touching or doing harm to the members of other religions or sects 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-salam), 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. One needs to be among one's nation so that one 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 said in the above 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 see whether one should sacrifice oneself for the nationalism which admit religious freedom or for one's irreligious nation the more:

An irreligious nationalist may think this way: the feeling of dying for the nation should be in common. It should be considered an injustice to die for one part while another part survives. 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 honor? No one knows on which mountain and where the soldiers who, in an army of millions, had died for their nation, are, and their names have been wiped out from the hearts of people. Those men had sacrificed their possessions along with their lives. To be more clear, they are, on their account, in a pitiable condition, rather than being praise worthy. If the self-sacrifice I would render for the nation will not be appreciated and, in addition, if I will be deemed guilty because of those who envy me, what will become of me?

In irreligious nationalism, there is no thoughtful and 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 had been witnessed in the Second World War, those who had fought in the battlefield and won honor 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 in a manner of worshiping and who suppose their every idea, every deed to be the very truth and the very happiness, are, again, imitative. Men have been attached to the bonds of business and profession, that is, of irreligious nationalism, which they had discovered with their minds and thoughts, more than 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 ayat of the surat al-Hujurat declares that human beings, the descendants of the same parents, can be graded only according to their fear of Allahu ta'ala, and there cannot be racialism in Islam. Some put forth this ayat in favor of parting Muslims into nations and say that

Islam is not against parting into different kinds of nationalism and all should be respected. Whereas, if Muslims be divided into separate nationalities, the danger of conflicting with one another will commence.

The hadith, "On the Day of Judgement Allahu ta'ala will say: 'O men! I chose a family, a lineage (having common religious qualities, e.g. fear of Allahu ta'ala). You chose another family (you cared for racial qualities). I said he who feared Me more was 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,' " obviously 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. Whereas, in nikah (Islamic betrothal) every kind of suitability, right or wrong, between the man and the woman are considered. If it were permissible to break the nikah done with the consent of the both sides because of racial and national difference, then it might be rightful to suppose so. While, all over the world today, every nation tries to win every support to its own advantages, we also should think of our own nationality. Nationality without religious freedom will not have been esteemed by doing this, for the idea of nationalism is based not on knowledge but on emotions. Georgy Zaidan, 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 (radi-Allahu 'anh) was based on this idea. He puts forth Hadrat 'Umar's (radi-Allahu 'anh) endeavors not to leave any polytheist on the Arabic Peninsula as evidence to this. Whereas, those endeavors 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. Thus religious unity has been developed and the feeling of nationalism has been born in Europe. Islam, establishing commercial, industrial and social order, includes the idea of nationalism. There is no need for establishing different nationalism among Muslims. For this reason, it is written in all books teaching elements of the religion, "Religion (din) and nationality (milla) are the same." Moreover, it will be quite right to say that the Europeans' suspicions against Islamic religion are born 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 of becoming more powerful than 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 adhan and the Qur'an are recited in five times of salat 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 biggest blow to be given to a nation's religion comes through this way. As a matter of fact, Muslims in Sicily and Spain have been Christianized by this way. And now, Russians use this sharp weapon to annihilate the iman in Muslims of Turkistan. Their dungeons, electric furnaces, exiling in Siberia and merciless massacre cannot be as effective as this sharp weapon is. Jalal Nuri Beg recommends Arabic as a common language for Muslims in his book Itihad-i Islam. Yavuz Sultan Salim Khan endeavored 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 hadith 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 Hadith 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 cause many deeds which will make them to be rewarded in the next world. 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 Hadith says, "If you do not try to bring the evil amongst you to the right course, that is, if you do not perform al-amru bi'l-maruf wa 'n-nahyu 'ani 'l-munkar, Allahu ta'ala will give upon you so bad calamities that in order to get rid of them even the entreaties to Allahu ta'ala of the good ones among you will no longer avail." The 110th ayat of the surat al 'Imran commands Muslims to perform al-amru bi 'l-maruf wa 'n-nahyu 'ani 'l-munkar. When Yavuz Sultan Salim 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 behavior wrong. Whereas, this behavior of that honored 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 Mufti of Boghazlayan, his hand on his chest full of iman 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 salat and who have their wives and daughters covered when going out and who do not have alcoholic drinks, "bigots". Whereas, 'bigotry' or 'obstinacy' means 'holding to one's own sect and opinion and refusing others' right words that are unsuitable with his'. A person who persistently defends an unright thing is called "bigot". Bigotry is a bad habit which Islam dislikes.

When our master Rasulullah ('alaihi 's-salam) was asked what Islam was, he said, "Islam means to esteem Allahu ta'ala's commands great and to pity His creatures." Muslims who walk on the luminous path which Rasulullah (sall-Allahu 'alaihi wa sallam) points out in this hadith know that it will deserve a severe punishment in the next world to meddle with others' rights no matter of which race, nation or religion they are. The above-mentioned behavior of a Mufti 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 irreligious national feelings superior to everything. The one 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 Allahu ta'ala, behaves with great love and sacrifice. Advancement of his nation will be easier and firmer. It will not harm other nations. Muslim means the one who takes his each step for Allahu ta'ala and reckons up his account for Him. Such a person cannot do any harm either to himself or to anybody. Whereas, those who abandon the religion and Allahu ta'ala and who think of nationality deprived 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-fourth ayat of the surat al 'Imran says, "O Jews and Christians, who say, 'We believe in Allah's book!' Come to the word [iman, six principles of iman] on which we have no disagreement." Here is the difference between the nationality that provides religious freedom and that does not in front of humanity!

38 - The reformer says:

"In Islamic family life, the man is the full ruler and the woman is the full 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 very few. The man, crushed under poverty and oppression, tortures his wife as if he revenges himself on his wife. The woman obeys rather than rebelling. 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 the 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, animal-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 more. They live like Christian women. All of what they do is 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 in front of the priest. See this terrible example injuring the basis of our religion out of a crazy pleasure in imitating Europeans and Americans! In Islam, one does not need be forgiven by a man before one can entreat Allahu ta'ala 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, so it is a 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 honor, one should have fallen into the ditches of aberration dug for the progressives if he admires the scandal of confession in Christianity, which disregards the chastity and honor of especially 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 married, 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 "Bait al-mal" 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 favor to her husband. And this is a virtue which Muslim women have. It is a noble feeling in them. Islam's recognition of such rights for the woman and its protecting her against being a slave or a toy in men's hands, indicate that Allahu ta'ala lays much value in women.

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 non-Muslim citizens. The Hadith says, "Among you, the one who has the most perfect iman 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 you all the good morals." In Islamic books, there are innumerable more hadiths 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 hadiths cannot be defect or stain 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 wants whenever she wants. She is unaware that she is tearing up her faith, morality and customs. She looks at the veiled Muslim women hatefully and mockingly. Even 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 insufficiently 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 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 naked 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. And, 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 to their houses. 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 calamity. They listen to the tunes of avaricious, 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. All they are the entreaties and adventures of the voluptuous persons who flutter with the desire of embracing 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 put forth any solution for this complicated problem. These social diseases have been reported from a reasonable 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 Allahu ta'ala and the feeling of honesty and chastity based on such strong fundamentals as religion and morals are deprived of fundamental knowledge.

3-Reformer's attack on veiling of the Muslim women

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 colored 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 much 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 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 the mind and intellects, which Allahu ta'ala has endowed on human beings. Thus, we should clean and correct the nafs in such a manner that it should desire for 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 is adult. It is never harmful for a girl, who has reason and thought enough to understand what chastity and honesty are, to go out unveiled 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 legitimacy 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 come on slowly. 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 theaters. 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 had prepared centuries ago and have had their men say in every epoch. These were said and written by the religion reformers in the time of the Union Party. When they brought freemason Rashid Pasha to the fore, they had him say these. When the ignorant's Party took hold of the administration of the Ottoman State with the help of booties and their aid, they, on the one hand, had religion reformers say these and, on the other, they passed new laws. They began attacking Islam. The Party members were 'ignorant' because the majority of these cruel people, who declared wars stupidly, caused bloodshed of hundred thousands of Muslims and killed innumerable innocent people in dungeons and on gallows, were ignorant. But if Muslim learn their religion well and teach it to youngsters, the plans of the enemies of Islam will fall down on their own heads. Allahu ta'ala declared in the eighth ayat of the surat al-Isra, "When Islam comes, polytheism and unbelief cannot survive." This ayat 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 also many important and dismal facts, but, in order to inoculate the youngsters with his intentional writings, freemasons do not hesitate to write a full book of sweet, creamy true writings in order to deceive people with a single line of poisoned writing. Another plan of these enemies of Islam for deceiving Muslims is their coating their poisons with sugar and have Muslims swallow them like pills.

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 does not decrease but increase her honor.

He says that, rather than aesthetic beauty, social use should be looked for in woman and she should be given place in social life. This is not right because woman does not give up adorning herself in that 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 surat Yusuf that even a great prophet as Yusuf ('alaihi 's-salam) 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 everybody. 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 avail in protecting their chastity and honesty. If the youngsters get used to mixed life, it will cause the danger of regarding its evil consequences most normal. The unveiling of women among men is a natural state indicating the feeling or intercourse between man and woman. Any man, let alone Muslim, will not believe in the mendacious, unaware words denying this reality. In beaches, where women exhibit their arms, shoulders, necks and legs to men and where they divert together, do not men look at them any more? Women, seeing that uncovering their arms, necks and legs became familiar, began to reveal their breasts, back and shoulders and to use miniskirts. These uncoverings, whose ends are unknowable where to conclude, points out a strong desire peculiar to women. In other words, the more women think that their uncovering themselves becomes familiar, they uncover the more. Their former immodesty begins to seem unnatural. Such spreading of unveiling among women shows that it is done for purpose other than the reasons put forth such as getting rid of the inconvenience of veiling, or getting an 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 their amusing themselves with women, is dissipation itself. The examples showing that women's exhibiting themselves to men and leading society life give way to fornication, immorality, home ruining, family disasters and deaths, are encountered frequently.

Islam does not say, "Do not talk to women or girls! Do not amuse yourselves with them! Live without women like priests." Islam says, "Do not pervert your neighbor's wife, 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 orders to work, earn and marry early when young.

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

The balls, which have arisen against the man-woman relations' remaining only between wife and husband and done in order to embody a mixed and unlimited relation, began to take the place of the assemblies of nikah in Islam, with the difference that Muslims' betrothal 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) Nikah.

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 long for 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 divided into society 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 some other evaluate it as "following nature". Whereas, Islam points out the way of living which is most suitable with nature. Islam, though being 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 let their own wives and daughters not only talk to him but also 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 poor people cannot think that other men also will freely attack their wives, daughters and sisters. Or, being in ecstasy with these pleasures and flavors, they forget about this disturbing harm, or they do not hesitate to sacrifice them for their amusement 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 ayat of the surat an-Nisa, "Men are the educators, employers of women. Allahu ta'ala has created men superior to women." They will rescue women from their place pointed out in this ayat! 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 ayat of the surat al-Anbiya', "If there were another god besides Allahu ta'ala, 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 ayat, every member of the family should have a separate right, value, honor 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 show their words 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 ayat," 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? Whereas, 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 saying "Life is in common," is, as the religion reformers defend it, for women to help 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. A more surprising thing 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, dyes, 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 especially the skin of those women who use powder, lip-stick 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 have toilet and make up for hours in front of the mirror. On a winter morning, as I was riding the tramway 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-mal, that is, the government treasury, is to support her. Every need of the woman should come to her. We have heard very often about the laments, complaints about their own lives of those women.

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 in front of the mirror to make themselves pretty every morning, the real meaning of this freedom and independence, which the remainder are supposed to have or, to be more exact, 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 are the imitators of Europeans, and later women also have been dragged down to this ditch. Where is the poor youth being dragged? Showing respect and politeness towards women, which has become a custom in society life, is out of sheer ostentation and done in order to decrease 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 common 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. Whereas, 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 of women. As for the woman, she accepts the proposal of matrimony of the man. Contrary to this trouble which women have in setting up 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-zawjat* in Islam. Whereas, 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. Whereas, 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 in front of his eyes and the curtain of veiling of other Muslim women come together not to show him a prettier one. Even, 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 Janab Shihabuddin Beg in his magazine *Evrak-i Eyyam*: "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 terrible 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 the heart of the woman who has gone there with her husband she

loves. Could you imagine it? Each of the balls, theaters 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 war and during peace and to learn them from other women. But, still they should stay away from men stranger 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 stranger men's being away from one another as a duty are attached to the country with a most sensitive vein.

Another pretext religion reformers use in defending 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 lustful presents which the shop distributes," they say. Whereas, Muslim customers do not go to such shops where immodestly dressed women are present and where alcoholic drinks are sold. The earnings that come through haram means are wicked and without Allahu ta'ala's blessing. Their consequence will be harmful both in this and the next worlds.

It is haram and a great sin for women and girls to exhibit themselves undressed to stranger men and for men to look at them. It does not become a Muslim to earn worldly property by means of haram. goods earned in such a way are useless and without Allahu ta'ala's blessing. He who slights he haram becomes a kafir.

If a person claims to be a Muslim, his actions have to be in conformity with the Shariat. If he does not know how he should behave, he has to learn by asking a scholar in the Madhhab of Ahl as-sunnat, or by reading books written by scholars belonging to this Madhhab. If what he has done runs counter to the Shariat'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 the namaz and always, 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) ijma', i.e. in all the four Madhhabs, or that one should not look at those parts of other people's bodies; in other 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 Hanbali Madhhab. 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 ijma', i.e. in agreement by all the four Madhhabs. 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 Madhhabs. The same rule applies to women's exposing their awrat parts, singing, or reciting aloud the (eulogy that praises our Prophet 'sall-Allahu '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 ijma', i.e. which he, or she, does not have to cover according to (at least) one of the remaining three Madhhabs, 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 fard 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 hadiths are quoted from the book Zawajir [Egypt, 1356 A.H. (1937)] by Shafi'i scholar Hadrat Ibn Hajar al-Makki [889-974 A.H. (1494-1567)].

"Do not show your thigh, nor look at the thigh of a person dead or alive."

"Allahu ta'ala will severely punish the one who shows the private parts of one's body to others."

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

"It is a big sin to uncover one's private parts."

"Three kinds of people will never go to Paradise. The first one is the dayyuth, 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 kinds of people who will go to Hell: the first ones are those who carry whips or truncheons and beat people unjustly. The second ones 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."

Abu Dawud reported Hadrat 'Aisha (radi-Allahu 'anha) as saying that her sister Asma' came near Rasulullah (sall-Allahu 'alaihi wa sallam). She had a thin dress on her. The color of her skin was visible. Rasulullah ('alaihi 's-salam) did not look at his sister-in-law. He turned his blessed face away and said, "O Asma! When a girl arrives the age of performing salat, she should not show men her parts other than her face and hands." It is understood from this hadith that it is a big sin for women to go immodestly dressed near men. Imam az-Zahabi says that Allahu ta'ala will punish in this and the next worlds those women who show men their ornaments, e.g. gold, pearls over their outer dress, who use perfumes or are dressed in multi-colored, silk tissue, with broad cuffs which show their arms outside and show themselves to men in this manner. Because these evils exist mostly in women, Rasulullah ('alaihi 's-salam) said, "On the Night of Miraj, I saw Hell. I saw that the majority of those in Hell were women."

"He who believes in Allahu ta'ala and in the Last Day should enter the public bath wrapping himself with a large bath-wrapper. He who believes in Allahu ta'ala 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 'hammam' there. Men shall enter the hammam covered with a large bath-wrapper and send their wives there only for a bath-cure or for getting clean from haid and nifas!"

"The person who believes in Allahu ta'ala and in the Last Day should not stay with a stranger woman in a room!"

"Towards the end of this world, it will become haram for the men of my umma to go to hammams; for there will be people whose private parts are uncovered there. May Allahu ta'ala damn him who uncovers his private parts and him who looks at another's private parts!"

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

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

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

"Allahu ta'ala's punishment becomes just to those who are in a country where adultery and riba have spread."

Rasulullah (sall-Allahu 'alaihi wa sallam) asked as-Sahabat al-kiram (radi-Allahu 'anhum),

"How do you consider adultery?" They said, "O Rasul-Allah! Allahu ta'ala and His Messenger have forbidden adultery. It will be forbidden until the Resurrection." 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 stranger women."

"Paradise is haram for the dayyuth," Dayyuth (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 stranger woman voluptuously 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 big sin to commit fornication. It is a bigger sin to commit adultery. The sin bigger than this is fornication or adultery committed with a mahram relative. It is a bigger sin for a widow to commit adultery than it is for a girl to commit fornication. It is a bigger sin for an old man to do it than it is for young people. It is a bigger 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 is because we do not want our fellow countrymen to get into trouble in this and the next worlds, and it stems from our feelings of goodness and service for them. In fact, it does not become a Muslim to know oneself 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 writing conformable to the Book and laws or, at least, pray for their liberation 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 haram to find fault with, to slander or backbite (ghiba) anybody, which is a more grave sin for us than their sins. Allahu ta'ala loves those who have patience, do goodness, give service to and advise others, and who have soft words and smiling face and do favors. He does not love those who admire themselves. We should do the good things Allahu ta'ala likes! We should be sweet-tempered. Harsh treatment and injuriousness 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 more grave sin. It does not befit a Muslim to sin. He obeys the State and laws. He does not break any law. He is an honorable person who wins everybody's love and regard.

The Hanafi alim Khair ad-din ar-Ramli wrote in the subject of "Nafaqa" in Al-fatawa' al-khayriyya: "It is wajib 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 salih. These neighbors help in

the woman's religious and worldly affairs and prevent the husband's oppression. The house should contain a kitchen, water-closet, 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 (alimony). 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 do not lend. The court finds the husband and has him pay the lender. Because the husband has committed a grave sin, he is also punished with tazir. If the wife, seeing her husband's escape and fearing that he will not give nafaqa, applies to the court demanding him to show a guarantor, the judge orders him to show 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 nisab and has to give zakat must give the nafaqa of the rich. If the woman proves with two witnesses that her husband has fled and has not left nafaqa, the Shafi'i judge abolishes the nikah. After the 'idda (length of time within which a woman may not remarry), she may marry another man according to the Hanafi madhhab. If, later, the husband comes and proves that he has left nafaqa, it is not acceptable. 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 "Nikah": "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 nikah is not sahih. She is to be believed if she says, 'I refused when I heard.' " The above passages show that the Muslim woman is not a toy in the hands of the man and that woman'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 Allahu ta'ala, who wants people to be happy in this and the next worlds, 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. Whereas, while Muslims marry up to four women, Europeans cohabit with many 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 thoughts incompatible with observation and reason. In fact, when we observe the reasons for the propagation of 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 word of theirs. 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 Ziya Gokalp, a very insidious, clever religion reformer working behind the curtain of Turkish nationalism vomited poison in his poem "Din ve Ilm" (The Religion and Knowledge):

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

So that the structure of family 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 the attacks the Qur'an and salat in his other writings so in this poem of his he attempts to blemish Islam under the curtain 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 Allahu ta'ala has made! A cock directs eight to ten hens. But two cocks cannot stay together in a flock of hens. 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 is not present in every respect. Woman can influence 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 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 labors have not rendered them dominant or ruling. It has been declared in the Qur'an that men are superior to women. Allahu ta'ala 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.

Besides, 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 Turkiye of Rajab al-fard 3, 1393 (August 2, 1973) Thursday issue says:

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

"Statistics show that the women population is 2 million more than the men 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 unequilibrium will go further because of more increase in the women 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, begins to speak earlier and, up to a certain age, develops 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 dangerous. 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), Hurriyet, a daily published in Istanbul, reports: "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 an always changeable situation. 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 low persons 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 deception. It cannot be thought of for man who 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 towards 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 stays 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 customers are women and prostitutes are men.

The bashfulness of women provides them with greater patience and determination. It prevents them from rushing into many heavy jobs. If we put aside the communists, who do not appreciate the value of both woman and man so much as an animal and their servants who, to deceive Muslims, name their states 'socialist Islamic republic', the nations which are in the hardest situation today do not send women to the battlefield by arming them. When men decrease, they employ women in supply service behind the front and in slight 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 jihad against the enemy is compared to women's struggling with their nafs in the Hadith:

"Allahu ta'ala imposed jealousy on women and jihad on men. The woman who believes and endures this task will be rewarded in the next world as much as a martyred fighter for Islam." This hadith 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 jihad. It is correct to hold jihad equivalent to ta'addud az-zawjat, because the latter causes the population to increase and war causes it to decrease. In the magazine Bayan al-haqq, Mustafa Sabri Effendi (rahmat-Allahi 'alaih) explained this equivalence in detail.

Islam does not command ta'addud az-zawjat but it permits it. Though it is not a sin 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 unjustify 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 look for a sinful way in order to meet the need of ta'addud az-zawjat. While there is no one who attempts to use this permission today, religion reformers talk fault-findingly on it as the disunionists reproduce the combats between 'Ali and Muawiya (radi-Allahu 'anhuma) that took place fourteen centuries ago -the 'fait accompli' which have been evaluated well by Islamic scholars- and thus calumniate the Prophet's companions (radi-Allahu 'anhum). Such out-of-place and out-of-time discussions avail nothing but sow discord among Muslims and motivate the enemies of Islam. Ta'addud az-zawjat is not a command but a permission. It is written in the Turkish book Nimat-i Islam that it is even not a mustahab but a mubah. It is fard to believe in that it is not permissible to speak ill of this permission of Allahu ta'ala. It is kufr to deny or dislike this permission, which is clearly declared in the Qur'an. Let us also add the fact that the husband who, because the laws forbid it and he regards the feelings of his wife, prefers to live only with her will be rewarded in the next world for having done without ta'addud az-zawjat. 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 be prohibited, they would immediately change their opinion; such words as, "Since ta'addud az-zawjat is unnatural, it has not remained among Muslims," would not be uttered any more and ta'addud az-zawjat would spread by itself.

As if marrying more than one could not settle because of its unsuitability and 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-zawjat with illegitimacy. For this reason, by tearing the curtains between man and woman, they play with women's modesty and honor. 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 means the crushing of women's rights. One man's having one wife is the equal, just distribution of human rights. Ta'addud az-zawjad spoils this equality and justice," the following points also will be helpful:

It is obvious that in countries where there is not ta'addud az-zawjat, 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 clamors 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 less than men, ta'addud az-zawjat 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, shall he be in the legitimate way or in the illegitimate way. Here is all the difference between the views of religion reformers and Muslims. It is 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 onto Islam. It is impossible to attain salvation without being Muslim.

Many people argue saying, "While nikah 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 point in Radd al-mukhtar.

Should not a man marry another woman esteeming the feelings of his first wife and, being deceived by his sexual desires, shall he satisfy his desires in other places. Shall he injure his own chastity and honesty and spoil the chastity and honesty of another woman? Shall he sin as much as he wants and deserve the punishments stated in the above-quoted hadiths? Shall evil feelings arise in his wife when she finds out these illegitimate, evil deeds of her husband? Shall her chastity be injured, though 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 behaviors, and the health that is risked to venereal diseases, it will be easier to decide correctly and reasonably. Syphilis and gonorrhea spread through illegitimate intercourse and threaten the whole world. See the Divine Wisdom! Allahu ta'ala has sent the worst, the most dangerous diseases in the actions outside Islam. The affected children are not just the children that have not been born; Islam's subtle command rajm (stoning to death) against adultery is the punishment ordered by Islam to prevent the birth of the child that would be born out of adultery as a degenerate bastard and would have no honor 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-zawjat, 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 Allahu ta'ala, 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 next world. They will help municipality. Opposing the laws or the government gives way to their own sex, to find a husband. If women be brought up with such a sacred, religious education, the uses of which are obvious, the harm of ta'addud az-zawjat, which is only to feelings 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 even if it will rescue the individual, the family and the whole 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?

In the time of the Union Party, Mansuri Zada Said, the deputy of Manisa, offered the National Assembly to pass a law to prohibit ta'addud az-zawjat. The majority of deputies said it was impossible. The law was not passed. As for the question what should Muslims do in a country where there is such a law, Muslims do not oppose 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 nikah and registration at the municipality. Opposing the laws and the government gives way to punishment, trouble and fitna (Muslims' disunion), which is not permissible. It is declared in the Hadith, "Fitna is asleep. May Allahu ta'ala damn him who wakes it." May Allahu ta'ala protect Muslims against fitna and calamities! Amin.

In the Ottoman Empire, marriage contracts were registered at municipalities or marriage offices, where marriage licences were obtained, and canonical betrothal (nikah) was performed according to its provisions by a pious Muslim who knew the religious knowledge of his madhhab correctly and performed salat regularly. The quantity of gold money which is called mahr-i muajjal or mahr-i muajjal and upon which the couple agreed was recorded in the licence while the nikah was made. Mahr-i muajjal was paid by the man to the woman before the wedding. Mahr-i muajjal 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, a cut of that amount in his salary was paid to her or he was imprisoned. Because of the fear of such a high recompensation, of misery of becoming 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 karama inherent in betrothal. He was an honorable person among his circle and acquaintances and was given high esteem and credit by everybody.

4-Mawdudi's (Maududi) characterization of Imam al Ghazali as a reformer and its answer

42 - Abul A'ala Mawdudi, one of the religion reformers of the present time, introduces Imam al-Ghazali as a reformer in his book *The Revivalist Movement in Islam*. He writes:

"Imam al-Ghazali 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 ijtihaad, 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 Hadith, 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-Sunnat scholars. He calls these imaginary defects "dangerous attitude". He extravagantly goes on:

"Ibn Taymiyya removed these dangers, revived Islam's spirit of idea and morals and accomplished the explorations of renewal. A little before him, no one had dared to invite the people to Islam out of the fear of being calumniated; the narrow-minded scholars had cooperated with the cruel rulers, and it was his lot to unfurl the flag of renewal against them. He was profound in interpretation of the Qur'an and a leader in the Hadith and he took Islam from where al-Ghazali had left it forward. He defended Islamic faith and found more beautiful proofs for Islamic spirit than al-Ghazali had. Al-Ghazali's judgement had remained under the harmful influence of rational thoughts. Ibn Taymiyya was more effective and chose the way of reason, which was closer to spirit of the Qur'an and Sunnat. Thus, he won a wonderful success. Men of knowledge did not know the interpretation of the Qur'an. Those who were educated scholastically were not able to establish the connection between themselves and the Qur'an and Hadith. It has been only Ibn Taymiyya's lot to accomplish the real explanation of Islam. He made ijthahs by deriving his inspiration directly from the Holy Book, from the Sunnat, and from the way of living of the Prophet's companions. Ibn al-Qayyim, his disciple, studied over the divine causes, the meanings of which had not been solved, and put Islamic rules. By clearing out the evil effects that had leaked into 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-Sunnat scholars. They have corrected heresies, wrong deeds and superstitions that have been introduced among Muslims by ignorant people and by the enemies of Islam. They have revealed the true knowledge transmitted by the Ahl as-Sunnat mujtahids as they had heard it from as-Sahabat al-kiram. They did not say anything from themselves. They are called "mujaddidin" (renewers). The Prophet ('alaihi 's-salam) 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." Mujaddidin were praised in this hadith: "The scholars of my umma are like the prophets among the Children of Israil." The absolute mujtahids such as al-Imam al-azam (the Greatest Leader) Abu Hanifa, al-Imam ash-Shafi'i and the like, who were madhhab leaders, al-Imam ar-Rabbani Ahmad al-Faruqi as-Sirhindi, the 'ulama' who were attached to the madhhabs in each century and Hadrat al-Mahdi, who will come in the future, are of these mujaddidin. 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 hadith. The ignorant believe one of them and call him a mujaddid. Whereas, Rasulullah (sall-Allahu 'alaihi wa salam) explained the characteristics of mujaddidin. He said that they all would be in the path of as-Sahabat al-kiram (radi-Allahu anhum). And those who are in this path are the Ahl as-Sunnat scholars. These mujaddidin, who were predicted in the Hadith, have been the great scholars of the Ahl as-Sunnat, the apples of Muslims' eyes. They did not say anything from their own mind or opinions, nor did they give ayats and hadiths meanings according to their own ideas and understanding. They have tried to spread and emphasize the meanings given by

the scholars of tafsir and hadith. How could Mawdudi ever say "ignorant" about these profound scholars whom Rasulullah (sal-Allahu 'alaihi wa sallam) praised?

In the basic books of Islam, there is no mawdu' hadith 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 are written in these books but have been forgotten later, to explain and teach them to everybody. Such an exalted scholar of Islam is called a "mujaddid" rather than a "reformer".

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

Our Prophet ('alaihi 's-salam) predicted also that they would appear. The Hadith ash-Sharif 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 its iman." [This hadith is reported in many valuable books. For example, it is written on the first page of the translation of Al-milal wan-nihal that it exists in the four books of Sunan and that it is explained more detailedly in at-Tirmidhi's book. It is also written in the Sahihain of al-Bukhari and Muslim. Furthermore, it is written on the 609th page of Sharh al-Mawaqif, which is one of the greatest kalam books taught in high grades of madrasas, and in the 67th letter in the second volume of Maktubat by al-Imam ar-Rabbani. The ahl al-bida and disbelievers deny this hadith.]

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 ayats and hadiths. They strive to demolish Islam from 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 in them. Thus such reformers are very successful. In order to deceive Muslims, they praise a few Ahl as-Sunnat scholars and write that they admire them, yet they dislike most of the teachings written in their books and call them superstitions. Of the hadiths written in these great scholars' invaluable books, they say "mawdu', made-up" about the ones which do not suit their purposes and which hinder their advantages. They force the heretical, harmful things they themselves make up to be accepted as true. Thus, they try to blemish these great scholars. Another group of them constantly speaks ill of, or even attribute disbelief to, one or two of the Ahl as-Sunnat scholars.

From the term 'religion reformers', we Muslims understand the la-madhabbi (non-madhabite, non-Sunni) people, that is, members of the second and third groups. The group which is declared in the above-quoted hadith to possess the true faith and will not go to Hell for this reason is called the "Ahl as-Sunnat wal-Jamaat". This hadith shows that a person is either a Muslim or a disbeliever. And a Muslim is either a Sunni or a heretic. Then a person who does not belong to the Ahl as-Sunnat is either a heretic or a disbeliever.

Today, Muslims should be very learned lest they should be deceived by these destructive religion reformers who 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 haram or even disbelief and, to exalt the reformist men of religious profession, who are their associates in the guilt. For example, Ali Pasha (d. in 1287/1871, buried in the Sulaimaniya Mosque yard), who because Grand Vizier five times during the times of Sultan 'Abd al-Majid and Sultan 'Abd al-'Aziz, was a freemason. He brought Jamal ad-din al-Afghani, a religion reformer hostile to Islam, to Istanbul, and in co-operating with him he began to reform the religion. But the Ahl as-Sunnat scholars were vigilant enough not to leave the field to them. They proved Jamal ad-din's disgrace, and Ali Pasha could not support him.

Jamal ad-din al-Afghani 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 Russians upon Afghanistan and received much money from the Russians. In 1285, he came to Egypt and became a freemason. Ali 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-Islam, had him give lectures that year. But, when he spoke recklessly, the great scholar Hasan Fahmi, the Shaikh al-Islam, gave the fatwa that he was a disbeliever. Hasan Fehmi Effendi was one of the profound scholars of his time and the hundred and tenth Shaikh al-Islam of the Ottoman Empire. He had won the first place in the examination of ru'us. He became a mudarris, that is, a professor of religious knowledge at the university. He educated many disciples. Having been promoted through many positions, he became the Shaikh al-Islam. When Sultan 'Aziz went to Egypt, he prepared the khutba delivered at the Juma prayers. He kept long company with Hadrat Shaikh Saka, the famous scholar at Jami' al-Azhar. The Egyptian scholars appreciated his knowledge. Because of this same scholar's righteous opposition, Jamal ad-din was disgraced. Ali Pasha had to dismiss Jamal ad-din from Istanbul. It is written in the book Ad-durar by Adib Ishaq of Egypt that Jamal ad-din was the chief of the freemasonic lodge in Egypt. He inoculated Egyptians with ideas of revolution. In order to increase his fame, he pretended to side with those who prepared the event of "A'Rabi Pasha" against the British. He made friends with Muhammad 'Abduh, the Mufti of Egypt. He inoculated him with his reformatory thoughts. Muhammad 'Abduh wrote: "Before I saw Jamal ad-din my eyes had been blind, my ears deaf and my tongue dumb." In London and in Paris, Jamal ad-din 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 cavalymen. He went to Baghdad and London. He wrote articles against Iran. Thence he came to Istanbul, where, co-operating with the Bahais he made the religion a means for politics. He tried to stir up a rebellion 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 Macka 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-Islam and Muslim scholars just in order to show him great.

Great Muslim scholar Hadrat Sayyid Abdulhakim Arwasi (d. in 1362/1943) said, "It was Ibn Taymiyya 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 Taymiyya was born in Harran in 661/1263 and died of disease in prison in a fortress in Damascus in 728/1328. He did not like the Ahl as-Sunnat scholars. He denied tasawwuf entirely. He called the apples of the eyes of Islam such as Muhyiddin ibn al-'Arabi and Sadr ad-din al-Qonawi "disbelievers". Whereas, he was not

too ignorant not to know that he who called a Muslim "disbeliever" would himself become a disbeliever. It is a pity 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-Wahhab ash-Sharani (rahmat-Allahi 'alaih), one of the leading 'ulama' of Islam and a specialist in 'ilm at-tasawwuf, exposed Ibn Taymiyya's this deplorable state in this Tabaqat al-kubra, in the preface of which he wrote: "Only walis can recognize a wali. If one who is not a wali or does not know anything about wilaya does not believe in wilaya, this indicates his obstinacy and ignorance. Now, as such is Ibn Taymiyya's denial of tasawwuf, his belittling 'arifs. One should not read such people's books, keeping away from them as if running away from beasts of prey. Abu 'l-Hasan ash-Shadhili, one of the superiors in tasawwuf, reported the state of those who had denied awliya' in detail." Therefore, Ibn Taymiyya's followers bear hostility against Hadrat 'Abd al-Wahhab ash-Sharani and have aimed their arrows of slander at this great scholar of Islam.

Ibn Taymiyya said that the early Muslims had adapted themselves to the Qur'an and Hadith, but the madhhab leaders who had appeared later had introduced their own opinions, and he blamed the Ahl as-Sunnat. Whereas, as written in the seventeenth article above, the Ahl as-Sunnat scholars, in regard to religious knowledge, have never departed from the way of narration (naql). They have not followed their own points of view. It is accepted unanimously by Muslim scholars that especially al-Imam al-azam Abu Hanifa (rahmat-Allahi 'alaih) followed the narration in every respect and held his own point of view inferior to it. [For documented explanation, see the 27th chapter in Endless Bliss I.] While slandering the Ahl as-Sunnat scholars in this respect, Ibn Taymiyya himself interpreted the Qur'an 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-Sunnat scholars had misunderstood the Qur'an and Hadith and that even the Sahabat al-kiram had gone wrong on many points, that he himself corrected Allahu ta'ala's religion and that only he understood the true meaning of the Qur'an. He disliked the great mujtahid of the first and second centuries of the Hegira, who had been praised in the Hadith, and the Muslim scholars who have spread the mujtahids' madhhabs all over the world. Because of this, he began to fall into disesteem in front of the men of knowledge. The authorities of religion co-operated and began to observe minutely the way he had taken, and it was understood to be heretical and harmful. The chair of professorship that he had inherited from his father was taken back from him. But still he did not keep quiet. He reproduced the words of the heretical group called "Mushabbiha" and said that Allahu ta'ala was material and an object. He supposed that the Creator was in the shape of man. By giving wrong meanings to symbolic (mutashabih) ayats and hadiths 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, "Allahu ta'ala descends on the earth from the sky as I descend now," and got down from the pulpit. Ibn Battuta reported this. The 'ulama' of the four madhhabs, by writings answers refuting these words of Ibn Taymiyya, prevented the deterioration of Muslims' itiqad. The book Ar-raddu 'ala 'l-mushabbihi fi qawlihi ta'ala ar-Rahmanu 'ala 'l-Arsh-istawa by Muhammad ibn Jamaat, who was a Shafi'i scholar of fiqh and hadith and had been the Qadi Of Egypt, Damascus and Quds and passed away in 733 (1333), is full of these invaluable answers. In the fatwa book Tatarhaniyya and in Al-milal wa 'n-nihal and in many other books, it is written that the groups of Mujassima and Mushabbiha, that is those who believe Allahu ta'ala to be a material being who sits, gets down and walks on the 'Arsh, were disbelievers. In 705 A.H. scholars and officials, justifying Egyptian Sultan Nasir's decision, imprisoned Ibn Taymiyya in the well of Cairo fortress because he spread such heretical words. Because he gave wrong fatwas which the Ahl as-Sunnat 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 got sick in the dungeon and died.

Ibn Taymiyya said that he was in the Hanbali madhhab. Whereas, one has to believe in accord with the Ahl as-Sunnat so that he can be in one of the four right madhhabs. Many words of his indicate that he did not belong to the Ahl as-Sunnat and, on the contrary, he disliked the Ahl as-Sunnat. He represented himself as a mujaddid, as a reformer. Hanbali scholar Mar'i (d. 1033 A.H.) wrote a biography of Ibn Taymiyya titled Kawakib, in which he quoted Ibn Taymiyya's writings that did not recognize the necessity of following the imams of madhhabs and even the ijma'. Though he attacked the Ahl as-Sunnat scholars because they had done qiyas, he himself did qiyas on many points, especially in his book Majmuat ar-rasa'il wal-masa'il. He did not believe in the greatness of awliya' and attacked visiting graves. He changed the hadith, "One shall set off on a long journey only for visiting three mosques," into "Only three mosques are to be visited," and said that it was a sin to visit even Rasulallah's (sall-Allahu 'alaihi wa sallam) tomb. Hadrat Ibn Hajar al-Haitami answered this in detail in his book Fatawa al-fiqhiyya. In the 222nd article of the book Nuzhat al-hawatir by 'Allama 'Abd al-Hayy al-Hasani (d. 1341/1923), it is written that Muslim scholar Muhammad 'Abd al-Hayy al-Luknawi of India (d. 1304/1887) debated upon this subject with Muhammad Bashir, a la-madhhabite Indian. Ibn Taymiyya was aggressive against the madhhab of Hadrat Abu 'l-Hasan al-Ashari, one of the greatest Ahl as-Sunnat scholars, and against this profound scholar's explanation of qadar and of the Names of Allahu ta'ala and against his interpretation of the ayats 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 be accepted as zakat. He did not admit that the words incompatible with what the four madhhabs had unanimously declared were of disbelief. He strived to rebut the honor and fame of the Ahl as-Sunnat scholars. In al-Jabal mosque in Salihhiyya, he said that Hadrat 'Umar (radi-Allahu 'anh) had made many mistakes. In another gathering, he said that Hadrat 'Ali (radi-Allahu 'anh) went wrong three hundred times. A hadith, which is written in the book Kunuz by al-Manawi, in Imam Ahmad's Sahih and in the book Mirat al-ka'inat, states: "Allahu ta'ala has put the true word on 'Umar's tongue," by which Rasulallah ('alaihi 's-salam) meant that Hadrat 'Umar (radi-Allahu 'anh) would never go wrong. Ibn Taymiyya opposes this hadith by saying, " 'Umar made many mistakes," Whereas, he was learned enough to know of this hadith. He was much learned on the Hadith, but he went wrong as much. It was true that many of the Sahabat al-kiram except 'Umar (radi-Allahu 'anh) might have made mistakes in those matters that were to be understood through ijtihaad. But their mistakes were the mistakes in ijtihaad. For this reason, even the mistakes of those great people and also of the Ahl as-Sunnat scholars in those matters understandable through ijtihaad will be rewarded (thawab) in the next world, since all of them were mujtahids. As for Ibn Taymiyya's mistake in the teachings pertaining to belief, it took him away from the right path and caused the punishment he deserved to increase. 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-din al-Qonawi, Muhyiddin ibn al-'Arabi and 'Umar ibn al-Farid. He said that al-Ghazali's books were full of mawdu' hadiths, and he did not neglect to criticize our scholars of qalam. He could not understand that the madhhabs arose out of the differences of ijtihaad and supposed that they were the results of philosophical thoughts. He considered it as a guilt that the Ahl as-Sunnat scholars

had said that the old churches in Muslim countries should not be touched, and for this reason, he spoke ill of the great men of Islam.

Mawdudi, like Ibn Taymiyya, misrepresents Imam al-Ghazali as defective. Great scholar Ibn Hajar al-Makki, in commenting on the causes of disbelief, wrote that the person who would claim to have found fault with Imam al-Ghazali's writings either envied him or was an atheist. [Al-alam bi kawati al-Islam, p.137, with references to Ibn as-Subki and other scholars.] Hanafi scholar Ibn 'Abidin wrote at the end of his Al-'uqud Durriyya, "One who says that Imam al-Ghazali was not an alim is the most ignorant among the ignorant and the worst of fasiqs. He was Hujjat al-Islam and the most superior of the scholars of his time. He wrote very valuable books on fiqh. Some rules of the Shafi'i madhhab was based on his books."

Some Muslim scholars have declared that Ibn Taymiyya departed from Islam and became a renegade. Profoundly learned scholars such as Ibn Battuta, Ibn Hajar al-Makki, Taqi ad-din as-Subki and his son, 'Abd al-Wahhab, 'Izz ad-din Ibn Jamaat and Abu Hayyan az-Zahiri al-Andulusee, each of whose words have been regarded as documentary evidence, considered him a man of bidat, a heretic. Even those who said he was a heretic did not deny his knowledge, intelligence and zuhd, but, a hadith written in Mishkat states, "The worst of the bad is the bad man of religion." Hadrat al-Imam ar-Rabbani Ahmad al-Faruqi wrote in his fifty-third letter:

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

Imam as-Subki, too, used to praise Ibn Taymiyya's knowledge and intelligence much. Burhan ad-din ibn Muflih wrote in his Tabaqat that Imam as-Subki praised Ibn Taymiyya much in the letter he had written to az-Zahabi. But, Imam as-Subki, in his work Ar-raddu li Ibn Taymiyya, and his son 'Abd al-Wahhab, in his Tabaqat, wrote that Ibn Taymiyya departed from the Ahl as-Sunnat and went astray. Many persons whom he inoculated with his ideas, especially his disciples Ibn al-Qayyim and az-Zahabi, praised him too much. 'Ali al-Qari ' and Mahmud Alusi, who are considered as religious scholars because of their annotations for famous books and who lived on writing on the Qur'an and valuable books, and Muhammad 'Abduh, who claimed to be a mujtahid, followed in his footsteps and departed from the Ahl as-Sunnat. Yusuf an-Nabhani, one of the profound scholars of the present century, in his book Shawahid al-haqq, and Shaikh al-Islam Mustafa Sabri Effendi, one of the great Ottoman scholars, in his book Al-'ilm wal-'aql, and Abu Hamid ibn Marzuk, a Damascene scholar, in his two-volume work, which was partly published by offset under the title At-tawassulu bi 'n-Nabi wa Jahalat al-Wahhabiyyin in Istanbul in 1395 A.H. (1975), proved Ibn Taymiyya's heresy with documents.

Those who approve Ibn Taymiyya, in order to prove his being judged and imprisoned unjustly, write: "His writings against the men of tasawwuf offended them. His fatwas about divorce made the scholars of fiqh feel hostile towards him. And his fatwas about the Divine Attributes hurt the scholars of kalam. Therefore, the scholars of kalam, 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. Whereas, Ibn Taymiyya rose in rebellion against the Ahl as-Sunnat. He spread the fire of fitna over the Muslim world. For example, when Abu Hayyan, a scholar of Arabic, came to Cairo in 700 A.H., Ibn Taymiyya said to him, "Who is Sibawaih that you call him a scholar of Arabic! There are exactly eighty mistakes, which you cannot distinguish, in his book."

Hearing these words which would not become a man of knowledge, Abu Hayyan preferred to keep away from him and censured him in his Qur'an commentary Al-bahr and also in its abridgement titled Nahr.

Ibn Hajar al-Askalani quotes az-Zahabi in his book Durar al-kamina, "When talking on knowledge, Ibn Taymiyya used to get angry, try to defeat the person whom he talked to and offend everybody." Imam as-Suyuti wrote in his book Kam' al-mu'arid, "Ibn Taymiyya was arrogant. He was self-conceited. It was habit to represent himself as superior to everybody, to slight the person whom he talked to and to make fun of great Muslims." Muhammad 'Ali Beg, a Damascene scholar, wrote in his book Hittat ash-Sham, "Ibn Taymiyya's and Priest Luther's aims were alike. While the Christian reformer was successful, the reformer of Islam was unsuccessful." Mawlana Muhammad Ziyaullah, one of the prominent 'ulama' of Pakistan and the imam and Khatib of the city of Siyalkut, wrote in the 93rd page of his work The Truth of Wahhabism (Published in Urdu in 1969): "Mawlawi 'Abd al-Hayy Luknawi (d. 1304 A.H.), the great alim of India and the author of hundreds of invaluable books known by the world, said in his book Ghais al-ghamam, 'Like the predecessor Ibn Taymiyyat al-Hurrani, the successor ash-Shawqani was very learned but less intelligent. The latter was exactly like, even more inferior than the former.' "

Goldziher writes that Ibn Taymiyya deemed the right madhhabs to be bidat' and, saying that they changed the early purity of Islam, attacked them and also opposed the Ashari madhhab and tasawwuf and announced visiting the graves of prophets and awliya' to be a sinful act.

Mustafa 'Abd ar-Razzaq Pasha, former Rector of the Jami' al-Azhar and student-follower of Muhammad 'Abduh, wrote: "When issuing fatwa, Ibn Taymiyya did not follow any madhhab, but he acted in accordance with the proof he himself found. He denied the kashfs of tasawwuf leaders."

Ibn Taymiyya wrote about Sadr ad-din al-Qonawi: "Sadr ad-din, a friend to Muhyiddin ibn al-'Arabi, surpassed his master in scientific knowledge and kalam, yet he was more disbelieving, less learned and had less iman than his master had. Since such people's faith was disbelief, more skillful of them were more excessive in disbelief." Some Islamic scholars said that Ibn Taymiyya was a disbeliever, and most others said that he was one of ahl al-bidat. Shaikh al-Makki, a scholar contemporary with Yavuz Sultan Salim Khan, answered the attacks against Hadrat Muhyiddin ibn al-'Arabi and wrote: "Ibn Taymiyya said that disbelievers would get out of Hell after burning there for many years and supported this claim with the hadith, 'Some day the doors of Hell will open and grass will grow on its ground.' He also quoted some other hadiths. Whereas, it is clearly stated in the Qur'an that disbelievers will remain in Hell eternally. There has been tawatur and ijma' on this fact. Most scholars said that Ibn Taymiyya opposed the tawatur and ijma." [Al-janab al-gharbi, Rashid Effendi section, Sulaimaniyya Library.]

'Abd al-Wahhab ash-Sharani wrote: "Those who say that all the inhabitants of Hell will go out and that Hell will become empty, in fact, oppose the Qur'an and Hadith. The Ahl as-Sunnat scholars, the just imams, unanimously said that the punishment in Hell would be eternal for disbelievers. The ayat, '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 a lot of 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 shafa'a and only their place will become empty and grass will grow on the ground of the first division of Hell. Imam al-Qurtubi writes that the above hadith is mawkuf, that it was not reported to have been heard from Rasulullah ('alaihi 's-salam). Hadrat Muhyiddin ibn al-'Arabi, 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." [Mukhtasaru tadhkirat al-Qurtubi, p.96.] Ibn Taymiyya, putting forth the hadiths telling that believers will go out of Hell, denied the ayats, tawatur and ijma'. Calling the Ahl as-Sunnat scholars "disbelievers" causes one to become a disbeliever. It is written in the subject on the Qadi of the book Radd al-mukhtar that it is disbelief to deny the hadiths which were not interpreted differently by the Salaf as-Salihin and which are of tawatur. Maliki scholar Muhammad ibn 'Abdullah of Tanja, who is famed with the name Ibn Battuta, gave many quotations from Ibn Taymiyya that were incompatible with Islam and wrote: "Ibn Taymiyya had much knowledge. But there was something wrong with his mind... I was in Damascus. In the Friday salat, he, after reciting the khutba, descended the stairs saying, 'Allahu ta'ala descends on the world's sky as I descend now.' Ibn Zahra, a Maliki scholar, told the congregation the badness of these words in detail. The ignorant majority of the congregation had believed Ibn Taymiyya to be on the right path and liked his pompous words much. Upon the Maliki scholar's word, they beat him with their hands and shoes. He fell down. His turban fell off and his silk skull-cap appeared. Under the pretext of this [Islam forbids man to wear silk clothes], they took him to the Hanbali Qadi. The Qadi punished him with tazir and imprisoned him. Maliki and Shafi'i scholars said that this tazir was unjust. The affair was taken to Nasir the Ruler. A council of scholars was appointed and they came to the conclusion that Ibn Taymiyya caused partition (fitna) among Muslims. With the command of the Sultan, he was imprisoned in Damascus." [Tuhfat an-muzzar, p.9. The author of this history work, Ibn Battuta, dictated it to his secretary, Ibn Jazi. It has been translated into many languages. The second translation into Turkish by Muhammad Sharif Beg was printed in Istanbul in 1335 A.H. (1917). The above-quoted passage is also quoted in Yusuf an-Nabhani's Jawahir al-bihar in the entry "Abd al-Ghani an-Nabulusi".] May Allahu ta'ala endow comprehension and guidance to the right path upon those who believe in the inferiority of our madhhab leaders to him, whose heresy was understood and who was punished by the scholars of his time and by all Muslims! May He protect Muslim children against believing heretics! Amin.

Hadrat Ibn Hajar al-Makki wrote: "One of Ibn Taymiyya's superstitious absurdities was his denial of tawassul or istighatha, putting Rasulullah (sall-Allahu 'alaihi wa sallam) as an intermediary when praying to Allahu ta'ala. No scholar before him had ever said so. Because of this absurd idea of his, he became the subject of Muslims' conversations. The opposite of his fatwa is the truth. It is always good to put Rasulullah (sall-Allahu 'alaihi wa sallam) as an intermediary. He could be put as an intermediary before and after he was born, and in this world as well 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 awliya' of their ummas had done so. Ibn Taymiyya's slanderous word was not based on any fact or rule. A hadith reported by Hakim an-Nishapuri, a hadith scholar, declares that, 'When Adam ('alaihi 's-salam) was mistaken, he said, 'O my Rabb! Forgive me for the right of Muhammad ('alaihi 's-salam).' Allahu ta'ala said, 'I have not created Muhammad ('alaihi 's-salam) 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, "La ilaha ill Allah Muhammadun Rasul Allah," all around the 'Arsh. I understood that Thou had put the name of him whom Thou loved most among Thine human creatures next to Thine Name.' And Allahu ta'ala declared, 'O Adam! You have said the truth. Among Mine human creatures, he is the one whom I love most. Since you asked my pardon for his right, I have forgiven you immediately. If it were not for Muhammad ('alaihi 's-salam) I would not have created you.' Muhammad's ('alaihi 's-salam) right' means 'Allahu ta'ala's loving and cherishing him very much' or 'his rights upon

other human creatures' or 'his right which Allahu ta'ala, as a blessing upon him, recognizes upon Himself'. Likewise, it was said in a hadith, 'What is human creatures' right upon Allahu ta'ala?' In this context, 'right' does not denote something that must be done by Allahu ta'ala, for Allahu ta'ala does not have to do anything. He does it if He wills. Asking something from Allahu ta'ala for Rasulullah's ('alaihi 's-salam) right cannot be said to be polytheism since it is not asking it for him. Allahu ta'ala declares that He loves His Messenger ('alaihi 's-salam) very much and that He has endowed a high rank upon him. Allahu ta'ala is asked to give for the right, for the sake of his love and this high rank. One of the blessings, gifts which Allahu ta'ala has endowed 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. Rasulullah (sall-Allahu 'alaihi wa sallam) was put as an intercessor when he was alive, too. An-Nasai and at-Tirmidhi reported that a blind man came to Rasulullah ('alaihi 's-salam). He begged him to pray so that his eyes might open. Rasulullah ('alaihi 's-salam) 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,' Rasulullah ('alaihi 's-salam) 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-salam)! I turn towards my Rabb through thee. O my Allah! Make him an intercessor for me!" ' Also Imam al-Baihaki reported that the blind man stood up and, seeing, walked away. Rasulullah ('alaihi 's-salam) himself did not pray but taught him the prayer. He wanted him to turn towards Allahu ta'ala, to entreat Him and to put Rasulullah ('alaihi 's-salam) 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-Salihin, after his death, said this prayer very often and attained their purposes through it. As reported by at-Tabarani and al-Baihaki, a man whose request was not accepted by the Caliph 'Uthman (radi-Allahu 'anh) went to Hadrat 'Uthman ibn Hanif, a Sahabi, and asked his help. He taught him this prayer. When he approached the Caliph after saying the prayer, his request was accepted. In a hadith reported by at-Tabarani, Rasulullah ('alaihi 's-salam), when praying, said, 'For the right of Thine Prophet and Thine other prophets preceding him'. Tawajjuh, tawassul, istighatha and tashaffu' through him, through other prophets or awliya' all mean the same thing. Islam has also declared it permissible to put some kind of deed or 'ibada as an intermediary. The Hadith informs that, of old, some people who were imprisoned in a cave, entreated by mentioning their old deeds done only for the sake of Allahu ta'ala 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 good deeds, it is certain that the prayers sent through those who have performed the best deeds will be accepted. 'Umar ibn al-Khattab (radi-Allahu 'anh) prayed for rain by putting Hadrat 'Abbas (radi-Allahu 'anh) as an intermediary. None of us, Sahabat al-kiram objected to it. The reason why he did not pray through Rasulullah ('alaihi 's-salam) or through his blessed grave but through Hadrat 'Abbas was because he deemed himself very low and considered Rasulullah's ('alaihi 's-salam) relatives higher than himself. His praying through Hadrat 'Abbas, in actual fact, was praying through Rasulullah ('alaihi 's-salam). The words 'tawassul', 'tawajjuh' or 'istighatha' do not show that the one through whom is prayed is higher than the one to whom is prayed, because the one with a high status is made an intermediary in asking from the one with a higher status. 'Istighatha' means 'asking for help from somebody by putting someone else as an intermediary'. The former is higher than the intermediary. Muslims, when praying through Rasulullah ('alaihi 's-salam) or awliya', do not think otherwise. No other thing comes to their hearts when saying these words. Allahu ta'ala

alone is the One who is prayed to and is asked from; the Prophet is an intermediary, a mediator between. Only Allahu ta'ala helps by creating or making; the Prophet is the cause, the intermediary of the help. Allahu ta'ala is the Real Helper, and Rasulullah ('alaihi 's-salam) is the symbolic helper. A hadith reported by al-Bukhari declares, 'On the Day of Resurrection, they will pray first through Adam, then through Musa and then through Muhammad ('alahimu 's-salam).' 'Praying through Rasulullah' means 'asking him to pray'. He is alive in his grave and understands the demand of the person who asks from him. According to an authentic narration, there was dearth in the time of Amir al-Muminin 'Umar (radi-Allahu 'anh) and a Sahabi visited Rasulullah's ('alaihi 's-salam) grave and said, 'O Rasul-Allah! Pray for your umma so that it shall rain! Your umma are about to perish.' Rasulullah ('alaihi 's-salam) 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 greetings! Give him the good news that it will rain. Tell him to act mildly.' 'Umar (radi-Allahu 'anh) was severe and strict in carrying out the commands of the religion. The Sahabi told the Caliph about his dream. The Caliph listened and wept. According to some reports, this Sahabi was Bilal ibn Harith al-Muzani (radi-Allahu 'anh). Here, the point is not the dream but the Sahabi's praying through Rasulullah ('alaihi 's-salam) at his dream. As it is seen, Rasulullah ('alaihi 's-salam) 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 Day of Resurrection, he will intercede with Allahu ta'ala for his umma, and his intercession will be accepted. This fact has been reported as ijma' by Islamic scholars. Hadrat 'Abdullah ibn 'Abbas (radi-Allahu 'anhuma) reported the hadith saying that Allahu ta'ala declared to 'Isa ('alaihi 's-salam), 'O 'Isa! Believe in Muhammad ('alaihi 's-salam)! And command your umma that those of your umma who will live in his time believe in him! Had it not been for Muhammad ('alaihi 's-salam), I would not have created Prophet Adam ('alaihi 's-salam). Had it not been for Muhammad ('alaihi 's-salam), I would not have created Paradise and Hell. I created the 'Arsh on the water. It moved. When I wrote, "La ilaha ill Allah," on it, it stopped.' This hadith was reported with sahih references by Hakim. Would not a prayer be accepted, which is asked for the sake of such a prophet, who has such a high status and infinite honor, and who attained Allahu ta'ala's blessings? Would not a prayer sent by asking for his intercession be accepted?" [This passage is translated from Ibn Hajar al-Makki's Jawhar al-munzam. It is also quoted in Shawahid al-haqq.] The prayers which Nuh [This passage is translated from Ibn Hajar al-Makki's Jawhar al-munzam. It is also quoted in Shawahid al-haqq.], 'Ibrahim and other prophets had asked for the sake of Muhammad ('alahimu 's-salam) are written in tafsir books.

Imam as-Subki, as quoted Shawahid al-haqq, said, "There are two forms of tawassul of Rasulullah ('alaihi 's-salam); the first one is to ask from Allahu ta'ala for the sake of his high status and baraka. One of the terms 'tawassul', 'istighatha' and 'tashaffu' ' is used when praying so. All of them mean the same. He who prays by expressing one of these terms asks from Allahu ta'ala by putting Rasulullah ('alaihi 's-salam) as an intermediary. He asks from, prays to, Allahu ta'ala through him. In even 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 Rasulullah ('alaihi 's-salam) is to ask him to pray to Allahu ta'ala so that one may attain one's wish, for he is alive in his grave and understands what is asked from him and he can ask for it from Allahu ta'ala. Also in the next world, he will be asked to intercede, and he will intercede, and his intercession will be accepted."

Hadrat Shihab ad-din ar-Ramli, as quoted in the book *Shawahid al-haqq*, said, "Prophets and awliya' can be made intermediaries even after their death. The mujizat of prophets and the karamat of awliya' do not cease after their death. The hadith clearly declares that prophets are alive and perform salat and hajj in their graves. It is known also that martyrs are alive and they help warriors."

Muhammad ibn 'Abd al-Wahhab read Ibn Taymiyya'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.

5-Wahhabi's labeling of Ahl as-Sunna Muslims as polytheists and its answer

43 - Followers of Muhammad ibn 'Abd al-Wahhab, who died in 1206 (1762), are called the Najdis or Wahhabis. 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 awliya', ask for help from them and who respect shrines by performing vows, alms and other things, are polytheists. 'We expect their shafa'a. We render them intermediaries in order to approach Allahu ta'ala'; these words do not rescue them from polytheism. Polytheists of the time of Rasulallah also used to pray and beg Allah when they were in trouble. When they became safe, they used to pray angels, awliya' and idols. Likewise, today's polytheists beg such and such a chief Darwish 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 Rasul-Allah! Do shafa'a for me, come to my rescue,' are unbelievers, too."

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

The Ahl as-Sunnat scholars refuted him and declared that he was on a wrong path. Sulaiman ibn 'Abd al-Wahhab, Muhammad's brother, wrote a great book to refute him. The books *Fasl al-khitab* and *Kashf al-khijab* by 'Ali ibn Ahmad, a famous molla and a scholar of Basra well-known with the name al-Kabani, prove that he has deviated from the right path.

He had the book *Dalail al-khairat* put in fire because it contained such words as 'Sayyidina' and 'Mawlana'. Whereas, Sultan 'AbdulHamid Khan read this book every day. Ibn 'Abd al-Wahhab frequently said, "If I could, I would demolish the Prophet's shrine. I would throw away the golden gutter on the Kaba 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-Farid and Hadrat Muhyiddin ibn al-'Arabi were unbelievers. He made fun of the hadith, "The parting of my umma into madhhabs is [Allahu ta'ala's] compassion for them." He did not believe that the waqf (pious foundation) was Islamic and said that the salary the Qadis received was a bribe. Al-Kabani rebutted these one by one with documents.

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

According to the Ahl as-Sunnat scholars, it is sunnat to visit Rasulallah's ('alaihi 's-salam) shrine. Some even said it was wajib. Ibn 'Abidin wrote in the commentary of *Durr al-mukhtar*, "Before Ibn Taymiyya, no scholar had prohibited visiting tombs. He made up a new bidat. He fell into

disesteem in front of all Muslims." A hadith reported in the Sahih of Muslim declares, "I prohibited to visit graves before. From now on, visit them!" Najm ad-din 'Umar ibn al-Hajji, in his book *Al-jawab fi'r-raddi 'ala Ibn Taymiyya*, proved that it was permissible to visit tombs and refuted Ibn Taymiyya with sound evidences. Also Burhan ad-din Ibrahim ibn Muhammad wrote a beautiful book under the same title. [These two books exist in the Sulaimaniyya Library, in the "Beshir Aga" section with call number 142.]

Ibn 'Abd al-Wahhab said that what Ibn Taymiyya had forbidden was unbelief. He called "unbelievers" those who vow, pray, walk around or kiss the coverings of, take soil from shrines, and who ask for help from awliya'. He claimed that those who do not consider these as unbelief are unbelievers, too. In fact, he wrote, "It is halal to kill and confiscate those who make mediators of prophets or awliya' with a view to attain shafa'a or nearness to Allahu ta'ala," [Muhammad ibn Abd al-Wahhab, *Kashf ash-shubuhah*, also translated into Turkish.] and thus ordered murder and plunder of Muslims. Whereas, he who does not believe the well-known indispensable beliefs in the religion, e.g. the Oneness of Allahu ta'ala or the fact that it is fard to perform salat five times a day, will be an unbeliever. A Muslim who believes what are declared clearly cannot be called an unbeliever just because of a doubt. Ibn Taymiyya should have used the word 'shirk' (polytheism) for these to mean minor polytheism, but Ibn 'Abd al-Wahhab said it was polytheism equivalent to unbelief. It is apparent polytheism to worship idols. The occult polytheism (shirk khafi), however, to ask something from anyone besides Allahu ta'ala. Men cannot escape occult polytheism. Even prophets begged Allahu ta'ala in order to escape it. Following the nafs, sexual desires and hypocrisy are examples of this kind of polytheism, which removes the thawab of worship. But no scholar has said, "The hypocrite is an unbeliever. It is halal to kill and confiscate him."

Prostration (sajda) towards the sun, the moon, stars, idols or statues as a form of worshiping any of them is unbelief. It is not unbelief but a sin to prostrate before other things for reverence without a view of worshiping them. Though it is unbelief to sacrifice an animal for something whom one worships, it is not unbelief but haram for a worshiper of Allahu ta'ala to make a sacrifice for others without worshiping them. By 'worshiping' ('ibada) is meant the 'believing that every benefit and every harm come from, and everything is made by, and, therefore, begging, the one adored.' It was said that it was makruh for the worshipers of Allahu ta'ala to take soil from or to walk around shrines. The Wahhabite book, however, say polytheism for these and use the word 'unbelievers' for millions of Muslims of all ages. For the martyrs who fought against Musailamat al-Kadhdhab, as-Sahaba built graves about 27 inches above the ground so that everybody could recognize and recite the Fatiha for them. The heretics speak ill of as-Sahaba for this reason, too. They have demolished these graves. This shows that they are on al-Kadhdhab's way.

They said it was a bidat to build tombs over graves or minarets for mosques or to eat with spoons. They ruined Husain's (radi-Allahu 'anh) tomb in Karbala and plundered the invaluable things in it. They burned and ruined the city of Ta'if and killed the Ahl as-Sunnat Muslims including the women and children and plundered their possessions. The most valuable books such as the Sahihain of al-Bukhari and Muslim and thousands of books on hadith, fiqh and other fields, even the Qur'an, 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-salam), Abu Bakr, 'Umar (radi-Allahu 'anhuma) and Fatima (radi-Allahu anha) were born. They said it was polytheism for

muazzins to recite the salawat for the Prophet's soul. They forbade smoking and burned all the pipes, hookahs, cigarette-boxes and musical instruments in Mecca.

Showing the ayats, "Besides Allahu ta'ala, do not pray to anybody, who is neither useful nor harmful to you!" and "Do not pray to another person together with Allahu ta'ala!" and the hadith "Prayed is the essence of worship," they said that he who asked for something from someone besides Him would become an unbeliever. Whereas, the prayer prohibited in the ayat means the 'prayer that is performed as worship' in the Islamic knowledge. This prayer can be performed only to Allahu ta'ala. And, a person knowing that only Allahu ta'ala can be worshiped, 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 awliya' as intermediaries and asks help from their souls by thinking that they are the beloved human creatures of Allahu ta'ala 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 awliya' to help them in purifying their hearts and to give them faid and marifa, knowledge which has flowed from Rasulullah's ('alaihi 's-salam) 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.

Allahu ta'ala declares in the surat az-Zumar, "Those who worship beings other than Allahu ta'ala 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-bidat liken the Ahl as-Sunnat to idolatrous disbelievers and say that the words "In order to approach Allahu ta'ala, we put His beloved human creatures as intermediaries," will not rescue the Ahl as-Sunnat from polytheism. It is true that, since idolaters are polytheists, their pretext does not rescue them from the punishment of polytheism, but is not polytheism to put His beloved human creatures as intermediaries. Why should the Ahl as-Sunnat 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. 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 Allahu ta'ala.

Muslims cannot be called unbelievers by making an analogy to this ayat, which refers to polytheists, because, even if unbelievers and polytheists said that Allahu ta'ala created the good and the evil and everything, they worshiped the statues called al-Lat and al-Uzza and angels, which, they believed, were worth worshiping and could have Allahu ta'ala do everything they wished. With this belief, they prostrated before them, made sacrifices to them and vowed to them. As for Muslims, they do not make sacrifices to Rasulullah ('alaihi 's-salam) or to the souls of awliya'. They make sacrifices only to Allahu ta'ala and send its thawab for the souls of awliya'. "Shafaat ya Rasul-Allah!" ('alaihi 's-salam) 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 ayat, "Ask the village," in the Qur'an. 'Umar (radi-Allahu 'anh), while visiting the Kaba, said before the Hajar al-aswad, "You cannot do anything! But I kiss you in order to follow Rasulullah ('alaihi 's-salam)." 'Ali (radi-Allahu 'anh) said upon hearing this, "Rasulullah ('alaihi 's-salam) said, 'On the Day of Judgment, the Hajar al-aswad will intercede for people.' " [This hadith is reported by at-Thirmidhi, an-Nasai, al-Baihaki, at-

Tabarani and al-Bukhari in his History.] And 'Umar thanked 'Ali (radi-Allahu 'anhuma). While a stone can be helpful, is it possible that prophets and others who are loved by Allahu ta'ala cannot be helpful? Allahu ta'ala declared that He would admit the prayers and intercession of those whom He loved. [The forgoing ten paragraphs are extracted from the seventh volume of Jevdet Pasha's History.]

Hadrat Mawlana Khalid al-Baghdadi, a profound scholar and a treasure of miracles, wrote in his work Ar-risalat al-Khalidiyya, "Muslims, when holding on to a means, think that it will be a means through which Allahu ta'ala will create what they want; they do not believe that the means will be the maker. As for polytheists, they believe that their idols will create or have Allahu ta'ala create it. Those who cannot distinguish between these two beliefs from each other perish by falling into the whirlpool of denial."

Yusuf an-Nabhani, extracting from the book Khulasat al-kalam [Second part of this book is reproduced by Hakikat Kitabevi, Istanbul, 1395 (1975).] by Sayyid Ahmad Dahlan, writes: "Some say that the one who regards Rasulullah (sall-Allahu 'alaihi wa sallam) or another prophet or wali as an intermediary or visits his grave and says, for example, 'O Rasul-Allah ('alaihi 's-salam), I ask for your intercession,' becomes an unbeliever. By putting forth the ayats such as, 'Do not pray to anybody besides Allahu ta'ala!' Who else can ever be more heretical than the one who prays to somebody besides Allahu ta'ala?' and 'Those to whom you pray besides Allahu ta'ala 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 bidat called the believers 'unbelievers'. Muhammad ibn 'Abd al-Wahhab said, 'These ayats show that the one who addresses a grave and asks for intercession is a polytheist. Ancient idolaters, too, believed that their idols could make nothing, that Allahu ta'ala alone created everything, but they said that their idols would intercede with Allahu ta'ala for them, and, therefore, they became polytheist. Also, those who ask for shafa'a at graves or shrines become polytheists.' These words are very wrong, for the believers neither worship prophets or awliya' nor attribute them as partners to Allahu ta'ala, but believe that they, too, are creatures, impotent human beings, who are not worth worshiping 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 want to get benefit through them. Whereas, the polytheists, mentioned in the ayats believed that the idols were worth worshiping, 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 worshiped them so that they intercede with Allahu ta'ala for them. It is surprising, indeed, that the true believers are likened to idolatrous unbelievers. If it were polytheism for the believers to ask for intercession. Rasulullah (sall-Allahu 'alaihi wa sallam), as-Sahabat al-kiram or the Salaf as-Salihin would have never asked for intercession. As a matter of fact, when praying, Rasulullah (sall-Allahu '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 intercession in these terms. He taught this prayer to his companions and declared, 'Pray in this manner!' It is declared in a hadith quoted in Al-Jami' al-kabir by Jalal ad-din as-Suyuti and reported by Ibn Maja, 'When leaving your house for the mosque, say this prayer!' Islamic scholars said this prayer every day. At-Tabarani, Ibn Habban and Hakim reported that when interring Fatima bint Asad (radi-Allahu 'anha),' Ali's (radi-Allahu 'anh) mother, Rasulullah (sall-Allahu 'alaihi wa sallam) said, 'O my Rabb! Forgive Mother Fatima bint Asad for the right of Thine Prophet and Thine other prophets who came before me!' " Also, Ibn Abi Shaiba and Ibn 'Abd al-Birr reported this hadith with more details as written in the book Al-

Jami' al-kabir by as-Suyuti. There is an evident tawassul in the prayer Rasulullah ('alaihi 's-salam) taught a blind Sahabi. These people of bidat, 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-Sahabat al-kiram al-ways said that prayer when Rasulullah ('alaihi 's-salam) was alive.

"While visiting the Masjid an-Nabi, Jafar Mansur, the second 'Abbasid caliph, asked Imam Malik, 'Shall I turn my face to the Kaba or face Rasulullah's ('alaihi 's-salam) grave when reciting prayers?' [One stands between the Ka'ba and the Prophet's blessed grave when standing in the Masjid an-Nabawi.] Imam Malik said, 'How can you turn your face away from Rasulullah ('alaihi 's-salam)! He is the cause of you and your father Adam ('alaihi 's-salam)! Turn your face to him and pray through him!' Hadrat Ibn Hajar al-Makki wrote in his book Jawhar al-munzam that this report was so authentic that it cannot be rejected. Those who say that Imam Malik said that it was makruh to pray while facing Rasulullah's ('alaihi 's-salam) grave slander the exalted imam by saying so.

"It is not right that only prophets ('alahimu 's-salam) can be put as intermediaries, for Hadrat 'Umar (radi-Allahu 'anh), when praying to Allahu ta'ala so that it would rain, put Hadrat 'Abbas (radi-Allahu 'anh) as an intermediary. None of the Sahabat al-kiram who were present there said anything against him. Since Rasulullah ('alaihi 's-salam) had said, 'Allahu ta'ala has placed the truth into 'Umar's tongue,' Hadrat 'Umar's putting Hadrat 'Abbas (radi-Allahu 'anhuma) as an intermediary is an apparent evidence, a sound document and was intended to show everybody that it was permissible to put others besides Rasulullah (alaihi 's-salam) 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 (radi-Allahu 'anh) taught that it was permissible. If he had prayed through Rasulullah ('alaihi 's-salam), 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-Sahabat al-kiram prayed through Rasulullah ('alaihi 's-salam) after his death, some examples of which have already been given above.

"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 Allahu ta'ala 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 wali's grave or regard ordinary people as awliya' and expect miracles from them. However, even such ignorant people who express such wrong words and thoughts believe also that no one besides Allahu ta'ala can create use or harm. They know they have recourse to awliya' in order to get blessings from Allahu ta'ala. 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 Allahu ta'ala can create use or harm. They all have recourse to awliya' in order to get a share from their blessings. When they say, 'Awliya' did,' they do not mean that awliya' 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-Sunnat scholars as, 'What satiates one is not the food or the medicine but Allahu ta'ala. The food or the medicine is a means created by Allahu ta'ala.' 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'ani (semantics) have decided unanimously.

"Ibn Taymiyya and his disciples said that tawassul was haram. The Wahhabis said that it was polytheism. Whereas, the Prophet ('alaihi 's-salam), as-Sahabat al-kiram and all Muslims did tawassul. It is not possible that the whole umma have committed haram or kufr. It is declared in the Hadith, 'My umma do not agree on deviation!' It is declared in the hundred and tenth ayat of the surat al 'Imran, 'You have become the best of ummas!' Is it conceivable that all or the majority of such an umma would agree on deviation or heresy?

"Ibn Humam, a Hanafi scholar, said, 'It is better to turn towards the Prophet's ('alaihi 's-salam) grave than towards the qibla when sending one's prayers.' To say that al-Imam al-azam (rahmat-Allahi 'alaihi) said, 'It is better to turn towards the qibla would be a big slander against the exalted imam, for he wrote in his book Musnad that 'Abdullah ibn 'Umar (radi-Allahu 'anhuma) said, 'It is sunnat to turn towards the Prophet's ('alaihi 's-salam) grave, one's back being towards the qibla.' All the Hanafi scholars have reported that al-Imam al-azam (rahmat-Allahi 'alaihi) said, 'It is mustahab to turn towards the Blessed Grave.' Rasulullah (sall-Allahu '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 Kaba would be behind them. It is certainly the same while visiting his blessed grave. If, in the Masjid al-Haram, the mosque around the Kaba, a person approaches to tell something to his master or father who stands towards the Kaba, he certainly says it facing him, the Kaba being behind him. Turning one's face towards Rasulullah ('alaihi 's-salam) 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-salam) blessed grave when visiting. Imam as-Subki quotes their writings one by one in his book Shifa as-saqam. That al-Imam al-azam was against tawassul, as written in the tafsir of Alusi, is not true. No Hanafi scholar has agreed with this statement. All Hanafi scholars have reported that tawassul was mustahab. We should not believe Alusi's statement.

"Az-Zarqani wrote: 'When one says, 'O my Rabb! I pray to Thee through Thine Prophet ('alaihi 's-salam). O the Prophet, who is [Allahu ta'ala's] compassion for men! Intercede for me in the presence of Thine Rabb!' Allahu ta'ala accepts this prayer.' [Az-Zarqani, his annotation to Al-mawahib al-ladunniyya in 8 volumes Beirut, 1393 (1973).]

"The above proofs eradicate the bidat that has come forth at the roots. As Imam al-Baihaki reports, a villager visited Rasulullah ('alaihi 's-salam) and begged him to pray so that it would rain and said, 'We have nobody besides you to trust ourselves to. The place where men will take refuge is their Prophet ('alaihi 's-salam) only.' Rasulullah ('alaihi 's-salam) did not say anything against him and, as Anas ibn Malik noted, Rasulullah ('alaihi 's-salam) immediately mounted the pulpit and prayed for rain. The prayer was not finished when it began to rain. It is written in the Sahih of al-Bukhari that a villager complained about dearth to Rasulullah ('alaihi 's-salam) and as soon as Rasulullah ('alaihi 's-salam) began to pray, it began to rain, upon which he said, 'If Abu Talib was alive, he would be pleased a lot.'

"Great scholar Hadrat Ibn Hajar al-Makki wrote in his book Khairat al-hisan, 'Imam Muhammad ash-Shafi'i, on the days when he was in Baghdad, would visit Imam Abu Hanifa's grave and

greet him. He would pray through the imam so that his wish would be accepted.' And Imam Ahmad used to pray through al-Imam ash-Shafi'i. In fact, when his son, 'Abdullah, was surprised at this, he said, 'O my son! al-Imam ash-Shafi'i is like the sun among men! He is like good health for bodies! In western countries, Imam Malik would be put as an intermediary when praying, and al-Imam ash-Shafi'i heard this and did not oppose it. Imam Abu 'l-Hasan ash-Shadhili said, 'The person who asks something from Allahu ta'ala should pray through Imam al-Ghazali.' It is written in the book Sawa'iq by Ibn Hajar al-Makki that al-Imam ash-Shafi'i always prayed through Ahl al-Bait an-Nabawi.

"As Allahu ta'ala has made pious deeds and worship means to happiness and high status, so He has made His beloved, select men, anbiya', awliya' and sulaha', whom He has commanded us to love, intermediaries for the admission of prayers. It is for this reason that as-Sahabat al-kiram and all scholars have performed tawassul when praying. None of them has denied this. By giving wrong meaning to ayats and hadiths and denying many true reports, ahl al-bidat have been defiling Muslims' iman. They have been striving to cause Ahl al-qibla (Muslims) to dissent from the right path. Any person, upon whose lot Allahu ta'ala has endowed auspicion and happiness, will learn the above evidences, thus escape the disaster of being deceived by them." [Yusuf an-Nabhani, Shawahid al-haqq.]

6-Mawdudi's slandering of Islamic faith and the Ahl as-sunnat scholars and its answer

44 - Mawdudi, in the first edition of this book *The Revivalist Movement in Islam*, slandered the Islamic faith and the Ahl as-Sunnat scholars. Muslims with right belief in Pakistan began to defend themselves and refuted his slanders and heretical thoughts with documents. Mawdudi, altogether confused with these righteous criticisms, had to tidy his book up. Changing some parts of it 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." Yet, in the same book, he did not give up speaking ill of the words of reverence such as 'Imam', 'Hujjat al-Islam', 'Qutb al-'arifin' and 'Shaikh al-Islam', that had been presented to the Ahl as-Sunnat scholars by Muslims, and proclaimed that he did not regard the Ahl as-Sunnat scholars worth these high titles. But, in praising Ibn Taymiyya and 'Abduh, who are documentedly proved to have had departed from the Ahl as-Sunnat, the right path, he himself did not neglect to write the words 'Imam' and 'Ustadh' (master) in front of their names. The words of reverence, which he deems too much for the Ahl as-Sunnat scholars are given freely to them by him. It is written detailedly on page 487 of the fifth volume of Ibn 'Abidin's *Radd al-mukhtar* for whom and which words of reverence can be used. At the beginning of *The Revivalist Movement in Islam*, Mawdudi says: Islamic faith puts forth its own philosophy, which greatly differs from irreligious philosophies. Its knowledge about the Universe and mankind is quite opposite 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' understanding of Islam by looking at it from the outside. As explained in detail in our book *Se'adet-i Ebediyye*, one's degrading Muslim scholars down to the degree of philosophers shows his misunderstanding of them. Islamic knowledge is divided into two parts:

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. The science Muslims learn is seen as "quite opposite" by Mawdudi, which means to deny that there is scientific knowledge in Islam. And this is to spoil the lot instead of being useful. It is pertinent to quote the exalted Islamic scholar Imam al-Ghazali here: "It will not be useful but harmful to the religion for the ignorant to attempt to help the religion."

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

"One of the two reasons why the institution of caliphate weakened was because Hadrat 'Uthman did not have as much quality of a leader as his predecessors had had."

With these words, he tries to blemish 'Uthman's (radi-Allahu 'anh) governance. Sayyid Qutb, an Egyptian writer, also attacks Hadrat 'Uthman (radi-Allahu 'anh) thus presumptuously in his book *Al-'adalat al-ijtima'iyata fi 'l-islam*. Speaking ill of Hadrat 'Uthman Dhi 'n-nurain (radi-Allahu 'anh), who was recommended by Hadrat 'Umar (radi-Allahu 'anh) and elected by the Prophet's ('alaihi 's-salam) companions unanimously and whose superiority had been declared in many hadiths is a symbol of being too ignorant to understand that it is a grave sin to speak ill of him or a symbol of attempting to demolish Islam insidiously from behind the screen. Each of the Sahabat al-kiram was a hero honored by being praised in the hadiths, "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 ayat, "They are very strong against disbelievers." To misrepresent 'Uthman (radi-Allahu 'anh) as the cause of weakening of the institution of caliphate can be done only by those who cannot comprehend their honors. The history is obvious. The extent of lands conquered in the time of Hadrat 'Uthman (radi-Allahu 'anh) was much greater than the former. Muslim lands enlarged from Philippines to Tunisia. The capacity of this book does 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 Sozun Vesikalari*. Those who misrepresent Hadrat 'Uthman's (radi-Allahu 'anh) martyrdom as a defect for him reveal what they think about the prophets whom the Children of Israil had martyred and about the hadith, "No prophet suffered as much torture as I have." Evidently, the reason why they do not speak ill of Hadrat 'Umar's (radi-Allahu 'anh) martyrdom by his servant is because they cannot find the favorable opportunity. Let us tell these ignorant people again that each of the Sahabat al-kiram was a perfect leader and a courageous mujahid. From Hadrat Habib (radi-Allahu 'anh), who challenged the enemies in his speech on the tripod of gallows in Mecca, up to Abu 'Ubaida (radi-Allahu 'anh), the Conqueror of Damascus, and to Hadrat Khalid (radi-Allahu 'anh), who was amongst the fighters of the army that came 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."

Words of this kind do not befit the mouths and pens of believers. These absurd, crazy words against Muawiya (radi-Allahu 'anh), one of the prominent Sahabis, disgrace with unbelief all the caliphs up to Sultan Muhammad Vahidaddin Khan, the last caliph of Muslims, and, therefore, are not worth answering. His attempt to interpret wrongly the hadith stating that Muslim rulers are zill-Allah (Allahu ta'ala's shade) and his considering Muslims so stupid as to suppose that Allahu ta'ala 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 'Uthman Ghazi, the founder of the Ottoman Empire, which is written in many books, for example, in Qisas-i Anbiya', will understand the truth.

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

It is surprising that he relates the birth of madhhabs to the movements of fitna (mischief, disunion). Rasulullah (sall-Allahu 'alaihi wa sallam) foretold it and praised beforehand the four madhhabs in that their birth was Allahu ta'ala's compassion. They did not arise from worldly conditions. They arose from religious, divine reasons pertaining to knowledge. Those who look at Islam from the outside and cannot penetrate into its essence strive to end up the sacred, spiritual manifestations by the substance and appearance.

Mawdudi, from behind the screen, 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 'alims who were adherent to the world co-operated with them. With the idea of giving place to graves and to awliya' in worship, the meaning of the Qur'an was distorted. Many a hadith were 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-Sunnat scholars have answered them one by one and refuted the ones which were incompatible with Islam. And, let alone comparing with Islamic literature, no one has ever condescended to use the word 'literature' for their sayings. If Mawdudi wants to attack the seventy-two heretical groups or the bidat' 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-Sunnat scholars of all ages have shown them Allahu ta'ala'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 Mawdudi. If Mawdudi 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-Sunnat 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 very surprisingly.

It is a historical fact that the evils of Iran and Rome had mixed with the pre-Islamic Arabs but not with Islam! As he says, idolatry had gone as far as even into the Kaba. 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 hostile against him. All of them were in a pitiable situation. The whole Arabian Peninsula was in ignorance and heresy. They could not understand the good word. They refused the exalted Prophet ('alaihi 's-salam) 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 made up a new religion and spread the partnership of property and woman far and wide. He had prohibited the right of possessing. He had established today's communism yet then

in Iran. He had turned the social life and morality in Iran upside down. Afterwards, Nushirwan Shah struggled to brake this current, yet he was not able to clear it off entirely.

As for the Romans, their morality 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. Here are the moral principles of the ancient Greek civilization! An irreligious civilization should have been so. This system dragged many people on to despair and suicide, for not everybody could 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 want to escape 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 get a base flavor 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 fogs of ignorance 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 got strong by following Rasulullah ('alaihi 's-salam). They challenged shahs and kings whose sovereignties they had admired to see once upon a time. Conquering their lands they disseminated Islam in there. The history is evident! Books, documents, works are obvious!

Mawdudi 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 Islamic societies. Thus, it lured Islamic knowledge and literature to deviation and supported monarchism. It confined the whole religious life to certain rites and ceremonies."

Rasulullah (sall-Allahu 'alaihi wa sallam) gave the good news that a mujaddid would come and strengthen Islam at the onset of each century. So it happened. In every century, Islam has illuminated the humanity in every field through the leadership of the Ahl as-Sunnat scholars and has been the source of civilization. In order to portray Ibn Taymiyya as a source of illumination like the sun, Mawdudi tries to annihilate the great Islamic civilization and to misrepresent as obscure the luminous skies of the century of the Tabi'in, who were praised in the Hadith, and the following century. Those who read Islamic books and true histories written by reasonable pens in Europe will not have difficulty in comprehending these destructive tactics of his.

He tries to separate the meaning of the word 'mujaddid' in the hadith we have quoted above from the Ahl as-Sunnat scholars. He blames the Ahl as-Sunnat scholars, e.g. Hadrat al-Imam ar-Rabbani, for having said that Hadrat al-Mahdi, who had been mentioned in the Hadith would be the mujaddid of the third millennium. In addition, he insults Muslims and men of tasawwuf by calling them "ancient type reactionary people". He makes fun of sacred beliefs by saying, "Shall jihad be performed with spirituality, amulets and prayers and would tanks be destroyed with malediction?" He marks those who believe so with the words 'populace' and 'ignorant'. He

defends that al-Mahdi 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 clamor against the novelty which he will bring. Whereas, in the times when Hadrat al-Mahdi will appear 'Isa ('alaihi 's-salam) 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 Mawdudi tries to impute on the early Muslim ages praised in the Hadith, will appear in that future time as pointed out again in the Hadith. The attacks of the people like Mawdudi to the Ahl as-Sunnat and their attempts to extinguish the Ahl as-Sunnat knowledge indicate that those gloomy days pointed out in the Hadith are drawing near. When Hadrat al-Mahdi will appear and renew the Ahl as-Sunnat knowledge, those same non-madhhabite people, heretics and religion reformers will cry and oppose him and Hadrat al-Mahdi will put them to sword. Hadrat al-Imam ar-Rabbani wrote in the 255th letter in the first volume of Maktubat that al-Mahdi will kill the heretics occupying religious posts in Medina. Mawdudi thinks that al-Mahdi will be "not a man of supernatural works or karamat, inspirations and spiritual accomplishments, but a man of struggle like other revolutionists." He says, "Al-Mahdi 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."

Mawdudi, who departs in many respect from the Ahl as-Sunnat, takes Hadrat al-Mahdi as an ordinary leader. Great scholar Ahmad Ibn Hajar al-Makki gave about two hundred characteristics derived from the hadiths about him in his book Al-qawl al-mukhtasar fi 'alamat al-Mahdi. A person who reads this book can easily see the difference between the real al-Mahdi whom Rasulullah ('alaihi 's-salam) described and the imaginary one whom Mawdudi tries to form.

That the first mujaddid in Islam was 'Umar ibn 'Abd al-'Aziz is another product of Mawdudi's short sight. 'Umar ibn 'Abd al-'Aziz was one of the mujaddidin 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 Abu Bakr as-Siddiq (radi-Allahu 'anh) who, after Rasulullah's ('alaihi 's-salam) death, overpowered 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. But the Umayyads and 'Abbasids could not prevent Islam's progress. Since the hadith and fiqh scholars were unfamiliar with rational knowledge, they remained deprived of interpreting and explaining the Islamic system under the light of contemporary inclinations of thought. They could do nothing but resort to bad influences. Imam Abu 'l-Hasan al-Ashari 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 Mutazila 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 Sunnat. The wars declared for luxury, ambition and avarice by a notorious group governing the State cause a serious retrogression. Knowledge and arts disappeared. Meanwhile, Imam al-Ghazali 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-Sunnat] 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 hadith. He had dealt too much with rational knowledge. It was a defect for him to have too much interest in

tasawwuf. It was Ibn Taymiyya's lot to revive Islamic thought and spirit by abstaining from these three dangers."

It is true that there have been some Muslim rulers who committed cruelty and sin 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. Thus, the worst ones among them became 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 of Lord Davenport, an Englishman, will easily comprehend not only that Mawdudi is wrong but also that he is in a struggle of hostility. We want to emphasize that non-Sahabi 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-Islam and counselors. 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 benevolence and arts which each of them handed over to the next generation were innumerable. Their remains and many of them themselves are evident. Millions of Muslims get use from them today. It is a tactic of the enemies of Islam to attempt to speak ill of them by putting forward their human defects. Islamic scholars' staying away from the sultans does not show that sultans were evil. Following the hadith, "The one who approaches and is modest towards a rich man because he is rich will lose one-third of his iman," scholars have abstained from every rich or famous person, yet they did not neglect to tell them Islamic commands and prohibitions. Mawdudi, who cannot comprehend the subtlety between these two, attacks Islamic scholars and caliphs writing at random. If, instead of writing about their few faults, he had the honor 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.

Supposing that hadith and fiqh scholars were deprived of rational knowledge shows lack of understanding the greatness of Islamic scholars. An Islamic scholar is a great person who has reached the grade of ijtihad in religious knowledge and learned well what has been discovered up to his time in experimental knowledge and who has attained the degree of Wilayat al-khassa al-Muhammadiyah in the marifa of the heart.

For the truth-seeking youth, who are confused by Mawdudi's aggression, which is as base as to call the Muslim caliphs "irreligious", the short biographies of some caliphs in the history book *Mirat al-ka'inat* are translated in the following: [The Roman numeral in front of each name shows his order of caliphate and the Arabic numerals in parantheses show the dates of his birth and death in the Muslim calendar. Long biographies of Khulafa ar-Rashidin, Umayyad and Abbasid caliphs are given under the heading "Iwaz" in the famous work by ad-Damiri.]

"VI: Muawiya [The book begins with prayers for Hadrat Muawiya.] (radi-Allahu 'anh) was one of Rasulullah's ('alaihi 's-salam) clerks who wrote down the Qur'an. He acquired his prayers which asked blessings on him. He had a strong reason and intellect, much forgivingness, generosity and administrative power. He was mild, majestic and brave. He looked as if he had been created to be a sultan. He conquered Sudan, Afghanistan, many part of India, Cyprus, going to the last one in person. He sent soldiers to Constantinople. His caliphate was rightful.

"The la-madhabii slander Muawiya on account of his combat against 'Ali (radi-Allahu 'anhuma) and grievously exaggerate the sad situations which might take place in any combat. When the Ahl as-Sunnat scholars give them answers based on the Qur'an, the Sunnat and reason, they lose their head. They cannot find anything to say. They begin to tell about the evils of his son, Yazid. They say, 'He opened the way to such a bad tradition as passing the caliphate from the father on

to the son. He turned caliphate into sultanate.' On the subject about praying in congregation, Ibn 'Abidin says, 'It is necessary for a Muslim who is to be caliph to be elected by the notables of scholars and administrators or to be designated by the former caliph as his successor. The caliphate of the Muslim who has seized the government by force also will be religiously rightful. Abu Bakr (radi-Allahu 'anh) when he was about to die, designated 'Umar (radi-Allahu 'anh) the Caliph. All the Prophet's companions accepted it.' It is seen that it was a rightful act compatible with Islam for Muawiya (radi-Allahu 'anh) and for all other caliphs to designate their sons, whom they themselves brought up and trained, or others whom they could confide in, for their place. If a caliph began cruelty afterwards, it cannot be a defect for his predecessor. (19-60)

[Mawdudi's attacking Islamic caliphs and the Ahl as-Sunnat scholars by writing at random is not only deprived from any value pertaining to knowledge but also diametrically opposite to historical and religious facts. The following passages from a Persian work of Shah Wali-Allah, whom Mawdudi praises very much, is an evident proof for the pure youth:

"Muawiya ibn Abu Sufyan (radi-Allahu 'anhuma) was one of Rasulullah's ('alaihi 's-salam) companions. Among as-Sahaba, he was well-known for his beautiful virtues. Be cautious of thinking ill of him! Do not fall into the danger of speaking ill of him. Or else you will be committing haram. It is declared in a hadith reported by Abu Dawud, 'Do not speak ill of my companions! Even if you give gold as big as Mount Uhud as alms, there will not be as much thawab as in their alms of a handful of barley!' Again in a hadith reported by him, Rasulullah (sall-Allahu 'alaihi wa sallam) pointed to Hadrat Hasan (radi-Allahu 'anh), 'This son of mine is mature. Through him, I expect, Allahu ta'ala will reconcile two armies of my umma.' A hadith reported by at-Tirmidhi declares about Muawiya (radi-Allahu 'anh), 'O my Rabb! Make him hadi and muhdi!' that is, 'Keep him in the right path and make him a means for guiding others to the right path.' A hadith reported by Ibn Sad and Ibn 'Asakir declares about Muawiya (radi-Allahu 'anh), 'O my Rabb! Teach Him the book and make him own countries and protect him against punishment.' Rasulullah ('alaihi 's-salam) knew he would become the caliph. 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 and guide them to the right path. It is declared in a hadith reported by Hasan (radi-Allahu 'anh) and conveyed by Ad-Dailami, 'Someday Muawiya will be the head of the State.' Hadrat Muawiya (radi-Allahu 'anh) said that since the day when Rasulullah ('alaihi 's-salam) had said to him, 'O Muawiya! When you become head of the State, do favors!' he had been awaiting the time when he would become the caliph. A hadith reported by Umm Hiram (radi-Allahu 'anha), a Sahabi, declares, 'Of my umma, those who will fight in the first naval battle of Islam will certainly enter Paradise.' Muawiya (radi-Allahu 'anh) fought in the first naval battle of Islam during the caliphate of Hadrat 'Uthman (radi-Allahu 'anh). And Umm Hiram (radi-Allahu anha), since she had heard the hadith herself, was among his soldiers and was martyred when she landed [on Cyprus]. With the blessing of these prayers by Rasulullah ('alaihi 's-salam), he became a just, trustworthy caliph. He kept a few of Rasulullah's ('alaihi 's-salam) hairs, which, in order to be blessed with, were requested in his will to be put into his nose. "Rasulullah ('alaihi 's-salam) prophesied the Battle of Siffin between 'Ali and Muawiya (radi-Allahu 'anhuma), too. The scholars al-Bukhari and Muslim reported the hadith: 'Unless two great soldiers fight each other, the end of the world will not come. Both of them will fight for the cause.' In a hadith reported in the Sahih of al-Bukhari, the Prophet ('alaihi 's-salam) said to Ammar ibn Yasar, 'You will be killed by some disobedient people.' He was killed by Muawiya's (radi-Allahu 'anh) soldiers....[Shah Wali-Allah ad-Dahlawi, Izalat al-Khafa, p.571]

"There are some hadiths disapproving the Umayyad caliphs, but some other hadiths praise them. A hadith declares, 'Caliphate will be in Medina, and sultanate will be in Damascus.'

"It is declared in a hadith, 'Up to the twelfth caliph, Islam will be cherished. They all will belong to the Quraish.' More than half of these twelve caliphs, who were praised in this hadith, were the Umayyad caliphs. It is declared in a hadith reported by Ibn Maja, 'People with a black flag will come from the east, and they will fight the Arabs. Obey their caliphs! They are the caliphs guiding to the right path!' This hadith and the like praise the Abbasid caliphs... [Shah Wali-Allah ad-Dahlawi, Izalat al-Khafa, p.601]

"The caliph who did Rasulullah's ('alaihi 's-salam) task of guidance as he had done was called Khalifat rashida. These were perfect, real caliphs. The caliph who did not carry out this task precisely and who did not obey Islam was called Khalifat jabira.. [Shah Wali-Allah ad-Dahlawi, Izalat al-Khafa, v. II, p.330].

"Rasulullah's ('alaihi 's-salam) task of guidance had three parts. The first one was to have Allahu ta'ala'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 'ihsan' was to purify the heart. Al-Khulafa' ar-rashidin did all of these three tasks. Those who succeeded them did only the task of sultanate. The task of teaching was given to the imams of madhhabs, and the task of ihsan was given to the great men of tasawwuf." .. [Shah Wali-Allah ad-Dahlawi, Izalat al-Khafa, v. II, p.342. A hadith written on its 567th page calls such a caliph "Malik al-adud", who has been called "caliph" symbolically. The khulafa al-jabira came next.]

"VII: Yazid ibn Muawiya became the caliph in 60 and died four years later in Hawwarin, which is located between Damascus and Tadmur. He was buried there. (23-64)

"VII: Muawiya It ibn Yazid 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'an very beautifully. He abstained from sins and feared Allahu ta'ala very much. He was the beloved son-in-law of Hadrat 'Uthman (radi-Allahu 'anh). It was written on his seal, 'I trust in Allahu ta'ala. I ask from Him.' (2-65)

"X: 'Abd al-Malik ibn Marwan was a hadith and fiqh scholar. He was famous for having much zuhd and 'ibadat . Imam an-Nafi', a prominent one among the Tabiin, said, 'In Medina, I have not seen a person who was learned in fiqh more profoundly, worshiped more, knew the knowledge and manners of hajj more or read the Qur'an more beautifully than 'Abd al-Malik.' According to many scholars, 'Abd al-Malik was one of the seven fiqh scholars of Medina. Imam ash-Shabi, another prominent one among the Tabiin, said, 'I found myself superior to every scholar whom I interviewed. I found only 'Abd al-Malik superior to me.' He fought Mukhtar, the chief of the rebels who shed much blood and killed him. His caliphate was religiously rightful. He repaired the Kaba. His construction continued till the restoration by Murad Khan IV in 1040 (1631). Before him, Byzantine gold coins and Persian silvers had been used, and he was the one who coined the first Islamic money. He is the conqueror of Adana and Sicily. He sent his son Maslama to conquer Constantinople. Maslama (rahmat-Allahi ta'ala 'alaih) performed salat in the big church of St. Sophia and built the Arab Mosque. (26-86)

"XI: Walid ibn 'Abd al-Malik was very pious and charitable and worshiped much. He read through the Qur'an in every three days. His good deeds and favors were countless. As soon as he became the caliph, he appointed his cousin, 'Umar ibn 'Abd al-'Aziz, the governor of Medina. He had the Umayya Mosque built in Damascus, spending four hundred chests of gold coins. It was Walid 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 Bukhara peacefully from the Turks. He was the conqueror of Andalusia (Spain), Ankara, Samarkand and India. It was written on his seal: 'O Walid! You will die and be called to account!' (46-96)

"XII: Sulaiman 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 Allahu ta'ala 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 person. The order was written immediately and given to the farmer. (60-99) [Another example showing the justice of Islamic caliphs is written in Hadrat Sayyid Abdulhakim al-Arwasī's (rahmat-Allahi ta'ala alaihi) note book: "Caliph Sulaiman asked Hadrat Abu Hazim, one of the Tabi'un, 'We don't want to die. What is the reason?' He said, 'O Sulaiman! 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-Aziz ibn Marwan (rahmat-Allahu ta'ala 'alaihi) was a good, just Muslim. (61-101) [Maodudi, too, praises him. He says that Umar ibn Abd al-Aziz 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 Caliph Sulaiman who had designated Umar as his successor. To him, the caliphs spoil 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. Whereas, they designated them with the intention of following Islam. Then, religion reformer speak ill of the followers of Islam but praise those who adapt Islam to their own thoughts and points of view.]

"XIV: Yazid ibn 'Abd al-Malik had been formerly addicted to pleasures. But when he became the caliph, he became pious and just. (71-105)

"XV: Hisham 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 bait al-mal, he would not accept it unless forty persons bore witness to that they were taken in a halal way. (71-125)

"XVI: Walid ibn Yazid was literary, eloquent. Because he was seen to be mentally deficient, a year later he was killed while reading the Qur'an. (92-126)

"XVII: Yazid ibn Walid ibn 'Abd al-Malik was intelligent, clever and devoted to the religion. He prohibited alcoholic drinks. (90-126)

"XVIII: Ibrahim ibn Walid ibn 'Abd al-Malik was the caliph 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 Khawarij and killed their chief Dahhak. He was overcome and killed by the 'Abbasids. (72-132)

"XX: 'Abdullah Saffah ibn Muhammad ibn 'Ali ibn 'Abdullah ibn 'Abbas was learned, intelligent, provident, eloquent and generous. He died of small-pox. He is the first caliph of the 'Abbasids. (104-135)

"XXI: Mansur ibn Muhammad had much knowledge and decency. He did not care for amusement. He was brave and patient. He worshiped much. (95-158)

"XXII: Mahdi ibn Mansur was learned, brave, intelligent and very generous. Everybody liked him. His itiqad was very pure. He killed the renegades. (126-169)

"XXIII: Hadi ibn Mahdi was learned, intelligent, eloquent and generous. It was written on his seal, 'I believe and trust in Allahu ta'ala.' (147-170)

"XXVI: Harun ar-Rashid ibn Mahdi performed a hundred rak'as of salat every day and every night. He went on hajj one year and on ghaza every other year. He followed Islam in everything he did. He had in himself all the beautiful habits. (148-193)"

Al-Imam al-azam Abu Hanifa, Imam al-Ghazali, Imam an-Nawawi, Ibn Hajar, al-Imam ar-Rabbani and Khalid al-Baghdadi and many other great scholars were like these. It is obvious that people like Mawdudi, Sayyid Qutb and Hamidullah have remained outside this circle. Nothing can be so credulous as regarding as Islamic scholars the people who do not know anything about Islamic knowledge and Islamic scholars and who cannot penetrate into the inner essence of Islam but observe it from the outside like non-Muslim orientalist authors. The branches of knowledge taught in madrasas which are called "scholastic knowledge" by Mawdudi are 'ulum an-naqliyya (religious knowledge). And what he calls "rational knowledge" is 'ulum al-'aqliyya (scientific, literary knowledge). Both of these make up the Islamic knowledge. It does not befit a Muslim to say that fiqh and hadith 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'an and Hadith. They are the heirs of prophets. They have organized the division of labor among themselves, each undertaking the job of disseminating a separate branch of knowledge. This division of labor confuses the ignorant, and they suppose that Islamic scholars have not been exalted in other branches of knowledge. Hadrat 'Abd al-Wahhab ash-Sharani wrote at the beginning of his book Al-mizan al-kubra: "Hadrat Abu Hanifa, the founder of and expert in the knowledge of fiqh, was a great wali like Hadrat 'Abd al-Qadir al-Geilani . He was a man of karamat 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 worship done with the body, 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 the inside, try to blemish Islamic scholars in this respect also in order to deceive the Muslim youth. 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, Imam Muhammad al-Ghazali's Persian book Kimya' as-Saada will easily realize his deepness 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 get out of order when the quantities of substances in blood change, just like it is told in today's physiology books. Since Islamic scholars were so superior not only in scholastic knowledge but also in rational knowledge, they have been successful in everything they did in every century, and Islamic countries have been the home of civilization. Their thousands of books, which spread their superiority over the world, are evident. 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-zunun 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 hadith, will go to Hell, introduced into Islam some superstitions long before, like contemporary religion reformers do now. But the Ahl as-Sunnat scholars investigated and cleaned them off one by one. Today there is no superstition or mawdu' hadith in the basic books of Ahl as-Sunnat. Shams ad-din as-Sahawi, ash-Shawkani, Ibn Taymiyya, 'Abduh, 'Ali al-Qari and Ismail Hakki said that there were mawdu' hadiths in the basic books of Ahl as-Sunnat, especially in al-Baidawi's tafsir book and in al-Ghazali's Ihya'.

They are not right; it is a calumny against these great scholars. [For details of this subject, see below, the 55th article.]

Mawdudi's words "declared for luxury, ambition and avarice" about jihad, which is one of Islam's five basic 'Ibadat, reveal his own personality. Since the ayats and hadiths commanding jihad have become tawatur, it is not necessary to quote them here in addition. He himself admits them in his book Holy War in Islam. Our ancestors performed jihad not for pleasure or ambition but for spreading Allahu ta'ala's Word. Jihad is carried out by the State, by its army. People perform jihad by serving the army.

Mawdudi mistakes the rightful madhhabs for the heretical groups. In none of the Ahl as-Sunnat madhhabs, either of itiqad or 'amal, is there a mawdu' hadith or anything incompatible with Islam. There are mawdu' and un-Islamic aspects in the seventy-two heretical groups. All Islamic scholars, especially Hadrat Imam al-Ghazali, criticized these heretical groups. Mawdudi 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 Bukhara 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:

"Shah Wali-Allah ad-Dahlawi removed the old doubts concerning itiqad. He illuminated the heads with a new spirit."

He means that Shah Wali-Allah ad-Dahlawi (rahmat-Allahi 'alaih), too, was a religion reformer. Wali-Allah ad-Dahlawi's works bear witness for the fact that he belonged to Ahl as-Sunnat; this fact is also declared by Hadrat 'Abdullah ad-Dahlawi. That Muslims' Iman has been doubtful for centuries is a lie made up by the la-madhabbi. Mawdudi could not be too ignorant to know that doubtful iman is not iman. But it is a heresy worse than ignorance to say that Muslims' iman has been doubtful for centuries. The iman of the Ahl as-Sunnat who form ninety percent of Muslims on the world, 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.

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

"The difference between the idea and doctrine of caliphate and sovereignty was explained by Shah Wali-Allah, and the pictures from the Hadith, which were not known before him, were drawn by him. He wrote in his book Musaffa: 'The idiots of four century have abandoned ijtihaad. 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 pity that they do not have a common understanding.' "

Hadrat Shah Wali-Allah ad-Dahlawi did not say "idiots" about the Ahl as-Sunnat 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-Sunnat scholars:

"Rasulullah ('alaihi 's-salam) said, 'Great scholars will come in Iran.' Besides great hadith scholars such as al-Bukhari, Muslim, at-Tirmidhi, Abu Dawud, an-Nasai, Ibn Maja, ad-Darimi, ad-Dara-Qutni, Hakim, al-Baihaki and many others who were educated in Iran, there are the great fiqh scholars such as Abu 't-Tayyib [Qadi Tahir at-Tabari], Shaikh Abu Hamid [al-Isfaraini], Shaikh Abu Ishaq ash-Shirazi, and al-Juwaini ['Abdullah ibn Yusuf and his son], Imam al-Haramain 'Abd al-Malik ibn 'Abdullah al-Juwaini and Imam Muhammad al-Ghazali and many many others, who were also educated in Iran. Even Imam Abu Hanifa and his disciples in Mawara an-nahr and Khurasan are the scholars of Iran and are the subject of the good news in

the Hadith. A hadith 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-Aziz removed the cruelty of the rulers and established the principles of justice. In the second century, al-Imam ash-Shafi'i explained the knowledge of iman and separated the knowledge of fiqh. In the third century, Abu 'l-Hasan al-Ashari formulated the Ahl-as-Sunnat knowledge and rebutted the people of bidat. In the fourth century, Hakim and al-Baihaki and the like established the fundamentals of the knowledge of the Hadith, and Abu Hamid and the like spread the knowledge of fiqh. In the fifth century, Imam al-Ghazali opened a new way and said fiqh, tasawwuf and kalam were not different from one another. In the sixth century, Imam Fakhr ad-din ar-Razi spread the knowledge of kalam; and Imam an-Nawawi 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 just saying that the above hadith and the like are the miracles predicting future happenings. We should also realize the importance and the value of the predicted happenings." [Shah Wali-Allah ad-Dahlawi, *Izalat al-Khafa 'an khilafati'l-Khulafa'*. v II. p. 377, Karachi, 1372.]

Shah Wali-Allah ad-Dahlawi wrote in another book:

"One of the wajibs of Islam is to learn the Divine Rules (al-Ahkam al-Ilahi), which can be learned from the Qur'an, the Hadith, the athars of as-Sahaba and of the Tabiin and from the teachings deduced from the Qur'an and the Hadith. Fiqh is the branch of knowledge that deals with the Divine Rules, and fuqaha' are the scholars of fiqh. Fuqaha' 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 affair. For those who cannot understand the Qur'an, the Hadith and the books of scholars, such form of following (taqlid) is very rewarding on condition that they should have resolved to follow the Qur'an and the Hadith in this taqlid. If one fairly presumes that his madhhab's ijthihad concerning one of his affairs is in disagreement with an explicit ayat or hadith, he should follow another mujtahid's ijthihad which agrees with the Qur'an and Hadith more. He should not be prohibited to follow another madhhab for that affair. A scholar of later generations who learned the Sunnat and the athars well, studied the sayings of one of the fuqaha' of Islam well, who could deduce rules by comparing the hadiths that seemed disagreeing to a hadith all the transmitters of which were known by him and which had been used as a support (sanad) by a faqih, thus served the madhhab of his imam, and who could deduce new rules according to the methods of the madhhab of his imam, was called the mujtahidu fi 'l-madhhab. This way of following is very rewarding, 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 sanads of the madhhab. Islamic teachings are composed of three parts, namely, zahir, nawadir and takhrij teachings, the last one being the teachings deduced by scholars. All three of them exist in the sciences of fiqh, tasawwuf and 'aqa'id. One 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 alim of Islam or mujtahid. Only such an alim can understand the Qur'an and Sunnat. In the books Tahzib by al-Baghawi, Hidayah by Imam al-Haramain, Sharh al-wajiz by ar-Rafii, Ghaya by 'Izzad-din ibn 'Abd-as Salam, Sharh al-muhadhdhab by an-Nawawi, Adab al-futya by Abu 'Amr ibn Salah and in Kitab al-bahr by Badr ad-din az-Zarkashi, knowledge is divided into two, one of which must be learned by everybody. Learning the other is a fard kifaya, and, therefore, an alim who has become a mujtahid learns it; if there is such an

alim in a town, others need not learn it and, if there is no such alim, all Muslims are sinful. If such an alim can deduce rules from the Qur'an, Hadith, ijma' and qiyas 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 kinds of non-*mustaqil* *mujtahids*. A *mujtahid* of the first kind does not follow the imam of his madhhab in searching for documents and deducing rules. Because he is on the way of an imam, he is said to belong to an imam's madhhab and is called a *mujtahid muntasib*. He is a *mujtahid mutlaq*, and there must always be such a *mujtahid*. The *Ashab at-tarjih*, of the second kind, depend on the methods and documents of the imam of the madhhab, and each is called a *mujtahid muqayyad*. A *mujtahid* of the third kind knows the documents of his madhhab. The one belonging to the fourth kind can understand the teachings of his madhhab and conveys them to others.

"The ordinary Muslims who are not able to perform *ijtihad* and do not study knowledge are permitted to follow a madhhab. For the one who has reached the degree of performing *ijtihad*, however, following a madhhab is disapproved." [Shah Wali-Allah ad-Dahlawi, *Al-intibah*, part III. The author of *It'haf*, an annotation to *Al-intibah*, wrote: "The one who said that a Muslim should give up following a madhhab and do his actions direct according to ayats and hadiths was not Shah Wali-Allah but ash-Shawkani," and added that ash-Shawkani's words were better and superior, thus displayed that he was against the madhhabs.]

Shah Wali-Allah's above writings clearly show the fact that Mawdudi is a heretic who has not realized the greatness of the *Ahl as-Sunnat* scholars, all of whom were praised in the Hadith and who followed the same path and spread and strengthened *Rasulullah's* (sall-Allahu 'alaihi wa sallam) path.

Mawdudi writes altogether nonsense on the eighty-third page; see what he writes out of delirium: "Because of the difference of opinions with regard to *fiqh*, the Hanafi and the Shafi'i 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 muchness of interpretation."

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 contrary, each madhhab considers it permissible to follow other madhhabs when in difficulty. [For details, see Abd al-Ghani an-Nabulusi's *Khulasat at-tahqiq* and our book *The Sunni Path*, p. 32.] Such a corrupt, absurd and obvious lie as this can be written only by a heretic attacking Islam behind the curtain. poor Mawdudi has tried to dive into *kalam* and *fiqh*, which are the important subjects of Islam, but, being inexperienced, he has been drowned.

On the ninetieth page, he praises Shah Wali-Allah and says that he selects the following lines from his book *Al-tafhimat*:

"In the contemporary age, reality, which is compatible with the spirit of Divine Knowledge, combines the Hanafi and the Shafi'i madhhabs. The Qur'an commentaries should be reviewed and the parts that are against the Hadith should be sifted out, and what is without essence and value should be discarded."

A Muslim who knows his religion and madhhab becomes infuriated at these words. It is unbelievable that such a great scholar as Shah Wali-Allah would have such heretical ideas. In order to show the fact to our brothers-in-Islam and to disgrace Mawdudi, we will give some quotations from the same book:

"The origins of Islam are the Qur'an and the Hadith. There is no other source. Ijtihad is permissible in deciding about worldly affairs. If such an affair was decided about before, the decision cannot be changed. There is not qiyas or ijma' in the knowledge of Islam." [Shah Wali-Allah ad-Dahlawi, at-tafhimat al-ilahiyya, v. II. p. 142, Pakistan, 1387 (1967).] The anti-madhhabite people say, "The gate of ijihad cannot be closed. Ijtihad can be done anytime," thus they want to change the religious knowledge. They refer to Shah Wali-Allah as a support for these words. Whereas, Shah Wali-Allah clearly writes above that he never admits ijihad and qiyas in the religious knowledge and also shows that the words and references of such non-madhhabite people as Mawdudi and Sayyid Qutb are unsound.

"Read the hadith books of al-Bukhari, Muslim, Abu Dawud and at-Tirmidhi and the Hanafi and Shafi'i fiqh books! Hold fast to the books 'Awarif al-ma'arif and Ar-risalat an-Naqshibandiyya! These great people wrote about the dhikr and yad 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. [Shah Wali-Allah ad-Dahlawi, at-tafhimat al-ilahiyya, v. II. p. 290, Pakistan, 1387 (1967).]. I dreamt of Rasulullah ('alaihi 's-salam). I asked him which madhhab and Tariqa were better and which he liked most. 'All the madhhabs and Tariqas are equal. None is superior to another,' he said." [Shah Wali-Allah ad-Dahlawi, at-tafhimat al-ilahiyya, v. II. p. 301, Pakistan, 1387 (1967).]

"Muslims have parted into madhhabs. The scholars reported the religion that had come from Rasulullah ('alaihi 's-salam). 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 disapproved those who separated from them. From fear, the separatists either hid themselves or behaved double-facedly, which showed that they were the people of bidat. 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 imam of the madhhab reported the religion coming from Rasulullah ('alaihi 's-salam) correctly. It occurs to my heart that it would be good to compare the present teachings of the two most widespread madhhabs, the Hanafi and Shafi'i, with hadith books. When the teachings without foundation, [By these words, Shah Wali-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 Hanafi and Shafi'i madhhabs or in hadith books. When such teachings are cleared off, it will be seen that there is very little difference between madhhabs, for there is no difference pertaining to the teachings that are expressed clearly in the Hadith 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 (easiness, facility) or azima (difficulty). For more detail, see The Sunni Path, published by Hakikat Kitabevi in Istanbul.] are excluded, the two madhhabs will seem as if they are united. Of the remaining teachings, the ones in common with both madhhabs would be taken. Those which are not common would be classified as rukhsa or 'azima. In case of darura (necessity or emergency), the ones that are rukhsa would be followed." [Shah Wali-Allah, At-tafhimat, v. I, pp. 277-9.] Here he gives definite answers to the la-madhhabi and shows that their statement, "Our opponents are polytheists," is unbelief. This passage, only the last sentence of which is played as a trump card by Mawdudi, does not ever support his point of view, but it rescues the madhhabs, from the slanders with which the ignorant people and heretics smeared the madhhabs. As a

matter of fact, Shah Wali-Allah explained it more clearly: "What Allahu ta'ala likes is to search firstly through the Qur'an and Hadith. If a person can comprehend and draw conclusions from them, he has attained to a great blessing. If he cannot comprehend them, he should follow the madhhab of an imam who, he believes, understood them correctly and suitably with the Sunnat and communicated clearly what he understood. Arabic knowledge and the lessons at the madrasa should be studied with the view of understanding them, not for other purposes!" [." [Shah Wali-Allah, *At-tafhimat*, v. I, pp. 283.] As it is seen, Shah Wali-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*, Shah Wali-Allah's invaluable writings praising the four madhhabs in his works *Al-insaf* and *'Iqd al-jayyid* [These two arabic books are reproduced photostatically in one volume by Hakikat Kitabevi, Istanbul, 1395 (1975).] are quoted lengthily. Even the Turkish book *Nimat ul-Islam* clearly states that the madhhabs cannot be united and it is superstitious to be a mulfiq. In the fatwa book *Fatawa al-Haramain* and Persian *Saif al-abrar*, which were written in India, and in Hadrat 'Abd al-Wahhab ash-Sharani's preface to his *Al-Mizan al-kubra*, [These three books are reproduced in Istanbul.] 'madhhab' is explained clearly, and it is proved with documents that the madhhabs cannot be united. To pioneer something about which has been unanimously said "cannot be done" for a thousand years means to turn Islam upside down. Are those who defend it Muslims or are they are enemies of Islam? It is left to the readers to decide about it.

Shah Wali-Allah explained and praised tasawwuf and the Tariqas throughout his Persian work *Hama'at* (Pakistan, 1944), from which the following lines are extracted:

"If the salik is not so learned as to study the hadith books or the knowledge coming from as-Sahaba and the Tabiin, he should follow one of the four madhhabs. All the Tariqas 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 mashayikh al-kiram, 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 the lack of following the rules of adab towards the mashayikh of the Tariqa he follows. If the salik cannot understand the reason, the shaikh will understand it with his tawajjuh and insight and will let him know of it. This faqir [Wali-Allah ad-Dahlawi himself] paid my tawajjuh to the world of souls and understood that each Tariqa had a different relationship to it. Also i'tikaf in shrines will help one make progress. Speaking ill of the Salaf as-Salihin 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 one's soul is in relation with the pure souls of prophets or of awliya' or with angels, facts not taught to others will be taught to him. If one understands that someone is a wali and loves him, his soul gets attached to the wali'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 awliya', reading the Qur'an and giving alms and sending its thawab to their souls, and revering 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. One who gets benefit from the souls is called an Uwaysi. Because his attraction is very strong, Hadrat 'Abd al-Qadir al-Geilani has the ability to be beneficial as alive awliya have. This faqir paid my tawajjuh to the souls of the mashayikh and attained many blessings. Five hundred

years after the death of the mashayikh, there is not any natural power left in their bodies and their effects on those who visit their graves become more. 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."

Wali-Allah ad-Dahlawi (rahmat-Allahi 'alaih) further wrote: "One is permitted to gather the rukhsas of the four madhhabs only when it is not prohibited by the explicit nasses of the Qur'an and Hadith, by the ijma' of the Salaf as-Salihin or by an explicit qiyas." [Izalat al-khafa, p. 522, Pakistan, 1386 (1966), original Persian and translated Urdu versions together.] As it is seen, Shah Wali-Allah, let alone saying that the madhhabs should be united, he makes conditions even for taking their rukhsas.

Mawdudi goes on attacking the Ahl as-Sunnat scholars and again claims to quote from Shah Wali-Allah's book Musaffa, on the 91st page of his book The Revivalist Movement in Islam: "Ijtihad is necessary in every age. It is necessary to put new rules event if it may not agree with a certain madhhab. Because it is a must to have divine responsibilities according to the peculiarities of every century. The books of the madhhabs that have been written up to now are inefficient and full of 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 Shah Wali-Allah. He makes that great scholar a false witness for himself. These slanders reveal his real purpose and raise his mask. Hadrat Wali-Allah, however, wrote in the preface of his famous work Izalat al-khafa:

"Most of the rules declared in the Qur'an are concise. They cannot be solved or understood without the explanation by the Salaf as-Salihin. Most of those hadiths reported by one person cannot be documents unless they were reported by many of the Salaf as-Salihin and unless the mujtahids derived rules from them. If those great people had not worked so hard, the hadiths that seemed to disagree with one another would not have been brought together. Likewise, unless all the branches of religious knowledge, such as 'ilm al-qira'a, 'ilm at-tafsir, 'ilm al-'aqa'id and 'ilm as-suluk, have come from those great people, they cannot be documents. In all these branches of knowledge, as-Sahaba were the source for the Salaf as-Salihin and shed light on their way. The pillar to which the Salaf as-Salihin held on is the cuffs of the Khulafa' ar-rashidin. The person who breaks this origin, this pillar, will be demolishing the whole religious knowledge."

Shah Wali-Allah further wrote: "For being a mujtahid, it is necessary to know the majority of the detailed documentation from the Qur'an, Hadith, ijma' and from qiyas of the knowledge of fiqh. He must 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 kitab qira'atan wa tafsiran; 'ilm al-hadith, that is, to know each hadith together with its documents and to recognize the daif hadith and the sahih hadith immediately; the third one is 'ilm al-aqawil as-Salaf, that is, to know what the Salaf as-Salihin said about each matter so that one will not go out of ijma', so that one 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, bayan, ma'ani, balagha,] etc; the fifth one is 'ilm at-turuq al-istinbat wa wujuh 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 similar to it together with its documents. It should be known certainly that interpreting the Qur'an also requires being deeply specialized in these five branches. In addition, it is necessary to know the

hadiths telling the reason for the descent of the ayats. He should know what the Salaf as-Salihin said about interpreting the Qur'an. His memory and comprehension should be very strong. He should understand the siyaq, sibaq and tawjih of ayats and the like." [Izalat al-khafa, p.21.] Those people who attempt to do ijihad and to write Qur'an commentaries, such as Mawdudi, 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 arises the fact that those who do not realize this or do not want this to be realized either by themselves or by others are trying to demolish Islam from the inside under the mask of Muslim scholars. May Allahu ta'ala protect Muslims against believing such insidious enemies of Islam! Lest my dear readers should be taken in by wrong, very dangerous articles of anti-madhhabite people, I deem it proper to give additional information on ijihad in the following.

7-Ijihad, past-present

45 - **IJTIHAD**: 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 lead everybody astray. These symptoms are written in detail in the hadiths written in Mukhtasar at-tazkirat al-Qurtubi and in al-Birghiwi's Wasiyyat-nama. Then, Muslims should be vigilant. They should not believe in every word. They should not believe those who do not mention the Ahl as-Sunnat scholars and their books but extract meanings from ayats and hadiths 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 Muslims and led them astray. We should search for the meanings which the Ahl as-Sunnat scholars have given to the ayats and hadiths about which those heretical people talk and should learn the truth of the matter. For doing this, we should read the dependable 'ilm al-hal books. The Ahl as-Sunnat scholars have studied all the ayats and hadiths minutely, found out their true meanings by splitting hairs and written them down in books. Now the ignorant of religion who know little Arabic assume themselves to be mujtahids. By saying, "We have graduated from the university; we have received diploma," they despise Islamic scholars. Whereas, if a teaching which the mujtahids of a period have reported as ijma', 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 ijma' becomes an unbeliever. He who believes but does not follow it becomes a fasiq. 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 bidat. He who does not follow it becomes a fasiq, a sinner.

Ibn Malak wrote on ijma' in his book Usul 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 succeeding them should follow the words of one of them and is not permissible for them to say differently. All scholars have said unanimously that it must be so and thus ijma' has resulted." There is not a mujtahid in any part of the world today. 'Mujtahid' means 'an Islamic scholar who has attained to the grade of ijihad'. Not from ourselves do we say that there is no mujtahid on the earth today; all scholars have been declaring this, including Hadrat Shah Wali-Allah ad-Dahlawi, of whom Mawdudi tries to make a false witness. For example, Ibn 'Abidin, while commenting on the

statement, "To call very loud for the muazzins will spoil their salat," in Durr al-mukhtar, wrote: "After 400 years following Rasulullah's ('alaihi 's-salam) death there has come no great scholar to do qiyas, and no mutlaq mujtahid who could derive rules by comparing one affair to another came." As declared in the Hadith, profound scholars who would attain to the grade of ijtiḥad would come every hundred years, but these have been the mujtahids within a madhhab, who have not undertaken the task of doing qiyas, that is, performing new ijtiḥad, but have tried to renovate the ijtiḥad of the leader of the madhhab to which they have belonged and to lead people to the right course, seeing that there was no need for new ijtiḥad and being interested in emphasizing the Ahl as-Sunnat knowledge. 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 ijtiḥad over a matter disagreeing with what the mujtahids have communicated before; this is understood from the unanimity quoted from Ibn Malak above. The hadith, "My umma will not agree on deviation," indicates that this unanimity of scholars is a means of salvation and is correct.

8- Fatwa about Mawdudi's deviation

46 - Mawdudi was one of the descendants of Khwaja Qutb ad-din Mawdud al-Chishti, a notable of the Chishtiyya Tariqa. Hadrat Muin ad-din al-Chishti of Ajmar was Qutb ad-din's caliph, one of those who were ordered and given permission by him to guide the people who wanted to learn. Mawdudi was born in Hyderabad 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-Banna's thoughts and caused him to revolt against the government in Egypt and to be killed. Mawdudi's inefficiency in knowledge has brought innumerable Muslims like this 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 would spread not through revolution but through knowledge, justice and morals. Mawdudi strove to solve all the main principles of Islam with his own reason and always departed from Islamic scholars and Islamic knowledge. If one observes his books minutely, one will easily 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 shaped Islam's institution of caliphate according to 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 mujahid. His political thoughts were considered extensive Islamic knowledge.

Mawdudi 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. Whereas, those who suggested the idea of Pakistan's establishment and who worked for this purpose were numerous others led by Ali Jinnah. While Ali Jinnah was arousing in the Indian Muslims the

idea of independence and inviting them to unity, Mawdudi made demands for his personal advantages. In order to prevent disunion, a fatwa was issued for his imprisonment. His instigation was suppressed and Pakistan became firmly established in 1366 (1947), and he was freed in 1950. As the pure Muslims of the Ahl as-Sunnat pursued the cause of Islam within the new state, Mawdudi began to busy the minds with a false religion named "Qadianism", and consequently in 1953, he was judged and imprisoned for 26 months more. 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 inoculating 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 Mawdudi did not keep quiet. He caused the organization of Jamaat 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, Mawdudi 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 hadith, "Upon him who helps a cruel person, Allahu ta'ala sends that cruel person to worry him," manifested and he was imprisoned by those whom he wanted to approach.

Muhammad Yusuf Banuri (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-ustad al-Mawdudi* that Abu 'l-ala Mawdudi (Mawdudi) was anti-madhhabite and unqualified in Islam. Muhammad Yusuf wrote:

"As an unfortunate coincidence in his youth, Mawdudi employed a mulhid named Niyaz Fathpuri as his secretary, whose heretical ideas demoralized him. With the help of his secretary, he could give articles to various periodicals and made his living on writing. Then he took hold of the directorate of the *Jamiyyat al-'Ulama' al-Hind*, later editing the periodical *Muslim* with the help of Mufti Muhammad Kifayatullah and Shaikh Ahmad Said ad-Dahlawi. He started the periodical *Tarjuman al-Qur'an* in 1352 (1933). Later he founded the *Dar al-Islam* with his four friends namely Muhammad Mauzir Numani, Abu 'l-Hasan 'Ali Nadwi Luknawi, Amin Ahsan al-Islahi and Masud 'Alim an-Nadwi. At last he established *Al-Jamaat al-Islamiyya* in 1360 (1941). He wrote many articles with his fluent pen. He won the appreciation and praise of great scholars such as Shaikh Munazir Ahsan al-Geilani, Sayyid Sulaiman an-Nadwi and 'Abdulmajid Daryabadi. When he began to spread his ideas, there arose doubts in the long-sighted men of knowledge. Against his book, Shaikh Munazir Ahsan al-Geilani was the first who wrote criticism under the heading "A New Kharijite" in the periodical *Sidq al-jadid* which was edited by 'Abdulmajid Daryabadi. Then Sayyid Sulaiman an-Nadwi and Husain Ahmad al-Madani wrote refutations against Mawdudi.

"The reason for the heresy of Mawdudi was that he learned religious information from the non-authority. He could not gain any skill in the Arabic sciences. He could not attain to the sohbat 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 Masud 'Alim an-Nadwi and his disciple. Because the author was written as Mawdudi on their covers, the readers thought that Mawdudi wrote them in Arabic.

"Mawdudi is not a man of religion but a politician. He has a fluent style in the Urdu language, but the sins his books cause are much greater than their benefit. Their harm is much more. Their

evils surpass their good effects. He tries to blemish as-Sahaba especially in his Urdu books. He defames 'Uthman (radi-Allahu 'anh), the Khalifat ar-rashid. He alters the terminology of Islam and blessed ayats. He insults at the Salaf as-Salihin. All his writings openly reveal his desire for position and fame. The members of the Rabitat al-Alam al-Islami, which was founded by the lamadhhabi, 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 Kusaymi, the author of Sarra', and Nasir Albani, a mudarris at the Jamiat al-Madina. Muhammad Zakariyya, a Pakistani man of religion, liked Mawdudi's writings at first, but later he wrote a letter of advice to him and published a booklet covering his heretical opinions when he understood his heresy and deviation. Doctor 'Abdurrazzaq Hazarawi Pakistani translated this booklet into Arabic and published it adding his comments. Those who read it will understand Mawdudi's opinions openly. Some of his opinions are of fisq (immorality); some are bidat'; some are ilhad (heresy); some reveal his ignorance in Islam, and some others show that he has not understood religious knowledge well. His various writing contradict one another.

"Great Muslim scholars of India of every madhhab congregated at Jamiyyat al-'Ulama' in Delhi on the 27th of Shawwal, 1370 (August 1, 1951) and reached the conclusion that Mawdudi and his Al-Jamaat al-Islamiyya caused the destruction and deviation of Muslims and published this fatwa (decision) in a book and in papers." [Al-ustad al-Mawdudi, p.7. Reproduced in Arabic by Hakikat Kitabevi, Istanbul, 1977.] And the scholars of Pakistan passed a resolution that Mawdudi was a heretic who tried to make others heretics; this resolution was edited once again in the Akhbar al-Jamiyya in Rawalpindi on the 22nd of February, 1396 (1976).

A certain group in the Muslim world propagandize Muhammad 'Abduh, Mawdudi and Sayyid Qutb's ideas which are against Islam, as if they were of ingenuity. 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 validity of the identification of these people is Mawdudi's own words, which are incompatible with Islam's basic teachings and which are written in the paragraphs above. May Allahu ta'ala protect Muslim children against being tricked by heretical, aberrant ideas. Amin

9-Exposing some heretical thoughts of freemason reformer Muhammad Abduh (Abdoh)

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-waqayi' al-Misriyya, an Egyptian paper of his time, in the magazine Al-Manar and in the paper Al-Ahram reveal his heretical thoughts. He had some activities in Beirut for a while, too, but the Ahl as-Sunnat scholars perceived his evil purposes and he had to go to Paris. There, he cooperated with Jamal ad-din al-Afghani, who had been preparing the application of freemason plans against Islam, and they published the magazine Al-'urwat al-wuthqa. Then he returned to Beirut and

Egypt, and began to apply the decisions made in Paris and to deceive the youth. The government of Khidiw Tawfiq Pasha, seeing that his lectures and articles were harmful, employed him in one of the offices of the law-court. But he continued trying to demolish Islam and to apply the masonic plans in all his writings. With the help of freemasons he became the Mufti of Cairo. He began to attack the Ahl as-Sunnat. As the first activity, he attempted to change the curriculum of the madrasa of Jami' al-Azhar, thus preventing the youth from valuable courses. He abrogated the university level courses. High and junior high school books were taught in the universities. Freemasons had already done the same thing in the Ottoman Empire; after the Tanzimat (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 get defiled. When there is no cloud, it will be to wish for miracles to expect rain. Allahu ta'ala is able to make this, but His Divine Custom 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.

Hanna Abi Rashid, chief of the masonic lodge in Beirut, wrote: "Jamal ad-din al-Afghani was the chief of the masonic lodge in Egypt, which had about three hundred members, most of whom were 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." [Da'irat al-maarif al-masoniyya, p. 197, Beirut, 1381/1961.]

Seeing the reforms made by Muhammad 'Abduh, many people suppose that he was an Islamic scholar. The Ahl as-Sunnat scholars have written answers to his articles and torn up his mask. For example, Elmalili Hamdi Beg, in his interpretation of the surat 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-Sunnat books and to spread the irreligious propagandas written by the enemies of Islam under the name of philosophy in Muslim countries. The opposition of the professors of Jami' al-Azhar to these propagandas was called "retrogression and enmity against knowledge, science and logic" by him.
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'an and Hadith, and that he had been correcting them.
5. In his book Islam and Christianity, he wrote that all religions were the same except being different only outwardly 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'an 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 fell into a bad situation, that the religion will shake hands with knowledge and then Allahu ta'ala would complete His Light. To him, Allahu ta'ala did not complete His religion in the time of our master Rasulullah (sall-Allahu '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 though it shows unbelief in a hundred respects. Then, they all should be acknowledged as believers. The word 'zindiq' does not exist in Islam. It has been produced 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 zindiq, he did not like this word to be used. He denied the hadith, "Zindiqs among my umma will increase," which is written in Kunuz ad-daqa'iq and ad-Dailami's Musnad.

8. In the interpretation of the ayat, "He who does goodness as heavy as a mote will get its reward certainly," of the surat az-Zilzal, he wrote: "Either be a Muslim or an unbeliever, everybody who does good deeds will enter Paradise." This wrong, unjust claim, which would be laughed 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 ayat of the surat an-Nisa', had to say, "Master Muhammad 'Abduh does not ever remember the clearness of the ayats contradicting his thought. These ayats contradict 'Abduh's ideas." In fact, the dosage of the masonic opium which Abduh was made to swallow in Paris was so much that his mind and conscience were too upset to see the relations between the ayats.

9. In the interpretation of the surat al-'Asr, he said, "Iman does not mean an imitative belief in the things which mind and conscience cannot grasp. It is not of iman 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 *Risalat at-tawhid*, [A compilation of his propagandas directed to the students of Al-madrasat as-Sultaniyya in Beirut in 1885, published a year after his death.] 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 Hilal Publications in Egypt and author of *The History of Islamic Civilization*, wrote about 'Abduh, "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 Fatiha, he wrote: "The Qur'an 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 hadiths about the superiority attained by as-Sahaba.

12. In an attempt to interpret the ayat, "The deed-books of fajirs are in Sijjin," he wrote: "I have seen in some people's books that 'senjun' means 'mud' in the Ethiopian language. This word has probably come to Yaman from Ethiopia. The ayat, then, means, 'The deeds of the fajirs are like

mud.' " Disliking the interpretations of Rasulullah ('alaihi 's-salam), as-Sahabat al-kiram and of the profound Islamic scholars, he interpreted ayats depending on coincidence and probability.

13. When interpreting the surat al-Fil, he wrote, "The birds of Ababil may be mosquitos, so the soldiers possibly died of small-pox or measles." I wonder how he would interpret it if he came a hundred years later. Whereas, Rasulullah ('alaihi 's-salam) explained their meanings, and tafsir scholars found these meanings and wrote them in their books.

14. In the interpretation of the surat an-Nas, 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." This poor man, who knew nothing about the books and knowledge of Islamic scholars, came forward with the claim that it was necessary to follow only the 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 kalam, fiqh and tasawwuf and that he had not tasted Islamic flavor. If he had understood the greatness of Islamic scholars and escaped the paws 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-balagha by Radi, who was the brother of 'Ali Murtada', a convert from the Jewish religion. This book, which caused faction among Muslims, had been commented on first by Ibn Abi 'l-Hadid 'Abd al-Hamid al-Mada'ini ash-Shii and then by another Shiite, Maisum al-Bahrani, Abduh's commentary was printed in Beirut in 1301 (1885).

10-Freemason reformer Sayyid Qutb's attack on some Sahaba al-kiram and its answer

48 - Sayyid Qutb, one of the religion reformers of this century, too, announced his admiration for Ibn Taymiyya 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 Taymiyya."

If he meant the empire of Genghis by Tatars, Ibn Taymiyya had not been born yet when the Georgians (of Caucasus), the Persians and the Tatars in the army of Hulagu, the famous unbeliever, burned and ruined Baghdad and put hundreds of Muslims to the sword in 565 A.H. Ibn Taymiyya was born in Harran in 661 A.H. It is written in the Turkish Islam Ansiklopedisi (volume V) that he was assigned to preach for jihad 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 *Mirat al-ka'inat*, "Sultan Mahmud Ghazan Khan, Hulagu's grandson, became the Mogul ruler in 694 A.H. That year, upon the advices of Amir Nawruz, his vizier, he embraced Islam with 400,000 Mongols including his commanders, viziers and soldiers. He read the Qur'an and fasted [in the Ramadan of] that year." And on the 930th page of *Qisas-i*

Anbiya' is written, "Ghazan Mahmud Khan wrote to Egyptian Sultan Nasser to cooperate with him and work fraternally so that Islam might get stronger. Nasser, who was the ninth Turkoman sultan, did not listen to him. Nasser's soldiers plundered the neighborhood of Mardin. Upon this, Ghazan Khan came to Aleppo in 699 A.H. Nasser's army was routed in Homs. Ghazan Khan left a commander named Kapchak and a number of fighters to capture Damascus and he himself went back to his country. 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 Taymiyya, 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 Ghazan Khan, whom Sayyid Qutb slanders in order to represent Ibn Taymiyya as an Islamic struggler, 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 belonged to the Ahl as-Sunnat. Shamsaddin Sami Beg wrote that he loved to make the right prevail and to do justice and possessed many virtues and superiorities and that he was reverent to sayyids and scholars. If Ibn Taymiyya had advised these two Muslim sultans and had told them that they were brothers by following the ayat, "Reconcile your brothers!" as the Ahl as-Sunnat scholars had done, Ghazan Khan and Sultan Nasser, who were goodwill themselves, would have co-operated and, perhaps, he would have caused the establishment of a greater Islamic empire. Even the process of history and the world's face would have changed. He did not perform this benevolent deed but set men of knowledge and rulers at loggerheads.

Long before Ibn Taymiyya when the Tatarian unbelievers ruined and burned Muslim countries and martyred millions of Muslims, not the men of bidat like Ibn Taymiyya but the preaches and books of Burhan ad-din Shadid, Fakhr ad-din ar-Razi, 'Umar an-Nasafi, Sadr ad-din al-Qonawi, Shaikh Sadi ash-Shirazi and many other Ahl as-Sunnat scholars and thousands of awliya', who were educated by the spiritual masters such as Ahmad ar-Rifai, Imam al-Ghazali, Najm ad-din al-Kubra, Ahmad an-Namiqi Jami' and 'Abd al-Qadir al-Geilani, protected Muslims' religion and iman. These great 'ulama' and awliya' both guided the peoples of many countries to the right course and performed jihad in person against unbelievers as soldiers. Many of them became martyrs. The history is obvious.

49 - In the 42nd paragraph above, it is explained that Ibn Taymiyya 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-salamu al-'alamiyya wal-Islam* (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 much as necessary."

He wants this knowledge to be learned from his book. The laws, constitutions, fatwas and documents in the achieves of the six-hundred-year-old Ottoman Empire are so countless that it might take a whole life to examine the thousands of books of Islam's policy of state control. The European orientalist 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 when he was a student, and

thus he pretended to be a savior and a fighter for Islam. As he cleverly strived to inject 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 do not remain 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 on the policy of state control, which had been written throughout centuries, had not been along the way of Islam, 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'an and the Hadith, would have been abandoned and the philosopher Qutb's ideas would have been 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."

Rasulullah (sall-Allahu 'alaihi wa sallam) declared in a hadith ash-Sharif quoted by al-Ghazali in his book *Kimya' as-saada*, "The basis and the most dependable symptom of having iman is to love Muslims and to dislike unbelievers." Allahu ta'ala declared to Hadrat 'Isa ('alaihi 's-salam) (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 ayat of the surat al-Mujadala, "Those who believe in Allahu ta'ala and in the Day of Resurrection dislike the enemies of Allahu ta'ala." Allahu ta'ala and His Prophet ('alaihi 's-salam) 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.

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 Mathum wrote in the twenty-ninth letter of his *Maktubat*, "It has been clearly commanded in the Qur'an to dislike unbelievers, to be hostile against them by heart, to treat the people of dar 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'an." We should do justice to zimmi, the unbelievers in a Muslim country, and we should not do harm to them. Sayyid Qutb regarded the unbelievers in dar 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."

Whereas, jihad is intended to make Allahu ta'ala'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 zimmi. Allahu ta'ala commanded the jihad 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 ayat of the surat an-Nisa', "Those who perform jihad against the enemies of the religion by sacrificing their wealth and lives in order to spread Allahu ta'ala's religion are higher than those who sit and worship." Jihad and ghaza are

the two forms of al-amru bi'l-maruf by using force against unbelievers. Jihad 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 make people to admit Islam by force. 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 inviting to the religion."

Sayyid Qutb reversed the meaning of jihad, which is openly ordered in the Qur'an and Hadith and unanimously defined in millions of books and countless 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 Qadianism (Ahmadiyya), which has been put forth by the British in India and which has nothing to do with Islam.

When explaining the seventy-third and following ayats of the surat an-Nisa', he, too, had to write the truth as communicated by the Ahl as-Sunnat 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. Jihad is necessary all the time. It is an element that walks together with the Divine Invitation," and quoted the hadiths encouraging to jihad. On the other hand, in the interpretation of the ayat, "If they turn away from tawhid 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 slandered Islam and denied what he had written on the previous page. Interpreting the 100th ayat well, "He who migrates for the cause of Allahu ta'ala 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 wajib for those Muslims who remained in a country of unbelievers to migrate to dar al-Islam. 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 "jihad". Whereas, 'jihad' means 'the Islamic State's fighting with its army, with all its modern weapons and methods of war against non-Muslim states to rescue people from unbelief and torture'. The jihad 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 showing the beautiful morals of Islam.

Hadrat al-Imam ar-Rabbani wrote: "When going out to fight against unbelievers, one has to intend to spread the Name and Religion of Allahu ta'ala and to weaken the enemies of the religion. Muslims have been commanded this. And this is what jihad means." [Maktubat, II, 69th letter.]

Allahu ta'ala declares in the twenty-eighth ayat of the surat at-Tawba, "Fight against those who do not believe in Allahu ta'ala and in the Last Day and who do not say 'haram' about what Allahu ta'ala and His Messenger ('alaihi 's-salam) said 'haram' and who do not admit the religion of truth, until they accept to pay the jizya or become Muslims!" When Hadrat 'Umar (radi-Allahu 'anh) became the caliph, he delivered a khutba to encourage the Sahabat al-kiram to jihad and

ghaza, by saying, "O the Prophet's ('alaihi 's-salam) companions! Allahu ta'ala has promised that He would give Muhammad's ('alaihi 's-salam) 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 ghazi 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'ala's human creatures and leave their home to attack the dictators, who are the enemies of Islam?" Upon this speech, the Sahabat al-kiram promised to go to jihad against unbelievers. Leaving their homes, they spread over the world. They performed jihad till death. This jihad 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 muamalat and 'uqubat, they were legally considered as Muslims. They lived in comfort and peace.

Islam defines two kinds of countries in the world: dar al-Islam, the Muslim country, and dar al-harb, the country of unbelievers. In dar al-Islam, Muslims and the unbelievers who pay the jizya live. These unbelievers are called ahl adh-dhimma or zimmi. They live comfortably and peacefully possessing Muslims' rights and freedom fully. 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; Islam only wants them to have iman and become real Muslims or to admit the jizya and become Muslims legally. In order that they may attain to one of these two, it commands Muslims to perform jihad against the dictators who tyrannize over them. The jihad 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 jihad but incitement to sedition. It is surprising that when beginning to interpret the surat al-Ma'ida, Sayyid Qutb, too, explained these two kinds of country correctly, thus concealing his own point of view.

Imam Muhammad ash-Shaibani wrote: "The commandment of jihad 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-kitab (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,' descended. In the ayat which descended sixthly it was commanded for the State, the army, to fight with the unbelievers all the time. Thus, jihad became fard kifaya; if the State does not make preparations for it nor perform it, all Muslims will be punished in Hell. It should always make preparations for jihad, 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 dar al-Islam, it is fard 'ain, fard for every Muslim, woman or man, to fight under the army's command, against these cruel people." [Translation of Imam Muhammad ash-Shaibani's *As-siyar al-kabir*, p.82.]

Sayyid Qutb wrote correctly about jihad 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 another book of his. Communists, too, introduce themselves differently in different countries and conceal themselves.

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 whole humanity."

Islam provides for peace and order in dar al-Islam. For this, it is sufficient for Muslims and zimmi in dar al-Islam to obey Islam's commands and prohibitions, since peace and order can be maintained only by following the commands and prohibitions of Allahu ta'ala. Those who do not follow them are brought to the right course with the punishments which, again, are shown by Islam. Muslims do not fight for the comfort, peace and ease of the unbelievers in dar al-harb. In fact, unbelievers, not through war but by embracing Islam or by accepting to pay the jizya, can attain to peace and order. Wherever the Qur'an is obeyed, peace, ease and justice happen by themselves. It is for this reason that Allahu ta'ala endowed Islam on His human creatures. Muhammad's ('alaihi 's-salam) prophethood is His compassion for all human creatures. Therefore, Muslims perform jihad in order to make unbelievers attain to peace and ease through this single way. They sacrifice their lives and wealth in order that all the people on the earth may be honored by being Muslims. Allahu ta'ala declared that He has created all human beings so that they become Muslims. He commands all of them to become Muslims. He promises to reward very much in the next world those who perform jihad for this salvation of His human creatures. The spread of His word means the spread of kalimat at-tawhid, thus jihad means the spread of kalimat at-tawhid, that is, iman. The only way of providing people with justice, peace, order and safety is the spreading of kalimat at-tawhid all over the world. World's peace can be established only as such. It was declared in a hadith quoted in *As-siyar al-kabir*, "I was commanded to fight with people. I will fight until they say, 'La ilaha illa'llah,' " Ibn 'Abidin wrote *Durr al-mukhtar*: "Jihad is the call for all people to iman, the State's fighting against the dictators who prevent them from hearing and admitting this call. The individual's Jihad is to help the Islamic army by praying and doing everything necessary in material and thought. Jihad is fard kifaya. 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 makruh tahrima; if the State's money does not suffice, it is permissible to ask help of the people." The help collected by force should be paid back later.

It is fard kifaya for Muslims to make and use in jihad 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 ceaselessly attacking Islam to deceive especially the youth. Muslim men should make atomic bomb, rockets, jet planes and electronic apparatuses on the one part, and on the other part they should stand against the cold war of unbelievers. They should both teach the superiority, the uses of Islam to Muslims, to Muslim youngsters by means of books, magazines, newspaper, radio and motion pictures and spread it all over the world. 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 service to Islam and to be able to confront 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-Sunnat today. Those who are inefficient in one of these two will be rather harmful than

useful to Islam. The saying "A half scholar takes away one's faith," is well-known. These should be done by men. When men work, there will be no hard labor left for women to do. In every village the State should open courses for teaching the Qur'an, and every boy or girl should be taught the Qur'an and the fundamental teachings of Islam. Old men and ladies should perform 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 directed by 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 and who are even unaware of this terrible war will suffer punishment in both this and the next worlds. Those who help the State that fights against the enemies of Islam as much as they can, will be rewarded for jihad in the next world. By making jihad 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 from their paws these innocent people and guide them to happiness. This order, this 'ibada, can be done by helping the State, the army of jihad. If it is done without the State's permission, it is not jihad but fitna and anarchy. Allahu ta'ala helps the working people. He dislikes and does not help those who sit idly.

It was declared in a hadith quoted in al-Bukhari's and Muslim's Sahihain and explained in Bariqa and Al-Hadiqa 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 want them to be unified on the truth, for only what the Ahl as-Sunnat scholars have pointed out is true among all of them. It was declared in the Hadith 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 believe the same belief, the Ahl as-Sunnat itiqad. For accomplishing this, we should read the books, magazines and papers writing about what the Ahl as-Sunnat scholars have reported and supply them for our acquaintances. 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 corrupts their morals and tries to harm their religious beliefs, we should report him to the Ministry of Education and transfer them to a school with conscientious, honorable, learned teachers who are men of Allahu ta'ala. We should prevent our children from being dragged on to endless disaster and be very vigilant lest they should fall into the traps of the enemies of Islam. We should send our children to the teachers of the Qur'an before they reach the age for school. We should strive to illuminate their fresh brains and pure souls with the light of the Qur'an al-karim. Children can be brought up as Muslims only in this manner. A country can remain Muslim only if the children are brought up as Muslims. These writings constitute the ideological jihad, and this jihad is fard like the jihad through war.

50 - In this book World's Peace and Islam, Sayyid Qutb wrote:

"Zakat is collected from the main wealth in an amount of two-and-a-half per cent every year. The state collects this tax as it collects every 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. Zakat is a

tax. The state collects it and spends it on certain places. Zakat is not an individual gift of alms that passes from hand to hand.

"If, today, some people divide the zakat 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 Taymiyya's words on zakat, departed from the Ahl as-Sunnat scholars also on this point. Mawdudi and Hamidullah, too, write the same about zakat. The four madhhabs of the Ahl as-Sunnat unanimously report that 'zakat' means 'to give (tamlik) a certain part of one's fully possessed zakat goods obtained in a halal way to seven out of eight kinds of Muslims described in the Qur'an al-karim'. In the Hanafi madhhab, it can be given even to only one of them. These seven kinds of Muslims are: faqir; miskin; 'amil, the collector of the zakat of stock animals and that of farm products called 'ushr; one who is on hajj or ghaza; 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'an to give zakat also to the eighth class of persons called al-muallafat al-qulub 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. Rasulullah ('alaihi 's-salam) had given zakat to all these three kinds of people. But Hadrat 'Umar (radi-allahu 'anh) who was in charge of bait al-mal during the time of Hadrat Abu Bakr (radi-Allahu 'anh), read the ayat quoted by Ibn 'Abidin and the Ma'adh hadith reported by Ibn 'Abidin to be quoted in all al-kutub as-sitta and said that Rasulullah ('alaihi 's-salam) had abolished the giving of zakat to al-muallafat al-qulub. The Caliph and all the Sahabat al-kiram admitted this and the ijma' formed that it had been abolished and none of them would be given zakat any more. Abolition (nash) could be done when Rasulullah ('alaihi 's-salam) was alive, and ijma' could be done after his death. Those who cannot comprehend this delicacy suppose that Hadrat 'Umar (radi-Allahu 'anh) himself abolished it and they speak ill of the Sahabat al-kiram and fiqh scholars. As it is reported in Badayi' and other books, it is always permissible to give goods or money to the enemy in order to help the religion and to prevent their harm, but it can be given not from the zakat but from another division of bait al-mal. Then, it has not been prohibited to give something to the persons called al-muallafat al-qulub, but it has been prohibited to give them zakat.

There are four types of zakat goods: gold and silver; commercial goods; quadruped stock animals; crops. The zakat of the products growing from the earth is called 'ushr. It is written in Majma' al-anhur and Radd al-mukhtar, "The State had been collecting every kind of zakat from the rich until Caliph 'Uthman (radi-Allahu 'anh) left it to them to deliver personally the zakat of gold and silver and commercial goods. He did this so that the officials who collected the zakat should not torment the people or take zakat from the debtors. Thus he also protected the debtors from imprisonment. All the Sahabat al-kiram agreed with him and ijma' took place. When the possessors of these kinds of goods give their zakat, the State cannot demand it. If it demands, it will be opposing the ijma' ". To say that one cannot give the zakat himself means to hold the ijma' of the Sahabat al-kiram of the time of Hadrat 'Uthman (radi-Allahu 'anh) of no account. The Ahl as-Sunnat scholars, having comprehended the greatness of the Sahabat al-kiram, have not followed their own points of view and understanding but adapted themselves to the ijma' of the Sahabat al-kiram.

The Ahl as-Sunnat scholars declare that the rich person has to hand his zakat to the poor. If a rich person nourishes an orphan under this guardianship with the intention of zakat, he does not give the zakat at all. He should give the food to the child and the child should eat 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 zakat; the rich person must see the poor or his representative take it. If he, with the intention of zakat, lets the poor one live in his house and if he does not take hire, it will not be accepted as zakat, for he has to give goods to the poor. Of the four types of zakat goods, the legal (mashru') State collects the zakat of certain animals and crops and of the commercial goods 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 a representative of the poor. For none of the charitable deeds and public services such as building mosque, fountain, road or dam or performing hajj or jihad can the money of zakat be spent. Every type of zakat should be handed to one of the seven kinds of persons or to his representative. The State cannot use the zakat it has collected in other fields but gives to the seven kinds of persons. It is more thawab for the rich person to give it to his poor relatives, poor pious Muslims and to the poor who study knowledge. The Hadith says, "O my umma! I swear by Allahu ta'ala, who has sent me as the Prophet, that Allahu ta'ala does not accept the zakat 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 bidat who have become unbelievers like the Mushabbiha.

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

In Durr-i Yakta, one of the most valuable Turkish 'ilm al-hal books, it is written: "Of the four types of zakat goods, gold and silver and commercial goods are called al-amwal al-batina (secret possessions). It is not permissible to investigate secret possessions and to ask for their zakat. It has been left to their possessors to estimate the amount of such possessions and give their zakat. The possessor is free to give his zakat to any poor person he likes. The animals of zakat and farm products are called al-amwal az-zahira. It has not been left to the owner to estimate the amount of al-amwal az-zahira and to distribute its zakat to the poor. These will be done by the 'amil, the official sent by the imam of Muslims."

What men need and keep for use is a possession. A few seeds of wheat, a spoonful of soil, a drought 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 money, would become of no currency in markets, become useless and would not be kept for use. Ibn 'Abidin wrote on "Sarf" in his Radd al-mukhtar: "If flus (copper coin) is legal tender, it will be money worth the value written on it. If the value written on it is canceled, 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 zakat of one's full possessions, that is, his goods which he is permitted and able to save or use, should be given. If they are not his full possessions, their zakat need not be given. If the zakat goods are in his hands, they are called 'ain. If someone else keeps them, they are called dain. In trade, it is different for the goods to be 'ain or dain. Mabi', goods that have been bought, become one's possessions 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 added to the account of zakat before delivery. Before the saman (exchange, payment) of a property sold 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, that is, if it is sold on credit, it can be given [as a present, alms, etc.] only to the debtor (buyer). For this reason, the saman also will be added to the account of zakat before it has been taken.

Whether 'ain or dain, one year after one's full possessions of al-amwal al-batina reach the amount of nisab (the border of richness), it is fard to determine one-fortieth of it and give it as zakat. It is written in the book Durr al-mukhtar that its zakat is given 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 zakat of the part that has been donated will have been given as dain, too. If dain property in a rich person's hands is donated to him, its zakat has to be given to the poor as 'ain in addition by the donor.
- 2) The zakat of a property which is 'ain should be given as 'ain. That is, in order to give the zakat of a property which is present, the owner will reserve one-fortieth of this property which is in his hands and give it to the poor.
- 3) The zakat of a property which is dain cannot be given as dain. It should be given as 'ain, that is, the zakat of one's property which someone else keeps must be given out of his property which is present in his hands. If he has no property present, he asks for and takes as much as the amount of the zakat of his property from the one who keeps his property and then gives it to the poor.
- 4) It is not permissible to give the zakat of a property which is 'ain as dain, that is, it is not permissible to donate what he has lent to other poor people to a poor person as the zakat of his property which is present in his hands. But, it is permissible for him to command the poor person to get the debt which someone else owes him, as the zakat of his property which is in his hands, for it will become 'ain when the poor man takes the property or gold from debtor, and thus the zakat of his property which is 'ain will have been given as 'ain. The zakat of a property which a poor person keeps as dain cannot be given from that dain property, for the remainder will become 'ain when he takes it from the poor person and the zakat of 'ain will have been given as dain, which is not permissible.
- 5) If one donates a part of the dain which a poor person owes him to that poor person, the zakat of that part will have been given. It will be necessary to give the zakat of the remaining part separately as 'ain. He cannot count what he has donated as the zakat of the remaining part, for the remainder will become 'ain when he takes it back and the zakat of 'ain cannot be given as dain and is not permissible.

It is written in Al-fiqhu 'ala 'l-madhahibi 'l-arba'a, which covers the teachings of fiqh according to each of the four madhhabs separately, that while it is necessary in the three madhhabs to give

the zakat of paper money, its zakat is given when the gold or silver equivalent of it is obtained in the Hanbali madhhab.

The zakat of paper money is given 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 zakat of dain cannot be given as dain, the zakat of paper money cannot be given in paper money. It is necessary to give it as 'ain, that is, to get the dain property into one's hands and then give it to the poor person. Moreover, any kind of debt must be paid from the zakat goods first. While there are zakat goods, that is, gold and silver or commercial goods, it is not permissible to pay the debt by giving another property, for example, rugs and pearl which are used in the house and the zakat of which is not to be given. The zakat of paper money, too, is a debt which one owes to the poor. He has to pay this debt from the zakat goods. Gold is the zakat goods 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 zakat goods such as gold, silver, commercial goods and zakat animals, he has to pay his debt from gold and silver first. [Ad-durr al-mukhtar, and Radd al-mukhtar, p.8.] 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 give the poor as zakat, for the goods that are not commercial for him cannot be given as zakat. He has to buy gold and give it.

In order to give the zakat of commercial goods, their buying price must be as much as the amount of nisab in gold or silver money, and one-fortieth of the goods themselves or of their value will be given. Ash-Sharnblali says in the explanation of Ad-durar, "If the metal coins called flus are current, or if they are commercial goods, it is wajib to give the zakat out of their value." It is declared in a hadith quoted in Hidayah, "Calculating the value, five dirham of silver will be given for two hundred dirham." As it is seen, for the zakat of flus and paper money, not they themselves but as much gold as their value must be given. Those who are not merchants should give the zakat of their paper money only in gold. Merchants may give the zakat of their paper money either in gold or from the goods which they sell, but they cannot give it from other goods. [For more information on zakat, see Endless Bliss, V.]

A person might come forth and say:

"It was in ancient times to give the zakat in gold. Today, gold is not used. Paper money is used everywhere. Now, to say that the zakat has to be given in gold is to arouse difficulty for Muslims. Allahu ta'ala declare, 'Do not arouse difficulty, show easiness!' The use of paper money has become al-balwa al-'umumiyya. The scholars have given permission to use the thing which has become al-balwa al-'umumiyya. Then, why should not the zakat be given in paper money today?"

These words are not correct. They are both wrong and they are slanders against Islamic scholars. Because:

'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 (mash) his masts lightly with wet hands, for Islam has permitted it. Yet one cannot put on one's masts before washing his 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

masts 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 zindiqs. Such zindiqs have increased in Egypt and in the Hijaz today. They explain Islam in the way they wish. The religion-merchants, who give these heretics and zindiqs 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 iman of the people, have been increasing in our country, too.

Our scholars have permitted al-balwa al-'umumiyya, that is, the things that are so widespread that it is hard to dispense with, after having studied the books minutely and finding among various ijtihaads the easiest one even if it would be daif and reporting it to the people. When al-balwa al-'umumiyya is in question, it is permissible to give fatwa according to the most daif 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 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 give the zakat in gold. It is not difficult at all. It is not necessary to buy gold. A rich person who insists on distributing his zakat to the poor in paper money does as the books Ashbah and Radd al-mukhtar write how a rich person can donate the debt a poor person owes him as his zakat 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 nisab. He says to a pious poor Muslim, "I will give the zakat to you and to some of my acquaintances. Our religion commands the zakat to be given 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 representative to take your zakat 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 in whom the rich man trusts is appointed as the representative. He gives the gold as zakat to the representative when the poor person is absent. This representative 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'an, to Muslims who render service to the religion or perform jihad. If he distributes them to those whom it is not permissible to give and those who do not perform salat, he will not be rewarded in the next world though he will escape the punishment of not giving zakat. He returns the gold to the person from whom he has borrowed. If he has to give more zakat, he repeats this procedure.

To the one whose iman is firm, worshiping is not difficult but easy and sweet.

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

"Some people say on behalf of the religion, 'The [money and any] property the zakat of which has been given might not be considered as the property stocked for the duty concerning property is the zakat only. After giving the zakat, there is no guilt in keeping the property away from common use.' This is not true. The owner of personal property may not keep the property away from common use or reserve it. In order to meet the need of bait al-mal, the government may commandeer it, take the excess of it and distribute 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-Imam ar-Rabbani, whom Mawdudi also had to praise, wrote:

"He who wants to attain to endless bliss should adapt himself to Muhammad ('alaihi 's-salam). To get honored by following him, it is not necessary to abandon the world altogether. When the zakat, which is fard, is given, the world will have been abandoned. The property will escape harm, for, the property the zakat of which has been given escapes harm. The remedy of rescuing worldly property from harm is to give its zakat. Though it is better to give all property, giving its zakat is like giving all of it." [Maktubat, I, 165th letter.]

The property the zakat of which has been given does not harm its owner no matter how long it is kept in hand. It is not a guilt to withdraw a property from common use if its zakat 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 to high degrees in the next world. Great scholar Hadrat 'Abd al-Ghani an-Nabulusi wrote in his book Al-Hadiqa that zakat protected property against harm. Rasulullah ('alaihi 's-salam) said, "Protect your property from harm by giving its zakat." This hadith is written also in al-Manawi's Kunuz ad-daqaq with its document. When the ayat, "There is very bitter punishment for those who conceal their golds and silvers and who do not distribute them in Allahu ta'ala's way," descended, Rasulullah ('alaihi 's-salam) said, "Zakat was commanded in order to purify Muslims' possessions. The property whose zakat is given will not be kanz, that is, it will not be considered as a property which is stored." A hadith declares, "There is very bitter punishment in the next world because of the property the zakat of which will have not been given." Sayyid Qutb wrote as if he did not believe these hadiths. It is declared in a hadith reported by at-Tabarani and al-Manawi, "The property the zakat of which has been given is not kanz." Rasulullah ('alaihi 's-salam) said that the property the zakat of which was given would not be considered as stored property, and Sayyid Qutb said that this was incorrect. This shows what kind of a person Sayyid Qutb was.

52 - 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."

Jawdat Pasha, who put Allahu ta'ala's commands into the form of law-articles, says in the 95th article of his Majalla, "One cannot command anybody to use other's property." For example, one cannot command anybody to give that property of so and so to such and such a person. It is written on its 96th article and in Durr al-mukhtar, "A person's property cannot be used without his permission." Property is something which one possesses. A hadith says, "If a Muslim's possession is taken without his consent, it will not be halal." This hadith ash-Sharif is written in the book Kunuz ad-daqaq by Imam al-Manawi, in Musnad by Imam Ahmad and in Sunan by Abu Dawud. This means that the government cannot take something illegitimately or something which exceeds the legitimate amount from the people. It cannot burden the people with illegitimate taxes, either. If it takes, it will have usurped and tortured; it will have to return these goods 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 Rashid Pasha says that ishtirak amwal (collective ownership, communism) is never permissible in Islam. Nor is there a capitalistic system in Islam. The fard of zakat eradicates these two homes of cruelty which gnaw humanity. There is social justice in Islam. Everybody gets the reward of his labor and of the sweat of his brow. Nobody casts covetous eyes on others' possessions. Neither the government nor the rulers may gnaw the people. They cannot use the money of bait al-mal, 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 pays their expense from the public treasury called bait al-mal. It is not permissible to take it from the people by force. The budget of Islamic state is bait al-mal, and the revenue of the state is the revenue of bait al-mal. The state should not exhaust the sources of bait al-mal or waste them or spend them on illegitimate places. If the revenue of bait al-mal does not suffice for jihad and for legitimate services, it will be permissible for it to borrow money justfully from the people. But, later on, it has to be paid back, or it is necessary for those who have lent it to donate it. If it does not run the sources of bait al-mal and if it does not spend bait al-mal on legitimate places, it will have done cruelty. There is extensive information on this subject in the fifth volume of Durr al-mukhtar. If the state furnishes for the revenue of bait al-mal and uses them legitimately, it will suffice for all its duties and will not have to ask for any help from the people. In explaining the thirty-third article of Majalla, Haji Rashid Pasha says that Islam does not permit to meddle with the property of anybody. Even the one who is in urgent need cannot touch 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 on. His hunger or being in the danger of death does not cause somebody to lose his rights on his possessions. 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 Bariqa that the word 'Muslims' in the hadith, "Allahu ta'ala accepts the thing which Muslims consider to be good," means 'Muslims who are profound 'ulama', 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 the road. But unless its cost is paid it cannot be confiscated from him. When the government commands, he can be forced to sell, but it cannot be taken without paying the money.

Communism is not something new. The lexicon Burhan-i qati' 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 worshiped. Everything 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 give their possessions to the poor and meet their need."

Because this religion suited the purposes of lazy people, vagabonds and especially woman-chasers, it spread rapidly. Kubad Shah, too, was an evil person addicted to pleasure. He also admitted communism. When his son Nushirvan came into power, he put base Majdak and his eighty thousand men to the sword and did away with the nuisance of communism. The justice of

Nushirvan Shah is praised in the Hadith. It is obvious that those who prepared the communistic revolution in Russia in 1917 and caused thousands of citizens to massacre one another and a big nation to be enslaved by a small savage minority followed the path of the idiots annihilated by Nushirvan Shah.

The duty of the Islamic government is to protect the property, life and chastity of the people, to get the rights of the oppressed from the cruel. The government may never hurt the property, life and chastity of the people.

53 - 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 government may add it to its treasury, wholly or partly, whenever it wants. Historical examples indicate that the government has been given this right entirely."

He went wrong again. It is true that such unjust earnings cannot be halal. The government has to get them back, not whenever it wants but immediately. But what the government takes back cannot be its own. It should transmit them to their owners. The duty of the government is to get the oppressed person's due from the cruel one. If the government, 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 bait al-mal in the fifth volume of Radd al-mukhtar, Ibn Abidin wrote: "The property obtained in a haram way, for example, that which is usurped, should be returned to its owner. Such a property cannot be bait al-mal's. It cannot be a common property for all Muslims, either." The properties that have been collected illegitimately from the people, i.e. the usurped property, cannot be owned by the government. They should be returned to their owner or, if they are dead, to their inheritors. If their owners are unknown, they should be distributed to the poor. It is haram for those who know them to get or use them.

If a person, though he knows its owner, does not return the property haram for him, and if he expects to be rewarded in the next world for doing with it a charitable deed such as building mosque or giving alms, he becomes an unbeliever. And if others who know that the property was haram for him say that he has earned thawab, 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 distribute to the poor with the intention that its thawab be given to them. It is haram to use it for something else. It is haram for others also to buy (or accept as a gift, alms, etc.) and use this property if they know that it is haram.

If one mixes the property he has obtained in a haram way with another property earned in a halal or haram way and gives alms from this mixture and expects thawab 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 haram for him to use it before paying its cost, it is not haram for someone else to buy and use it.

54 - Again in World's Peace and Islam Sayyid Qutb wrote:

"Muslims are revolutionists. They revolt against cruelty and injustice."

This ideas of his does not conform with what the Islamic scholars have 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 jihad but fitna (mischief) to oppose the laws and commands. Sayyid Qutb, Mawdudi and those who have been deceived by them have fallen into calamity by giving wrong

meaning to the thirty-ninth ayat of the surat al-Hajj. This ayat states, "Jihad against the cruel who attack Muslims has been permitted." When the unbelievers of Mecca had oppressed, injured and killed Muslims, permission to fight against them had been asked many times. It had not been permitted. This ayat was revealed upon the migration to Medina, permitting the newly founded Islamic State to perform jihad against the cruel in Mecca. This ayat does not permit Muslims to oppose their cruel government; it permits the Islamic State to make jihad against the armies of cruel dictators who prevent their peoples from hearing about Islam and becoming Muslims. The hadiths quoted on the forty-first and seventy-first pages of the translation of *As-siyar al-kabir* declare, "Paradise is haram to the person who revolts against the ruler," and "Perform jihad under the command of every ruler, just or cruel!" Jihad, as it is written in books means 'war against the unbelievers of other countries'. The hadith given in the books *Radd al-mukhtar*, *Kamil* and *al-Baihaki's Shua'b al-iman*, declares, "When you cannot correct a wrong thing, be patient! Allahu ta'ala will correct it." This hadith commands not to oppose or revolt against the laws but to advise through legitimate ways and to be patient. The hadith quoted by *al-Manawi*, *at-Thirmidhi* and *at-Tabarani* declares, "The most valuable jihad is to say the word pointing to the right way in the presence of a cruel sultan." Scholars should advise the state officials as much as they can. But one should be very careful lest sedition should arise while performing *al-amru bi 'l-maruf*; this means that Muslims neither revolt nor surrender to cruelty and injustice. They seek for their rights through legitimate ways. It is wajib for every Muslim to obey the government's legitimate (*mashru'*) commands. No person's commands are to be carried out if they are haram, yet one should not revolt against them and cause *fitna* (oppression over Muslims). One should not oppose the cruel or dispute with them. For example, while it is one of the greatest sins not to perform *salat*, if one's chief or commander is a cruel unbeliever and says, "Don't perform *salat*," one should answer, "With pleasure. I won't," and think of saying, "I won't when near you for it is haram to cause *fitna*." Right after leaving that cruel person, he should perform *salat*.

'Abd al-Haqq ad-Dahlawi [d. 1052 A.H. (1642)], one of the great 'ulama' of Islam in India, wrote in the part "*Kitab al-fitan*" of his Persian commentary *Ashi'at al-lama'at* to the invaluable hadith book *Mishkat al-masabih*: "*Hudhaifa* (radi Allahu 'anh), one of *as-Sahaba* said, 'I asked *Rasulullah* (sall-Allahu 'alaihi wa sallam) about the *fitnas* that will happen in the future.

Because, I feared of being harmed by their wickedness.' Keeping away from harmful things is more important than attaining to useful things. '*Fitna*', as used here, means 'confusion, fight among people'. Though spread of committing haram is also *fitna*, there is no need to ask about this, since *harams* are evident. I said, "Oh *Rasul-Allah*! We were bad people before becoming Muslim. Allahu ta'ala, with your honorable body, endowed upon us the favor of Islam and excellences. Will a bad time come after these days of bliss?" "Yes, it 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. *Itiqad's* being *sahih*, *a'mal's* being *salih* and the leaders' justice will not be the same as those in the first century [of Islam]. *Vices* and *bidat'* will spread everywhere. The bad will go among the good, and *bidat'* will take place among the *Sunnat*. I asked what 'blurred' meant. He declared, "They are those who do not adapt my *sunnat* and follow my path. They both perform '*ibada* and commit sin."

They do goodness and wickedness. They commit *bidat'*. 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, "Oh Rasul-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 ayats and hadiths, they will preach and give advices, but there will be no goodness or goodwill in their hearts. I said, "What do you order us to do if we reach their time?" He declared, "Adhere to the Muslims' jamaat (community) and government." I asked, "What shall we do if there is not a Muslim jamaat and government?" He declared, "Get yourself into a corner. Never go among them. Live alone till you die!" ' He declared in a hadith ash-Sharif, "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 taken!" That is, do not rise against the cruel government that attacks at your property and lives; do not cause fitna; be patient and busy with your 'ibadat; 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 order means that we should be very careful not to rise against the government and not to cause fitna." As it is understood from these hadiths and from the explanations of the 'ulama' of Islam, men of religious post do not get involved in the formation of the State and in law-making; do not busy with politics; do not become tools in the hands of politicians; do not advocate this or that form of regime. The 'ulama' of Ahl as-Sunnat have 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 oppose the power, to revolt against the government, since it is to throw oneself into danger, which is haram. It is not permissible for a Muslim visiting non-Muslim countries to harm unbelievers' possessions, lives or chastity. One can receive benefit from unbelievers by pleasing them. It is more important to observe the rights of zimmi, unbelievers living in dar al-Islam, and of the harbi, 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, jihad does not mean to rise in rebellion against the government but to spread the religious knowledge.

Ibn 'Abidin wrote, "When a Muslim ruler or other oppressors, forcing and threatening with death, imprisonment or torture, orders to commit, some certain sins become mubah or even fard. Disobeying his command becomes a sin." It is written on the 91st page of Bariqa, "The Hadith says, 'Obey your commanders!' Even if your commander is the most inferior of you, it is wajib to obey his orders conformable to Islam. Nobody's command which is a sin should be obeyed; yet it will be obeyed if disobedience causes fitna, for, as written is Ashbah, it is permissible to commit minor harm in order to escape grave harm. It is wajib to do the mubah commanded by the ruler." 'Abd al-Ghani an-Nabulusi wrote on the 143rd page of Al-Hadiqa, "It is not wajib to obey the commands the rulers gives out of his reason and wish. If he is unjust, tortures and oppresses, however, it becomes a necessity to obey also his orders and prohibitions unconformable to Allahu ta'ala's rules. Especially, if those who disobey are ordered by him to 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-'Imad and in the book Al-matalib al-wafiyya."

Ibn 'Abidin wrote in the subject on 'Baghi': "When Muslims perform 'ibadat comfortably 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, again. 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. [The greatest cruelty is to prevent Muslims from performing ibadat and teaching religious knowledge to their children, to cause them to commit haram and to spoil their iman.] Those who rebel, to get hold of the power, against the government that does not oppress people are called 'baghis', and then Muslims should help the State against them. Because, the Hadith declares, 'May Allahu ta'ala damn him who wakes fitna!' If those who rebel say 'kafir' for the government and for Muslims and attacks at their property and lives, they are called 'kharijis', who do not become kafir if this belief of theirs is caused by the tawil (explaining away) of an inexplicit dalil. Some heretical people of the present time say 'kafir' for and attack at Muslims who do not believe as they do. Since these behaviors of theirs are out of tawil of inexplicit dalils, they cannot be regarded as kafir, yet if they say it without depending on a tawil, they become kafir. Whether he be just or unjust, obeying the ruler's commands conformable to Islam is wajib. If the Caliph is a murtad or insane or unable to practice Islam he is to be dismissed. If his dismissal would cause fitna and his harm is minor, he is to be tolerated. If a Muslim takes the position of the Caliph by subjugation and force and gets hold of the power, he is to be obeyed. A governor appointed by a non-Muslim government is obeyed if he practices Islamic rules. If he cannot put Islamic rules into practice or if the governor is a kafir, too, Muslim choose one from among them as Mufti or head. The Mufti practices Islamic rules. If this is not possible, either, slavery life to be accepted, that is, fitna should not be caused." As it is understood from this passage, the fatwa signed by Shaikh al-Islam Hasan Hayrullah Effendi for the dismissal of Sultan 'Abdulaziz Khan and the fatwa signed -when the fatwa officer Haji Nuri Effendi refused to sign- by a bigot threatened with death under arms for the dismissal of 'AbdulHamid Khan It were not mashru' (legal). It is written in the twelfth volume of Turkiye Tarihi (History of Turkey) that these fatwas were not sahih and were based on mere pretexts. Therefore, the two Sultans were the mashru' Caliphs till they passed away. And because of this situation, the Ottomans lost the wars of "93" (with Russia in 1877-1878) and "Balkan" and the First World War; for, these three wars were initiated and directed not by Muslim governments but by secret revolutionists who had no connection with Islam.

55 - 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 insolent dictators either commit a big 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) [Reference to the Turkish translation of Sayyid Qutb's Islamic Studies.]

Thus he incited fitna among Muslims. Whereas, the Hadith declares, "Fitna is asleep. May Allahu ta'ala damn him who wakes fitna!" and "When you cannot correct a wrong thing, be patient! Allahu ta'ala will correct it." Hadrat al-Imam ar-Rabbani said that al-amru bi 'l-maruf should be performed mildly. It was declared in a hadith, "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 Maktubat [For the translation of this letter, see Endless Bliss, III.] by Hadrat al-Imam ar-Rabbani is a precise answer to these writings of Sayyid

Qutb and helps one understand immediately what kind of path Sayyid Qutb followed. Allahu ta'ala commands to pray to and trust in Him, and He says He likes those who pray to and trust in Him, but Sayyid Qutb made fun of those who prayed to and trusted in Allahu ta'ala. The Qur'an and the Hadith command to tell beads. They praise those who tell their beads, but he denied this. It is common to Muslims and unbelievers to get prepared for war, to hold fast to the means and to make the most modern media of defense; however, there is the weapon of tawakkul and prayer in Muslims in addition.

Hadrat Ibn Hajar al-Makki wrote: "The one who disbelieves in saying prayers, in fact, disbelieves in the Qur'an al-karim and the Hadith according to most Islamic scholars and, therefore, 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 sin to be forgiven. Allahu ta'ala likes His human creatures to pray and beg Him. There are conditions for the prayers to be accepted. One of them is to eat and wear halal, and another is to ask them from one's heart, that is, sincerely. It is declared in a hadith, 'Allahu ta'ala 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 sunnat to use rosary." [Al-fatawa al-fiqhiyya, p. 149-50.] Sayyid Qutb's writing, "It is not Islamic," about these kinds of worship, which are stated in the Hadith, shows what kind of a reformer he was.

"Islam never keeps in view to make war in order to convert anyone to the religion through compulsion." (Page 33)

"The thing asked of the Prophet of Islam and his followers is to convert people to the religion by making endeavor 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 advice (al-amru bi 'l-maruf) everybody mildly. Muslims of dar al-Islam are commanded to get on well with the unbelievers of dar 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 hadiths 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 ayat, "Reconcile Muslims!" referred to all the people in the world. Islam does not command to practice justice in the non-Muslim countries. It commands Muslims to introduce iman 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)

Allahu ta'ala declares in the Qur'an, "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.

"Since property belongs to the society, the individual is bound to lend his possession without interest to those in need." (Page 69)

Property belongs to the 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 may be compelled to lend anything to anybody.

"Zakat is a payment which is not left to the individual's conscience. The government collects it. Zakat is not a donation given from individual to individual." (Page 70)

We 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 ideal." (Page 75)

We have proved documentedly 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 as much as necessary," which contradict with his 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 at random.

"It will never suffice for us to invite them to Islam with brief or detailed teachings today, as the Prophet has done 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. Allahu ta'ala and His beloved Prophet's ('alaihi 's-salam) commands and messages make up Islam. Theories arising from man's short comprehension 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-Sunnat 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 as Islam such writings as these, which are incompatible with the knowledge derived from ayats and hadiths and written in the invaluable books by the Ahl as-Sunnat scholars, means to attempt to spoil and demolish Islam from the inside.

"We invite all beliefs equally and to the same liberty. It is the duty of Muslim government to protect the freedom of belief. All the compatriots have equal dues from the sources of income. Personal possession is limited; it is the society's right to get the extra property." (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 above.

"Whenever necessary, the government may get unconditionally from well-to-do individuals as much money as it needs for the protection of the society." (Page 87)

We have given detailed answers to these wrong thoughts of his in the fifty-second paragraph.

"If the zakat 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, had put them forth as his own, he would have perhaps been able to find a place for himself among the youth, who have been taken in and bewildered by various currents. But, his disguising himself as a religious man and attacking the Ahl as-Sunnat scholars and his misrepresenting his own thoughts as Islam disgrace him in both this and the next worlds, he himself being the target for the vengeance of Allahu ta'ala. 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 dar al-harb and Muslims equal and considers it as a duty to struggle so that unbelief, which Allahu ta'ala calls foul and dirty, may spread and attain freedom. He sees jihad, which is done in the way of Allahu ta'ala, in this manner. From every earthenware leaks what is in it. He who goes to the rose-garden smells like a rose, but the bitter apple which grows in the rubbish-heap certainly spreads a noxious scent. Our master Rasulullah (sall-Allahu 'alaihi wa sallam) said "Do not smell the flowers grown in a rubbish-heap!" To attain happiness in this and the next worlds, one should read Ahl as-Sunnat 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 heretic cannot find it and think that it does not exist. It is declared in the Hadith that those who depart from the Ahl as-Sunnat will go to Hell. May Allahu ta'ala protect the youngsters from the harms and books of the false men of religion! Amin.

56 - Sayyid Qutb's another book Al-adalatu 'l-ijtima'iyyatu fi 'l-Islam (Social Justice in Islam) has been translated from Arabic into Turkish and has been pushed in front of the youngsters. In this book, Sayyid Qutb, whom the translators praise so much, stripped his mask off his face completely and exhibited clearly that he was an anti-madhabite 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 comparison 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'an and the Hadith cannot be changed by the great scholars who are mujtahids, either. Besides, there is no great scholar who is in the grade of ijihad today. Though it is permissible to change those parts of religious knowledge such as buying and selling, betrothal and punishments according to social usages and customs, this has some conditions. It is not permissible to change them outside the conditions laid by Islam. By changing Islam, Sayyid Qutb wanted to bring French and socialistic laws in place of Allahu ta'ala's commands. As a matter 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 the heart.
- 2) Things that are to be done by the heart or the body.

The knowledge to be believed through the heart is certainly a whole and was declared by Rasulullah ('alaihi 's-salam) and conveyed by as-Sahabat al-kiram. Learning this knowledge from them, the Ahl as-Sunnat scholars wrote this knowledge in their books. All Muslims have to read these books and unite in the same one iman. Muslims should unite, and there should not be disagreement or faction. For achieving this, all Muslims should unite in the belief of Ahl as-

Sunnat, which is the only right path, and they should not deviate into the heretical groups predicted by our Prophet ('alaihi 's-salam). There cannot be another way for unity. It was necessary also for Sayyid Qutb to learn this knowledge of iman and not to spread the absurd heresies born from his head and from the head of his famous freemason 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 wanted the madhhabs to be abolished and a false Islam to be made up. Also, all of such anti-madhhabite people as Jamal ad-din al-Afghani, 'Abduh and Mawdudi and the zindiqs such as Qadiani (Ahmadi) and Bahai have been on the same path. As our Prophet ('alaihi 's-salam) declared, the four madhhabs into which Ahl as-Sunnat parted are Allahu ta'ala's compassion, and as he commanded, the mujtahids had to perform ijthihad. But heretics have wanted the madhhabs to be abolished and a new religion, a collection of the laws of Christians, Jews and communists, to be made up. In order to deceive Muslims, they call this new religion "Islam" for the time being.

Allahu ta'ala has not revealed openly and definitely all the teachings pertaining to 'Ibadat, marriage, trade and human rights. He willed those teachings which were not detailed or clear to be explained by the Prophet Muhammad (sall-Allahu 'alaihi wa sallam). And His Prophet explained them but not completely, leaving those teachings he did not clarify to be explained and applied to daily events by the 'ulama' who were mujtahids. While these 'ulama' did this duty, some differences arose among them. Thus the madhahib came forth. In carrying out his 'ibadat, every Muslim chooses and follows the madhhab which is suitable and easy for his countrys's social usages and customs, climate and his physical abilities. Existence of different madhhabs is a blessing and easiness for Muslims.

"Proprietorship can be established only with the confirmation and the prearrangement of the shari' (legislator). This right is something which the shari, who is sort of the public's representative, has specially put into the individual's possession." (Page 156)

It is true that possession becomes one's possession with the permission of the shari', but the shari' (Maker of Islam) is Allahu ta'ala Himself, that is, He is the One who orders and forbids. Muballigh (Messenger) who revealed Islam was His Prophet ('alaihi 's-salam). Not only possession but also every right has been a right because Allahu ta'ala has permitted it. Each person's possessions and rights have become possessions and rights because Allahu ta'ala has permitted and ordered them. It is for this reason that nobody can take away one's possessions unless one gives them willingly.

"It is extravagance and haram 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 haram for a person who gives his zakat to the poor and who earns through halal with the sweat of his brow to have villas built. It is halal and blessed. It is haram to sit idly, not to work and to remain poor, or to give one's earnings for what are haram and then live in a simple dwelling. Why should the strenuous people be guilty because of lazy people who waste their possessions on the things that are haram? It is halal for those who give their zakat to live in villas, to dress smartly and to utilize all the facilities found out by science. Allahu ta'ala 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. Allahu ta'ala likes those rich people who thank Him. It is haram to be conceited and to consider oneself superior to others because one is rich. It is written in Qisas-i anbiya': "Hadrat Zubair ibn Awwam (radi-Allahu

'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 much property and vast areas of land in Medina, Basra, Kufa and in Egypt. He had a thousand servants, but he used to distribute all his income to the poor. Also Hadrat Talha (radi-Allahu '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 'Uthman (radi-Allahu '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 Ghaza of Tabuk, he attained Rasulullah's ('alaihi 's-salam) prayers.

"Richness is not an imperfection. The hadith ash-Sharif, 'It is happiness to be rich at the last ages of the world,' is written in Ramuz al-ahadith. Such prophets as Ibrahim, Dawud and Sulaiman ('alaihimu 's-salam) were very rich. Many of the poor among as-Sahabat al-kiram were reported to have said, 'The rich, in addition to worshiping as much as we do, are earning much thawab by performing charitable deeds with their wealth,' thus longing for the situation in which the rich who thanked Allahu ta'ala in this way were."

"Caliphate, after the four caliphs, turned into kingship which is passed from the father over to the son by way of inheritance. Public property was made mubah (permitted) for the relatives and sycophants of these persons and haram for meritorious people who were adherent to Islam. Umayyad's coming into power was harmful. Had Hadrat 'Umar remained in caliphate a couple of years more, or had Hadrat 'Ali been the third caliph, or had Hadrat 'Uthman 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 possessions and distribute them to the poor equally." (Page 247)

With these writings of his, he misrepresents Hadrat 'Uthman (radi-Allahu 'anh) as incapable in administration. The hadiths telling about his superiority in administration and policy are as many as to be said to be innumerable. Let us also quote the most famous one of them here: "The highest of my companions is Abu Bakr. Then comes 'Umar. Then comes 'Uthman. Then comes 'Ali (radi-Allahu 'anhuma)." The superiority in the Hadith 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-salam) chose Hadrat 'Uthman (radi-Allahu '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 (radi-Allahu 'anh), when he was about to pass away, considered as being worthy and capable of becoming the Caliph after him. Our Prophet ('alaihi 's-salam) declared, "Allahu ta'ala has put the true word on 'Umar's tongue." 'Umar (radi-Allahu 'anh), who always spoke correctly and appropriately as noted in the hadith, recommended him by saying, " 'Uthman is worthy and capable of becoming the Caliph." 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 the Caliph are portrayed in detail in the Turkish book Hak Sozun Vesikalari.

Sayyid Qutb's likening Islamic caliphs to the kings of unbelievers and saying that they prohibited meritorious people who were adherent to Islam from public property is another slander against Islamic caliphs. 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-qulub from being given zakat, we can do some similar disposal of the expenditures of zakat. 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-Sahabat al-kiram were profound scholars, mujtahids. Especially the Four Caliphs were Rasulullah's (sall-Allahu 'alaihi wa sallam) counselors when he was alive and representatives after his death. It is declared in a hadith, "Hold fast to my path and, after me, to the path of the Four Caliphs! Their path is the right path." We have to follow the unanimity of as-Sahabat al-kiram. 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 (radi-Allahu 'anh). He attempts to change the persons whom the zakat will be given. Our religion has declared clearly to whom and how the zakat 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 the zakat. A Muslim who has well understood Islam will easily find out how to establish factories and industrial foundations and how to help for jihad and for pious foundations suitable with Islam with the money of zakat. The way of doing these is written in the book Endless Bliss. 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 zakat goods, the zakat of crops and animals and the zakat which is collected from importers by the zakat official called 'ashir 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 zakat or to deliver them. They cannot establish zakat banks or zakat ministry. The zakat that would be given to them will not be acceptable. A Muslim who lives under the authority of a non-Muslim government should give his any kind of zakat to one of the persons described in the Qur'an or to the person whom they have appointed to be their representative, or his own representative should give it. We should perform our worship suitably with the books of the Ahl as-Sunnat scholars.

He quoted the eighth ayat of the surat an-Nisa', "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 ayat 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 ayat says, 'If... present,' which means 'If ever exists.' " (Page 305)

Islamic scholars have said about this ayat that it was an act not commanded but deserved thawab and favor. Those scholars who said that it was a command also said that this ayat was abolished with the other ayats about inheritance that came after it. It is written in Tafsir-i Husaini, "This ayat 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 Sana'ullah ad-Dahlawi wrote in his At-tafsir al-Mazhari, "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. Said ibn Jubair and Dahhak reported that this ayat was abolished when the ayat "Yusikumullah" came. Some scholars said that it had not been abolished. Ibn 'Abbas said that those inheritors who were wise and have reached the age of puberty would give something little from the property of inheritance to them; if the inheritors were small, their trustees or representatives would give it, or they might say that it was orphans' property and ask pardon. As Muhammad ibn Sirin reported, 'Ubaidat as-Salmani divided and distributed the property of inheritance of some orphans. Then he ordered them to slaughter a sheep. It was cooked and given to the persons prescribed in the ayat and they ate it. And he said, 'If it weren't for this ayat, I would pay for the sheep.' It is not fard but mustahab to give something to these persons." 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 ayat 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 changes the ayat altogether. Religious scholars declared long before that, when the ignorant would be religious authorities, nothing would remain for the Devil to do.

57 - In his book *Fi dilal al-Qur'an*, attempting to interpret the 33rd ayat of the surat al-Ma'ida, Sayyid Qutb writes down the ijtihaads of the four madhhabs and says, "In this respect, we consider Imam Malik's opinion as worth preference. We are in favor of his opinion." This writing of his again shows that he is not a member of any madhhab, that he think of himself as superior to the imams of madhhabs and that he knows nothing of the knowledge of *usul al-fiqh*. A few pages later, in the subject of punishing the thief, he gives the ijtihaads of the four madhhabs and says, "But Imam Abu Yusuf opposes al-Imam al-azam, and a third point of view, different from the other two, comes forward," thus he uses indecent, irreverent terms against the imams of the madhhabs and their ijtihaads. He thinks ijtihaads as mere thoughts and ideas. Whereas, Islamic religion is a religion of decency and beautiful morals. Islamic scholars have been the representatives of Islamic religion in decency 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 ayat of the surat al-Ma'ida, he says, "About the context of this statement in the Qur'an, 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 Jarir at-Tabari mentioned most, though it is not in a capacity to relieve me emotionally." Whereas, for example, the Qur'an commentary by al-Baidawi, who has been loved and respected by all mufassirs, and also its annotation by Shaikh-zada explain this ayat more clearly and satisfactorily. Hadrat Sayyid 'Abdulhakim Arwasi, a great Islamic scholar of profound knowledge and an expert in *tasawwuf*, explained this ayat at the Bayazid Mosque in Istanbul for many days, quoting from the annotation of al-Baidawi's Qur'an commentary and from the Qur'an commentaries by Abussuud and Ni'matullah, thus relieving the souls of those cultured youngsters who listened to him in admiration. If Sayyid Qutb, too, had been honored with attending the lectures and sohbat of such a profound Islamic scholar who was perfect both in *batini* and *Zahiri* knowledge, and if he had attained a few drops of his ocean of knowledge and *marifa*, he would have understood something from the clearness, context, indications, denotations, necessitations and implications of ayats. Perhaps he would have perceived what

tafsir and mufassir meant. The faid of those lectures, softening and purifying the hearts that were hard like stone 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-Salihin. Surely, they could understand the highness of the scholars of Ahl as-Sunnat so well that they fully believed that for attaining endless bliss there was no other way than following them. Hadrat al-Imam ar-Rabbani Ahmad al-Faruqi repeatedly stated in his book Maktubat that these scholars were the ones who were praised by the hadiths, "They are the prophets' inheritors," and "Their ink will weigh heavier than the blood of martyrs."

By putting forth the ayat from the surat al-Ma'ida, Sayyid Qutb's belittling hundreds of the 'Ulama' of tafsir except Ibn Jarir whom he praises displays that he is non-madhabite. See how the famous book Fat'h al-majid, too, praises Ibn Jarir on its 294th page: "There has been nobody more learned than Muhammad ibn Jarir ibn Yazid at-Tabari on the earth. He was one of the mujtahidin. He did not copy (taqlid) from anybody. He had many disciples educated in his own madhhab. He passed away in the year 310[A.H.]" It writes that Ibn Jarir was non-madhabite. And Sayyid Qutb approves and praises only this person among the 'ulama' of tafsir.

'Abd al-Ghani an-Nabulusi wrote: "Though it is permissible to believe out of imitation (taqlid) what one hears concerning itiqad, one will be sinful because one has not studied and examined. In 'amal and 'ibadat, it is permissible through unanimity of scholars to follow (taqlid) a madhhab leader without research. Since there has not been any person for a long time to accumulate the conditions for being a mujtahid in himself, it is necessary to learn one of the four madhhabs. And this is possible only by reading a dependable book or by asking and understanding 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 ijihad and give fatwa in matters within a madhhab. It is not permissible to learn religious knowledge by reading just any religious book or by asking and understanding from just anybody who passes for a religious man. Among those who have been said to be religious men, ignoramuses, zindiqs, sinners and hypocrites who have written their own thoughts as religious knowledge or who have wanted to demolish Islam from the inside and also those who earned their living by serving them as their assistants have always existed. Being a real religious man requires to possess knowledge, 'amal and ikhlas, that is taqwa. For guiding men to happiness, a religious man should first of all have the itiqad of Ahl as-Sunnat, that is, he has to follow as-Sahaba and obey ijma' al-Umma." [Al-hadiqat an-nadiyya, p. 460.]

As for Sayyid Qutb, when attentively observed, it will be seen that he is just an orator who brings the readers into raptures by his zealous writings, which are 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 has not noticed that he has contradicted and denied himself at many times. It is feared very much that his following writing in the interpretation of the 115th ayat of the surat al-Ma'ida may bring his readers to kufr: "The story of the Descent of the Meal is not mentioned in Christian books as it exists in the Qur'an. In these gospels, which were written after Hadrat 'Isa's death..." On the other hand, he himself has explained the ayat, "They did not kill 'Isa ('alaihi 's-salam). They did not hang him," detailedly before. The Qur'an never says that he was killed; the hundred and fifty-seventh ayat of Maida Sura purports, "They did not kill Isa,

nor did they hang him," while another ayat al-karima purports that he was exactly taken up (tawaffi) to heaven. All his books are bawling to inform with the fact that he is not a scholar of tafsir 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, treat the things that are loved and respected so well and give them such a vividness that only those who know the matter closely can understand if they are sincere in their writings. But those who cannot understand it, being admirers of the thing under discussion become tools for his desires, run after him, thus dragging themselves into calamity together with him. As a matter of fact, thousands of Egyptian youngsters enraptured by Sayyid Qutb's writings were led to torments in this and the next worlds. And now we pity and worry for the youngsters who have been thirsty for learning their religion that they would be deceived by his anti-madhhabite, heretical writings, or by those bogus men of religion who mistranslate their already heretical books.

There has been a disease spread among ignorant and incompetent people: to speak ill of the past, to misrepresent our ancestors as if they had been deficient. The disease has gone beyond the limit in the Wahhabite book and in Sayyid Qutb: "After as-Sahaba, for many centuries Muslims made indestructible barricades between the Qur'an and life. The Qur'an became melodies at mihrab and prayers at graves. Eventually, to lay his finger on this great problem of Islam, Sayyid Qutb has written his book *Fi dilal al-Qur'an*," they say. We would ask them: who established those Islamic universities which spread the teachings and the light of the Qur'an over the world and which founded the home of today's civilization? Our ancestors adapted their lives to the Qur'an completely in knowledge, in jihad, in science and in morals. Hundred thousands of books which they wrote and various Islamic civilizations which they established have been praised in world's histories. Sayyid Qutb's followers who make fun of our ancestors' reciting the Qur'an for the dead should know well that our Prophet ('alaihi 's-salam) commanded to visit graves and to recite the Qur'an for the dead, and also he himself did so. Our ancestors, in order to obey this command, this sunnat, visited the dead and recited the Qur'an for their souls. Thus they held fast to the Qur'an and to the Sunnat 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 reveal his disgrace, for a religious teaching which is not narrated (riwaya) from Rasulullah (sall-Allahu 'alaihi wa sallam) or from as-Sahabat al-kiram is called a "bidat". It is declared in a hadith ash-Sharif, "All religious teachings which are not narrated from us but which have been fabled later are bidat'." Another hadith declares, "No worship of the inventors of bidat' is acceptable. They will go to Hell." These hadiths clearly show that the followers of Sayyid Qutb are very wrong and that only Ahl as-Sunnat will be rescued, for Sayyid Qutb refuses the narrations coming from the Salaf as-Salihin. But Ahl as-Sunnat hold fast to the narrations which the Salaf as-Salihin brought from Rasulullah ('alaihi 's-salam). It is written in the commentary of al-Birghawi's *Wasiyyat-nama*, "It is fard for every Muslim to learn the madhhabs of Ahl as-Sunnat and the itiqad reported by these scholars and to correct his beliefs in accordance with it. Everybody should learn this. He should not remain ignorant, for a belief which does not agree with Islam is very harmful. Recently bidat' have spread far and wide. There are very few people left who know the itiqad of Ahl as-Sunnat wal-Jamaat. Ignorance has covered the whole 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 half-religious man will ruin

one's faith; a half doctor will ruin one's body.' Recently, many ignorant people using names such as shaikh, alim or murshid have been deceiving Muslims and leading them to heresy. May Allahu ta'ala protect Muslims from believing them! We should beware these heretics very much. We should not follow the books and the word of any person who passes for a religious man, who might cause us to fall into heresy. We should not follow those fatwas and decisions which have not been derived from fiqh books and which have been given by modernists, but we should look for and find the one who knows the matter and ask him and learn the truth of the matter." Every Muslim should take these advices of Islamic scholars as warnings for himself, come to his senses and should not believe the deceptive advertisements and misleading propagandas of heretical books.

Those who call Sayyid Qutb's heretical thoughts "sagacious tafsir" are so astonishing. We should hold fast not to the corrupt thoughts produced by Sayyid Qutb but to the knowledge which Allahu ta'ala's Messenger ('alaihi 's-salam) understood and conveyed from the Qur'an and to the real books of tafsir which the Ahl as-Sunnat scholars built up by gathering this knowledge. Those who want to attain happiness by sheltering in the shade of the Qur'an should believe not those books of tafsir written by this person or that but the correct books of tafsir of the Ahl as-Sunnat scholars. Those who will make one attain to happiness are not the inheritors of Sayyid Qutb, but they are the Ahl as-Sunnat scholars, who are Rasulullah's ('alaihi 's-salam) inheritors: Sayyid Qutb's followers say that he was a Shafi'i. Whereas, being in one of the four madhhabs requires belonging to Ahl as-Sunnat first. For a person who dissents from Ahl as-Sunnat, especially if he dislikes Ahl as-Sunnat, it means to deceive Muslims to claim to be in one of the four madhhabs.

A Muslim who glances through Sayyid Qutb's tafsir book is greatly pleased to read the interpretations of ayats, and his soul becomes cheerful, for these interpretations were taken from the Ahl as-Sunnat scholars' tafsir books. But, upon reading Sayyid Qutb's heretical writings, and their translations, which are incompatible with Islam's main sources, a Muslim gets annoyed. His heart darkens. Inferiority of Qutb's level is perceived at once. It is seen that he attempts to explain iman and Islam with philosophical thoughts. It is for this reason that those reasonable Muslims who have read the Ahl as-Sunnat scholars' books, which enliven the souls, and who could perceive the greatness of these exalted scholars, have been reading those real books of tafsir today also and, let alone rejecting Sayyid Qutb's books, they have been trying to protect the youngsters from reading them.

Though he sprinkled his heretical ideas in every part of his tafsir book, *Fi dilal al-Qur'an*, 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 surat al-Baqara, he says, "Each sura has a peculiar musical effect and harmony." Our master Rasulullah ('alaihi 's-salam) said, "Ghina (music) increases hypocrisy in the heart." Does the Qur'an 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-Birghiwi's *Wasiyyat-nama*, "You should not listen to the things that are read melodiously. The men of Tariqa of our time are very ignorant and obstinate. They recite poems melodiously. About the sensual emotions caused by music, they say that they feel them out of 'ibada. Such heretics who ignore the Book and madhhabs are the pioneers of the Dajjal'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 Sunnat, Ahl as-Sunnat! Do not listen to those who read the Qur'an al-karim, call the

adhan and say the dhikr and prayers melodiously! Silence them! The fatwa book Tatarhaniyya writes that there is unanimity of scholars on that it is haram to do these melodiously. The scholars of fiqh have put forward many evidences and documents showing that it is haram."

2) "Migration to Medina was done under some compulsion," he says. But Islamic scholars report that the Hegira was done not under fear, trouble or compulsion but with Allahu ta'ala's decree and permission. It is written in Al-mawahib al-laduniyya, "Rasulullah (sall-Allahu 'alaihi wa sallam) commanded his companions to go from Mecca to Medina. He remained in Mecca and waited for Allahu ta'ala's permission. One day, Jabrail ('alaihi 's-salam) came and said, 'The unbelievers of Quraish will kill you. Do not sleep in your bed tonight.' The next day he brought the ayat permitting him to migrate." Islamic scholars said and wrote so decently about Rasulallah (sall-Allahu 'alaihi wa sallam).

3) "Various opinions have been put forward in interpreting the letters that exist at the beginning of some suras of the Qur'an. We take one of these opinions, which counts them as indicating that the Qur'an is made up of these letters," he says. The Ahl as-Sunnat scholars say, "These letters are of the mutashabihat; Allahu ta'ala has concealed their meanings, which are many. He has revealed some of them only to His beloved Prophet ('alaihi 's-salam) and 'Ulama' ar-rasikhin, who are his inheritors." It is declared clearly in other ayats that the Qur'an 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 Abu Bakr, 'Umar (radi-Allahu 'anhuma) and the scholars of tafsir said. Hence it is understood that he knows nothing of the mysteries in the Qur'an and the Divine Ma'arif which have been inspirations for the great men of tasawwuf.

4) "Scholars of tafsir and tawhid 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'an are nothing but the disaster of mixing Greek philosophy and the religious controversies in 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-Salihin! Which Muslim's heart would not feel sharp pain from these insults, these impertinences which he does against the scholars of tafsir and kalam? By saying, "They should have known," he attempts to give lessons to these exalted scholars. By saying, "It should not be forgotten," he belittles by ignorance the most prominent people of the auspicious century praised by Rasulallah ('alaihi 's-salam). 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 the apples of Islam's eyes, 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'an commentary 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 placed among these attractive writings of his.

5) Like in his statement, "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 tafsir book. It is understood here that he is not ignorant, but vulgarly

ignorant. If he had learned the Zahiri knowledge of the Qur'an by reading al-Baidawi's tafsir and its annotation and At-tafsir al-kabir and understood something from the mysteries in the Qur'an by reading Nimatullah's Tafsir and the tafsir book Ruh al-bayan by Hadrat Ismail Hakki of Bursa, he would have known his place and perhaps behave himself.

6) When interpreting the 117th ayat of the surat al-Baqara, he says, "The Creator does not have any match. And here the philosophy of Wahdat al-wujud remains completely outside Islamic conception, and Islam refuses the concept of Wahdat al-wujud of non-Muslims," thus shows that he knows nothing of tasawwuf. He supposes that the inspirations and kashfs of the great men of tasawwuf were just a philosophy. He becomes as insolent as saying "non-Muslims" about the 'Ulama' ar-rasikhin, for the knowledge of Wahdat al-wujud that had existed before Islam also had been put forward by the men of tasawwuf of the ancient revealed religions which were right. Greek philosophers and the unbelievers of the Alexandria school had appropriated this knowledge stealing it from the religious men of tasawwuf. The knowledge of Wahdat al-wujud is not an invention of philosophers, but it is the marifa and kashf of those believers who were of high rank in the religion. [For details on Wahdat al-wujud, see Endless Bliss, I, chapter 40, and III, chapter 56.]

7) In the tafsir of the third ayat of the surat az-Zumar, he says, "One who has tawhid and ikhlas does not ask anything from somebody other than Allah. He does not trust in anybody who has been created. People deviated from the tawhid preached by Islam. Nowadays, awliya' are worshiped in every country. People ask intercession of them just as the pre-Islamic Arabs worshiped angels and statues. There exists no intermediary or intercession between Allah and men in respect of tawhid and ikhlas revealed by Allah," With these words, he announces that he is a Wahhabi.

8) This socialist writer thinks of himself as a scholar of tafsir and gives wrong meanings to many ayats. For example, he says in his interpretation of the seventh ayat of the surat an-Nisa', "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..." But Islamic scholars told about that ayat, "Men have share from what the parents and the close relatives left. Women also have share from what the parents and the close relatives left. Whether the property left is little or much, they will be given their shares as much as prescribed." Its reason also has been explained in al-Baidawi's tafsir. Especially about the ayat following that one, he says, "We do not see any evidence of abolition here. To our opinion this ayat is explicit. It is fard as prescribed," and thus he does not feel shame to write that he interprets according to his opinion. Whereas, the scholars of tafsir chiefly al-Baidawi said that this ayat was mustahab, though there were also those who said that it was wajib. And it has been performed so in all Islamic countries.

After quoting the preceding ayat, he says, "Allahu ta'ala has distributed possessions and property to the society. The society is obliged to use these possessions well. The society originally owns all possessions. Heirs [trustees] have the right to use these possessions only with the permission of the society," thus slandering Islamic religion and attempting to reform it. He struggles to inoculate the youth with his socialistic ideas under the name of tafsir.

9) In his book World's Peace and Islam and Islamic Studies, he says, "The zakat is a tax. The government collects this tax. It is not a procedure 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 zakat of one's property with his own hands and to distribute it with one's own hands. The word which says that the property the zakat of which 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. [See the paragraphs 49-53 above, and Endless Bliss, V, chapter on zakat.] It is written in all the books of fiqh that the property the zakat of which has been given is not kanz and that the government can by no means lay hands on it. It is written in Al-ahkam as-sultaniyya and also in many valuable books, " 'Zakat' and 'alms' are used in the same meaning in the Qur'an. Nobody has any share from Muslim's property besides its zakat. A hadith declares, 'There is no claim to [others'] property besides zakat.' The possessions the zakat of which has to be given are of two kinds: al-amwal az-zahira and al-amwal al-batina. Al-amwal az-zahira 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-batina are those possessions that can be hidden. Examples of these are gold, silver and commercial goods. The government cannot demand the zakat of al-amwal al-batina. The owner has the right to give their zakat. If he gives 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 zakat of al-amwal az-zahira 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 zakat. If the government is cruel in collecting zakat but just in giving it to the prescribed persons, it is permissible to give it to the government though the owner may distribute it himself. If the government is just in collecting zakat but cruel in distributing it, it is not permissible but wajib not to give it to the government; if it takes the zakat with the owners' wish or by force, the zakat will not have been given. It is necessary for the owners themselves to separate and distribute it to the prescribed people, again. Rasulullah (sall-Allahu alaihi wa sallam) used to distribute the collected zakat to the persons whom he deemed suitable. Then, Allahu ta'ala declared the kinds of persons one by one whom the zakat would be given and commanded not to spend it at other places. It has been reported unanimously that an unbeliever will not be given zakat."

It is written at the end of the section on kafalat in Durr al-mukhtar, "At-Tarsusi says that it is not permissible for the Sultan [the government] to lay hands on anybody's property. Only, if the zakat-collecting officials of bait al-mal, governors and the clerks of bait al-mal betray the people by misappropriating Muslims' possessions, the government can lay hands on their possessions, which they have obtained unjustly. So is the case with the clerks and officials of the pious foundations. If they spend prodigally, lead a life of dissipation full of dancing and build apartment houses for themselves, the government lays hands on their possessions and dismisses them from the service. It returns the possessions which they have obtained unjustly to the pious foundations. If it is not known from certain from which pious foundation they have taken them, it gives them to bait al-mal. Caliph 'Umar (radi-Allahu 'anh) sent Abu Huraira (radi-Allahu 'anh) to Bahrain as a governor to collect zakat. 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 Hakim and others." On this account, Ibn 'Abidin comments: "The government's commandeering the possessions of the officials of bait al-mal means its taking the zakat goods misappropriated by them back from them

and giving them to bait al-mal, that is, putting them back to their place. And the government cannot spend these possessions at other places. Abu Huraira (radi-Allahu 'anh) said, 'Hadrat Umar (radi-Allahu 'anh) sent me to Bahrain to collect zakat. 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, Abu Khatam (radi-Allahu 'anh) said, 'Though Yusuf ('alaihi 's-salam) 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 Yusuf ('alaihi 's-salam). 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 Abu Huraira's (radi-Allahu 'anh) madhhab, it was permissible for the officials of zakat to accept presents, but it was not permissible in Hadrat Umar's (radi-Allahu 'anh) madhhab, who 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 (radi-Allahu '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 hadith, "The poor have right also in the property besides zakat," and says that the government will take the zakat 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 interprets the ayats and hadiths wrong. While trying to be useful, he becomes more harmful. The above hadith does not show that giving alms is fard as giving zakat, but it shows that it is worthy of much more thawab than other supererogatory kinds of worship, for it has been declared that those who do not give the poor their due, which is called zakat, 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 thawab. 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 hadith "A Muslim has five rights upon another Muslim," are not fard. Whereas, the following hadiths quoted from Zawajir show clearly that zakat is not so: "Protect your possessions by giving zakat! Cure your sick relatives by giving alms! Protect yourselves from calamities by praying"; "The property on which zakat has been given cannot be counted as kanz, (treasury cursed by Allahu ta'ala) even if it were buried under the ground. The property on which zakat has not been given becomes kanz even if it were left in the open"; "Stinginess and iman do not stay together in a believer's heart!" Hadrat Ibn Hajar al-Makki explained the 'stinginess', which is blamed in the hadiths, as 'not giving zakat'.

11) Though the ayat, "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 ayat by saying, "They were reduced to the low grade of monkeys. They must not have become monkeys in body," supposing himself to be a mujtahid such as Imam Mujahid. Great scholar 'Abd al-'Aziz ad-Dahlawi writes in his Persian Tafsir-i 'Azizi 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 tafsir book, he says, "No rule has been mentioned in the Qur'an 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 the society to admit a rule which was against the common usage." Through this absurd logic, he tries to cover his error. He cannot deny the fact that, in the year 7 A.H., Rasulullah ('alaihi 's-salam) distributed the captives which he had captivated in the Ghaza of Khaibar to his companions as slaves and jariyas and this has been practiced 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 Allahu ta'ala and would cause unbelief. Whereas, Islam has not brought any rules, that is, commands and prohibitions, to unbelievers. Islamic rules are for Muslims and Muslim societies. Islam demands one single thing from unbelievers: To have iman. The reason why the zimmi have to obey muamalat 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 on account of his country. The greatest error of this writer, whose single art is his being a good translator, is that he has not realized that he has to be a muqallid in religious knowledge. Whereas, only mujtahids' opinions are worth being followed on the interpretations of explicit ayats and hadiths and in those teachings about which there is no explicit ayat or hadith. The opinions of non-mujtahids, that is, we muqallids, cannot be religious knowledge. Those religiously ignorant people who put forward ideas disagreeing with mujtahids' opinions are called "religion reformers" or "zindiqs". These are the people who want to demolish the religion from behind the curtain with which they disguise themselves as religious men. The true man of religion means the real Muslim who learns the explanations and opinions of mujtahids by wearing out the elbows for years and who conveys them to the people of his time in a way they can comprehend.

Sayyid Qutb, knowing Arabic well on account of his country, attempted to compare the socialistic teachings he had studied and defended in admiration for forty years with the Qur'an. 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 Wahhabism in the final years of his life. His book Social Justice in Islam, published in 1948, is full with his destructive, heretical ideas. Saying that we should hold fast to the Qur'an, he towed the youth behind his heretical thoughts. I wish he had read the writings of those mujahids who had studied and understood Islam well, such as 'Abd al-Qadir Uadah and Ahmad al-'Adwi al-Azhari who were contemporary with him; thus he would have learned the superiority of the Ahl as-Sunnat 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 iman," meaning that his iman 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 deceived by the modernist, heretical ideas of Sayyid Qutb, strive to disseminate his un-Islamic ideas among the youth. And some others who want to profit from his condition mistranslate his tafsir and some parts of his other books and publish them for high

prices. They attack our books which display the realities and awaken the youth and thus lessen their profit. Because they cannot make criticisms based on knowledge and documentation, they recourse to lies and slanders. When asked to prove their claims about my books, these liars and slanderers cannot show them in my books.

The following fatwa of Hadrat Ahmad ibn Hajar al-Makki, a prominent Islamic scholar, is sufficient to understand how heretical and harmful Sayyid Qutb's tafsir, *Fi dilal al-Qur'an*, is: "The law courts should take preventive measures against those who, instead of quoting from the tafsirs of Islamic scholars, write their own ideas as tafsir and push such tafsirs in front of the people. Such tafsirs are heretical and superstitious. Men of religious posts who publish them are heretics endeavoring to turn others away from the right path."

A Muslim who reads this fatwa, which is quoted from *Al-fatawa al-hadithiyya*, should not be deceived by the writings of ignorant, heretical men of religious posts, should hold fast to the *Ahl as-Sunnat* books, which they try to defame, and should not buy or read the false, poisonous books of those heretics whom they praise highly and systematically.

11-Deviation of Tabligh al-Jama'at from the Ahl as-Sunnat

58. There is a group of people who have been visiting Islamic countries and preaching and advising Muslims under the name Tabligh jamaat. 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-Sahaba. Some of them also say that they follow the Hanafi madhhab and admire Ibn Taymiyya. Though they speak very usefully and righteously and since the fact that they never mention the names and words of Islamic scholars and seem to hush up part of the *Ahl as-Sunnat* knowledge, they arouse suspicion and sorrow. 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 Jamaat at-tabligh. Their center is in Delhi [with large branches in Karachi and Lahore in Pakistan.] Wherever they go, they lay very much stress upon performing salat. 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 Mawlana Muhammad Ilyas. This man was born in Kandla in 1303 A.H. (1886). He was Rashid Ahmad Gangohi's disciple. It is written on the 43rd and 49th pages of the book *Mawlana Ilyas Uranki din Dawat* by one of Ilyas's close disciples that he stayed near him for ten years. When Rashid Ahmad died in 1323 (1905) he was taught by Khalil Ahmad Saharanpuri. In his Urdu book, *Khalil Ahmad [d. Medina, 1346 (1928)]* says that the devil is more learned than *Rasulullah ('alaihi 's-salam)*. Rashid Ahmad says on the 51st page of *Barahin-i qati'a* that Khalil Ahmad's book was a blessed one and kept it at the place called 'Bait-i 'ain-i Islam.' Rashid Ahmad was the Khalifa of Haji Imdadullah al-Madani [d. Mecca, 1317 (1899)], and was first taught by Ismail Dahlawi, who wrote on the 38th page of *Taqwiyat al-iman* which is the Urdu translation of Ibn 'Abd al-Wahhab's *Kitab at-tawhid*, '*Rasulullah ('alaihi 's-salam)* died and rotted away. He became soil. He who believes that he will intercede in Resurrection becomes a polytheist.' Another tutor of Ilyas was Ashraf 'Ali Tahanawi who also was a Khalifa of Haji Imdadullah of the Chishtiyya Tariqa. In the first part of his Urdu book *Bahisti Zivar*, he writes very loathsome things which reduce the high grade of *Rasulullah ('alaihi 's-salam)* to the low

degree of a child, of a mad person or of animals. All the four tutors of Ilyas became unbelievers because of such writings of theirs in their books. Ilyas praises, exalts and excessively respects these unbelievers. He says that they are the most eminent awliya' of their time. The 114th page of the book *Malfuzat-i Hadrat-i Mawlana Ilyas Rahmatullahi 'alaih* is full with such praises. He says about his shaikh Rashid 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, *Mawlana Ilyas Uranki*). Allahu ta'ala declares in the last ayat of the surat al-Mujadala, 'Those who believe in Allahu ta'ala and the Day of Resurrection will dislike those [unbelievers] who do not obey Allahu ta'ala and His Messenger ('alaihi 's-salam). Allahu ta'ala will fill with iman the hearts of those who dislike unbelievers even though they were their fathers, sons, brothers or relatives.' All the members of Tabligh jamaat exaggerate and praise Ilyas and his teachers very much and say 'rahmatullahi 'alaih' when they mention or hear their names. They spread their above-mentioned books everywhere.

"The Ahl as-Sunnat 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 Mawlana 'Abd al-'Alim Siddiqi wrote that Ilyas's teachers were in an endeavor to demolish Islam from within." [This is written in detail also in the books *al-mustanad*, *Usul al-arba'a fi tardid al-Wahhabiyya*, *ad-dawlat al-Makkiyya* and *Hediyya-t-ul-Mehdiyyin*, which were reproduced in Istanbul in 1395 (1975).]

When Ilyas died in 1363 (1949) the successor was his son, Muhammad Yusuf Kandhlawi [b. Delhi, 1335 (1917); d. Lahore, buried Delhi, 1394 (1974)]. Yusuf's three-volume book, *Hayat-us-Sahaba*, was translated into Turkish and published in 1395 (1975). Because as-Sahaba are praised much in this book it arouses admiration in the reader. But there is a famous saying: "Judge a man by his actions, not by his words." One who believes in the superiority of as-Sahaba and loves them has to follow in their path, which is the path shown by the Ahl as-Sunnat scholars. The sign of love for as-Sahaba is to learn the fiqh books of one of the four Ahl as-Sunnat madhhabs, to endeavor to disseminate this knowledge and to live up to it. Muhammad Yusuf was succeeded by his son, Shaikh In'am al-Hasan, who was the hadith teacher at Mazahir-i 'Ulum Madrasa in Saharanpur, India. Abu 'l-Hasan 'Ali Nadwi, the director of Nadwat al-ulama' [founded in Lucknow, India in 1310 (1891)], praises al-Imam ar-Rabbani Ahmad as-Sirhindi and his services in his book *Ad-da'wat al-Islamiyya* [Lucknow, 1395 (1975)], but adds his praises for Ismail Dahlawi (killed in 1246), Nadhir Husain Dahlawi (d. 1320), the madrasa in Diobend which was founded by Muhammad Qasim Nanawtawi [d. 1317 (1899)], one of the Khulafa' of Imdad-ullah, in 1288 (1871), Ashraf Ali Tahanawi (d. 1362), the Tabligh group and its founder, Muhammad Ilyas. This faqir, the author, has read the book *Taqwim al-bayan*, Persian translation of Ismail Dahlawi's *Taqwiyat al-iman* [Pakistan, 1396 (1976)] and come to the conclusion that Ismail is not only a sheer ignoramus but also a non-madhabbi idiot who strives to censure the right by alloying it with the wrong. May Allahu ta'ala protect Muslims from reading and believing such heretical writings and falling into endless calamity! Amin!

In the Shawwal 1399 A.H. (1979) and following issues of the monthly periodical *Al-muallim* which is published by the Jamiyat al-'ulama' called "Samasta" located in the Malappuram City of the Kerala State, South India, Mawlana Abu Ahmad, one of the Ahl as-Sunnat scholars, wrote under the heading 'Disclosure of the Suspicions about Jamaat 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 words, 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 Taymiyya and Muhammad ibn 'Abd al-Wahhab an-Najdi. 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 put forward by Mawlana Ilyas. They call themselves 'Jamaat at-tabligh.' 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 'ulama' of Samasta Kerala have opened jihad 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-bidat. They issued the fatwas that they have dissented from the righteous path of Ahl as-Sunnat wal-Jamaat and that they were on the route of bidat and dalala (heresy). These fatwas of the 'ulama' of southern and northern India and Ceylon Island became an ijma'. And we, with the guidance of Allahu ta'ala and by keeping on the footsteps of the Salaf as-Salihin, will explain their vicious beliefs and heretical path: "The founder of this heretical path was Muhammad Ilyas ibn Ismail, who was born in 1303 A.H. (1886) and died in 1363 (1944). He formerly taught at Mazahir al-'ulum 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 Tariqa of 'Tabligh'. Jamal Muhammad Sahib, 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 Jamaat at-tabligh, which is located in Delhi, and his friend Muhammad Idris al-Ansari explain the causes of the establishment of this path in the booklet Tabligh-i Dustur 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 usul. This is understood from the 139th ayat of the surat Al 'Imran which states "You are more honorable and superior than them, for you have belief." Firstly, the aim of Islam is to change the batin (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 wholly 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 salih jamaat (pious community), that is, Jamaat al-Islamiya, which must work according to the way shown by Islam. Now, this job is done by Muhammad Ilyas, one of the salih servants of Allah. Gathering the ones who want to work in the way of Islam, he formed a new community called the Jamaat at-tablighiyya.'

"look at these words! According to the leader of the Jamaat at-tablighiyya, the works done by al-Ummat al-Muhammadiyya, singly or wholly, for fourteen hundred years were not in the way of prophets ('alaihi mu 's-salatu wa 's-salam) 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 jamaat! Those who have wanted to separate al-Ummat al-Muhammadiyya and to start a new heretical movement against Ahl as-Sunnat have always come about by saying such words; claiming that the whole Ummat Islamiyya 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 Mawdudi, recently founded an organization called Jamaat Islami in Pakistan. On the fifteenth page of his Urdu booklet *Min Musliman ur mawjuduhu siyasi*, 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 *ilhad* and *dahriyya* [he calls the religion of his ancestors as '*ilhad* 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 Ilyas said the same, claiming that what the *Ummat al-Muhammadiyya* had done for centuries were not conformable to the way of prophets. Muhammad Manzur an-Numani, on the twelfth page of his booklet *Malfuzat*, quotes him: 'All of what the *Ummat al-Muhammadiyya* do now are *rusum* and customs. Those who taught religion and directed religious affairs depended on *rusum* and customs.' Muhammad Hasan Khan, one of the leaders of *Jamaat at-tabligh*, wrote in the preface to *Miftah at-tabligh*, 'Because religious affairs are misdirected at the present time, many people are caught by the current of *shirk*, *kufir* and *ilhad*. Pitying at this situation of men, Allahu ta'ala sent Shaikh Muhammad Ilyas as a *mujiza* to awaken Muslim from unawareness and to initiate them into the spirit of religion. This *mujahid* endeavored 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 Ilyas find the right path while the whole *Umma* was in *kufir* and *dalala*?' "In summary, the group of *Jamaat at-tabligh*, like their other upstart colleagues, say that the *Ummat al-Muhammadiyya* has fallen for *dalala*, dissented from the right path. These words are exactly opposite to what our Prophet (sall-Allahu 'alaihi wa sallam) had conveyed, for he said in a hadith reported by at-Tirmidhi, 'My *umma* do not agree on deviation.' This hadith absolutely tells that the knowledge on which the *mujtahidin*, 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 *Jamaat at-tablighiyya* will be detailed: "Abu 'l-Hasan Ali Nadwi, famous authority on religion and history in India, quotes the founder of the *Jamaat at-tablighiyya*, Ilyas, 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 *Mawlana Ilyas Urunki dini 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 Allahu ta'ala. The inner aspect of this movement is written in detail in *Malfuzat al-Ilyas*. On page 50 of this book, his pupil Muhammad Manzur an-Numani gives this good news of his master to his friends: '*Ru'ya* (dream) is one of the 46 parts of prophethood. Promotions (*taraqqi*) that cannot be obtained through *riyada* and *mujahada* can occur to some selected men in *ru'ya*. Teachings that dawn upon them in *ru'ya* are parts from prophethood. Won't promotion come about with these? Knowledge increases *marifa*. And *marifa* makes one closer to Allah. Therefore, Allahu ta'ala commanded us to say, "Oh Allah! Increase my knowledge!" Man is given *sahih* knowledge in *ru'ya*. 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 tabligh was shown to me in ru'ya. The interpretation of the ayat, "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'ya. Like prophets, I have been created for the invitation of the people. The phrase 'You have been created' in the ayat 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'an is interpreted in dream, he claims, and sahih knowledge was given to him in dream, and it cannot be obtained through riyada or mujahada. From the word 'Ukhrijat' in the ayat, he derives a meaning which has not been reported by any mufassir. He tells his followers to endeavor to sleep much and teaches many other things as understood from his writings. Are not these the examples of interpreting the Qur'an according to his own point of view? Our Prophet prohibited and frightened Muslims against such interpretation with the hadith, 'Let Hell fire be the residence of who interprets the Qur'an according to his own view.' This hadith was reported by at-Tirmidhi. Those who cannot differentiate their left side from the right or recognize fard and sunnat travel to carry out tabligh just because of this interpretation in ru'ya. After the spread of Islam everywhere from the East to the West, their going from house to house to complete al-amru bi 'l-maruf, too, was all commanded in dream! 'Allama ibn Jarir at-Tabari and many mufassirs among the Salaf as-Salihin interpreted this ayat, and 'Allama Imam as-Suyuti reported them in his book Durar al-mansur. On the 64th page of the second part of this work, it is written, ' 'Abd Ibn Hamid, Ibn Jarir at-Tabari and Ibn al-Munzir reported from Imam Mujahid that, in the ayat, "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 tafsir had interpreted this ayat as Ilyas did. Then, his movement of tabligh is not in conformity with the path of the Qur'an, Hadith and Salaf as-Salihin. It is based on an interpretation done in a dream, in sleep. And this is ibtida' in Islam, that is, inventing a bidat. Our Prophet (sall-Allahu 'alaihi wa sallam) declared, 'Reject it when a thing absent in Islam comes up in our religion.' This hadith ash-Sharif is quoted in the Sahihain of al-Bukhari and Muslim. [An-Nabulusi, too, gives extensive explanations concerning this subject on the 128th page of Al-Hadiqa. [The first volume of Al-hadiqat an-nadiyya has been reproduced by Hakikat Kitabevi in Istanbul.] He writes on its 168th page, "Dreams seen in sleep, like spiritual inspiration (ilham ruhani), cannot be reasons that disclose the rules of Islam." On its 170th page, he writes, "It is possible (jaiz) that Allahu ta'ala opens and fills with ma'arif and haqiqa the heart of someone who has not read any book. When this person hears an ayat or a hadith, he interprets it and bewilders 'ulama'. But adapting oneself to him is not sahih. He is a wali but not an imam or murshid. To be a scholar of Islam, one has to have a full understanding of the ahkam of the hadiths." 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 Allahu ta'ala'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 ahkam (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, awliya' 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'an, the Sunnat, ijma' al-Umma and qiyas al-fuqaha'. 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-Askalani said, 'Dreams of people other than prophets do not communicate the rules of Islam, which are understood through wahi and ijihad.' Then, how can an ayat 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. "Allahu ta'ala has declared that He sent the Qur'an to be explained to people. The leader of Jamaat at-tabligh, however, says that the Qur'an was interpreted to him in his dream. According to him and as it is claimed in Tanbihat by Abul Ala Mawdudi, who had the same views with him, explanation of the Qur'an through the known tafsir 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 bidat, give meanings to the Qur'an according to their own views, while they still claim to follow the Qur'an and the Sunnat; this, however, is an open lie. "It is said in their booklet Dustur al-'amal, 'The aims and beliefs of the members of Jamaat at-tabligh 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 Ilyas, the head of the Tabligh movement said, 'Our aim is to teach what Rasulullah had taught to as-Sahaba. It is the first step of this movement to go around every country to tell about salat and give advices,' (Malfuzat, p. 31) These words mean that they tell Rasulullah's teachings according to their own understanding of them and according to their view point. He said to his friend Zahir Hasan, 'Our movement is supposed to be a group teaching only salat. I swear by Allah that our movement is not aimed at teaching salat. We bring up a new nation.' (Dini da'wat, p. 205) These words openly displays his aim. It is apparent that the followers of Ilyas are not sincere in trying to make everybody perform salat. This behavior is a beginning, a trap to make everybody join themselves. As a matter of fact, the statement, 'To this humble person myself, our Tabligh is composed of Islam, Tariqa and haqiqa,' (Makatib, p. 66) shows that this community, which was established on a dream of Ilyas, included in itself a new Islam, and Tariqa. In fact 'din' (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 bidat and dalala. "Muhammad Idris Ansari, one of the followers of Ilyas, said, 'The belief of this community is "La ilaha ill-Allah Muhammadun Rasulullah" ' (Dustur, p. 4) This is Islam's fundamental belief. Qadianis (Ahmadis) and Bahais, who were unanimously ruled out as non-Muslims, also claimed this belief, and these, too, started new groups of bidat by claiming the same. By saying, 'In order to do a task or an 'ibada or to prohibit something, it should have been declared by Rasulullah. No other document is needed,' (Dustur, p. 5) Ilyas denied ijma' and qiyas among al-adillat ash-Shariyya. 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 Dustur al-'mal as such: 'Anybody who says and believes the meaning of kalimat ash-shahada 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 Qadiani or a member of other groups of bidat, e.g. one of the heretics of Kharijiyya, Qadariyya, Mutazila or Mawdudiyya, may become a partner to this group and do his worship depending only on hadiths. They do not pay attention to what the Salaf as-Salihin had done and to ijma' and qiyas. They do not follow one of the four madhhabs. On the other hand, they claim to adapt themselves to Islam, Tariqa and haqiqa wholly. This, however, is an apparent dalala, a heretical confusion. This movement as named Jamaat at-tabligh resembles the heretical group called Jamaat Islami of Abul Ala Mawdudi. "He comments on the selection of the Jamaat's leader, 'In Islamic order, the status of amir (head, leader) is very important. The Amir selected from among Jamaat at-tabligh 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 Rasul are obeyed (p. 6)... It is wajib to obey without objection those commands of the Amir which are conformable to Islam. It is not permitted to investigate the Amir'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 amirs to the status of prophethood. On the eighth page, it is said, 'Before the Amir will give a command, it is wajib for him to consult with the prominent of the Jamaat, 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 hadiths and their amir, as if the Qur'an commanded obeying only their amir as a fard and, to them, Allahu ta'ala will revenge those who do not follow him. They confess that obedience to the amir 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 amir will be from among themselves, that is, among those who have come together just upon saying kalimat ash-shahada without investigating their cult or knowledge or looking for any other condition. However, the Salaf as-Salihin, that is, the scholars of Ahl as-Sunnat, have defined the characteristics of the person to be 'Ulu 'l-amr. Allama Abu 's-Su'ud Effendi said, 'Ulu 'l-amr are the commanders who follow the Divine Path and the judges who are just. They are the Khulafa' ar-rashidin, the four caliphs, and those who follow in their footsteps.' Imam al-Karkhi said, 'They are the commanders of the time of Rasulullah (sal-Allahu 'alaihi wa sallam) and those who come later. Judges and military leaders are similar.' To some, however, Ulu 'l-amr means the 'ulama' of Islam. It is apparent that the amirs of Jamaat at-tabligh, whom they choose from among themselves, cannot be included. Also, it is without foundation that it is a wajib to obey and a grave sin to disobey their amirs' commands. "While telling about what will happen to his umma, Rasulullah ('alaihi 's-salam) declared, 'The Sons of Israil 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-Sahabat al-kiram upon hearing this, asked, 'Oh Rasul-Allah! Which is that?' He declared, 'They are those who follow my and my Sahaba's path.' This hadith ash-Sharif was reported from 'Abdullah ibn 'Umar (radi-Allahu 'anh). As reported from Muawiya (radi-Allahu 'anh) by Imam Ahmad and Abu Dawud, Rasulullah ('alaihi 's-salam) declared, 'Of them, 72 are in Hell, and the remaining one is in Paradise. And this is one jamaat.' This hadith ash-Sharif is also quoted in the chapter on 'T'isam' of the book Mishkat. Oh Muslims! We must search and find this single community of salvation mentioned in this hadith and their beliefs which cause entrance to Paradise and should beware of heretical groups who oppose these beliefs! In this way, we shall endeavor to get saved from the Hell fire and flame! Hadrat Ghawth al-azam 'Abd al-Qadir al-

Geilani explained the former hadith and the word 'jamaat' in the latter hadith in these words: 'The believer (Mumin) should adapt himself to the Sunnat and to the Jamaat. The Sunnat is the way shown by Rasulullah ('alaihi 's-salam). The Jamaat is composed of the things done unanimously by as-Sahabat al-kiram who lived in the time of the four caliphs called Khulafa' ar-rashidin. A Muslim must prevent the multiplication of the men of bidat and be away from them and should not greet them. Ahmad Ibn Hanbal, the imam of our madhhab, said that greeting a man of bidat meant loving him since it had been declared in a hadith ash-Sharif, "Disseminate [your] greeting (salam)! Love one another in this way!" ' These are written on the 90th page of Gunyat at-talibin. Great alim Ahmad ibn Hajar al-Haitami, the last muhaqqiq, wrote on this subject in detail on page 149 of his work Sawa'iq al-muhriqa, where he said, 'Those who dissent from the Ahl as-Sunnat faith are called mubtadi'. They began to come forth in the first century [of Islam].'

"Hadrat Ibn Hajar al-Haitami said in his work Fat'h al-jawad, 'Mubtadi' is the person who does not have the faith (itiqad) conveyed unanimously by Ahl as-Sunnat. This unanimity was transmitted by the two great imams Abu 'l-Hasan al-Ashari and Abu Mansur al-Maturidi and the 'alims who followed their path.' On the 205th page of the book Al-fatawa al-hadithiyya, it is written, 'Man of bidat means one whose beliefs are different from the Ahl as-Sunnat faith. The Ahl as-Sunnat faith is the faith of Abu 'l-Hasan al-Ashari, Abu Mansur al-Maturidi and those who followed them. One who brings forth something which is not approved by Islam becomes a man of bidat.' Shafi'i alim Ahmad Shihab ad-din Kalyubi al-Misri wrote on the fourth volume of his marginalia to the book Kanz ar-raghibin: 'One who departs from what Abu 'l-Hasan al-Ashari and Abu Mansur al-Maturidi reported is not Sunni. These two imams followed the footprints of Rasulullah ('alaihi 's-salam) and his Sahaba.'

"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 wajib 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-Ashari and Abu Mansur al-Maturidi. How could it be correct of one who comes afore by establishing a new group in this age sees saying 'La ilaha illa-Allah Muhammadun Rasulullah' sufficient and stays away from the faith of Ahl as-Sunnat wal-Jamaat? The speeches and writings of the upstart group called Jam'at at-tabligh show that uttering 'La ilaha ill-Allah Muhammadun Rasulullah' is the only condition necessary for admission to this group. Any person, whether he belongs to a heretical group or disobey everybody except Rasulullah, immediately becomes a member of this group upon this utterance, even if he would disobey as-Sahaba and mujtahids. People representing Qadianism, Nijari, Wahhabism, Mawdudism and various non-Muslim movements are witnessed to belong to this jamaat. What else would it be if this behavior 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 behavior. They prohibit speaking on the madhhabs. They give freedom to everybody in his beliefs. On the 16th page of Dustur 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 Miftah at-tabligh. Their leader Muhammad Ilyas wrote on the 116th page of Malfuzat: The basis of our movement is to strengthen iman. It is not correct to widen the knowledge concerning beliefs (aqa'id). If we do so, there will arouse sedition in hearts and suspicions in minds.' He says on the 142nd page of Makatib, 'Sometimes you use the word bidat. Do not utter such words! Such words cause disunion among people.' "In

conclusion, they do not have the Ahl as-Sunnat 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 hadith. They say that it will cause disunion if studied. They do not use the word 'bidat' or similar ones, which, they claim, cause sedition. Despite all these heretical behaviors, they claim to belong to Ahl as-Sunnat wal-Jamaat. However, in view of the followers of this path of truth, there is no doubt about their heresy.

"The 'ulama' of Islam prohibited Muslims from friendship with men of bidat. Hadrat Qutb al-aqtab 'Abd al-Qadir al-Geilani said that it was much reward-deserving (thawab) to believe that the madhhab of people of bidat was corrupt, and not to follow them and to bear hostility against them. Our Prophet (sall-Allahu 'alaihi wa sallam) declared, 'Allahu ta'ala fills with aman (courage) and iman the heart of the person who stare with enmity at the man of bidat. The one who knows the man of bidat as wicked is saved by Allahu ta'ala against the fear of the Day of Resurrection. [Rank of] a hundred degrees is endowed by Allahu ta'ala in Paradise upon him who insults the man of bidat. One who meets the man of bidat with smiling face or does goodness to him will have disliked Islam sent to Muhammad ('alaihi 's-salam) by Allahu ta'ala.' The hadith ash-Sharif reported by Mughira from 'Abdullah ibn 'Abbas (radi-Allahu 'anhuma) says, 'Unless a man of bidat gives up his bidat, Allahu ta'ala will not accept any of his worship.' Fudail ibn 'Iyad said, 'Allahu ta'ala destroys the 'ibadat and takes the light of iman out of the heart of the one who loves the man of bidat.' Even in case the 'ibadat of the one who does not love the man of bidat is limited, it is hoped that his sins will be forgiven. In order not to come across a man of bidat, change your direction! The above-given hadiths and advices are written on the 90th page of the book Gunyat at-talibin. The followers of Jamaat at-tabligh, who call themselves Muslim and introduce themselves as Ahl as-Sunnat, accept heretics of every kind into their community. Whether of Ahl as-Sunnat or ahl al-bidat, 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 Jamaat at-tabligh, Muhammad Ilyas, 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 Makatib, he says, 'It is certainly good to attend at the gatherings of hatm al-Qur'an and dhikr. The prominent people of the religion said so.

However, because there is the risk of being like the men of bidat, it is better to refrain from attending at such places. There is the same danger both in saying salat and salam upon the Prophet with the thought in mind that he is present and sees, and in saying salat and salam as the men of bidat [?] say. Yes, though it is permitted to say it unconsciously out of extreme love, the Satan may intervene and spoil iman. And this is a greater danger.'

"look at these words! He does not permit saying salat and salam 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 Wahhabite belief. His prohibiting it even in case of extreme love is a heresy that surpasses that of the Wahhabis. One who is Muslim does not prohibit it. What does he think about all Muslims' saying, 'As-salamu 'alaika ayyuha 'n-Nabiyyu,' in salat? See what the 'Document of Islam' (Hujjat al-Islam) Imam al-Ghazali (rahmat-Allahu 'alaih) wrote in his work Ihya al-'ulum: 'At first, bring to your heart the holy figure of Rasulullah ('alaihi 's-salam). Then recite As-salamu 'alaika ayyuha 'n-Nabiyyu and believe that he will hear you and answer you.'

(First volume, p. 129) Ottoman alim Muhammad Hakki Effendi (d. Mecca, 1301 A.H.)/1884) wrote in the first article on page 166 of his *Hazinat al-asrar*, 'The Muslim should think of himself as being in the presence of Rasulullah ('alaihi 's-salam) and, showing honor, respect and manners and keeping in mind that he is the intercessor, wasila and savior between him and Allahu ta'ala, say salat and salam. At this holy place, the most suitable is to say, As-salamu 'alaika ayyuha 'n-Nabiyyu.'

"Al-'arifu bi 'llah Sayyid Muhammad 'Uthman al-Mirghani al-Makki al-Hanafi (d. Mecca, 1268 A.H./1852) said on page 14 of his work *Akrab at-turuki ila 'l-haqq*: 'Think of Rasulullah's ('alaihi 's-salam) presence facing you, his seeing and hearing you! Even if you are far away, Allahu ta'ala makes your voice be heard and displays you. Here, being near or distant is the same.' All these passages show that Rasulullah ('alaihi 's-salam) sees and hears those who think of facing him. The founder of *Jamaat at-tabligh* 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 Wahhabite tenet that states, 'The dead do not hear.' The most correct comment on this subject is the following fatwa of Ahmad ibn Hajar al-Haitami, the last of profound 'ulama', which is written on the ninth page of the second volume of *Fatawa al-kubra*:

"Question: 'Does a person, when he commends his soul, see Rasulullah (sall-Allahu '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 Rasulullah (sall-Allahu '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 Allahu ta'ala'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 Rasulullah ('alaihi 's-salam) can be seen in various ways at various places at the same moment. In fact, this can be believed through intellect, too: adh-dhat ash-Sharif (honorable person) of his becomes like a mirror, and everybody sees the image of his own beauty or ugliness in this mirror. There takes place no change in the beauty of the mirror. The 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 awliya' have taken various figures in this world, too. It is famous that Kadib al-ban Hasan al-Musuli and others have been seen as such.'

"He wrote in the first fatwa on the 29th page: 'The dead recognize those who visit them. The hadith reported by Ibn Abi '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 hadith says, "When a person passes by the grave of a Muslim brother of his acquaintance and greets the dead person recognizes him and responds his greeting." ' He writes in the second fatwa, 'The dead hear the voices of the alive. The hadith reported by Imam Ahmad states, "The dead person recognizes those who wash him, carry him and put him in grave." ' Hadrat Sayyid 'Abdulahakim-i Arwasi, the profound alim and great wali who passed away in Ankara in 1362 A.H. (1943), said, 'Ibn Hajar al-Makki was one of the most superior 'ulama' of Islam. His every word is documented and is a document.'

"How come one can suspect of Rasulullah's (sall-Allahu 'alaihi wa sallam) becoming present and seeing? The status of prophets, even of awliya', is promoted after their pure souls depart from their bodies; they become possessors of full tasarruf (disposal, effect) like angels. This has been reported unanimously by the 'ulama' of Ahl as-Sunnat and has been denied only by the Muhammad ibn 'Abd al-Wahhab who was left in heresy by Allahu ta'ala. And Ilyas, the head of Jamaat at-tabligh, was caught by his heretical current. The following is another example from the words of 'ulama' to brighten the eyes of those who believe him and to disgrace the faces of mulhids: "Shah Wali-Allah ad-Dahlawi, one of the great 'ulama' of India, wrote in his work Hujjatu 'Illahi 'l-baligha (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 inspiration and help to men. They help in the dissemination and strengthening of Allahu ta'ala'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 Rasulullah (sall-Allahu 'alaihi wa sallam) becomes present and hears? The 'ulama' of Islam have unanimously reported that he is the cause of all beings and the unique means of getting near to Allahu ta'ala. "In his work Ar-rawd an-nadir, 'Allama 'Abd ar-Ra'uf al-Manawi wrote: 'After pure souls depart 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, how the most superior of them is should be pondered and understood well!' "Hadrat Ahmad Zaini Dahlan says on page 58 of Taqrib al-usul: 'Most of the 'arifs said that, after a wali passes away, his soul's connection to his murids continues. With the soul's baraka, nurs and faids come about. This is explained detailedly by Hadrat Qutb al-irshad 'Abdullah al-Haddad, who said in summary: "After a wali passes away, he keeps his concern with his immediate acquaintances. This concern is more than that when he was alive. Because, he has been busy in this world also with his duties of being Allahu ta'ala's servant; 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 haqiqa (reality) continues to exist. They are alive in their graves. Because the wali is alive in his grave, his knowledge and intellectual and spiritual powers do not change at all. Even, they all increase further after death." ' While the case is as such with all awliya', 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-madhabite poison and those who have been caught in the trap of mulhids and dissented from Islam. May Allahu ta'ala protect all Muslims against this grave disaster! Amin." [Al-mu'allim, monthly periodical; see above, beginning of this article. The Arabic original of the passage is published together with the book Al-ustad Mawdudi in Istanbul.]

12-Ten fatwas from the great Islamic scholar of India, Ahmad Rida Khan Barilawi (Alternately written as Ahmad Raza Khan of Barelwi or Bareilly.)

59 - Of the great 'ulama' in India, Ahmad Rida Khan Barilawi, in his fatwa book Fatawal-Haramain, answers twenty-eight questions. All of these fatwas are in conformity with the

knowledge of the Ahl as-Sunnat 'ulama'. Ten of these fatwas are given below for their auspiciousness:

Question 1: "The British spies in India, who call themselves 'Nayashira'. They believe that Jabrail ('alaihi 's-salam), angels, genies, the Satan, heavens, the mujiza of Miraj, Hell and Paradise exist and that bodies will get alive again as Muslims believe. Yet they give false meanings to the ayats that deal with these subjects, as some of the people called Batiniyya do. They say that these things are not made of matter but they are conceptual and imaginative. They say that nothing can exist outside customs and physical laws. Thus they deny that Allahu ta'ala can create many things outside the laws of nature. They do not believe in mujizat, and they explain them away according to what they see and learn in nature. They say that it is haram and cruelty to use as slaves the captives taken from among non-Muslims in the jihad performed for spreading Allah's religion and that it is a thing 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 tafsir and hadith books. They claim that all their contents have been invented by 'ulama. They say, 'The Qur'an remains the sole truth in our hands. We interpret the Qur'an 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-shahada and perform salat 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, they have no connection with Islam. They are enemies of Islam fed by the British. They are the worst of non-Muslims and murtads, because they deny the things that are known to be indispensable in religion. Their saying kalimat ash-shahada and professing that the Kaba is the qibla do not show their being believers or Ahl al-qibla. None of the 'ulama' and books of itiqad 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, after understanding their teachings and heresy, call them Muslims, or even regard them as 'ulama' of Islam and authorities on religion, or praise them with the terms that have not been used for the superiors of Islam yet, and, by mentioning their names, 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 as such, write, publish and advertise their books as the 'books of superiors of religion'?"

Answer 2: One who does not believe in one of the things indispensable in Islam becomes a kafir. One who has suspicion of such a person's not being a kafir and in that he will not be punished in Hell eternally is a kafir, too. That the latter, too, is a kafir is openly written in the books Bazaziyya, Durr al-mukhtar, Qadi Iyad's Shifa, Imam an-Nawawi's Rawda and Ibn Hajar al-Makki's Al-alam. It has been unanimously declared by the 'ulama' of Islam that it also makes one kafir to have doubt that it is infidelity (kufr) if somebody does not regard a Christian, a Jew or a dissenter from Islam as a kafir. This unanimity is written in the above-mentioned books. While one become a kafir out of doubting in the other's being a kafir, it should be pondered well how the one who regards him as a Muslim or, even, praises him with the terms reserved for the

'ulama' of Islam will be. From these words of ours, we should understand well the situation of those who consider such people as 'ulama' of Islam and praise and spread their speeches and writings filled with kufr. Praise or effort to disseminate or to advertise shows consent and love. Consent to kufr causes kufr. Consent to kufr does not mean to want the kafir to remain in kufr but to love his kufr.

Question 3: "What does 'ahl al-bidat' mean?"

Answer 3: If the cause of an innovator's dissent from Ahl as-Sunnat is his belief in the superiority of 'Ali over Abu Bakr and 'Umar (radi-Allahu 'anhum), he is of ahl al-bidat as it is written in Hulasa, Hindiyya and many other invaluable books. The one who does not believe in the khilafat (caliphate) of one or both of the latter two caliphs was said to be a kafir by the 'ulama' of fiqh and to be a man of bidat by the 'ulama' of kalam. For the sake of precaution, the term 'man of bidat' should be used for them. One absolutely becomes a kafir if says that Allahu ta'ala is a creature, or that the present Qur'an al-karim is deficient and contains alterations of as-Sahabat al-kiram and of later times, or that 'Ali (radi-Allahu 'anh) or one of the Twelve Imams is superior to prophets. It is written in Hindiyya, Zahiriyya, Al-Hadiqat an-nadiyya and in fiqh books that he will be treated as a murtad. There is detailed information on this subject in the book Makalat al-mufassira an ahkami 'l-bidati 'l-mukaffira. [Ibn Abidin wrote 'unlawful betrothal' in Radd al-muhtar: "If one worships Ali (radi-Allahu anh) or says, 'Jabrail was ordered to reveal the Qur'an to Ali, but he mistook and revealed it to Muhammad,' or 'Abu Bakr was not a sahabi,' or Hadrat A'isha committed adultery,' he becomes a kafir. If he says that 'Ali (radi-Allahu anh) superior to the two caliphs, or curses or slanders at a sahabi, he becomes a man of bid'a." In the third volume, he wrote: "If one curses at or damns the two caliphs, he becomes a kafir. Though those people called Durziz, Mulhids and Isma'ilis carry out the five fundamentals of Islam, they become kafirs because of their belief in transmigration of the soul and by regarding wine and intercourse as halal and giving false meanings to ayats." Ibn Abidin, in his book Uqud ad-duriyya, quoted Shaikh al-Islam Abdullah Effendi's extensive fatwa about the Shi'ites and reveals those who fell in kufr among them.]

Question 4: "What would say about those who praise the people called 'Batiniyya' with the words the 'stars of knowledge,' 'suns of 'ulama', 'great alim of our time,' or 'guide of the century' and about those who believe these words?"

Answer 4: If they know that they praise those declared to be murtads, they also become murtads. Even if those praised are not murtads, it is apparent that it is ugly and bad to praise them. The hadith as-Sharif reported from Anas ibn Malik (radi-Allahu 'anh) by Ibn Abi 'd-dunya, Abu Yala and al-Baihaki and from Abu Huraira (radi-Allahu 'anh) by Ibn 'Adi says: "When a sinner (fasiq) is praised, our Rabb's indignation arouses." Permitting such praises or disseminating or advertising them shows consent to them. Consent to evils is also evil. [It is heard that some people admire the religious and political movement of, and praise the personality of, Humaini of Iran who is understood to be an enemy to as-Sahaba and to the whole of Ahl as-Sunna. They should carefully read this hadith and fatwa, get lesson from them and wake up from unawareness.]

Question 5: "What would you say about some people's saying that Allahu ta'ala and His Prophet ('alaihi 's-salam) may lie?"

Answer 5: Lying is a deficiency and ugliness. It has been unanimously declared that there is no ugly thing attributable to Allahu ta'ala or His Rasul ('alaihi 's-salam). This is dealt in detail in my

book Subhana 's-subbuh an 'aybi kazbin makbuh, wherein I gave documents from the 'ulama' of kalam and tafsir. In many books by Arab and Persian 'ulama', 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 'Allama Ahmad ibn Zain ibn Dahlan al-Makki, who was one of my masters in hadith, tells in detail about their heresies and gives, from Hadrat Mawlana Abu 's-su'ud, the Mufti of al-Madinat al-munawwara, passages refuting them. They have been caught by the Satan's current and become soldiers to the Satan. The soldiers of the Satan will certainly be ruined.

Question 6: "We nowadays see upstart people who are called 'Ghair al-muqallidin,' that is non-or la-madhhabite people. They neither follow any of the four madhhabs nor let anybody follow one of them. They call themselves ahl al-hadith. They say that they follow only the Hadith. 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 Hijaz, Iraq or in Damascus and write books on religion. What would you say about them and their books?"

Answer 6: In the subject on 'Zabayih' in the marginalia of Durr al-mukhtar, 'Allama Sayyid Ahmad at-Tahtawi, one of the 'ulama of the Hanafi madhhab, writes: "One who departs from the path of the 'ulama' of fiqh, from as-siwad al-azam, will have directed himself to Hell. Oh Muslims! Therefore, hold fast to the path of Ahl as-Sunnat wal-Jamaat which is called 'al-firqat an-najiyya' (group of Salvation), the unique group reported by our Prophet ('alaihi 's-salam) to be saved from Hell! Because, Allahu ta'ala's help, protection and taking to bliss are only for those who are on this path. Allahu ta'ala's Ghadab (Wrath) and adhab (torture) are for those who dissent from this path. Today, this firqat najiyya has gathered in the four madhhabs, namely, Hanafi, Shafi'i, Maliki and Hanbali. One who does not belong to any of these four madhhabs is a man of bidat or a man for Hell [heretic or unbeliever]." Great Imam Sufyan ath-Thawri (radi Allahu 'anh) said, "If one who is not an alim in fiqh tries to adapt his affairs to hadiths, he leads himself to heresy." Great Imam Ibn al-Hajj al-Makki said the same in his work Al-mad'hal. My fatwas about and articles on the la-madhhabi are available in my book Al-barikat ash-sharika 'ala marikat al-musharika.

Question 7: "Some people say, 'The la-madhhabi belong to Ahl As-Sunnat and are even licensed authorities on religion. They differ from Ahl as-Sunnat only in insignificant teachings, and this difference is beneficial as that between the Hanafi, Shafi'i and Maliki madhhabs, thus they help the religion of Islam. Should not the la-madhhabi, therefore be considered as those in the Hanafi and Shafi'i madhhabs and should not we know them as Islamic brothers and love heartfully and respect them? Isn't it the way of those intoxicated with love for Allahu ta'ala to do one's affairs according to hadiths though one is not a mujtahid? Didn't Abu Dharr al-Ghaffari (radi-Allahu 'anh), a Sahabi, act upon the hadith, "Do not save your properties to make them kanz, a treasure"?' What would you say about those who say these about the la-madhhabi?"

Answer 7: These words are not correct at all. The person who says these becomes one among them, even one worse than them. How could a man of bidat be respected? The hadith reported from 'Abdullah ibn Bashir (radi-Allahu 'anh) by at-Tabarani says, "One who respects the man of bidat will have helped in the annihilation of Islam." Another hadith, reported from Muaz (radi-Allahu 'anh) in Kabir by at-Tabarani and in Hilya by Abu Nuaym, says, "One who walks to show respect for the man of bidat has helped in destroying Islam." There are many similar hadiths. It is dalala, heresy, for those not promoted to the status of mujtahid not to follow one of the four

madhhabs but to do one's worship and affairs according to what he understands from hadiths. It is dissention from the believers' path. Allahu ta'ala declares in the 43rd ayat of the surat an-Nahl, "Ask what you do not know from the people of dhikr!" A hadith reported from Jabir ibn 'Abdullah (radi-Allahu 'anh) by Abu Dawud says, "Ask what you do not know. Medicine for ignorance is inquiry." These ayat and hadith command those who do not know to learn by asking those who know. As it is concluded from this, those who speak about the la-madhhabi as quoted above or who admit and believe their words, in fact, belong to the la-madhhabi, being partners to them in heresy.

Question 8: "In the last two years, this kind of people have multiplied in India. An organization named 'Nadwat ul-ulama' has been founded in claim of service to Islam and to awaken Muslims. Here, every kind of people and those with heretical beliefs have gathered, and la-madhhabi people, including a few belonging to Ahl as-Sunnat, have taken hold of high chairs. What would you say about this?"

Answer 8: This behavior of them is haram 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-Sunnat scholars all sitting at the same line of chairs, think of those heretics also as respectful and beneficial. They begin to show respect for them, which is sinful. Islamic religion commands humiliation and severe treatment of the men of bidat and forbids showing respect to them. In 'aqa'id books, for example, in Sharh al-maqasid, the 'ulama' of Islam wrote, "It is necessary to treat severely, to humiliate, to refute and to expel the men of bidat." 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 the men of bidat cause the dissention of them 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 Sunni and other groups of bidat. 'They should not refuse one another's beliefs, but live brotherly. 'Ulama' should not speak or write on the beliefs in disagreement 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 bidat 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 'ulama' of Islam. Salaf as-Salihin and the 'ulama of all times up to now have always opposed bidat in this way. One who does not refuse the men of bidat but let them by themselves will have dissented from Muslims' unanimity, got away from the Islamic jamaat and loved bidats and offenders of bidat. And this means to discredit the Ahl as-Sunnat madhhab and the Muslims of this right path; to forbid the established reason and to command the prohibition; to lead Muslims to Allahu ta'ala's damnation. Great alim Hadrat Ahmad ibn Hajar al-Makki, the imam of Muslims, said in the preface to his work As-sawa'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 hadith ash-Sharif reported in Al-Jami' by Khatib al-Baghdadi: 'When seditions and bidats spread and my Sahaba are slandered, those who know the reality shall declare what they know! May those who do not declare what they know be damned by Allahu

ta'ala, by angels and by all people! Allahu ta'ala does not accept any of their 'ibadat and goodness.' " The statement, "Telling what one knows causes disunion, is sinful and is self-destruction," is a slander against Allahu ta'ala and Islamic 'ulama', dissention from the Ahl as-Sunnat 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-Sunnat and ahl al-bidat; 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 everybody's getting share in one's sorrow and loss; to make known that all who say kalimat ash-shahada are brothers even if their beliefs would be different. This is aimed on account of the command in the hadith, "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 Allahu ta'ala. The salat, fast and ta'at 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 iman and enter Paradise. Though men's every kind of sins may possibly be forgiven, discord and enmity between one another 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 hadiths and the words of Islamic imams support this. Let's quote some of the hadiths that forbid friendship with men of bidat and command keeping away from them: the hadith reported in the Sahih of Muslim from Abu Huraira (radi-Allahu 'anh) says, "Run away from them! [So] they shall not lead you to heresy, throw you into discord!" The hadith reported from 'Abdullah ibn 'Umar (radi-Allahu 'anh) by Abu Dawud says, "Do not visit them when they get sick!" The hadith reported from Jabir by Ibn Maja (radi-Allahu 'anh) states, "Do not greet them when you encounter them!" The hadith reported by 'Ukaili from Anas ibn Malik (radi-Allahu 'anh) says, "Do not keep company with them! Do not eat or drink with them! Do not intermarry with them!" [This hadith forbids friendship, eating and marrying with ahl al-bid'a. It is written in Hindiyya and Bahr ar-raiq, "Zindiqs, Batinis, Ibahis and all the groups with beliefs that causes kufr are mushriks (polytheists) like idolaters and worshippers of stars. Marriage with such mushriks or intercourse with their females as jariyas is haram." The above writings conclude that, if the belief of those who do not belong to one of the four madhabs, that is those who are not of Ahl as-Sunna, causes kufr, they become mushriks. Marriage with them and eating the carcass they have slaughtered are haram. Of them, those whose belief does not cause kufr are ahl al-bid'a, and marriage with them is not haram; though the nikah would be sahih, not with them but with ahl as-Sunna should Muslims get married, because living with them and even greeting them are forbidden by hadiths.]

The hadith ash-Sharif reported by Ibn Hibban says, "Do not perform their funeral prayers! Do not perform salat with them!" The hadiths reported from Ma'adh (radi-Allahu 'anh) by ad-Dailami say, "I am not of them. And they are not of me. Jihad against them is like jihad against disbelievers." The hadith ash-Sharif which was reported through the ancestral succession of Imam 'Ali (radi-Allahu 'anh), Husain, Zain al-'Abidin 'Ali, Muhammad Bakir and Imam Jafar as-Sadiq and which was said to Abu Umama states: "Do not have relation with those in the groups of Qadari, Murjii and Khariji! They will spoil your religion. They betray as did the Jews and Christians." The hadith reported from Anas ibn Malik (radi-Allahu 'anh) by Ibn Asakir states, "When you meet the man of bidat, treat him harshly! Allahu ta'ala is hostile to all men of bidat.

None of them will be able to pass the Sirat bridge; they will fall in Hell fire." The hadith reported from Hadrat 'Umar (radi-Allahu 'anh) by Abu Dawud and Hakim says, "Do not be in company with people of the Qadariyya group! Do not consult them your affairs." The hadith reported from 'Abdullah ibn Masud (radi-Allahu 'anh) by Ahmad ibn Hanbal, Abu Dawud, at-Tirmidhi and Ibn Maja and from Abu Musa 'l-Ashari (rahmat-Allahu 'alaihi) by at-Tabarani says, "The Sons of Israil committed sin. Their scholars advised them; they did not listen. Their scholars later talked with them. They ate and drank together. Allahu ta'ala introduced enmity among them; He condemned them through the mouths of Dawud ('alaihi 's-salam) and 'Isa ('alaihi 's-salam)."

At-Tirmidhi, Abu Dawud and Ibn Maja reported from Nafi' that a man conveyed someone's salam to 'Abdullah ibn 'Umar (radi-Allahu 'anhuma), who said, 'I have heard that he has become a man of bidat. If he is so, do not take my salam to him.' Hasan al-Basri and Muhammad ibn Sirin said, "Do not come together with men of bidat." Ayyub as-Sahtiyani said, "I and Talaq ibn Habib were sitting together. Said ibn Jubair, passing by, said to me, 'Do not sit with him! He is a man of bidat.' " As Asma ibn Ubaid told, two men of bidat came to 'Ali Sirin and said that they wanted to ask him about a hadith; "No, don't ask," he said. When they said that they will ask him about an ayat, 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 ayat from al-Qur'an al-karim?" He replied, "I feared that they would read the ayat after altering it and that this alteration might make place in my heart." Salam ibn Abi Muti' told that, when a man of bidat said to Ayyub that he would ask him a word, he said, "I wouldn't listen even a half word from you." Someone asked something to Said ibn Jubair, who gave no answer; when the reason was asked, he said, "He is a man of bidat, so shouldn't be talked with." Abu Jafar Muhammad Bakir said, "Do not stay near those who dispute. They give meanings to ayats as they wish." In the explanation of Mishkat, Imam Ahmad ibn Hajar al-Makki comments on 'Abdullah ibn 'Umar's (radi-Allahu 'anhuma) saying, "Do not say my salam to..." and adds, "Because, we are ordered to keep away from men of bidat." In the explanation of the hadith, "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-Islam that Salaf as-Salihin did not get close to men of bidat since a hadith said, "Do not stay with men of bidat! Their vices are as contagious as scabies." Another hadith 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 hadith says, "Allahu ta'ala fills with iman the heart of him who gives stern answer to the man of bidat; He protects him against terrible things. One who disesteems the man of bidat will be saved by Allahu ta'ala against the fears of Resurrection." It is written in the book Irshad as-saree sharhu sahih al-Bukhari that, unless it is understood that a man of bidat has vowed for repentance, it is necessary to keep away from him.

I, the poor servant [that is, Ahmad Rida Khan], am preparing a booklet on this subject now. With documents from al-Qur'an al-karim and hadiths, I explain the necessity of keeping away from the men of bidat and treating them severely. I additionally give the comments of the 'ulama'. This work will be the light for the eyes, and the remedy for the hearts.

While the harms of being together with men of bidat are that many, it should be estimated how many more the harms of loving and praising them are. A hadith says, "One is with those whom he loves." Another hadith quoted by Imam 'Ali (radi-Allahu 'anh) and others, says, "I swear that Allahu ta'ala will resurrect the man with those whom he loves." The hadith reported by at-

Tabarani says, "Allahu ta'ala will resurrect the man among those whom he loves." The hadith reported from Abu Huraira (radi-Allahu 'anh) by Abu Dawud and at-Tirmidhi says, "Man's religion is similar to his friend's religion. Everybody shall examine whom he has friendship with!" Extensive explanation about the foregoing hadiths is given in my book *Fih an-Nasrin bi jawabi 'l-as'ilati 'l-ishrin*.

The aim of Nadwat al-'ulama' is the same as that of the damned Satan. They endeavor for the dissention of 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 'ibadat will not be accepted. They will not attain to blessings and happiness," is a slander against Allahu ta'ala. Their words, "Dispute with and hostility towards men of bidat 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-Sunnat wal-Jamaat and that they deny the ayats which say, "Allahu ta'ala forgives all the sins but shirk of whomever He wishes," and "Allahu ta'ala certainly forgives all sins." Their saying, "Pardon of this sin is impossible," results in their denial of these ayats. Also, they ascribe wrong meaning to the hadith, "Allahu ta'ala's servants, be brothers [of one another]!" This hadith'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 bidat to become brothers to the Muslims of the right path, they should give up their bidats and accept the Sunnat. Their calling Muslims of Ahl as-Sunnat to become brothers for themselves despite their persisting in committing their bidats is an apparent heresy and an ugly deceit. [The Arabic work *Fatawa'l-Haramain*, from which the foregoing ten fatwas are translated, has been reproduced in offset in Istanbul. The author, Ahmad Rida Khan Barilawi, passed away in India in 1340 A.H. (1921).]

60 - When religion reformers want to annihilate a command of Islam, they attack hadiths as a last resort. They say that the hadith which that command depends upon is mawdu'. Upon finding out that they cannot make believe, they say, "It is a daif hadith, if not mawdu'; a daif hadith cannot be depended upon for a judgement." For example, it is haram for men to wear gold rings. Religion reformers say that the hadith telling this is daif and gold ring is not haram. Their words contradict themselves, for, since a daif hadith cannot be depended upon for a judgement, the hadith from which the judgement, "Gold ring is haram," was derived must be sahih, which is the truth of the matter. The Ahl as-Sunnat scholars studied the hadiths hair-splittingly and sifted out all mawdu' hadiths. They derive the fard, halal and haram only from sahih and mashhur hadiths. In the commentary of the book *Manar*, Ibn Malak states this fact clearly: "A daif hadith cannot necessitate or make wajib. A religious deed cannot be performed according to a hadith which cannot be understood whether it is sahih or not." In the section on wudu' in *Radd al-mukhtar*, is commentary to *Durr al-mukhtar*, Ibn 'Abidin says, "It is not necessary for the muqallid to search for the proofs, documents of the decisions which the mujtahids have made."

The person who attacks the Ahl as-Sunnat scholars and who is irreverent towards fiqh books belongs to none of the four madhhabs. 'Abdullah ibn 'Isa Sanani, in his book *Saif al-Hindi fi ibanati tariqati 'sh-shaikhi 'n-Najdi* (ed. 1218 A.H./1803), proves with documents that those who say "mawdu' " for sahih hadiths are of no madhhab and that they strive to demolish Ahl as-Sunnat. Mudarris Sayyid 'Abdullah Effendi, in his book *Irsal al-makal*, answers those who speak ill of hadiths by saying that they are daif or mawdu', and he refutes Ibn Taymiyya and as-Shawkani, the leaders of this mischief.

There is a separate branch of knowledge called *usul al-hadith*, in which 'mawdu hadith' does not mean 'made-up hadith'. Today, those who know nothing of this knowledge think of its lexical meaning and suppose that it means 'made-up hadith.' [For more detailed information on this knowledge and on mawdu hadiths, see the fifth chapter in the book *Endless Bliss*, II.]

The book *Usul al-hadith* by the great scholar Imam Muhammad al-Birghiwi is very valuable. Dawud al-Karsi wrote a commentary to this book in 1251 A.H. (1835) which was commented again by Yusuf Effendi of Harput in 1292 (1875) and was printed in Istanbul a year later. The following passage is translated from this Arabic work:

"All the hadiths reported by a person who was known to have lied when reporting any hadith are called mawdu' or muftari hadiths, for there was the probability that all the hadiths he reported were made-up, slanderous. As it is seen, in *usul al-hadith*, a hadith called mawdu' does not have to be made-up, for, even if the person who was caught in his lying with one hadith repented and became pious, all the hadiths he reported would still be said to be mawdu'. The book *Tadrib* by Imam as-Suyuti and also many of the hadith 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 hadiths. And some tekke shaikhs invented hadiths in order to encourage in worship and to frighten against sinning. It is haram to invent hadith with such good intentions, and it is kufr if it is intended to trick Muslims. The hadiths praising the suras in the tafsir books of as-Salabi, al-Wahidi, az-Zamakhshari, al-Baidawi and Abu 's-Su'ud are claimed to be mawdu' by some ignorant people. It is obvious that the hadiths that praise the suras al-Fatiha, al-Anam, al-Kahf, Ya Seen, ad-Dukhan al-Mulk, az-Zilzal, an-Nasr, al-Kafirun al-Ikhlās, al-Falaq and an-Nas are sahih. The writers of these books quoted in their books the hadiths that were claimed to be mawdu' because they considered them as sahih, hasan or at least daif, or because they had conveyed them just as they were from the hadith scholars whom they depended on, or because they would not admit that they were mawdu'. With the help of the fairly certain presumption, it can be decided if a hadith is sahih; it cannot be known for certain. There are many hadith which the majority of hadith scholars said to be sahih but which other scholars of this branch did not say so. Many others were not able to understand whether they were sahih or not, for it was very difficult to understand if a hadith was sahih. It could be understood only with presumption; it could not be understood certainly. In order to make sure that a hadith 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 hadith should have been incompatible with Islam, with reason, with calculation or with experience, and it could not have been explained away differently. Only the hadith 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 'sahih', 'hasan' or 'daif' about many of the hadiths for which Abu 'l-faraj ibn al-Jawzi said 'mawdu' in his book *Mawduat*. Imam az-Zahabi said that the majority of the hadiths written in that book were dependable and beautiful hadiths. We have derived what we have written up to here from the books *Taqrib* by Imam an-Nawawi, *Tadrib* by as-Suyuti and *Nukhba* by Shaikh al-Islam Ibn Hajar al-Askalani." [Imam Muhammad al-Birghiwi, *Usul al-hadith*, p.91.]

It is of great disrespect, unscrupulousness and unreasonableness to suppose that the greatest scholars like al-Baidawi, Imam al-Ghazali, Jalal ad-din as-Suyuti, Sadr ad-din al-Qonawi and Sana'ullah PaniPuti were too ignorant to distinguish a sahih hadith from a made-up hadith, 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 hadiths as sahih hadiths. We have told at length in the seventh and eighth paragraphs of our book how strictly Islamic scholars studied hadiths. 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 made-up hadiths in the books of such a great scholar as Imam al-Ghazali, is worth cutting his tongue and burning his books. To say that those exalted scholars could not understand the hadiths while their successor Ibn Taymiyya could is not a word which anyone besides the enemies of the Ahl as-Sunnat scholars can say. Those who cannot comprehend the greatness of Islamic scholars suppose that those exalted leaders also wrote with their short reasons and aberrant thoughts, like they do. They use so base words as to say, "Al-Ghazali's discernment remained under the bad influence of social ideas." They cannot comprehend that each of his writings is an explanation of ayats and hadiths. If a person who praises al-Imam ar-Rabbani is sincere in his word and if he likes that exalted leader's writings, he should follow these writings and love the Ahl as-Sunnat scholars, whom al-Imam ar-Rabbani praises highly, and he should not be disrespectful towards them. A scholar only can appreciate the value of a scholar. Not to realize the value of the Ahl as-Sunnat scholars, or to strive to blemish, to criticize those blessed persons, causes one to depart from al-firqat an-najiyaa (the group of Salvation), and he who departs from Ahl as-Sunnat becomes either a heretic or an unbeliever. [Mawlana Hamd-Allah ad-Dajwi, *Al-basa'ir li-munkirit-tawassuli bi-ahl al-maqabir*, Pashawar, Pakistan, 1385, p. 52.] As it is written on page 65 of the book *Hidayat al-muwaffiqin* by Abu Muhammad Viltori, one of the 'ulama' of India, 'Allama Ahmad Sawi al-Maliki said on the ayat "Idha nasita" of the surat al-Kahf in the marginalia of Jalalain's tafsir: "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 (dalala) and also leads others to heresy. Some of such people become kafir, because, one of the things that cause kufr is to attempt to drive rules from ayats and hadiths."

61 - The following passage is translated from an-Nabulusi's *Al-Hadiqat an-nadiyya*:

"1) The hadith ash-Sharif recorded by al-Bukhari and Muslim declares, 'If something that does not exist in this religion, which I have revealed, is brought forth with the hope of thawab, this thing will be refused.' This hadith points out that it is not a bidat 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 bidat.

"2) A hadith recorded by at-Tabarani says, 'If Muslims, after their Prophet ('alaihi 's-salam), make a bidat, an innovation in the religion, which he revealed, a sunnat which is similar to it disappears from among them.' This hadith points out that it is not bidat to make an improvement or a change in worldly affairs and customs, which is done without expecting thawab.

"3) It is declared in a hadith recorded by at-Tabarani, 'Until a man of bidat gives up his bidat, Allahu ta'ala does not accept his repentance.' It is necessary to repent after every sin. 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 he has any debt or duty to other people, he has to pay it back and have himself forgiven. By 'man of bidat' is meant one who brings forth a bidat or who commits a bidat that has already been brought forth. 'Bidat' 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. Man of bidat expects thawab from his bidat and thinks that he is doing something good. Therefore, he does not think of repenting.

"4) It is declared in a hadith recorded by Ibn Maja, 'Unless the man of bidat gives up his bidat, Allahu ta'ala does not accept any of his 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 bidat.

"5) It is declared in a hadith recorded by Ibn Maja, 'Even if a bidat does not cause unbelief, its inventor's fast, hajj, 'umra, jihad, 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.' [For the originals and explanation of these five hadiths, see an-Nabulusi's Arabic book Al-hadiqat an-nadiyya published by Hakikat Kitabevi.] Though his fard and supererogatory kinds of worship which he does suitably with the rules will be valid (sahih) and he will get rid of debt of worship, his worshiping will not be accepted (maqbul), that is, he will not be rewarded in the next world. If his bidat gives way to unbelief, that is, if he utters a word, uses something or does something which cause unbelief, his iman will disappear and his worshiping will not be valid. A man of bidat considers his bidat good and thawab-deserving. Therefore, he gets out of the religion easily. The person who commits a bidat supposes that it is 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 Allahu ta'ala and fears His punishment. Bidats are great sins, but not every sin is a bidat.

"Bidat is an Arabic word. It means something which did not exist formerly and which has been brought forth later. In this respect, the changes, reformations done both in customs and in worshiping are bidat. 'Adat (custom) is an action which is done for its worldly use alone without expecting any reward as a recompense in the next world. In contrast, 'ibada (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 Sahabat al-kiram and the Tabiin and appeared later is a bidat, scholars have divided bidat' into such groups as mubah, wajib, mustahab and haram. They have called that which is mustahab or wajib a bidat hasana.

"In view of the religion, however, bidat means an addition or reduction that has been made in the religion and against the Prophet's ('alaihi 's-salam) consent after as-Sahabat al-kiram and the Tabiin, that is, it is a change made as worship and presumed to be thawab-deserving. And reform in the religion means bidat in the religion. Changes that are made in customs are outside this kind of bidat. The ones that are declared to be evil in the Hadith ash-Sharif are the bidat' in the religion. These reforms do not help worship. They all spoil worship.

"The reforms in the religion part into two groups: the bidat' in belief and those in 'ibada. The reforms in belief are either made with ijtihaad, that is, they are derived from the Qur'an and the Hadith, or out of choice by reasoning or deducing. Ijtihaad requires to be done by a profound scholar, that is, a mujtahid. If a mujtahid makes a mistake in doing ijtihaad 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 worshiping. If the thing concerning belief

had been declared openly but is not the kind everybody has heard of, or if it had not been declared openly, he will become not an unbeliever but a man of bidat or a heretic. This wrong belief of his is a sin which is greater even than the great sins such as murder and fornication. It has been declared in hadiths that there would be seventy-two groups of bidat and that they will 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 ayats and hadiths 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 ijthad, in Rasulullah's ('alaihi 's-salam) Ascension (Miraj) or in the questioning in grave becomes a man of bidat, that is, 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 the teachings of the religion.

"Islamic scholars who have not gone wrong in their ijthad in the belief and the Muslims who believe the truth like them are called Ahl as-Sunnat or Sunni.

"The worship of the seventy-two groups of bidat is not acceptable even if they worship correctly. Their bidat in their worshipping is an additional guilt, even if they call it ijthad.

"The ijthads deduced by the Ahl as-Sunnat scholars in the knowledge concerning 'ibadat are not bidat'. 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-salam) who revealed Islam, from the sources which Islam declares. This knowledge has not changed Islam, but it has helped Islam. Ijthad cannot be employed on the things that are declared clearly in the Qur'an and the Hadith. 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 'ibada based on this deduction is a bidat and heresy. If such a reform causes a sunnat muakkada to disappear, it will be a greater sin.

"The action Rasulullah ('alaihi 's-salam) used to perform as an 'ibada and omitted from time to time is called sunnat huda 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 wajib. That which he performed at times is called mustahab. An action which he used to do not as an 'ibada but as custom is called sunnat zawaid 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.

"It is not a bidat to make changes in customs. It is better for men of wara' not to do it. It is declared in the Hadith, 'Hold fast to my sunnat and, after me, to the sunnas of al-Khulafa' ar-Rashidin.' The word sunnat, when used alone, means everything that Islam declares. Muhammad ('alaihi 's-salam) who revealed 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 the Hadith, '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 Islam. Changes that are done in the things outside Islam are not bidat'.

"Minarets, schools, books and the like which have been produced later are not bidat' 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 bring forth the things which Islam has prohibited. Bidat' are sunnat sayyia. The reason why the sunnat hasana were not done in the time of as-Sahaba and Tabiin was because they did not need these useful things. They were performing the jihad against unbelievers, conquering lands and spreading Islam over the world. In their time, men of bidat had not appeared or increased. It is permissible and thawab to bring forth sunnat hasana until the end of the world.

"In 'ibadat it is worse to commit a bidat than to neglect a sunnat. It is haram to commit a bidat while it is makruh to neglect a sunnat without excuse. If one supposes that it is thawab to neglect a sunnat without any excuse, it will be bidat for him to neglect a sunnat. When it is unknown if a belief, a deed or a word is a sunnat or bidat, it is necessary not to perform it, for it is necessary not to do the bidat, and it is not obligatory to perform the sunnat. If something not obligatory is omitted, it will not be performed afterwards. Therefore, the omitted sunnas of salat will not be performed afterwards. It is more thawab than all the worship of human beings and genies not to commit the smallest of what Allahu ta'ala has prohibited. For this reason, a wajib also can be omitted where there is difficulty. But it has been said by scholars that haram cannot be committed. For example, one cannot clean, near others, the parts of his body that, have to be covered.

"Unanimity of the mujtahids who have lived in the same century is called ijma'. Ijma' has to be based on a proof, a document. This proof is an ayat or a hadith even if only one person has reported it, or it is a qiyas based upon them. Qiyas is the explanation of something that has been declared indistinctly in the ayat and in the Hadith. Hadrat al-Imam al-azam Abu Hanifa performed ijtihaad through qiyas.

"A person may become an 'arif or a wali without reading any book. He might interpret ayats but cannot be a guide. One cannot set his heart on him. A perfect guide has to have reached the degree of ijtihaad in knowledge and the grade of Wilayat khassa al-Muhammadiyah in marifa. A perfect guide's every behavior, every manner, every word is compatible with Islam. This means to say that he follows Rasulullah ('alaihi 's-salam) in every respect. For this reason, Allahu ta'ala loves him. Muslims, since they love Allahu ta'ala, love also the person whom Allahu ta'ala loves. Loving the perfect guide arises from loving Allahu ta'ala and Rasulullah ('alaihi 's-salam). This love is called al-hubbu fi'llah. It has been declared in the Hadith that the most valuable worship is al-hubbu fi'llah. 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 Allahu ta'ala, they love a human being. Abandoning Islam, they worship a human being,' about Muslims, are ignorant and base slanders.

"Following as-Sahabat al-kiram is wajib. It is not permissible to make qiyas on something which they explained. Yet, it is not permissible for us the muqallids, that is, the persons who have not reached the grade of ijtihaad, to follow their words. Their words and action indicate the Nass (the Qur'an and the Hadith) and their own ijtihaads. Only the profound scholars who have attained the grade of ijtihaad can understand them. Our madhhab leaders have understood them and communicated them to us as far as we could comprehend. This means to say that those who want to adapt themselves to the Sahabat al-kiram have to follow the Ahl as-Sunnat scholars.

"It is declared in a hadith recorded by al-Bukhari, 'Allahu ta'ala declared, "My human creature cannot approach to Me with anything else as close as he approaches by performing the fard actions. I love My human creature who approaches to Me through supererogatory worship." This hadith indicates that the kind of worship which Allahu ta'ala likes best consists of the fard actions. The supererogatory worship mentioned in the hadith is the worship done together with the fard. It means that Allahu ta'ala loves those who perform the fard and also the supererogatory worship.

"Allahu ta'ala says in surat al-Ma'ida as ma'al, 'look for a wasila (cause) to approach Me.' 'Ma'al' means 'according to what the scholars of Islam understood'. The Wahhabis say, 'Ibadat are the causes. In order to attain to Allahu ta'ala's consent and love, the 'ibadat that are fard and nafila should be performed. Entering a Tariqa, following a shaikh or entreating dead or living persons does not make one approach Allahu ta'ala; in fact, he gets far away.' The scholars of Ahl as-Sunnat, however, say, 'It is true that 'ibadat are the causes. Yet, the 'ibadat that are sahih, correct and khalis can be causes. 'Ibadat are sahih if one has correct iman and pure morals and performs them according to their conditions. For the salat to be sahih, for example, ablution, using clean water, performing it in due time and towards the qibla, reciting the ayats, tasbihs and prayers in salat correctly and knowing many other conditions and causes are necessary. Every 'ibada 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 'ulama' who believe, know and practice them or by reading their books, as scientific knowledge is learnt through professors in a long time. Such real scholars of Islam with pure iman 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-Sunnat who knows, practices and teaches to others the Sharia, that is, the 'ibadat performed through the heart, soul and body'. To carry out the order in surat al-Ma'ida, every Muslim should look for such a murshid or for his books and should learn all fard and nafila 'ibadat from him.'

"We should not fall for the wrong words of the ignorant men of religion, who do not know Islam and for the impetuositities of the evil-minded people, who have not read the books of the Ahl as-Sunnat scholars and for the deceitful, false article 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 knowledge from the Qur'an and the Hadith. 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 halal and the haram. They spoil Islam." [An-Nabulusi, al-hadiqa.]

In the section on the things that invalidate salat, Ibn 'Abidin wrote: "It is makruh tahrimi to accept the blameworthy, loathsome ones of the bidats 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 makruh to do and to use the ones that are not bad or harmful without trying to be like them. Rasulullah (sall-Allahu 'alaihi wa sallam) had a pair of shoes, which priests wore, made and he wore them."

Is it bidat or not to recite the surat al-Fatiha after salat and praying? Hadrat Hadimi writes its answer detailedly on the hundred and thirty-seventh page of the book Barika. Let's explain briefly: there have been those who considered it bidat and those who said the opposite.

According to many of them, it is better to recite the Fatiha at places where it was declared to recite prayers. Moreover, it has been declared in the Hadith to recite prayers after salat. 'Bidat' means 'the 'ibada that is performed without Muhammad's ('alaihi 's-salam) permitting it.' The surat al-Fatiha descended in order to reveal the best of prayers. No one has said it would be a bidat to recite it after salat or prayers. It is forbidden for all the people to recite it aloud altogether. When the imam says "Fatiha", it is good that everybody recite it silently. For it is mustahab to do hamd after prayers. And the best hamd is to recite the Fatiha. It is makruh to recite it between fard and sunnat and in order to attain what one desires.

13-Deviated ideas of Muhammad Qutb and Muhammad Hamidullah

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 what nonsense he talks:

"The victories which the Turks gained in battlefields honored 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 ijtiha and the knowledge of fiqh got 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 of as much quality as 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. From which source were this dynamism, this morals, this patience, this heroism, which led the Ottoman Turks from one victory to another, as this Egyptian writer has to admit of it? Weren't they from the Islamic source? One cannot honor Islam. One can be honored by Islam. Hadrat 'Umar (radi-Allahu 'anh), the honorable Amir of Muslims, said, "We used to be contemptible, low persons; Allahu ta'ala honored us by making us Muslims." The ignorant, who do not know that Islam is the source of every kind of virtue and honor, suppose that Islam is to be honored.

The Islamic army going towards Vienna from Istanbul rested 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 Attila? 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 wherever 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 'Abbasids were not ashamed of calling themselves "Sultan al-Haramain" in khutba. When Sultan Yavuz Salim Khan conquered Egypt and rescued the caliphate from slavery in 923 A.H. (1517), he silenced the orator who also called him "Sultan al-Haramain" in khutba customarily, and said, "For me, there cannot be a greater honor than being a slave of those blessed places. Call me Khadim al-Haramain!" It is written in the history books. It may be understood now whether the Egyptians or the Ottomans have frozen Islamic morals. Sultan AbdulHamid Khan It took every year a person, who finished the Faculty of Political Science with the first prize, into the palace as a clerk. Thus, he encouraged youngsters to work and study. Asad Bey who was assigned as a clerk, says in his book *Hatirat-i AbdulHamid Khan Thani*, "I wrote a cipher on a midnight. I knocked at the door of the Sultan's Bedroom for his signature. It was not opened. I knocked once more. It still was not open. I was about to knock for the third time, the door opened. The Sultan, who met me, was drying his face with the towel. 'Sonny! I kept you waiting. I beg your excuse! I got up yet at the first knock. I understood that you came for an urgent signature at midnight. I was without ablution. I had never signed any paper of this nation without ablution (wudu). I was late in order to perform the ablution. Let me hear,' he said. I read. He signed it pronouncing the Basmala, and he said, 'Let's hope for the best, Insha-Allah,' " The Ottoman Sultans were that much attached and that much respectful to Islam. Ayyub Sabri Pasha says in his book *Mirat al-Haram-Ain*, "Sultan Abdulmajid Khan, upon finding out that Mustafa Rashid Pasha was a Mason and had chosen a path not compatible with Islam, got sick of his 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 waiting for its turn, he was said, 'An application of the inhabitants of Medina will be read.' 'Hold over! Don't read! Help me sit!' he said. He was helped to sit putting a pillow behind him. He said, 'They are our Master Rasulullah's ('alaihi 's-salam) neighbors. I would be ashamed of listening to their application lying down as I was. Do at once what they want! 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 rascals who lie down like carcasses in Masjid as-Saada with their foul feet pointing towards the Qabr as-Saada?

In the words, "Islam's improvement was stopped in the Ottomans," there smells the noxious scent of insidious hostility towards Islam. Fenari, Molla Khusraw, al-Hayali, al-Galanbawi, Ibn Kamal, Abussuud, 'Allama al-Birghiwi, Ibn 'Abidin, 'Abd al-Ghani an-Nabulusi, Mawlana Khalid al-Baghdadi, as-Suwaidi, 'Abdulhakim-i Arwasi and 'Allama Mustafa Sabri, who disgraced 'Abduh, and many a scholar of fiqh and kalam, and calligraphers, Mimar Sinan

(architect), Sokullu and Koprulu; in which State were all these great men educated? Weren't they educated in the Ottomans? Hundred thousands of books of knowledge written by the Ottoman scholars have filled up the national libraries in every city. Their catalogues are evident. Weren't they the Ottoman Shaikh al-Islams who gave fatwa to the whole 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-Hayali's commentaries of 'ilm al-kalam books, Molla Khursraw's Ad-durar, al-Halabi's Multaqa, Ibn 'Abidin's Radd al-mukhtar, Abussuud's tafsir and Shaikhzada's commentary to al-Baidawi's tafsir shed light upon the whole world today. Didn't the Ottomans educate these exalted scholars and awliya? Today also, those who want to learn their faith correctly should read these valuable books. The most valuable Qur'an commentaries are those written by Shaikhzada and Abussuud. He who wants to be useful to Muslims should translate these books into Turkish. The Qur'an commentaries of reformist writers are not so, because, with their short sight and inefficient knowledge, they have mixed with these books whatever occurred to their minds under the name of tafsir, thus adding rotten rings to the chain. He who relies on a chain with rotten rings and descends on the sea by clasping it, will certainly be mistaken and drown. Therefore, one should not read the translations of such made-up books of tafsir. The six-hundred-year-old guardians of Islam and the Sources of Islamic knowledge were always the Ottomans. Hundreds of fatwa books like Bahjat al-fatawa, 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 Majalla, 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 responsible persons to the Israelite spies in London; nor would the Arabic unity have been disgraced in front of the whole world.

The fearless, shameless aggression of the Egyptian writer Kutb to the Sahabat al-kiram and then to the real Muslim administrators of the Umayyads, Abbasid and Ottomans, is not without its purpose. He himself explains its reason. The gypsy reveals his theft while boasting of his qualities. He lets out what he has hitherto kept back and says, "Wahhabism rescued Islam from slavery." Yes, in order to praise the la-madhhabi, he speaks ill of Islamic caliphs and Islamic scholars. The plans and the policy of Mawdudi, Sayyid Qutb, Muhammad Qutb and 'Abduh are based on this fundamental. They all attack the early Muslims. They slander the Ahl as-Sunnat scholars. On the other hand, they misrepresent Ibn Taymiyya and the heretics like Jamal ad-din al-Afghani as rescuers. Why do they praise the la-madhhabi? As their values pertaining to religion and knowledge are zero, so their immoralities are under zero; Sa'ud showed it to the whole world by his dissipated, dishonest and immoral behaviors and by spending millions of dollars for his pleasure and sensuality in Europe. We wonder if the Egyptian writer does not blush seeing and hearing 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 liras, from each of the millions of hajis coming from the Muslim world. They do not let their brothers-in-Islam perform their duty of hajj unless they give them hundreds of liras. Whereas, it is written in the Ottoman book Radd al-mukhtar that it is haram to levy any toll on 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. Allahu ta'ala declares in the one hundred and fourteenth ayat of the surat al-Baqara, "No one can be more cruel than he who prohibits to mention Mine Name in Mine mosques." Hadrat 'Ata is quoted in Tafsir at-tibyan, "This ayat descended because, on the Day of Hudaibiya, the disbelievers of Mecca would not let Muslims into the Masjid al-Haram and perform hajj. In the Qur'an, unbelievers are called 'the cruel', too." This ayat clearly describes those who do not let Muslims who cannot pay money into the Masjid al-Haram and those who praise these heretics. There were the Ottoman Muslims, whom they blame, and here are the enemies of Ahl as-Sunnat whom they praise! Also, his word "The Ottomans stopped ijtihaad," 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 ijtihaad. They prevented the ignorant like Sayyid Qutb, Muhammad Qutb and 'Abduh, who were the enemies of Islam, from inserting their dirty pens to 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. As a matter of fact, it is seen with pain that Islam has been injured and made a toy in the hands of the heretics in Mecca and Egypt. Today, real Islam, as Rasulullah ('alaihi 's-salam) had left it, has remained in Turkish people with all its cleanliness and purity. [For those who want to learn the real aspects of Ibn Taimiyya, the leader of the anti-madhhabite, and of those who are excessive in anti-madhhabism in detail. Indian scholar Muhammad Hamd-Allah ad-Dajwi's Arabic work Al-basa'ir li-munkiri't-tawassuli bi-ahl al maqabir and Muhammad Hasan Jan al-Faruqi al-Mujaddidi as-Sirhindi's Persian work Al-usul al-arba'a fi tardid al-Wahhabiyya (both were first printed in India then reproduced in Istanbul, 1375/1975) are advisable.]

63 - An Indian named Muhammad Hamidullah also spreads, under the name of Islamic knowledge, his thoughts which are incompatible with what the Ahl as-Sunnat 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 put forward in front of the youth, thus leading many Muslims astray. We were astonished 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-salam] again in Hubesha [Yaman] and in the country of the Abdulgaises [Eastern Arabia, Bahrain, Oman] as a merchant. It may be thought even that he went to Ethoipia, perhaps by sea. All these journeys provided him with the acquirement of the commercial and administrative traditions and laws of Byzantium, Persia, Yaman and Ethioipia, in his age of maturity, this experienced man of forty attempted to reform his nation."

Whereas, Muslim historians say unanimously that Rasulullah ('alaihi 's-salam) was suckled by his mother for three days, then by Abu Lahab's jariya named Suwaiba for 40 or 120 days and then by Halima Khatun until he was five years old. At his age six, his blessed mother, Amina Khatun, took him to Medina to see his maternal uncles. After having stayed there for a month, she passed away on the way back, near the place named Abwa, when she was twenty. He came to Mecca with Umm Ayman, a jariya, 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, Abu Talib.

He was amongst those who went to Damascus once with Abu Talib when he was nine or twelve years old, once with Abu Bakr (radi Allahu 'anh) at his twenty, and once with Khadija's (radi-

Allahu 'anha) caravan at his twenty-five. In all these three expeditions, when they came to a place named Busra, [Busra is located 90 km southeast of Damascus and 130 km northeast of Jerusalem.] the priests of the local church, Bahira and then Nastura, saw in him the signs of the Last Prophet ('alaihi 's-salam), whom they read about in the Injil, and they said, "Don't go to Damascus! Jews in Damascus will recognize and kill this boy." So, they traded there and returned back. When he was fourteen or seventeen years old, his uncle Zubair, who was going to Yaman, took him so that his trade be bountiful. After twenty years of age, he began to live on looking after sheep. There is not any dependable information about his going to Bahrayn; nor has anyone, besides those who disbelieve his prophethood, thought of his having traveled to Ethiopia. Those who say, "He was heard speak Ethiopian language. This makes one think that he may have gone to Ethiopia," are wrong. Because 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 mujizas which Allahu ta'ala bestowed upon him. In none of the three or four expeditions mentioned above did he joined by himself; he was taken in order to get blessed with abundance by his honorable body. In the last expedition to Damascus, Maisara, leader of the caravan, wanted to send him to Khadija (radi-Allahu 'anha) to give her the good news. But Abu Jahl, who was in the caravan, said, "Muhammad is young yet. He is inexperienced. He has never traveled to any place. He may lose his way. Send someone else." This indicates that Hamidullah thinks wrongly and eccentrically. Saying that he went to Byzantium, Persia, Ethiopia and Yaman and attempted to reform his nation by putting forth what he had learned in these places, and behaving insolently towards Rasulullah (sall-Allahu 'alaihi wa sallam) by saying "this experienced man" are not what a Muslim would do.

It is written on page 391 of *Kisas Anbiya'* that Rasulullah (sall-Allahu 'alaihi wa sallam) was ummi, 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 Tawra, the Injil, and in all other books that had descended from heaven and the states of people that had passed. In those days, historical knowledge had been complicated and spoilt. There were very few people to distinguish the correct from the wrong. He responded to men of every religion and silenced them all. These accomplishments show that he was and is the Prophet ('alaihi 's-salam) sent down by Allahu ta'ala. Though he defied the literary men and the poets of his time, none was able to express even a line like the Qur'an he revealed. Whereas, the Meccans were interested in reading poems, making speeches and used to strive hard and compete with one another in this way. They used to boast of speaking coherently. The Qur'an overcame all the poets. They could not oppose the Qur'an. Out of their bewilderment, they took up to sword and risked fighting and dying. Unais, Abu Dharr's brother (radi-Allahu 'anhuma) was a famous poet who had overcome twelve poets. As soon as he heard the Qur'an, he understood that it was Allahu ta'ala's word and embraced Islam. The 48th ayat of the surat al-Ankabut says, "You had not read any book before the Qur'an 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 Allahu ta'ala and of Islamic scholars anybody with iman 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 remained all through her life. In a holy war, his foster-sister Shaima, too, was amongst the slaves captivated. When she told him the event and showed him the scar, Rasulullah recognized her." The enemies of Islam fabricated many slanders about Rasulullah ('alaihi 's-salam). 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-salam) as a cannibal to youngsters. Whereas, Halima Khatun always kept him with her and would not let him go far away. One day, she missed watching him for a moment. He went among the lambs with his foster-sister Shaima. Halima, when she noticed his absence, looked for him and found him. She asked Shaima, "Why did you go out? It is so hot." Shaima 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. Halimah 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. "When he sucked, I could not stand looking at his beautiful face. He began to talk by uttering the words of the kalimat at-tawhid first. When he held something, he said 'Bismi'llah'. 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 Hunjain Ghaza, a woman named Shaima amongst the captives said, "O Rasul-Allah! I am your foster-sister," and told some of what had happened in those days. He listened to Shaima's words. He recognized her and gave her many gifts. When he was yet a child, so many mujizas and wonderfully beautiful manners were seen in him that they have been written in very many books. Instead of doing an honorable service such as writing about those superiorities, which make the readers love them, and finding and adding to these what 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-salam), 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 Rasulullah's (alaihi 's-salam) 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 mujiza. 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 Kalbi narrates that Muhammad himself has sacrificed a dark sheep in front of 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 Iman and Islam. Every book writes 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 Rasulullah ('alaihi 's-salam) hated idols. Every Muslim should believe that no prophet has ever committed anything that is forbidden in any

religion, in any age of his life. It is written in the books Tuhfat al-ithna 'ashariyya and Asma al-muallifin that Ibn Kalbi, whom Hamidullah puts forth as a reference in order to trick Muslims, is an insolent la-madhhabi person. Yes, Rasulullah ('alaihi 's-salam) sacrificed a dark sheep, but he sacrificed it on the 'iyd 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 Sahih of al-Bukhari and Al-mawahib al-ladunniyya write detailedly about the messengers who came from the Abdulqais clan in Bahrayn. None of them report that Rasulullah ('alaihi 's-salam) 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 a lot, and on the other hand to narrate Islam's basic beliefs as if it were a historic 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 wants to liken Rasulullah ('alaihi 's-salam) to an ogre.

Whereas Qisas-i Anbiya' writes, "Allahu ta'ala collected all kinds of beauty in His beloved Prophet ('alaihi 's-salam). 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-mawahib 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 loveliness 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 looking for anything else. Those who loved him as soon as seeing his beauty tried to describe it as much as they could and said that human sense would not be able to portray his beauty. Some of what those lovers expressed is given in Endless Bliss. Those who read it will immediately realize that Allahu ta'ala has created His beloved Prophet ('alaihi 's-salam) in an inconceivable proportion and a beauty which one would not get tired of looking at; they will begin to love him without seeing him. Those who love Habib-Allah (sall-Allahu '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 Mawlana Khalid al-Baghdadi, one of those who loved him without seeing him, in his Persian divan (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-Saada:

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 "Kaba 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,

Refusing your endless mercy, I knocked at your door.

The source of goodness, the ocean of pity you are!
 Favor me a drop, I am at a loss of remedy!
 Everybody comes to Mecca, Kaba, Safa 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 Jami, 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 favor I came!.'
 In another poem of his, he expresses as follows:
 "O the shelter of sinners, to take refuge in you I come!
 I committed many guilts, here to beg you 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 honored 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 favor 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'an and the Hadith. 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."

Rasulullah ('alaihi 's-salam) and his companions and every Muslim trusted only in Allahu ta'ala in everything they did. Yet, they held on to the intermediaries because He commanded so. They did not depend upon the intermediaries. They believed that the intermediaires did not make but help. On the ninety-second and third pages, he says:

"The Miraj is a state of mood. It was done when he forgot about his body and when his soul was dominant. The sura Isra says that one night Hadrat Prophet was taken from the holy center on earth to the holy center in the sky (Masjid Aqsa). The distant masjid cannot be thought to be in Jerusalem. For there was not a masjid in Jerusalem then. The sura Rum declares that Palestine is the nearest place. A masjid which is far away cannot be a place which is near. Allahu ta'ala consoles him by reminding him of the history of the ancient prophets."

Allahu ta'ala declares, "I took My 'Abd from the Masjid al-Haram to Masjid al-Aqsa 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 Hadith in the Sahih of al-Bukhari, in the Qur'an commentaries of the Ahl as-Sunnat scholars and in all the books dealing with the Miraj that Rasulullah (alaihi 's-salam) said, "I went to Masjid al-Aqsa in Jerusalem and saw it." In those days, Masjid al-Aqsa existed in Jerusalem. Long ago, Sulaiman ('alaihi 's-salam) had had it built. Later it had come into the possession of Persians and Greeks. After 'Isa's ('alaihi 's-salam) Ascension to Haven, it came into the Romans' possession. It collapsed and was repaired several times. Lastly, 'Umar (radi-Allahu '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-Aqsa was the one farthest to Mecca then. Therefore, it 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 salat towards Masjid al-Aqsa. If a masjid had not existed in Jerusalem then, would it have been commanded to perform salat towards there? Would Rasulullah ('alaihi 's-salam) have said that he had performed salat in Masjid al-Aqsa? Since Hamidullah's intellect, thought and scientific understanding cannot comprehend that Rasulullah ('alaihi 's-salam) was taken to Jerusalem and thence to heaven with his blessed body, he cannot believe it. He means that the Miraj was a state of spirit. Therefore, he misinterprets the Qur'an. He strives to prove his thought to be right by evasive words. If the Miraj 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 disbelieved it. It is declared unanimously by Islamic scholars that he who does not believe that Rasulullah ('alaihi 's-salam) was taken to Jerusalem from Mecca will be kafir. And he who does not believe that he was ascended to heaven, will be a man of bidat, a heretic.

In the books of Indian scholars, there are pertinent answers to this writing of the Indian Hamidullah who goes so far into disbelief. Hadrat 'Abdulhaq ad-Dahlawi, a great scholar of the Hadith, says in his Persian Madarij an-nubuwwa: "One of the most honorable blessings of Allahu ta'ala on Muhammad ('alaihi 's-salam) is His having him ascend to heaven in the Miraj. He has not given this miracle to any prophet besides him. It is declared clearly in the Qur'an that he was taken from Mecca to Masjid al-Aqsa; he who does not believe this becomes a disbeliever. Mashhur hadiths inform with the fact that he was taken up to heaven from Masjid al-Aqsa; the one who disbelieves this becomes a man of bidat, a sinner. The majority of the Sahabat al-kiram, of the Tabiin, of the scholars of the Hadith, of the scholars of fiqh and of the scholars of kalam communicate that the Miraj happened as he was awake and with body. Also sahih hadiths communicate that this happened so. Miraj took place many times. One of them was when he was awake and with body. Others happened spiritually only. 'Aisha (radi-Allahu 'anh) told about one which happened spiritually in his dream. This narration of hers does not necessarily show that the Miraj which happened when he was awake and with his body was untrue. Nevertheless, Islamic scholars communicate unanimously that prophets' dreams were wahi. 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 Miraj that would happen bodily. Because the disbelievers would not believe in the Miraj and asked for information about Masjid al-Aqsa in order to test him, it was declared clearly in the surat al-Isra that he was taken to Masjid al-Aqsa. In this sura, the ayat, 'I took him to show Mine Ayat,' shows the fact that he was taken up to heaven. The dream mentioned in the sixtieth ayat, "We have made the dream which We showed you an instigation for people," of this sura implies the Miraj. Some scholars said, 'It was the dream in which he saw that he would go to Mecca and perform tawaf (hajj) together with

as-Sahaba. Because they did not go into Mecca but turned and went back from Hudaibiya in the year when he communicated this dream to as-Sahaba, the munafiqs aroused instigation.' Whereas he did not see the dream that year; why should it have caused instigation, then? Many of the scholars of tafsir have informed that the word 'ruya' (dream) is used in the sense 'seeing while awake at night' here, and they have put forward examples for this from the Diwan of the poet Mutanabbi. The Batinis, that is, members of the Ismailism, have said that the Miraj was not a journey with body, but it was the soul's getting exalted passing beyond the ecstasies and ranks; this word of theirs is kufr and ilhad, that is, it is being zindiq; it is enmity against Islam." Hamidullah's writing shows that he belongs to the Ismaili group. The fact that he is from Hydarabad, center of the Ismailis, emphasizes this supposition of ours. Most of the Sahabat al-kiram reported the hadith about the Miraj. It is written with details by al-Bukhari and Muslim. Those who have iman should also believe the mujiza of the Miraj.

It is seen that Hamidullah, in all his books, tries to explain Islam in two different points of view, one according to the history and one according to his own understanding. The majority of what he derives and communicates from history books narrates the events correctly. But his own heretical points of view and corrupt beliefs, which he has secretly pushed among this knowledge, shock the iman of those who read and believe them and annihilate their respect and love towards Rasulullah ('alaihi 's-salam) and their trust in the Ahl as-Sunnat scholars.

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 religious men and getting diplomas, each of them has been writing different things. All of them have been demolishing Islam and spoiling the belief of Muslims. The pure youngsters are at a loss as to which book to read and whom to believe.

Those who want to learn Islam, which Allahu ta'ala likes, and to attain repose and happiness in both worlds by holding to Rasulullah's ('alaihi 's-salam) religion should read 'ilm al-hal books, which are the selections from the books that the great men of tasawwuf wrote after the Ahl as-Sunnat scholars. Only the Ahl as-Sunnat scholars have comprehended the real meaning of the Qur'an and communicated it by writing thousands of books. They are the apples of the eyes of Islam and were praised in the Qur'an and the Hadith. One should not read the deceitful and made-up 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 right books prepared by real Muslims, who adapt themselves to Islam and who make their children live compatibly with Islam, that is, who perform every kind of 'ibadat and abstain from the haram.

64 - Hadrat al-Imam ar-Rabbani al-Mujaddid al-Alf ath-Thani Ahmad al-Faruqi wrote: "Allahu ta'ala has sent prophets is a compassion and favor to all the creatures. Allahu ta'ala made known His existence and Attributes to His weak-minded, short-sighted creatures like we are 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 and the next worlds from the harmful ones. If these honorable prophets had not been sent, the human mind could not have realized that Allahu ta'ala 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 Allahu ta'ala's existence. They denied the Creator. Their short intellects supposed that time had been making everything. Everybody knows about the struggle between Nimrod, who was the king of the world, and Ibrahim ('alaihi 's-salam)

which is narrated in the Qur'an. Also the ominous Pharaoh said, 'You do not have any other god besides me.' Again, this idiot wanted to frighten Musa ('alaihi 's-salam) by saying, 'If you believe in any other god besides me, I will imprison you.' So, men's short intellects cannot comprehend this greatest blessing [of realizing Allahu ta'ala's existence]. Unless the exalted prophets existed, they cannot attain this endless bliss.

"When the Greek philosophers heard from prophets that the earth and the skies had one creator and thus understood that they themselves had gone astray and were in an evil way, they had to affirm that Allahu ta'ala existed. They said that all the things had one creator. A glitter of the lights which prophets spread illuminated their dark hearts. The remnants of the open dining-tables of those great people became medicine for these deadly sick people.

Likewise, what prophets revealed, such as that Allahu ta'ala has Superior Attributes, that He has sent prophets, that angels are innocent, that there will be Resurrection after death and that there are infinite blessings, favors in Paradise and torments in Hell and many more things which Islam declares, cannot be comprehended through reasoning. Unless these are heard from prophets, they cannot be found out with men's short minds.

"Ancient Greek Philosophers said that reason never went wrong and it comprehended the truth of everything and was without a limit. They tried to solve by reasoning what reason could not comprehend. Whereas, reason goes wrong even in worldly knowledge. And it can never comprehend the knowledge pertaining to the next world. As reason can find out 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 Allahu ta'ala 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 disbelieve in prophets, which is like disbelieving the sun.

"Allahu ta'ala 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 favors 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 Allahu ta'ala only by prophets' revelation. The information called 'inspiration', which occurs to the hearts of the awliya', 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 Allahu ta'ala better than anybody did. Whereas, in comprehending Allahu ta'ala's existence and Superior Attributes it is realized the most ignorant of men have been these philosophers. A few of them performed mortification and endeavors and caused their nafs to shine by oppressing it because they heard it from prophets and saw it in Muslim men of tasawwuf, and thus they found out a few things; yet, they could not realize that it was aberration to divert, to make shine the nafs and what is obtained through this way. It is necessary to cause the heart to shine and to purify it. After the heart is purified, the nafs begins to get clean. The spiritual lights will come to the pure heart first. To cause the nafs to shine before having purified the heart is like lighting lamps so that the enemy may plunder at night. The enemy whom the nafs helps is the devil. Yes happiness and reality can be attained

also by starvation, by denying physical desires, by oppressing the nafs and by reasoning. But this may be possible only after having believed in prophets and what they have brought from Allahu ta'ala. For prophets' every word was reported by unfailing angels. The devil cannot meddle with this knowledge. 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 honor of being contemporary with 'Isa ('alaihi 's-salam). Yet he was vulgarly ignorant and presumed that he did not need to learn anything from anybody. He deprived himself of being blessed by that exalted prophet.

"It is surprising that philosophers, that is, those who suppose that reason never goes wrong, disbelieve not only Allahu ta'ala but also the Last Judgement. They say that matter never stops existing and that everything goes on as it has come."

[Scientists' words that are not related to experimentation and calculation incite this aberration. When French chemist Lavoisier 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 Allahu ta'ala's Infinite Power could go beyond the laws of physics and chemistry, immediately believed his word, 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 bewildered. It was understood that the progressives, who, being unable to comprehend that this word was true only in chemical reactions, said that nothing would cease to exist in nature were wrong. It is a pity that thousands of imitators had become the victims of this wrong belief until the truth revealed itself. Presuming Lavoisier's words to be scientific, which he said out of supposing it to be the truth according to his mind, they denied the Resurrection, thus dying without iman and dragging into endless disasters only after inoculating many people with harmful ideas. Those who depended on the Ahl as-Sunnat scholars and held to 'ilm al-hal books did not fall for progressives, thus saving their belief.

The lessons of high school, university and the knowledge of mathematics, matter and science are certainly useful. They protect intellect from going within its own limits. They help in discovering new things that provide people with a comfortable life and a facility 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 accomplishments can be achieved. These are the things which are not against Islam but parallel to Islam and which strengthen iman. Because Islam conforms with science in all the branches of knowledge within reason. Reason, because it is able to find out the truth of these branches of knowledge, is compatible with Islam. Muslims should learn and utilize these also.]

"It is a disgrace for men to utilize scientific knowledge in worldly affairs and not to utilize it in comprehending Allahu ta'ala and the knowledge pertaining to the next world, and even, conceited to be guided by their intellect and nafs, to try to solve also the knowledge pertaining to the next world with intellect, thus going astray and departing from the religion. This case is like that of a person who prepares for war and goes into much labor and expense and who, when the time for war comes, revolts and rises against his own legitimate government. And this shows that all the scientific knowledge is available in things which reason can comprehend. It is not correct to end up the matter causing endless happiness and disaster and to attempt to solve the matters

pertaining to the next world with this knowledge. 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. Because, worldly knowledge is not useful in matters which the reason cannot comprehend and which can be comprehended only through prophets' revelation. Al-Imam al-Ghazali says in his *Al-munqidh min ad-dalal*, '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 in ancient ummas.' "Philosophers, who speak on the religion according to their own mind, materialists and those who have gone astray 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 gilded, false titles such as reformer, mujtahid, advanced man of religion or martyr, they offer their destructive words, their books to the youngsters. Even, they regard their corrupt, mendacious words superior to the knowledge which the Ahl as-sunnat scholars have derived from the knowledge which the Ahl as-sunnat scholars have derived from the Qur'an and the Hadith. May Allahu ta'ala protect Muslims from their harms! It throws man into calamity to presume the religion reformers as religion scholars. "Knowledge and science mean 'to comprehend the truth of everything'. Statements which spoil Islam and which cannot measure 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 the reason's limit. They strengthen Islam. It is harmful to use knowledge and science against religious knowledge, which is beyond the reason's limit. This subtlety should be comprehended well. The ignorant people, the egoist and those crazy about lust and pleasure use knowledge and science as a mask for themselves in attacking Islam. They misrepresent their heretical ideas as scientific knowledge. They attempt to blame the religious knowledge just because it does not conform with their heretical ideas. Or, by taking those religious teachings that are beyond the reason's limit and by saying that it cannot be solved by means of science, they say that Islam is the beliefs of the Middle Ages that are incompatible with reason and science and so it is retrogression. Muslims should learn the knowledge and science well enough not be tricked by these mendacious, base people." [Maktubat, v. III, 23rd letter.]

14-WHAT IS A TRUE MUSLIM LIKE?

The first advice is to correct the belief in accordance with those which the Ahl as-sunnat savants communicate in their books. For, it is this madhhab only that will be saved from Hell. May Allahu ta'ala give plenty of rewards for the works of those great people! Those scholars of the four madhhabs, who reached up the grade of ijtiḥad and the great scholars, educated by them are called Ahl as-sunnat scholars. After correcting the belief (iman), it is necessary to perform the

worship informed in the knowledge of fiqh, i.e. to do the commands of the Shariat and to abstain from what it prohibits. One should perform the namaz five times each day without reluctance and slackness, and being careful about its conditions and tadil-i arkan. He who has as much money as nisab should give zakat. Imam-i azam Abu Hanifa says, "Also, it is necessary to give the zakat of gold and silver which women use as ornaments."

One should not waste his precious life even on unnecessary mubahs. It is certainly necessary not to waste it on haram. We should not get involved with taghamni, 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.

One should not commit giybat. Giybat is haram. [Giybat means to talk about a Muslim's or a Zimmi's secret fault behind his back. It is necessary to tell Muslim about the faults of the Harbis, 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, thus causing Muslims to beware their harms, and to tell about the slanders of those who talk and write about Islam wrongfully; these are not giybat. Radd-ul-Mukhtar: 5-263)].

One should not spread gossip (carry words) among Muslims. It has been declared that various kinds of torments would be done to those who commit these two kinds of sins. Also, it is haram to lie and slander, and must be abstained from. These two evils were haram in every religion. Their punishments are very heavy. It is very thawab to conceal Muslims' defects, not to spread their secret sins and to forgive them their faults. One should pity 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 heat or swear at those poor persons for trivial reasons. One should attack nobody's property, life, honor, or chastity. Debts to everyone and to the government must be paid. Bribery, accepting or giving, is haram. However, it would not be bribery to give it in order to get rid of the sufferings by a cruel one, and also in case of being disgusted with. But accepting this would be haram, too. Everybody should see his own defects, and should every hour think of the faults which he has committed towards Allahu ta'ala. He should always bear in mind that Allahu ta'ala does not hurry in punishing him, nor does He cut off his sustenance. The words of command from one's parents, or from the government, compatible with Sharia, must be obeyed, but the ones, incompatible with Sharia, should not be resisted against so that we should not cause fitna. [See the 123rd letter in the second volume of the book Maktubat-i Mathumiyya.]

After correcting the belief and doing the commands of fiqh, one should spend all one's time remembering Allahu ta'ala. One should continue remembering, mentioning Allahu ta'ala as the great men of religion have communicated. One should feel hostility towards all the things that will prevent the heart from remembering Allahu ta'ala. The more you adhere to the Shariat, the more delicious it will be to remember Him. As indolence, laziness increase in obeying the Shariat, that flavor 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 as a result of being deceived by their lies and slanders.

15-TRANSLATION of 110th LETTER

The hundred and tenth letter of the second volume, which Muhammad Mathum 'rahmatullahi alaihi' 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 bidat. Yahya bin Muaz Radi 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 hafizes who think of worldly advantages; those shaikhs who are unlearned in Islam." If the words, actions and behaviors of a person passing as a shaikh do not conform with the Shariat, 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. Junaid-i-Baghdadi, 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'an al-karim and hadith ash-Sharifs, 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'an al-karim) and the Sunnat (the way taught by Rasulullah)." 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 behavior which is counter to the Shariat is harmful. Tasawwuf means to endeavor to adapt yourself to the Shariat. 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 karamats that do not fit the Shariat are quite useless. [Abdullah-i-Dahlawi '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) Tariqat does not carry out the duties assigned to him, he will have left the Tariqat."] Karamats (wonders) occur also on people who subject themselves to hunger and other mortifications. This does not show that they are Awliya. Abdullah ibni Mubarak passed away in 181 [A.D. 797]. He states, "A person who fails to observe the adab of the Shariat will be deprived of following Rasulullah'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 harams cannot be a Wali." It was stated in a hadith ash-Sharif:

"Insistence on (committing) harams will produce disbelief." Abu Said-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 traveling through various cities in an instant," this time his answer was: "The devil also does so."

These things do not 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." Abu Ali Ahmad Rodbari, a great Wali, 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." Abu Sulaiman Abd-ur-rahman Darani 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 Shariat." [Imam-i-Rabbani 'quddisa sirruh' states as follows in the eighty-second letter of the second volume: "Do not hold fast to the world's sequined pleasures, and do not fall for its easily exhaustible beauties! Do your best so that all your words and deeds be agreeable with the Shariat! First, align your belief with the tenets taught in the books written by the scholars of Ahl as-sunnat! Then be sure that all your behaviors 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 halals and harams. Supererogatory worships are of no value when compared with those worships that are fard. The thawab for giving one lira in the name of zakat, (which is fard), is very much more than the thawab 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 iman and then obeying the Shariat." Islam is to have iman with the heart and to obey the Shariat with the body. Commandments of Allahu ta'ala are called Fard. His prohibitions are called Haram. Collectively, they are termed Shariat. Male or female, it is fard for every Muslim to learn immediately the six tenets of belief and those teachings of the Shariat which are so widespread and commonly known that they have become parts of one's daily chores, such as performing namaz and reciting the sura Fatiha in namaz, 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 Shariat is the Qur'an al-karim and hadith ash-Sharifs. Every utterance of Muhammad 'alaihi-salam' is termed a Hadith-i-Sharif. The Qur'an al-karim and hadith ash-Sharifs are in Arabic. Only Muhammad 'alaihi-salam' understood the meanings purported in the Qur'an al-karim, and he explained all these meanings to his Sahaba. Islamic scholars learned these meanings from the Sahaba and wrote them in books. These books are called books of Tafsir. And these honorable scholars are called the scholars of Ahl as-sunnat(t).

Those highest of the scholars of Ahl as-sunnat compiled the teachings of the Shariat existing in the books of tafsir 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 tafsir 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 Bidat, if they did not lose their iman. Those who lost their iman 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 Shii (Shiite). Those who were misled by British spies are called Wahhabi. How the British established the Wahhabi sect is related in our book Confessions of A British Spy, and how the British founded the Wahhabi Saudi government is detailed in the encyclopedic dictionary Munjid, within the entry 'Lawrence'. Shiites and Wahhabis, in order to fix the heretical writings in their books in the name of truth into young minds, intersperse ayats, hadiths, and statements made by the Sahaba and the Salaf as-salihin 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.

Allahu ta'ala created everything in a certain order and harmony. He declared in the Qur'an al-karim 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 Mujiza. His creating without a cause as an acceptance of the invocations offered by (those people who are called) Awliya (and) who have purified their hearts and nafs by obeying the Shariat, is called Karamat. 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 Istidraj or Sihir (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 Shariat, it will be concluded that he is a Wali. 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 Allahu ta'ala. The devil never leaves such people alone.

A Muslim who has a wish to attain, applies Allahu ta'ala'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-sunnat. 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 la-madhhabi person, his iman will become blurred. Allahu ta'ala 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, endeavoring to attain Allahu ta'ala's love. And this, in its turn, depends on not earning one's living by working on a way that is haram or by infringing others' rights, and on invoking Allahu ta'ala alone. A person who cannot fulfill these conditions asks a person who fulfills them, i.e. a Wali, to invoke a blessing on him.

The Awliya will hear after death, too. They will ask a blessing on those people who visit their graves and beg them.

Our Prophet 'sall-allahu alaihi wa sallam' stated, "When you get confused in your problems, ask people in graves to help you!" Shaikh-ul-islam Ahmad ibni Kamal explains this hadith ash-Sharif in his book Hadis-i erbain tercemesi. It is also explained in detail in the books Al-tawassul-u-bi-n-Nabi wa bi-s-Salihin (in Arabic), Radd-i-Wahhabi (in Persian), and Kiyamet ve Ahiret (in Turkish). Abdullah-i-Dahlawi'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 Awliya so much puissance:

Be it a fired bullet, they'll send back a nuisance.

Wahhabis, who have been misled by British spies, deny this fact. Books published by Hakikat Kitabevi refute Wahhabis.]

It was stated in a hadith ash-Sharif, "Holders of bidat 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 hadith ash-Sharif, "The devil will tempt holders of bidat to do acts of worship. As they worship they will weep (from fear of Allah)." In another hadith ash-Sharif: "Allahu ta'ala will not accept the namaz, the fast, the alms, the hajj or 'umra, the jihad or any other sort of fard or supererogatory worship performed by holders of bidat. 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 istighfar [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 taqwa [avoiding the harams] 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 Siddiq and having a strong iman to avoid the prohibitions. Maruf-i-Karhi was Sirri-i-Saqati's master. He passed away in Baghdad 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 hadith ash-Sharif, "On the Rising Day, people of wara' and zuhd will be ahead of all those people blessed with Allahu ta'ala's grace." [Zuhd means to abstain from property that is more than necessary even if it is halal]. It was stated in a hadith ash-Sharif, "A namaz performed behind an imam 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 thawab]. It was stated in a hadith ash-Sharif, "Two rakats of namaz performed with an imam who holds wara' is more blessed than a namaz performed with a fasiq." [The word 'efdal', (which is used in the hadith ash-Sharif and which we translated into English as 'blessed'), means 'that which brings more thawab.'] 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 Mufti (religious guide) in doing actions about which you feel doubt! It was stated in a hadith ash-Sharif, "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 hadith ash-Sharif, "Things that are halal and those which are haram have been declared openly. Beware from doubtful things! Follow those which have been declared openly!" It was declared in another hadith ash-Sharif, "Allahu ta'ala declared the halals and the harams 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 hadith ash-Sharif, "Put your hand on your heart! The heart will be calm [feel easy] as you do something halal."

Deem all your prayers and acts of worship as deficiently performed! Be anxious to perform them in due manner! Abu Muhammad bin Manazil stated, "Allahu ta'ala praises in the seventeenth ayat of Al-i-'Imran sura those who are patient, those who are faithful (sadiq), those who perform namaz, those who pay zakat and those who say istighfar at the time of seher (early morning). His mentioning the saying of istighfar last implies that a person should consider all his acts of worship as faulty and should always say the istighfar." Jafar bin Sinan 'quddisa sirruh' stated, "Worshippers' complacency is worse and more harmful than sinners' offense." Imam-i-Murtaish used to perform i'tikaf in a mosque after the twentieth of the blessed month of Ramadan. People saw him outside and asked him why he had left the mosque. He said, "I saw the hafizs' self-satisfied demeanours and ran away from them."

It is permissible to work for your and your family's living. A hadith ash-Sharif praises people who work so. The Salaf as-salihin 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 Salim Hamada was a Qadi in the Shafi'i 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 mubah 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 Allahu ta'ala)." 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. Khwaja Muhammad Bahaaddin Naqshiband 'quddisa sirruh' passed away in 791 [A.D. 1389], in Bukhara. 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 Allahu ta'ala]. 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-sunnat and who have learned the Shariat and adapted their life-styles to these teachings], should seclude themselves, [that is, they should utilize their time working, earning halal property, and reading books written by scholars of Ahl as-sunnat. 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 la-madhhabis. You should not allow into your home those radio and television broadcasts that spread viruses of irreligiosity, disbelief, Christianity, Judaism and immorality]. It was stated in a hadith ash-Sharif, "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 Belyani states, "Being a Darwish does not only consist in namaz, fast and spending your nights worshipping. These things are everybody's duties as a born slave. Being a Darwish means not to hurt hearts. A person who can do this will attain Allahu ta'ala's love. [He becomes a Wali]." They asked Hadrat Muhammad Salim, "How should it be known that a certain person is a Wali?" He said, "It will be known from his sweet tongue, beautiful moral behavior, smiling face, generosity, not quarreling with anybody, accepting others' excuses, and having mercy on everybody." [A Wali means a person who has attained Allahu ta'ala's love.]. Abdullah Ahmad MaqQari Maliki passed away in 1041 H. He states, "Futuwwat [bravery] means doing favors 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 Allahu ta'ala]. You should trust to Allahu ta'ala in every matter. [That is, you should hold fast to causes. Yet you should rely on Allahu ta'ala for the effectiveness of causes]. You should not miss or postpone any fard. Junaid-i-Baghdadi 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 Allahu ta'ala." It was stated in a hadith ash-Sharif, "If a person trusts to Allahu ta'ala 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. Yahya bin Muaz Radi passed away in Nishapur 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 Allahu ta'ala. 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 Allahu ta'ala!" Abu Muhammad Rashi [Rashi means 'from the Syrian town Rasia.' It does not mean 'briber'.] states, "The greatest curtain [hindrance] between yourself and Allahu ta'ala is to think of yourself only and to put your trust in someone who is as incapable as you are. To be a sufi does not mean to go wherever you like, to rest in the shade of clouds, or to be revered by others. It means to keep a continuous confidence in Allahu ta'ala." 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 Allahu ta'ala. 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 bidats! At times of trouble, do not give up hope from Allahu ta'ala, and to not even feel worried at all! The fifth ayat of Inshirah sura 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 Abu Said-i-Arabi was asked how a person could be a faqir [Darwish], 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." Sirri Saqati was Junaid-i-Baghdadi's spiritual guide. He passed away in Baghdad 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." 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 hadith ash-Sharif, "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 Allahu ta'ala declares in the Qur'an al-karim." You should always read about the behaviors of the Salaf as-salihin and visit the gharib (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-maruf and nahy-i-munkar, that is, to give religious advice to people. You should help the poor and mujahids (people who try to serve Islam) with your property. You should perform pious and charitable deeds. You should avoid committing sins. When Muhammad bin Alyan was asked about the signs indicating that Allahu ta'ala loves a born slave of his, he answered, "His feeling pleasure in worships and abstaining from sins." It was stated in a hadith ash-Sharif, "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 ayat of Baqara sura 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 Allahu ta'ala 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 hadith ash-Sharif, "A person who has a crowded family but a low income and yet who performs his prayers of namaz 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 hadith ash-Sharif, "How lucky for those who die on their way to (perform) hajj and those who perform ghaza (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 hajjis and ghazis."

A distich:

If Haqq ta'ala 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. Jafar Huldi, one of the companions of Junaid-i-Baghdadi, passed away in 348 H. He states, "Our superiors worked and earned in order to help their brothers in Islam, not for their own nafs." Muhammad Abu Abdullah bin Hafif 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!' " Abu 'Umar Zujjaji 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 tariqat." A person without adab cannot attain Allahu ta'ala's love. My blessed father, i.e. Imam-i-Rabbani, wrote detailedly on the adab 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 Awliya. It may, let alone being useful, give harm. Abu Bakr Ahmad bin Sadan states, "A person who wishes to attend the sohbat of the Sufiyya-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 Allahu ta'ala's marifat [love]! Abu Bakr as-Siddiq 'radi-allahu ta'ala 'anh' stated, "Marifat of Allahu ta'ala [to know him] means to realize that He cannot be known Imam-i-azam Abu Hanifa's asseveratio, "I have known Thee," means, "I have realized very well that Thou couldst not be known." Abu Bakr-i-Tamstani 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 murid has to fulfill the qualifications described in the hundred and eighteenth ayat of Tawba sura, 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 Allahu ta'ala's wrath is possible only by committing yourself to His protection." If one's love for Allahu ta'ala 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 gharib, 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.