

Hakikat Kitabevi Publications No: 15

DOCUMENTS of the RIGHT WORD

Hüseyin Hilmi Işık

Thirteenth Edition



Hakikat Kitâbevi

Darıüşşefeka Cad. 53/A P.K.: 35

34083 Fatih-ISTANBUL/TURKEY

Tel: 90.212.523 4556-532 5843 Fax: 90.212.523 3693

<http://www.hakikatkitabevi.com>

e-mail: info@hakikatkitabevi.com

AUGUST-2020

CONTENTS

	Page
Part One – The book Documents of the Right Word , is the English version of the book Hujaj-i-qat'iyya, by Abdullah Suwaydî.....	3
Part Two – The book Radd-i-rewâfid , by Imâm-i-Rabbânî, mujaddid-i-elf-i-thânî Ahmad Fârûqî	57
Part Three – Tezkiya-i-Ahl-i-Bayt , rebuts the calumnies which an enemy of Islam has heaped on Islam in a book titled Husniyya.....	101
Part Four – The book Let us Be in Unity and Love One Another	164
Part Five – The book O My Brother; if You Wish To Die in Îmân, You Should Love the Ahl-i-Bayt and the As-hâb	211
Also, Letter 24, Volume 3, by Imâm-i-Rabbânî.....	329
Part Six – What Is Prophethood? Muhammad ‘alaihîs-salâm’ is the Last Prophet	337
Part Seven – A Biography of Imâm-i-Rabbânî.....	373
Translation of thirty-two letters from Muhammed Ma’thûm Fârûqî’s Mektûbât.....	395
Part Eight – English Version of Eyyuhelveled	441
Part Nine – Answers to A Religiously Ignorant Person.....	458
Part Ten – Communism; and Communists’ Hostility Against Religion	475

Publisher’s Note:

Those who wish to print this book in its original form or to translate it into another language are permitted to do so. We pray that Allâhu ta’âlâ will bless them for this beneficial deed of theirs, and we thank them very much. However, permission is granted with the condition that the paper used in printing will be of a good quality and that the design of the text and setting will be properly and neatly done without mistakes. We would appreciate a copy of the printed book when completed.

TYPESET AND PRINTED IN TURKEY BY:

İhlâs Gazetecilik A.Ş.
Merkez Mah. 29 Ekim Cad. İhlâs Plaza No: 11 A/41
34197 Yenibosna-İSTANBUL Tel: 90.212.454 3000

ISBN: 978-975-8883-52-3

PART ONE
DOCUMENTS OF THE RIGHT WORD
PREFACE

(TO THE TURKISH VERSION)

Allâhu ta'âlâ, having mercy on the whole of mankind, creates useful things and sends them these things in the world. And in the Hereafter He will choose some of those Believers who are to go to Hell, forgive them, and make them attain to Paradise. He, alone, creates all living beings, keeps all beings in existence, and protects them all against fear and horror. Trusting ourselves to the honourable Name of such a Being, Allah, we begin writing this book.

If any person thanked and praised any other person in any manner, for anything, at any place, at any time, all this thanks and praisal would have been done to Allâhu ta'âlâ by rights. For He, alone, is the creator, the educator, the discipliner of all beings, and the actuator and sender of all types of goodness whatsoever. He, alone, is the owner of power and energy.

May all types of benedictions be pronounced over MUHAMMAD 'alaihi-salâm', who is His Prophet and most beloved born slave, the most virtuous and most valuable of the entire creation, and over all of his Âl (household) and As-hâb (Companions), who were his helpers and beloved ones 'alahimus-salawâtu wa-t-taslîmât'!

Serving humanity has always been considered as the most noble obligation, and most people claim to be exclusively doing this service. There are very many people who cover the struggles they have been carrying on for their own sensuous desires, pleasures and financial advantages under the mask of this service. Serving humanity means causing human beings to attain comfort and peace in this world and in the Hereafter. And the only way to success in doing this is the guide to happiness, i.e. Islam, which has been conferred by Allâhu ta'âlâ, most compassionate and most kind, the Creator and educator of human beings. Then, serving humanity is possible by serving Islam; serving Islam

means serving humanity. Enemies of humanity have striven to annihilate Islam. Their most effective aggression has been deceiving Muslims, thus destroying them from within. They have provoked segregation among them, made them hostile against one another, and led them into the talons of irreligious people.

Rasûlullah ‘sall-Allâhu alaihi wasallam’ made statements warning Muslims against these catastrophes awaiting them. He said, for one, **“My Umma will be divided into seventy-three groups. Of these groups, only those who follow me and my As-hâb shall escape Hell.”** Fortunately, most of the seventy-two groups who are to go to Hell are extinct today. Hundreds of millions of Muslims on the earth now are only in the three remaining groups, i.e. Sunnîs, Shi’îs, and Wahnâbîs. If these three groups of Muslims today do not take measures of conciliation and cooperation with one another, if they prefer to abuse one another, the enemies of Islam will gain grounds to defile Islam, to divide Muslims into yet other groups, and to mislead young people out of Islam by using all sorts of lies and slanders. As history shows, nations negligent in their faith have incurred Allah’s scourge and fallen into cruel paws. We see today that most of them are still being trodden under the enemy boots called Communists and are being brutally employed for obtaining their food, like beasts, by an immoral, irreligious and cruel minority. Rescuing humanity from this desperate situation depends merely on serving Islam and rescuing Islam. Today, any person living in Europe or America, where human rights are observed, will attain peace and comfort to the extent that he or she follows Islam’s principles, whether consciously or by chance. In order to convince our readers of this fact and to motivate them towards seeing their own peril, we have considered it appropriate to warn them against Communism by appending to our book a brief sampler of the lacerating afflictions suffered by nations who fell into Communists’ traps.

This book explains how the Hurûfîs, who infiltrated the Shi’î communities, attacked the Sunnîs, how the Iranian King **Nâdir Shâh** organized a debate between the Sunnî and the Shi’î scholars, which ended in the bilateral recognition that the Shi’î (Shiah) way had been mixed with Hurûfî elements and that on the other hand the Sunnîs were in the right way, and how it was decided, and the decision was sanctioned by Nâdir Shâh that Iran would be Sunnî as before.

Upon reading this book of ours, our Iranian brothers will agree with the decision taken by the Shiite scholars, become

Sunnî Muslims, and attain happiness. Gratitude be to Allâhu ta'âlâ, next to none of the recent Iranian learners has abandoned the Sunnî way. We observe with gratitude, for instance, that the Persian book **Kimyâ-i-Sa'âdat**, written by Imâm-i-Ghazâlî, a Sunnî scholar, was reprinted in a most splendid form in Tehran in 1964, and the younger generation in Iran are being informed about the statements made by hundreds of Sunnî scholars, thus being impressed by their superior merits.

The very day Shiites free themselves from the Hurûfîs deceit, realize the way shown by their own scholars, and cooperate with the Sunnîs in spreading Islam over the world, the Wahhabîs will join them, Muslims will be in unity, they will certainly resume their past grandeur and superiority, they will once again shed a light on humanity and guide others to civilization, and thus the whole world will attain happiness. Then all people will know that serving Islam means serving humanity.

Mîlâdî
2001

Hijrî Shamsî
1380

Hijrî Qamarî
1422

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

DOCUMENTS OF THE RIGHT WORD

The book **HUJAJ-I-QAT'IYYA** was written in the Arabic language by Abulberekât Abdullah Suwaydî of Baghdâd. It was printed in Egypt in 1323 [A.D. 1905], and reproduced by offset process in Istanbul. Its Turkish translation, by Allâma Yûsuf Suwaydî, was printed in the Kurdistan printhouse in Egypt in 1326 [A.D. 1908]. Suwaydî Abdullah Efendi was born in Baghdâd in 1104. After performing his duty of hajj in 1137, he was given an ijâzat (certificate, diploma) from Abdulghanî Nablusî [1050-1143 (A.D. 1730) Damascus], and another ijâzat by Alî Efendi of Istanbul [1099-1149]. He taught for years in Baghdâd. He wrote many valuable books. His thirtieth grandfather is Abû Ja'fer Abdullah Mensûr, one of the Abbâsî Khalîfas. Nâdir Shâh [1099-1160 (A.D. 1746)], an Iranian ruler, convoked the scholars of Iran and Bukhara and commanded them to discuss and come to a bilateral conclusion on which one of the Sunnî and Shi'î groups was right, and they appointed him as president of the debate. The book **HUJAJ-I-QAT'IYYA**, which gives an account of the talks made in this assembly, is very valuable. After a long discussion with the Shiite scholars in this assembly, he (Abdullah Suwaydî) proved that the Sunnîs were right. The Shâh liked this and congratulated him. He passed away on the eleventh day, Saturday, of (the Arabic month) Shawwâl in 1174 [A.D. 1760]. He was buried near the tomb of Hadrat Ma'rûf-i-Kerhî 'rahmatullâhi aleyh', who had passed away in 200 [A.D. 815].

When Shâh Huseyn Safawî, the ninth and last king of the Safawid dynasty in Iran, was killed by the Afghans in 1142 [A.D. 1729], a state of chaos began in Persia. The Shâh's son, Tahmâsib II, was an incompetent and pleasure-seeking person. Therefore his vizier named Nâdir took over. He expelled the Afghans out of Iran and recaptured the capital, Isfehân. He besieged Baghdâd, which was then governed by Ahmad Pasha. Eight months later an army commanded by Uthmân Pasha, whose nickname was Lame, arrived from Istanbul and repelled the Iranian army.

Nâdir Shâh became the Shâh of Iran in 1148. He captured Delhi. He shed very much blood. Then he captured Afghanistan and Bukhâra. He was given the nickname (Shâhinshâh). He sent ambassadors to the Ottoman State and proposed to arrange a scientific discussion to decide which one of the Sunnî and Imâmiyya groups was the right one. Organizing a great army, he moved towards Baghdâd and Musul. Unable to capture them, he

retreated to Nejef.

In order to eliminate the disagreeing principles of belief between the Sunnîs and the Shi'îs and to unite the two groups in one by adhering to the right one, scholars from both groups came together upon the order of NÂDIR SHÂH. Abdullah Efendi made such detailed, scientific, mental and documental speeches in front of the whole assembly that the Shiites were short of answering him. [The questions asked and the answers given by both sides were compiled in a book and published with the title (HUJAJ-I-QAT'IYYA)].

Ahmad Pasha, Governor of Baghdâd, sent for me. When I went there Ahmad Agha, one of the officials of Ahmad Pasha, met me and said that the Pasha wanted to send me to Nâdir Shâh. I asked him why. He said, "The Shâh asked for a Sunnî scholar. You are to conduct a debate with the Shiite scholars to find out whether the Shiite tenets are right. If so, Shiism will be proclaimed as the fifth (true) madh-hab."

"O Ahmad Agha," I said. "Don't you know that the Persians are obstinate, headstrong people? Do you think they will admit my words? Especially their Shâh is cruel and proud. How can I state the documents showing that their way is wrong? How can one ever talk with them? They already deny the hadîth-i-sherîfs I am to put forward as documents. They reject the religious books. They interpret the âyat-i-kerîmas in such a manner as will suit their purposes. How can I prove to them the fact that it is permissible to make masah^[1] on mests^[2] when making ablution? This facility has been made permissible by the sunnat-i-seniyya. The hadîth-i-sherîf stating this permission has been narrated by more than seventy Sahabîs. One of them is Hadrat Alî 'ker-rem-Allâhu wejheh'. If I tell them these facts, they will say that more than a hundred Sahabîs have reported that this facility is not permissible. If I tell them that the statements they look on as hadîth-i-sherîfs are mawdû', that is, they have been fabricated afterwards, they will tell me the same thing. They will say, 'Whatever you say, we will say it back to you.' For this reason, I beg Hadrat Pasha to excuse me from this duty."

He said, "This is impossible. The Pasha has chosen you for this duty. You have to obey him. Don't you ever object to his command."

[1] To wet the hands and rub them gently on mests.

[2] Light, soleless leather boots worn with overshoes.

The following morning I had a long conversation with Ahmad Pasha. He said, "Go and get to it. May Janâb-i-Haqq give effectiveness to your tongue and argumentation! If they show obstinacy and vanity during the debate, talk briefly. Yet do not let them go without an answer! If they admit the facts and talk reasonably, do not hesitate to state all the facts that you know! Never be the losing party! Nâdir Shâh must be in Nejeff now. Be there by Wednesday." I and a few other people set out. Throughout the journey I thought about the answers I was going to give and the evidences I was going to furnish. People I met on my way said that the Shâh had convened almost seventy Shiite muftis.

I thought to myself. It would be wrong to refrain from stating the facts in front of them. And yet there was fear that they might make changes in my statements before reporting them to the Shâh. The best thing to do would be to request that the Shâh attend the debate. We were two hours from Nejeff, when somebody came and said, "Why are you lingering here? The Shâh is waiting for you." I asked if it was the Shâh's habit to send men to meet his guests on their way. He said, "No. You are the first person the Shâh has ever sent a message to and said to hurry up." Upon these words I said to myself, "The Shâh's purpose is to force me to admit the Imâmiyya (Shiite) tenets. He is going to press upon me, maybe he will compel me. Yet I am not going to let them corner me; I am not afraid of them. I shall not hesitate to state the truth even if I know they will kill me. Muslims have been in a difficult situation twice so far. The first one was when Rasûlullah 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wasallam' passed away. Then Abû Bekr-i-Siddîq 'radiy-Allâhu anh' came to their rescue and relieved them. Second; Hârûn-ur-reshîd's son, Me'mun, the Khalîfa, [his mother was a jâriya. He was born in 180 and passed away in 218. His grave is in Tarsus], liked the Shiite group. He said that Qur'ân al-kerîm was a creature. Ahmad bin Hanbel [164-241, Baghdâd] 'rahmatullâhi aleyh' saved Muslims from this fitna (instigation, mischief). And now it is seen that a third fitna is cropping up. If I make a mistake or falter, it may hold on till the end of the world. That is, Islam's improvement or impairment depends on some means. Now I am going to be the means for the elimination of this fitna." I decided to exert myself and be perseverant. I ventured even my life.

Two flags appeared in the distance. When we came nearer, I saw the royal tents. The Shâh's tent was set up on seven big posts.

There were thousands of sentinels. Someone met us. He asked about Ahmad Pasha and the begs (officials under the Pasha's command), mentioning their names one by one. I was surprised at his way of asking as if he had known them. "I served as the Iranian Ambassador to the Ottoman State. I served Ahmad Pasha, too. My name is Abd-ul-kerîm Beg," he explained. Then nine other people came. Abd-ul-kerîm Beg stood up respectfully when they came. I knew they were people of high positions. We greeted each other. They said, "We invite you to take presence with the Shâh," and raised the curtain in front of the big tent. Walking through a passageway, we entered the Shâh's room. When Nâdir Shâh saw me, he said, "Abdullah Beg, merhabâ (hello)! Come nearer." We took ten steps, and he said again, "Come nearer!" I walked on, so that there was only one or two metres between him and me when I stopped. He was seated. You could tell he was tall. There were exuberantly ornamented ribbons on his head, around his neck and arm. He was proud, contented. He looked tired and aged. His beard was dyed black, and he had lost his front teeth. His eyes were beautiful with his eye-brows like open bows. He was an imposing, yet at the same time affable, person. When I saw him the fear I had had in my heart diminished. He said, in Turkish again, "How has Ahmad Pasha been?" "He is well, in good health," was my answer.

[At that time Sultan Mahmud Khan I, the twenty-fourth Pâdishâh (Emperor), was on the Ottoman throne. Yet Ahmad Khân III, the previous Sultan, was still alive. He was born in 1083 and passed away in 1149 [A.D. 1736]. He is in the mausoleum of (Turhan Sultan), his paternal grandmother, which is at Bahçekapı, between Yeni Câmî' (New Mosque) and Mısır Çarşısı (Market). He ascended to the throne in 1115. He was dethroned upon the Janissary insurrection. His brother's son, Sultan Mahmud I, took his place. The defeat of Petro (Peter) the Crazy and the lynching of Ibrahim Pasha of Nevşehir in 1143 took place during his reign.

It is stated as follows in the first volume of the book *Sijill-i Uthmânî*: Ahmad Pasha is Eyyûbî Hasan Pasha's son. He became the governor of Konya in 1129, the governor of Basra in 1130, the governor of Baghdâd upon his father's death in 1136, and then he was sent to Iran as the Serasker (Commander-in-chief). In 1149 he became the governor of Baghdâd again. He passed away in the (Arabic) month of Zilqa'da in 1160. His two-time governorship of Baghdâd lasted for twenty-two years.]

He said, "Do you know why I wanted you here?"

I said, "No, I don't."

He explained, "As you know, my country is of two divisions. One of them is Turkistan and Afghanistan. People in these provinces assert that Iranians are disbelievers. It is not something good for people under my command to call one another disbelievers. I appoint you my deputy. You shall confer with them and determine the right party. You shall do away with this segregation. Let me know whatever you see and hear at the place of meeting! Report to Ahmad Khan, too."

Upon his permission I left his presence. I'timâd-ud-dawla, i.e. the Grand Vizier, ordered me to be his guest and to meet the head Molla, that is, Chief of Religious Affairs, after early afternoon prayer. I was very happy when I left the place. At lunch time they took me to the Grand Vizier. The Vizier acknowledged my salutation, seated as he was. He did not stand up or show any respect. When I sat down, he stood up and said, "Welcome." According to their custom, the host would stand up after the guest sat down. Because I did not know about this, I felt annoyed first. In fact, I was going to ask the Shâh to punish the Grand Vizier for irreverence to a religious scholar, as the first step in eliminating the acts of disbelief, which was the Shâh's command. However, when I learned about this custom of theirs, I knew that he had been respectful. After lunch we mounted animals and set out to see the head Molla. On the way I met an Afghan. He saluted me. When I asked him who he was, he said, "I am Molla Hamza, the Afghan Mufti." "Do you know Arabic?" I asked. He answered positively. I said, "The Shâh has commanded me to correct the heretical principles of belief and wrong deeds held and practised by the Persians. But what should I do if they obstinately stick to their disbelief or conceal some of their tenets? I do not know much about these people. Tell me whatever you know, so that I shall act accordingly."

He said, "Do not trust the Shâh! He sends you to the head Molla so that you will speak with him alone. Be extremely circumspect during the conversation."

I said, "I fear a probable treachery."

"No," he said. "Don't be afraid as to that! The Shâh posted men he could trust at every step to report the talks to him. It is impossible to misinform the Shâh."

I approached the head Molla's tent. He walked out to meet me.

He was short. He showed me a seat which was by him and somewhat above him. In the midst of the conversation he said, "Today I saw Hâdî Khodja, the Afghan Mufti. He is an ocean of knowledge." Hâdî Khodja was the Qadi (Judge) of Bukhara. He was very profoundly learned. He was called Bahr-ul-'ilm (Ocean of Knowledge). He had been here for days previous to my arrival, with six other scholars from Bukhara.

He (the Molla) said, "How could he ever think the name (Bahr-ul-'ilm) becoming himself? He is quite devoid of knowledge. If I gave him two evidences proving the fact that Imâm-i-Alî 'radiy-Allâhu anh' was the first Khalîfa by rights, he would not be able to find an answer. Not only him; even if all the Sunnite scholars came together, they would not be able to answer."

"What are those unanswerable evidences of yours?" I said.

1- He said, "First, I should like to ask you a question: Hadrat Prophet 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wasallam' stated as follows about Alî ibn Ebî Tâlib 'radiy-Allâhu anh': **'Whatever Hârûn (Aaron) was in relation to Mûsâ (Moses), you are the same with relation to me. The only difference is that no Prophet shall come after me.'** You, too, know this hadîth."

"Yes. In fact, it is widely known," I said.

He said, "This hadîth-i-sherîf shows that Imâm-i-Alî should be the Khalîfa after hadrat Prophet."

"How is that," I asked.

He said, "It is pointed out that the position of Imâm-i-Alî in relation to the Prophet is identical with that of Hârûn to Mûsâ. The only exception is stated to be **"Yet no Prophet shall come after me."** For this reason, hadrat Alî should be the first Khalîfa. Had Hârûn's lifetime not ended, he would have succeeded Mûsâ."

"You assert clearly that these statements have a general reference according to the knowledge of logic. How do you reach the conclusion that they have a general meaning?"

"In exceptions, annexation implies a general meaning."

"Hârûn 'alaihis-salâm', like Mûsâ 'alaihis-salâm', was a Prophet. On the other hand, as you, too, know, hadrat Alî was not a Prophet; neither before, nor afterwards. Furthermore, Hârûn 'alaihis-salâm' was Mûsâ's 'alaihis-salâm' real brother. On the other hand, hadrat Alî 'radiy-Allâhu anh' is not Rasûl-i-ekrem's 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wasallam' real brother. Exception in something general refers to supposition in the knowledge of logic. Therefore,

the meaning of the statement must be sought as to a position, a station. Accordingly, the letter (t) at the end of the (Arabic) word ‘menzila’ (position) indicates a singular meaning. The izâfet (annexation) ‘like the position of Hârûn’ is an izâfet-i-ahdiyya, as is the case with most types of annexation. In other words, it does not indicate a general meaning. And the word ‘Only’ means ‘Yet’. Then, the statement bears a suppositious meaning, not a definite one. In statements such as this, something which is uncertain can be understood with the help of some other information. That is, as the relation between the words ‘menzila’ and ‘Hârûn’ indicates that he was the Khalîfa only for the Sons of Israel, so it indicates that hadrat Alî ‘radiy-Allâhu anh’ was left in Medîna-i-munawwara as the Khalîfa during the Holy War of Tabuk.

“Being left there as the Khalîfa shows that he is more virtuous. He must be the first Khalîfa,” he said.

I said, “Then, Abdullah ibni umm-i-Mektûm ‘radiy-Allâhu anh’ must be a Khalîfa, too. For Rasûlullah ‘sall-Allâhu alaihi wasallam’ left him, as well as others, as the Khalîfa, that is, as his representative, in Medîna-i-munawwara. Now, for what reason do you choose hadrat Alî ‘radiy-Allâhu anh’ as the first Khalîfa instead of conferring the honour on one of the others; for instance, on this one (named above)? Moreover, if being left as a representative were a cause of superiority, Alî ‘radiy-Allâhu anh’ would not have expressed his anxiety by complaining, ‘Are you going to leave me here with women, children and the incapable?’ And our Master Fakhr-i-âlem ‘sall-Allâhu alaihi wasallam’ would not have consoled him by stating, **‘Don’t you like to have a position with me like that of Hârûn with Mûsâ?’**”

“According to the Sunnite (branch of) knowledge (called) Usûl, the important thing is not the dissimilarity between the causes but the generality of the statement,” he said.

I said, “I am not treating the dissimilarity between the causes as a documentary evidence. Yet I am stating that the indefinite element in this hadîth-i-sherîf is a token suggesting its specificity.” He was silent.

I went on, “Furthermore, this hadîth-i-sherîf cannot be put forward as a document. For it has not been reported unanimously. Some of the scholars have stated it was sahîh, some of them have said it was hasan, and others have declared it was a dha’if^[1] hadîth.

[1] Kinds of hadîth-i-sherîfs are explained in full detail in the sixth chapter of **Endless Bliss**.

Ibn-ul-Djawzî, for instance, says that it is mawdû'. [Abulferedj Jemâl-ud-dîn Hâfiz Abd-ur-Rahmân bin Ali-yyul-Djawzî 'rahmatullâhi aleyh' is a great 'âlim (savant, profoundly learned scholar) of hadîth. He was born in Baghdâd in 508 and passed away there in 597 [A.D. 1201]. He wrote more than a hundred books. His tafsîr (explanation of Qur'ân al-kerîm), titled **Mughnî**, is well-known]. How could this (hadîth) prove that Imâm-i-Alî 'radiy-Allâhu anh' was the first Khalîfa, despite the fact that a document should be widely known nass (an âyat-i-kerîma or hadîth-i-sherîf which has been stated clearly)?"

He said, "Yes, that is right. This (hadîth) is not our only evidence. The hadîth, 'Salute Alî as the Emîr (Ruler) of Believers,' is an evidence. It is an irrefutable fact that this hadîth-i-sherîf signifies Alî's right to be the first Khalîfa, if not his prophethood."

I said, "This hadîth-i-sherîf is mawdû' to our knowledge. The books of the 'Ulamâ (savants) of Ahl-as-sunna 'rahmatullâhi ta'âlâ alaihim ajma'in' do not contain a sahîh hadîth of this sort." He mused (for a while). Then he said suddenly:

"I am going to state another evidence, which is impossible to interpret otherwise. The âyat, **'Come on! Let us call your children and our children!'**, is my evidence," he said.

I questioned, "How can this âyat-i-kerîma, which is the sixty-first âyat of Âl-i-'Imrân sûra, be an evidence?"

He said, "When the Christians coming from Nejran to Medina disbelieved, Rasûlullah 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wasallam' said to them, **'I challenge you; let us imprecate Allah's condemnation on the party which is lying.'** And then he came forward, taking Alî, Fâtima (his daughter), Hasan and Huseyn (his two grandsons) with him. Certainly, a person who joined (the Prophet) in this invocation is more virtuous than one who did not."

I said, "What you have just told is an episode. It does not signify superiority. For there is an episode that is ascribed to each of the As-hâb-i-kirâm 'radiy-Allâhu ta'âlâ anhum ajma'in' and which distinguishes him from the others. History readers are quite familiar with this fact. Furthermore, Qur'ân-i-azîm-ush-shân was revealed in the Arabic language. For instance, supposing two tribes were about to fight each other and the chief of one of them said, 'I shall take the brave ones of my tribe with me. And you must select the brave ones in your tribe;' this statement would not prove that neither tribe contained any brave men other than those

who came forward. Being with one's immediate relations during an invocation is (an indication of) a broken heart and it is intended for the acceptance of the invocation."

"This shows abundance of love," he said.

I said, "This is a kind of love innate in one's nature. It is like one's loving oneself, one's children. It is out of place to look for superiority in this."

"One more thing: The Prophet 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wasallam' put hadrat Alî in the same place with himself," he asserted.

I said, "You are not aware of the knowledge of Usûl; perhaps you do not even know Arabic! The word 'enfus', which you presume to be an evidence, is jem'i qillat (plural of paucity). It has been attached to (the word) 'Nâ', which is an element of plural. When one plural is placed against another plural, it causes the division of (the number) one by a thousand. For instance, to say that 'the cavalry company have mounted' means to say that all the horsemen in the company have mounted their horses. Jem' means more than one. The twenty-sixth âyat of Nûr sûra, which purports, **'These are not as they have said'**, points to hadrat Âisha 'radiy-Allâhu anhâ' and Safwân 'radiy-Allâhu 'anh'. Likewise, the expression 'their hearts', in the fourth âyat of Tahrîm sûra, is plural, yet according to the knowledge of logic it means 'two hearts' because it is attached to a pronoun signifying 'two'. By the same token, the expression 'our children', said about Hasan and Huseyn 'radiy-Allâhu anhumâ', and the plural reference 'women', made to hadrat Fâtima 'radiy-Allâhu anhâ' alone, are hyperboles. If this âyat-i-kerîma indicated that hadrat Alî should be the first Khalîfa, then Hasan, Huseyn and Fâtima should have been Khalîfas respectively. However, hadrat Fâtima could never be a Khalîfa."

He said, "I have another proof. The fifty-eighth âyat of Mâida sûra purports, **'Verily, thine protectors, thine owners are Allâhu ta'âlâ and His Messenger and Believers.'** As it is unanimously stated by scholars of Tafsîr (Islamic branch of knowledge involving explanation of Qur'ân al-kerîm), hadrat Alî 'radiy-Allâhu anh', as he was performing namâz, gave his ring as alms to a poor person, whereon this âyat-i-kerîma was revealed. The phrase 'inna-mâ' in the âyat-i-kerîma means 'he, alone'. That is, it refers only to him. And the word 'Walî' (in the âyat-i-kerîma) means 'the one who is best disposed to governing'. What is your opinion of the Sahâba-i-kirâm?"

“Our knowledge about them is such that they are true in person and in words,” was my answer.

2- He said, “Many an âyat in Qur’ân al-kerîm reproaches them. There are a number of âyats declaring that they are hypocrites, that they harassed and annoyed Rasûlullah. Examples of this fact are the fifty-ninth âyat of Tawba sûra and the eighth âyat of Mujâdala sûra and the first âyat of Munâfiqûn sûra and the sixteenth and twentieth and twenty-ninth and thirtieth âyats of Muhammad sûra. Moreover, as is pointed out in the hundred and second âyat of Tawba sûra and in the eleventh and twelfth and fifteenth âyats of Fat-h sûra and in the fourth âyat of Hujurât sûra, so clandestine were the hypocrites in Medina that our master Fakhr-i-’âlam himself, let alone other people, was unaware of them. It is stated in the Enfâl sûra, **‘Verily it is them who opposed Rasûlullah, who evaded the renowned Holy War of Bedr and returned before seeing the enemy, and who refrained from the honour of that day for which Believers gave up their lives.’** It is for this reason that Allâhu ta’âlâ ‘jalla jalâluh’, who is aware of secrets, reveals the hypocrites’ evil intentions in the sixth âyat of Enfâl sûra. It is these hypocrites, again, who escaped from the Holy War of Huneyn and who relied on their being superior in number and thus caused the revelation of the tenth and hundred and sixteenth âyats of Âl-i-’Imrân sûra. In the catastrophe of Uhud they ran away into the mountains, leaving hadrat Fakhr-i-kâinat in the hands of the enemy. They caused the wounding of his blessed face and martyrdom of two of his teeth and his falling down from the mare. In fact, when they were asked to help they pretended not to hear and were therefore reproached by Allâhu ta’âlâ in the hundred and fifty-third âyat-i-kerîma of Âl-i-’Imrân sûra. On account of the infamous behaviour they showed in Tabuk, they were reprimanded and threatened through the thirty-ninth âyat-i-kerîma of Tawba sûra.

(He went on), “As all these facts show, the Prophet’s As-hâb disobeyed him, opposed him. The âyat-i-kerîma about their desertion purports that all of them ran away, not only a few of them. For the forty-third âyat of Tawba sûra declares plainly that they incurred torment and censure. And they caused the revelation of the forty-fourth âyat-i-kerîma of Tawba sûra, which scolds the Fakhr-i-’âlam ‘sall-Allâhu alaihi wasallam’ because he allowed them to rejoin the Believers. Moreover, during the Holy War of Ahzâb, or Hendek (Trench), which took place during the eleventh month of the fifth year of the Hijra (Hegira), they were

reprimanded and censured through the thirteenth and fifteenth âyats of Ahzâb sûra and through many other âyats. How could such people ever be said to be true people? How could their actions and words ever be of documentary value in religious matters? It is neither reasonable nor scientific to believe or trust them.”

I took my turn: “All the âyat-i-kerîmas that you put forward as documents in order to vilify the As-hâb-i-kirâm ‘alaihîmur-ridwân’ were intended for munâfiqs (hypocrites). No one doubts as to this fact. In fact, Shiïtes also unanimously acknowledge this fact. It would be quite incompatible with justice and reason to attempt to heap the reproaches stated in these âyat-i-kerîmas which are known to have been revealed to reprimand the hypocrites on the As-hâb-i-kirâm, who have been praised and lauded through âyats, and thus to try to defame these great people. Formerly there were many hypocrites. Later on they began to decrease in number. Towards the end of the blessed lifetime of our master Fakhr-i-âlam ‘sall-Allâhu alaihi wasallam’ the hypocrites were separated from the true Believers. With the hundred and seventy-ninth âyat-i-kerîma of Âl-i-’Imrân sûra, Allâhu ta’âlâ severed the good from the vicious. Our master, hadrat Rasûlullah ‘sall-Allâhu alaihi wasallam’ stated, **‘As the fire in the smith’s forge severs the iron from its dirt, so Medina severs the good people from the bad ones.’** [That is, as the forges used by blacksmiths and blast-furnaces separate the scum called dross from the iron, so Medina city separates good people from bad ones.] How could it ever be justifiable to impute (the contents of) the âyat-i-kerîmas describing the hypocrites to the As-hâb-i-kirâm? The hundred and tenth âyat of Âl-i-’Imrân sûra purports, **‘You have been the most beneficent, the best of ummats.’** How could those people, who are praised and lauded through this âyat, be equated with the hypocrites?

(I went on), “Allâhu ta’âlâ praises the As-hâb-i-kirâm through many âyat-i-kerîmas. It is written in all the books of Tafsîr that the fifty-ninth âyat of Tawba sûra descended about Ibni zil Huwaysira bin Zuheyr, who was the chief of the (Khawârij) tribe. It is not worthy of a man of knowledge to impute (the evils purported in) this âyat-i-kerîma to the Sahâba-i-kirâm ‘ridwânullâhi ta’âlâ alaihim ajma’in’. It will be appropriate at this point to paraphrase the passages explaining this event in the book Bukhârî-yi-sherîf. Abû Sa’îd-i-Hudrî ‘radiy-Allâhu anh’ narrates: I was with our master Rasûlullah ‘sall-Allâhu alaihi wasallam’. I was enjoying the

pleasure of seeing his blessed luminous face. He was meting out the booties taken from the disbelievers in the Holy War of Huneyn. Huwaysira from the Benî Temîm clan came in, and said, ‘O Rasûlallah! Observe justice!’ Rasûlullah ‘sall-Allâhu alaihi wasallam’ stated, **‘Shame on you! If I do not administer justice, who does? If I did not dispense justice, you would suffer much harm!’** At that moment ‘Umar-ul-Fârûq ‘radiy-Allâhu anh’ stood up and said, ‘Please give me permission to kill that nescient.’ He (Rasûlullah) stated, **‘Leave him! For this man has friends. They perform namâz like you. They fast, read Qur’ân al-kerîm with you. Yet the word of Allâhu ta’âlâ does not go down their throats. They leave the religion (Islam) like an arrow leaving the bow. When he looks at his arrow and at the target and at the bottle, he cannot see any of them. Yet the arrow has reached the bottle, pierced it, and shed the blood. Among them will be a person, whose colour is black. One of his arms is like the udder of an animal. It drips ceaselessly.’** As Abû Sa’îd-i-Hudrî narrates, hadrat Alî ‘radiy-Allâhu anhumâ’ made war against the Khawârij during his caliphate. We saw a man of this sort among the captives. He was exactly as our master Rasûlullah described him. It has been reported that the reason for the revelation of this âyat-i-kerîma was due to the following statement made by a hypocrite named Abulhawât: ‘O my friends! Why don’t you look at your owner! He wants to make a show of justice by giving what belongs to you to shepherds.’

(I went on), “Also, the eighth âyat of Mujâdala sûra was revealed for the Jews and hypocrites. For they were organizing meetings hidden from the Muslims among themselves, and trying to deceive the As-hâb-i-kirâm with eye and eye-brow gestures. The Believers, on the other hand, would feel pity for them, thinking that they were apprehending a certain calamity that was going to befall them and talking secretly among themselves lest others should know about it. Yet the prolongation of these talks revealed their real purposes. The As-hâb-i-kirâm ‘alaihimur-ridwân’ complained to our master Fakhr-i-’âlam ‘sall-Allâhu alaihi wasallam’ and petitioned that these malevolent secret meetings should be put an end to. Therefore he (Rasûlullah) commanded that such meetings should be discontinued. Yet the hypocrites disobeyed him and carried on their sedition. Upon this the eighth âyat of Mujâdala sûra was revealed, which purported, **‘Have you not seen those who were prohibited from holding secret meetings? They have met again despite the prohibition. They have been**

meeting for sinning, for (stirring up) enmity, opposition to Rasûlullah.’ Their disobeying the prohibition and meeting again means opposition.

(I went on), “The blessed meaning of the eighth âyat of Mujâdala sûrâ is, **‘When they greet thee, they do not do so** (in the same manner) **as Allâhu ta’âlâ greets thee.**’ Jews are reproached in this âyat-i-kerîma. Whenever Jews met Rasûlullah they would say, **‘May sam be to you,’** instead of saying, **‘May salâm be on you.’** And Rasûlullah ‘sall-Allâhu alaihi wasallam’ would reply, **‘And the same to you!’** Thus, instead of saying, ‘salâm’, which means ‘safety, security’, they would say, ‘sam’, which means ‘death’. They thought they could deceive Fakhr-i-kâinât, who is the highest of all creatures and of all the past and future human beings. When they left him they would say that they had deceived him and that if he had been a Prophet they would have incurred (Allah’s) scourge on account of this atrocity of theirs. It is for this reason that it was declared, **‘Their calculation shall add up to torment in Hell’**, at the end of the âyat-i-kerîma. (Bukhârî) states in his book that when Jews entered the presence of our Prophet ‘sall-Allâhu ta’âlâ alaihi wasallam’ they would pronounce their doubtful, wicked word of greeting, as it was their vicious custom. Âisha ‘radiy-Allâhu anhâ’ understood this and became angry. Our master, Rasûlullah, stated that there was no reason for becoming angry and that his invocation, **‘May the same be to you!’**, was accepted (by Allâhu ta’âlâ).

“The expression, **‘When the munâfiqs (hypocrites) come to thee...’**, in the first âyat of Munâfiqûn sûra, refers to Abdullah bin Selûl and his friends. It has nothing to do with As-hâb-i-kerâm.

(I went on), “The meaning of the sixteenth âyat of Muhammad sûra is, **‘Of them, the ones who listen to thee; when they leave thee...’** This âyat-i-kerîma, too, was revealed for the hypocrites. The hypocrites would appear in the presence of Rasûlullah ‘sall-Allâhu alaihi wasallam’, hear his statements, and yet they would be unwilling to understand what he was saying. Imâm-i-Muqatil [Of Belh; passed away in Basra in 150] states as follows in his Tafsîr: As Rasûlullah ‘sall-Allâhu alaihi wasallam’ preached during the Khutba, they would pretend not to understand, asking Abdullah ibni Abbâs ‘radiy-Allâhu anhumâ’, ‘What does this man want to say?’ Abdullah ibni Abbâs ‘radiy-Allâhu anhumâ’ reports that they would ask him from time to time. Allâhu ta’âlâ, who is the (real) owner of justice, revealed the sixteenth âyat of Muhammad sûra, thus distinguishing the faithful Believers who

were serving whole-heartedly from the hypocrites. The blessed meaning of this âyat is, **‘Allâhu ta’âlâ has sealed their hearts shut.’** Then, revealing the next âyat, He (Allâhu ta’âlâ) gave the Ashâb-i-kirâm the good news of hidâyat (guidance to the right way) and najât (salvation). Sa’îd bin Jubeyr ‘radiy-Allâhu anh’ states: The expression, **‘Thou hast seen those with ailing hearts’**, purported in the twentieth âyat of Muhammad sûra, uncovers the hypocrites explicitly. For there are three kinds of hearts: The first one is the Believer’s heart, which is pure and attached to Allâhu ta’âlâ with love. The second kind of heart is rigid and dead. It will never feel mercy. The third kind is the ailing heart. This ailment is the singular property of hypocrites. Allâhu ta’âlâ describes all these three kinds of hearts in the fifty-first âyat of Hajj sûra. Two of these three hearts are in torment. One of them shall attain salvation. The Believer’s heart is Selîm. Allâhu ta’âlâ praises and lauds the heart that is Selîm. The eighty-eighth âyat of Shu’arâ sûra purports, **‘That day, property and children shall do no good. Only those who come with a heart that is Selîm shall attain benefits.’**

“The Benî Anber tribe were disbelievers. It would be wrong, both mentally and scientifically, to place them among the Ashâb-i-kirâm.

“As for the Holy War of Bedr; as it is explained both in your books and in our books, it took place as it is stated in the first âyat of Enfâl sûra.

(I went on), “The dispersal that took place in the Holy War of Huneyn was not a desertion. It was a precaution, a tactical stratagem. Every war embodies retreats as well as forward movements. After all, those who dispersed were not the greater ones of the As-hâb-i-kirâm. They were the slaves who had been emancipated after the conquest of Mekka a few months earlier. It was for certain that the result was going to be a victory. In fact, that this withdrawal brought about victory is informed in the twenty-seventh âyat of Tawba sûra, which purports, **‘Then He conferred serenity on His Messenger and on the Believers.’** Rasûlullah ‘sall-Allâhu alaihi wasallam’ was aware of this. For this reason he did not rebuke those who had dispersed. He was not offended with any of them. Then, would it be proper for us to censure them? Since it is stated, ‘It is permissible to desert the battle when one’s life is in danger,’ in the book (**Kitâb-ush-sharâyi’**) which was written by Abulqâsim Shi’î, a Shiite scholar, would it not be necessary to hold one’s tongue about the Sahâba ‘radiy-Allâhu

ta'âlâ anhum ajma'in' who retreated during the Holy War of Huneyn?

“As for the desertion in the Holy War of Uhud; it took place before its prohibition. It is declared in the hundred and fifty-fifth âyat of Âl-i-'Imrân sûra that Allâhu ta'âlâ has forgiven them.

“It is explained in all books of Tafsîr that the good news purporting, **'Allâhu ta'âlâ has forgiven thee,'** which is before the hundred and fifty-third âyat-i-kerîma of Âl-i-'Imrân sûra, is attached to this âyat, which follows it.

“The meaning of the ninety-ninth âyat of Tawba sûra is, **'O those who have had îmân! What happened to you when you were said to go out for Jihâd?'** This does not mean to censure or rebuke them. Yet it means to inform them that they have been slack. And this information includes all of them. It has not been stated that hadrat Alî 'radiy-Allâhu anh', who was among them, was an exception.” Upon this the head Molla began to talk:

3- “Would it be something right to make a person Khalîfa while his caliphate was a matter of controversy? The Benî Hâshim (tribe) were the notables of the As-hâb-i-kirâm. Only after long hesitation and upon insistent coercion did they acknowledge his caliphate. Is this the way of accepting a Khalîfa?”

I answered, “All the Sahâba 'radiy-Allâhu ta'âlâ anhum ajma'in' unanimously agreed on the caliphate of hadrat Abû Bekr 'radiy-Allâhu ta'âlâ anh'. Anyone without prejudice will acknowledge this fact. Hadrat Alî 'radiy-Allâhu ta'âlâ anh' and a few other Sahâbîs 'radiy-Allâhu ta'âlâ anhum ajma'in' were late to acknowledge their obedience, not because they were opposed, but because they had not been invited to the election and therefore had not attended it. Besides, a few people's opposition could not have turned the preference of the majority to the other way round. Had such a thing been possible, it would have been possible when hadrat Alî 'kerrem-Allâhu ta'âlâ wej-heh' was elected the (fourth) Khalîfa (afterwards), and consequently his caliphate would not have been rightful.”

4- The head Molla changed the subject: “Abû Bekr deprived hadrat Fâtima of her right by violence. Putting forward the hadîth-i-sherîf, **'We Prophets do not leave inheritance behind us. What we leave will become alms,'** he did not give her her dues. During the battle of Hayber, Jebrâîl (Gabriel) 'alaihîs-salâm' brought the command which purported, **'Give the person who is close to thee**

his right. When our master the Prophet asked, **‘Who is the person close to me?’**, he was told that it was Fâtima. It has been reported by Umm-i-Eymen and Esmâ bint-i-Umeys and Alî ibni Ebî Tâlib that upon this event Fâtima was given the date orchard called (Fedek). Despite these witnesses, he deprived her of her right with a hadîth-i-sherîf reported by him; what is this, if not cruelty? Is it compatible with Islam to accept a Khalîfa whose conduct and deeds are like this?”

I answered: “There are two possible reasons for hadrat Fâtima’s demanding for the date orchard called Fedek. She might have said that she had inherited it. Or she might have claimed it was her property because it had been given to her before (her father’s death). Your assertion denotes that she asked for it because it was her property. None of the scholars of Ahl as-sunna has said that the orchard named Fedek had been given to Fâtima ‘radiy-Allâhu anha’ or that it was her property. Nor is it written in any Islamic book. All books say that she asked for it because (she thought) it was an inheritance from her father. How could this event, which is narrated clearly in the book (**Bukhârî-i-sherîf**), be changed into ‘it was taken away from her by force’? Hadîth-i-sherîfs are plain enough not to tolerate such distortions. For the date orchard named Fedek was in the possession of our master the Prophet. When he passed away it went under the control of Abû Bekr, his Khalîfa. When hadrat Fâtima asked for it as an inheritance, he answered her as it was stated in the hadîth-i-sherîf, and swore that he held Rasûlullah’s relatives higher than his own. These facts are written in the book (**Bukhârî-i-sherîf**). It is completely wrong to say that this hadîth-i-sherîf was reported only by Abû Bekr. This hadîth-i-sherîf was reported also by ’Umar, ’Uthmân, Alî, Talha, Zubeyr, Abd-ur-Rahmân, Abbâs, and the blessed wives of our master Rasûlullah ‘sall-Allâhu alaihi wasallam’. It is written in Bukhârî-i-sherîf. Imâm-i-Ismâîl Bukhârî states: Is-haq said to me: I have heard this hadîth-i-sherîf from Mâlik bin Enes. (He said) he had heard it from Shahâb-i-Zuhrî, who (had said he) had heard it from Mâlik bin Ews. I visited Mâlik bin Ews and asked him. He said to me: One day before noon I was sitting in front of my house, when one of hadrat ’Umar’s men came and said that the Khalîfa wanted to see me. I went there and entered the Khalîfa’s presence. The Khalîfa was sitting on a couch. There was not a mattress on the couch. He was leaning back on a cushion. I greeted him, and sat down. He said to me, ‘A few people from your tribe were here. I ordered that

they should be given some money. I sent for you because I would like you to divide this money and distribute it to them. Take it and mete it out!’ I requested the Khalîfa to excuse me and have someone else carry out this order. But when he insisted I could not refuse him. At that moment the door-keeper entered and said that ‘Uthmân, Abd-ur-rahmân, Zubeyr, Sa’d ibni Ebî Waqqâs ‘radiy-Allâhu anhum’ requested admittance. He (the Khalîfa) said they could come in. So they entered and sat down. Some time later the doorman came in again and said that hadrat Alî and Abbâs ‘radiy-Allâhu anhumâ’ were waiting outside for admittance. Given the permission, they entered, and sat down. Hadrat Abbâs began to talk, saying that ‘Alî ‘radiy-Allâhu anh’ and I are here for the settlement of a disagreement between us concerning the property of (Benî Nadr), which Allâhu ta’âlâ gifted to Rasûlullah.’ He wanted this matter to be discussed so that those who had come earlier would feel satisfied and pleased, too. First the Khalîfa began to talk, saying, ‘I ask you (to tell the truth) for the right of Ulûhiyyat (being worshipped) and Izzat (Honour, Glory) of Allâhu ta’âlâ, who has created the earth and heavens and who allows them to maintain their existence every moment: Did Rasûlullah ‘sall-Allâhu alaihi wasallam’ make the statement, **(We Prophets do not leave inheritance behind us! What we leave behind will become alms)**? Do you know that he uttered this hadîth-i-sherîf?’ ‘Uthmân and his friends, who had arrived there earlier, said, ‘Yes, we know about it. He (the Prophet) said so.’ Then the Khalîfa turned to Alî and Abbâs and repeated the same question. Both of them replied in the affirmative. ‘Then you must be ready to listen to the decree enacted in this respect: Jenâb-i-Rabb-ul-’âlamîn ‘ta’âlâ wa taqaddes’ has given this property as a ghanîmat. That He has made this gift only upon His Habîb-i-ekrem, and no one else has been qualified with this concession, is pointed out in the sixth âyat of Hashr sûra. Our master the Fakhr-i-kâinât spent all such property, distributing it in a manner compatible with Islam, leaving behind what exists today. Setting apart the legitimate needs of his household from that ghanîmat, he would give the rest to those who were granted an allowance from the Beyt-ul-mâl. What do you say about this? Would Rasûlullah not do so?’ Upon this question of the Khalîfa, all the people being there replied in the affirmative.

“Hadrat Khalîfa went on with his discourse: When Rasûlullah passed away, Abû Bekr as-siddîq ‘radiy-Allâhu anh’ took control.

He followed Rasûlullah's example and did the same. Until his death, he carried on a faultless administration. Now you two are there to have me talk, to ask from me. Since both of you ask the same question, there must be one answer for both of you. You, hadrat Abbâs, are here to ask about the right of your brother's son, Alî, and you, hadrat Alî, are here to ask about your wife's right, which is an inheritance from her father. I have quoted to you the hadîth-i-sherîf, '**We do not leave inheritance behind us...**', which you admit to have heard. Then I have informed you about the policy followed by Abû Bekr-i-Siddîq, who was the rightly-guided Khalîfa of our master the Rasûl-i-ekrem. The very day I became the Khalîfa I assigned the task of carrying on this business to you, making it a stipulation that you were to follow the same policy as before.' Thus, in the presence of hadrat 'Uthmân and his friends, he (the Khalîfa, hadrat 'Umar) answered hadrat Alî and Abbâs's question, stating that they had been given this duty under that stipulation. (And he went on), 'Now, if you have come here to ask for permission to do something contrary to this stipulation; I swear by the greatness of the Creator of earth and heavens that I shall not give permission to do something counter to the wishes of Allâhu ta'âlâ and His Messenger. If you are incapable to execute this task, return it to me! I shall provide your needs for you.' When Urwa-t-abn-i-Zubeyr was asked about this event, he repeated that he had heard it from Mâlik bin Ews 'radiy-Allâhu anh' as it was. And he added a narration reported by hadrat Âisha 'radiy-Allâhu anhâ', the blessed wife of our master Rasûlullah 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wasallam': One day the Ezwâj-i-tâhirât (the Prophet's pure wives) 'radiy-Allâhu anhunna' sent me to my father (hadrat Abû Bekr-i-siddîq) to ask my father, who was the Khalîfa at that time, about the portions they were to receive from the ghanîmat. He stated, 'Don't you fear Jenâb-i-Haqq? Our master Rasûlullah's hadîth-i-sherîf, (**We Prophets do not leave inheritance**), shows that you do not have any portions. Do you remember this hadîth-i-sherîf?' Upon this refusal, I remembered the hadîth-i-sherîf and went back.

"In order to explain that those who are vulgarly obstinate despite all these clear evidences must be malevolent people, I have quoted the hadîth-i-sherîf in the book Bukhârî-i-sherîf exactly as it is. Hadrat Abû Bekr 'radiy-Allâhu anh' heard this hadîth-i-sherîf from our master Rasûlullah 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wasallam'. It is the most dependable document for him. For there are three ways of learning something: First, by perceiving it; second, by hearing it

from all people; third, by hearing it from Rasûlullah. Hadrat Fâtima's not having heard about this hadîth-i-sherîf does not signify its nonexistence. Hadrat Alî and Abbâs's confirmation and the Prophet's blessed wives' stopping asking for their rights upon hadrat Âisha's dissuasion, leave no doubt as to its authenticity. And you are wrong to say that hadrat Fâtima brought two women as witnesses. She proposed hadrat Alî and Umm-i-Eymen 'radiy-Allâhu ta'âlâ anhum' as witnesses. Only one of these witnesses, i.e. Umm-i-Eymen, was a woman. This fact is also written in the book (**Nehj-ul-haqq**), by Ibn-ul-Mutahhir Hasan bin Yûsuf Hullî, a Shiite scholar. After all, this could not be an Islamic way of argumentation. The following event will explain why it is not: Hadrat Alî 'radiy-Allâhu anh' sued a Jew for a coat of arms, and proposed hadrat Hasan, (his son), and Qanber, his slave, as witnesses. Qâdi Shureyh, who was the judge, dismissed the action because it was not Islamic for a person to be a witness for his father. And Imâm-i-Alî 'radiy-Allâhu anh', the Khalîfa as he was at that time, followed Islam and reason by acquiescing in the decision.

[Ibni Mutahhir-i-Hullî was born in 684, and passed away in 726 [A.D. 1226]. He was one of the scholars of Imâmiyya group. He wrote hundreds of books. Qâdi Shureyh was appointed the Qâdi of Kûfa by hadrat 'Umar 'radiy-Allâhu ta'âlâ anhumâ'. He served as a judge there for almost sixty years. He passed away in 87, when he was one hundred years old. He should not be mistaken for Qâdi Shureyh, who was a friend of Imâm-i-a'zam Abû Hanîfa. Mensûr, the Khalîfa (at that time), appointed him the Qâdi of Kûfa. He was born in 95, and passed away in Kûfa in 177 (A.D. 793)].

“Supposing all these evidences are disigned and it is still presumed that the Khalîfa Abû Bekr as-siddîq took the date orchard called Fedek by force; then why did hadrat Alî 'radiy-Allâhu anh' not give the date orchard to hadrat Hasan and Huseyn when he became the Khalîfa and everything was now in his hands, under his command? Why did he not change what had been done by the three Khalîfas previous to him? Hadrat Alî's following the same policy as had been followed by the previous three Khalîfas concerning the date orchard is a plain evidence for the fact that it had not been taken by force by Abû Bekr.” Upon this the head Molla said:

5- “Would it be sahîh (acceptable) for a person who has attempted to reject Rasûlullah's commandment to become the Khalîfa?”

“No, it couldn’t be,” I said.

He said, “How did it come to be saḥīḥ that ‘Umar, who had beaten Abū Hureyra ‘radiy-Allāhu anh’ and prevented him from carrying out the command he had been given, became the Khalīfa? Rasūlullah ‘sall-Allāhu alaihi wasallam’ gave Abū Hureyra his blessed sandals, and said to him, **‘Go with these! Give the good news that those who believe in the Kelima-i-shahâdat shall enter Paradise!’** As Abū Hureyra was going to carry out this commandment, he met ‘Umar. ‘Umar asked him where he was coming from and where he was going. When Abū Hureyra told him about the duty he was going to do, he knocked him down with a blow on the chest, and told him to go back. Abū Hureyra was badly offended. Going back, he told Rasūlullah (what had happened). As is written in the book **(Al-Jam’u beyn-as-sahīḥayn)**, by Hâfiz [person who is profoundly learned in the knowledge of Hadīth] Muhammad bin Ebî Nasr Hamîdî Andulusî Mâlikî [passed away in 488 (A.D. 1095)], Abū Hureyra says: Abū Bekr, ‘Umar, and I were sitting with Rasūlullah. The Fakhr-i-kâinât stood up and left. He did not come back. We were anxious. We went out to look for him. I was ahead of the others. I walked on till I reached the wall of (the house that belonged to) Benî Nejjâr, who was one of the Ensâr. I began to walk around, looking for the door. I saw Rebi’a go in through a small door, and followed him in. I saw Rasūlullah inside. He told me to go near him. He gave me his blessed sandals and said, **‘Go with these! Give the good news to all those you meet that those who have îmân in the Kelima-i-shahâdat shall enter Paradise!’** I went out to do his command. First I met ‘Umar. He asked where I was going. When I told him that I was going to give some good news to Believers, he hit me and told me to go back. I went back in tears. As I was telling Rasūlullah, ‘Umar came there, too. He listened. Rasūlullah asked ‘Umar what he had done. He said: ‘O the Messenger of Allah! I am ready to sacrifice my parents for you! Did you give your blessed sandals to Abū Hureyra and tell him to give the good news of Paradise to those who have the îmân of Kelima-i-shahâdat in their hearts?’ When our master Rasūlullah said, **‘Yes, (I did)’**, ‘Umar said, ‘O the Messenger of Allah! Please do not do this! I fear that those who hear this will put their trust in this and become slack in doing the (worships that are) farz and wâjib. Please leave them to themselves!’ So Rasūlullah stated, **‘All right, leave them!’** When due attention is paid, doesn’t this behaviour of ‘Umar’s mean to reject the commandment of Allāh and His Rasūl (Messenger)

‘sall-Allâhu ta’âlâ alaihi wasallam’? Isn’t this behaviour opposing the commandments? How could it ever be permissible to make such a person Khalîfa and to deliver Muslims’ matters into his hands?”

I answered: “This behaviour of hadrat ‘Umar’s does not mean to reject Rasûlullah’s command. Nor does it signify disobedience. He submits his opinion, his apprehension to Rasûlullah. His opinion will be either accepted or rejected, depending on Rasûlullah’s final, irrevokable commandment. By saying, ‘O the Messenger of Allah! I am ready to sacrifice my parents for you,’ which is a sign of utter courtesy, mildness, and deep reverence, he shows that he is ready to do his commandment anyway. Rasûlullah ‘sall-Allâhu alaihi wasallam’, on the other hand, does not rebuke hadrat ‘Umar on account of this behaviour of his, but, instead, he accepts his opinion, considering it useful for Muslims. He orders Abû Hureyra to **‘Leave the sandals, and do not say so!’**

This kind of behaviour is not peculiar to hadrat ‘Umar only. Most of the As-hâb-i-kirâm did similar things, and our master the Prophet accepted most of them. It is written in the books Bukhârî and Muslim that our master, Rasûlullah ‘sall-Allâhu alaihi wasallam’, stated, **‘Every person that comes to the world has a place allotted for him (or her) either in Paradise or in Hell.’** One of the audience said, ‘O the Messenger of Allah! Then, might we as well wait and go to the one where Allâhu ta’âlâ has allotted a place for us instead of worshipping?’ Our master Rasûlullah said to that person, **‘Do not give up your worships. For those who are to go to Paradise will be made to do the deeds that will take them to Paradise. And those who are to go to Hell will do what will lead to Hell.’** Then he recited the fifth âyat of Wel-leyli sûra. Hadrat ‘Umar’s statement is similar to this answer of Rasûlullah’s. In fact, hadrat ‘Umar made this statement relying on this hadîth-i-sherîf of Rasûlullah’s. That is, he meant to say, ‘O Rasûlallah ‘sall-Allâhu alaihi wasallam’! We have learned from you that it would not be right to give this kind of good news to the ignorant. I am afraid most of them may rely on the Kelima-i-shahâdat and neglect the worships that are farz and wâjib and slacken in their adherence to Islam.’ It was accepted (by the Prophet) that hadrat ‘Umar’s pure intention was only this and therefore his dissuasive request was welcomed.

Hadrat Alî ‘radiy-allâhu anh’ also made many such statements as this which could be considered irreverence. In fact, the group called Nawasib (a subdivision of Khârijiyya group) speak ill of

him on account of these statements. Abd-ul-Hamîd Nâjî attempted to belittle Imâm-i-Alî by quoting these statements with documents in his book. Alî bin Ahmad ibni Hazm (384-456 [A.D. 1064]; wrote some four hundred books), an Andalusian scholar, in his book (**Tafsîl**), and Sherîf Murtadâ, a Shiite scholar, in his book (**Tenzîh-ul-enbiyâ**), answered these (vilifications) and rebutted Nâjî. If you wish, I can give you many examples of these (answers).” The head Molla did not say anything. He shifted to another question:

6- “Is it fair for a person who calls himself the Emîr-ul-Mu’minîn to prohibit something which has been made halâl (permitted) by Allâhu ta’âlâ and His Messenger?”

“What is that?” I questioned.

He said, “ ’Umar prohibited the (Mut’a nikâh),^[1] which had been made halâl by Allah and His Messenger and which is declared in the Book (Qur’ân al-kerîm) and the Sunna (hadîth-i-sherîfs). If this is not opposing the commandment of Allâhu ta’âlâ, how can it be explained otherwise? Can such a person be called a Muslim? Can he be the Emîr-ul-Mu’minîn?”

I gave the following answer to the head Molla: “As is explained in the well-known book (**Musnad**) by Ibnî Mâja, a hadîth scholar, [Muhammad bin Yezîd was born in Qazvîn in 209, and passed away in 273 (A.D. 886). One of the six books of Hadîth is his book (**Sunan**)], ’Umar ‘radiy-Allâhu anh’, as he was the Khalîfa, said, ‘Fakr-i-’âlam ‘sall-Allâhu alaihi wasallam’ made the mut’a nikâh halâl (permitted) for us three times, and he made it harâm (forbidden) three times. Wallahi (I swear in the name of Allah), if I hear that a married person has confined a woman (in his house) by way of mut’a nikâh, I shall carry out Islam’s commandment by Rejm, that is, by having him stoned to death.’ This statement does not show that mut’a nikâh was forbidden by hadrat ’Umar. It shows that he would not permit mut’a nikâh as it had been forbidden by Rasûlullah. All the As-hâb-i-kirâm, with the exception of hadrat Abdullah ibni Abbâs, supported this statement of the Khalîfa’s. No one except him was opposed to this. And later on he, too, agreed, it thus being a unanimous decision of the As-hâb-i-kirâm. The book Bukhârî says in its report of a narration coming from hadrat Alî that, hadrat Alî said to Abdullah ibni Abbâs, ‘You are wrong. Our master the Fakhr-i-’âlam

[1] Nikâh means marriage contract as prescribed by Islam. Mut’a nikâh is a kind of temporary marriage practiced among Shiite Muslims.

prohibited mut'a nikâh.' Upon this statement of hadrat Alî's, Abdullah (ibni Abbas), too, agreed with this decision and admitted that mut'a nikâh had been made harâm afterwards.

(I went on), "Furthermore, Suleymân bin Ahmad Tabarânî, a great hadîth scholar, [who was born in Tabariyya in 260, and passed away in Isfahan in 360 (A.D. 971)], and Suleymân bin Dâwûd Tayâlisî, [who passed away in 202 (A.D. 817)], quote in their books Saïd bin Jubeyr as having said: I said to Abdullah ibni Abbâs, 'I could never say that mut'â nikâh was halâl. And you shouldn't have said it was halâl, either. Can you imagine the harm that will arise from saying so? When you say that it is permissible, it will spread everywhere and others will use this statement of yours as a document for the justification of mut'a nikâh.' Upon this Abdullah said, 'By saying so I did not mean that mut'a nikâh would always be halâl for everybody. I said it would be permissible only in case of indispensable necessity to prevent some harm which would otherwise be inevitable. I said so thinking that, inasmuch as Allâhu ta'âlâ gives permission to eat as much lesh,^[1] blood or pork as will eliminate harm in case of indispensable necessity, mut'a nikâh should be permissible (in case of strong necessity).' As will be understood from these explanations, that mut'a nikâh was always permissible for everybody was not Abdullah ibni Abbâs's opinion, either. His opinion was that it would be permissible to gratify some indispensable necessity which would otherwise be harmful, as is the case with all the things that are harâm. Abû Bekr Ahmad bin Huseyn Beyhekî [384-458 (A.D. 1067)], a Hadîth scholar, explains clearly that Abdullah ibni Abbâs 'radiy-Allâhu ta'âlâ anhumâ' changed his opinion. It is reported by Tabarânî and Beyhekî again that Abdullah ibni Abbâs said, 'Mut'a nikâh was halâl formerly. Yet it was made harâm after the revelation of the âyat-i-kerîma which purported, **'Your mothers are harâm for you.'** The âyat-i-kerîma that purports, **'Only your wives and the jâriyas that you have are halâl,'** in Mu'minûn sûra, emphasizes the fact that mut'a nikâh has been made harâm. For it is inferred from this âyat that only wives and jâriyas are halâl and others are harâm.'

"That mut'a nikâh was harâm has been reported by most of the As-hâb-i-kirâm including hadrat Alî. It is written in the book

[1] Kinds of meat Islam prohibits to consume are called lesh. They include putrifying meat as well as that of an animal killed not in the manner prescribed by Islam.

Bukhârî-i-sherîf that ‘hadrat Alî ‘radiy-Allâhu anh’ told Abdullah ibni Abbâs that Rasûlullah ‘sall-Allâhu alaihi wasallam’ prohibited mut’a nikâh and consumption of donkey flesh during the Holy War of Hayber.’ On the other hand, it is written in the book **(Muslim-i-sherîf)** and in Ibni Mâja’s book that our master the Prophet ‘sall-Allâhu ta’âlâ alaihi wasallam’ stated, **‘O Muslims! I gave you permission to marry women with mut’a nikâh. Yet now Allâhu ta’âlâ has made it harâm. If anyone has been keeping such a woman he should let her go and should not take back the property he has given her!’** Also, it is written in the books called **(Sahîh)** by Bukhârî and Muslim that ‘Our master Rasûlullah ‘sall-Allâhu alaihi wasallam’ made mut’a nikâh halâl three times. And he made it harâm three times.’ ”

I asked the head Molla, “Could a woman married by mut’a nikâh be an heiress to the man? And supposing this woman had children by this man; could these children inherit from their father?”

“No, they couldn’t,” was the head Molla’s answer.

“Then this woman is not a wife. Nor is she a jâriya. What would you say about the âyat-i-kerîma, **‘Believers keep away from women other than their wives and jâriyas?’** That is, this âyat-i-kerîma makes only the wife and the jâriya halâl. It states plainly that one cannot come together with any women except these two. Wouldn’t it mean to oppose this plain commandment of Qur’ân al-kerîm to assert that it would be halâl to cohabit with a woman who could be called neither a wife nor a jâriya and with whom one has made a (temporary marriage) contract called mut’a nikâh? And wouldn’t this in its turn mean to strive obstinately, intentionally, and vainly to deviate from the right way?

“Furthermore, you make such preposterous statements as could by no means be justified. For instance, one of your scholars, a man named Alî ibni l’âl, has written that it would be permissible for a woman to have sexual intercourse with twelve men in one night and that, in case she conceived, the child’s father would be determined by holding a lottery. What other turpitude or enmity could be more destructive than this to Islam?” This answer of mine petrified the head Molla. He thought for a long while. Hoping to escape the quandary, he asked another question:

7- “It is wâjib for everybody to obey the Khalîfa and to comply with all his commandments. And the person to be obeyed should in his turn be sinless, faultless. Besides, it is unanimously acknowledged by both sides, (by Shiite and Sunnite scholars), that

the imâm (religious leader) is an innocent person. Everyone with reason will say so, too. For imâm means (person who is obeyed). As a shirt which is worn is called ridâ, so a person who is obeyed is called imâm. If the imâm were expected to say or do something wrong, he could not be trusted; he would be expected to say or do something that would lead others to disasters and abysses and which would run counter to the commandments of Allâhu ta'âlâ. Since obedience to the imâm is a commandment of Allâhu ta'âlâ, fallibility of the imâm would mean that Allâhu ta'âlâ commanded (us) to obey something which might be wrong. And this, in its turn, would be something quite polar to reason and religion.”

I answered him as follows: “Your assertion that there is unanimity in the innocence and infallibility of the imâm and that this is Islam’s commandment, is an altogether wrong and depraved behaviour. For one thing, you Shi’îs do not cherish Ijmâ’ (unanimity of the As-hâb-i-kirâm). You say that Ijmâ’ cannot be a document to show Islam’s commandment. According to your belief, ijmâ’ is not a delîl-i-sher’î (a document in religious matters). For this reason, your argumentation based on ijmâ’ is at loggerheads with your credo, which is the basis of your belief. On the other hand, if by ‘unanimity’ you mean that the Shi’îs also agreed in this belief, this time all the ijmâ’s before the appearing of the Imâmiyya group should have been untenable, wrong. In addition, since there was nothing in the name of Shi’ism by the time hadrat Alî ‘kerrem-Allâhu ta’âlâ wejheh’ was elected the Khalîfa, the unanimity that effected this election should have been corrupt, wrong, which in turn means that he should have been made the Khalîfa unjustly. For the caliphate of hadrat Muâwiya was recognized by hadrat Hasan and all the other Muslims including the Shi’î group. Yes, (imâm) means the person who is obeyed. Yet there is no document stating that he has to be innocent or infallible. Any evidence put forward to prove this assertion would be easily refuted by the following five antitheses:

I. It is wâjib^[1] only to obey the commands of an Emîr (Ruler, leader of Muslims) or a hâkim (Muslim judge). It is not necessary for a person who is obeyed to be infallible in whatever he does.

II. According to the Shi’î group, a muftî is not innocent, that is,

[1] Commandments that are plainly stated in Qur’ân al-kerîm are called **Fard**, or **Fardh**, (pl. Farâidh). If it has not been stated clearly whether something is a commandment, it is called **Wâjib**. In other words, a wâjib is a kind of commandment next to fard in importance.

infallible. Yet it is wâjib for everybody to comply with the commands of the muftî.

III. A hâkim (judge) will accept as a witness anyone who is considered to be impartial. A witness on whose evidence the judge bases his verdict is not necessarily an infallible person.

IV. A slave has to obey all his owner's commands unless they are harâm (deeds, actions, statements, behaviours forbidden by Islam). Yet this does not necessarily mean that his owner is sinless.

V. Throughout the namâz,^[1] those in the jamâ'at have to follow the imâm. Even if the imâm performs this namâz for some worldly advantage or makes the rukû' (bowing posture in namâz) and the sajda (prostration in namâz) for someone (or something) else rather than for Allah's sake, the jamâ'at will still have to follow him.

Thus the people who are obeyed and followed in these five instances are not necessarily sinless people." Upon this, the head Molla began to talk:

"We did not consider these meanings of obeying or following. We considered its meaning pertaining to the obedience that could be said of obedience to things with a certain degree of strength. The strongest of them is our master Rasûlullah's saying, '**Am I not ewlâ** (better, more valuable) **to you than your life is?**', to those who were around him. When they said, 'Yes, (you are), o the Messenger of Allah,' he (Rasûlullah) stated, '**Then, for whoever I am the mawlâ, Alî, too, must be his mawlâ.**' Therefore, obedience (in this context) means to make (someone) your master. Even if we were to take it in its general meaning as in the five items you have just stated, it would still not be as you think it is. Yes, it is wâjib to obey commanders and judges, yet (it is wâjib to obey) only those who have been appointed by the sinless imâm, [that is, by the Khalîfa]. It is not wâjib to obey those who are not so. The Shi'îs' saying that muftîs are to be obeyed is not intended to mean obedience to the muftis themselves. This obedience originates from the fact that they have been appointed by the sinless imâm

[1] Islam's most important commandment is the namâz, which is performed five times daily and in a manner prescribed by Islam. When a group of Muslims perform namâz together, one of them leads, conducts the prayer, and the others follow his actions. The person who conducts the namâz is called **imâm**, and the Muslims who imitate his movements are called **jamâ'at**.

(the Khalîfa). Since they are his representatives, their command is the imâm's command. However, it is not necessary to obey their own commands.

“As for obeying others; it is necessary to obey them only when their commands are permitted (by Islam), because this obedience has been commanded by Allah. However, obeying the imâm, [that is, the Khalîfa], is more general than the abovementioned examples. It therefore cannot be compared to them.”

My answer was as follows: “Obeying or following does not harbour doubt. This word is one of those words called *mutawâtî*. [What *mutawâtî* means is explained in full detail in the fourth chapter of the second part of the (Turkish) book (**Se'âdet-i Ebediyye**)^[1]. For obedience means for the follower to follow the one whom he obeys. If a person follows a superior person, the follower is called (*tâbi'*), and that superior person is called (*metbû'*). This act of following varies, depending on the degree and the duration of obedience, but the essence of the act of following will not change with the increase or decrease in the degree or the duration of obedience. In other words, its essential attribute called *mutawâtî* will not change. For it is stated unanimously by the scholars of *Usûl* and by others that the difference that causes **teshqiğ** is the difference in the essence of the matter. This difference is not based on time or amount. [**Teshqiğ** is explained detailedly in the (Turkish) book (**Se'âdet-i Ebediyye**)^[2]].

(I went on), “If you infer the meaning of (*iqtidâ*) from the word ‘following’, this, again, is *mutawâtî*. For *iqtidâ* means to follow in

[1] *Se'âdet-i Ebediyye* (Endless Bliss) has been partly translated into English and published in fascicles. For those who have not had the chance to read that book, we shall make a brief definition of the word *mutawâtî*: it is an attribute commonly and equally shared by all the members of a species. Like the attributes, or characteristics, of being human or animal. The highest of mankind and the lowest man are equal in being human. For instance, there is no difference between a Prophet and a disbeliever in being human.

[2] As it is explained in the book (**Se'âdet-i-Ebediyye**), **Musheqqiq** means an attribute, a quality, a characteristic which does not exist in equal amounts in all the members of a species. An example of this is knowledge, which is possessed in different amounts by learned people. The word **teshqiğ**, used in the text, is the noun form of the adjective **musheqqiq**. Please see *Endless Bliss*, Second Fascicle, Chapter 4, *Explanation of Wisdom*.

everything. If the (following) person does something by himself, be it something important or quite insignificant, he will not have done iqtidâ. Following only in one respect may be said to be iqtidâ in itself; yet the person (who has done so) cannot be said to have fulfilled iqtidâ in its full sense. Hence, your thesis, ‘the person followed is loved very much by the follower’, which is the center of gravity in your argument, is idle; it is like a rowing exercise. For this does not mean ‘following’ at all. Nor does the meaning you have stated have anything to do with the optional love that is commanded by Islam and which is similar to the love we should have for our master Rasûlullah as it is stated in the hadîth-i-sherîf, **‘Unless one of you loves me more than loving himself and his child(ren) and his parents and all other people, he shall not have had îmân in its full sense.’** You mistook the love stated in this hadîth-i-sherîf for choosing the Khalîfa and compared the Khalîfas to our master Rasûlullah; this comparison is vain from all points of view.” The head Molla was silent. Then he shifted to another subject.

8- He said, “It is a widely known fact that our master Rasûlullah was very compassionate over his Ummat (Muslims) and that he tried to protect their rights and peace. It is not even necessary to say this. It is due to this compassion of his that when he left the city of Medina and went to another city, he would appoint someone to take his place in his absence. While this is the case, how could it ever be possible for him not to have appointed an imâm, a representative to conduct the businesses of this Ummat and to meet the needs of all these people who have reached millions in number after his death, and to have left them uncontrolled till the end of the world? On the other hand, as it is understood from the Khutba called (Ghadîr-i-Hum), which is written in your sahîh (acceptable, authentic) books, and from other reports, Rasûlullah ‘sall-Allâhu alaihi wasallam’ appointed hadrat Alî to take his place after his death both by making clear statements and by implications. As a matter of fact, because it was wâjib for Rabb-ul-’âlamîn to appoint an imâm, towards his death he wanted to make a written will in order to carry out this important task and to prevent the obstinate from evading this task. He asked for a pen and some paper. ‘Umar, who was one of the audience, dissuaded him by treating the Messenger of Allah with such an insulting and abhorring statement as could not be made by vulgar people.” [Hum is the name of a well situated outside Mekka. Ghadîr-i-Hum is the name of a place that is near this well

and somewhere between Mekka and Medina].

I answered, “Your saying that ‘it was wâjib (compulsory, necessary) for Rabb-ul-’âlamîn to appoint an imâm’, is identical with the Mu’tazila group’s thesis that ‘it is wâjib for Allâhu ta’âlâ to do things, not doing which would run counter to the hikmat (ultimate divine wisdom of Allâhu ta’âlâ).’ This statement of yours is corrupt, wrong. For we know that, though all the deeds of Allâhu ta’âlâ are suitable with hikmat and always useful, it cannot be wâjib for Allâhu ta’âlâ to do something because it seems to be suitable with hikmat and useful. The Koranic verse which purports, **‘He cannot be questioned on what He has done. His born slaves shall be questioned on what they have done,’** shows clearly that your statement is wrong. If it were wâjib for Allâhu ta’âlâ to appoint an imâm, humanity would necessarily never have been without an imâm. It is a must for the imâm to be known by everybody, to have strength and power, to possess qualifications of an imâm, to be able to extirpate evil deeds and offensive customs, to effect good deeds, and to protect Muslims from harms. While asserting that the earth cannot be without an imâm and nominating only a certain number of innocent people including hadrat Alî for the position, you on the one hand presume that it is wâjib for Allâhu ta’âlâ to make them imâm, and on the other hand maintain that none of them has the qualifications of an imâm. You state that they all lived in a state of weakness, incapability, trouble and oppression, without being able to do anything or have any effect. What kind of use or hikmat could be expected from making imâm such an incompetent person who has to submit to others’ power so incapacitantly?

“This stubborn insistence of yours means to make Allâhu ta’âlâ weak and incapable – may Allâhu ta’âlâ protect us against such a belief! For, (according to your thesis), He has been unable to do something. Allâhu ta’âlâ is far and free from such suppositions.

“Another way to refute your thesis is this: Is being suitable with hikmat or being useful always necessary or not? If you say that being suitable with hikmat is not always good, you will have agreed with us. In that case we may say that the hikmats you have cited above did not exist at the time when Rasûlullah ‘sall-Allâhu alaihi wasallam’ was about to pass away. For when it is said that existence of hikmats makes no difference, their existence cannot be better than a situation in which they do not exist. On the other hand, if you say that existence of hikmats is better, this time these

hikmats should exist either in Allâhu ta'âlâ Himself or elsewhere. If they do not exist in Him, then something other than Allâhu ta'âlâ will have compelled Allâhu ta'âlâ; which is impossible. If hikmats are (supposed to be) in Allâhu ta'âlâ, this time some creatures will have settled in Allâhu ta'âlâ; and this is quite impossible.

“As it is seen, your saying that it is wâjib for Allâhu ta'âlâ to appoint an imâm is an altogether wrong and nonsensical statement. Yes, as the Ahl-i-Haqq, or the Ahl-as-sunnat (scholars) state, men need an imâm, a president for the protection of Islam, for the chastisement of offenders, for the protection and restitution of rights, and for the execution of (the very important tasks of) emr-i-ma'rûf and nehy-i-anilmunker (advising and motivating people to do the commandments of Islam and warning them against doing its prohibitions and dissuading them from doing them); it therefore is wâjib for us to have an imâm, a president. Yet it is not wâjib for Allâhu ta'âlâ to appoint one. For this reason, when our Prophet ‘sall-Allâhu alaihi wassalâm’ passed away the As-hâb-i-kirâm ‘alaihimur-ridwân’ came together and unanimously elected Abû Bekr as-Siddîq ‘radiy-Allâhu anh’ as their imâm. Thus the Islamic religion was protected against a disturbance.

(I went on), “According to the Mu'tazila group, the important thing is whether mind finds something beautiful or ugly. They leave it to mind to judge what things Allâhu ta'âlâ has created are beautiful and which of them are ugly. They say that Allâhu ta'âlâ has to create the ones that are found beautiful. No assertion could be so loathsome or so corrupt as saying that Allâhu ta'âlâ has to create the things which the human mind finds beautiful. Your assertion is similar to this. As it has been explained in detail, Allâhu ta'âlâ creates whatever He wishes (to create). He does not have to create anything. All the things He has wished (to create) are suitable with hikmat and useful. None of them is ugly. According to the Mu'tazila group, wâjib means an obligation which necessitates punishment when neglected. Accordingly, if a person could not be blamed for not doing something, it could not be said to be (wâjib for him to do). To say that Allâhu ta'âlâ has to create a certain thing would mean to say that it will be necessary to censure Him, to punish Him if He does not create it. And this in its turn would mean that Jenâb-i-Haqq (Allâhu ta'âlâ) is defective and imperfect and will become perfect and escape punishment only if He creates it. No other defiance a person

might insolently perpetrate towards Allâhu ta'âlâ could be more daring than this and no other statement contrary to His Attributes of perfection could be more repugnant. This sordid statement of yours could be refuted by many other answers as well. This statement of yours means to compare the Creator to His creatures, to apply the same criterion as we assess them with. And this, in its turn, is by no means possible. Allâhu ta'âlâ is not like anything, nor is anything like Him in any respect. Furthermore, if it were wâjib for Allâhu ta'âlâ to keep a sinless imâm, then it would be wâjib for Him to send a Prophet in every century, to keep a sinless imâm in every city, and to make every Ruler just and true. Yes, any person, whether he is good or bad, would not like to see an environment where Allâhu ta'âlâ has left His born slaves to themselves without a guide or an imâm and where they lead an ignorant and aberrant life tumbling in darkness.

“To this end, Allâhu ta'âlâ has revealed a book that will guide to happiness and peace and endowed man with enough mental capacity to apprehend its value. If you say that Allâhu ta'âlâ has always sent the sinless imâm, the owner of the time and entrusted the management of His born slaves' affairs into his hands, this will be another senseless and ridiculous assertion. Aside from the farcicality that this sinless imâm should have stayed alive throughout these thousand years during which all his children, grandchildren and kith and kin have died, how could he have been useful by remaining secret despite the increased number of Shiites, instead of coming forward to guide people to the right way, to awaken them from unawareness, and to promulgate Islam? How could he be said to have had such duties as guiding all people to the right way, making rights reach their owners, and many others? What else could be as eccentric and as devious as such a belief? If Allâhu ta'âlâ does not endow a person with the right way, no one can guide him to the right way.

“As all these facts show, Allâhu ta'âlâ does not have to do, or not to do, anything. As is written in your book (**Nehj-ul-balâgha**), hadrat Alî 'radiy-Allâhu anh' stated this fact plainly in the khutba he made during the combat of Siffin. He said, ‘Since I manage your affairs, I have rights on you. And you in turn have rights on me and on one another. When there are rights that a person owe to others, there will also be rights owed to him. Allâhu ta'âlâ is the only being who does not owe any rights though there are rights owed to Him. For He can do everything. Everything He does has

justice. The right that Allâhu ta'âlâ has on His born slaves is their worshipping Him, obeying Him. Being kind, He gives thawâb (rewards) in return for this.' If you pay attention to this khutba, you will see that your statements contradict hadrat Alî's statements.

"Your statement that our master Rasûlullah 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wasallam' enjoined that hadrat Alî should be made the Khalîfa, is wrong, too. Alongside the farz (Islam's commandments), the As-hâb-i-kirâm had to do Rasûlullah's commandments as well. Your statement comes to mean that they neglected this duty of theirs by concealing this commandment of Rasûlullah's. On the other hand, it is out of the question for such a great number of people to have agreed on wrongdoing. Moreover, contradicting the hadîth-i-sherîfs, your statement cannot be correct.

(I went on), "It was declared as follows in a hadîth-i-sherîf, which has been reported from Enes bin Mâlik by Ibni Ebî Âsim and Elqâ'î, two Shiite scholars: **'Allâhu ta'âlâ has protected my Ummat from making an agreement on aberration.'** It was declared in another hadîth-i-sherîf, reported by the hadîth scholar Hâkim Uyayna 'rahmatullâhi ta'âlâ aleyh' [who was born in Kûfa in 107 and passed away in Mekka in 198 (A.D. 813)]: **'Allâhu ta'âlâ will not bring this Ummat together on heresy.'** And the word **'hand'** in the hadîth-i-sherîf, **'Allah's hand is with the jamâ'at** (congregation of muslims)', means 'power', 'help'. As is shown by these hadîth-i-sherîfs and many other hadîth-i-sherîfs similar to these, the Ummat-i-Muhammadiyya (Muslims) can never form a unanimity in aberration. To say otherwise would mean to deny these hadîth-i-sherîfs.

"You allege that our master, Rasûlullah 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wasallam', asked for a pen and paper in order to make a written will. This last statement of yours belies your former allegation on the (Ghadîr-i-Hum) khutba. If he had delivered such an injunction, he would consider it unnecessary to make a written will in addition. This comes to mean that the (written) will which you allege Rasûlullah wanted to make during the khutba he made at the place called Ghadîr-i-Hum, is a pure invention. The truth is that all the As-hâb-i-kirâm 'radiy-Allâhu ta'âlâ anhum ajma'in', including hadrat Alî and all the Sons of Hâshim, unanimously elected hadrat Abû Bekr the Khalîfa. This unanimity proves in the light of the above-mentioned hadîth-i-sherîfs that his caliphate was rightly-guided and that your statements are null and void. If there had been such a will; during the caliphates of the other three, (i.e.

hadrat Abû Bekr and 'Umar and 'Uthmân), who in that case would have wronged hadrat Alî, he would demand that they give him his right back, and would take action against them if otherwise. As a matter of fact, when (later) he was elected the Khalîfa he drew his sword and fought against those who disobeyed him, as it was Islam's commandment (for the Khalîfa) to manage religious and worldly affairs. As we all know, he made wars that cost devastation to numerous cities and bloodshed to thousands of Muslims. A powerful and honourable person who was so harsh with those who would not obey him is now alleged to have remained silent though he saw he was forcefully debarred from the right vested to him by Islam and to have joined the jury to decide on the question of who the right was to be given; is this believable at all?

(I went on), "If it is claimed, as is alleged in the Shiite book, that hadrat Alî 'radiy-Allâhu anh' gave up demanding justice unwillingly because he did not have enough men to support him, (may Allâhu ta'âlâ protect us from saying so), he will have neglected the commandment of Allâhu ta'âlâ and disobeyed Him because he was afraid to fulfil the requirements of the task assigned to him by Allâhu ta'âlâ and His Messenger. It is a universally known fact, however, that hadrat Alî 'kerrem-Allâhu wejheh', who was Rasûlullah's 'sall-Allâhu ta'âlâ alaihi wasallam' paternal first cousin and son-in-law and the lion of Allah, would have rather faced the risk of death than let anyone smear him with such a shameful and humiliating stigma as cowardice, no matter whoever his opponent might be, be it anyone from all over the world, let alone from Arabia only. So you think such a base and ugly act would be worthy of the Emîr-ul-Mu'minîn hadrat Alî 'kerrem-Allâhu wejheh', who was a master of ours. This statement of yours directs hostility towards him, rather than expressing your love of him. I therefore deem it a debt for my part to consider that exalted imâm to be far and pure from such a defect as well as from all other sorts of doubt and defect, and to state this fact here.

(I continued), "Also, your statement that when Rasûlullah 'sall-Allâhu ta'âlâ alaihi wa sallam' asked for a pen and paper in order to write a will 'Umar 'radiy-Allâhu anh' dissuaded him, is untrue, since there is not enough authentic evidence to prove that this exalted person (hadrat 'Umar) would have exhibited such behaviour. For Abdullah ibni Abbâs says, as is narrated in the Meghâzî section of the book Bukhârî: It was Thursday, when our

master Rasûlullah's 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wasallam' illness became graver. He stated, **'Fetch me (some) paper! I shall write a book; so that after me you should never leave the right way.'** The people being there began to talk. He (the Prophet) stated, **'It is not suitable to talk aloud in the presence of the Prophet.'** It was asked (someone asked) 'Is he in a delirium? Ask him.' Again, Abdullah reported: Rasûlullah 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wasallam' was ill. There were a few of us with him. He stated, **'I shall write a book for you; so that after me you should not leave the right way.'** Some of us said, 'His pains have augmented. We have the Qur'ân al-kerîm with us. The Book of Allah will be enough for us.' We could not come to an agreement. Some of us said, 'Let us bring (some paper). Let him write it so that we shall not lose our way later.' Others stated other things. Different statements were on the increase, when he (the Prophet) stated, **'Stand up!'**

“So, as it is reported in **(Bukhârî)**, our second most valuable and dependable book after Qur'ân al-kerîm on the earth, the so-called objection was not raised by a certain person. A few people wondered whether it should be better not to do what was asked. For Bukhârî's account of the event is in plural form, 'They said,' which indicates that those who reacted were more than one. It would be wrong to attempt to use this event as a ground for reproaching hadrat 'Umar 'radiy-Allâhu anh' only. If there were people to be blamed in this event, all the people present there would equally share the supposed blameworthiness. Alî and Abbâs 'radiy-Allâhu anhumâ' were among them. Therefore, they, too, would be reproached. Now, on whatever grounds the Shiites would defend hadrat Alî and Abbâs, we would like to suggest the same reasons to defend hadrat 'Umar.

(I continued), “The scholars of Hadîth give varying accounts of the khutba that was made at Ghadîr-i-Hum. Be it as it may, this khutba does not support your thesis. In addition, your allegation that the seventieth âyat-i-kerîma of Mâida sûra which purported, **'Communicate the commandments that thine Rabb (Allah) hath revealed down to thee! Otherwise, thou will have neglected thine duty as the Prophet. Allâhu ta'âlâ shallst protect thee from (other) people,'** was revealed at Ghadîr-i-Hum, is wrong. For this allegation of yours gives the impression that Rasûlullah 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wasallam' did not communicate the commandments of Allâhu ta'âlâ to his As-hâb (may Allâhu ta'âlâ protect us from saying so)! In this case, it would come to mean that, as he did not want to communicate this commandment and

therefore requested Jebrâil (Gabriel) ‘alaihi-salâm’ to ask Allâhu ta’âlâ to excuse him through this khutba, he should have abstained from doing this commandment for fear of his As-hâb. There is no doubt as to the fact that our master, the Messenger of Allah ‘sall-Allâhu alaihi wasallam’, was innocent of things of this sort.

“Our second evidence is that (your allegation implies that) Allâhu ta’âlâ had not protected Rasûlullah ‘sall-Allâhu ta’âlâ alaihi wasallam’ against other people until this khutba, which he made sometime towards his death. On the other hand, it had been known a long time before this khutba of his that Allâhu ta’âlâ had been protecting him. Then, your allegation is wrong because it is contradictory to a known fact.

“As a third proof we say that (your allegation bears the meaning that) Allah’s Messenger ‘sall-Allâhu ta’âlâ alaihi wa sallam’ had been afraid of disbelievers until that day, and that he was afraid of the As-hâb-i-kirâm as well. On the other hand, it is a known fact reported through various narratives that the As-hâb-i-kirâm ‘alaihimur-ridwân’, our masters, never hesitated to sacrifice their own lives and their parents for Rasûlullah’s sake. It would be paradoxical both with reason and with Islam’s teachings to suppose that they might have come together to make a threat to Allah’s Messenger. Since it is known how fearlessly, how valiantly our master Rasûlullah endeavoured to promulgate Islam obeying the âyat-i-kerîma which commanded, **‘Teach (people) (the things) that have been commanded!’**, in the beginning, when he was so lonely and his adversaries and the unbelievers of Qoureish were so merciless; it would be a very ugly, an exceedingly abominable slander obnoxiously offensive to that respectable Prophet embellished with superior attributes to say that he was afraid to communicate Allah’s commandments during the event of Ghadîr, after Mekka had been conquered, the number of people coming in large groups from all directions and becoming Muslims had increased, all those heroic people called the Sons of Hâshim and the Sons of Abd-ul-muttalib had become Muslims, the sûra of (Izâjâeh) had been revealed to give the glad tidings of (new) conquests and victories, and at such a place where the Muhâjirs^[1]

[1] Those Meccan Muslims who left their hometown and migrated to Medina with the Messenger of Allah. This migration of the Prophet is called Hijrat (Hegira) and is accepted as the beginning of the Muslim Era.

and the Ensârs^[1] and the Sons of Hâshim were an absolute majority. Especially, to say that he was afraid of the As-hâb-i-kirâm would mean to deny the hundred and tenth âyat-i-kerîma of Âl-i-'Imrân sûra, which purports, **'You are the most beneficent of ummats. You are the select of people.'** It could by no means be justifiable.

“Fourthly, (your allegation means that) our master, Rasûlullah 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wasallam', after disobeying Allâhu ta'âlâ in communicating His commandments to his As-hâb, came to Medina and, becoming ill, appointed hadrat Abû Bekr to take his place as the imâm for a couple of days, thus ignoring the commandment of Allâhu ta'âlâ a second time by leaving hadrat Alî behind although, according to your claim, Allahu ta'âlâ had commanded him to appoint hadrat Alî as the imâm. Inasmuch as he (Rasûlullah) appointed Abû Bekr the imâm after having been commanded through the âyat-i-kerîma (supposed to have been) revealed at Ghadîr-i-Hum that he should tell his As-hâb to make hadrat Alî the imâm (after him), this âyat must have been revealed not at the so-called place as they suppose, but at (the place called) Arafa, and its revelation was intended not for the As-hâb-i-kirâm, but for the polytheists of Qoureish, as is unanimously stated by great scholars. If Rasûlullah 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wasallam' had known that hadrat Alî were to be the first Khalîfa, he would certainly have stated it. There was no reason to be afraid to state it. Because all the Meccans, particularly the Sons of Abd-ul-muttalib were kith and kin to him, they would have been happy and no one would have suffered any fear or harm.

“Aside from all these facts, when the shallow and mediocre phraseology used in this khutba is studied with a critical, unbiased, impartial and reasonable eye free from recalcitrance, it is impossible that these statements should have been uttered by an average person aware of the Arabic literature, nonetheless by the blessed mouth of that Prophet, who was unique in eloquence and rhetoric. This means to say that all these statements are lies fabricated by outsiders. Even if the statement, **'Then, for whoever I am the mawlâ, Alî, too, must be his mawlâ,'** which is one of these statements, were a (true) hadîth-i-sherîf, it would not signify that hadrat Alî were to be the (first) imâm. For the word 'mawlâ' has

[1] Muslims who lived in Medina during the Hegira and hosted the Muhâjirs.

many different meanings. Twenty of these meanings are written in (the Arabic lexicon called) **Qâmûs**. In what meaning a word of this sort is used (in a certain text) should be indicated by means of a special sign, denotation or connotation. It would be wrong to interpret it without such a sign. It is not certain whether it would be correct to give it all or some of its meanings; yet most (scholars) have said that it would be wrong. Supposing for acquiescence's sake we said it would be correct. We agree with you in giving the meanings 'lover' and 'helper' to the word 'mawlâ'. Yet we do not consider it appropriate to give other meanings. In such cases, it is better to give meanings agreed on. It is for this reason that Abd-ul-ghâfir bin Ismâil Fâris (451-529 [A.D. 1135]; in Nishâpur), in his explanation of the word (welfî) in his book (**Mejma'ul-gharâib**), quotes this hadîth-i-sherîf as, **'If a person loves me and knows me as his helper, he should know Alî as his helper, too!'** When the matter is pondered over carefully, it will be seen that this hadîth does not signify better fitness for caliphate, or superiority at all. For it would not be correct to explain the word 'welfî' as 'awlâ', neither lexically nor from the Islamic point of view. That it would not be Islamic is plain. As for its lexical aspect; words belonging to the (mef'al) category have never been used in the (ef'al) category (in Arabic)." Upon this the head Molla said:

"Abû Zeyd, a scholar of lexicon, states that they are used in the Tafsîr of Abû Ubayda. And he interpretes the expression '(He) is your mawlâ' as '(He) is more suitable for you.' "

I said, "His statement cannot be a document. For none of the Arabic scholars has approved this statement of his. If they were synonymous expressions, it would not be wrong to say, 'So and so is mawlâ (a helper, a lover) for you,' instead of saying, 'So and so is ewlâ (better, more suitable) for you.' However, they (scholars of lexicon) have said that it would never be correct. Abû Ubayda's statement is refuted by other ways as well. We have seen that the word 'ewlâ' cannot be used instead of 'mawlâ'. Supposing we were to say it could be used, it still could not be used to mean 'to have', 'to use'. Possibly, 'ewlâ' means 'more suitable for respect and love'. Even if it were admitted that it meant 'to use', it would be disagreeable with the meaning of the âyat-i-kerîma. Could the word 'ewlâ' in the sixty-eighth âyat of Âl-i-'Imrân sûra, which purports, **'To Ibrâhîm the ewlâ of people,'** be said to mean 'to use (Ibrâhîm 'alaihi-salâm)'? 'Ewlâ' in this context could mean 'more suitable to love him' for the very most.

“Furthermore, the word (Wâli) used at the end of the hadîth-i-sherîf means (to love). If it meant ‘being more suitable to be used, with respect to Rasûlullah,’ then he (Rasûlullah) would have said, ‘Whoever is more suitable for being used.’ Since he did not say so, it (the expression used in the hadîth-i-sherîf) means, ‘to love hadrat Alî and to avoid hostility against him,’ and not ‘to be suitable for being used.’ In fact, Abû Nu’aym Ahmad bin Abdullah ‘rahima-hullâhu ta’âlâ’, [who passed away in Isfahan in 430], reports from Hasan, the son of hadrat Hasan: Hasan was asked about this. They said, ‘Does the hadîth-i-sherîf (**... for whoever I am the mawlâ, ...**) show that hadrat Alî must be the (first) Khalîfa?’ His answer was that ‘If Rasûlullah ‘sall-Allâhu alaihi wasallam’ had meant to say by this hadîth-i-sherîf that hadrat Alî must be the (first) Khalîfa, he would have stated, ‘O men! This person is the walî of my duties (my trustee who will take over my duties). He is to be the Khalîfa after me. Hear and obey (this)!’ I swear by the name of Allâhu ta’âlâ that if Allâhu ta’âlâ and His Messenger ‘sall-Allâhu alaihi wa sallam’ had wished that Alî be the (first) Khalîfa, then Alî would have disobeyed Allâhu ta’âlâ by not trying to carry out His commandment in this respect, which would in its turn have been a very grave sin.’ When one of the listeners said, ‘Why, didn’t our Prophet say, (**For whoever I am the mawlâ, Alî, too, must be his mawlâ**)?’, Hasan said, ‘No. Wallahi (I swear by the name of Allah that), if Rasûlullah had wished Alî to be the (first) Khalîfa, he would have commanded this as clearly as he commanded (Muslims) to perform the namâz and to fast.’ So these statements of Hasan, an outstanding member of the Ahl-i-beyt and a grandson of hadrat Alî, reveals clearly that your statements are wrong and corrupt.” The head Molla was silent. Then he changed course:

9- “What will you say about the hadîth-i-sherîfs pointing out the fact that on the Judgement Day every Muslim will be questioned on whether he loved Alî and his children as well as on (his behaviour on) matters pertaining to this world and the Hereafter? For Alî bin Muhammad ibni Sabbâgh-i-Mâlikî, (who passed away in 855 [A.D. 1451]), in his book (**Fusûl-ul-muhimma**), derives from the book Al-manâqib and quotes Ibn-il-Muayyad as having said: Abû Burayda reports: One day I was sitting in Rasûlullah’s presence. Our master Rasûlullah stated, ‘**I swear by Allâhu ta’âlâ, whose power holds my soul, that on the Judgement Day the first (set of) questions human beings will be**

asked are: How did you spend your lifetime? What did you wear out your body doing? Where did you earn your property, and where did you give it? Did you love My Messenger?’ Hadrat ‘Umar, who was by my side, said, ‘What is the token of loving you, O the Messenger of Allah?’ He (Rasûlullah) put his blessed hand on the head of hadrat Alî, who was sitting by his side, and declared, **‘Loving me is loving this (person) after me.’** As is written in, again, the same book, hadrat Alî said, ‘Wallahi (I swear by the name of Allah that) our master, Nebiyy-i-ummî ‘sall-Allâhu alaihi wa sallam’, stated that those who loved me were Believers and those who did not love me were hypocrites.’ So, don’t you think a person about whose love everybody will be questioned on the Judgement Day must be more virtuous than others and he and his offspring are more rightful to caliphate than others are?’”

I answered, “Ibni Sabbâgh, whom you call ‘Mâlikî’, is not in the Madh-hab of Mâlikî.^[1] His books and writings show that he is in the madh-hab of Shi‘î. It is a fact stated by all scholars that Ibni Muayyad, notorious with his nickname ‘Firewood of Hârezm’, is a Shiite, too. Besides, there is no need to look for other documents. Some Shiites change hadîth-i-sherîfs and give them the name of a great scholar of hadîth. They try to mislead Muslims with such lies. It is obvious that a person who changes and misrepresents a hadîth-i-sherîf which is written in its true form in books, must be a liar. Here, the true form of this hadîth-i-sherîf is quoted as follows by Imâm-i-Muhammad bin Îsâ Tirmuzî, (who was born in 209 and passed away in 279 [A.D. 892]): **‘Man will be questioned on four things. He will be asked how he spent his life time; what he did with his knowledge; where he earned his property; how he wore away his body.’** Tabarânî, too, quotes this hadîth-i-sherîf; yet the final clause reads as follows: ‘how he spent his youth.’ So the true form of this hadîth-i-sherîf is quoted as such. Love for the Ahl-i-Bayt^[2] or the name of hadrat ‘Umar is not mentioned in it. This comes to mean that Ibni Sabbâgh and Ibni Muayyad were liars. Nevertheless, it would have nothing to do with caliphate. Even if we were to accept the misrepresented form of the hadîth-i-sherîf as

[1] One of the four right and authentic groups of Sunnî Muslims. The other three are the Madh-habs that are called Hanafî, Shâfi‘î, and Hanbalî.

[2] The Prophet’s immediate relatives: hadrat Alî, his son-in-law and paternal first cousin; hadrat Fâtima, his daughter; hadrat Hasan and Huseyn, his grandsons.

true, it would signify love for the Ahl-i-Bayt at the very most. The Sunnî Madh-hab also commands us to love all the members of Ahl-i-Bayt, every one of them with a love symmetrical with the position they occupy, being neither too frugal nor too inordinate in this respect. Being Sunnî requires loving the Ahl-i-Bayt in a manner suitable for their honour. But you make statements contrary to Islam in order to wage loving them; a person with the least î mân in his heart could not make such statements. You say, for one, 'If a person loves Alî, no wrongdoing will harm him.' Likewise, some of you fabricate hadîths. For instance, could we ever believe a person who slanders our master the Prophet by saying that he (the Prophet) said, 'Alî's Shî'a (group) shall not be questioned on the Judgement Day, neither on venial sins, nor on grave ones. Their evils shall be changed into goodnesses'? Ibnî Bâbawayh fabricates a hadîth in which he quotes Ibnî Abbâs as having said that our master the Prophet stated, 'Allah will not burn Alî's lovers in Hell.' Another hadîth which they fabricate in order to mislead others is, 'A person who loves Alî shall enter Paradise, even if he is a Jew or a Christian.' Isn't it injustice to slander our master Rasûlullah 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wa sallam' by fabricating such statements in the name of hadîth?

[The real name of Abû Ja'fer bin Bâbawayh is Muhammad bin Alî. He is one of the four renowned men of Fiqh and Tafsîr in the Shiite group. He has a book of Tafsîr and a book of Fiqh, which is highly esteemed by the Imâmiyya group (the Imamites). He was born in Khorasan, and died in 381 (A.D. 991)].

"Calumniation is neither Islamic nor reasonable. Allâhu ta'âlâ declares in the hundred and twenty-second âyat of Nisâ sûra, '**The wrongdoer shall be punished.**' The last âyat of Zilzâl sûra purports, '**He who does the smallest evil shall pay for it.**' The unfounded slanders run counter to these âyat-i-kerîmas.

"Furthermore, it is a worship to love the Ahl-i-Bayt. And this, in its turn, depends first and foremost on having î mân, as is the case with all types of worship. The ninety-fourth âyat of Enbiyâ sûra purports, '**The good deeds performed by the Believer...**'. It is not Islamic to say that people who have not attained the honour of î mân, e.g. Jews and Christians, will enter Paradise only by loving the Ahl-i-Bayt, or to believe that love of these people will change venial and grave sins into goodnesses and thawâb. It is written in the Shiite books that our master Alî 'kerrem-Allâhu wejheh' would always give the following advice to his Ahl-i-Bayt: 'Do not rely on your ancestors! Keep up with your worships and prayers!

Do not swerve from doing the commandments of Allâhu ta'âlâ in the slightest degree!' The statements you have made are of no value because they contradict this advice of hadrat Alî's and many other reports. Inasmuch as attainment of happiness in this world and in the Hereafter and the orderliness of worldly matters are dependent on dissuading and deterring people from committing sins and prohibitions, it is entirely paradoxical to say that 'sins will change into thawâb.' This statement will incite malevolent people and even Shiites to doing evils, sins and atrocities, which in its turn will demolish Islam. It is obvious that a person with a certain mental capacity will, let alone believing such statements, not even turn to look at them."

After these words of mine, the people who attended the meeting proposed that the questions already prepared be asked and answered. But some of the Shiites said to the head Molla, "Beware from contending with this man. For he is a scholar who is as profound in knowledge as the sea. He has refuted all the evidences you have furnished. It is probable that you will lose your fame and honour." Upon this, the head Molla looked at me, smiling. He said:

"You are a superior scholar. You could answer any other questions as you have answered these. Yet the Bahr-ul-'ilm of Bukhârâ could not rebut my arguments."

I said, "At the beginning of the conversation you said the scholars of the Ahl-i-sunnat 'rahmatullâhi ta'âlâ alaihim ajma'in' could not refute you. It is this statement of yours which has impelled me to talk."

He said, "As I am an Iranian, I do not have a rich repertoire in the Arabic branches of knowledge. I may have used inappropriate words. It was not what I meant."

I said, "I would like to ask you two questions. Let all your scholars come together and answer them."

"What are those questions," he asked.

10- "My first question is this: What do you Shiites say about the Ashâb-i-kirâm?"

"All the Ashâb, with the exception of five of them, became renegades because they did not elect hadrat Alî the Khalîfa. They went out of Islam. The five Sahâbîs are Alî, Mikdâd, Abû Zer, Selmân, and Ammâr bin Yâser," he answered.

I said, "Supposing what you have said were true, then how did it happen that hadrat Alî married his daughter Umm-i-Gulthum to

hadrat 'Umar?"

"That marriage took place against his wish," was his answer.

I said, "I swear by the name of Allah that you downgrade hadrat Alî in such a way that even the basest and lowliest member of the Arabic race would have protested against it. Such heinous vilification of hadrat Alî must be part of a sordid plan. As Allah knows, the lowest, the most plebeian Arab would have protected his chastity and honour at the sacrifice of his life. How much less for a most notable member of the Sons of Hâshim, who were the highest and most virtuous of all the Arabic tribes with respect to genealogy, manliness, honour and fame; and how could it be possible for the whole tribe to have agreed to such a humiliating disgrace? How can you attribute something that would have been rejected even by the lowest people to such an honourable and noble hero whose reputation as the 'Lion of Allah' has spread all over the world?"

He said, "Perhaps a female jinnee fell in love with 'Umar and showed herself in the guise of Umm-i-Gulthum."

My answer was, "This statement displaces the former in venality. How could reason ever accept such an absurdity? This way of explaining facts would turn all the principles of Islam topsyturvy. For instance, a man coming home from work might find his wife refusing him to enter his house saying that he must be a jinnee and not her husband. Supposing he were backed with two witnesses (to prove that he is himself), this time she might reject the witnesses, too, saying that they also were jinnes. Thus everything would be in utter disorder, not only in every home, but also everywhere. A murderer or a thief might object to the execution of Islam's penal code by saying, for instance, 'I am not the man you are looking for. He might as well be a jinnee.' In fact, Ja'fer Sâdiq 'rahmatullâhi ta'âlâ aleyh', who you claim is the leader of your madh-hab, might have been a jinnee." The head Molla was perplexed. He kept silent. Upon this I said, "Here I am asking my second question:

11- "According to the Shi'î madhhab, are the commandments of a cruel Khalîfa acceptable?"

"No, they are not sahîh. They are not to be accepted," was his reply.

"Who was the mother of Muhammad bin Hanafiyya, (who was) hadrat Alî's son?" I asked.

He said, "She was Hanafiyya, the daughter of Ja'fer."

I asked, “Who took this Hanafiyya prisoner?”

He said he did not know.

He did know, yet he said he did not know in order to vitiate the argument. Some of the audience said she had been taken prisoner by Abû Bekr ‘radiy-Allâhu ta’âlâ anh’.

I said, “Everybody knows it is necessary to make a careful choice in marriage. How do you think hadrat Alî ‘radiy-Allâhu ta’âlâ anh’ considered it permissible to marry and have children from a jâriya who had been taken prisoner by hadrat Abû Bekr, who you claim was not a rightly-guided imâm or a lawful Khalîfa?”

He said, “Perhaps hadrat Alî ‘radiy-Allâhu anh’ asked his friends to give the jâriya as a gift to him, and they married the jâriya to him.”

“You would need evidence to prove this,” I said. The head Molla could not say anything. After a short pause, I went on:

“In order to avoid prolongation of the debate, I did not quote âyat-i-kerîmas or hadîth-i-sherîfs. For any hadîth-i-sherîf quoted would be put to the question, both parties would be asked to produce their evidences, and thus the debate would hardly come to an end.”

In the meantime, the talks that were made during the debate were reported accurately to the Shah (King). Upon this, he (the Shah) ordered that scholars from Iran, Bukhâra and Afghanistan should come together, eliminate all the heretical elements, and make out an irrevocable written report, and appointed me his representative and president to this council of scholars representing three different nationalities. We went out of the tents. The Afghans, the Uzbeks, the Persians were pointing to me with their fingers. Seventy of the Iranian scholars assembled behind the blessed grave of Imâm-i-Alî ‘kerrem-Allâhu ta’âlâ wejheh’. Alî Ekber, the head Molla, was the chief of the Iranian scholars.

The head Molla showed me to Molla Hâdi Khodja, who was the Bahr-ul ’ilm and a scholar from Bukhâra, and asked him if he knew me. When the Bahr-ul ’ilm answered in the negative, he said, “This person is Suwaydî-zâde Shaikh Abdullah Efendi, a prominent Sunnî scholar. The Shah asked Ahmad Pasha to send him here to attend our debate and to preside over us as the Shah’s representative. If we come to a unanimous agreement, he will bear witness for all of us and make the final decision for us. Now, let us

clear out all the heretical elements whatsoever. Let us eliminate them in his presence. After all, Abû Hanîfa does not call us disbelievers. However, let us ponder deeply over this matter. The book (**Sherh-i-mawâqif**) does not call the Imâmiyya (Imamite) group disbelievers. Abû Hanîfa ‘rahmatullâhi ta’âlâ aleyh’ states in his book (**Fiqh-i-ekber**), ‘We do not call people who perform the namâz in the direction of qibla^[1] disbelievers.’ And it is written in the book (**Sherh-i-hidâya**) that the Imâmiyya group are one of the groups of Muslims. However, the later generations (of Sunnites) called us disbelievers.

“And our later generations in turn called you disbelievers. Neither we nor you are disbelievers. Now, let us know our utterances that caused your later generations to call us disbelievers, so that we will cease from such utterances (beliefs).”

Hâdi Khodja said, “You become disbelievers because you swear at the Shaikhayn (the two Shaikhs), that is, Abû Bekr and ‘Umar ‘radiy-Allâhu ta’âlâ anhumâ’.”

The head Molla said, “We desist from swearing at the Shaikhayn.”

Hâdi Khodja: “You become disbelievers by calling the As-hâb-i-kirâm ‘radiy-Allâhu ta’âlâ anhum ajma’in’ disbelievers.”

The head Molla: “Now we say that all the As-hâb-i-kirâm ‘radiy-Allâhu anhum’ are Muslims and are true ones, too.”

“You say that Mut’a nikâh is halâl.”

“It is harâm; only ignoble people would to it.”

“You hold hadrat Alî superior to hadrat Abû Bekr, and say that it was Alî’s right to become the (first) Khalîfa.”

“The second highest man after the Prophet ‘sall-Allâhu alaihi wa sallam’ is Abû Bekr-i-Siddîq. Next to him is hadrat ‘Umar. Then comes hadrat ‘Uthmân. Hadrat Alî comes after him ‘radiy-Allâhu anhum ajma’in’. Their (right of) succession to caliphate is in the order I have given above.” The Bahr-ul ‘ilm asked:

“What is your madh-hab^[2] in belief?”

The head Molla: “Our creed is that of Abulhasan-i-Esh’arî.”

[1] The direction which Muslims face as they perform the prayer called Namâz (or Salât). This direction is Ka’ba, in Mekka (Mecca).

[2] Muslims have two Madh-habs in matters pertaining to belief. They are: (1) Abulhasan-i-Esh’arî; and (2) Abû Mansûr-i-Mâ-Turîdî. For detailed information, please see the books **Belief and Islam, Endless Bliss, and The Sunnî Path.**

“Now it is necessary to know correctly all the things that are stated (by Islam) to be *halâl* and *harâm* and to believe in them as such; in other words, you should not say *harâm* about things that are stated to be *halâl*, or *halâl* about those which are stated to be *harâm*.”

“We accept this principle,” he said. Upon this, the *Bahr-ul`ilm* said:

“It is necessary not to do the actions which all the four *Madh-habs* of *Ahl as-sunna* unanimously state to be *harâm*.”

The head *Molla* said they accepted this, too.

Then he added, “We accept all these. Now will you say we are one of the Islamic groups?” The *Bahr-ul`ilm* paused for a while, and said:

“A person who swears at the *Shaikhayn* becomes a disbeliever.”

“We have ceased from swearing at the *Shaikhayn* ‘*radiy-Allâhu ta`âlâ anhumâ*’. We have accepted the other principles, too. Won’t you consider us Muslims now?” The *Bahr-ul`ilm* repeated:

“It is disbelief to swear at the *Shaikhayn*.” His purpose was to imply that “According to *Hanafî Madh-hab*, if a person has sworn at the *Shaikhayn*, his *tawba* (repentance) will not be accepted. *Iranians* used to swear at the *Shaikhayn* before. Therefore they had become disbelievers. Their ceasing from swearing (at the *Shaikhayn*) now will not salvage them from the state of disbelief.” *Molla Hamza*, the *Afghan Mufti*, said:

“O *Hâdi Khodja*! Is there any evidence to prove that the *Iranians* swore (at the *Shaikhayn*) before this meeting?”

Hâdi Khodja replied, “No, there is no evidence.”

Molla Hamza: “Since they will not swear at them from now on, what other reason could there be for saying they could not be Muslims?”

Hâdi Khodja: “If so, they are Muslims. This means to say that we agree on *halâls* and *harâms*, on good and evil.” Upon this, they all stood up and made *musâfaha* (shook hands in the manner prescribed by Islam); they turned to me and said, “Be our witness.” Then we dispersed. It was a Wednesday evening, the twenty-fourth day of (the Arabic month) *Shawwâl*. There were some ten thousand *Iranians* around us, all watching us.

As it was customary, at four o’clock after midnight the *I`timâd-*

ud-dawla (Grand Vizier) left the Shah and came to me. He said:

“Hadrat Shah sends you his thanks and salutations. He orders that tomorrow the same scholars (who attended the debate) should convene again, write down and undersign the decision made. And he asks you to register your testimony by putting your signature on top of the decision.” I said I would do so.

Thursday afternoon I went to the place of the meeting first. Some sixty thousand Iranians had gathered there, so that they made up a huge crowd extending far away from the Merqad-i-Alî (his blessed grave) ‘radiy-Allâhu ta’âlâ anh’. When I arrived there and sat down, a long piece of paper was brought. With the command of the head Molla, Mufti Aqa Huseyn read it (aloud). It was in Persian. Its Turkish (English) translation is as follows:

The divine habit and hikmat of Allâhu ta’âlâ is such that He has sent Prophets to men in order to announce His commands and prohibitions. Among Prophets, the final turn belonged to our Peygamber-i-zîshân, hadrat (MUHAMMAD) ‘sall-Allâhu alaihi wa sallam’. As the last Prophet, he accomplished his task of teaching the commandments and prohibitions of Allâhu ta’âlâ, and passed away. After him the As-hâb-i-Ghuzîn assembled and unanimously agreed on the superiority of Abû Bekr as-Siddîq with respect to piety, goodness, and religious devotion, and elected him Khalîfa. Hadrat Alî, too, was among the electors. He used his vote on his own volition, not under compulsion or intimidation. Thus his (Abû Bekr’s) caliphate was by the unanimous vote of all the As-hâb-i-kirâm. All the As-hâb-i-kirâm who elected him are just and true Muslims ‘radiy-Allâhu ta’âlâ anhum’. They are praised in Qur’ân-i-azîm-ush-shân, in the âyats that purport, **“Muhâjirs and Ansâr, who are ahead of and above all others...”** and **“Verily, Allâhu ta’âlâ loves those Believers who promised thee under the tree.”** Also, the Fakhr-i-âlam ‘sall-Allâhu alaihi wa sallam’ praises them: **“My As-hâb are like celestial stars. If you follow any one of them you will attain hidâyat!”**

After Abû Bekr as-Siddîq, hadrat ‘Umar Fârûq, commended by him, became the Khalîfa. Hadrat Alî was again among the people who voted for him. Hadrat ‘Umar commended six people before he passed away, and advised that after him these six people should elect the next Khalîfa among themselves. Hadrat Alî was one of these six people. Five of them unanimously voted for hadrat ‘Uthmân and elected him Khalîfa. Hadrat ‘Uthmân was undecided in this election. After his martyrdom all the As-hâb unanimously

voted hadrat Alî to caliphate. When these four people lived together, no disagreement, no quarrel ever occurred among them. They always loved, praised and lauded one another. In fact, when hadrat Alî was asked about the Shaikhayn he said, "These two noble persons are the imâms elected justly and rightfully." Also, when hadrat Abû Bekr as-Siddîq became the Khalîfa, he said, "Have you voted for me, with Alî among you?"

O Persians! Superiority and fitness for caliphate among the four Khalîfas follows this succession. If any person swears at them, censures them, or speaks ill of them, his household and blood will be halâl for the Shah. May such people be accursed in the opinion of Allah, as well as in the opinions of Angels, Holy Books, and Prophets! When you made me the Shah at the Megan Square in the year eleven forty-eight (1148), I made some stipulations. Now I add this stipulation: I forbid you to swear at the Shaikhayn. You must certainly desist from it! If anyone gets involved in this abominable practice of swearing (at the Shaikhayn), his household shall be taken prisoner, and his property shall be confiscated, and he shall be killed. Formerly this ignoble practice of swearing at the Shaikhayn did not exist in the Iranian country. This atrocious deed was invented by Shâh Ismâ'îl Safawî and his children, who followed his way. It held on for some three hundred years.

This agreement was undersigned and sealed by all the scholars. Then the (Fermân-i-âfî), the firman issued by Nâdir Shâh in order to address the whole nation, was read aloud. The following is its Turkish (English) version.

FERMÂN-I-SHÂHÎ

First I trust myself to Allâhu ta'âlâ. Be it known that Shâh Ismâ'îl Safawî appeared in the year 906 [A.D. 1500]. He gathered some ignorant people around himself. In order to obtain this base world and attain his sensuous desires, he instigated faction and mischief among the people. He invented the practice of swearing at the Shaikhayn, (which was later turned into a sect called) Shiah. Thus he sowed very grave discord among Muslims. He caused the flags of hypocrisy and aggression to fly. So much so that, while disbelievers are leading a life in comfort free from anxieties, Muslims are molesting one another. They are destroying one another's blood and chastity. It is for this reason that when all of you, from the oldest to the youngest ones, wanted

to make me the Shâh in the meeting held at the Megan Square, you stated you would cease from all the wrong beliefs and inane words that had settled in Iran since the time of Shâh Ismâ'îl if I accepted this request of yours. You promised you would believe and express with your tongues that the four Khalîfas are rightful and true, which was the Madhhab of your virtuous grandfathers and which has therefore been our blessed tradition, and that you would stop censuring and speaking ill of them and love all the four. And now, in order to emphasize this auspicious performance, I have studied the matter by asking distinguished scholars and highly devout persons. As all of them have unanimously stated, since the day our Prophet 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wa alâ âlihi wa as-hâbihi ajma'in' called (people) to the way of Haqq, each of the four Khalîfas 'radiy-Allâhu anhum', who were the Sahâba-i-râshidîn, sacrificed their lives and property, left their wives, children, and uncles, and tolerated all sorts of abusive terms, vilifications, and arrows for the promulgation of the Dîn-i-mubîn (Islam). On account of this, they were honoured with the special sohbat^[1] of our master, hadrat Rasûlullah 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wa sallam'. It was on account of this, again, that they attained the praise and laud expressed in the âyat-i-kerîma purporting, **"The eminent ones of the Muhâjirs and Ansârs..."**. After the master of the good passed away, Abû Bekr as-Siddîq 'radiy-Allâhu ta'âlâ anh', his companion in the cave, was appointed the first Khalîfa by a unanimous vote of the notables of the As-hâb-i-kirâm, who were the managers of the matters among the Muslims. After him, appointed by the Khalîfa and approved by the As-hâb-i-kirâm, hadrat 'Umar Fârûq 'radiy-Allâhu anh' became the Khalîfa; and after him 'Uthmân bin Affân, the Zinnûrayn, 'radiy-Allâhu anh', out of the six candidates (nominated by hadrat 'Umar), was voted into the office of caliphate unanimously; and after him the Emîr ul-mu'minîn Alî ibni Ebî Tâlib 'kerrem-Allâhu wajhah', the lion of Allah, the aim of those who seek someone (to guide them), the treasure of bewildering values, became the Khalîfa. During their caliphates, all these four Khalîfas were in harmony with one another and

[1] The lexical meaning of (sohbat) is (being together). When this togetherness is with someone loved by Allâhu ta'âlâ, it causes great spiritual use and elevation. Since our Prophet 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wa sallam' is the creature Allâhu ta'âlâ loves best, it goes without saying how useful, how progressive spiritually it should have been to attain his sohbat.

were beyond the blemish of any sort of disagreement among themselves. They were in brotherly terms and in unity with one another. Every one of them protected the Islamic countries against polytheism and the malice of polytheists. After these four Khalífas, Muslims preserved their unity in matters concerning belief. As times and situations changed, the Islamic scholars had some differing inferences in matters pertaining to fast, hajj, zakât and the other types of worships; yet no fault or deficiency or decay or slackness took place in the principles of belief or in loving Rasûlullah ‘sall-Allâhu alaihi wa sallam’ and his As-hâb or in regarding them all as true Muslims. All the Islamic countries retained this pure and clean quality until the emergence of Shâh Ismâ’îl. Fortunately, owing to your common sense and the guidance of your pure hearts, you have ceased from such practices as swearing at the As-hâb-i-kirâm and being Shiites, which were invented afterwards. You have embellished your hearts with love of the four Khalífas, who are the four main pillars of the Islamic palace. I therefore promise to report these five covenants of ours to the Islamic Pâdishâh, who is as high as heavens, the Sultan of lands and seas, the servant of the haramayn-i-sherifayn (the two blessed cities, Mekka and Medina), the earth’s second Zulqarnayn,^[1] our brother, and the Sultan of Byzantine Greek lands. Let us accomplish this concern in a manner concordant with our wishes. May what we have written here, with the help of Allâhu ta’âlâ, be realized very soon! Now, in order to reinforce this auspicious endeavour, the Allâma-

[1] Alexander the Great. This name has nothing to do with Alexander, the son of Philip and the king of Macedonia, or Alexander, the king of the ancient Yemen. This Alexander, whose name is given as Zulqarnayn in Qur’ân al-kerîm because he went to Western as well as to Eastern countries, was either a Prophet or a Walî. He lived long before the other two Alexanders. He was of Japhetic descent. Hidir ‘alaihis-salâm’ was one of the commanders in his army and was the son of his maternal aunt. He saw and talked to hadrat Ibrâhîm, who asked a blessing on him. He dominated the European and Asian continents. Upon the request of the Mu’min (Believer) Turks living in the Northeastern part of Asia, he built a great wall in order to protect them against Ye’jûj and Me’jûj (Gog and Magog). Built between two mountains, the wall, which has nothing to do with the famous Wall of China, was six kilometres long, twenty-five metres wide, and one hundred metres tall. Gog and Magog were left behind the wall, and the Turks were thus saved. History books mostly mistake these three Alexanders with one another.

i-'Ulâmâ (Molla Alî Ekber), the head Molla, and our other scholars have written a memorial. They have thus torn apart all the curtains of doubt. It has been realized that all these slanders, heresies and discordances were born from the fitna (mischief, instigation) invented by Shâh Ismâ'îl. Before him, Muslims of all times, especially those in the early days of Islam, held one common belief, one way of thought. Therefore, with the help of Allâhu ta'âlâ and the inspiration He has endowed our hearts with, we have come to this noble and exalted decision. From the arising of Islam till the emergence of Shâh Ismâ'îl, all Muslims regarded the Khulâfa-i-râshidîn (the four rightly-guided Khalîfas) as rightful and true Khalîfas. They knew that they became Khalîfas rightfully. They avoided reviling and speaking ill of them. Orators and great preachers would tell about the goodnesses, merits, superiorities of these Khalîfas in their speeches and discourses. Whenever they were to pronounce or write their blessed names, they would add the expression 'radiy-Allâhu anhum'. I have ordered hadrat Mirzâ Muhammad Alî, a profound scholar and the essence of the superior, to promulgate the Fermân-i-humâyûn of ours in all the cities of Iran, so that my people will hear it and accept it! Disobeying or opposing it shall incur the torment of Allâhu ta'âlâ and the wrath of the Shâh-an-shâh. Be it known so.

After this firman was read and understood, I was admitted to the Shâh's presence, where I attained most sincere compliments. Nâdir Shâh was very pleased about this achievement of mine, and expressed his gratitude very earnestly. He ordered that the Friday prayer should be performed acceptably in Kûfa Mosque. I said to the I'timâd-ud-dawla (the Grand Vizier) that that prayer would not be acceptable, for three individuals from the towns-folk would have to attend the prayer according to Hanafî Madh-hab, and this compulsory number would be forty (at least) according to Shaifi'î Madh-hab. The Grand Vizier said they (people) would be invited only to listen to the khutba. I went to the mosque. There were some five thousand scholars and officials. Alî Meded, the Shâh's imâm, was on the menber. Meanwhile, the head Molla and the scholars of Kerbelâ talked among themselves, and Alî Meded was dismounted from the menber. One of the scholars of Kerbelâ took his place and mounted the menber. (Menber is a raised enclosed platform from which the preacher in the mosque delivers discourse or the khutba, that is, the special discourse delivered before Friday prayer). After saying the prayers of

Hamd^[1] and Salawât,^[2] he cited the names of the four Khalîfas, saying, ‘radiy-Allâhu anh’, after each name. Yet when the turn came to hadrat ‘Umar, he uttered the name ‘Umar in munsarif (declined) case, though he knew Arabic well (enough not to do it by mistake). (That is, he said ‘Umari’ instead of ‘Umara’). Thus he severed (the qualities of) adl (justice) and ma’rifat (occult spiritual knowledge), which makes the name ghayr-i-munsarif (not declined), from hadrat ‘Umar. It was obvious that there was some trick in this. With the Shâh’s order, benedictions were pronounced, first over the welfare and majesty of hadrat Mahmûd Khân bin Mustafa Khân, who was the Khalîfa-i-Muslimîn, and then over the welfare and majesty of Nâdir Shâh. The Jum’a (Friday) sûra was recited in the first rak’at (of the Friday namâz). After the namâz, I asked for Nâdir Shâh’s permission and returned to Baghdâd. I related all the events to Ahmad Pashâ. I submitted a copy of the covenant made between the two parties and a copy of the Fermân-i-Shâhî, which Nâdir Shâh proclaimed to the Persian people. These, and an account of the event was sent to Istanbul and presented to the Khalîfa. This incapable person (hadrat Abdullah Suwaydî means himself) was honoured with so many favours and gifts by His Highness the Khalîfa, that I should confess I would fall short of paying the debt of gratitude were I to pronounce benedictions over His Highness till my death.

[Sultan Mahmûd I ‘rahimahullâhu ta’âlâ’ was born in 1108, and passed away in 1168 [A.D. 1754]. He became Khalîfa in 1143 [A.D. 1730]. He is in the graveyard called Vâlîde (Mother) Turhan Sultan, beside the Yeni Câmi’ (New Mosque), at Eminönü, Istanbul. This graveyard contains (the graves of) Turhan Sultan and her son, Mehmed IV, Mustafa II, Ahmad III, Osmân (‘Uthmân) III, and Murad V ‘rahimahumullâhu ta’âlâ’].

The Arabic original of the book **Hujaj-i-Qat’iyya** was reproduced by offset process in Istanbul in 1400 [A.D. 1980].

[1] Praising, lauding, and thanking Allâhu ta’âlâ.

[2] Special prayer for asking a blessing on our Prophet’s soul, e.g. ‘sall-Allâhu ta’âlâ alaihi wa sallam.’

PART TWO TRANSLATION (OF THE BOOK) RADD-I-REWAFID

There are twenty groups of people who call themselves Shi'is (or Shiites). A few of these groups go to extremes. Some of these eccentric people say that "Allah is inside Alí. Worshipping Alí, therefore, means worshipping Him." A second group, however, castigate this group, saying, "Could Alí ever be Allah? He is human. Yet he is the highest of mankind. Allah sent Qur'ân al-kerîm to him. But Jebrâ'îl (The Archangel Gabriel), showing favouritism, brought it (Qur'ân al-kerîm) to Muhammad 'alaihi-salâm', instead. So Muhammad 'alaihi-salâm' cheated Alí out of his right." There is yet a third group, who reprove this second group and claim, "Could such a thing ever be possible. Our Prophet is Muhammad 'alaihi-salâm'. Only, he said that Alí should be the Khalîfa after him. Yet the As-hâb-i-kirâm disobeyed this commandment of his and voted the other three into the office of caliphate, leaving Alí the fourth turn." Thus, alleging that the other three Khalîfas deprived hadrat Alí of his right, they show hostility against them. They extend this hostility to most of the As-hâb-i-kirâm by asserting that they did not give him his right. Also, they are indignant with Alí 'radiy-Allâhu anh' because, they allege, he did not insist on his due. All these four groups are disbelievers. The remaining groups, on the other hand, are groups of Bid'at^[1] because they misinterpret the Nass^[2] though they do not deny them. May Allâhu ta'âlâ give them all hidâyat (guidance to the right way)! May He bless them with the good luck of coming round to the right course! Âmin.

Millions of people living in the villages of Iran, in Iraq and Syria today, have lost their way. Muslims (in these places) are made to read a book titled (**Husniyya**). The book, which was published in Istanbul as well, is alleged to be a written account of the conversations taking place between a jariya named Husniyya and some other people in the palace of Hârûn-ur-reshîd. Yet it has been found out that it was prepared in the style of a novel by

[1] Any belief or behaviour that did not exist in the time of the Prophet or his four rightly-guided Khalîfas and which was fabricated afterwards, is called **Bid'at**.

[2] Âyat-i-kerîmas and hadîth-i-sherîfs with clear meaning are called the Nass.

an enemy of Islam, a Jewish convert named Murtedâ. Giving the âyat-i-kerîmas and hadîth-i-sherîfs distorted meanings and misrepresenting the facts and events, it assails the As-hâb-i-kirâm ‘radiy-Allâhu ta’âlâ alaihim ajma’în’ and the ‘Ulamâ (scholars, savants) of Ahl as-sunna ‘rahmatullâhu ta’âlâ alaihim ajma’în’, and misdirects the unlearned people by fabricating false sad stories.

The second part of the book (**Documents of the Right Word**) consists of the comprehensive answers given to Murtedâ’s delusive writings. Here we begin translating the book (**Radd-i-Rewâfid**).

TRANSLATION OF RADD-I-REWÂFID

May plentiful, beautiful, fruitful hamd be to Allâhu ta’âlâ in a way He likes, loves best! May benedictions and salutations be over our master, Muhammad ‘alaihis-salâm’, the highest of mankind, the Prophet of all people, whites and blacks alike, in a manner becoming his high honour! May salutations be over Muhammad’s ‘alaihis-salâm’ four Khalîfas, who followed and guided to the right way, over his children, over his Ahl-i-Bayt, all of whom were beautiful and pure, and also over his Sahâba, in a manner agreeable with their great positions and high grades!

This poor born slave, (**Ahmad the son of Abd-ul-Ahad**) Fârûqî,^[1] who is intensely in need of the mercy of Allah, the sender of all the necessities of every being, the one and only one owner and possessor, and who is the servant of the ‘Ulamâ of Ahl as-sunna, have seen a booklet recently. This booklet seems to have been written as an answer to the scholars of Mâverâ-’un-nahr (Transoxiana) during the Shiites’ siege of Mesh-hed city. These scholars had written that those who censure the As-hâb-i-kirâm are disbelievers. When I read the booklet, I saw that they are calling the three Khalîfas disbelievers and traducing hadrat Âisha-i-Siddîqa^[2] ‘radiy-Allâhu anhâ’ by means of representations believable only to idiots. I have heard that a few piteous people among the learners in our vicinity have been boasting about reading this book and sending copies of it to statesmen and even to sultans. This faqîr, (Imâm-i-Rabbânî means himself) have already been giving logical and scientific answers to those untrue

[1] Hadrat Imâm-i-Rabbânî means himself.

[2] One of the Prophet’s blessed wives and, at the same time, hadrat Abû Bekr’s daughter.

writings, and convincing everybody that those people are wrong and aberrant, in my speeches and lectures [and in most of my letters in (the book) **Mektûbât**]. Yet the Islamic spirit I have had, enhanced by the commandment in the hadîth-i-sherîf, **“When fitnas (instigations, mischiefs) and bid’ats appear and my As-hâb are vilified, a person who knows the fact should let others know it, too. If he does not, may he be under the curse of Allâhu ta’âlâ and angels and all mankind! Allâhu ta’âlâ will not accept this scholar’s worships, neither the farz (compulsory) ones nor the supererogatory ones”**, stimulated me into feeling discontented with these speeches [and writings] of mine. I could not sprinkle water on the burning of my lungs. I could not help feeling deeply grieved. I humbly thought that, unless their purposes were written, the benefit I have been expecting could not be obtained. Trusting myself to Allâhu ta’âlâ, the only Being to whom everyone in need supplicates, the most generous favourer, and the only protector of man against repulsive, embarrassing things, and relying on His help, I began writing this booklet. Allâhu ta’âlâ is our owner. He, alone, is the helper of everybody. It is with His help that success is attainable. It is by asking Him that guidance to the right way is possible.

[The (celebrated Arabic) dictionary, (**Qâmûs**), written by (Mejd-’d-Dîn) Muhammad bin Ya’qûb Firûz-âbâdî [729-816 [A.D. 1413], in Yemen], was translated into Turkish by Ahmad Âsim Efendi [1235 [A.D. 1820], in Nuh Kuyusu, Üsküdar (Scutari, Istanbul)]. It is a very valuable dictionary. It is written as follows in this dictionary: “Shiah or Shi’î means ‘One’s supporters, people who make one stronger’. And Râfida or Râfidî means one who forsakes, leaves, deserts. The Râfidîs said Zeyd bin Zeynel’âbidîn Alî was the imâm. They told Zeyd to be hostile to Abû Bekr and ’Umar. He answered that he could not be hostile to the good people loved by his great grandfather, Rasûlullah. Upon this, they abandoned Zeyd. Therefore they were called Râfidî.”^[1] Râfidîs say that they love Alî ‘radiy-Allâhu anh’, and that for loving him it is necessary to be hostile to all or some of the As-hâb-i-kirâm. Fortunately, the educated Iranian Shi’îs, who are mostly scientists, are not so. As for the word Alawî (or Alevî), it has been used in three different meanings:

- 1- Hadrat Alî’s ‘radiy-Allâhu anh’ offspring living in every

[1] Also see **TURKISH AND ENGLISH LEXICON**, by Sir James W. Redhouse, 1974, Librairie du Liban, p. 957.

century have been called Alevî. In books written in the early ages (of Islam) the children of hadrat Hasan and Huseyn, (the two sons of hadrat Alî), are mentioned as Alevîs. Later, hadrat Hasan's offspring were and has been called Sherîf, and hadrat Huseyn's offspring, Sayyed 'radiy-Allâhu anhumâ'.

2- People who love hadrat Alî 'radiy-Allâhu anh' and who learn his way well and correctly and follow it because it is the way guided by Muhammad 'alaihi-salâm', should be called (**Alevî**). Those who adhere to this right way will love all the As-hâb-i-kirâm 'radiy-Allâhu ta'âlâ alaihim ajma'in'. This is the way followed by the Ahl as-Sunna (the Sunni, or Sunnite, Muslims). This means to say that the right of being Alevî belongs to the Ahl as-sunna.

3- The enemies of Islam have today been calling themselves (**Alevî**) in order to deceive the pure Muslim Alevîs in Turkey. They have been using this beautiful name as a mask].

It is written in the aforementioned book that, "After our Prophet's 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wa sallam' honouring the Hereafter with his presence, the leader, the imâm of Muslims is Alî 'radiy-Allâhu anh'. Succession to this presidency in every century rightfully belongs to his offspring alone. No one else can ever be Muslims' imâm [president] in any time. It is only wrongfully, by oppression or coercion that others could obtain this presidency, in which case there could be nothing for these people (hadrat Alî's descendants) to do to prevent it." Various groups of Shi'is have appeared in the course of time, yet their main groups are twenty. Before beginning our principal subject, we shall mention a few of their notorious groups and explain their beliefs and aims. Thus everybody will learn about the inner essence of the matter, and right and wrong will be distinguished clearly from each other:

Ahmad Fârûqî states: The first person to curse the As-hâb-i-kirâm was **Abdullah bin Seba'**.

[It is stated in the dictionary named **Munjid** and in **Qâmûs ul-a'lâm** that, "This convert, who is said to have been a Jew, instigated an insurrection in Egypt, whereupon the marauders roaming around (came and) martyred hadrat 'Uthmân 'radiy-Allâhu anh'."]

Alî 'radiy-Allâhu anh' exiled him (Abdullah bin Seba') to Medayn city. He (Abdullah bin Seba') used to say, "Ibni Muljam did not kill hadrat Alî. The Satan had disguised himself into Alî. So he (Ibni Muljam) killed the Satan. Alî is among clouds.

Thunder is his voice. And thunderbolt is his whip.” The **Seb’iyya**, people who have been misled by this Jew named Abdullah Seba’, say, “O thou Emîr al-mu’minîn! May salutations be on you,” when they hear thunder.

[In the city of Esterâbâd in Iran a heretic named Fadlullah inserted many superstitions and lies into Seba’ism and named it Hurûfî sect. He was killed in 796 [A.D. 1393]. Hurûfîs have merged into Shiites, though they have nothing to do with Shi’ism].

The **Kâmiliyya** group vituperate the As-hâb-i-kirâm. They call the As-hâb-i-kirâm disbelievers because they did not make hadrat Alî ‘radiy-Allâhu anh’ the (first) imâm. They say that Alî ‘radiy-Allâhu anh’ was a disbeliever because he did not insist on his due. They believe in metempsychosis. [There is detailed information about Metempsychosis in the (Turkish) book **Se’âdet-i-Ebediyye**^[1]].

The **Benâniyya** group are the followers of Benân bin Jem’an. They say, “Our God is in human form. In the course of time he has perished. Only his face has remained. His soul was in Alî. Then it transmigrated into his (Alî’s) son, Muhammad bin Hanafiyya, and from him into his son Abû Hâshim. Now it is in Benân.”

The **Jenâhiyya** group. Their leader is Abdullah bin Muâwiyya. They believe in metempsychosis, that is, transmigration of souls from one body to another. They say, “God’s soul went into Âdam ‘alaihi-salâm’ first, and then into Shîst ‘alaihi-salâm’. Thus, transmigrating from one Prophet to another, it finally entered Alî and his children. It is in Abdullah now.” They do not believe in rising after death. They say halâl about many things that are harâm, such as drinking wine, eating lesh (meat from an animal that has died by itself or which has been killed in a manner not prescribed by Islam), committing fornication.

The **Mansûriyya** group are the followers of Abû Mansûr Ajlîm. He was one of the disciples of Imâm-i-Muhammad Bâqir ‘radiy-Allâhu anh’. When this Imâm dismissed him, he declared his religious leadership. These people (the Mansûriyya group) say, “Abû Mansûr ascended to heaven. Allâhu ta’âlâ rubbed His hand gently on his head and said: O my son! Go and announce my commandments to my born slaves!” According to these people, “The word ‘kifan’ in the forty-fourth âyat of the Tûr sûra in

[1] The book **Se’âdet-i-Ebediyye** has been partly translated into English and published in fascicles entitled **Endless Bliss**.

Qur'ân al-kerîm implies Abû Mansûr. (The chain of) Prophethood has not come to an end yet. There are Prophets to come. Jannat (Paradise) means the imâm (religious leader) we are to love. And Jahannam (Hell) signifies people we must hate, e.g. Abû Bekr and 'Umar 'radiy-Allâhu ta'âlâ anhum'. Farz (overt commandments of Islam) are people we should love. And harâms (Islam's overt prohibitions) are people we are to hate."

The **Hattâbiyya** group are the followers of Hattâb-i-Esedî. He was one of the disciples of Imâm-i-Ja'fer Sâdiq 'rahmatullâhi aleyh'. Offended by this person's insolent behaviours, Imâm (Ja'fer Sâdiq) dismissed him. Yet, after this Imâm's death, he claimed to be the new imâm. According to his followers, "Imâms are Prophets. In fact, they are Allah's sons. Ja'fer Sâdiq is a god. Yet Abul-hattâb (Esedî) is superior to him and also to Alî." They say, "It is halâl (permissible) to bear false witness in order to protect the friends against the enemies. Jannat (Paradise) signifies leading a good and comfortable life in this world. And Jahannam (Hell) means worldly troubles and cares. There is neither a beginning nor an end of this world. There is no doomsday. Has anyone seen Paradise or Hell? Is there anyone to say he has been to either one of these places?" They therefore commit harâms and disignore the farz.

The **Ghurâbiyya** group. They say, "Muhammad 'alaihi-salâm' resembled Alî very much. The similarity between them was much more exact than that which is between two crows or two flies. Allâhu ta'âlâ had ordered Jebrâil (Gabriel) to take the Qur'ân al-kerîm to Alî. Confused by this exact similitude, Gabriel revealed the Qur'ân al-kerîm to Muhammad 'alaihi-salâm'." For this reason they curse Jebrâil 'alaihi-salâm'.

The **Dhammiyya** group vituperate Muhammad 'alaihi-salâm'. They say, "Alî is the God. He appointed Muhammad 'alaihi-salâm' the Prophet. Yet Muhammad 'alaihi-salâm' attached people to himself instead of (to) Alî." Another group of them say that Muhammad 'alaihi-salâm' is the God. That is, some of them hold Muhammad 'alaihi-salâm' higher, whereas others consider Alî 'radiy-Allâhu anh' higher. There is yet another group who maintain the belief that "Muhammad, Alî, Fatima, Hasan and Huseyn, who are in one ahl-i-abâ [overcoat], make up a unity. The same one spirit has entered all these five people at the same time. They have no superiority over one another. Fâtima, too, is male."

The **Yûnusiyya** group are the followers of Yûnus bin Abd-ur-Rahmân. They say, "Allah is sitting on the Arsh. Angels mounted

Him on to the Arsh, yet He is more powerful than angels. This is like the case with an ibis, who is bigger and stronger than its legs though it walks on its legs.”

The **Mufavvida** group. They say that “Allâhu ta’âlâ created the world and then committed all the worldly matters to the charge of Muhammad ‘alaihi-salâm’.” According to others, “He (Allâhu ta’âlâ) committed the worldly matters to Alî. And Alî ‘kerrem-Allâhu wajhah’ is creating whatever he wishes.”

The **Ismâiliyya** group say that Qur’ân al-kerîm has a bâtin [invisible inner essence] as well as a zâhir [outward appearance]. The zâhir, when compared to the bâtin, is like the shell of a hazelnut in comparison to its kernel. Whatever a person would obtain by enduring the difficulty and trouble of obeying the commandments and prohibitions, which make up the zahîr, is easily attainable by adapting oneself to the bâtin. So, one does not have to go into trouble by worshipping.” For making people believe these statements of theirs, they quote the thirteenth âyat of Hadîd sûra, which points out the wall between the people who are in Paradise and those who are in Hell. They say, “There is no harâm (prohibition). Everything is halâl (permitted). There are seven Prophets in possession of a religion. They are Âdam, Nûh (Noah), Ibrâhîm, Îsâ, Mûsâ, Muhammad ‘alaihi-salâm’, and Muhammad Mahdî, who is to emerge in the future.” Their purpose is to demolish the religion. By asking deceptive questions on religious matters, they try to instil doubts into Muslims. Examples of these questions, which are intended to shock the îmân in young people, are: “Why is it that a menstruating woman has to perform her duties of fasting later which she has not been able to do (because of her menstruation), and does not have to perform the daily prayers of namâz which she has missed (for the same reason)? Emission of semen necessitates ghusl (ritual washing of the whole body) but urination does not (necessitate ghusl), though urine is dirtier than semen; why? Why do some prayers of namâz that are farz have four rak’ats, while others have three to two rak’ats?” [Indeed, the scholars of Ahl as-sunna have already given the answers of such questions, and explained the reasons, in their books]. They fabricate meanings for the commandments of Allâhu ta’âlâ. For instance, they say, “Making ablution means loving the Imâm. And performing namâz means the Prophet. For the forty-fifth âyat of the Ankebût sûra of Qur’ân al-kerîm purports, **‘Namâz will prevent man from evil, wicked things.’** This âyat-i-kerîma signifies the Prophet.

Becoming junub (canonical uncleanness) means letting others know about things one has to keep to oneself. And ghusl (washing in order to become canonically clean) means to promise again. Zakât^[1] means cleaning one's nafs by learning religious knowledge. Ka'ba means the Prophet; the door of Ka'ba means Alî; the hill of Safâ means Muhammad 'alaihi-salâm'; the hill of Merva means Alî, the seven tawâfs (circumambulations) means loving the seven imâms. Jannat (Paradise) means escaping the trouble of worships, and Jahannam (Hell) means the torture and agony of avoiding the harâm." A few of their other illogical and irreligious absurdities are their statements, such as, "Allah is neither existent nor nonexistent, neither learned nor ignorant, neither powerful nor incapable."

Hasan bin Muhammad Sabbâh, a schoolfellow of Nizâm-ul-mulk and the (well-known) poet 'Umar Hayyâm, founded the Ismâiliyya State in Rey city in 473 [A.D. 1081], declared himself the time's imâm (religious leader), and coerced the Sunnite Muslims into his sect. He and, after his death in 518, his successors until the termination of his State in 654 [A.D. 1255], perpetrated a great deal of persecution and cruelty in order to establish their beliefs and revolutions. The earnest and truthful scholars of Ahl as-sunna rotted in dungeons and were martyred. According to these eccentric people, there has to be an imâm in every age. They prohibit ignorant people from reading books and learned people from reading old books. This is intended to cover their wickedness, to conceal the fact that they are in the wrong way. They are fond of the ancient Greek philosophy. They mock religious teachings. [Another name of this group is **Qarâmita**. For a man named Hamdân Qurmut, from a village called Vâsit in the neighborhood of Baghdâd, founded the Qarâmita State in 278 [A.D. 891], subjected the Sunnite Muslims to very harsh torments and forced them to join the Ismâiliyya group. This group settled in Nejd. Abû Tâhir, who became their leader in 317 [A.D. 929], invaded Mekka and slaughtered thousands of hadjis. He ransacked the treasury department and (most) homes. His men hoisted off the (sacred stone called) Hajer-i-eswed from its original place and carried it to Hejr city, their capital in the vicinity of Basra. This blessed stone

[1] Certain amount of property which people who are rich according to Islam have to give yearly to people whom Islam accepts as poor. Zakât is one of the five commandments of Islam. There is detailed information about zakât in the first chapter of the fifth fascicle of **Endless Bliss**.

was retained by the Qarâmitis for twenty-two years. Their State collapsed in 328, an event that succoured Muslims from a grave nuisance].

The **Zeydiyya** group are attached to Zeyd bin Alî Zeynel'âbidîn. [Zeynel'âbidîn Alî bin Huseyn is the fourth one of the twelve imâms. He was twelve years old when he survived the catastrophe of Kerbelâ. He passed away in Medina (46-94 [A.D. 713]). His grave is beside that of his (paternal) uncle, Imâm-i-Hasan 'radiy-Allâhu anhum']. The Zeydiyya group have been divided into three groups: The group called **Jârûdiyya** claim that "Caliphate was Alî's right. The As-hâb became disbelievers by not giving him his due." The second group, **Suleymâniyya**, believe that Abû Bekr and 'Umar 'radiy-Allâhu anhum' are rightful Khalîfas. They say that, "the As-hâb-i-kirâm made a mistake by making them Khalîfas instead of Alî. This mistake of theirs, however, is not a sin or wrongdoing. 'Uthmân, Talhâ, Zubeyr, and Âisha 'radiy-Allâhu anhum' became disbelievers." The third group is **Tebîriyya**. They are identical with the Suleymâniyya. The only difference is that this group do not revile 'Uthmân 'radiy-Allâhu anh'. Most Zeydîs of our time are in one of these three groups; their belief system conforms with that of the Mu'tezila group, and their ways of worship are identical with those of the Muslims of Hanafî Madh-hab.

The **Imâmîyya** group say that "It had been commanded plainly that Alî 'radiy-Allâhu anh' was to be the (first) Khalîfa. The As-hâb became disbelievers by not carrying out this commandment. It is an absolute fact that caliphate reached Imâm-i-Ja'fer Sâdiq through a paternal chain. It is not certain who succeeded him in caliphate." According to most of them, after Ja'fer Sâdiq the seventh imâm was his son, Mûsâ Kâzim [129-186 (C.E. 799), buried in the district called Kâzimiyya in Baghdâd]; then his son, Alî Ridâ [148-203, buried in the city of Mesh-hed, alias Tus, in eastern Iran]; then his son Muhammad Takî [194-220, in Kâzimiyya]; then Ebulhasen Alî bin Muhammad Hâdî Nakî [213-254 in the district called Asker in Sermen Rey city]; then, the eleventh imâm, Hasan bin Alî Askerî [232-261 (C.E. 875), buried beside his father, in Baghdâd]; and then, the twelfth and last imâm, Muhammad bin Hasan Mehdî; [he was born in 255, and when he was ten, or seventeen, years old, he went into a cave in his home and did not come back out again]. They believe that he is at the same time the person who is named Mehdî and who will emerge towards the end of the world.

There are other groups, who are more or less similar to these groups. All of them have deviated from the right way; changing with time, some of them have come nearer the right course, while others have gone altogether beyond measure.

[In today's Iran, all these aberrant groups exist among the illiterate people. Nevertheless, it is observed with gratitude that the educated ones have been reading true books and day by day getting closer to the right word of the Ahl as-sunna. For instance, it is stated as follows in the dictionary of Doctor Muhammad Muqremî, which was printed in Tehran in the solar hijrî year 1333 [C.E. 1954]: "The Khulafâ-i-râshidîn: Abû Bekr and 'Umar and 'Uthmân 'radiy-Allâhu anhum', and Alî 'kerrem-Allâhu wajhah'."]

Upon reading the lines above, a person who is reasonable enough to tell good from bad, will realise at once without seeking another evidence how false and how wrong these groups, who have merged among the Shi'îs, are. It is obvious that their beliefs are thoroughly unfounded, irreligious, and illusory. It is a subject vulnerable to derision, for people who hold these beliefs, to claim that they love the Ahl-i-Bayt of our master the Prophet 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wa sallam' or the twelve imâms. No, they could not be sincere. For those great people, (the Ahl-i-Bayt and the twelve imâms), do not want inordinate, excessive love, and they hate being followed in words only. The Hurûfîs' saying that they love the Ahl-i-Bayt is like Christians' claiming that they love Îsâ (Jesus) 'alaihi-salâm'. Loving him excessively, they make a god of him and worship him. However, Îsâ 'alaihi-salâm' does not want this kind of love. As a matter of fact, Alî 'radiy-Allâhu anh' stated that Rasûlullah 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wa sallam' had said to him: **"O Alî! The case with you is like the case with Îsâ 'alaihi-salâm'. Jewry became hostile to him. They spread a very offensive slander about his mother. Christians, on the other hand, loved him too much. They exalted him to a rank that would have been impossible for him to occupy."**

Now, trusting ourselves to the help of Allâhu ta'âlâ, the great owner and ruler of mankind, we will answer the addle protests in that booklet. Allâhu ta'âlâ is powerful enough to do everything, and He never turns down those who ask for His help.

1- The scholars of Mâverâ'un nehr [May Allâhu ta'âlâ give them plenty of reward for their toils. The vast extent of land lying between the rivers Seyhûn (Jaxartes) and Jeyhûn (Oxus), which

flow into Aral Sea, is called Mâverâ`un nehr (Transoxiana)] state that:

“Our Prophet ‘sall-Allâhu alaihi wa sallam’ highly valued the three Khalîfas and loved them very much. There are many sahih hadîths praising each of them. Every statement he made was a piece of wahy [a revelation made by Jebrâil ‘alaihis-salâm’]. As a matter of fact, the third âyat of Wan-najmi sûra purports: **‘He never makes idle talks. He merely says whatever is** (revealed through) **wahy to him.’** A person who reviles these three Khalîfas will have opposed the wahy. And opposing the wahy, in its turn, is disbelief.”

The booklet gives the following answer to these writings: These reasons you have cited signify that the three Khalîfas are to be cursed, not that they should be loved. They show that they became Khalîfas unjustly. For Alî bin Muhammad Âmidî [born in Âmid town in Diyar Bekr in 551 and passed away in Baghdâd in 631 (C.E. 1234)], a great Sunnî scholar, says in his book **Sherh-i-Mawâqif** that some disagreements arose among Muslims towards the death of our Prophet ‘sall-Allâhu alaihi wa sallam’. The first disagreement was when the Messenger ‘alaihis-salâm’ stated, **“Fetch me (some) paper. I shall write a few things so that you should not deviate from the right way after me.”** ‘Umar ‘radiy-Allâhu anh’ did not like this order. This person became pained all over. He said, “The Book of Allâhu ta’âlâ is sufficient for us.” The As-hâb could not come to an agreement. Voices were raised. This situation hurt the Prophet ‘sall-Allâhu alaihi wa sallam’, and he said, **“Go! It is not nice to make noise in my presence.”**

The second disagreement occurred as follows: After the disagreement on (the Prophet’s) asking for paper, Rasûlullah ‘sall-Allâhu alaihi wa sallam’ ordered that an army under Usâma’s command should set out for jihâd (holy war). Some of them were reluctant to go. When they stated this disinclination of theirs, the Prophet repeated his order more emphatically, saying, **“Let Usâma’s army be prepared! May Allah curse those who do not join this army!”** The same people were still unwilling; and they disobeyed this order. According to the aforementioned âyat-i-kerîma, his asking for paper in order to make a written will was by wahy. By preventing this, ‘Umar ‘radiy-Allâhu anh’ refused the wahy. And refusing the wahy, in its turn, is disbelief, as you have stated. Furthermore, the forty-seventh, forty-eighth, and fiftieth âyats of Mâida sûra purport, **“Those who do not judge compatibly**

with the rules and commandments revealed by Allâhu ta'âlâ, are disbelievers." And a disbeliever in turn cannot be the Prophet's representative, i.e. the Khalîfa. By the same token, a person who did not join Usâma's army must have become a disbeliever. None of the three Khalîfas joined the army. You say that everything Rasûlullah did was by wahy. The same rule applies to this instance. Rasûlullah 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wa sallam' had deported Merwan out of Medina. This, too, was by wahy. [Merwan bin Hakem bin Ebil 'âs bin Umayya was born in the second year of the Hijrat (Hegira). He was 'Uthmân's 'radiy-Allâhu anh' paternal first cousin. He passed away in 65, during his caliphate]. The Khalîfa 'Uthmân 'radiy-Allâhu anh' invited him back to Medina, employed him as a secretary in the office of caliphate, thus prizing him; this is disbelief. And it is disbelief for two different reasons. The first reason is that which you have stated. The second reason is the twenty-second âyat of Mujâdala sûra, which purports, **"People who have îmân (belief) in Allâhu ta'âlâ and on the Judgement Day, would not love the enemies of Allâhu ta'âlâ and His Messenger, even though they were their brothers, (sisters), or relatives."**

With the help of Allâhu ta'âlâ, here is our answer to this booklet: Not everything Rasûlullah 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wa sallam' said or did was by wahy. The author of the booklet erroneously introduces this âyat-i-kerîma as an evidence. For the âyat informs that Qur'ân al-kerîm is wahy. Beydâwî [Abdullah bin 'Umar; passed away in Tabriz in 691 (C.E. 1291)], the paramount guide of Mufassirs (scholars dealing with the meanings of âyat-i-kerîmas), explains this âyat as follows: "Whatever he says of Qur'ân al-kerîm is not of himself. It is by wahy." If all his words and actions had been by wahy, Allâhu ta'âlâ would never have contradicted or reproved him. For instance, the first âyat of Tahrîm sûra purports, **"O my Prophet 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wa sallam'! Why are you prohibiting yourself from something which Allâhu ta'âlâ has made halâl for you?"** The forty-fourth âyat of Tawba sûra purports, **"Why did you give them the permission? Allâhu ta'âlâ has forgiven you this deed of yours."** The sixty-seventh âyat of Anfâl sûra purports, **"It would not be worthy of any Prophet to set free in return for property the captives in war. Killing most of them on the earth will cause them to become weaker. You are after worldly property. Yet Allâhu ta'âlâ wishes you to earn thawâb and attain Paradise and (its) blessings."** Rasûlullah 'sall-

Allâhu alaihi wa sallam' was about to conduct the namâz of janâza^[1] for a (dead) munâfiq,^[2] when the eighty-fifth âyat of Tawba sûra was revealed, which purports, **“Do not perform namâz for any of those disbelievers who are dead eternally!”** Qur'ân al-kerîm contains many such âyat-i-kerîmas. This means to say that some of his words and actions reflected his personal choice and ijtihâd. The tafsîr of Beydâwî provides the following explanation on the âyat-i-kerîma concerning the setting free of the slaves: “This âyat-i-kerîma shows that Prophets make ijtihâd, and their ijtihâd may be wrong. However, it shows at the same time that they are instantaneously informed that they are wrong, and their error is corrected.”

In worldly matters pertaining to mentality, it is permissible for the As-hâb-i-kerâm to disagree with Rasûlullah 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wa sallam'. Sometimes the wahy that was revealed tallied with the inference of the As-hâb. For instance, in the question of how the captives in (the holy war of) Bedr should be treated, hadrat 'Umar's 'radiy-Allâhu anh' ijtihâd did not conform with Rasûlullah's 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wa sallam' ijtihâd. The wahy (the âyat-i-kerîma that was revealed to inform with the divine decree) commanded that hadrat 'Umar's ijtihâd should be executed. For Rasûlullah 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wa sallam' would not busy his blessed heart with matters that could be solved with mind. Beydâwî states, “Seventy slaves were captured in the holy war of Bedr. Among them were Rasûlullah's paternal uncle Abbâs, and Alî's elder brother Uqayl, [who became a Muslim in the second year of the Hijrat]. He consulted with his As-hâb (Companions) about what they should do with the captives. Abû Bekr 'radiy-Allâhu anh' said, ‘These people are your fellow citizens and relatives. Do not inflict punishment on them! Perhaps, Allâhu ta'âlâ will grant them the lucky chance to repent (for having been disbelievers). Set them free in return for money. This will add to the (financial) power your As-hâb has.’ ‘Umar, on the other hand, said, ‘These people are the leaders of Islam's enemies. Allâhu ta'âlâ has not put us in a situation to need their money. They came here to kill you and us. Order me and I shall kill so and so. Order Alî and Hamza and they will kill their own brothers.’ Rasûlullah

[1] When a Muslim dies, other Muslims come together and perform a certain prayer of namâz, which is called namâz of janâza.

[2] A person who disbelieves âyats of Qur'ân al-kerîm and conceals his disbelief is called a munâfiq. He is the basest type of unbeliever.

‘sall-Allâhu alaihi wa sallam’ stated, **‘Allâhu ta’âlâ creates some hearts soft. So much so that they are softer than milk. And He creates some hearts hard, so that they are harder than stone. O Abû Bekr! You are like Ibrâhîm ‘alaihis-salâm’. He would say: He who goes by my side will be with me. And he who does not follow me; Allâhu ta’âlâ is ghafûr (all-forgiving) and rahîm (compassionate)... O ‘Umar! You are like Nuh (Noah) ‘alaihis-salam’. He said: Yâ Rabbi (O my Allah)! Do not leave any disbeliever on the earth!’** Most of the As-hâb-i-kirâm were of the opinion that they should be set free in return for property. They set the slaves free. Upon this the ayat-i-kerîma cited above was revealed. When ‘Umar ‘radiy-Allâhu anh’ visited Rasûlullah, he saw him and Abû Bekr weeping together. He said, ‘O the Messenger of Allah! Why are you (two) weeping? Tell me, so that I shall weep with you.’ He (the Prophet) said, **‘I am weeping for my As-hâb. I have been shown the torment that was to befall them on account of their having set the slaves free in return for property. It (the torment) was closer than that tree,’** and he pointed to a tree opposite them.” Beydâwî goes on as follows: Rasûlullah ‘sall-Allâhu alaihi wa sallam’ stated, **“If the torment had not been turned back, no one except ‘Umar and Sa’d bin Mu’âdh would have escaped it.”** For Sa’d had agreed with ‘Umar ‘radiy-Allâhu ta’âlâ anhumâ’ and said that the slaves should be killed. [Sa’d belonged to the Evs (or Aws) tribe and came to îmân (became a Muslim) one year before the Hijrat). He also brought the people under his command to îmân (caused them to become Muslims). He joined the ghazâs (holy wars), and died of the wound he had received in (the holy war of) Handak (Trench). Rasûlullah conducted the namâz of janâza for him and wept bitterly].

Rasûlullah’s ‘sall-Allâhu alaihi wa sallam’ asking for paper or ordering the preparation of an army under Usâma’s command or deporting Merwân out of Medina may not have been by wahy. Each of these decisions was out of his own thought and ijtihâd. Those who did not carry out these (orders) cannot be called disbelievers. For we know other examples as well in which the As-hâb-i-kirâm did not agree (with Rasûlullah). We have already cited one of them above. At that time the wahy would be revealed and right and wrong would be distinguished from each other; those who disobeyed such commandments would not be blamed or reproached. Otherwise, if there had been the slightest disrespect towards Rasûlullah, Allâhu ta’âlâ would have immediately cautioned and dissuaded from it, warning that such acts would

incur punishment. An example of this is the command in the second âyat of Hujurât sûra, which purports, **“O those who have had the honour of having îmân! Do not raise thine voice louder than the voice of the Messenger of Allah. Do not call to him as you shout at one another! If a person shows disrespect to him, his worships will become null and void.”** Sayyed Sherîf Alî bin Muhammad Jurjânî [740-816 (C.E. 1413)], who has explained the book **Mawâqif**, quotes Âmidî as having said, “All the As-hâb-i-kirâm, with the exception of munâfiqs, that is, those who concealed the impiousness of their hearts and pretended to believe, were in unity on the day when Rasûlullah ‘sall-Allâhu alaihi wa sallam’ passed away. Later on, there were some differences in their ijtihâds. These differences were not in principles of belief. None of them became a disbeliever on account of these differences. All such differences were based on the intention of upholding Islam and maintaining its correctitude. For instance, Rasûlullah’s ‘sall-Allâhu alaihi wa sallam’ asking for paper brought about (the first) difference. Then another difference of ijtihâd occurred in the matter of preparing an army for Usâma, whereby some of the As-hâb-i-kirâm said that Rasûlullah’s ‘sall-Allâhu alaihi wa sallam’ order should be executed, while others, seeing that his illness was getting worse, were of the opinion that they should wait instead of wearying him.” If a person asserted something impossible, e.g. if he said, “Every ijtihâd of Rasûlullah’s was by wahy. Therefore, all his words and behaviors were by wahy,” we would answer him as follows: His words and behaviors that were not based on ijtihâd were by wahy. Examples of these are the hadîth-i-sherîfs praising the three Khalîfas. These (hadîth-i-sherîfs) gave information about the unknown, which is possible only by wahy. He could not have said them out of ijtihâd. The fifty-ninth âyat-i-kerîma of En’âm sûra purports, **“Allâhu ta’âlâ, alone, knows the ghayb,** [that is, things that are not known mentally, found out by calculation, or taught by Islam]. **No one except Him knows them.”** And the twenty-sixth âyat of Jinn sûra purports, **“He, alone, knows secrets. Of the secret things He knows, He intimates the ones He chooses only to the one He likes (best) of Prophets,** [that is, to Muhammad ‘alaihis-salâm’].” The âyat-i-kerîma that purports, **“He does not talk from himself,”** signifies the Qur’ân al-kerîm and the (pieces of) wahy revealed to him. Certainly, it would be kufr (disbelief) to deny such words and behaviors of his. There are many other hadîths explaining that the hadîth-i-sherîfs praising the three

Khalîfas ‘radiy-Allâhu ta’âlâ anhum’ were revealed through wahy by Allâhu ta’âlâ. So many (scholars) narrated these hadîth-i-sherîfs that they have become mesh-hûr, and even mutawâtir,^[1] hadîths. We will quote some of them:

I. He stated to Abû Bekr: **“You are my companion in the cave. You are my companion by the Kawthar (Kevser) Pond (in Paradise).”** (Tirmuzî).

II. **“Jebrâil ‘alaihis-salâm’ came to me. He held me by the hand. He showed me one of my ummat entering through the gate of Paradise.”** Abû Bekr ‘radiy-Allâhu anh’ said, “O Rasûlallah! I want to be with you there.” He (Rasûlullah) stated, **“O Abû Bekr! Among my Ummat, you will be the first to enter Paradise.”** (Tirmuzî).

III. When he (the Prophet) stated, **“I entered Paradise. I saw a villa. I saw a houri [maiden of Paradise] in it. I asked her: Who are you for? She said: I have been created for ‘Umar ibni Hattâb. I wanted to go in and see her. But, O ‘Umar, I thought it might hurt you!”**, ‘Umar ‘radiy-Allâhu anh’ said, “I would sacrifice my mother, my father, and everything I have for your sake, O Rasûlallah!” (Bukharî and Muslim).

IV. He (Rasûlullah) pointed to ‘Umar ‘radiy-Allâhu anh’ and said, **“This (high) person’s rank in Paradise is higher than that of any of the rest of my Ummat.”** (Ibni Mâja).

V. **“I have not brought Abû Bekr and ‘Umar (into a position) ahead of you all. Allâhu ta’âlâ has brought them ahead of you all.”** (Abû Ya’lâ).

VI. **“I asked Jebrâil ‘alaihis-salâm’ about the virtues of ‘Umar. Were I to tell about the values he has as long as the period of Nûh’s ‘alaihis-salâm’ Prophethood [nine hundred and fifty years], I still would not be able to finish. All the values ‘Umar has, on the other hand, are (equal to) only one of Abû Bekr’s values.”** (Abû Ya’lâ).

VII. **“In Paradise, after Prophets ‘alaihimus-salâm’, the highest ones of all mankind are Abû Bekr and ‘Umar.”** (Tirmuzî and Ibni Mâja).

VIII. Abû Mûsa-l-esh’arî narrates: We were sitting in the yard (of a house) in Medina, when someone knocked on the door. The Messenger of Allah ordered, **“Open the door and give the visitor**

[1] Kinds of hadîth-i-sherîfs are explained in detail in the sixth chapter of the second fascicle of **Endless Bliss**.

the good news that he shall go to Paradise!” When I opened the door, Abû Bekr Siddîq came in. I gave him the good news. He made hamd, (that is, he thanked, praised and lauded Allahu ta’âlâ).^[1] Then there was another knock on the door. **“Open the door and give the good news!”**, said the Prophet again. I opened it, and ’Umar Fârûq came in. When I gave him the good news, he made hamd to Allâhu ta’âlâ. The door was knocked once more. The Messenger of Allah said, **“Open it and give him the good news and tell him that he will suffer a catastrophe!”** I opened (the door). It was ’Uthmân Zinnûreyn ‘radiy-Allâhu anh’. I gave him the good news, and he made hamd. (Bukhârî and Muslim).

Supposing we were to acknowledge that Merwân’s deportation from Medina had been by wahy, this would not mean a lifelong deportation. Why should it not be possible that he might have been deported for a certain period of time? ’Uthmân ‘radiy-Allâhu anh’ knew the duration of deportation, and took him back to Medina when the time was over.

The âyat-i-kerîma that purports, **“A person with îmân will not love the enemies of Allâhu ta’âlâ and His Messenger,”** prohibits from loving disbelievers. Merwân was not a disbeliever; why should it be forbidden to love him.

It is stated as follows in the booklet: “The hadîths praising the three Khalîfas do not exist in our books. On the other hand, the hadîths about (Rasûlullah’s asking for) paper and (his order for preparation of) Usâma’s army, which reprove the three Khalîfas, are recorded in your books, too. Furthermore, some of the scholars of Ahl as-sunna have said that it would be permissible to call a useful statement a hadîth. Therefore, hadîths that do not exist in the Shiite books are not dependable.”

With the help of Allâhu ta’âlâ, we give the following answer: Those who are too excessive in injustice, malign the three Khalîfas. So much so that they call them disbelievers. They consider that saying so is Islam and worship. Consequently, they do not believe the sahîh hadîths praising the three Khalîfas. They discard or change these hadîths. They even interpolate and slander Qur’ân al-kerîm, which is Islam’s basic document and which has been authenticated by all people throughout centuries and remained intact until the present time, and make changes in âyat-i-kerîmas. For instance, they have defiled the twenty-sixth

[1] The Arabic word is “Al-hamd-u-lillâh”, which means, “May thanks, praise and laud be to Allâhu ta’âlâ.”

âyat of Qiyâmat sûra, which reads, “**Alainâ jam’a hu wa Qur’âna,**” and changed it to, “**Alîyan jama’a Qur’âna,**” which means, “Alî compiled the Qur’ân.” Mad with inordinate bigotry, they attempt to allege that ‘Uthmân ‘radiy-Allâhu anh’ expunged the âyats praising the Ahl-i-Bayt from Qur’ân al-kerîm. As we have explained above, in our discourse on their various groups, some of their groups say that it is permissible to bear false witness when and where it is considered useful. For this reason, any term of reproach would fall short of giving them their deserts. It would be sheer credulity to take them on trust, or to think they are right. Their books cannot be trusted. They are like the changed, defiled copies of the Torah and the Bible. The books of the Ahl as-sunnat, on the other hand, are as secure as steel. For instance, **Bukhârî** is the second most correct book after Qur’ân al-kerîm. There are many hadith-i-sherîfs praising the three Khalîfas in this book, as well as in the book **Muslim** and many another valuable book. These books do not contain any statement vilifying or reproving the three Khalîfas. Inferring such meanings as belittle the three Khalîfas from âyat-i-kerîmas and hadîth-i-sherîfs is a sign of malevolence. What they infer is wrong, and what they suppose is out of place and illusory. This misconception of theirs is like the case with a person with deranged bile; this person will not enjoy the real taste of sugar because something sweet will taste bitter to him. Allâhu ta’âlâ defines these people as follows in the seventh âyat of ‘Imrân sûra, which purports: “**People with deranged hearts, in order to cover the truth and instigate mischief, will infer wrong meanings from Qur’ân al-kerîm, thus deviating into heresy.**” Among the Ahl as-sunna people, there have been those saying that it would be permissible to call a useful statement a hadîth; yet the scholars of Hadîth have rejected this and explained in their books that such hadîths are false and slanderous. No one has valued them or adhered to them as hadîths. Therefore, it is an altogether irrelevant and nonsensical argumentation to introduce the so-called statement as an evidence. It is out of place also to say, “It is not disbelief not to obey a hadîth reported by only one person. For some of the mujtahids of Ahl as-sunna have not obeyed such hadîths.” A few of the hadîth-i-sherîfs praising and exalting the three Khalîfas were reported by one Sahabî, yet they have been narrated through various ways by many people and they have thus reached the degree of tawâtur. It is certainly disbelief to deny them. None of the mujtahids has disobeyed such hadîths. In fact, Imâm A’zam

Abû Hanîfa ‘radiy-Allâhu anh’, who is the leader of the Ahl as-sunna, would hold a hadîth-i-sherîf reported by one person, and even the statements of the As-hâb-i-kirâm, higher than his own inferences (from Qur’ân al-kerîm), and would say that it would not be permissible to disregard them.

Seeing that there are many hadîths praising the three Khalîfas, and thus realising that they will not be able to withstand them, they take another turn and say, “The three Khalîfas were praised, but that was before their unbecoming deeds were seen. Such praises do not necessarily show that they would remain pious Believers till death. For it would have been unfair to blame a malefactor before he had committed the malefaction. By the same token, the Emîr-ul-mu’minîn Alî ‘radiy-Allâhu anh’ knew that Ibni Muljam^[1] would commit a murder. Yet he did not punish him before he committed the murder.” However, various hadîth-i-sherîfs declare clearly that the three Khalîfas ‘radiy-Allâhu ta’âlâ anhum’ would remain good and virtuous till death and they would pass away as Believers. We have already quoted a few of them. Sahîh (authenticated) books contain many other such hadîth-i-sherîfs. We agree that a person will not be punished for some guilt he has not committed yet, even if it is known that he will commit that guilt. Nor would it have been correct, however, to praise a person if it had been known that he would turn out to be a wicked person, a person who would deserve punishment. Then, a person praised through hadîth-i-sherîf must always be good and virtuous, earlier and later alike. Likewise, the Emîr ‘radiy-Allâhu anh’ did not punish Ibni Muljam, yet he did not praise him, either. He neither castigated nor valued him. We shall expand this answer of ours in the explanation of the eighteenth âyat of Fat-h sûra.

2- The ‘Ulamâ (savants, scholars) of Mâwarâ’un-nehr ‘rahmatullâhi ta’âlâ alaihim ajma’în’ state that: The three Khalîfas were among the people honoured with the eighteenth âyat of Fat-h sûra, which purports, “**Allâhu ta’âlâ has been pleased with those who extended their hands to you and promised you under the tree. He loves them all.**” It is therefore disbelief to vilify or curse them.

The enemies of the As-hâb-i-kirâm answer this as follows: “This âyat-i-kerîma shows that Allâhu ta’âlâ loves the promises, not the people who promised. We all believe this. All these three people did a couple of good deeds. We say that they did bad deeds,

[1] Person who martyred hadrat Alî.

too. These malefactions of theirs nullified their promises. For instance, although the Prophet ‘sall-Allâhu alaihi wa sallam’ commanded plainly that Alî ‘radiy-Allâhu anh’ should be the (first) Khalîfa, they disobeyed this command and forced their way into the office of caliphate. As it is narrated in Bukhârî, they offended Fâtima ‘radiy-Allâhu anhâ’. It is declared as follows in a hadîth-i-sherîf, which the book **Mishkât** quotes in its chapter about Fâtimât-uz-Zehrâ: **‘He who hurts her will have hurt me. And he who hurts me will have hurt Allâhu ta’âlâ.’** The fifty-seventh âyat of Ahzâb sûra purports, **‘May those who torment Allâhu ta’âlâ and His Messenger be accursed both in this world and in the Hereafter!’** On account of these malefactions, plus their disobeying the Prophet’s commands, such as when he asked for paper and when he ordered to prepare an army for Usâma, all three of them must be cursed and reprovèd. Taking the last breath in î mân (dying as a Believer) depends on doing good deeds, and first of all, obeying the Messenger of Allah, at the end of one’s life.”

Here’s our answer: When Allâhu ta’âlâ was pleased with the people who made a promise under the tree, He knew (what was in) their hearts, their intentions. He infused firmness and serenity into their hearts. The final part of the âyat-i-kerîma points out this fact. Rasûlullah ‘sall-Allâhu alaihi wa sallam’ gave the good news that the three Khalîfas would go to Paradise. He declared plainly that they would pass away in î mân (die as Believers). He informed that they would abide by their promises, that they would not renege on their promises. If we admit that Allâhu ta’âlâ stated that He liked their promises and not their persons, (we will have to admit also the fact that), when Allâhu ta’âlâ likes their promises they must pass away in î mân. For Allâhu ta’âlâ will not like any deeds of disbelievers. Supposing a group of people were doomed to die as unbelievers, Allâhu ta’âlâ would not be pleased with any of their good deed, however pleasing, charitable and pious their deeds might seem to be. Their good deeds are depicted as follows in the thirty-ninth âyat of Nûr sûra, which purports, **“The deeds performed by disbelievers are like a mirage perceived in a desert. Thirsty people will fancy it to be water when they see it from the distance. When they go near it, they will not find anything. They will realise their disillusionment.”** Also, the fifty-seventh âyat of Mâida sûra purports, **“If one of you parts with î mân and dies as a disbeliever, all the good deeds he has performed shall perish. They will do him no good, neither in the**

world, nor in the Hereafter.” To say that a deed that would do no good in the Hereafter might please Allâhu ta’âlâ, would be an inane assertion. To be pleased with something means to like it, to accept it to the last degree. Our Prophet ‘sall-Allâhu alaihi wa sallam’ did not advise that hadrat Alî ‘radiy-Allâhu anh’ should be the first Khalîfa. If he had advised so, it would have spread through tawâtur and become known widely. If there had been such a command, be it by implication, the Emîr ‘radiy-Allâhu anh’ would have stated it, insisted on his due, and lodged an objection to Abû Bekr’s caliphate. As a matter of fact, Abû Bekr ‘radiy-Allâhu anh’ quoted the hadîth-i-sherîf, **“Khalîfas are from the Qoureish tribe,”** and said that he would not assent to the caliphate of a person from the Ansâr. And the Ansâr, on their turn, agreed with him and forfeited their claim for caliphate. It is stated as follows in a commentary of the book **Tejrîd** by Nasîr-ed-dîn Tûsî, [Allâma Muhammad bin Muhammad Nasîr-ed-dîn Tûsî, 672 [C.E. 1273]]: “Rasûlullah’s ‘sall-Allâhu alaihi wa sallam’ As-hâb fought against their own relatives and tribes for the sake of his way. They carried out all his commands with their utmost energy. They endured all sorts of difficulty in making progress in his way. They would not hesitate to sacrifice whatever they had for his sake. Now, what kind of mentality or understanding should a person have to admit the assertion that such faithful people as these disobeyed his open commandment and held an arbitrary election for caliphate even before his funeral. If there had been, let alone a commandment, a slight implication, a flimsy allusion (on the part of the Prophet) denoting that hadrat Alî ‘radiy-Allâhu anh’ were to be the first Khalîfa, all of them would have raced to do it. Indeed, none of the scholars of Hadîth has reported any commandment, or any implication, showing that hadrat Alî ‘radiy-Allâhu anh’ should be made the first Khalîfa; and those scholars who are known for their excessive fondness for hadrat Alî and who have always reported the hadîth-i-sherîfs commending his high virtues and heroic accomplishments and his services to Islam, are no exception. Alî ‘radiy-Allâhu anh’ did not utter a single word to allude that he deserved to be the (first) Khalîfa, neither in his conversations or khutbas, nor during any of his struggles, nor on the occasions when he had to make talks, such as when there was some delay in the election of Abû Bekr as the Khalîfa or when he was nominated to be one of the six candidates to succeed ‘Umar in the office of caliphate. During the meeting held for the six nominees for caliphate, Abbâs held his

hand out to Alî ‘radiy-Allâhu anhumâ’ and said: Give me your hand! Let everybody see that the (paternal) uncle of the Messenger of Allah ‘sall-Allâhu alaihi wa sallam’ has made you Khalîfa and obey you! He refused this.”

The commandment warning against offending Fâtima ‘radiy-Allâhu anhâ’ is not an unexceptional commandment. For the Emîr (Alî) ‘radiy-Allâhu anh’ offended her a couple of times, and these behaviours of his were not considered culpable. By the same token, Rasûlullah ‘sall-Allâhu alaihi wa sallam’ said to some of his wives: **“Do not offend me by displeasing Âisha! Be it known that in her bed I am being revealed the wahy.”** On the other hand, hadrat Âisha ‘radiy-Allâhu anhâ’ was really offended by hadrat Alî ‘radiy-Allâhu anh’. We can therefore say that the injunction, “Do not displease,” in the hadîth-i-sherîf, means, “Do not displease by falling for the desires of your nafs or the tricks of the devil.” Otherwise, it would not be forbidden in cases of inevitability such as executing an Islamic principle or establishing the truth. The reason why Fâtima ‘radiy-Allâhu anhâ’ was offended with Abû Bekr ‘radiy-Allâhu anh’ was because he would not give her a share of inheritance from Fedek. [Fedek was a village rich in its date orchards in the vicinity of Hayber fortress. According to a peace treaty made with the Jews, half of the village had been given to Rasûlullah]. On account of a hadîth-i-sherîf, which declared, **“We, Prophets, do not leave inheritance. What we leave will become alms (to be given) to the poor,”** Abû Bekr ‘radiy-Allâhu anh’ divided the income from the dates and distributed it to the poor. Obeying this hadîth-i-sherîf, he did not give a share to Fâtima ‘radiy-Allâhu anhâ’. It would not be an offense because this behaviour of his did not originate from his nafs or from the devil. Should it be asked why Fâtima ‘radiy-Allâhu anh’ was offended for something done with the sheer intention of obeying hadîth-i-sherîf, our answer will be: Her taking offence was the result of a frailty inherent in the human nature; it was not an attitude assumed purposely. This offending, which is inevitable, is not forbidden.

3- The scholars of Mâwarâ’un-nehr ‘rahmatullâhi ta’âlâ alaihim ajma’in’ stated: “Allâhu ta’âlâ referred to Abû Bekr ‘radiy-Allâhu anh’ as the Prophet’s ‘sall-Allâhu alaihi wa sallam’ sâhib, that is, companion, in the fortieth âyat of Tawba sûra. It would not be permissible to censure, to curse the Prophet’s companion.”

The booklet gives the following answer to this: The thirty-fifth

âyat of Kehf sûra purports, **“As he spoke to his sâhib (companion), he said: Thou hast disbelieved thine Rabb (Allah), thine creator...”**. Here, a disbeliever also is referred to as the Prophet’s sâhib (companion). As a matter of fact, in the thirty-ninth âyat of Yûsuf sûra, Yusûf ‘alaihi-salâm’ addressed the disbelievers ‘my sâhibs’, by saying, **“O my companions in the dungeon...”**. Yûsuf’s ‘alaihi-salâm’ addressing two idolaters ‘my sâhibs’ shows that the Prophet’s ‘sall-Allâhu alaihi wa sallam’ referring to a person as his sâhib (companion) does not necessarily mean that he is a good person.

Our answer is this: Companionship established with mutual love is certainly effective. It has been stated (by the ’Ulamâ) that denying the effect of Sohbat is a sign of ignorance. Since a Muslim and a disbeliever will not love each other, their sohbat will not produce any effect, any use. There is yet another fact we would like to point out to this effect. The so-called two idolaters were honoured with becoming Muslims owing to the barakat, the fruitfulness of Yusûf’s ‘alaihi-salâm’ sohbat. Then, why should Rasûlullah’s sohbat not have had any effect on Siddîq (Abû Bekr) ‘radiy-Allâhu anh’, who had always been with Rasûlullah more than anyone else and loved him so much? Why should he not have benefited from his maturated ma’rifats? Indeed, Rasûlullah ‘sall-Allâhu alaihi wa sallam’ stated: **“All the ma’rifats, all the pieces of (occult) knowledge Allâhu ta’âlâ has poured into my chest, I have poured into Abû Bekr’s chest.”** The more the love and the attachment, the more the benefits that will be attained. It is for this reason that Abû Bekr Siddîq ‘radiy-Allâhu anh’ became the highest of all the As-hâb. For his attachment to Rasûlullah was more than anybody else’s. He (the Prophet) declared in a hadîth-i-sherîf, **“The superiority of Abû Bekr is not because he makes namâz and fasts very much, but because he has something in his heart.”** Our ’Ulamâ (profoundly learned Islamic scholars, savants) state that the thing he had in his heart was his love for Rasûlullah ‘sall-Allâhu alaihi wa sallam’. Then, how could it ever be justifiable to vilify, to curse such a companion?

4- The ’Ulamâ of Mâwarâ’un-nehr state that: Emîr Alî ‘radiy-Allâhu anh’ accepted the three Khalîfas although he was very powerful and very popular among the As-hâb-i-kirâm. He did not raise any objections. This shows that the three Khalîfas were rightful. Saying otherwise would mean to blame Alî ‘radiy-Allâhu anh’.

The following answer is given in the booklet: “As the Emîr

‘radiy-Allâhu anh’ was busy with the preparations for the funeral, the three Khalîfas convened most of the Sahâba under the brushwood shelter called Benî Sa’îda. They made Abû Bekr the Khalîfa. Alî ‘radiy-Allâhu anh’ heard about this. Yet he thought it would be futile to fight because he had few men and he did not want the good people to die, and for some other good reasons unknown to us. This does not show that Abû Bekr was right. For one thing, Alî ‘radiy-Allâhu anh’ was very strong and brave, yet he and Rasûlullah ‘sall-Allâhu alaihi wa sallam’ and many Sahâba migrated from Mekka to Medina without making any war. They considered it inappropriate to fight at that time. As they and fifteen hundred Sahâbîs were on their way to Mekka in the sixth year of the Hegira, they made peace at a place called Hudaybiya and returned (to Medina). Since it was permissible for Rasûlullah and Alî and the other Sahâba not to fight at those places, it should certainly have been permissible for Alî not to make war by himself. As the fact that war was not made at those places would not show that the disbelievers of Qoureish were right, so Alî’s not making war would certainly not show that Abû Bekr was right. Likewise, Pharaoh maintained his claim to be a god for four hundred years in Egypt. Also, other kings such as Sheddâd and Nimrod continued this corrupt claim for many years. Allâhu ta’âlâ, the Almighty as He is, did not kill them. Even Allâhu ta’âlâ does not hurry to avenge on His enemies; why should it not be permissible, then, for a born slave not to oppose his enemy? The Emîr’s acquiescence to their caliphate was intended to act toward the situation. It was not a willing acceptance.”

Our answer to this will be: According to the ‘Ulamâ of Mâwarâ’un-nehr, Alî’s not fighting Abû Bekr ‘radiy-Allâhu anhumâ’, and obeying him, instead, shows that he (Abû Bekr) was the rightly-guided Khalîfa. And this fact cannot be refuted or denied by making a comparison of it to Rasûlullah’s ‘sall-Allâhu alaihi wa sallam’ not fighting against the disbelievers of Qoureish or Allâhu ta’âlâ’s delaying the killing of His enemies such as Pharaoh, Sheddâd and Nimrod. These examples given in the booklet confute its own argument. For Rasûlullah ‘sall-Allâhu alaihi wa sallam’ and Allâhu ta’âlâ always reproved these enemies of theirs. They stated that those enemies were always evil and base. How can those people be examples for this case? Where is the similarity? Thwarted by the multitude of the reports stating that Alî accepted Abû Bekr’s caliphate and obeyed him ‘radiy-Allâhu anhumâ’, and seeing that it would be futile to deny this fact,

these people have to change their course, and say that Alí accepted it unwillingly in order to act toward the situation. They cannot find a better answer to prove that Abû Bekr's 'radiy-Allâhu anh' caliphate was unjust. They cannot find another way to resolve the dilemma they have driven themselves into. At this point, it will be appropriate to relate how Abû Bekr 'radiy-Allâhu anh' was elected Khalífa. We shall therefore have recourse to the most reliable sources, thus proving at the same time that it would be impossible to degrade Alí 'radiy-Allâhu anh' to the contemptible state of having committed a wrong deed in order to act toward the situation because of the overpowering conditions.

When Rasûlullah 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wa sallam' passed away, the As-hâb-i-kirâm 'radiy-Allâhu anhum ajma'în' set about the election of the Khalífa before beginning the procedures of funeral. They considered it their primary duty to find a president for the Believers. For there were some commandments of Rasûlullah's 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wa sallam' to be carried out, such as the execution of the punishments called (Hadd), defending the country against enemies, organizing an army to this end, and the like. And these tasks, in their turn, could be performed only by the State. It was wâjib, therefore, for the Muslims to elect a president for the State. Upon hearing about Rasûlullah's passing away, most people became so sad that they were at a loss as to what to do, and many others were verging on the insane. Someone to bandage this very serious wound of the people and to diminish the severe pains was prerequisite. Abû Bekr 'radiy-Allâhu anh', in a serene temperance inherent in his immaculately matured character, convened the As-hâb-i-kirâm, and said aloud:

“O thou the blessed Companions of the Prophet 'radiy-Allâhu anhum ajma'în'! If anyone here is worshipping Muhammad 'alaihis-salâm', let him know that he is dead. And whoever is worshipping Allâhu ta'âlâ should know that He is always alive. He will never die!” The rest of his speech was equally effective. Yet, when he heard that the Ansâr had come together in order to elect the Khalífa from among themselves, he went to their meeting place, taking Abû Ubayda and 'Umar along. He said to them, “I have heard that you have been electing to perform and execute the commandments of Allâhu ta'âlâ. Think and search! The Khalífa is to be from among the Qoureish (tribe).” Then, pointing to Abû Ubayda and 'Umar, he added, “Elect one of these people.” Upon this, 'Umar said, “You are the Khalífa, O Abâ

Bekr,” holding out his hand to him. All the Ansâr unanimously agreed to his caliphate. The following day he went to the mosque and mounted the menber. He looked at the jama’at (Muslims), and saw that Zubeyr bin Awwâm was not among them. He sent for him and, when Zubeyr came, he asked him, “Do you have anything against this unanimity of Muslims?” Zubeyr said, “O the Khalîfa of the Messenger! I have nothing against it,” and he held out his hand in submission. The Khalîfa looked around once again. When he did not see Alî ‘radiy-Allâhu anh’, he sent for him. When the Emîr came, he said to him, “Do you want to be opposed to this unanimity of Muslims?” Alî, too, held out his hand in submission and said, “O the Khalîfa of the Messenger! I am not opposed.” Zubeyr and Alî apologized for being late to accept the Khalîfa. They said, “We were sorry because we had not been informed about the caliphate election. We know very well that no one among us would be more rightful to the office of caliphate than Abû Bekr is. For he has been honoured with being (the Prophet’s) companion in the cave. We are very well aware of his honour, his superiority. Rasûlullah ‘sall-Allâhu alaihi wa sallam’ chose him among us as the imâm to conduct the namâz.” [Zubeyr bin Awwâm ‘radiy-Allâhu anh’ is one of the ten fortunated who were given the good news (by Allâhu ta’âlâ) that “they shall enter Paradise.” His parents were the brother of our mother Hadîja and Rasûlullah’s paternal aunt Sâfiyya. He became a Muslim when he was fifteen years old. He was the first Muslim to draw his sword, the first to migrate to Abyssinia, and the first to migrate to Medina. He received numerous wounds in the Holy Wars of Bedr, Uhud, Hendek (Trench), Hudaybiya, Hayber, Mekka, Hunayn, and Tâif. He joined the conquest of Egypt, too. He was very rich. He gave all his wealth in the way of Allah. He was against hadrat Alî in the event of Camel. He was martyred in the thirty-sixth year (of the Hijrat), when he was sixty-seven years old].

Imâm-i-Muhammad Shâfi’î ‘rahmatullâhi aleyh’ [150-204 (C.E. 819), in Egypt] states: “When Rasûlullah ‘sall-Allâhu alaihi wa sallam’ passed away, the As-hâb-i-kirâm considered and searched, and finally decided that no one on the earth could be superior to Abû Bekr ‘radiy-Allâhu anh’. They unanimously made him Khalîfa.” The As-hâb-i-kirâm ‘radiy-Allâhu anhum’ unanimously wanted to make one of the following (three) people Khalîfa: Abû Bekr, Alî, and Abbâs ‘radiy-Allâhu anhum’. Alî and Abbâs said nothing against the caliphate of Abû Bekr. They both

accepted the caliphate of Abû Bekr. Thus Abû Bekr was unanimously elected Khalîfa. If Abû Bekr had not been the rightful Khalîfa, Alî and Abbâs would have opposed it and demanded their rights. As a matter of fact, (later) Alî ‘radiy-Allâhu anh’ did not accept the caliphate of Muâwiyya ‘radiy-Allâhu anh’ because he did not consider it rightful. Although Muâwiyya’s army was more powerful than his, he insisted on his due and caused many people to die. On the other hand, it would have been much easier for him to oppose Abû Bekr, and he would have been elected Khalîfa. For that time was closer to the time of Rasûlullah ‘sal-Allâhu alaihi wa sallam’ and therefore people were more inclined to find out (and do) what was right. Furthermore, Abbâs offered Alî to be Khalîfa, yet he refused it. If he had considered himself to be more rightful, he would have accepted it. Indeed, Zubeyr and all the sons of Hâshim, with all their great fame and bravery, and many other Sahâbîs were with Alî ‘radiy-Allâhu anh’. This ijmâ’ [unanimity] would suffice to prove the fact that Abû Bekr was the rightful Khalîfa. And the fact that there is not a single commandment or even an implication to contradict this, emphasizes the state of rightfulness. In fact, according to the majority of scholars, the ijmâ’-i-ummat, that is, unanimity of the As-hâb, is more dependable than a commandment which is not mesh-hûr (narrated by all scholars unanimously). For something on which there was ijmâ’ (unanimity of the As-hâb) is certainly true. A commandment which is not mesh-hûr, on the other hand, is supposed to be true. We would like to add at this point that there are implications, even commandments advising that Abû Bekr should be the (first) Khalîfa. The profoundly learned ‘Ulamâ of Tafsîr and Hadîth have reported them. It is true that there are no such commandments according to the majority of the profound scholars of the Ahl as-sunna. Yet this same statement shows that others do not have the right, either. Hence it becomes obvious that Abû Bekr became the Khalîfa rightfully by the unanimous vote (of the Sahâba) and Alî cannot be said to have acted toward the situation unwilling as he was. If the Sahâba had been the kind of people who would not have accepted the truth, then (the probability of Alî’s) having acted toward the situation might be considered. How could Alî ‘radiy-Allâhu anh’ ever be reproached with having abdicated a right in order to handle people honoured with the hadîth-i-sherîf, **“The best of times is my time.”**?

‘Uthmân bin Abd-ur-Rahmân ibn-is-Salâh, [his book Aqs-ul-

amal was printed in London; 577-643 (C.E. 1245)], and 'Abd-ul-'azîm Munzirî [581-656] 'rahmatullâhi ta'âlâ alaihimâ' state: The As-hâb-i-kirâm were all equitable people. It is an absolute fact that all the As-hâb-i-kirâm will go to Paradise. The tenth âyat of Hadîd sûra purports, **“O Believers! Among you, the ones who gave their property and fought for the sake of Allâhu ta'âlâ before the conquest of Mekka, will have higher grades than those who gave (property) and fought after the conquest of Mekka. They are not equal with respect to their ranks. I promise them all (that I shall give them) Paradise.”** This means to say that all the As-hâb-i-kirâm shall enter Paradise. That the promise made in this âyat-i-kerîma is given to those who sacrificed their property and lives does not necessarily mean that the ones who did not give alms or make jihâd (Holy War) will not enter Paradise. [It is stated in the tafsîrs of Beydâwî and Huseynî and Mawâqib that, according to the majority of mufassirs (profoundly learned savants who make explanations of Qur'ân al-kerîm), this âyat-i-kerîma was revealed in order to inform with the high honour Abû Bekr as-Siddîq had. For he was first to have îmân and to dispense his property and to fight against disbelievers].

To assert that “Alî 'radîy-Allâhu anh' accepted (the caliphate of) hadrat Abû Bekr unwillingly, in order to get along well,” means to disparage that Lion of Allah. For it is a sin not to tell the truth. And doing something unwillingly is what the meanest Believer would hate. Could the Emîr, the Lion of Allah, the son-in-law of the Messenger of Allah, the peerless paragon of valour and heroism, ever have lowered himself to the mediocre state of doing such repugnant acts? Their ignorance, blended with gross excessiveness, drives them into the ludicrous position of depreciating hadrat Alî 'radîy-Allâhu anh' in the name of appreciating him. While downgrading him, they think they are extolling him.

5- The 'Ulamâ of Mâwarâ'un-nehr 'rahmatullâhi ta'âlâ alaihim ajma'in' state: To curse, to vituperate the three Khalîfas or a few of the pure blessed wives of Rasûlullah is disbelief. If a person says it is permissible, he must be punished.

The following answer is given to this in the booklet: The commentator of (the book) Aqâid-i-Nesefî does not agree that it will cause disbelief to curse the Shaikhayn [Abû Bekr and 'Umar]. [The book **Aqâid-i-Nesefiyya** was written by 'Umar ibni Muhammad Neseff (461-537, in Semerkand). The book of fiqh entitled **Zahîra** is very valuable. Many scholars wrote

commentaries for **Aqâid-i-Nesefiyya**. Its most celebrated commentary is that of Mes'ûd bin 'Umar Sa'd-ad-dîn-i-Teftâzânî (722-799, in Semmerkand)]. The author of **Jâmi'ul-usûl** considers those people who curse the Shaikhayn to be among the Muslim groups. Also, the book **Mawâqif** states so. [The book **Jâmi'ul-usûl** was written by Mubârak bin Muhammad Ibn Esîr (544-606, in Musul). The book **Mawâqif** was written by Qadi Adûd Abd-ur-Rahmân bin Ahmad. It is a very valuable book of Aqâid (principles of Islamic belief). Among its commentaries, the most celebrated ones are that of Sayyed Sherîf Alî bin Muhammad Jurjânî [740-816, in Shîrâz], and that of Muhammad bin Es'ad Jelâl-ad-dîn Dewânî. Dewânî's Persian book, **Akhlâq-i-Jelâlî**, is famous; it was printed and translated into English. The explanation of Sayyed Sherîf Alî's commentary, made by Abd-ul-hakîm Siyalkutî Hindî [1068 (C.E. 1658), in India], is well-known and was printed]. Imâm-i-Muhammad Ghazâlî [450-505 (C.E. 1111), in Tus city] says that it is not disbelief to curse the Shaikhayn. Abul-Hasan Esh'arî [Alî bin Ismâ'îl, 266-330 (C.E. 941), in Baghdâd] says that a person who performs his duty of namâz cannot be called a disbeliever. Then, considering the people who curse the Shaikhayn to be disbelievers, is an attitude contradictory to the books of the Islamic scholars, to Qur'ân al-kerîm, and to hadîth-i-sherîfs.

We give the following answer: It is disbelief to curse the Shaikhayn (Abû Bekr and 'Umar) 'radiy-Allâhu ta'âlâ anhumâ'. The hadîth-i-sherîfs show that it is disbelief. It is declared as follows in a hadîth-i-sherîf reported by Tabarânî [Suleyman bin Ahmad, 260-360 (C.E. 971), in Isfehân] and by Hâkim [Muhammad bin Abdullah, 321-405 (C.E. 1014), in Nishâpur]: **“Allâhu ta'âlâ has chosen me. And He has chosen the best ones of mankind as my As-hâb [Companions]. From among my As-hâb, He has selected viziers, assistants, relatives for me. If a person curses them, may Allâhu ta'âlâ and angels and human beings curse him! Allâhu ta'âlâ will not accept the farz or sunnat worships of those people who curse them.”** A hadîth-i-sherîf reported by the Hadîth scholar Alî bin 'Umar Dâraqtunî declares: **“After me, some people will appear. If you meet them, kill them! For they are polytheists [disbelievers].”** Alî 'radiy-Allâhu anh' asked, “What is their sign?” He (Rasûlullah) declared, **“They will make an excessive display of attachment to you. They will say about you what you do not have. They will censure the religious superiors coming before them.”** [Dâraqtun is a village in Baghdâd. 306-385,

in redundant]. In the same book, he (Rasûlullah) declared, **“These people censure Abû Bekr and ’Umar. They swear at them. May Allâhu ta’âlâ and angels and all human beings curse those who swear at my As-hâb.”** There are very many similar hadîth-i-sherîfs, and since most of them are well-known, it is unnecessary to quote them here.

Cursing the Shaikhayn means enmity towards them. And enmity towards them, in its turn, is disbelief. For it is declared in a hadîth-i-sherîf, **“Enmity towards them is enmity towards me. To hurt them means to hurt me. And to hurt me means to torment Allâhu ta’âlâ.”** It is declared in a hadîth-i-sherîf reported by Alî bin Hasan ibni Asâkir [499-571, in Damascus], **“It is î mân to love Abû Bekr and ’Umar ‘radiy-Allâhu anhumâ’. Enmity towards them is kufr (disbelief).”** It is declared in a hadîth-i-sherîf, **“If a person says to a Believer something which states that he is a disbeliever, [if he says, for instance, ‘O you the enemy of Allâhu ta’âlâ!'], he himself becomes a disbeliever.”** Then, a person who calls the Shaikhayn disbelievers or considers them to be disbelievers will become a disbeliever himself. We know for certain that Abû Bekr and ’Umar ‘radiy-Allâhu anhumâ’ are Believers. They are not enemies of Allâhu ta’âlâ. They have been blessed with the good news (that they shall attain) Paradise. Then, a person who calls them disbelievers will become a disbeliever. It is true that the hadîth-i-sherîf quoted above is reported by only one person. Yet it shows that a person who calls a Believer a disbeliever will become a disbeliever. Nevertheless, a person who denies this will not become a disbeliever. Abû Zur’a Râzî, a great contemporary scholar, states, “If a person vituperates one of Rasûlullah’s ‘sall-Allâhu alaihi wa sallam’ As-hâb, he is a zindiq. For Qur’ân al-kerîm is certainly true. Rasûlullah certainly tells the truth. The information we have been receiving from them is certainly true. All this information praises and lauds the Ashâb-i-kirâm. To speak ill of them means to deny Qur’ân al-kerîm and hadîth-i-sherîfs. And this, in its turn, is blasphemy, heresy, and aberration.” Sehl bin Abdullah Tusturî [200-283 (C.E. 896), in Basra] states, “A person who does not esteem the As-hâb-i-kirâm has not had î mân in Rasûlullah.” Abdullah bin Mubârek [116-181 (C.E. 797), in Iraq] was asked, “Which person is higher; Muâwiyya, or ’Umar bin Abd-ul-’azîz?” He replied, “The dust that entered the nose of Muâwiyya’s [d. 60 (C.E. 680), when he was seventy-nine years old] horse as he escorted Rasûlullah, is much higher than ’Umar bin Abd-ul-

'azîz." Thus he informed that no degree of highness could reach the level attained by being in Rasûlullah's sohbat and seeing his blessed face. [ʿUmar bin Abd-ul-ʿazîz, the eighth Emewî (Umayyad) Khalîfa, was a profoundly learned, extremely pious person. He was martyred in the year 101, when he was forty-one years old. He bought Malatya from the Byzantine Greeks in return for a hundred thousand slaves]. This kind of superiority, which is the sheer result of sohbat with the exclusion of all other personal virtues is common in all the As-hâb-i-kirâm. When the other types of virtues are added to this superiority; for instance, a Sahabî who made jihâd with Rasûlullah and who taught the Believers coming after him what he had learned from him and who devoted his property for his sake, must be even more superior, higher. There is no doubt that the (first) two Khalîfas were among the higher ones of the As-hâb-i-kirâm. They were even the highest ones. Then, it would be disbelief to attribute the slightest inferiority to the Shaikhayn, nonetheless for calling them disbelievers. It would mean blasphemy, aberration. It is stated as follows in the book **Muhît**, written by Shems-ul-aimma Muhammad bin Ahmad Serahsî [483 (C.E. 1090), in Turkistan]: "It is not permissible to perform namâz behind an imâm (who is notorious for his) vituperating the Shaikhayn. For that person denies the fact that Abû Bekr 'radiy-Allâhu anh' was the Khalîfa. On the other hand, the fact that he (Abû Bekr) was rightfully elected Khalîfa has been acknowledged unanimously by all the As-hâb-i-kirâm." It is stated as follows in the book of fatwâ named **Hulâsa**, written by Tâhir bin Ahmad Bukhârî: "If a person denies the caliphate of Abû Bekr, he becomes a disbeliever. It is mekrûh (not liked by Rasûlullah, though not forbidden) to perform the namâz conducted by a bid'at^[1] holder. If the bid'at he holds is so bad as to cause disbelief, the namâz conducted by him will not be sahîh (accepted). If it is not so bad as disbelief the namâz will be sahîh but mekrûh. It is almost equally true that a person who denies the caliphate of hadrat 'Umar 'radiy-Allâhu anh' will become a disbeliever." In light of the fact that a person who denies their caliphates will become a disbeliever, one should imagine the destiny awaiting those people who vilify and curse them. As it is seen, to call such eccentricities disbelief is exactly

[1] Bid'at is any act, any behaviour, any belief, any prayer or worship that did not exist in Islam originally and which was fabricated later in the name of religion. All kinds of bid'at are somehow harmful to Islam.

concordant with hadîth-i-sherîfs and the statements made by the Islamic 'Ulamâ. When some of the Ahl as-sunna scholars 'rahmatullâhi ta'âlâ alaihim ajma'in' said that these people should not be called disbelievers, they meant those who were not excessive in their eccentricities. Their statements are therefore in agreement with the hadîth-i-sherîfs and the statements of the (other Islamic) 'Ulamâ.

The booklet curses, vituperates Âisha-i-Siddîqa 'radiy-Allâhu ta'âlâ anhâ', too. These people assert that she is to be cursed because she disobeyed the âyat-i-kerîma and the hadîth-i-sherîf. They traduce her – may Allâhu ta'âlâ protect us from doing such an ignoble act. They say, "It was commanded, **'Stay in your homes'**, in the âyat-i-kerîma. Disobeying this commandment, she fought Alî 'radiy-Allâhu anh' in the event of Camel. On the other hand, it had been stated in a hadîth-i-sherîf, **'He who fights you will have fought me.'** This means to say that fighting Alî means fighting Rasûlullah 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wa sallam'. And he who fights the Prophet will become a disbeliever. For this reason, it is necessary to censure, to curse Âisha."

Our answer is this: The commandment, **"Stay in your homes,"** does not mean, "Always sit in your home in all circumstances. Never go out." The fact that some of Rasûlullah's wives accompanied him in some of his expeditions shows that the truth is not as they state. This means to say that the commandment to stay in homes was intended for certain occasions and situations. It is like expressing something as a whole while meaning a part of it. Such statements are not absolute commandments. It is permissible for a mujtahid, therefore, to infer another part from this whole. For there are some qualities common in all the parts. Âisha 'radiy-Allâhu anhâ' was doubtless a learned scholar and a mujtahid. Abû Mûsal-esh'arî [one of Rasûlullah's governors. He introduced the custom of putting dates on written documents, letters, etc. He passed away in Kûfa in 51] states in Tirmuzî's book: Whenever the As-hâb-i-kirâm wanted to know something, they would go and ask hadrat Âisha and learn from her. Mûsâ bin Talha states, again in Tirmuzî's book: I saw no one who could talk more eloquently, more correctly than Âisha did. Owing to the profound knowledge she had, Âisha 'radiy-Allâhu anhâ' understood the inner meaning of the âyat-i-kerîma, followed the exceptional cases which made it permissible for her to go out, and went out. The meaning inferred from the âyat-i-kerîma is, "Do not go out without covering yourselves." Indeed, the final part of

the âyat-i-kerîma purports, **“Do not show your ornaments, jewels to men, as was done by women in the time of nescience** (the time before Islam)!” This means to say that it is permissible (for women) to go out with something to cover themselves. Âisha’s ‘radiy-Allâhu anhâ’ going out in the event of Camel was not intended to make war. It was intended to quell the fitna and restore peace. Even if it had been intended for war as the historians interpret it, nothing could be said against it. For she acted upon (her) ijtihâd. She did not go out only because she wished to do so. As a matter of fact, as Sherh-i-mawâqif narrates from Seyf-ud-dîn Alî Âmidî ‘rahmatullâhi aleyh’, the events of Camel and Siffîn were on account of ijtihâd. If a mujtehid is wrong (in his or her ijtihâd), he (or she) cannot be blamed for this. The sixty-eighth âyat of Enfâl sûra purports, **“Had it not been for the book of Allâhu ta’âlâ beforehand, you would suffer great torment on account of what you have done.”** Beydâwî explains this âyat as follows: “Allâhu ta’âlâ wrote in the Levh-il-mahfûz beforehand that He will not torment unless what He has clearly forbidden is committed. If He had not foreordained that he would not torment for erring or mistaking... .” Another fact we would like to point out is that a mujtehid’s erring is a rahmat (compassion), a hidâyat (guidance to the right way and salvation) from Allâhu ta’âlâ. ‘Umar ‘radiy-Allâhu anh’ states in a book (written) by Rezin bin Muâwiyya (524), one of the sons of Abduddar bin Qusay, that Rasûlullah ‘sall-Allâhu alaihi wa sallam’ stated: **“I asked my Rabb (Allâhu ta’âlâ) about the disagreements (that will occur) among my As-hâb after me. My Rabb intimated to me: O My beloved Prophet Muhammad ‘alaihis-salâtu wa-ssalâm’! Your As-hâb are like the stars in the sky. Some of them are brighter than others. They all emit lights. A person who follows one of them will attain hidâyat.”** Then he stated this hadîth-i-sherîf: **“My As-hâb are like the stars in the sky. If you follow any one of them you will attain hidâyat** (guidance to the right way) **and salâmat** (salvation).”

Perhaps Âisha ‘radiy-Allâhu anh’ had not heard about the hadîth-i-sherîf, **“O Alî! He who fights you will have fought me.”** Or perhaps a certain fighting was meant. Or perhaps the wars he made during the Asr-i-Sa’âdat were meant.

In order to convince others and to defeat the Ahl as-sunnat, (the author of) the booklet says: “The Prophet ‘sall-Allâhu alaihi wa sallam’ was talking with Ibni Umm-i-Mektûm, who was sightless in both eyes, when one of his (the Prophet’s) wives came

near them. Annoyed, the Prophet stated, **‘He may not see, but you do (see)!’** While it was so strongly prohibited for women to show themselves to men, it is written in the Sunnite books how Âisha ‘radiy-Allâhu anhâ’ leaned her head on the Prophet’s shoulder and watched the men playing (musical) instruments and dancing. The Prophet stated, **‘Are you still not sated, o Humeyrâ?’** We could not say that the basest people would do the same.” Our answer is this: This behaviour of watching the dances may have happened before the âyat-i-kerîma commanding (women) to cover themselves was revealed. On the other hand, (the Prophet’s) prohibiting (his blessed wife) from showing herself to Ibnî Mektûm occurred after the revelation of the âyat-i-kerîma. Or, perhaps, the dances watched were those kinds of dances that were not forbidden; they may have been permissible kinds of dances. As a matter of fact, (some) sahîh (authentic) reports show that bayonet dances were performed in the yard of Mesjîd-i-Nebevî. And this, in its turn, being a war dance, is not sinful. Indeed, the fact that it was performed in the yard of the Mesjîd (Mosque) indicates that it was permissible. Even if the watching of the dances had occurred after the revelation of the âyat-i-kerîma, Âisha ‘radiy-Allâhu anhâ’ was too young then. She was not liable (to religious commandments) yet. In fact, Bukhârî and Muslim quote her (hadrat Âisha) as relating, “Rasûlullah ‘sall-Allâhu alaihi wa sallam’ was standing in the door of the room. Some Abyssinians were doing a dance on the Mihrâb of the Mesjîd. Rasûlullah ‘sall-Allâhu alaihi wa sallam’ covered me with a cloth that was on his blessed back. I watched the dance, looking through the aperture between his blessed ear and neck.”

It should be known very well that meddling with the behaviours of the As-hâb-i-kirâm, and saying whatever occurs to one’s mind about them, is the lowest degree of insolence and the last grade of asininity a Muslim could do. A person who bears the name Muslim should love all the As-hâb-i-kirâm, leaving the disagreements and rows among them to Allâhu ta’âlâ. He should know that loving them means loving Muhammad ‘alaihis-salâm’. For the Messenger of Allah stated, **“He who loves them, loves them because he loves me.”** This is the only way to salvation for a Muslim. Imâm-i-Muhammad bin Idris Shâfi’î ‘rahmatullâhi aleyh’ states, “As Allâhu ta’âlâ has protected our hands from being smeared with the blood shed among the As-hâb-i-kirâm, so we should protect our tongues from poking into it.” ’Umar bin Abdul’azîz also made a similar statement. [Sayyed Ahmad bin Alî

Rifâf [512-578 (C.E. 1183), in Umm-i-Ubeyd, in the neighborhood of Basra] states as follows in the seventy-eighth page of the Turkish book titled **Ahmad Rifâf**, which was printed in Istanbul in 1340: "It is never permissible to exceed the limit (prescribed by the 'Ulamâ) in talking about the events that took place among the As-hâb-i-kirâm 'alaihim-ur-ridwân' or to pronounce judgements on them. Every Muslim should be discreetly reticent about the As-hâb-i-kirâm, always mention their virtues, love and praise them all." However, some people speak ill of the As-hâb-i-kirâm. They are so daring as to vituperate, curse those people who are Islam's most beloved personages. It is necessary for the Islamic 'Ulamâ 'rahmatullâhi ta'âlâ alaihim ajma'in' to answer them, to refute them, to explain that their way of thinking is erroneous, unhealthy. It is to this end that this faqîr, [that is, Imâm-i-Rabbânî, mujaddid-i-elf-i-thânî, Ahmad Fârûqî 'rahmatullâhi aleyh' [971-1034 (C.E. 1624), in Sirhind, India], have written a few words. Yâ Rabbî (O my Allah)! Do not punish us for what we have forgotten or for our mistakes! This is the end of the answer which this faqîr has had the lucky chance to write in order to rebut and chagrin the author of the book I have read. May Allâhu ta'âlâ place in our hearts the love of His religion! May He honour us all with making progress in the way of His beloved Prophet Muhammad 'alaihis-salâtu wassalâm'! Âmîn.

The thirty-sixth letter of the second volume of the book **Mektûbât**, written by the great 'âlim and Qayyûm-i-âlam, hadrat Shaikh Muhammad Ma'thûm bin Ahmad Fârûqî 'quddisa sirruhuma' [1009-1079 (C.E. 1667), in Sirhind] who was a qayyûm-i-âlam and one of the very rare scholars educated throughout centuries, answers various long questions. It has been considered appropriate at this point to translate only the answer to the eighth question in the letter:

Question: It is stated as follows in the book **Sherh-i-Dîwân-i-kutub-i-tawârih**: "When hadrat Emîr 'kerrem-Allâhu ta'âlâ wajhah' detected the fact that some people were nursing a grudge against him, he began to utter maledictions against five people including Mu'âwiya 'radiy-Allâhu ta'âlâ anh' after each of the five daily prayers of namâz. Upon hearing about this, they (these five people) began to utter curses after each of the five daily prayers upon five people, who were hadrat Emîr (Alî), hadrat Hasan, hadrat Huseyn, Abdullah ibni Abbâs and Mâlik-i-Ejder 'radiy-Allâhu anhum ajma'in'. In fact, the Khalîfas of Benî Umayya spread this ignoble practice far and near. In khutbas they

pronounced curses upon the Ahl-i-Bayt. This practice continued until 'Umar bin Abd-ul-Azîz canceled it. 'Umar bin Abd-ul Azîz annulled this malediction and recited the ninetieth âyat-i-kerîma of Nahl sûra for its place.” Did this vile event really take place, or not?

Answer: Hadrat Emîr ‘kerrem-Allâhu ta’âlâ wajhah’, who was rahmat from head to foot, never, never cursed any Muslim at all, none the less for uttering maledictions against the As-hâb of our master, the Prophet ‘sall-Allâhu alaihi wa sallam’, especially aganist Mu’âwiya ‘radiy-Allâhu anh’, on whom the Messenger of Allah asked a blessing many times. Hadrat Emîr said about those who were with Mu’âwiya, “Our brothers have not agreed with us. They are not disbelievers or sinners. They have acted on their ijtihâd.” This statement of his keeps disbelief and sinfulness away from them. Why should he have cursed them, then? The Islamic religion does not contain a kind of worship comprising malediction, be it against the worst unbeliever. Since it is necessary to utter benedictions and to ask blessings after the five daily prayers of namâz, why should he have given up benedictions for the sake of maledictions which would have served only for the appeasing of personal hatred. Do these people put down hadrat Emîr, who had attained the highest grade of Fanâ^[1] and the end of Itmi’nân^[2] and completely renounced his personal desires, as a simpleton whose nafs seethed with grudge, contumacy, animosity like their own nafs-i-emmâra?^[3] Is it this stupid supposition that causes them to traduce that very exalted person in such a despicable way as this? Hadrat Emîr had attained the highest grades of Fanâ fi-llâh (see footnotes) and Muhabbat-i-Rasûlillah (love of the Messenger of Allah), and had relinquished his life and property for the sake of his ‘sall-Allâhu alaihi wa sallam’ way. Why should he have wasted the time allotted for him to pray

[1] The highest grade of Tasawwuf. In this grade the person concerned totally forgets about his own existence and disappears into the existence of Allâhu ta’âlâ.

[2] The grade in which the malignant component existent in man’s nature, which is called NAFS, forgets about its own sensuous desires and adapts itself to the commandments of Allâhu ta’âlâ.

[3] The malignant being in man’s nature; all the desires of the nafs run counter to the commandments of Allâhu ta’âlâ. It is one’s nafs that causes one to feel reluctant to do Islam’s commandments. And it is this very nafs again that may tempt one into the very dangerous position of being proud of the worship one has done.

cursing his (supposed) enemies instead of spending it, for instance, pronouncing maledictions upon the enemies of Allâhu ta'âlâ and His Messenger 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wa alâ âlihi wa sallam', upon those people who had inflicted all sorts of torture and persecution on the Sultân of both worlds, our master, the beloved Prophet of Allâhu ta'âlâ 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wa sallam'? On the other hand, his statement, "They have acted on their ijtihâd," shows that he was not hostile to them. The truth is that the wars and controversies between them did not stem from inimical feelings, nor were they based on inveterate bitternesses such as grudge. They were the results of ijtihâd and ta'wîl. There could have been no place for criticising, let alone cursing, in this business. If it were a pious act, a worship to vituperate or curse a person, it would have been one of the requirements of Islam to curse the accursed devil, Abû Jahl, Abû Lahab, and the other ferocious, unbelievers of Qoureish who hurt, persecuted and tormented our master the Prophet 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wa sallam' and who perpetrated so many pernicious acts of turpitude against this true religion. Inasmuch as it is not a commandment to curse the enemies, how could it be a pious act to curse the friends? Rasûlullah 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wa sallam' stated, **"If a person curses the Shaytân (Satan), he (the Satan) will say, 'I am the accursed already. Your cursing will not give me any (additional) harm'. If a person supplicates, "Yâ Rabbî (o my Allah)! Protect me against the Shaytân', he (the Shaytân) will say, 'You have broken my back.'"** This comes to mean that the allegations above are slanders, calumniations against hadrat Emîr. On the other hand, to say that Mu'âwiya 'radiy-Allâhu anh' began to curse hadrat Emîr, hadrat Hasan, hadrat Huseyn, and the others 'radiy-Allâhu anhum ajma'în' would mean to slander hadrat Mu'âwiya 'radiy-Allâhu anh'. You say, "Did this event really take place? If it did, why should it not be normal to curse Mu'âwiya and the others? If it did not happen, what is the meaning in the book of Tafsîr of Kash-shâf (the book titled **Sherh-i-Dîwân-i-kutub-i-tawârih**)?" Our answer is: No, it did not take place. According to the Madh-hab of Ahl as-sunnat wa-l-jamâ'at (the scholars of the Sunni way), it is not permissible to speak ill of Mu'âwiya 'radiy-Allâhu anh'. The allegation (above) is intended to traduce him. In addition, there is not a true report in this respect. Historians narrate it; yet how can their narration be of documentary value? Religious principles cannot be based on historians' statements. In this matter the statements of Imâm-i-a'zam Abû Hanîfa and his

As-hâb (companions) are to be taken into consideration; not the statements of historians or the narratives written in Kash-shâf. Neither the Emir's name nor Mu'âwiya's is mentioned in the writings that you say have been derived from Kash-shâf. Nor is it so much as hinted that those two great personages of Islam exchanged maledictions. The writings (in the book mentioned) are entirely true. There is nothing running counter to our knowledge. Why, then, should we search for an agreeable meaning? Yes, the Khalifas of Benî Umayya had the Ahl-i-Bayt cursed throughout the (religious sermons given on the) members (in mosques) for many years. 'Umar bin Abd-ul-Azîz put an end to this practice. May Allâhu ta'âlâ give him plenty of rewards! Yet Mu'âwiya, one of the Umayyad Khalifas as he was, is an exempt. Cursing or vituperating Mu'âwiya 'radiy-Allâhu anh' would mean cursing or vituperating a considerable number of the As-hâb-i-kirâm who joined these controversies and wars with him, and among them were a few of the Ashara-i-mubash-shara [the ten people who were given the good news while they were still living that they would go to Paradise after death]. And speaking ill of these great religious authorities would in its turn mean rejecting and vitiating the religious information coming to us from them. No Muslim would see this appropriate or agreeable.

Sir! I will explain to you the two madh-habs in this matter. The word of the Ahl as-sunnat wa-l-jamâ'at, and the word of others. Some people speak ill of the three Khalifas and Mu'âwiya and those who followed him. They curse them. They say that after our Prophet 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wa sallam' all the As-hâb became renegades, with a few exceptions. According to the Madh-hab of Ahl as-sunnat wa-l-jamâ'at, the As-hâb of our master the Prophet 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wa alâ âlihi wa sallam' cannot be spoken of but in favourable terms. None of them is bad or evil. The hadîth-i-sherîf, **"He who loves them, loves them because he loves me. He who is inimical to them, is so because he is inimical to me,"** commands us to love them all. We should know that the fights and combats between them were done with good intentions. We must consider and hold them quite far from the wicked and base desires and the recalcitrance inherent in the human nafs. Imâm-i-Yahyâ bin Sharaf Nawawî [631-676 (C.E. 1274), in Damascus] states in his explanation of the hadîths in **Muslim** that the As-hâb-i-kirâm parted into three groups in the combats that took place in the time of Imâm-i-Alî 'radiy-Allâhu anh'. The ijtihâd of one group showed them that the Emîr 'radiy-Allâhu anh' was right. It was

wâjib for them to follow the way agreeable with their ijtihâd. So all of them helped hadrat Emîr. Another group of the As-hâb failed to reach a conclusion in their ijtihâd. It was therefore wâjib for them not to interfere with the matters at all. A third group, on the other hand, came to the conclusion in their ijtihâd that those who were opposed to the Emîr were right. So it was wâjib for the owners of this ijtihâd to support the opposing party. This means to say that each group acted upon their own ijtihâd. For this reason, it would be wrong to blame any one of them. However, hadrat Emîr and those who followed him because their ijtihâd agreed with his had found the truth in their ijtihâd. Those who were opposed to them were wrong in their ijtihâd. Yet, for their error pertaining to ijtihâd, they cannot be criticized or blamed. Whereas the erroneous party deserved one thawâb,^[1] the group who explored the truth deserved ten thawâbs. Imâm-i-Shâfi'î 'rahmatullâhi aleyh' stated, 'As Allâhu ta'âlâ has protected us from getting our hands smeared with their blood, so should we protect our tongues.' This valuable statement indicates that it would be wrong even to utter the word 'wrong' about them and that we should mention even their errors with (respect and) good will. All this adds up to mean that a person who dislikes Mu'âwiya 'radiy-Allâhu anh' and curses him cannot be in the group of Ahl-i-sunnat wa jamâ'at. Now, the Shi'îs will hate him, too. For they hate any person who likes the three Khalîfas. Therefore this person is neither Sunnî nor Shi'î. He must have taken up a third way.

If you still have doubts as to the teachings of the scholars of Ahl as-sunna concerning the disagreements that occurred among the As-hâb-i-kirâm, you should read dependable books on i'tiqâd (Islamic belief), which explain all facts one by one and in detail. You should not believe the incongruous, untenable statements fabricated afterwards. This is the end of the translation of the thirty-sixth letter. With a view to ending this writing of ours in beautiful statements, we are writing about the honourable deeds, praises and virtues of the Ahl-i-Bayt 'radiy-Allâhu anhum':

The thirty-third âyat of Ahzâb sûra purports, **“O the Ahl-i-Bayt of My Beloved One! Allâhu ta'âlâ wishes you to be sinless.”** Most of the Mufasssirs (scholars skilled in explaining the âyats of Qur'ân al-kerîm) have stated that this âyat-i-kerîma came for Alî,

[1] Reward; act, behaviour, belief, or thought for which Allâhu ta'âlâ promises reward in the Hereafter; the reward that will be given.

Fâtima, Hasan, and Huseyn ‘radiy-Allâhu ta’âlâ anhum’. Âisha ‘radiy-Allâhu anhâ’ stated so, too. There are also those (scholars) who say that it was revealed for his (the Prophet’s) blessed wives ‘radiy-Allâhu anhunna’. For the âyat-i-kerîma following this clearly addresses to his wives. Abû Sa’îd-i-Hudrî, [was thirteen years old when the Holy War of Uhud was made. He passed away in 64 (Hijrî). His grave is believed to be in the yard of Qariya Mosque at Ayvansaray, Istanbul], is quoted as having said as follows in the book Musnad, by Ahmad bin Hanbal [164-241 (C.E. 855), in Baghdâd]: This âyat-i-kerîma came for Rasûlullah, Alî, Fâtima, Hasan, and Huseyn. These five people are called **Ahl-i-abâ**, which means ‘covered with cloak’. According to Ahmad bin Muhammad Sa’labî [427 (C.E. 1036), in Nishâpur], the word ‘Ahl-i-Bayt’ in this âyat-i-kerîma means ‘the Sons of Hâshim’, (or Hâshemites). And the word ‘rijs’ used in the âyat-i-kerîma means ‘to sin’, ‘to doubt about the principles of belief’. Then, these people (Hâshemites, or Hâshimites) will never enter Hell. Sa’d ibni Ebî Waqqâs ‘radiy-Allâhu anh’, [one of the Ashara-i-mubashshara. He was in his seventeenth year when he became the seventh earliest Muslim. He joined all the Holy Wars. He was the first archer who threw an arrow. He was a very good marksman. He was the commander-in-chief of the Islamic army that won a victory in Qadsiya and erased the magian Iranian State from the pages of history. 55 (Hijrî), in Medîna], stated: When the sixty-first âyat of Âl-i-’Imrân sûra, which purports, **“Come; Let us call Our children and your children”**, was revealed, Rasûlullah ‘sall-Allâhu alaihi wa sallam’ called Alî, Fâtima, Hasan, and Huseyn ‘radiy-Allâhu ta’âlâ alaihim ajma’in’, and stated, **“Yâ Rabbî! These are my Ahl-i-Bayt.”**

Musawwir bin Mahrama ‘radiy-Allâhu anh’, [attained martyrdom when he was hit by a stone flung by a mangonel as he was performing namâz. 2-64, in Medîna], quoted Rasûlullah ‘sall-Allâhu alaihi wa sallam’ as having stated, **“Fâtima ‘radiy-Allâhu anhâ’ is a piece from me. He who annoys her will have hurt me** (by doing so).” [She was thirteen years old during the Hijrat (Hegira). When she was fifteen years of age, she was married to Alî ‘radiy-Allâhu anh’, who was twenty-five years old then. She passed away in Medîna in the eleventh year of Hijrat, six months after the Prophet’s passing away].

Abû Hurayra ‘radiy-Allâhu anh’, [became a Muslim during (the Holy War) Hayber, and presently joined the Holy War. A very poor man as he was, he would always keep Rasûlullah

company. Mu'âwiya appointed him governor of Medîna. He passed away in 59, when he was seventy-nine years old. In Medîna], relates: I was with the Messenger of Allah, when Hasan came. He (Rasûlullah) supplicated, **“Yâ Rabbi! I love this (grandson of mine). (Please), You, too, love him and (love) also those who love him!”** Enes bin Mâlik, [was in Rasûlullah's service for ten years. He lived more than a hundred years], stated, “No one else resembled Rasûlullah ‘sall-Allâhu alaihi wa sallam’ more than Hasan did.” And he said at some other time, “Huseyn radiy-Allâhu anh’ resembled Rasûlullah very much.” Zeyd bin Erqam, [was a small boy at the time of the Holy War of Uhud. He joined the other seventeen Holy Wars. 61 (Hijrî), in Kûfa], quotes Rasûlullah as saying, **“I am leaving two things over to you after me. If you adhere to these (two things) you will not leave the (right) way. One of them is greater than the other. One of them is Qur’ân al-kerîm, the Holy Book of Allâhu ta’âlâ; it is like a strong rope extending from heaven down to earth. The second one is my Ahl-i-Bayt. These two are inseparable. If a person dissents from them, he will have abandoned my way.”** In another hadîth-i-sherîf narrated again by Zeyd bin Erqam, he (Rasûlullah) states, **“To fight Alî, Fâtima, Hasan and Huseyn, means to fight me. To be in peace with them means to give up one’s self to me.”** Jemî’ bin ‘Umar ‘radiy-Allâhu anh’ relates: My (paternal) uncle and I asked Âisha ‘radiy-Allâhu anhâ’ who Rasûlullah ‘sall-Allâhu alaihi wa sallam’ had loved best. “(He loved) Fâtima ‘radiy-Allâhu anhâ’ (best),” she answered. When we asked who the man he had loved best was, she said it was Fâtima’s husband. Abdullah ibni ‘Umar ‘radiy-Allâhu anh’, [Hendek (Trench) was the first Holy War he joined; he joined all the other Holy Wars. He passed away in Mekka in 73 (H.), when he was eighty-four years old], quotes Rasûlullah ‘sall-Allâhu alaihi wa sallam’ as saying, **“Hasan and Huseyn are my fragrant odours in the world”**. Alî ‘radiy-Allâhu anh’ stated: “The upper part of Hasan’s body and the lower part of Huseyn’s body resembled those of Rasûlullah’s, respectively.” Abdullah ibni Abbâs ‘radiy-Allâhu anhumâ’, [was very profoundly erudite. He passed away in Tâif in 68 (H.), when he was seventy years old.], relates: Rasûlullah ‘sall-Allâhu alaihi wa sallam’ had Hasan on his blessed shoulder. Someone (who saw them) said, “O Hasan! What a good place you have seated yourself.” Upon this the Messenger of Allah said, **“What a good person is the one on my shoulder!”** According to a narrative reported from Âisha ‘radiy-Allâhu anhâ’, [daughter of Abû Bekr

as-Siddîq. Upon the command of Allâhu ta'âlâ she was married to our master, Rasûlullah, through nikâh (marriage contract as prescribed by Islam) when she was six years old, and the wedding ceremony was held in the first year of Hijrat, when she was nine. She was praised and lauded (by Allâhu ta'âlâ) in Qur'ân al-kerîm. She was learned, literary, very wise, and masterly skilled. She reported more than a thousand hadîth-i-sherîfs. She was eighteen years old when Rasûlullah 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wa sallam' passed away. She passed away in Medîna in 57 (H.), when she was sixty-five years old. She was Abdullah bin Zubeyr's maternal aunt]; the As-hâb-i-kirâm would race for attaining Rasûlullah's love; for instance, they would bring him their presents when he was in Âisha's home. There were two groups of the (blessed) wives. Hafsa, Safiyya, and Sawda were with Âisha. The second group were Umm-i-Salama and others. This group sent Umm-i-Salama to Rasûlullah with the request, "Please command your As-hâb that anyone who would like to give you a present should take it to the home of the wife you happen to be with!" Upon this, Rasûlullah stated, "**Do not hurt me about Âisha! Only when I was with her did Jebrâil (Gabriel, the Archangel) 'alaihi-salâm' visit me.**" Sorry about what she had said, Umm-i-Salama made tawba and begged for forgiveness. But the wives sent Fâtima 'radiy-Allâhu ta'âlâ anhunna' with the same request. The (Prophet's) answer was: "**O my daughter! Will you not love whom I love?!"** When Fâtima answered, "Of course, I will," Rasûlullah said, "**Then, love Âisha!**" Âisha 'radiy-Allâhu anhâ' related, "Among Rasûlullah's wives, Hadîja^[1] 'radiy-Allâhu anhâ' was the one I envied most and wished I had been in her place, though I had never seen her. For, dead as she was, he mentioned her name very frequently. Whenever he killed a sheep and dealt out the meat, he would make sure that a certain amount (of meat) be reserved and would send it to Hadîja's relatives. On one such occasion I said to him, 'Why do you mention Hadîja's name so often as though Allâhu ta'âlâ had given you no other women?' He answered, '**Yes, I did have other women. Yet she was so good, so...**' (He praised

[1] Hadîja-t-ul-kubrâ, Rasûlullah's first blessed wife. Our Prophet did not marry another woman as long as she lived. She was forty years old when she married the Messenger of Allah, who was twenty-five then. She passed away in Mekka, in the blessed month of Ramadân, three years before the Hijrat (the Prophet's migration to Medîna). It was one year after her passing away that Allâhu ta'âlâ commanded His beloved Messenger to "marry (hadrat) Âisha."

Hadîja for a while, and added), **and I had children through her.’** ” Abdullah ibni Abbâs quoted Rasûlullah as having said, **“Abbâs is from me, and I am from Abbâs.”** [Abbâs ‘radiy-Allâhu anh’ was a slave captured in the (Holy War) Bedr. Later he became a Muslim. He joined the Holy Wars of Mekka and Hunayn. He was tall, light-complexioned, and very handsome. He passed away in 32, when he was eighty-eight years old. He is in Baqî, Medîna]. Another hadîth-i-sherîf reported by Abdullah declares, **“Love Allâhu ta’âlâ, who sends you plenty of His blessings. As you love Allâhu ta’âlâ, love me, too. As you love me, love my Ahl-i-Bayt!”** Abû Zer Ghifârî, [the fifth earliest Muslim. He passed away in Rabda village of Medîna in 32], quoted Rasûlullah ‘sall-Allâhu alaihi wa sallam’ as having stated, **“Be it known that my Ahl-i-Bayt among you is like Nûh’s (Noah’s) ‘alaihis-salâm’ Ark. As those who boarded the Ark (at that time) attained salvation, so any person who loves my Ahl-i-Bayt (now and on) shall attain salvation. And he who turns away from them shall end up in destruction.”**

This is the end of the book **Radd-i-Rawâfid**, by Imâm-i-Rabbânî, mujaddid-i-elf-i-thânî Ahmad Fârûqî ‘rahmatullâhi aleyh’.

Ilâhî!^[1] For the sake of Fâtima’s children, Make my last word the Kalima-i-tawhîd!^[2] Shouldst Thou reject or accept my invocation, I’ve held on to the skirts of Ahl-i-Bayt-i-Nebî.

Yâ Rabbî (o my Allah)! For the sake of Thine Prophet and his Ahl-i-Bayt ‘radiy-Allâhu anhum’, forgive Imâm-i-Rabbânî Ahmad Fârûqî and his mother and father! For the sake of the beautiful character of Thine Beloved one, treat them well and beautifully ‘rahmatullâhi alaihim ajma’in’! Make our duâ and salâm reach Thine Beloved Prophet and his Ahl-i-Bayt, and give them khayr and barakat in a manner as Thou likest, as many times as the number of Thine creatures and as heavy as Thine Arsh. Âmin. May hamd (praise, laud, and thanks) be to Allâhu ta’âlâ, and may duâs and salâms be to the ummî Prophet, Muhammad ‘alaihis-salâm’, till the end of the world!

The book (**Radd-i-Rawâfid**), by hadrat Imâm-i-Rabbânî Ahmad Fârûqî Serhendî, was printed in India and Pakistan. Ghulâm Mustafâ Khan, a professor in the university of

[1] O my Allah!

[2] The word expressing that Allâhu ta’âlâ exists and is one: **Lâ ilâha il-Allah.**

Haydarâbâd, Pakistan, had it printed in a splendid layout and published it together with its Urdu translation under the title **(Te'yîd-i-Ahl-i-sunnat)** in 1385 [C.E. 1965]. This edition of the book was reproduced by offset process in Istanbul in 1397 [C.E. 1977]. The book was translated into Arabic by Shâh Waliy-y-ullah Dahlawî, an Indian scholar, and the translation was printed in India. This Arabic version was reproduced by offset process in Istanbul and published as an appendix to the book **An-Nâhiya**.

***No one do I complain to but what I lament over my state;
Trembling like a culprit, as I look into my future state!***

PART THREE
THE BOOK TEZKIYA-I-AHL-I-BAYT
by
MAWLAWÎ 'UTHMÂN EFENDÎ

May hamd be to Allâhu ta'âlâ, who is the Rabb of everything, that is, who creates and raises all beings! May goodnesses and salvations be upon our beloved Prophet, Muhammad 'alaihi-salâm', who has guided us to the right way. May benedictions be over his close relatives and over his As-hâb, who had the honour of believing in him and seeing his beautiful and luminous face!

Of all the seventy-two different miscreant groups who have deviated from the right way in this world, which is a place of examination for mankind and an open space of ground whereon the good are distinguished from the bad, haters of the As-hâb-i-kirâm are the most staunch followers of the devil and the most miserable victims of the deceitful human nafs, so much so that they have already surpassed the devil in this respect. These people make a show of excessive love for the close relatives and the children of our Prophet 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wa sallam', and say that loving them is the greatest worship. They claim to be adherent to the âyat-i-kerîma which purports, **"I do not demand any return for having brought you the Islamic religion. All I demand from you is to love my Ahl-i-Bayt, who are close to me."** Yet the evil cult they actually adhere to is based on vituperating, cursing Rasûlullah's 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wa sallam' As-hâb 'radiy-Allâhu 'anhum ajma'in', who are Islam's greatest teachers. Some of them go even further, so that they censure our master the Messenger of Allah 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wa sallam' and even Jebrâîl 'alaihi-salâm', the trustworthy Archangel who carried the Wahy from Allâhu ta'âlâ. They consider this wicked attitude of theirs as an act of worship.

Jewish priests who haunt Iran under the cloak of tradesmen strive day and night to mislead Muslims, boasting of their "endeavours to save humanity". The very clever ones disguise themselves as hodjas or shaikhs and travel incognito through villages, where they disseminate their obnoxious, poisonous assertions. The rich ones spend all their property and money for this goal. In fact, hadrat field marshal Muhammad Nâmik Pasha [1219-1310], who was aide-de-camp to Sultan Abd-ul-Hamîd Khân II, Muslims' Khalîfa and the great Pâdishâh of the Ottoman Turks, [1258 (1842)-1336 (1918), in the graveyard of Sultan Mahmûd],

related to this faqîr, ('Uthmân Efendi means himself): “During my governorship of Baghdâd I observed how Jewish priests published hundreds of thousands of books for the purpose of disseminating their heresies and circulated them in a clandestine way in the villages of Iran and Iraq. I had the books collected and thrown into a river. I prevented them from writing and publishing such mischievous books.” Despite so many efforts to prevent them, it has not been quite possible to stop these base-natured people causing turmoil and misdirecting people. So far, they have not hesitated to sacrifice their property and lives for this purpose.

[People who are Muslims in name and yet enemies of Islam in reality are called **zindiqs**. One of the harmful books, and probably the worst, which zindiqs have written with all sorts of lies and are trying to give universal currency to, is a pamphlet titled **Husniyya**. Originally written in the Persian language, the book has been translated into Turkish and circulated in a surreptitious way in Istanbul and almost all over Anatolia. When a lithographic copy of the book was obtained and scanned, it was seen that it did not contain any true writings. It was understood that it was a spurious, mendacious pamphlet fabricated with preposterous, impracticable, illusory ideas. It is observed with consternation that this writing, circulating among the Hurûfî fathers in Iran, was printed in Istanbul in 1958 and has been being sold freely and contaminating, misleading some wretched people who happen to read it. We have seen with gratitude on the other hand that our noble and pure people avoid buying this pamphlet, so that it does not sell much.

It is an obvious fact that those pure Muslims belonging to the group of Ahl as-sunnat wa-l-jamâ'at and people with average mental capacity and a smattering of general knowledge will not believe such writings; yet falsifications disguised in good, true statements and covered under ornamented, falsely-adorned writings may confuse the readers. The introductory section of the so-called book has been decked deceitfully].

According to the Ahl as-sunna, it is necessary to love very much the Ahl-i-Bayt-i-Nebevî, that is, hadrat Alî and his children ‘radiy-Allâhu anhum ajma’în’. Loving them will cause one to die in îmân (to die as a Believer). Books written by the savants of Ahl as-sunna teem with writings commending their love. The Iranian Jew named Murtadâ, the author of the so-called book Husniyya, must have known this fact very well; it was shrewd of him to write in the beginning about his exuberant love for the Ahl-i-Bayt so that the ignorant people reading these falsely adorned statements should

consider Islam to consist of loving the Ahl-i-Bayt, which is certainly something beautiful in itself, and thus take the whole book for granted and, consequently, deviate from the right way, believing that the book is rightful in its criticism of the As-hâb-i-kirâm ‘radiy-Allâhu ta’âlâ anhum ajma’in’ and the scholars of Ahl as-sunna.

The book **Tuhfa-i-Isnâ Ashariyya**, written in the Persian language and printed in India in order to refute mentally and scientifically the writings in the so-called book and in other similarly poisonous books, has been translated into Turkish and printed in order to protect Muslims from falling into such a grave, bottomless, abysmal disaster, with the command of hadrat Sultan Abd-ul-Hamîd Khân II, our master and Pâdishâh ‘rahmatullâhi ta’âlâ aleyh’, a protector of the Islamic religion and a rescuer of Muslims, and the Turkish version is already in circulation. Yet we have considered it appropriate to write another refutation of the book **Husniyya**, and named this refutation of ours **Tezkiya-i-Ahl-i-Bayt**. Detailed refutation is available also in our book **Sahâba the Blessed**, from the fifth heading on.

[The book Tuhfa-i-Isnâ ashariyya, in Persian, was printed in India in 1266 [C.E. 1850]. A copy of the book exists in the library of Istanbul University. It was written by Ghulâm Halîm Shah Abd-ul-’Azîz Dahlawî, who passed away in India in 1239 [C.E. 1823]. The book, which tells about Shi’îs, was printed again in 1309. Abd-ul-’Azîz Dahlawî is the son on Waliyy-ullah Ahmad bin Abd-ur-Rahîm Dahlawî (1114-1180), the celebrated (Islamic) scholar].

A closer look at the book Husniyya betrays the fact that its translator was not a Persian but he must have been an Ottoman clerk in Istanbul who, though being of the Sunni ancestral origin, had wandered away from the right way. In order to rescue both this person and those young people who might have had the unlucky chance of reading this book from meeting the endless disaster, we are beginning to write this refutation of ours, trusting ourselves to Allâhu ta’âlâ. This refutation, Tezkiya-i-Ahl-i-Bayt, was printed in Istanbul in 1295 (C.E. 1878). It has been discovered that the refutation was written by ’Uthmân (Osmân) bin Nâsir Efendi, the Shaikh of Yenikapı Mevlevîhâne in Istanbul. It is written in **Qâmûs-ul-a’lâm** that his father, Nâsir Efendi, passed away in 1236 (C.E. 1821)].

1- It is related as follows at the beginning of the book Husniyya: “A merchant, who was a devoted friend of Imâm-i-Ja’fer Sâdiq’s [83-148, in Medîna] ‘radiy-Allâhu anh’, had a very

pretty jâriya^[1] named Husniyya. This jâriya stayed with the Imâm until she reached the age of twenty, learning in the meantime all the branches of knowledge. After the Imâm's death the merchant went bankrupt and wanted to sell the jâriya to Hârûn-ur-Reshîd, the Khalîfa. [Hârûn-ur-Reshîd was the fifth Abbâsî (Abbasid) Khalîfa. He was born in 148, and passed away in 193 in Tus city. He became the Khalîfa in 170]. Petrified by the beauty of the girl, the Khalîfa asked the price. Fifty thousand golds, was the answer. When the Khalîfa asked what skills the jâriya had to be worth that much, the merchant told him all about the knowledge and the virtues she had. She was given an examination in the presence of scholars. She proved to be superior to the scholars. She rebutted all of them. The scholars and mujtahids present for the occasion, among whom were Imâm-i-Abû Yûsuf Ya'qûb bin Ibrâhîm [113-182, in Baghdâd] and Imâm-i-Muhammad bin Idris Shâfi'î [150-204, in Egypt], could not answer her. They knew a scholar who they believed was superior to them all. This scholar, Ibrâhîm Khâlid by name, lived in Basra and was the author of numerous books. They sent for him, yet he, too, proved short of coping with her and became completely baffled."

According to some Madh-habs, it is not permissible for this jâriya to stay with another man while being in the possession of the merchant. There are some scholars who say that it is not permissible in Hanafî Madh-hab, either. This fact is written in the two hundred and thirty-fifth page of the fifth volume of Ibnî Âbidîn. To say that such a pious personage as Imâm-i-Ja'fer-i-Sâdiq 'radiy-Allâhu anh', who is well-known for his wara'^[2] and taqwâ,^[3] continuously committed a forbidden or (at least) dubious deed by keeping another man's young and pretty jâriya in his service and teaching her for years, means to calumniate that great Imâm. It might be thought that the Imâm, being a mujtahid himself, might have had the ijtihâd that such an act would be permissible; but how could we presume that this great Imâm would have been so indifferent as to acquiesce in a jâriya's being deprived of freedom for many years and being put up for sale at the end of all these years in his service

[1] Woman slave captured in a Holy War. Muslims treat their slaves and jâriyas as they treat their brothers and sisters.

[2] Wara' means to abstain from acts, behaviors, words, food, drinks, and all things that are dubious, that is, anything about which one cannot be sure whether it is forbidden or permitted.

[3] Taqwâ means to abstain from all sorts of forbidden acts, behaviours, thoughts, words. (Ibni Âbidîn)

and after attaining such a perfect level in knowledge and integrity owing to his tutorship? Learning all the branches of knowledge so much as to beat and rebut all the other religious scholars and mujtahids is an indication of a profound mental and intellectual capacity and skill. Therefore, to write that hadrat Imam could not realize the value of such a dexterous jāriya and did not put an end to her slavery but acquiesced to her being sold from one person to another, would mean to accuse that exalted Imâm of atrocity. And this, in its turn, would signify animosity, let alone love, towards the Ahl-i-Bayt. This allegation of the Jewish author of the book Husniyya is a stupid method no less ludicrous than the humorous anecdote of a man who “kills his friend inadvertently while trying to kill the fly on his forehead with a big stone,” which is related in the **Mesnevî** of Celâl-ed-dîn Rûmî ‘qaddas-Allâhu sirrah-ul-’azîz’. Furthermore, it is harâm for women to raise their voice so high as to let men hear them. According to some scholars, they are permitted to (talk to men) in case of strong necessity, but even in this case they must be careful not to exceed the prescribed limits, i.e. they must talk in a low and rough tone, and stop it as soon as the necessity is over. This fact is explained in full detail in the book Durr-ul-mukhtâr, and also in the two hundred and seventy-second page of its explanatory commentary. In light of this fact, a woman’s sitting on a raised platform in front of hundreds of men and talking to them for hours, while it was possible for them to carry on this debate in a written form, would raise doubts as to her concept of chastity and decency. Not only that; this situation would also put hundreds of religious scholars and mujtahids into a position of sinfulness. No Muslim would believe such nonsense. It betrays the fact, however, that the author of the book Husniyya is in the dark about Islam.

2- *“Husniyya quoted âyats from Qur’ân al-kerîm and explained them by means of hadîth-i-sherîfs with such competence that the scholars in her presence were unable to answer her and had to remain silent. This state exasperated Hârûn-ur-Reshîd. Husniyya’s silencing the scholars of Baghdad caused far-reaching repercussions in the city for many days,”* it says. While making this allegation, the book does not say what the so-called questions that could not be answered were, so that we might see for ourselves whether they were really so profound and difficult that the so-called mujtahids were unable to answer. On the other hand, the innumerable books that still exist today reveal the fact as apparently as the sun that not only the scholars of Ahl-i-sunnat themselves ‘rahmatullâhi ta’âlâ

alaihim ajma'în' but also every one of the thousands of pupils educated by them gave various answers to all the slanderous allegations of the many miscreants, thus inflicting a humiliating defeat on them. Everybody sees this fact. Obviously these profound scholars, who had educated such superior disciples and proved their powerful competence by establishing essential methods and principles for belief and worships and laying the religious problems on firm, unshakable foundations, could not be expected to have fallen into such a shameful position by falling short of answering a jâriya's questions; a person with common sense could not believe this derogatory allegation. Another fact known by all groups of Muslims is that there has not been a scholar superior to mujtahids so far. Nor does any (Islamic) book make mention of a superior scholar named Ibrâhîm Khâlid of Basra. The Jewish author of the book Husniyya should have heard of Abû Sawr Ibrâhîm bin Khâlid and fabricated his story over his name. Yet Abû Sawr was born in Baghdâd, lived in Baghdâd, and passed away in Baghdâd in 240 (H.). He, let alone having taught five hundred scholars in Basra, took lessons formerly from Imâm-i-a'zam's disciples and later from Imâm-i-Shâfi'î in Baghdâd.

3- The book quotes the jâriya as having said, "*The As-hâb-i-kirâm became disbelievers because they made Abû Bekr their Khalîfa after Rasûlullah's death. Therefore the As-hâb deserves being cursed. Rasûlullah 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wa sallam' stated: After me my As-hâb will quote many hadîths. Most of these hadîths will be false. Do not believe in the statements of my As-hâb unless they are one of my Ahl-i-Bayt!*" Modifying the hadîth-i-sherîf, "**After me my Ummat (Muslims) will part into seventy-three groups. One of them will attain salvation. The remaining seventy-two groups will go to Hell. This one group is those who follow me and my As-hâb,**" he (the author) transforms (the last clause) into "those who follow me and my Ahl-i-Bayt." Then the jâriya is made to lapse into the heretical theory called Mu'tazila with the following assertion:

"The jâriya, in order to prove that Qur'ân al-kerîm is a creature and is not eternal, asked various questions, which the mujtahids were unable to answer. Upon this, thousands of people who attended the debates as auditors, Sunnite as they were, spat in the mujtahids' faces, all the people of Baghdâd applauded the jâriya by clapping their hands. As the Khalîfa (Hârûn-ur-Reshîd) was listening to the debate, she said that only the twelve imâms of the Ahl-i-Bayt, and no one else, were rightful to caliphate and that the

Sunni Muslims would make anyone their Khalîfa sinful and evil as the person might be, and she cursed the thousands of Sunni Muslims who were present. When she said before all those people that hadrat Alî and six other Sahâba had been opposed to hadrat Abû Bekr's caliphate, that this disagreement had led to wars, that the number of Alî's supporters had reached twenty-two, that all the As-hâb, with the exception of these twenty-two people, and those who loved them and all the mujtahids and scholars who followed them and all the Sunni Muslims were disbelievers and even worse than disbelievers, and that it would be the most valuable worship to curse them, the Khalîfa, Hârûn-ur-Reshîd, became so jubilant and admired her so much that from time to time he scattered golds on her." These fake events are related in a sordid, derisive, extravagant language in the book.

The hundredth âyat of Tawba sûra purports, "**Allâhu ta'âlâ loves them. And they love Him.**" Here, He (Allâhu ta'âlâ) declares that He likes and loves all the As-hâb-i-kirâm, all the Muhâjirs and Ansârs alike. The sixth âyat of Ahzâb sûra purports, "**His wives are Muslims' mothers.**" Here, He (Allâhu ta'âlâ) praises and lauds Rasûlullah's 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wa sallam' blessed wives 'radiy-Allâhu ta'âlâ alaihimâ ajma'in'. It is not something a person with adequate wisdom would do, to resist these âyat-i-kerîmas, to call these religious superiors disbelievers, and to say that the hadîths reported by these people are not dependable. Statements such as these could be made only by insidious enemies or Jews striving to denigrate and demolish the Islamic religion.

The questions, which were actually copied from the Mu'tazila group and which are alleged to have been asked in order to prove that Qur'ân al-kerîm is a creature and that men's actions are not creatures, have been answered in a most pulchritudinous and indubitable way by every one of the disciples educated by mujtahids, thousands of valuable books have been written to this end, and most of them have been translated into various languages, winning the admiration of the world's scientists. Therefore, only idiots can be deceived by alleging in a falsely adorned, circumlocutory language that the mujtahids could not answer the questions asked by the jâriya. A person with common sense will see at once that these writings are lies and vilifications which the enemies of Islam and Jews use as weapons in their behind-the-scenes attacks in order to demolish Islam.

While writing the questions that the Mu'tazila group posed to

the Ahl as-sunna in order to prove that Qur'ân al-kerîm is a creature and that men's bad deeds are not created by Allâhu ta'âlâ but men create all their wishes themselves, he withholds, conceals the express and confuting answers which the scholars of Ahl as-sunna 'rahmatullâhi alaihim' gave them. However, these answers of the Ahl as-sunna are written in detail in our books of Kelâm.

Hârûn-ur-Reshîd was the most learned, the most courageous, and the most equitable of the Abbâsî Khalîfas. In the presence of such a Khalîfa and in front of scholars and statesmen a jâriya disparages the Khalîfa by saying to his face that he is not the rightful Khalîfa and then turning to the thousands of distinguished people being there and saying to them that they have made an atrocious sinner their Khalîfa; this is not something the human mind could accept. And his allegation that these words (of the jâriya's) made the Khalîfa laugh and he was so pleased that he scattered golds on the jâriya's head, is as ludicrous and as farcical as to arouse one's puerile feelings of mockery. His writing that "with these statements of hers the jâriya silenced the scholars and no one was able to answer her; people being there and all the Sunnite Muslims of Baghdâd were pleased and they manhandled the mujtahids", shows that the mujtahids, the Khalîfa, and all the people being there accepted the Mu'tazila sect and hated the Madh-hab of Ahl as-sunna. On the other hand, all books and historical records unanimously state that Hârûn-ur-Reshîd was in the Madh-hab of Ahl as-sunna throughout his life, that he had very deep respect for the scholars of Ahl as-sunna, that he would commune with them before going into any action. There is no written record, not even a sign, to show that the people of Baghdâd swerved into the Mu'tazila way during his time. Yes, it is recorded that one or two of the Khalîfas after Hârûn meant to urge the people to join the Mu'tazila group; yet it is a plain fact that such efforts proved futile and that all the Iraqis and Iranians maintained their Sunnite guidelines up until the time of Shah Ismâ'îl. The reappearing of the Shi'ah sect, which was actually brewed by Shah Ismâ'îl Safawî [born in 892, dead in 930 (C.E. 1524)] as a stratagem to break Muslims into sects and thus to hold his ground against the Ottoman Empire, was hundreds of years after Hârûn-ur-Reshîd. As is seen, Hârûn and the people's applauding the jâriya is a downright lie deliberately fabricated for sheer vilification.

4- The jâriya is made to say, "*Formerly, the mut'a nikâh was a*

common practice. Later it was forbidden by hadrat 'Umar." However, Rasûlullah 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wa sallam' prohibited the mut'a nikâh on the day when he conquered Mekka. The mut'a nikâh means an agreement made by a man and a woman to cohabit for a certain period of time. As any fallen woman, let alone a highly virtuous one, could not be so shameless as to talk about this matter amidst thousands of men, it is an abominable slander to allege that a mature, chaste, young and very pretty woman educated by hadrat Imâm Ja'fer Sâdiq talked about it so frankly. [There is detailed information on the prohibition of the Mut'a Nikâh in our book **Sahâba the Blessed**, and also in the fifth part of this book].

5- The jâriya is supposed to have said, "*Rasûlullah 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wa sallam' ordered his As-hâb on the night of his migration to Medîna from Mekka that no one should leave his home. Disobeying this order of Rasûlullah's, Abû Bakr as-Siddîq went out of his home and followed the Messenger of Allah. Rasûlullah did not want him to follow, and was thinking of telling him to go back, when Jebrâil 'alaihis-salâm' (the Archangel Gabriel) came and warned Rasûlullah, saying that Abû Bekr meant mischief and might betray him (Rasûlullah) to the disbelievers of Qoureish should he be made to go back. The fortieth âyat of Tawba sûra, which purports, 'Don't be afraid! Allah is with us,' shows that Abû Bekr was a disbeliever.*" [May Allâhu ta'âlâ protect us against saying so!]

On the contrary, according to the unanimous report of history books, day by day the unbelievers of Qoureish augmented their animosity against our master, Rasûlullah 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wa sallam', and the As-hâb-i-kirâm 'alaihim-ur-ridwân', and eventually laid siege to them. During this three years' siege some Sahâbîs migrated to Medîna-i-munawwara and some to Abyssinia. For example, as 'Uthmân 'radiy-Allâhu anh' [martyred in Medîna in 35 (H.), when he was eighty-two years old], who was the compiler of Qur'ân al-kerîm, and his blessed wife hadrat Ruqayya [passed way in Medîna in the second year of Hijrat] were leaving for Abyssinia, Rasûlullah 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wa sallam' saw them and said to them, "**Of Prophets 'alaihimu-s-salâm', Lût 'alaihis-salâm' was first to migrate together with his wife. And among my As-hâb you are the first to migrate with your wife. Allâhu ta'âlâ shall make you a companion to Lût 'alaihis-salâm' in Jennet (Paradise).**" Ruqayya 'radiy-Allâhu anhâ' was Rasûlullah's 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wa sallam' second daughter. Thus there was no one left in Mekka-i-mukarrama'

with the exception of hadrat Abû Bekr and hadrat Alî ‘radiy-Allâhu anhumâ’. Abû Bekr ‘radiy-Allâhu anh’ asked several times for permission to migrate. Yet he was not given the permission (by the Messenger of Allah, who said), **“You will migrate with me.”** So he began to wait for Allâhu ta’âlâ’s permission to migrate. Meanwhile, upon the suggestion advanced by Abû Jahl, the chief of Qoureish and the notorious enemy of Islam, they decided to kill the Messenger of Allah. [The real name of Abû Jahl is Amr bin Hishâm bin Mughîra. He belongs to the Benî Mahzûm tribe of Qoureish. He is a descendant of Mahzûm bin Yaqnata bin Murra. Qoureish is the name of Fihri, Rasûlullah’s eleventh father. Murra is Rasûlullah’s seventh father. Abû Jahl was killed in the Holy War of Badr in the second year of Hijrat]. Lest the murderer should be identified, they selected twelve vagrants, one from each tribe, and besieged Rasûlullah’s home on the night between Wednesday and Thursday. They were about to attack, for the murder of the Messenger of Allah, when Allâhu ta’âlâ ordered him to migrate. He ordered hadrat Alî ‘radiy-Allâhu anh’ to lie in his blessed bed and left home before sunrise, reciting the eighth âyat-i-kerîma of Yâsin sûra and walking by the unbelievers, who did not see Rasûlullah ‘sall-Allâhu alaihi wa sallam’ leave his house and walk by. Staying at some so far undiscovered place till noon, he went to Abû Bekr as-Siddîq’s place at noontime. He ordered Abû Bekr’s son Abdullah [joined many Holy Wars; passed away in the eleventh year] to walk amongst the unbelievers every day and take the information he would find and also some food and drink to a certain cave every night. That night he and Abû Bekr Siddîq left the latter’s house and went to a cave in the mountain called Sawr. In the mountain Rasûlullah ‘sall-Allâhu alaihi wa sallam’ put his blessed head on Abû Bekr’s knee and fell asleep. Lest a poisonous animal come out of one of the holes in the cave and hurt the Messenger of Allah, Abû Bekr as-Siddîq doffed the shirt he was wearing, tore it to pieces, and packed each piece into a whole. There being one piece too few, one of the holes was left unplugged. A snake appeared in this hole, holding its head out. To prevent the snake from going out and hurting Rasûlullah, Abû Bekr Siddîq put his blessed foot on the hole. The snake bit his blessed foot, yet he would not draw his foot back. However, the pain caused by the biting brought tears into his blessed eyes and when they fell on Rasûlullah’s ‘sall-Allâhu alaihi wa sallam’ blessed luminous face, the best of mankind woke up. Seeing what

had happened, he put his blessed spittle on the bitten place. It stopped the pain immediately. After spending three nights in the cave, they left there on the first Monday of the month of Rabî'ul-awwal, setting out for Medîna on camels and using the coastal route, which was shorter. When they reached the place called Qudayd, they came across a tent, wherein lived a woman. They asked the woman if she had something (to eat) for them to buy. She said she had nothing to eat but a skinny, milkless ewe. The Messenger of Allah asked for her permission to milk it. He rubbed his blessed hand gently on the sheep's back, said the Besmele,^[1] and began to milk it. Very much milk came out, so that all the people being there drank plenty of it and they filled all the containers she had. When the woman's husband came and was told about this miracle, he and his wife became Muslims.

All books give this same account about the Hijrat (Hegira). Since there was no one left in Mekka city except Abû Bekr and Alî 'radiy-Allâhu anhumâ', the allegation that "Rasûlullah ordered his As-hâb not to leave their homes" proves to be an open falsification. Abû Bekr-i-Siddîq 'radiy-Allâhu anh' was two years younger than Rasûlullah 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wa sallam'. When they were young they were very close, loving friends. This mutual love between them lasted increasingly as long as they lived. They were always together, day and night. When Rasûlullah 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wa sallam' travelled to Damascus and honoured the place with his blessed presence twice, he accompanied him. To disignore all this love, attachment and self sacrifice and assert that Rasûlullah did not trust him, is a very evident lie, an abominable slander. He says that Rasûlullah did not tell Abû Bekr that he was going to migrate. The unbelievers who had besieged the house did not perceive Rasûlullah's leaving the house. If Abû Bekr sensed this and followed the Messenger of Allah, this must be a sign of kashf (seeing, understanding, perceiving, sensing through one's heart) and kerâmat (miracle happening on Awliyâ, i.e. people loved very much by Allâhu ta'âlâ). Accordingly, would it be logical to state that a person with kashf and kerâmet would betray Rasûlullah? Supposing he would betray him, then did not he have the opportunity to betray him to

[1] The word 'Bi-s-m-illâh-ir-rahmân-ir-rahîm,' which means, briefly, 'In the name of Allah, (who is very) merciful, compassionate.' Every Muslim should utter this word before doing anything unless it is something sinful.

the unbelievers when they came to the mouth of the cave (wherein Rasûlullah and hadrat Abû Bekr were hiding) on Friday and saw the spider's web completely covering the mouth of the cave and gave up entering the cave saying, "It seems as if no man has entered here since the creation of the earth"? Would he miss this chance?

To distort the meaning of the âyat-i-kerîma which purports, **"Don't worry! Allâhu ta'âlâ is with us,"** and to attempt very sordidly to use it as a ground for condemning Abû Bekr Siddîq 'radiy-Allâhu ta'âlâ anh', is the most disgusting way of ignorance and enmity towards Islam. It is not worth answering at all.

6- *"Husniyya talked with Ibrâhim Khâlid for a long time. She asked him questions on subtle matters. Like the other mujtahids, he failed to answer her questions. Placed in a quandary, he asked Husniyya who was rightful to the caliphate. When Husniyya replied that the caliphate rightfully belonged to the earliest Muslim, he asked who the earliest Muslim was, to which Husniyya answered, 'Hadrat Alî was.' When he objected to this answer, saying, 'Hadrat Alî was a child when he became a Muslim. Since a child's becoming a Muslim is not important in this sense, the earliest Muslim was Abû Bekr Siddîq,' Husniyya recited the âyat-i-kerîmas telling about Hadrat Îsâ (Jesus) and Mûsâ (Moses) and Ibrâhîm (Abraham), said that those (Prophets) had become Muslims in their childhood, and vituperated Ibrâhîm Khâlid and the scholars of Ahl as-sunna. Hadrat Imâm-i-Shâfi'î, who was present there, asked the Khalîfa to punish the jâriya. The Khalîfa just refused the suggestion, ordering that she must be beaten through knowledge."*

On the contrary, the hadîth-i-sherîf, **"Every child comes to the world in a nature well fitted for becoming a Muslim. Later their parents turn them into Jews or Christians or atheists,"** is widely known among the Sunnite Muslims, so that everyone has heard it. While there is this hadîth-i-sherîf, to believe the assertion that Ibrâhim Khâlid or any other man of religion said, "Hadrat Alî 'radiy-Allâhu ta'âlâ anh' was a child when he became a Muslim. So his being a Muslim cannot be taken into consideration," and that hundreds of scholars who heard this eccentric statement accepted it and remained mum, would be as droll as believing a person who calls white 'black', which would even make children laugh. The assertion betrays the fact that it has been written by an Iranian Jew.

7- The jâriya is alleged to have confuted the scholars by saying,

“Though it was hadrat Alî’s right to become Khalîfa, the three Khalîfas divested him of his right by using force. Selmân Fârisî and five to six other Sahabîs remained with hadrat Alî and would not vote for the three Khalîfas. They struggled against those cruel people for twenty-five years. For this reason, the three Khalîfas and the ten people [who had been given the good news that they would enter Paradise] and thousands of Sahabîs who voted for them became disbelievers [may Allâhu ta’âlâ protect us from saying so].” Then she, so to speak, uttered ugly, rude terms about the superior champions of Islam.

In an effort to make a show of excessive love for hadrat Alî, the Hurûfîs mix caliphate into the matter. Thus in this matter also they go beyond the Islamic limits and sink into heretical thoughts. When due attention is paid, it will be seen that they think of caliphate, which is in fact a commandment of Islam, as a means for worldly pomp. Having read about the historical stratagems and intrigues carried on and the murders perpetrated by fathers and sons against one another in their endeavours for sovereignty and presidency, they compare Rasûlullah’s ‘sall-Allâhu alaihi wa sallam’ four Khalîfas to them. Histories give a detailed account of how the four Khalîfas served humanity. And this is the real import of caliphate.

One day during the caliphate of our master Abû Bekr Siddîq ‘radiy-Allâhu anh’, hadrat ‘Umar saw him carrying a sack of flour on his back, and asked him why he was doing so. His answer was: “Yâ ‘Umar! Don’t I have to earn for my household?” Hadrat ‘Umar, admire as he did this answer of the Khalîfa’s, was surprised at the same time. He proposed that Rasûlullah’s Khalîfa should be paid a salary from the Bayt-ul-mâl, that is, from the State budget, so that he could carry out his duty of serving all people in due manner. This proposal was accepted by all the Ashâb-i-kirâm, and it was decided that the Khalîfa would be allotted the necessary share from the Bayt-ul-mâl. Hadrat Abû Bekr would take from this share only so much as to lead a life equal to that of any average person, returning any extra amount, if there was any. So was the case with the second Khalîfa, ‘Umar ‘radiy-Allâhu anh’. When the Islamic armies conquered the blessed city of Jerusalem and its vicinity, the European States sent forth a very knowledgeable and experienced ambassador to Jerusalem. After an audience with the Khalîfa, he went back home with the following report, though his requests had been refused: “He is such a Pâdishâh (king) that, with all his high knowledge and awe-

inspiring appearance, he does not have a palace or ornamented attirements. I paid attention to his clothes. There were eighteen patches on them. It is impossible to stand against such an unadorned hero who is always ready for war.” This fact is recorded in the unbiased ones of the records of European histories. The book **Mesnevî**, which is composed of more than forty-seven thousand distichs, by Celâl-ed-dîn Rûmî [born in Belh city in the hijrî year 604 and passed away in Konya in 672 (C.E. 1273)], has been translated into all the world’s popular languages. The book gives the following information: The ambassador sent forth by the Byzantine Emperor arrives in Medina and asks where the Khalîfa’s palace is. Shown a cottage, he makes for it, enters the yard, and there he sees the Khalîfa, lying on dry land using a piece of stone as a cushion. Hadrat ‘Umar Fârûq ‘radiy-Allâhu ta’âlâ anh’ wakes up and looks at the ambassador, who begins to shudder at the feeling of dread and the verve inspired by this first look. Then he recovers, talks with the Khalîfa, and leaves. As he leaves, the Khalîfa’s blessed wife gives the ambassador a present, which she has prepared by borrowing eighteen dirhams of silver coins from an acquaintance and which she asks him to take to the emperor’s wife. In return, the emperor’s wife sends her a very valuable gift ornamented with precious jewels. The Khalîfa, who has never done injustice in anything he has done, gives his wife only an eighteen dirham worth silver piece, sending the remainder to the Bayt-ul-mâl.

‘Umar ‘radiy-Allâhu anh’ would eat all his meals from an earthenware bowl. One day the As-hâb-i-kirâm ‘alaihim-ur-ridwân’ begged the Khalîfa’s daughter hadrat Hafsa and sent her to the Khalîfa with the request, “O my father, the Emîr of Believers! Hadrat Abû Bekr, the first Khalîfa, struggled with the munâfiqs until his death, so much so that he did not even have time for relief. Now you have conquered innumerable lands in the east and west. Ambassadors from the world’s universal emperors come to you and are fed in your generous kitchen. Mightn’t you as well give up those earthenware bowls and use sets of copper or other metal in the presence of these visitors?” This, of course, was the Sahâba’s suggestion. Hadrat Khalîfa’s answer to this was, “O my daughter Hafsâ ‘radiy-Allâhu anhâ’! I would chide anyone else for this statement. As I have heard from you, our master Rasûlullah ‘sall-Allâhu alaihi wa sallam’ had a mattress stuffed with grasses. Seeing that his blessed body was not comfortable on this bed, one night you laid out a soft bed and made Rasûlullah lie and sleep on

it, thus depriving him of getting up and praying that night (because the new bed was too comfortable for him to wake up for his regular midnight prayers). He expressed his regrets to you, remonstrating, **‘Do not do so again!’** The second âyat of Fat-h sûra purports, **‘In order to cover your past and future faults... .’** This being the style of life led by a Prophet who has been given the good news that he shall be pardoned and forgiven, can a poor ‘Umar, who is not sure about his future, leave the way of life led by Rasûlullah and lead a luxurious life by eating from copper plates?”

In daytime ‘Umar Fârûq ‘radiy-Allâhu anh’ was busy in Medina conducting his armies in Asia and supplying and dispatching their needs, and he would spend the whole night patrolling the city for protecting the Muslims’ property, lives, and chastity. As he was out on his patrol one night, he heard a voice crying. He went there and asked why. A poor woman said, “I have no one to subsist me. It has been two days since I came here. My children have been crying of hunger for two days. I made a fire, so that I have been making them sleep by putting only water in the pot and telling them that I am cooking them food!” The Khalîfa felt so sorry that he began to weep. Saying, “ ‘Umar has been ruined! ‘Umar has perished,” he condemned himself, and left. He had some meat with him when he came back. As he was blowing the fire to make it burn faster, his blessed beard caught fire. These events are not tales. They are true events recorded in history books. Today, some people watch the fabricated films produced by film makers and call the Islamic histories mythologies, myths, and stories.

So was the case with hadrat Alî ‘radiy-Allâhu anh’, the fourth Islamic Khalîfa. As he was passing away, the worldly property he had was no more than the mule named Duldul, which was a keepsake from the Messenger of Allah, his sword called Zulfikâr, and his blessed shirt. And these things had been pawned to a Jew. Likewise, Muhammad ‘alaihis-salâm’, who was the final Prophet and the master of worlds, left behind a bedstead made of teak timber, a shirt, and a set of clothing. He would give the milk he obtained from twenty camels, one hundred sheep and seven goats to the poor ones of the As-hâb-i-kirâm. He did not even have a house of his own. All the four Khalîfas lived like Rasûlullah ‘sall-Allâhu alaihi wa sallam’. They never deviated from the way led by him. All four of them accepted the caliphate as it was Islam’s commandment, in a fashion like shouldering a burden, and

because the Ummat (Muslims) wished them to be their Khalîfa and elected them on a unanimous vote. For it was declared as follows in the hadîth-i-sherîfs of our master Rasûlullah's 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wa sallam': **“The votes of my Umma will not come together on aberration.” “Whatever Believers find beautiful is beautiful to Allâhu ta’âlâ.”** To assert that the four Khalîfas seized the office of caliphate by using force, when it is a fact that they were elected by the Ummat, is a very grave oddity and a detestable defamation. The following event shows plainly that hadrat Abû Bekr Siddîq was not at all eager for caliphate: Rasûlullah 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wa sallam' would give some disbelievers worldly goods from the Bayt-ul-mâl in order to appease them and to conciliate them with Muslims. Those disbelievers who were given such goods were called 'Muellefa-i-qulûb'. When Abû Bekr Siddîq 'radiy-Allâhu anh' became Khalîfa, he gave one of the muellefa-i-qulûb a piece of land from the Bayt-ul-mâl. This person, sensing the vast popularity 'Umar had been enjoying among the As-hâb-i-kirâm and expecting him to be the next Khalîfa, took the title deed he had been given to 'Umar and asked him to undersign it. Upon seeing the title deed, hadrat 'Umar took it and went with it to the Khalîfa to ask him how come the person had been given land from the Bayt-ul-mâl. When the Khalîfa explained that the muellefa-i-qulûb had been given land from the Bayt-ul-mâl in Rasûlullah's time, too, hadrat 'Umar stated, “It was because Muslims were not powerful enough yet. Now we are not weak, and therefore that necessity does not exist any longer. Even if it were still necessary, the decision to execute it could be made only after communing with six or seven of the As-hâb-i-kirâm.” The Khalîfa found this statement well put and said, “Yâ 'Umar! When I was elected Khalîfa, I said I was not fit for the office and suggested that you would be a better choice. But the As-hâb-i-kirâm would not listen to me. It has been seen once again on this occasion that you are superior to me. I want to resign from caliphate. And I request that you accept this service.” 'Umar 'radiy-Allâhu anh' replied in due respect that he was not superior at all, that he did not think of becoming the Khalîfa, and that his purpose was to remind (the Khalîfa) of what he ('Umar) thought would be right. Thereupon hadrat Khalîfa commanded that from then on nothing should be put into practice without a foregoing consultation in matters pertaining to the Bayt-ul-mâl.

During the caliphate of 'Umar 'radiy-Allâhu anh', several Sahabîs came to him with the request that he make a will to advise

that after him Abdullah bin 'Umar should be made Khalîfa on the grounds that he was, they thought, the second most deeply learned scholar among the As-hâb-i-kirâm, and that "Rasûlullah 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wa sallam' loved him very much." 'Umar's 'radiy-Allâhu anh' answer to them was: "Being a Khalîfa is a heavy burden. I cannot put my son under it." 'Umar 'radiy-Allâhu anh' was martyred with a sword by a disbeliever named Abû Lu'lu, who was the slave of the Sahabî Mughîra, in the twenty-third year of the Hegira. When he received the fatal wound, he was asked to appoint a Khalîfa (to take his place). He nominated six Sahabîs as candidates because these six people, he said, "gained Rasûlullah's love more than anyone else did." The six Sahabîs he named were 'Uthmân (Osmân), Alî, Talha, Zubeyr, Abd-ur-rahmân bin Awf, and Sa'd ibni Ebî Waqqâs 'ridwânullâhi alaihim ajma'in'. Among themselves, these people elected 'Uthmân 'radiy-Allâhu anh' Khalîfa. Thus 'Uthmân bin Affân was the third Khalîfa. In his time insurrections and seditions provoked by munâfiqs broke out here and there. When a group of ignorant and ignoble people advanced towards the city and finally reached Medîna, some Sahâbis advised the Khalîfa to resign. Replying that "Rasûlullah 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wa sallam' informed me that I shall attain martyrdom while reading Qur'ân al-kerîm," he proved to have the merits of compliance with the fate (foreordained by Allâhu ta'âlâ) and patience in times of disasters. In the thirty-fifth year of the Hijrat, some wicked people attacked the Khalîfa's house. When Imâm-i-Alî 'radiy-Allâhu anh' heard the news of this assault, he sent his two sons, Hasan and Huseyn, like two lions to the Khalîfa's house to help and protect the Khalîfa. These two youngsters drew their swords and stood by the front door, so that not even a bird would fly in unseen. Yet five or six of the abject bandits entered the house through a back window by means of a ladder; and the Khalîfa was martyred as had been divined by the Messenger of Allah. When Alî 'radiy-Allâhu anh' heard about the deplorable news, he was so mad at his two sons for failing to protect the Khalîfa that he scolded them harshly and even nearly hit them with his blessed hand. However, he forgave them afterwards when it was found out that they had done their duty of protection perfectly and could not be blamed because the bandits had entered the house from the back.

The Jewish book alleges, "*Upon this tragedy, the As-hâb-i-kirâm assembled and unanimously elected hadrat Alî 'radiy-Allâhu anh' Khalîfa.*" Most of the As-hâb-i-kirâm, including such

notables as Talha and Zubeyr, asked the (new) Khalîfa to arrest the murderers and punish them as prescribed by Islam. Hadrat Alî answered them that the situation was so chaotic that it would be impossible to find the murderers, that another mutiny might occur in case he tried to investigate, and that he could perform this commandment of Islam after the re-establishment of public order. They protested this answer, saying that a Khalîfa who would not execute Islam's commandment was not to be obeyed. Imâm-i-Alî's ijtihâd was correct. On the other hand, the opposing party had to act upon their own ijtihâd. And the Khalîfa, in his turn, had to use force to subjugate the people disobeying him. Eventually the Camel event, i.e. the war called 'Jemel' took place, which cost a great deal of Muslim bloodshed. In the meantime, hadrat Mu'âwiya 'radiy-Allâhu anhum' was off in Damascus, where he had been appointed as governor. He therefore did not join the event of Jemel. Nor would he allow any Damascene blood to be shed on account of this event. When hadrat Alî, the victor (of the battle of Camel), asked the Damascene people also to obey him, hadrat Mu'âwiya followed his own ijtihâd and asked him to arrest and punish the murderers; and this in its turn led to another war, i.e. the combat called Siffîn.

As is seen, none of the four Khalîfas, and in fact none of the As-hâb-i-kirâm 'radiy-Allâhu anhum' thought of worldly advantages in the caliphate elections; they all endeavoured to execute the commandment of Allâhu ta'âlâ. The four Khalîfas never thought of their own comfort, struggling day and night for serving Islam and Muslims and accepting the duty as a *sine qua non* which someone would have to undertake for Allah's sake.

Hurûfîs compare the caliphate institution to a kingdom, to sovereignty. And because they think so, they say that hadrat Alî was opposed to the caliphate of the other three Khalîfas and therefore fought against them incessantly for twenty-five years. They presume that he vied for presidency for years and nursed a grudge and hostility against the As-hâb-i-kirâm because they were against his caliphate. They allege that "therefore the three Khalîfas and thousands of Sahâbîs who voted for them are to be cursed till the end of the world." In an effort to prove themselves to be right, they fabricate preternatural stories which are neither Islamic, nor logical, nor worthy of hadrat Alî's honourable renown.

8- The jâriya is made to say, "*When Abû Bekr Siddîq 'radiy-Allâhu anh' became Khalîfa, he confiscated the date orchard belonging to hadrat Fâtîmat-uz-zehrâ by force, and therefore*

hadrat Fâtimâ, offended, harboured a grudge against Abû Bekr till her death. In fact, before her death she made a will that she should be interred at night lest Abû Bekr and 'Umar should attend her funeral."

The so-called orchard contained only a few trees. Supposing it were as vast and as lush as a jungle; what an ill-favored Jewish slander and how sound a sleep of nescience it is to assert that Fâtimat-uz-zehrâ 'radiy-Allâhu anhâ', Rasûlullah's daughter, the most honourable of all women, the **Betûl**, called so because she would not even turn to look at worldly property, would bear hostility to the three Khalîfas, who had been given the good news by her father that they would enter Paradise, and would even curse them and advise other Muslims to do so, too, on account of something worldly. [May Allâhu ta'âlâ protect us from saying or believing so!] This slander, which would bring discredit on hadrat Alî and hadrat Fâtimâ's universal high distinction, is perhaps a sign of hostility, let alone love, towards them. A Jew only would perpetrate such equivocation.

The huge book **Qisâs-i-Enbiyâ** (A History of Prophets), written by Ahmed Cevdet Paşa of Lofja 'rahmatullâhi aleyh', who was born in 1238, and passed away in Istanbul in 1312 [C.E. 1894] and was buried in the graveyard to the south of the blessed mosque of Fâtih, was printed in Istanbul in 1331. The following information is given in its three hundred and sixty-ninth (369) page: "Rasûlullah 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wa sallam' devoted his date orchard named **Fedek** in Hayber to the pious foundation and dictated how it was to be utilized. He advised in his will that income from the orchard should be given to foreign ambassadors, to visitors, guests and travellers. Abû Bekr 'radiy-Allâhu anh' implemented this will during his caliphate. When Fâtima 'radiy-Allâhu anhâ' asked for it as (she thought it was) a share for her from the inheritance (her father had left behind), he said: I heard the Messenger of Allah say, '**No one can inherit (property) from us [Prophets]. Whatever we leave behind us is alms.**' I can never change something established by Rasûlullah. Otherwise, I fear I may deviate into an erroneous way. When hadrat Fâtima wanted to know who his (hadrat Abû Bekr's) inheritors were, he replied: My wife and children are. Then she asked: Why am I not my father's inheritor, then? The Khalîfa's answer was: I heard your father, the Messenger of Allah say, '**No one can be our inheritors.**' Therefore you cannot be his inheritor. However, I am his Khalîfa. Whoever he used to give when he was alive, I shall give. It is my duty to give

you whatever you need, provide aid in your matters, and serve you. Upon this hadrat Fâtima was quiet and never talked about inheritance again.” This is the end of the passage from **Qisâs-i-Enbiyâ**.

The number of the Sunnî Muslims living on the earth has always been many times that of those people without a Madh-hab in every century. Hurûfîs curse the Ahl as-sunna, who are much more numerous than themselves, and call them disbelievers. If the Ahl as-sunna Muslims respond to their bold and unfair inculpation in kind and say that they are heretics, the party whose number is overwhelmingly in the ascendant is more likely to be right.

Furthermore, it is thoroughly contradictory to Qur’ân al-kerîm to say that hadrat Alî was inimical towards the three Khalîfas ‘radiy-Allâhu anhum ajma’în’ or that hadrat Fâtima cursed the Ashâb-i-kirâm on account of an orchard. The second âyat-i-kerîma of Mâida sûra purports, “**Allâhu ta’âlâ calls His slaves to help one another in birr and taqwâ and to get on well with one another. Do not help in sinning or enmity.**” If the Ashâb-i-kirâm did not love one another, if Muslims cursed one another and called one another disbelievers, this would be a sinful state, which is quite contrary to birr and taqwâ. And this in turn would mean to say that hadrat Alî and hadrat Fâtima ‘radiy-Allâhu anhumâ’ disobeyed the âyat-i-kerîma. Saying, on the other hand, that these people “did not know that by opposing to hadrat Abû Bekr’s caliphate and bearing hostility towards the Ashâb-i-kirâm they would cause Muslims coming after them to call one another disbelievers, which in turn would lead to a convention quite counter to the âyat-i-kerîma. If they had known, they would have given up this behaviour,” would mean to deny their superiority and their ability in kashf and kerâmat.

Sayyid Abd-ul-qâdir Gheylanî [born in 471, and passed away in Baghdâd in 561 (C.E. 1166)], who was one of the descendants of hadrat Alî ‘radiy-Allâhu anh’ and at the same time one of the greatest Awliyâ, gives the following information in his book **Ghunyat-ut-tâlibîn**: “According to the Shiites, caliphate is the exclusive right of the twelve imâms. These people are innocent. They never commit sins. Kashf and kerâmet can be seen only on them. They know about everything that has happened and everything that will happen.” On the other hand, it would be contradictory with this belief to say that hadrat Alî, who (they allege) knew everything down to the number of sand grains, did

not know that his not voting for hadrat Abû Bekr would cause millions of Muslims to deviate from the right way.

We have already explained in our brief account of hadrat 'Umar's 'radiy-Allâhu anh' caliphate that caliphate was a heavy burden. Now, which would be wiser for a Muslim to do; to feel sorry because the other Muslims did not elect him and to bear hostility against them for this reason, or to be happy because he was not given a heavy burden? In addition, if he knew that his hostility would cause mischief and instigation among Muslims till the end of the world, he would necessarily support the Khalîfa by voting for him willingly.

The hundred and eighty-fifth âyat of Âl-i-'Imrân sûra and the twentieth âyat of Hadîd sûra purport, **“Worldly life consists of only such things as will delude the human beings.”** The thirty-second âyat of En'âm sûra purports, **“Worldly life comprises amusement and trifling. For those who fear Allah, life in the Hereafter is more beneficial. Why don't you realize that this is so?”** The twenty-eighth âyat of Enfâl sûra and the fifteenth âyat of Teghâbun sûra purport, **“Be it known that you have been given property and children only to assay you. Allâhu ta'âlâ shall give you very grand reward in return for your goodnesses.”** The thirty-eighth âyat of Tawba sûra purports, **“Do you like life in this world better than the Hereafter? Profits gained in this worldly life are far below those in the Hereafter.”** The forty-sixth âyat of Kehf sûra purports, **“Property and offspring are the ornaments of worldly life. The thawâbs (that are given) for the good deeds and which are eternal are better in the opinion of thine Rabb (Allah).”** Some sixty-six other similar âyat-i-kerîmas dissuade from setting the heart on worldly property and worldly position. Innumerable hadîth-i-sherîfs have been expressed to emphasize this importation. For instance, it is declared in a hadîth-i-qudsî, **“O you the son of Âdam! You have spent your life storing worldly goods. You have never desired Paradise.”** Certainly, hadrat Alî, who was the entrance to the town of knowledge, and Fâtimât uz-zehrâ, who was the highest of women, 'radiy-Allâhu anhumâ', knew these âyat-i-kerîmas better than anyone else did. Could we ever expect these people to have been sorry about worldly positions or to quarrel over worldly property such as a date orchard?

Question: Their sorrows or quarrels did not originate from their fondness for the world. Seeing that hadrat Abû Bekr and 'Umar had committed a sin by seizing caliphate by force, they tried

to rescue them from this sinful position.

Answer: The hundred and sixty-fourth âyat of En'âm sûra and the fifteenth âyat of Isrâ sûra purport, **“No sinner will also have the responsibility for someone else’s sin.”** Supposing, [though impossible], hadrat Abû Bekr and hadrat 'Umar 'radiy-Allâhu ta'âlâ anhumâ' and most of Rasûlullah's 'alaihi-salâm' Sahâba somehow committed a sin, this sin would not have any effect on hadrat Alî according to this âyat-i-kerîma, and it would still not be necessary for him to fight on account of it. Then, would it ever be possible for him to commence a fight that would cause hundreds of millions of people to be burned eternally in Hell?

This faqîr, [that is, 'Uthmân Efendi 'rahima-hullahu ta'âlâ], asked one of the Shi'î scholars, “Hadrat Fâtima's 'radiy-Allâhu anh' being offended with the As-hâb-i-kirâm for not giving her the date orchard would mean fondness for the world, which in turn would be something impermissible.” He replied, “Her being offended did not originate from fondness for the world. It was because she did not like a wicked deed.” With this evasive answer he blemished Rasûlullah's 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wa sallam' daughter, who was as clean as pure water. For something done in a manner compatible with Islam would sound wicked only to the nafs-i-ammâra. I remembered this fact and made the following explanation. He was so stupefied that he could say nothing. My explanation was: Everyone reading history knows this event: In a Holy War Imâm-i-Alî 'radiy-Allâhu anh' threw an unbeliever down to the ground and was about to deal him the fatal blow, when his desperate opponent spat all the foul contents in his mouth out into his face. His face dirtied all over, the imâm gave up killing the unbeliever. The unbeliever, who was already out of his mind, was bewildered all the more. “Why did you give up,” he asked. “Are you afraid?” Hadrat Alî 'radiy-Allâhu anh' let the unbeliever go, saying, “I was going to kill you with the commandment of Allâhu ta'âlâ because you would not become a Muslim. But now my nafs is your enemy because of the foul act you have done. If I kill you now, I will have done so to do the wish of my nafs. Thus my killing you will earn me sinfulness instead of thawâb.” Upon hearing these statements, the unbeliever admired the superiority of the Islamic religion on which Imâm-i-Alî's conscience was based and uttered the word kalima-i-shahâdat with all his heart, thus becoming a Muslim willingly. The two people, who were mortal enemies a few minutes earlier, were now brothers hugging each other.

Ibrâhîm bin Ad-ham ‘rahimahullâhu ta’âlâ’, one of the greatest Awliyâ, was born in Belh in 96, and passed away in Damascus in 162 [C.E. 779]. Formerly he was the Pâdishâh (emperor) of Belh. He left his throne and came to Mekka-i-mukarrama. He made a living carrying firewood on his back. He fought against his nafs till his death.

Fâtîh Sultan Muhammad Khan (Mehmed the Conqueror) ‘rahmatullâhi ta’âlâ aleyh’, the seventh Ottoman Pâdishâh, was born in the hijri year 833. He conquered Istanbul from the Byzantines in 857 [C.E. 1453], thus ushering in a new era. He passed away in 886. His father, Sultân Murâd Khân II, the sixth Ottoman Pâdishâh, was born in 806, and passed away in 855 [C.E. 1451]. He was buried in Bursa. He became the Pâdishâh in 824. In 847 he left the throne of his own accord to his son and retired to Maghnisa, where he spent the rest of his life worshipping in seclusion.

Since it is a fact as manifest as daylight that hadrad Alî and Fâtimat uz-zehrâ were no lower than the sultans mentioned above in realizing the fruitlessness of the world and in struggling against the nafs, it would be virtually impossible for a Muslim to say that these people mourned, let alone harbour a grudge, on account of worldly property or rank. There is no doubt as to that these calumniations were produced by a hypocritical Jew named Abdullah bin Saba’. In the time of hadrat ’Uthmân ‘radiy-Allâhu ta’âlâ anh’ this Jew left the Yemen for Egypt, and thence to Medîna, where he settled under the pretence of a new Muslim and did Islam such irreparable harm as others have not been able to do so far.

The hundred and thirty-third âyat of Âl-i-’Imrân sûra purports, **“Run for asking for forgiveness from thine Rabb (Allah) and for entering Paradise. Work for this end! Paradise is as large as heavens and earth. Paradise has been prepared for those who fear Allâhu ta’âlâ. These people will give their property in the way shown by Allah, regardless of whether they have little or much. They will not let others sense their anger. They will forgive everyone. Allâhu ta’âlâ loves those who are kind and generous.”** The tenth âyat of Hujurât sûra purports, **“Believers are brothers to one another. Make peace among your brothers!”** In about thirty other similar âyat-i-kerîmas Believers are commanded not to become angry with one another, to be kind and generous to one another, and to forgive one another. It is stated in a hadîth-i-sherîf, **“Allâhu ta’âlâ will have mercy on those**

who have mercy on one another. He is merciful. Be merciful on those that are on the earth so that angels in heaven be merciful on you.” Some fifty other similar hadîth-i-sherîfs command overcoming one’s wrath and being kind and generous and teach our duties as human beings.

Consequently, if hadrat Alî and Fâtimat uz-zehrâ ‘radiy-Allâhu anhumâ’ had been indignant about a worldly rank or a few date trees and had borne hostility against the As-hâb-i-kirâm ‘radiy-Allâhu ta’âlâ anhum ajma’in’ throughout their lives instead of forgiving them, they would have disobeyed these âyat-i-kerîmas and hadîth-i-sherîfs. Could this be at all possible? Such allegations would blemish their high honour.

In order to protect these two beloved ones of Rasûlullah’s ‘sall-Allâhu alaihi wa sallam’ against any probable disfigurement, the ‘Ulamâ of Ahl as-sunna ‘rahmatullâhi ta’âlâ alaihim ajma’in’ have avoided making such absurd statements about them and specially advised to love them by stating that “Loving these superior people will cause one to die in îmân (as a Believer).” Whose love for these superior people is true; that which is claimed by the Shi’is or the one recommended by the Ahl as-sunna? Anyone with reason and logic will easily see the distinction.

It is a universally known fact that hadrat Muhammad’s ‘alaihis-salâm’ Ummat are brothers and love one another very much. For instance, one day Abdullah ibni ‘Umar ‘radiy-Allâhu anhumâ’ entered Rasûlullah’s ‘sall-Allâhu alaihi wa sallam’ blessed presence. The Messenger of Allah praised and lauded him highly by uttering this hadîth-i-sherîf: **“On the Judgement Day every person will be given his berât, i.e. warrant for his salvation, after all his deeds have been measured. Abdullah has already been given his berât (when he is) in the world yet.”** When he was asked the reason for this, he (Rasûlullah) said, **“He not only has wara’ and taqwâ, but also expresses the following supplication whenever he prays: ‘Yâ Rabbî! Make my body so big on the Judgement Day that I will suffice to fill up Hell. Thus the promise You have made to fill up Hell with human beings will be fulfilled and none of hadrat Muhammad’s ‘alaihis-salâm’ Ummat will burn in Hell.’ He has shown by this invocation that he loves his brothers in Islam more than himself.”** It is written in the book *Menâqib-i-chihâr yâr-i-ghuzîn* that Abû Bekr as-siddîq also would make an identical invocation in his prayers. It is beyond doubt that hadrat Alî’s love for Muslims was several times stronger than that which was

fostered by Abdullah Ibnî 'Umar 'radiy-Allâhu ta'âlâ anhum'. It would be impossible for him to have shown a dislike which would have caused eternal Hell fire to millions of Muslims only because he had not been made Khalîfa.

The following event is written in the book **Kimyâ-i-sa'âdat**, by Imâm-i-Ghâzâlî, as well as in other books: During the Holy War of Tebuk a group of Sahâbîs were seriously wounded and were craving for water. Another Muslim came with a glass of water and offered it to one of them. The thirsty Sahâbî would not take it and suggested to give it to one of his Muslim brothers whom he had heard asking for water. The water was thus passed from one Sahâbî to another and they all attained martyrdom before having time to drink it. Such was the extent of love that Rasûlullah's 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wa sallam' Sahâba 'ridwânullâhi alaihim ajma'in' had for one another. Could it ever be supposed that Imâm-i-Alî who risked his own life in all the Holy Wars, and Fâtimat uz-zehrâ 'radiy-Allâhu anhumâ', the beloved daughter of the Messenger of Allah, disliked the three Khalîfas and most of the As-hâb-i-kirâm? Such an allegation would be an accusation of a wicked and atrocious act prohibited by âyat-i-kerîmas and hadîth-i-sherîfs, rather than an expression of admiration and praise. As these people were extremely pure and free from such atrocious and wicked deeds, it is quite obvious that assertions of this sort are lies and slanders fabricated by the enemies of Islam. For those who would like more detailed information, we recommend that they read part five, which is titled **O My Brother; If You Wish To Die in Îmân, You Should Love the Ahl-i-Bayt and the As-hâb.**

9- The jâriya is alleged to say, "*At the death of our master, Rasûlullah 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wa sallam', as hadrat Alî 'kerrem-Allâhu wejheh' was busy with funeral preparations, Abû Bekr as-Siddîq and 'Umar Fârûq 'radiy-Allâhu anhumâ' and five to six of the Ansâr gathered under the bower belonging to the sons of Sakîfa and began to share the caliphate among themselves. At the end hadrat 'Umar held hadrat Abû Bekr's hand and said, 'You shall be Khalîfa. The other people being there agreed. Then hadrat 'Umar, with his sword drawn, roamed around the streets of Medîna for three days, forcing anyone he came across to agree to Abû Bekr's caliphate. The second day hadrat Alî came to the place of meeting and said, 'Among you, I am the most knowledgeable, the most superior, and the bravest. How can you have the right to deprive me of caliphate?' Making other statements such as these, he insisted on his right, persuading*

twenty people to follow him. Later he agreed to Abû Bekr's caliphate, though unwillingly."

The truth, in contrast, is this: When the Messenger of Allah 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wa sallam' passed away, all the Sahâba were so deeply grieved that they were at a loss as to what to do. The disastrous affliction descended so heavily, so painfully on them that some of them became tongue-tied while some others felt so weak that they could not even stand up to go out. The fire of bereavement burned hadrat Alî, too, so he did not know what to do. Hadrat 'Umar was so confused that he took his sword and walked about in the streets, saying, "I shall behead anyone who says that the Messenger of Allah is dead." Malevolent munâfiqs, on the other hand, attempted to exploit this perturbation. Seeing this tumult, Abû Bekr as-Siddîq entered the mosque, mounted the minbar, and made the following speech: "O Sahâba of the Messenger of Allah! We worship Allâhu ta'âlâ. He is always alive. He will never die. He will never cease to exist. The thirtieth âyat of Zumer sûra purports, **'O my beloved Prophet! One day you shall certainly die. And certainly they, too, shall die.'** As is declared by Allâhu ta'âlâ, our master, Rasûlullah 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wa sallam', has passed away." Making effective statements of this sort, he admonished them. This speech eliminated the confused state among the As-hâb-i-kirâm and made them to come to themselves. In fact, hadrat 'Umar, who was among the audience, said upon hearing the above-mentioned âyat-i-kerîma from Abû Bekr as-Siddîq, "I had thoroughly forgotten this âyat-i-kerîma, so much so that I thought it was a new revelation." Hadrat Abû Bekr as-Siddîq 'radiy-Allâhu ta'âlâ anh' was wise to the hypocrites' plan to stir up a tumult and thus to elect the Khalîfa from among themselves and, leaving the job of making preparations for the funeral, he made for the place where the As-hâb-i-kirâm were discussing the problem of caliphate election. At the end of the discussion all the people present voted for hadrat Abû Bekr's caliphate. On the second Tuesday after Rasûlullah's passing away hadrat Alî went to the mosque and paid homage to hadrat Abû Bekr. Thus hadrat Abû Bekr was made Khalîfa by a unanimous vote.

Allâhu ta'âlâ disapproves and prohibits vanity and arrogance in all the heavenly books He has sent to His slaves. For instance, the twenty-third âyat of Nahl sûra of Qur'ân al-kerîm purports, **"Allâhu ta'âlâ will absolutely not like the conceited!"** According to a Biblical verse, on the other hand, the Apostles asked Îsâ

‘alaihi-salâm’: O Prophet of Allah! Who among us is the greatest and who is the smallest? In response to this question of theirs Îsâ ‘alaihi-salâm’ stated, **“The greatest one among you is the smallest; and the smallest one is the greatest.”** By this he meant, “He who thinks too much of himself is a mean person, and a modest person is a noble one.” In addition, Muhammad ‘alaihi-salâm’, the final and the highest Prophet, criticises presumptuous people and praises modest ones in quite a number of his hadîth-i-sherîfs. For instance, he states in a hadîth-i-sherîf, **“If a person condescends for Allah’s sake, that is, if he does not consider himself superior to Muslims, Allâhu ta’âlâ will heighten him.”** Scholars of Ahl as-sunna state that Allâhu ta’âlâ has endowed His slaves with a particle from each of His Attributes such as knowledge and power. Yet three of His attributes are peculiar to Him alone. He has not given any share from these three Attributes of His to any of His creatures. These three Attributes are Kibriyâ, being Ghanî, and Creating. Kibriyâ means greatness, superiority. Being Ghanî means not to need others and to be needed by all others. On the contrary, He has given His slaves three lowly, mean attributes. These are zul and inkisâr, that is, being low and humiliated, being needy, and being fânî, that is, ceasing to exist. Consequently, to be arrogant means to infringe on the Attribute (of Greatness) which belongs to Allâhu ta’âlâ by rights. Arrogance does not become slaves. It is the gravest sin. It is declared in a hadîth-i-qudsî, **“Azamat (Pride) and Kibriyâ (Greatness) belong to me. I shall very bitterly torment those who wish to share these two Attributes with Me.”** It is for this reason that Islamic scholars and outstanding men of Tasawwuf have always advised Muslims to be modest. Muslims will not be selfish. Allâhu ta’âlâ dislikes selfish people. Hadrat Abd-ul-qâdîr-i-Gheylânî ‘quddisa sirruh’, one of the greatest Awliyâ and an outstanding leader of Tasawwuf, was born in the Gheylân city of Iran in 471, and passed away in Baghdâd in 561 [C.E. 1166]. One day he, Sayyid Ahmad Rifâi and a number of his disciples were sitting by the Tigris River. As they talked he displayed such karâmats (miracles) as bewildered the audience. When one of them, entirely dazed with admiration, inadvertently let slip a laudatory remark, hadrat Abd-ul-qâdîr-i-Gheylânî humiliated his self and woke the others from oblivion with the following modest reply: “I do not presume there could be a Muslim on earth lower than I am.” Hadrat Ahmad Rifâi was born in a village named (Umm-i-Ubayda), somewhere between

Basra and Wâsit, in 512, and passed away there in 578 [1183]. As is seen, arrogance, conceitedness is a wicked quality. Modesty, on the other hand, is good and beautiful. All Prophets were modest in everything they did. And certainly so were all the As-hâb-i-kirâm. Their commending one another in the caliphate election and offering the office to one another shows that they were extremely modest. This being the case, it would have been vanity and arrogance for hadrat Alî to have challenged the Muslims by saying, “Is there anyone better learned, nobler and braver than I am?” to the As-hâb-i-kirâm. It would have been a behaviour reminiscent of the Iblîs (Devil), who boasted and claimed to be better than He. As such statements would not have been compatible with that great and noble person, hadrat Alî, it is quite obvious that they are lies, aspersions fabricated and cast against Allah’s Lion. Another absurdity is the statement alleging that hadrat ‘Umar, in order to make sure that Abû Bekr become Khalîfa, drew his sword and intimidated, forced the As-hâb-i-kirâm. For the tribes called Benî Hâshim and Benî Umayya, to which hadrat Alî was related, were the most powerful tribes among the As-hâb-i-kirâm. Abû Bekr as-Siddîq and ‘Umar ul-Fârûq had few relations. It would have been impossible for hadrat ‘Umar to draw his sword and compel these two tribes to make a choice agreeable to him. Furthermore, hadrat Alî was the Lion of Allah. It runs counter to logic to suppose that the As-hâb-i-kirâm chose Abû Bekr instead of him merely because a single person, i.e. ‘Umar, forced them to do so.

I heard the following story from one of the scholars of Kirkuk: I somehow went to the Iranian territory. I entered one of their mosques. A scholar was preaching there. During the preach he said, “One day hadrat Alî visited hadrat Abbâs in his home. He saw him weeping and asked him why. He said, ‘I nailed a few pieces of board above my front door for protection against the sun. ‘Umar the Khalîfa had them pulled down on the pretext that they might harm passers by. I cannot stand this insult.’ Exasperated, hadrat Alî unsheathed his sword called Zulfikâr and ran out, looking for ‘Umar the Khalîfa for revenge. However ‘Umar was informed with the danger just in time to save his life.” At this point one of his disciples asked for permission and said, “If hadrat Alî was the person to draw his sword against the Khalîfa for a wooden curtain and frighten him into running away, why didn’t he draw his sword as Abû Bekr was elected Khalîfa and frighten away those who voted for him? If he had drawn his sword and walked over

them, the Ummat-i-Muhammad (Muslims) would not have been broken into groups because of this and so many Muslims would not have deviated from the right way.” Confused, the preacher vacillated for a while as to how to answer this. Then he began to shout, “This man’s become an unbeliever. Beat him, kill him!” The helpless man was lucky enough to be merely thrown out of the mosque. So, not only is the Jewish book audacious enough to tell the open lie that hadrat ‘Umar drew his sword and forced the As-hâb-i-kirâm to vote for hadrat Abû Bekr’s caliphate, but it also has the face to allege that hadrat Alî drew a sword against hadrat ‘Umar.

The events that took place among the As-hâb-i-kirâm on the day when our master Rasûlullah ‘sall-Allâhu alaihi wa sallam’ honoured the Hereafter with his presence provide an occasion for the Jewish books whereby to mislead Muslims’ children by contaminating the sad experiences with extremely base and abhorrent slanders. We therefore consider it appropriate to borrow from the book **Qisâs-i-Enbiyâ** the following passage which narrates our master Rasûlullah’s ‘sall-Allâhu alaihi wa sallam’ passing away and the events that the As-hâb-i-kirâm experienced in the aftermath:

It was the twenty-seventh day of the (Arabic) month Safer in the eleventh year of the Hegira when our master Rasûlullah ‘sall-Allâhu alaihi wa sallam’ began to suffer a headache. He honoured the room of his blessed wife hadrat Âisha ‘radiy-Allâhu anhâ’ with his presence. He sent for Abd-ur-rahmân bin Ebî Bekr, told him he was going to dictate a written will recommending Abu Bekr as-Siddîq for the office of caliphate after him, and commanded him to bring an ink-well and a pen. As Abd-ur-rahmân was to leave for the performance of the commandment, he (the blessed Prophet) said, “**You will do it later. Let it wait now!**” Then he honoured the Mesjîd-i-sherîf with his blessed presence. The As-hâb-i-kirâm ‘alaihim-ur-ridwân’ heard the news and gathered together in the Mesjîd. Fakhr-i-’âlâm ‘sall-Allâhu alaihi wa sallam’ mounted the minber, gave some advice to his Sahâba, and asked them to forgive him if he had ever hurt them inadvertently. Then he commended Abû Bekr as-Siddîq for his superiority and high value among the As-hâb and said that he liked him very much. A few days later his illness became more severe. The Ansâr-i-kirâm, i.e. the native people of Medina, were extremely grieved. They began to walk around the Mesjîd-i-sherîf like the wings of a propeller. Fadl the son of hadrat Abbâs and

hadrat Alî the son of Abû Tâlib informed Rasûlullah about this state. The compassionate Prophet took the pains of walking to the Mesjîd-i-sherîf with the help of these two people, each of them supporting him under one arm. The As-hâb-i-kirâm gathered together in the Mesjîd. The blessed Last Prophet mounted the minber. After making hamd-u-thenâ (thank, praise and laud) of Allâhu ta'âlâ, he turned to the Ansâr and declared; **“O my As-hâb! I have heard that you are worried about my death. Did any Prophet remain with his ummat eternally, so that you expect me to remain with you till eternity? Be it known that I am going to attain my Rabb (Allah). I advise you to respect the notables of Muhâjirs.”** Then he stated, **“O Muhâjirs! My advice to you is this: Do good to the Ansâr! They were good to you. They granted you asylum in their homes. Although they had difficulty in making their living, they held you prior to themselves. They shared their property with you. If any one of you takes command over them, let him take care of them and forgive them their faults.”** Then he gave them some beautiful, effective advice and stated, **“Allâhu ta'âlâ has granted a slave of His the choice between staying in this world and attaining his Rabb (Allah). The slave has preferred to attain his Rabb.”** This statement of his showed that he was going to pass away soon. Abû Bekr as-Siddîq 'radiy-Allâhu anh' knew what this statement meant and began to weep, saying, “May our lives be sacrificed for your sake, o Messenger of Allah!” Rasûl-i-ekrem 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wa sallam' ordered him that he must be patient and enduring. Tears were falling from his blessed eyes. He declared, **“O my As-hâb! I am pleased with Abû Bekr, who sacrificed his property faithfully and with ikhlâs for the sake of Dîn-i-Islâm. Were it possible to acquire a friend on one's way to the next world, I would choose him.”** Then he ordered that those Sahâbîs whose doors opened into the Mesjîd-i-sherîf should close their doors, with the exception of Abû Bekr 'radiy-Allâhu anh'. Then, out of kindness he made the following speech:

“O Muhâjirs and o Ansâr! When the time for something is known, it would be of no use hurrying for it. Allâhu ta'âlâ does not hurry about any of His slaves. If a person attempts to change the qadhâ and qader of Allâhu ta'âlâ and overpower His Will, He will subdue him with His Wrath and ruin him. If a person tries to trick and deceive Allâhu ta'âlâ, he will deceive himself and lose control of his own matters. Be it known that I am clement and merciful towards you. You will attain the blessing of meeting me again. The place you will meet me is by the pond (called)

Kawthar. He who wishes to enter Paradise and attain the blessing of being with me there, should not talk idly. O Muslims! Disbelief and wrongdoing will cause change in the blessings and decrease in one's subsistence. If people obey the commandments of Allâhu ta'âlâ, their presidents, commanders, governors will be merciful and benign towards them. If they are wicked, indecent, inordinate and sinful, they will not attain merciful presidents. As my life has been useful to you, so my death will bring you good and compassion. If I beat or insulted any one of you unjustly, I am ready for him to revenge by treating me in kind; or if I seized anyone's property unjustly, let him come forward and take it back; I am ready to pay back. For worldly punishment is far less vehement than that which will be inflicted in the Hereafter. It is easier to endure." He dismounted the minber. After performing the namâz he mounted the minber again, made his will, and gave some more advice. Finally he stated, **"I entrust you to Allâhu ta'âlâ,"** and honoured his room with his blessed presence. During his illness, whenever the Adhân (Ezân) was called he went out to the Mesjîd and performed namâz in jamâ'at, he himself being the imâm. Three days before his passing away his illness became more serious. He could no longer go out to the Mesjîd. So he ordered, **"Tell Abû Bekr to (take my place as the imâm and) conduct the namâz of my As-hâb!"** Throughout Rasûlullah's lifetime Abu Bekr as-Siddîq assumed the duty of imâm and conducted namâz seventeen times. He ordered hadrat Alî to carry on the funeral services. He had received a few golds before his illness. He gave some of them to the poor, and the remaining few to hadrat Âishâ 'radiy-Allâhu anhâ'. On the tenth day, Saturday, of Rebî'ul-awwal, Allâhu ta'âlâ sent him Jebrâil (Gabriel) 'alaihis-salâm' to ask him how he was. The following day, Sunday, the angel visited him again, asked him how he was and gave him the good news that Aswad-i-Anasî the liar, who had been claiming to be a Prophet in the Yemen, had been killed. And Rasûl-i-ekrem, in his turn, gave the good news to his As-hâb. On Sunday Rasûlullah's illness became heavier. Hadrat Usâma, who had been appointed Army Commander by the Messenger of Allah, arrived. Rasûlullah was lying in his bed, subconscious. He did not say anything to Usâma. However, he raised his blessed arms and rubbed them gently on him. This meant that he asked a blessing on him. On Monday the As-hâb-i-kirâm were performing the morning prayer in lines behind hadrat Abû Bekr as-Siddîq in the Mesjîd-i-sherîf, when hadrat Fakhr-i-'âlam came to the Mesjîd-i-

sherîf. He saw his Ummat (Muslims) worshipping in lines. He was pleased, and smiled. He, too, adapted himself to hadrat Abû Bekr and performed the namâz behind him. When the As-hâb-i-kirâm saw Rasûlullah in the Mesjîd they thought he had recovered from his illness and rejoiced. Rasûl-i-ekrem ‘sall-Allâhu alaihi wa sallam’ honoured hadrat Âisha’s room with his presence and went to bed. **“I want to enter the presence of Allâhu ta’âlâ without leaving any worldly property behind myself. Give the golds you have to the poor, all of them!”** Then his fever worsened. After a while he opened his eyes again and asked hadrat Âisha ‘radiy-Allâhu ta’âlâ anhâ wa an Ebîhâ’ if she had dispensed the golds. She said she would. He ordered her again and again to distribute them immediately. When they were all dealt out immediately he stated, **“I have relaxed now.”**

Usâma ‘radiy-Allâhu anh’ came back. The Messenger of Allah said, **“May Allâhu ta’âlâ help you! Go out for war.”** So Usâma went out to his army and immediately gave the order to move.

At that hour the illness became worse. He sent for his blessed and very much beloved daughter Fâtima-tuz-Zehrâ. He said something into her ear. Hadrat Fâtima wept. He said something again. This time she smiled. It was found out afterwards that the first thing he had said was: **“I am going to die.”** This had made her cry. Then, when he had said, **“Of my Ahl-i-Bayt, you will be the first one to join me (in the Hereafter),”** she had rejoiced at the good news and smiled.

In the afternoon the same day Jebrâil ‘alaihi-salâm’ and Azrâil ‘alaihi-salâm’ (Angel of Death) came to the door together. Jebrâil ‘alaihi-salâm’ entered. He said that Azrâil ‘alaihi-salâm’ was at the door awaiting permission to enter. Rasûlullah ‘sall-Allâhu alaihi wa sallam’ gave permission. Azrâil ‘alaihi-salâm’ entered, greeted, and informed with the command of Allâhu ta’âlâ. Rasûl-i-ekrem ‘sall-Allâhu alaihi wa sallam’ looked at Jebrâil’s ‘alaihi-salâm’ face. The Archangel said, **“O Messenger of Allah! The Mala-i a’lâ is awaiting you.”** Upon this Fakhr-i-âlam ‘sall-Allâhu alaihi wa sallam’ stated, **“O Azrâil! Come and perform your duty!”** So the Angel took Muhammad’s ‘alaihi-salâm’ blessed soul and transported it to the A’lâ-yi illiyyîn.

When signs of death were seen on Rasûl-i-ekrem, hadrat Umm-i-Eymen ‘radiy-Allâhu anhâ’ sent a message to his son Usâma. Upon receiving this sad news, Usâma and ‘Umar Fârûq and Abû Ubayda left the army and came back to the Mesjîd-i-Nabawî. When Âisha-i-Siddîqa and the other women began to

weep, the Sahâbîs in the Mesjîd-i-sherîf were confused, confounded, and paralyzed. Hadrat Alî was motionless as if he were dead. Hadrat 'Uthmân was speechless. Hadrat Abû Bekr was in his home at that moment. When he arrived at the place, running, he entered the Hujra-i-sa'âdat. He opened the face of Fakhr-i-'âlam, and saw that the Prophet had passed away. The blessed face and all the limbs of the Messenger of Allah were elegant, clean, and luminous like a halo. He kissed him, saying, "O Messenger of Allah! You are so beautiful, dead or living!" He wept bitterly. He put the cover back on the Prophet's blessed face. He consoled the people in the house. He went to the Mesjîd-i-sherîf. He advised the dumbfounded Sahâba and restored everything back to normal. Thus all of them believed that Rasûlallah was dead. In the meantime, the army under Usâma's command entered the city. Hadrat Burayda-t-ibni Hasîb set up the flag he was holding in his hand. Pain and sorrow, like a poisonous dagger, pierced the hearts of the Sahâba. Their eyes were weeping, their tears were cascading, and their hearts were grieved with the woe of separation.

Hadrat Abbâs, his son Fadl, hadrat Alî 'radiy-Allâhu ta'âlâ anhum', and the people in the house began in tears to make preparations for the funeral. Hadrat Abû Bekr stood by the door, weeping, lamenting, and helping with the services. Lamenting and moaning, however, would not serve the purpose; a president, a Khalîfa was requisite for the management of Muslims' affairs and the performance of Islam's commandments. At that time Abû Bekr as-Siddîq was the most suitable person for this task.

Hadrat Abbâs and Alî 'radiy-Allâhu anhumâ' were closer to Rasûlallah. Yet Fakhr-i-'âlam 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wa sallam' had held Abû Bekr, his companion in the cave, higher than all the other Sahâba. During his illness, on the day he had made his farewell speech to his Sahâba, he had said that Abû Bekr had been the person he had been pleased with most. He had closed all the doors opening into the Mesjîd-i-sherîf and permitted only Abû Bekr's door to be left open. Three days before his passing away he had appointed him Imâm for his As-hâb, thus granting him a position ahead of all the others in the performance of namâz, which is Islam's basic pillar. All these facts denoted that Abû Bekr was to be made Khalîfa. What remained to be done was for the As-hâb-i-kirâm to come together and elect him.

On the other hand, some of the Ansâr attempted to elect a Khalîfa from among themselves. They gathered under Benî

Saïda’s brushwood shelter. Sa’d bin Ubâda ‘radiy-Allâhu anh’, the leader of Hazraj tribe, was there, unwell as he was. He said to the Ansâr:

“O Ansâr! No other tribe has the superior qualities you possess. Muhammad ‘alaihi-salâm’ called his tribe to Islam for thirteen years in Mekka. Very few of them believed him. And the few who believed him were not numerous enough to make Jihâd. When Allâhu ta’âlâ conferred on you the honour of becoming Muslims, he blessed you with the fortune of protecting His Messenger and his As-hâb and consolidating and promulgating the Islamic religion by making Jihâd. You were the people who subdued the enemies. It was the fear of your swords that convinced the peasants of Arabia to become Muslims. Rasûl-i-ekrem was pleased with you when he passed away. It is your right to preside now. Do not give this right to someone else.” Most of the Ansâr being there said, “You are right. May Allah help you. We elect you Khalîfa.”

The Aws (Evs) tribe of the Ansâr did not like this. They gathered around Usayyad bin Hudayr, their chief.

The Muhâjirs, on the other hand, would not have elected the Khalîfa from among either of the two tribes of the Ansâr. For the Qoureish tribe was the highest and the most honourable of all the tribes of Arabia. A great controversy was imminent among the Muslims.

It was at this very critical and dangerous time that Abû Bekr and ‘Umar and Abû Ubayda arrived at the place like the miraculous life saver, hadrat Hidir. At that moment one of the Ansâr had stood up and was saying, “We helped Rasûlullah. We gave asylum to the Muhâjirs. The Khalîfa must be one of us.”

On the contrary, Rasûl-i-ekrem ‘sall-Allâhu alaihi wa sallam’ would have Abû Bekr on his right hand side and ‘Umar on his left everywhere. And he would say about Abû Ubayda, **“He is the trustworthy one of this Ummat.”** ‘radiy-Allâhu ta’âlâ anhum.’ When all three of them suddenly appeared on the scene, it was as if Rasûl-i-ekrem resurrected and came to the place. Everyone was silent, waiting eagerly to hear what they were about to say. Hadrat Abû Bekr said:

“This Ummat used to worship idols formerly. Allâhu ta’âlâ sent them a Messenger so that they should worship Him. Unbelievers found it difficult to abandon the religion of their forefathers. Allâhu ta’âlâ blessed the Muhâjirs with the honour of

becoming Believers. They became Rasûlullah's companions and fellow-sufferers. They patiently shared with him the persecutions inflicted by the enemies of religion. They are the earth's first worshippers of Haqq (Allah) and Believers of His Messenger. For this reason, the Khalîfa will have to be from among them. No one can be their partner in this respect. It would only take cruelty to try to deprive them of this right. O Ansâr! Your services to Islam could not be denied, either. Allâhu ta'âlâ chose you as helpers to His religion and Prophet. He sent His Rasûl (Messenger) to you. After the people who had the honour of being the first Muhâjirs, no one is more valuable than you are. You embraced the Messenger of Allah. The honour of boasting about having helped him belongs to you. No one would dispute this. Yet all the people of Arabia wish that the Khalîfa be from among the Qoureish. They do not want to see someone else as Khalîfa. For everyone knows that the Qoureish are the highest of the Arabs with respect to genealogy and virtue. And their land is in the middle of Arabia. Let us be the commanders, and you will be our viziers, counsellors. Nothing will be done without taking your counsel."

Then hadrat 'Umar 'radiy-Allâhu ta'âlâ anh' said, "O Ansâr! Rasûlullah entrusted you to us during his illness. He would have entrusted us to you if you were to occupy the commanding position."

Being at a loss as to what to say, the Ansâr-i-kirâm began to think deeply. One of them, namely Hubâb bin Munzir, stood up and suggested, "Let us have one Emîr from among us and one from you." Hadrat 'Umar's answer was: "There cannot be two Emîrs at the same time. The Arabs will not accept or obey the Khalîfa unless he belongs to the same tribe as Rasûlullah 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wa sallam' did." Hubâb protested, "O Ansâr! The Arabs accepted this religion through your swords. Do not let anyone seize your right!"

Ubayda-tabnil-Jerrâh 'radiy-Allâhu anh' warned, "O Ansâr! You are the people who served this religion in the beginning. Be careful lest you should be its first spoilers, too." Upon these statements, one of the Ansâr, namely Beshîr bin Sa'd bin Nu'mân bin Kâ'b bin Hazraj 'radiy-Allâhu anh' of the Hazraj tribe stood up and said:

"O Muslims! Muhammad 'alaihi-salâm' belongs to the Qoureish tribe. It would be more appropriate for the Khalîfa to be from among them, too. It would be correct. Yes, we were earlier to

become Muslims. We had the honour of serving Islam with our property and lives. Yet we did all these because we love Allah and His Messenger ‘sall-Allâhu alaihi wa sallam’. We do not expect any worldly recompense for this service of ours.” Hubâb questioned, “O Beshîr! Are you jealous of your paternal first cousin?”

Beshîr ‘radiy-Allâhu ta’âlâ anh’ replied, “I swear by the name of Allah that I am not. I only do not want anyone to infringe on the rights of the Qoureish.”

At that moment hadrat Abû Bekr ‘radiy-Allâhu anh’ said, “I nominate these two people for you. Choose one of them,” pointing to ‘Umar and Ubayda. Both of them drew back and said, “Who could stand before a person whom hadrat Prophet placed before others?” Voices were raised. Everyone began to talk his way.

Hadrat ‘Umar ‘radiy-Allâhu anh’ began to talk. Turning towards hadrat Abû Bekr, he said, “Rasûl-i-ekrem made you his Khalîfa in namâz, which is Islam’s archstone. He placed you before all of us. Hold out your hand! I have chosen you Khalîfa.” Ubayda was about to hold out his hand to choose Abû Bekr, too, when Beshîr sprang forward, held Abû Bekr’s hand, and paid homage to him before the others did. “You are our new Khalîfa,” he said. ‘Umar and Abû Ubayda paid homage, too. All the members of the Aws tribe, headed by their chief Usayyad bin Hudayr, came and paid homage. Upon seeing them, the Hazraj tribe paid homage, too.

If Abû Bekr, ‘Umar and Abû Ubayda ‘radiy-Allâhu anhum’ had not arrived on time, Sa’d bin Ubâda would have been paid homage, which in turn would have given way to hostilities between the two tribes Aws and Hazraj. The Qoureish tribe, on the other hand, would have been thoroughly against this and the Muslims would have been broken to factions. Abû Bekr as-Siddîq prevented this great danger. Owing to his being elected Khalîfa, Islam weathered a crisis which would have led to its fracturing.

Hadrat Beshîr bin Sa’d, who had a major role in this service, joined the Holy Wars of Aqaba II, Bedr, Uhud and all the others and fought heroically. He attained martyrdom in the Yemâma Holy War in the twelfth year of the Hijrat.

After being elected Khalîfa on Monday, hadrat Abû Bekr ‘radiy-Allâhu anh’ went to the Mesjîd-i-sherîf on Tuesday and convened the Sahâba there. He mounted the minber, made hamd-

u-thenâ (thanking, praising and lauding Allâhu ta'âlâ), and made this speech: "O Muslims! I have become your governor and president. Yet I am not the best among you. If I do good, help me. If I do something wrong, show me the right way! Rectitude is trustworthiness. Lying is treachery. Someone who is weak among you is very valuable for me. I will save his right. And someone who depends on his power is weak to me. For I shall take others' rights back from him. Inshâ-Allâhu ta'âlâ, let none of you neglect Jihâd. Those who cease from Jihâd will become despicable. Obey me as long as I obey Allah and His Messenger. If I disobey Allah and His Messenger and deviate from the right way, you will no longer have to obey me. Get up, let us perform namâz! May Allâhu ta'âlâ bless you all with goodnesses!"

Then they completed their duty pertaining to Rasûlullah's 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wa sallam' funeral. Until evening they entered the room in groups and all of them, men, women, children and slaves alike, performed the namâz (prescribed for the funeral) without forming jamâ'ats, (that is, each of them performed the namâz individually). It was in the darkness of Wednesday night that they buried the blessed Prophet in the same room.

The following account is given in the four hundred and tenth page of **Qisâs-i-Enbiyâ**: As long as Rasûlullah lived, the Wahy was revealed to him and thus the Ummat (Muslims) were informed (with the commandments of Allâhu ta'âlâ). Revelation of the Wahy was out of the question after him. Yet most of the Sahâba had committed Qur'ân al-kerîm to their memories. And the matters that are not explained openly in Qur'ân al-kerîm were being observed in accordance with the Sunnat-i-seniyya, that is, the records containing Rasûlullah's utterances and actions as well as actions which he did not prohibit though he saw others do them. However, the Sunnat-i-seniyya and hadîth-i-sherîfs were not in the memories of all the Sahâba. For some of them were busy with buying and selling at market places, some worked looking after their date orchards, and others were peasants working on farms. They therefore had not had time to attend all the Sohbat (of the Messenger of Allah). Those who had attended a Sohbat would tell what they had heard to the ones who had missed it. Thus a person would learn the hadîth-i-sherîfs he had not heard by asking those who had heard them. In fact, it took them a lot of thinking to decide where to bury the Messenger of Allah. Following a hadîth-i-sherîf narrated by Abû Bekr as-Siddîq, they buried him at the place where he had passed away.

Likewise, they had to make painstaking inquiries about how they should deal out the property he had left among his inheritors. It was Abû Bekr as-Siddîq, again, who quoted the hadîth-i-sherîf, **“Prophets do not leave an inheritance behind them.”** So they acted accordingly.

Âisha-i-Siddîqa ‘radiy-Allâhu anhâ’, the mother of Muslims, stated: “When Rasûl-i-ekrem ‘sall-Allâhu alaihi wa sallâm’ passed away, the hypocrites rose in rebellion. The Arabs became renegades, that is, they abandoned Islam. The Ansâr held themselves aloof. The disasters that befell my father would have crushed mountains had they befallen them. The case as this was, wherever there was a disagreement, my father would be there to solve it and reconcile the people concerned.”

When the As-hâb-i-kirâm ‘radiy-Allâhu ta’âlâ anhum ajma’în’ were confronted with something they did not know how to do, (they would look the matter up in the Sunnat-i-seniyya,) and if they did not find a solution in the Sunnat-i-seniyya, either, they would (decide how to) do it through a method called re’y (finding) and qiyâs (comparison), that is, by comparing it with other matters they knew how to do. This paved the way to ijtihâd. If the ijtihâds of the As-hâb-i-kirâm or other mujtahids agree on a matter, there will be no doubt left pertaining to that matter. This concurrence of ijtihâds was called **Ijmâ-i-ummat**. Making ijtihâd requires having profound knowledge. Scholars who possess this deep knowledge (and are therefore capable of making ijtihâd) are called **Mujtahid**. If the ijtihâds made by mujtahids do not agree with one another, it becomes wâjib for each mujtahid to act upon his own ijtihâd.

The caliphate election was a matter of ijtihâd, too. There were hadîth-i-sherîfs denoting that Abû Bekr, ‘Umar, ‘Uthmân and Alî ‘radiy-Allâhu anhum’ would become Khalîfa. Yet the time for any of them was not stated clearly. Rasûlullah ‘sall-Allâhu alaihi wa sallam’ did not say, “Appoint so and so Khalîfa after me.” He left this job over to the As-hâb-i-kirâm to decide on. The ijtihâds made by the As-hâb-i-kirâm pertaining to caliphate election did not agree with one another. There were three different ijtihâds:

The first one was the Ansâr’s re’y [finding]; they said that the person “who has served Islam most must be Khalîfa. The Arabs became Muslims in the shade of our swords. Therefore one of us must be Khalîfa.”

The second ijtihâd was the re’y of most of the As-hâb-i-kirâm ‘radiy-Allâhu ta’âlâ alaihim ajma’în’; they said that Khalîfa “must

be powerful enough to enforce the regulations among the Ummat. The most honourable and the most powerful tribe among the Arabs is the Qoureish. The Khalîfa will have to be one from among the Qoureish.”

The third ijtihâd was the re’ÿ of the Hâshimîs, who said that one of Rasûlullah’s relations must be Khalîfa.

The correct one of these three ijtihâds was the second one. Yes, the Ansâr were of great help to Islam. And the relations of Rasûl-i-ekrem, on the other hand, were very honourable. Yet caliphate was not a chair for rest granted as a reward for past services. Nor was it an inheritable property to be handed over to relations. The second ijtihâd entailed that caliphate was to be given to the Qoureish tribe not because Rasûlullah ‘sall-Allâhu alaihi wa sallam’ was from this tribe, but because the Qoureish was a tribe renowned throughout Arabia for its honour, power, influence and dignity. For caliphate was an office to provide unity, loyalty and social order among Muslims. And doing this, in its turn, would necessitate being authoritative. The Khalîfa’s duty is to prevent mischief and instigation, to secure peace and freedom, to administer Jihâd, and to maintain order so that Muslims carry on their affairs and businesses easily and smoothly. Doing all these things requires power.

What the As-hâb-i-kirâm ‘alaihim-ur-ridwân’ took into consideration in the caliphate election was to unite the Muslim tribes so as to establish a powerful state. Giving the office of caliphate to the Hâshimîs, who were only one out of the ten Qoureishi tribes, would hardly provide this unity. The higher the number of the people establishing a government, the more powerful the government. For this reason, it would be necessary to elect one of the notables of the Qoureish. And the person to be elected would have to be a superior one, not only in tribal identification and genealogy, but also from the Islamic point of view. The highest Qoureishi tribe at that time was (Beni Umayya). And the most outstanding personage in that tribe was Abû Sufyân bin Harb. Yet the harms he had inflicted on the Muslims during the Uhud war had not yet been totally forgotten. He had already become a true and staunch Muslim. Yet the other Muslims could not fully trust him yet. Consequently, no one could be placed before Rasûlullah’s faithful companion in the cave, who had become a Muslim earliest and caused others to become Muslims, too, and who had been appointed (by Rasûlullah) as the imâm (to conduct public prayers). It was certain that everyone would vote

for him. In addition, since the normal procedure was for all the Sahâba to come together and elect the Khalîfa, the Ansâr's attempt for an election among themselves could cause a commotion. Thus, by running to the place, hadrat Abû Bekr 'radiy-Allâhu ta'âlâ anh' forestalled this danger and saved Muslims from a grave tumult.

During these events hadrat Alî was at his wife hadrat Fâtima's home 'radiy-Allâhu anhumâ'. Zubeyr, who was Abû Bekr as-Siddîq's son-in-law, and Mikdâd and Selmân and Abû Zer and Ammâr bin Yâser 'radiy-Allâhu anhum' were there, too. Their ijtihâd concurred with that of the third group. So Abbâs came to hadrat Alî and held out his hand in homage to him. Yet the latter had heard that hadrat Abû Bekr had become Khalîfa; he therefore refused the offer. Abû Sufyân said, "Hold out your hand and I shall pay homage to you. I shall fill everywhere with cavalymen and infantrymen if you want me to." Hadrat Alî 'radiy-Allâhu ta'âlâ anh' refused the notion, saying, "O Abâ Sufyân! Do you want to cause faction among the Islamic nation?"

As is seen, both Abû Bekr as-Siddîq and Alî 'radiy-Allâhu anhumâ' were sensitive about a probable instigation or controversy among the Muslims. At first hadrat Alî was somewhat sorry because he had not been called to the election held under Sakîfa's brushwood shelter. As is explained in the book **Musâmarât**, by Muhyiddîn-i-Arâbî, and in the book **Daw'us-sabâh**, by Hamîd bin Alî Imâdî (1175 [A.D. 1757]), Abû Ubayda came to the house where hadrat Alî was. He told him all the statements he had heard from hadrat Abû Bekr and 'Umar. [These statements, very long and effective, are quoted in **Qisâs-i-Enbiyâ**]. Hadrat Alî 'radiy-Allâhu ta'âlâ anh' listened. The statements were so impressive that he felt as if he had been penetrated to the marrow. He said, "O Abâ Ubayda! My sitting in the nook in a house is not intended to become Khalîfa or to protest against the Emr-i-ma'rûf or to castigate a Muslim. Separation from the Messenger of Allah has shocked me out of my senses and driven me mad." The following morning he went to the Mesjîd-i-sherîf. Walking past all the others, he went near hadrat Abû Bekr, paid homage, and sat down. The Khalîfa said to him, "You are blessed and honoured to us. When you are angry, you fear Allah. And when you are happy you thank Him. How lucky for the person who will not demand any more than a position bestowed on him by Allah. I did not want to be Khalîfa. I had to accept it lest there should arise a fitna (instigation,

mischief). There is no resting for me in this duty. A heavy burden has been imposed on me. I do not have the strength to carry it. May Allah give me strength! Allâhu ta'âlâ has taken this burden off from your back. We need you. We are aware of your superior qualities.”

Hadrat Alî and Zubeyr said that Abû Bekr was more suitable than anyone else for the caliphate. They said they had been sorry for not having been informed about the election beforehand, and they apologized for this. The Khalîfa accepted their apology. [The statements which hadrat Alî made in praise of Abû Bekr as-Siddîq that day are written with documents in the (Turkish) book **Se'âdet-i ebediyye**, in the twenty-third chapter of the second volume; that chapter is the translation of the ninety-sixth letter]. Then hadrat Alî asked for permission and stood up. Hadrat 'Umar very kindly saw him off. As hadrat Alî left, he said, “My being so late to come here was not intended to oppose (Abû Bekr as) the Khalîfa. And my coming here now is not out of fear.” All the Hâshimîs followed hadrat Alî's example and paid homage. Thus a unanimity was realized.

Both hadrat Abû Bekr and hadrat Alî 'radiy-Allâhu ta'âlâ anhumâ' managed very vigilant and wise performances throughout the caliphate election. Hadrat Alî's not being called to the meeting under Sakîfa's brushwood shelter was a fortunate event. Had he been there that day, the discussions between the Ansâr and the Muhâjirs would have been doubled with the joining of the Hâshimîs, which in turn would have made things all the more complicated.

Differences of ijtihâds pertaining to the caliphate election are not for us to discuss or to comment on. They are the best Muslims. Each and every one of them is a star guiding to salvation. It is from them that the meaning of Qur'ân al-kerîm was acquired. It is through them that hundreds of thousands of hadîth-i-sherîfs were heard. And it is via them that the commandments and prohibitions of Allâhu ta'âlâ were learned.

It would not be worthy of us to attempt to use the teachings we obtained from them as criteria for assessing their behaviours.

Yes, erring is a human attribute. Mujtahids will err, too. Yet a mujtahid will be rewarded with thawâb anyway; ten times for not erring, and one reward if he errs.

Each and every one of the As-hâb-i-kirâm is a pillar of Islam. Differences among them were based on ijtihâd. They knew one

another's value even when they criticised one another. If hadrat Zubeyr had preferred his personal considerations to his religious conceptions, he would not have disagreed with hadrat Abû Bekr, his father-in-law. Hadrat 'Umar was the most eager supporter of hadrat Abû Bekr in the caliphate election. On the other hand, he, again, was the person who cherished and praised hadrat Alî most. One day hadrat 'Umar asked hadrat Alî a question. The latter answered the question. Upon this he said, "I entrust myself to Allah's protection from confronting a difficult question in hadrat Alî's absence." Hadrat Alî used to say, "After Rasûl-i-ekrem, the most useful people in this Ummat are Abû Bekr and 'Umar." 'radiy-Allâhu ta'âlâ alaihim ajma'in'.

A month later hadrat Abû Bekr 'radiy-Allâhu anh' mounted the minber and said, "I want to resign from the office of caliphate. If you expect to see me following precisely the same way taken by the Messenger, this is impossible. For the devil could not approach him. In addition, he would be revealed the Wahy from heaven." Could the hearts of such noble persons harbour any ambitions for rank or position? Could any tongue speak ill of them?

Actually, Fâtima-t-uz-Zehrâ 'radiy-Allâhu anhâ' was so deeply distressed with the bereavement of her father's death that she could not go out. Hadrat Alî also mostly stayed at home to keep her company in her bereavement; therefore he could not frequently attend the Khalîfa's sohbet. However, after hadrat Fâtima's passing away he paid homage again. He would often enter the Khalîfa's presence, help him and make suggestions. 'radiy-Allâhu anhum ajma'in'.

As will be concluded from the abovementioned information which we have derived from Qisâs-i-enbiyâ, the allegation in the book being circulated among Shiites and which asserts that hadrat Alî and six other Sahâbîs did not pay homage to hadrat Abû Bekr, is ungrounded. To stand against the unanimity of the As-hâb-i-kirâm by not accepting hadrat Abû Bekr (as Khalîfa) and to make immoderate statements in this subject not only would have been incompatible with Islam, but it would also have meant to disobey Rasûlullah's command to his Sahâba: "Be in unity and avoid controversies." To say that hadrat Alî and six other Sahâbîs and Fâtima-t-uz-Zehrâ the highest of women did not carry out this command and disobeyed Islam would mean, let alone loving them, to controvert and belittle those great religious leaders. So grave is the controversy imputed to them that it has inflicted a fatal wound

in Islam and caused millions of Muslims to deviate from the right way till the end of the world. The harms done to Islam and the bloodbaths of millions of Muslims perpetrated by those who dissented from the Ahl as-sunna by reading the lies and slanders fabricated by Hurûfîs and Jews, are the causes of Islam's *status quo*. The harms which groups named Ahmadi and Qâdiyânî inflicted on Muslims are in the open. Could a wise and reasonable person with a light of Islam and love of imân in his heart say that hadrat Alî was the cause of this great malice?

Abd-ul-qâdir-i-Geylânî 'quddisa sirruh', one of the greatest Awliyâ, gives the following account in his book **Ghunya**: "Of the seventy-two groups of bid'at (aberration), nine are the most prominent. Shiites are one of these nine groups. They have parted into twenty sub-groups, all of which dislike one another. The group of Abdullah ibni Saba' are like Jewry. For instance, Jews say that the right to become an imâm belongs to a certain class of people. Likewise, these people allege that caliphate is a right which belongs to Imâm-i-Alî's descendants, and that it is not permissible for other people to preside over Muslims. According to Jews, Jihâd [War] is not permissible until the emerging of Dadjjal. And according to the Saba' group, Jihâd is not permissible until the emerging of Mahdi. The twelfth imâm, i.e. Muhammad Mahdi, who was the tenth grandson of Hadrat Alî, was the son of Hasan Askerî. He was born in 259. When he was seventeen years old he entered a cave and never came back out. The Saba' group think that he was the promised Mahdi who according to Islam's teachings will appear in the latest time. Jews do not break their fast before stars appear in the sky. This is the case with the Saba' group, too. Jews make masah on their socks (in ritual ablution). The Saba' group do the same. It is permissible for a Jew to kill a Muslim. And it is permissible for the Saba' group to kill the Sunnite Muslims. A woman divorced by a Jew can marry (another man) without having to wait for the time of iddat (according to Islam, length of time during which a divorced woman cannot marry another man). The Saba' group also do not wait for the time of iddat. According to Jews, having divorced a woman three times will not prevent from marrying her again. The Saba' group also will marry a woman whom they have divorced three times. Jews changed the Torah. There is not a single copy of the Bible that has remained intact on the earth today; nor is there a true copy of the Torah. Likewise, the Saba' group wrote the defiled forms of some âyats of Qur'ân al-kerîm in their heretical

books. This they did because they thought there were deductions and additions in Qur'ân al-kerîm."

'Uthmân Efendi, the author of the book **Tezkiya-i-Ahl-i-Bayt**, relates as follows: I was attending the Ministry of Education, when a pile of drafts of tafsîr (explanation of Qur'ân al-kerîm) written by the Saba' group arrived in a couple of chests. Permission was not given for their printing. They asked the reason: "Is there anything incompatible with Islam in it?" "Yes," I replied. "You write that hadrat Alî was a disbeliever." He was exasperated. "Don't be angry," I pacified. "Listen! According to the allegation written in the introduction, hadrat Talha asked hadrat Alî, 'It has been rumoured that hadrat 'Uthmân deducted seventy âyats from Qur'ân al-kerîm and that hadrat 'Umar deleted eighty âyats. Is this rumour true?' When hadrat Alî affirmed Talha queried again, 'It is said that you possess the unchanged copy of the Qur'ân. Do you?' Hadrat Alî's answer was: 'Certainly. And the copy I have is twice as copious as the existing ones.' When he was asked why he did not reveal it to Muslims, he complained, 'I would have given it to them if they had elected me Khalîfa instead of Abû Bekr. Because they did not elect me, I am not going to give it to them. I shall advise in my will that it should be kept in secrecy by my offspring till the end of the world.' These things are written in your tafsîr. Now I ask you for Allah's sake: Because Jewry concealed the twenty Pentateuchal verses informing about Muhammad 'alaihîs-salâm', Allâhu ta'âlâ declares in Qur'ân al-kerîm that they are disbelievers: **'Could there be anyone more cruel, more heretical than one who conceals my âyats?'** According to your allegation, hadrat Alî 'radiy-Allâhu anh' concealed a copy twice as extensive as Qur'ân al-kerîm, thus retaining more than three thousand âyats. Doesn't this allegation of yours impute worse cruelty and heresy to the Lion of Allah? For Allah's sake, answer this properly." Astounded, he could not find any answer. He said, "I am neither Shiite nor Sunnite. I am a freemason."

Jews feel hostility to Jebrâîl 'alaihîs-salâm'. Likewise, asserting that by mistake Jebrâîl brought the Wahy to Muhammad 'alaihîs-salâm' instead of revealing it to hadrat Alî, the Saba' group have become hostile to Jebrâîl 'alaihîs-salâm'.

These facts show plainly that the fabricator of these lies could not be Shiite or Sunnite. Actually, he is a Jew named Abdullah bin Saba'.

One day I asked Mirza Ridâ, a Persian scholar who had

travelled in Muslim countries for thirty to forty years: “You know all the Shiite groups. What is your impression about those people called Mulhid who live around Syria and Antioch?” “They are unbelievers because they worship Imâm-i-Alî.” When I asked him about the group called kızılbaş (Kisilbash) who lived in Iraq, he informed, “They, too, are disbelievers because they deny most of the âyats of Allâhu ta’âlâ.” Then I inquired about Hurûfîs, who covered themselves with the innocent name, Bektâshîs. His answer was: “These people camouflage their credal system; it is not known well what their cult is really like. However, they deny the farz (commandments of Allâhu ta’âlâ stated clearly in Qur’ân al-kerîm). They say ‘halâl’ about harâms. For this reason, Hurûfîs are unbelievers, too.” [Hadrat Hâcî Bektâş-ı Velî (Hâdji Bektâsh Walî), a Sunnî Islamic scholar and a Walî, was born in Nishâpur, Iran. He was a descendant of Imâm-i-Mûsâ Kâzim. He came to Anatolia, where he began to promulgate the teachings of Ahl as-Sunna. The then Ottoman Pâdishâh, namely Sultân Orhan Gâzî [b. 680; d. 761 (A.D. 1359)] visited him and was blessed with his benediction. This great scholar asked a blessing on the Janissaries, too. He passed away in 773 [A.D. 1371], during the reign of the third (Ottoman) Pâdishâh Sultân Murâd Hudâvendigâr [b. 726; martyred in 791 (A.D. 1389)]. His mausoleum is at a site called Hâcî Bektaş in Kırşehir. His disciples and people who followed the true way guided by that great Walî were called Bektâshî. The Bektâshîs in our country (Turkey) follow the way taken by those true Muslims. When Shâh Ismâîl was routed in the Çaldıran war and fled, the Kızılbaş, or Hurûfî, soldiers in his army spread in Anatolia. In order to survive they took asylum in Bektâshî convents. In the course of time they infested these convents with their heretical Hurûfî beliefs. As of today there is next to none of these indecent drunkards left in our country]. Upon this I said, “Now there is only one Shiite group left: the Imâmiyya group. There are five to ten million of these people. Today the number of the Sunnite Muslims is well over three hundred and fifty thousand million. There is no controversy among them to cause faction among Muslims. They all obey Qur’ân al-kerîm and hadîth-i-sherîfs. They all have the same heart, the same îmân. How could one’s tongue and conscience condone imputing to hadrat Alî a controversy that would lead to a tumult so grave as to break Muslims into groups oppugnant towards one another?” He answered, “The Sunnites are right in every respect. The Shiites are wrong. Only,” he added, “one mistake the Sunnîs have been

making is their fanatical advocacy of Mu'âwiya." This faqîr (I) said, "We, too, hate Yezîd and those who tormented and cursed the Ahl-i-Bayt and we say that they were wicked people. As for hadrat Mu'âwiya; we acknowledge that he erred in his ijtihâd and that hadrat Alî's ijtihâd was correct. Hadrat Mu'âwiya's disagreeing with hadrat Alî and fighting him was based on ijtihâd 'radiy-Allâhu ta'âlâ anhumâ'. Yet he never criticised or vituperated hadrat Imâm (Alî). Even as he fought against him he respected him, acknowledged his superiority, praised and lauded that noble Imâm. The person whom you suppose to be hadrat Mu'âwiya's enemy is actually very munificent. And his Rabb (Allah) is very compassionate, too. We therefore do not comment on the wars that took place among them. Quoting the âyat-i-kerîma at the end of Fat-h sûra, we say that they were very merciful towards one another."

[The book **Berekât**, which is also named **Maqâmât-i-Serhendiyya** or **Zubda-t-ul-maqâmât**, was written in the Persian language by Muhammad Hâshim-i-Kishmî in India in 1037 [A.D. 1627]. A copy of the book exists at number 1317 in the (Murâd Molla) library, located in the district called Yavuz Sultân Selîm in Istanbul. It was reproduced by offset process in Istanbul in 1977].

Kerâmats (miracles that occur through the Awliyâ or other pious Muslims) of Imâm-i-Rabbânî Ahmad Fârûqî are written in the eighth chapter of the second section of the book Berekât. Muhammad Hâshim narrates the seventh of these kerâmats as follows: I had a young Sayyid class-mate in madrasa. One day he came panting. He gasped out a wonderful event he had experienced. He had witnessed a great wonder through hadrat Imâm-i-Rabbânî. He said:

I used to dislike those people who had fought against hadrat Alî; of them, hadrat Mu'âwiya was the one I hated most. One night I was reading the book Mektûbât (Letters) written by your master, [i.e. Imâm-i-Rabbânî]. It read, "Imâm-i-Enes bin Mâlik said that hating or censuring hadrat Mu'âwiya is like hating or censuring hadrat Abû Bekr and hadrat 'Umar. If a person curses him, he must be punished as if he cursed these two great Sahâbîs." When I read this I felt rather annoyed and said to myself, "How come he wrote this nonsense here!" I dropped Mektûbât on the floor, lay in my bed, and soon fell asleep. I had a dream: That exalted shaikh of yours came towards me, indignant. With his both blessed hands he pulled me by the ears and said, "You ignorant child! You don't like what we have written and dump our

book unto the floor. You were consternated when you read my writing; and you don't believe it. Now I will take you to a noble person so that you see for yourself! Let him tell you how wrong you are hating his friends, who are the As-hâb of the Messenger of Allah 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wa sallam'." He pulled me along till we reached a garden. Leaving me in the garden, he proceeded alone. He entered a large room seen in the distance. A luminous faced great person was seated in the room. Bashful and respectful, he greeted that great person, who in his turn acknowledged the greeting, smiling. Observing the rules of manner due at such places, he kneeled before him. He was telling him something and pointing to me at the same time. I could see him looking at me from the distance and I knew he was telling him about me. After a while, that noble shaikh of yours stood up and beckoned to me. "That exalted person sitting in there is hadrat Alî 'radiy-Allâhu anh'. Listen well and see what he says," he warned. We entered. I greeted. The luminous faced person said, "Never, never harbour any resentment in your heart against Rasûlullah's 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wa sallam' As-hâb! Never speak ill of any one of those great people! We and those brothers of ours know what our intentions were in those deeds of ours which look like wars in their outward appearances." Then, mentioning the honourable name of that elevated shaikh of yours, he added, "And never be opposed to his writings!" After listening to his advice, I searched my heart and found that the discord, the hostility I had felt against those who had made the so-called wars was still there. He knew how I was and became angry. Looking at your noble shaikh, he said, "His heart needs better cleaning. Give him a slap in the face!" Hadrat Shaikh dealt me a good slap in the face, which made me think to myself, "It was my love for this person that made me hate those people. And now he is so badly offended with my grudge against them. He wants me to cease from this mood. So I must forget about this animosity!" When I searched my heart once again, I found it perfectly purified of the hostility it had had. At that moment I woke up. My heart is quite free of that hatred now. The spiritual flavour I received from the dream and the words has actualised drastic transformations in me. Now my heart does not contain any sort of love except that of Allah and I have much more belief in your exalted shaikh and the ma'rifats in his writings.

No one will be blamed in the Hereafter for not having cursed others or for having held one's tongue in the world.

We have not been commanded to curse or swear at anyone, be it those unbelievers who inflicted very bitter torments and persecutions on our master the Fakhr-i-kâinât ‘alaihi-salawâtu wa-t-teslîmât’ and the Sahâba for thirteen years, nor even the five or six ferociously cruel people who were their chiefs. Even the names of these exorbitant brutes have long been forgotten, with the exception of Abû Jahl. It is not an Islamic commandment to curse or vituperate any people belonging to any religion on the earth. If a person performs the commands of Allâhu ta’âlâ and avoids His prohibitions, the harâms, he will not be called to account for not having cursed the devil even once in his lifetime. Nor will he be accused of having been friendly with the devil. On the other hand, if a person neglects the commandments and curses the devil hundreds of times daily, he will be called to account in the Hereafter and his having cursed the devil will not save him from torment. This person will be considered not as an enemy of the devil, but as one of his friends. Consequently, cursing this person or that in order to prove one’s love for the Ahl-i-Bayt would be both preposterous from the mental point of view and futile, and even piacular, according to Islam. Nâdir Shâh, the Iranian Emperor, ascended to the throne in 1148. He captured Delhi in India in 1152 [A.D. 1739]. He tried to capture Baghdâd, too. He was killed during a mutiny that broke out in 1160. When this Nâdir Shâh raised the siege of Baghdâd, he convened an assembly of Sunnite and Shiite scholars and appointed Abdullah bin Huseyn Suwaydî [b. 1104; d. 1174 (A.D. 1760)] ‘rahmatullâhi ta’âlâ aleyh’ to preside over the assembly.^[1] This assembly took a unanimous decision to eliminate the beliefs that caused differences between the Sunnite and Shiite Muslims, and the decision was undersigned by all the scholars who took part in the debates. Upon Nâdir Shâh’s death this useful attempt had to remain on paper. At this point I should like to relate an episode which this subject reminds me of:

Nâdir Shâh asked the Shi’î scholars, “Will Jews, Christians and magians (unbelievers without a heavenly book, e.g. communists and freemasons) go to Paradise or Hell?” The unanimous answer was that these disbelievers would go to Hell. And when he asked where the Sunnite Muslims would go, “They will go to Hell,” they said. This made the Shâh angry. He said, “Did Jenâb-i-Haqq (Allah) create the eight worlds of Paradise for only a group of

[1] See the first part, **Documents of The Right Word.**

Iranian people?”

This faqîr (I) went on Hajj in 1282 [A.D. 1866]. On the way I met an Iranian scholar named Hasan Efendi. I said to him, “The As-hâb-i-kirâm ‘alaihim-ur-ridwân’ are praised through many hadîth-i-sherîfs. While this is the case, why do you feel hostility towards them and curse all of them?” He said, “I am not hostile against them. However, according to the majority of Shiites, Abû Bekr as-Siddîq took caliphate from Alî by violence, and the Sahâba supported him, thus becoming renegades.” In response to this I said, “Did not our master Rasûl-i-ekrem ‘sall-Allâhu alaihi wa sallam’ know that these people would some day become renegades when he praised and lauded them?” His answer was, “He did not know that they would do so at the end. If he had known, he would not have praised any of them. He would have cursed all of them.” Then I questioned, “Allâhu ta’âlâ praises the As-hâb-i-kirâm through various âyat-i-jalîlas. Did not Allâhu ta’âlâ know, either?” The Shiite could not answer this. I pursued: “Would it not be denigratory towards hadrat Alî to allege that he rowed over a worldly position?” He replied, “Hadrat Alî’s raising a row with the Sahâba was not intended for a worldly rank, position. Our Master, Fakhr-i-kâinât, had advised that Alî be appointed Khalîfa. The Sahâba became renegades because they disobeyed this command. And hadrat Alî fought against them for the execution of this command of Rasûlullah’s.” Upon this I asked this counter-question: “Shiites disobeyed so many of Rasûlullah’s commands. They invented numerous bid’ats. Very few of them perform the Islamic commandments and sunnats. Aren’t they renegades according to your syllogism?” He could not answer. I went on, “Supposing hadrat Alî and hadrat Fâtîma were offended with the As-hâb-i-kirâm, the former being so because he was not elected Khalîfa and the latter because she was not given the date orchard. It is harâm for a Believer to be offended or to become angry with his Muslim brothers and to remain cross with them for more than three days. How could it be justifiable to allege that they remained cross till the end of the world?” “Their being cross was because the others did not perform the commandment,” he said. Upon this I said, “If Believers disobey Islam, it will be farz to be offended with them and to admonish them to observe their duties. This, in its turn, will be done by the state by using force and by scholars by preaching. Other people will be offended in their hearts, which is the lowest grade of îmâm. Now, hadrat Alî ‘radiy-Allâhu anh’ was the lion of Allah. Why did he not have the

commandment executed by using force? Was he too weak to do that? Although a person has the right to demand that the murderer of his father, mother or child be given death penalty for retaliation, the two hundred and thirty-seventh âyat of Baqara sûra purports, **‘If you forgive, this will be closer to taqwâ,’** and the forty-eighth and the hundred and sixteenth âyats of Nisâ sûra purport, **‘Allâhu ta’âlâ will forgive the sins except shirk [disbelief] of anyone He likes,’** and the thirty-eighth âyat of Mâida sûra purports, **‘If a person commits zulm, that is, sins, and then makes tawba and then performs pious deeds, Allâhu ta’âlâ will certainly accept his tawba.’** There are some thirty other similar âyats promising that tawba will be accepted. While an average born slave who has committed all sorts of sins and then made tawba attains Allah’s forgiveness, how do you know that Rasûlullah’s Ashâb ‘ridwânullâhi ta’âlâ alaihim ajmâ’in’ did not make tawba and attain forgiveness supposing we were to admit that they were wrong in their decisions pertaining to caliphate?” Once again, he could not answer.

Arûs zâda Efendi, the Mufti of Baghdâd, told this faqîr (me) the following episode which he had heard from the keeper of our master hadrat Huseyn’s ‘radiy-Allâhu ta’âlâ anh’ mausoleum in Kerbelâ (Karbala):

One night the keeper dreamt of hadrat Huseyn ‘radiy-Allâhu anh’, who said to him, “Tomorrow a corpse will be brought from Iran. Never let him be buried anywhere close to me.” The next day a corpse was brought from Iran. They wanted to bury him near the mausoleum. At first he would not let them. However, being very rich, they persuaded him to permit them to do so by giving him a large amount of money. So they buried the corpse at a distance of about two thousand steps from the mausoleum. That night the keeper dreamt of Imâm-i-Huseyn ‘radiy-Allâhu anh’ again. This time the Imâm was angry with the keeper and shouted at him. The keeper said he was very sorry and begged for forgiveness. The following night the Imâm came into his dream again and rebuked him. The keeper said he was going to exhume the corpse and bury it somewhere farther away. Yet the beloved grandson of the Messenger of Allah ‘radiy-Allâhu anh’ said, “If a (dead) person lies somewhere close to us for two nights, he will be forgiven. He has been forgiven already, yet this has cost me a great deal of inconvenience.” Thus he denoted that the keeper as well as the dead person had been forgiven. When the keeper related this event to Arûs zâda, the valuable Mufti asked the keeper, “While a

sinner rejected by the Imâm for his wickedness attains forgiveness by staying two nights at a distance of two thousand steps from his shrine, haven't the Shaikhyan [Abû Bekr and 'Umar] 'radiy-Allâhu anhumâ', who have been lying side by side with Rasûlullah in the Hujra-i-mu'attara-i-Nabawiyya (the Prophet's Shrine) for twelve hundred and sixty years, attained forgiveness yet?" He was appalled and could not answer. His incompetence and ignorance became apparent. What a lovely rebuttal, and how grave an embarrassment!...

Of the Shaikhayn, 'Umar 'radiy-Allâhu anh' conquered cities and countries during his caliphate in order to propagate Allah's religion and Rasûlullah's fame all over the world. His armies spread heroically over the Arab peninsula and over the farthest places in the east and in the west, destroying the darknesses caused by unbelief and immorality and illuminating those places with Islam's light. I wonder if hadrat Alî would not forgive him for the sake of all these services he did to Islam? As hadrat 'Umar left for the conquest of Qudus-i-sherîf (Jerusalem), he appointed hadrat Alî his deputy for the caliphate. Hadrat Alî undertook the duty as the acting Khalîfa, carried on this duty until hadrat 'Umar's coming back, and returned the office to him when he came back. Does not this indicate the amount of mutual love between them? Had there been the tiniest amount of discord or row between them, would hadrat 'Umar have appointed him his deputy? Would hadrat Alî have so willingly returned the office of caliphate after having obtained it? If it should be said that "Afterwards he must have forgotten about caliphate. He would not have given it to 'Umar if he had not forgotten about it," then there must not have been any disagreement or discord left between him and the person he deputized, which in turn means that it is not permissible to criticize that person.

During the caliphate of hadrat 'Umar 'radiy-Allâhu anh', hadrat Alî 'kerrem-Allâhu wejheh' gave his daughter Umm-i-Gulthum in nikâh (marriage as prescribed by Islam) to the Khalîfa for forty thousand silver coins in the seventeenth year of the Hijrat. Hadrat 'Umar had a son named Zeyd and a daughter named Ruqayya from Umm-i-Gulthum. Thus hadrat 'Umar became hadrat Alî and hadrat Fâtima's son-in-law 'radiy-Allâhu ta'âlâ anhum', and the long-time mutual love between them became several times stronger. Most of the time they would be together day and night and search for ways of helping Muslims in their businesses. Did hadrat Alî reserve his grudge and hostility

despite all this closeness? What a grave slander it would be towards that exalted Imâm to say so.

I knew a person who had served as Pâsha and Vizier and yet who had later swerved into the heresy of Hurûfî, which had been disguised as the Bektâshî way. After some time this person came to his senses and made tawba. When this faqîr (I) asked him why and how he had made tawba, he told me the following story: A book highly esteemed by these false Bektâshîs calls hadrat 'Umar a disbeliever. To forestall the natural question how it happened that hadrat Alî gave his daughter to a disbeliever, the book gives the following account: One day 'Umar the Khalîfa sent for hadrat Abbâs and told him that he wanted to marry hadrat Alî's daughter. When the latter answered that the girl would be too young for him, he said, "Alî's answer was the same when I told him about my intention. Go and tell him! If he will not marry his daughter to me, I shall find two false witnesses, bring an action against him, decide that he is a thief, and mutilate his both hands." Helpless, hadrat Alî had to give his daughter to 'Umar. Upon reading this in the book, I said to myself, "If a cruel person tried to force me to give my daughter to a disbeliever and threatened to kill me if I should not obey him, I would rather die than give my daughter to a disbeliever although I am a black-faced, sinful person. Subsequently, hadrat Alî 'kerrem-Allâhu wejheh', the Lion of Allah, the beloved one of the Messenger of Allah, and a perfect, sinless Muslim, could not have thrown his daughter, who was at the same time Rasûlullah's 'sall-Allâhu ta'âlâ alaihi wa sallam' beloved granddaughter, into an abominable, foul rubbish heap forbidden by Islam only for fear of a doubtful danger." I realized that I had been in the wrong way, made tawba for good, and saved myself from the heresy called Hurûfî.

One of the (Ottoman) viziers, during his service as the governor of Baghdâd, asked a Persian what he knew about this marriage of hadrat 'Umar's. The insolent man made some dirty, slanderous statements about hadrat Alî's 'radiy-Allâhu anh' blessed daughter and left the place.

As it becomes clear from the detailed information given above, the great Walî Abd-ul-qâdir Gheylânî 'qaddas-Allâhu ta'âlâ sirrah ul'azîz' is very right in his comparing Hurûfîs to Jews in fifteen ways. It is obvious that the Hurûfî sect was invented by a Jew named Abdullah bin Saba' with a view to breaking Islam. In order to sow hostility among Muslims, this Jew alleged that hadrat Alî had been deprived of his right of caliphate by force,

thus leading to a long era of blasphemy throughout which one hundred and twenty-four thousand Sahâbîs have been wrongfully blemished with disbelief.

[Jews are the descendants of the twelve sons of the Prophet Ya'qûb (Jacob) 'alaihi-salâm'. Because Ya'qûb's 'alaihi-salâm' name was Isrâîl, these people were called **Benî Isrâîl**, (Children of Isrâîl, or Israelites). Isrâîl means Abdullah. When Mûsâ (Moses) 'alaihi-salâm' went to Mount Sinai (Tûr), these people abandoned their faith and began to worship a calf. Later they repented and made tawba. Therefore they were called Jews (Yahûdî, Judah). Judah means person who finds the way to salvation. Jews caused a great deal of trouble to Mûsâ 'alaihi-salâm'. Their later generations martyred one thousand Prophets. They calumniated Isâ (Jesus) 'alaihi-salâm' because he did not have a father. They called his mother hadrat Meryem (Mary) unchaste. They assailed them and tried to kill them. They poisoned Muhammad 'alaihi-salâm', the Prophet of the latest time. In the time of hadrat 'Uthmân they aroused a fitna, which ended in the Khalîfa's martyrdom. They invented the Hurûfî sect and thus broke Muslims into groups hostile to one another. Throughout centuries they tried to annihilate the religions revealed and the Prophets sent by Allâhu ta'âlâ. In order to destroy religions they established freemasonry. After the end of the First World War in 1336 [A.D. 1918] they founded communistic states which were inimical towards chastity, honesty and faith. In the meantime, Hayim Naum, who was the chief Rabbi, formerly of Istanbul and later of Egypt, carried on intrigues between the capitalistic and imperialistic states in order to demolish the world's unique Islamic (Ottoman) Empire. As a result, this great Empire, which was the leader of the Islamic world, collapsed. Muslims were called regressive people. Islam lost its power and was driven to the verge of extinction.]

Books, religious ones and those on history alike, unanimously state that hadrat Abû Bekr was elected Khalîfa on Monday. The following day, Tuesday, hadrat Alî and a few other people came to the Mesjîd and willingly paid homage to Abû Bekr. Hadrat Alî obeyed every command of the Khalîfa until the Khalîfa's passing away. He spared no effort, no help in the promulgation of Islam. For all these facts, these people impute wicked habits prohibited by Qur'ân al-kerîm to this great Imâm. Would not a Muslim shudder at the thought of slandering hadrat Alî in this manner? Hadrat Abû Bekr, 'Umar and 'Uthmân 'radiy-Allâhu anhum', as they were elected Khalîfa, said there were people better than

themselves; each of them thought of himself as a person not good enough for the office of caliphate. For they had the attribute of modesty commanded by Allâhu ta'âlâ. Is the allegation that "The following day hadrat Alî came forward with arrogance, one of the gravest sins, and defied others, asking if there was anyone better, braver, more learned than he was," something commensurable with being Muslim? Most of the paths of Tasawwuf begin with hadrat Alî. Leaders of Tasawwuf educate their disciples in accordance with hadrat Alî's instructions. And the first lesson they teach is modesty. While many âyat-i-kerîmas advise us to forgive our brothers in Islam their faults, how could it ever be justifiable to refer the wickedness of nursing a grudge for thirty years and advising others to maintain this hostility till the end of the world to a mean sinner, let alone to hadrat Alî? Great teachers of Tasawwuf educate their disciples by quoting the âyat-i-kerîmas teaching that everything is made by Allâhu ta'âlâ and advising contentment with qadhâ (fate, destiny). How could a person who advised this have been against qadhâ himself? Is it something believable? Is this allegation not a sheer slander? How could hadrat Alî be said to have been impatient with a problematic situation despite the âyat-i-kerîmas advising patience at times of trouble? Could hadrat Alî have forgotten about all the âyat-i-kerîmas warning against worldly ambitions and sowed seeds of instigation and faction among the Ummat-i-Muhammadiyya only for worldly ambitions? Could it be permissible to make such allegations about that honourable Imâm, whose statements have been utilized as maxims of sagacity and virtue by Muslims?

The three Khalîfas accepted caliphate unwillingly and only because it was farz for them to do so since the Sahâba of the Messenger of Allah elected them. They did not make a will to advise that they be succeeded by their sons in caliphate. Doesn't this fact prove that our statement is right? When the Sahâba unanimously appointed hadrat Alî Khalîfa, he accepted the duty unwilling as he was. Yet upon hadrat Muâwiya's (claiming to be the rightly-guided Khalîfa as a result of his) erroneous ijtihâd, he went to a great deal of trouble to subdue him to obedience because it was Islam's commandment. There is next to no one who does not know this fact. Furthermore, there are so many âyats and hadîth-i-sherîfs commanding to have mercy and compassion for Muslims and for all the creatures on the earth, and hadrat Alî, who is a source of beautiful moral qualities, is famous for his kindness and mercy, a fact proven through many widely known events; so much so that Allâhu ta'âlâ has given the good news that He will show his

mercy and compassion to His slaves by making him deal out blessed water from the Kawther pond on the Judgement Day. Now, how could one ignore all these facts and allege that millions of Believers will remain eternally in Hell because of him, a charge which could not be justified if it were, let alone hadrat Alî, made against a sordid sinner. For mercy for people means to try to secure their hereafter and to protect them against Hell fire. Helping them in their worldly affairs, when compared with helping them with their hereafter, is nothing. According to the charges concocted by the Jews, millions, even billions of Muslims are to burn eternally in Hell because of hadrat Alî.

With all the so many âyat-i-kerîmas and hadîth-i-sherîfs warning against backbiting, calumniating, making fun of Muslims, how could it be a right way to vituperate day and night and impeach with disbelief all the As-hâb-i-kirâm and all the Sunnite Muslims ‘rahmatullâhi ta’âlâ alaihim ajma’in’, who have merely been obeying the Prophet’s commandment? Is it worthy of a Muslim to assert that all this was because hadrat Alî, badly offended with the Sahâba’s considering him ineligible for caliphate, commanded to do that abominable deed? The As-hâb-i-kirâm ‘alaihim-ur-ridwân’ and the advanced ones among this Ummat deemed it their first duty to struggle against their nafs. Accordingly, it is beyond doubt that hadrat Alî ‘kerrem-Allâhu wejheh’ would not have committed such a grave sin even if his blessed nafs had been hurt. And it is a fact brighter than the sun that there was no reason for him to commit that sin since his nafs was not hurt at all.

We invite them to being reasonable, for among the Sahâba whom they consider to be their eternal enemies are hadrat Alî’s maternal aunt and first paternal cousin and many other relatives. With the existence of âyat-i-kerîmas teaching that it is wâjib to be kind and generous towards one’s relatives and to visit them, is it something a person with îmân could do to allege that that great person (hadrat Alî) advised in his will that all those people be looked on as enemies? While it has been declared through âyat-i-kerîmas that Rasûlullah’s wives are Believers’ mothers and it is a commandment (of Islam) to obey and respect one’s parents, how could a person with the light of îmân shining in his heart admit the allegation that hadrat Alî felt hostility against these blessed wives and called them disbelievers because they paid homage to Abû Bekr?

Since a person who arouses fitna is accursed according to hadîth-i-sherîfs, can hadrat Alî ‘kerrem-Allâhu wejheh’ be said to have stirred up a fitna among the Ummat-i-Muhammad?

Hadrat 'Umar 'radiy-Allâhu anh' said, "When I meet a disaster, I am pleased for three reasons. First, the disaster has been sent by Allâhu ta'âlâ. Anything coming from the beloved one will be sweet. Second, I thank Allâhu ta'âlâ for not sending me a more serious disaster. Third, Allâhu ta'âlâ will not send human beings something which is vain or useless. In return for disasters He will give blessings in the Hereafter. I am pleased with disasters because worldly disasters are insignificant when compared with the everlasting blessings in the Hereafter." Even today there are many Sunnite Muslims who take pleasure from troubles and disasters because they have purified their hearts by following hadrat Alî's path. Who on earth would believe the sophistry that hadrat Alî did not take pleasure from a troublesome situation, suffered the so-called trouble unwillingly for years, and before dying made a will advising hostility towards millions of Muslims and the As-hâb-i-kirâm 'ridwânullâhi ta'âlâ alaihim ajma'in'?

Despite the various âyat-i-kerîmas and hadîth-i-sherîfs commanding Hubb-i-fillâh and Bughd-i-fillâh, i.e. to love Muslims because they are Muslims and to dislike disbelievers and enemies of Islam, and while all the As-hâb-i-kirâm have been blessed with good news through an âyat-i-kerîma which purports, "**Allah is pleased with them all. And they, too, are pleased with Allâhu ta'âlâ,**" and with all the innumerable hadîth-i-sherîfs praising and lauding the Muhâjirîn-i-kirâm and the Ansâr-i-izâm 'ridwânullâhi ta'âlâ alaihim ajma'in', and while ten of those people were honoured with the name (Ashara-i-mubash-shara) because they had been given the good news that they would attain Paradise and it has been stated through various hadîth-i-sherîfs that these people must not be treated with hostility, is there any likelihood that hadrat Alî 'radiy-Allâhu anh', the highest member of the Ahl-i-Bayt and the gate to the town of knowledge, might have fostered rancor against them? Would such an extremely detestable imputation incur sympathy or resentment towards that great Imâm?

It is explained in âyat-i-kerîmas and hadîth-i-sherîfs that one would be sinful for not joining the jamâ'at for Friday prayer or for (any of) the five daily prayers of namâz. Everyone knows that the prayers of namâz that are farz are performed in the Mesjîd-i-Nabawî in Medîna-i-munawwara and the Khalîfa conducts these prayers as the imâm. Now, if hadrat Alî called these three Khalîfas, (i.e. Abû Bekr, 'Umar and 'Uthmân) disbelievers, then he must have followed people he called disbelievers whenever he performed the namâz in jamâ'at behind one of these three imâms. If a person performs namâz

(in jamâ'at) behind another person though he knows for certain that the latter, (who conducts the namâz as the imâm), is a disbeliever, he himself will become a disbeliever. If hadrat Alî did not perform namâz behind these three imâms, then he must have neglected Friday prayers and prayers that were performed in jamâ'at, which, in its turn, would be a sinful attitude, too. It is impossible for hadrat Alî to have committed any of these sins.

Hadrat Alî gave hadrat 'Umar 'radiy-Allâhu anhumâ' his daughter. A person who gave his daughter to another person whom he knew to be a disbeliever would become a disbeliever. Would that have been worthy of Hadrat Alî?

Thus far we have explained clearly how some Shiite groups have been polluted with Hurûfî beliefs and lies fabricated by Jews. Now we shall give some information about how and why this pollution took place. The inventor of the Hurûfî sect is a Jew of Yemen named Abdullah bin Saba'. He did this in order to confuse, mislead and break the Ummat of Muhammad 'alaihi-salâm', and to wreak vengeance on the Ahl-i-Bayt, the source of Islamic light. To conceal his inner purpose by camouflage, he pretended to have extreme love for hadrat Alî, alleged that he had been deprived of his right of caliphate, and asserted that the three Khalîfas and the Sahâba were disbelievers. He concealed his hatred for hadrat Alî under the cloak of excessive love for him. He fabricated a number of follies that are not only irreligious but also preposterous. And some half-witted, senseless people, quite unaware of faith and knowledge and as blind to light as a bat, fell into the trap set by this Jew, believed in slanders quite incommensurable with hadrat Alî's high merits, and bluntly supported the Jew's efforts to blemish the great Imâm. [Valuable books, which were the fruits of the profound knowledge and powerful pens possessed by scholars of Ahl as-sunna, awakened Muslims in every age and the heretical ideas of Abdullah bin Saba' were about to be forgotten for good, when a Persian Jew named Fadl-ullah Hurûfî rekindled this fitna before he died in 796 (A.D. 1393)].

The wicked imputations which Hurûfîs besmeared this great imâm with are written also in the Bible and the Torah. It is for this reason that Jews and Christians acknowledge that these slanders bear hostility instead of friendliness towards hadrat Alî.

Three things are required for attaining guidance to happiness:

1- It is necessary to be a Muslim. A person who utters this statement becomes a Muslim: **LÂ ILÂHA IL-L-ALLAH MUHAMMADUN RASÛLULLAH**, (which means, "There is no

god but Allah; and Muhammad ‘alaihi-salam’ is the Messenger of Allah.”)

2- To let your acquaintances and angels know that you have become a Muslim, you say, “**Esh-hadu an lâ ilâha il-l-Allah wa esh-hadu an-na Muhammadan ‘abduhu wa rasûluh.**” (This statement means, “I believe and testify that there is no god but Allah; and I believe and testify that Muhammad ‘alaihi-salâm’ is Allah’s slave and Messenger.”)

3- To purify the heart, to attain happiness in this world and in the Hereafter, to be immune against sorrows, disasters, maladies, malevolence, incantation, sorcery and assaults of jinnees, and to attain blessings, every Muslim should say through his heart (a certain word called) istighfâr very often daily. Istighfâr means to say, “**Estaghfirullah.**”

If a person obeys the Ahkâm-i-islâmiyya, (which means the principles and commandments of Islam,) Allâhu ta’âlâ (promises that He) will certainly accept his prayers and invocations. It is unnecessary to repeat the word of istighfâr or the prayer of istighfâr throughout the night, which would cost a sleepless night. If a person does not say the istighfâr with a pure heart, or if he only articulates it mechanically without meditating on its meaning, it will be quite useless to him. Once a person has expressed the word of istighfâr three times with his mouth, he will begin to say it through his heart. Persistent oral repetition is necessary for the purification of a heart which has become black because of its owner’s habitual sinning. If a person earns his living through (ways which Islam does not sanction and therefore terms) harâm, or if he does not perform his (daily prayers that are termed) namâz, his heart becomes pitch black. To make a heart as black as that begin saying istighfâr, it is necessary to say the prayer of istighfâr three times and then to say the word of istighfâr, i.e. to say, “**Estaghfirullah,**” sixty-seven times.

Final Word of TEZKIYA-I-AHL-I-BAYT (Second Part)

We have thus confuted the spiteful and blasphemous slanders in the book **Husniyya**, torn the curtain behind which its Jewish authors are hiding themselves, and divulged their hideous purposes. The following is a brief account of the answers which an Islamic scholar, upon coming across the Arabic books (Haqâyiq-

ul-haqâyiq), (Al-fâz-i-qudsiyya) and (Ayn-ul-hayât) written by Jews, gave to the slanders they contained.

Upon reading the book **Ayn-ul-hayât**, this person saw that all its contents from beginning to end were loathsome calumniations, curses and vituperations against the three Khalîfas and hadrat Muâwiya and hadrat Âisha and scholars of Ahl as-sunna ‘rahmatullâhi ta’âlâ alaihim ajma’in’, and made a list of those lies, as follows:

The book alleges that “When our master, Fakhr-i-’âlam ‘sall-Allâhu alaihi wa sallam’ passed away, all the As-hâb-i-kirâm, with the exception of Selmân and Abû Zer and Mikdâd ‘radiy-Allâhu anhum’, became disbelievers. It is necessary to curse hadrat ‘Uthmân and to say that Kâ’b was a disbeliever.” These fabrications cover the initial pages of the book up to the end of the ninth page.

It is alleged that “The three Khalîfas and most of the As-hâb-i-kirâm were enemies of Muhammad’s ‘alaihi-salâm’ religion and were polytheists. Imâm-i-a’zam Abû Hanîfa and Sufyân-i-Sawrî and all Sunnite Muslims are disbelievers.” The book showers slanders on scholars of Ahl as-sunna and great leaders of Tasawwuf concerning matters of Wahdat-i-wujûd (Unity of existence) up to the twenty-seventh page.

It is alleged that “Hadrat ‘Uthmân and the Sahâba in his time ‘radiy-Allâhu ta’âlâ anhum ajma’in’ were disbelievers.” The book casts vituperative aspersions on them and asserts that “Most Iraqi people have deviated from the right course. Allâhu ta’âlâ sends His slaves’ sustenance through the twelve Imâms. It is necessary to curse, to swear at the three Khalîfas. They were disbelievers, sinners, Jews. Sunnite Muslims became disbelievers on account of their love for these three Khalîfas. In the Camel event (war) hadrat Alî acted as our Prophet’s deputy and divorced hadrat Âisha. The existing tafsîrs (explanations of Qur’ân al-kerîm) are defiled. Abû Bekr, ‘Umar, Talhâ and Zubeyr ‘ridwânullâhi alaihim’ were disbelievers. Hadrat ‘Uthmân, Âisha, Talhâ, Zubeyr and Muâwiya were impious, wicked and cruel people.”

It is alleged: “As our master the Prophet learned from Jebrâîl, Mikâîl and Isrâîl and these angels learned from the Lawh and Kalem, being a Walî is indigenous only to Hadrat Alî and the twelve Imâms. Hadrat Alî is the fortress of Allâhu ta’âlâ. On the Judgement Day Hadrat Alî will decide who are to go to Paradise and who are for Hell. The events and fights between Hadrat Alî and the devil were revealed in ninety pages to Hadrat Fâtima. It was written in each page that the three Khalîfas and the As-hâb-i-kirâm were cruel,

miscreant and sinful people. Hadrat Imâm-i-Ja'fer Sâdiq is higher than Mûsâ (Moses) and Hidir (Hızır) 'alaihim-as-salâm'. The Rûh, which is mentioned in the eighty-fifth âyat of Isrâ sûra, is an angel appointed as a servant to the twelve Imâmns. Imâm-i-Alî 'radiy-Allâhu anh' would enliven dead people." The book contains long vituperative statements alleged to be the insults directed towards Hadrat Alî as he was forced to accept Hadrat Abû Bekr's caliphate, and goes on with its allegations: "High-ranking angels are servants under the command of the twelve Imâmns. Laws of Physics, chemistry and biology and the motions of atoms and celestial beings are controlled by the twelve Imâmns. Prophets will be questioned on the Judgement day and Noah (Nûh) 'alaihis-salâm' will trust himself to hadrat Alî and will be saved owing to two witnesses sent forth by Hadrat Alî. Sunnite Muslims defiled Muhammad's 'alaihis-salâm' religion, called halâl 'haram' and vice versa, deviated into heresies and sins, and became disbelievers. The Sunnî way was invented by Hadrat 'Umar. He spread it with the help of heretics and the devil. This led to hectic discussions between Imâm-i-Ja'fer Sâdiq and Sufyân-i-Sawrî, whereupon it became clear that Sufyân-i-Sawrî followed a course leading to disbelief and heresy.

"Scholars of Ahl as-sunna 'rahmatullâhi ta'âlâ alaihim ajma'în' were unable to see between âyats that are muhkem, muteshâbih, nâsikh and mensûkh. They disobeyed commandments and did not avoid harâms. Thus they remained in ignorance and aberration. Sufyân-i-Sawrî and Iyâd-i-Basrî tried to demolish Islam. Ibrâhîm bin Hishâm was a zindiq. Sunnite Muslims sing and dance in the name of worship. Ma'rûf-i-Kerhî was a liar. The Sunnites will go to Hell. A Sodomite who confesses his sin to Hadrat Alî will be pardoned. The namâz of Tarâwih performed by the Ahl as-sunna is ostentatious and heretical. It is like disbelievers' worships. A person who wishes to be a president will become accursed. On the Judgement Day Allâhu ta'âlâ will apologize to Shiites like a person apologizing to his brother. Sunnite Muslims will remain in Hell eternally with disbelievers. They are renegades, disbelievers. Their excuses and requests will be rejected and they will never be taken out of Hell. The names Pharaoh, Hâmân and Qârûn, who it is stated will enter through the gates of Hell, represent Abû Bekr, 'Umar, 'Uthmân, and the sons of Umayya." The book makes lengthy descriptions on the vehemence of Hell fire, on how the torments in Hell will be executed, and on the bitter torments that will be inflicted on Cain the murderer of Abel, on Nimrod and Pharaoh, on the Jew who misled Jewry and the Jew named Paul who misled Christians, on Abû Bekr and 'Umar, who did not have îmân in Allâhu ta'âlâ, and compares the torment

that will be inflicted on Pharaoh to that which Muâwiya will suffer. Then, it carries on its fabrications: “Hadrat Fakhr-i-’âlam would kiss and smell his daughter Fâtima every day. His (blessed) wife Hadrat Âisha would see this and become jealous. The expression, ‘Lâ ilâha ill-Allah, Alî Rasûlullah,’ is written everywhere in Paradise. It is permissible to perform namâz without ablution, yet in this case one should not expect thawâb (reward in the Hereafter). Because the unbelievers of Qoureish said angels were Allah’s daughters, an âyat was revealed. It was stated in an âyat that Shiites, the only true group, would increase in number in the course of time and the other groups would gradually fade out. Because most âyats of Ahzâb sûra divulged the evil and atrocious deeds of Qoureishi men and women, some of them were excised from the Qur’ân and others were changed. Abû Bekr, ’Umar and ’Uthmân continuously committed indecencies, forbidden acts, heresy and sins.” The book tells long imaginary stories about how Hadrat Âisha was taken prisoner by Hadrat Alî in the Camel War and how she and seventy other captives were sent to Medina, and curses Hadrat Âisha. Then it casts various aspersions, slanders, curses on Hadrat Muâwiya, and goes on: “Allah sold Paradise and Hell and also a jâriya to Hadrat Alî for four hundred dirhams of silver. During the war between Hadrat Muâwiya and Hadrat Alî ‘radiy-Allâhu anhumâ’, Hadrat Alî made a long speech, in which he explained that Hadrat Muâwiya was accursed. Sunnite Muslims wear woolen clothes in order to make a show of piety. They have been accursed for this reason. It has been informed through the Wahy that Sunnite Muslims are disbelievers and zindiqs. Muhammad Ghazâlî and Ahmad Ghazâlî and Celâl-ed-dîn Rûmî and Muhyiddîn-i-Arabî were accursed disbelievers.” The book showers curses and swearings on the three Khalîfas, asserts that Hasan Basrî, Mansûr-i-Dawânikî, Me’mûn and Hârûn-ur-reshîd were accursed, and adds, “Hallâj-i-Mensûr and Abû Ja’fer Shalghamânî and scholars of Ahl as-sunna ‘rahmatullâhi ta’âlâ alaihim ajma’in’ are all disbelievers and zindiqs.”

When the Jewish lies so far disclosed are read, it will be realized that the book **Ayn-ul-hayât** is a compilation of ridiculous statements and blasphemous stories of obscure origin. These things cannot have been written by a religious man. Especially, the allegations that Allâhu ta’âlâ sold Paradise to Hadrat Alî, that he will send anyone he likes to Paradise and those he hates to Hell, that worldly affairs are controlled by the twelve Imâms, mean to deny (Allah’s) Attribute of Will, which in turn indicates the gravest kind of polytheism. Hadrat Abû Bekr’s refusing to give the date orchard called Fedek to Hadrat Fâtima is told with such

exaggeration that the irrational, preposterous Persian tales would fall far behind it. This date orchard called Fedek was in the vicinity of Hayber. Rasûlullah would meet the needs of his household with the income from this orchard, and anything more than their subsistence would be dealt out as alms. Rasûlullah ‘sall-Allâhu alaihi wa sallam’ dedicated this orchard to a pious foundation supporting the poor and travellers towards his death. Hadrat Abû Bekr would keep the accounts of the income from the orchard himself during his caliphate. When Hadrat ‘Umar ‘radiy-Allâhu anh’ became Khalîfa, he yielded its management to Hadrat Alî upon the latter’s demand. These events are told (in the book) in a gross exaggeration and exploited in a manner as to vituperate Hadrat Abû Bekr and Hadrat ‘Umar ‘radiy-Allâhu ta’âlâ anhumâ’, and these exalted people are blemished with such aspersions as could never be forgiven even through tawba.

In addition to the three books mentioned above, there are some ten other booklets, all of which teem with various blasphemous absurdities. These booklets are disseminated in Iraq and Iran. They are trying to mislead the Anatolian Muslims, too. Naming themselves **Alawîs** (Alevî), they are endeavouring to deceive the Alevî Muslims in our country. Their purpose is to bring up a generation inimical towards scholars of Ahl as-Sunna ‘rahmatullâhu alaihim ajma’in’, and thus to demolish Islam from within.

[To prevent this planned catastrophe, we have translated various parts of the book **Tuhfa-i-ismâ ashariyya** from Persian into Turkish and published a book titled **(To Die in Îmân)**. The book **Tuhfa** was translated into Arabic and an abridged version of the book was printed in Egypt and was titled **Muhtasar-i-Tuhfa**. It was reproduced by offset process in Istanbul. An Iranian scholar has stated that the so-called books (the heretical books mentioned above) were written by the Jews in India, that these people are trying to mislead ignorant Iranians, that Irânian scholars are in the Imâmiyya group, and that the people who wrote the so-called books are enemies of Islam.]

Shiites of the Imâmiyya group living in Iran, mostly in Najaf and Kerbelâ, should cooperate with the Ahl as-Sunna to prevent these scurvy, groundless, untenable forgeries fabricated by the inexorable heretics. Negligence in this Islamic requirement will only serve these eccentric heretics to increase in number, which in turn will cost the Imâmiyya group quantitative and qualitative shrinkage. The restrictions which had been imposed on these wicked heretics after Yavuz Sultân Selîm Khân’s victory at

Caldiran in 920 [A.D. 1514] were maintained until recently, when fifteen years ago, [i.e. in 1280 (A.D. 1864)], they were abrogated and the harmful, vicious, base slanders of Jews reappeared all of a sudden. All this is the result of Muslims' slackness and negligence. This is the end of the book TEZKIYA-I-AHL-I-BAYT.

[If scholars of Ahl as-Sunna do not answer and refute freemasons, communists, Christians, missionaries, the unbridled Hurûffis in Iran and Iraq and Wahhabis, if they do not divulge their inner malevolent purposes and harms and inform the younger generations about them, if parents do not teach their children or at least have them read books written by scholars of Ahl as-Sunna, the future generations will be lost altogether. They will fall victims to the horrific talons of unbelief. Muslims will be driven into disasters and calamities similar to those experienced by the inhabitants of places such as Semmerkand, Bukhâra and Crimea. Allâhu ta'âlâ declares in the thirty-third âyat of Nahl sûra, "**Allâhu ta'âlâ does not torment them. Yet they torment themselves.**"]

Hadrat Imâm Rabbânî states as follows in the two hundred and seventy-fifth (275) letter of the first volume of his book **Mektûbât**:

You have attained the present blessing as a result of your teaching Islamic knowledge and spreading the principles of fiqh. Nescience had been settled, and bid'ats rife, in those places, when Allâhu ta'âlâ blessed you with the love of His beloved ones. He made you a means for promulgating Islam. Then, do your best to teach religious knowledge and to spread the principles of fiqh. These two are the fountainhead of all sorts of happiness, the means of promotion and the cause of salvation. Strive very hard! Show yourself as a religious man! Perform amr-i-ma'rûf and nahy-i-munkar and guide the people who live there to the right way! The nineteenth âyat of Muzzammil sûra purports: "**Verily this is an admonition: Therefore, whoso will, let him take a (straight) path to his Rabb (Allah)!**" (73-19)

***The slave will never suffer from his Hudâ;
Whatever everyone suffers is his own deserts!***

***Every blessing you offer is faithless, o world;
All ranks you give perish with the cold wind of death!***

***Nothing in life is so desirable as sovereignty.
No sovereign, yet, equals a breath that's healthy!***

PART FOUR

LET US BE IN UNITY and LOVE ONE ANOTHER

For thirteen hundred years enemies of Islam failed to stand against Islam. All their attacks rebounded upon themselves. The Islamic religion spread far and wide. At last they realized that Muslims' chests, full with îmân, were too firm for them to thrust a dagger into. They began to think of how to hit Muslims from the spiritual front, i.e. to corrupt their faith and morality, and concocted plans to destroy Islam from the inside.

As Islam rapidly spread over Asia and Africa in the times of hadrat 'Umar and hadrat 'Uthmân, a sly Jew of Yemen, named Abdullah bin Saba', pretended to be a Muslim and beguiled an Egyptian group into martyring hadrat 'Uthmân. Thus a very serious catastrophic fitna arose and millions of Muslims shed one another's blood. The factious sect which was thus founded in the name of Saba' came to be called the Hurûfî sect in the eighth century (of the Hegira). Ringleaders of this sect wrote books spoiling the Islamic beliefs and deranging the moral qualities prescribed by Islam.

Later on, another miscreant group, whose major aim was to destroy Islam's Madh-habs, appeared sometime during the twelfth century of the Hegira and spread in Arabia.^[1] The British, who had fought against Muslims in World War I, founded a new state in Hidjâz after the war. They took the two holy Islamic cities, Mekka and Medina, away from the Ottomans and gave these cities to this new state. Thus another fitna corroding Islam from within began to spread. Only those Muslims who hold fast to the books written by scholars of Ahl as-Sunna have managed to survive this disastrous flood of fitna.

It has been seen recently that some heretical books have been published and serving the purpose of causing discordance in our country. We therefore have considered it would be appropriate to reveal the lies and slanders fabricated in these books, which have been prepared for the purpose of effacing young people's beliefs and are offered to them like wolves in lambs' hides or like poisoned honey. Trusting ourselves to the divine kindness and help of Allâhu ta'âlâ, we have taken very injurious samples from

[1] Please see the book **Confessions of a British Spy**.

these books and confuted them with documentary evidences, thus preparing a book, and named this book **Let Us Be In Unity**. May infinite hamd-u-thenâ be to our Rabb for granting us the lot of printing the book! We hope that our young brothers will read this book now, see clearly between right and wrong, and adhere to the true way guided by scholars of Ahl as-Sunna. We supplicate to Allâhu ta'âlâ to bless them with the lot of attaining this greatest fortune.

LET US BE IN UNITY

1- Enemies of Islam have been writing various books in order to mislead Muslim children. A group of them deny the Madh-habs. They say that our religion does not contain any heavenly commandment justifying people's splitting into various different Madh-habs. They would not say so if they knew the meaning of Madh-hab. Nothing could bring one a disgrace as deep as one's ignorance. Their ignorance blindfolds them so badly that they criticise Islam and Qur'ân al-kerîm. These writings of theirs have been given detailed answers in the chapter **Müslimâna Nasîhat** (Advice for the Muslim) of the book **Kiyâmet ve Âhuret** (The Hereafter).

2- There were no controversies among Muslims in the time of Rasûlullah 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wa sallam'. The last âyat of Fat-h sûra purports that the As-hâb-i-kirâm loved one another continuously and very much. Allâhu ta'âlâ informs that this love among them continued to exist after Rasûlullah's passing away, too. As Rasûlullah passed away, it was hadrat Âisha who waited in tears at his bedside. When Rasûlullah died, none of the As-hâb-i-kirâm struggled for position. They did not even think of seizing power. Enemies of Islam compare the four caliphate elections to disbeliever kings', dictators' and revolutionists' seizing power. The case with the four Khalîfas, however, is quite the other way round, for, let alone criticizing them, each of their deeds must be taken as a documentary example by Muslims. Rasûlullah stated, "**Hold fast to the way guided by my four Khalîfas!**" There were cruel, sinful ones among the Umayyad and Abbasid Khalîfas. Yet none of them was a disbeliever. None of them was an enemy of Islam. All of them were Islamically rightful Khalîfas. They were elected not in accordance with the laws of presidential elections for, say, France, but in a manner prescribed by Allâhu ta'âlâ. A person who denies Allah's prescription will certainly dislike the procedures followed in their election. Hadrat Mu'âwiya 'radiy-Allâhu ta'âlâ

anh' gave so much freedom that an equal level of tenderness and patience can never be seen on the dictators governing today's so-called democratic socialist countries. A poet who was indignant about a personal interest did not hesitate to remonstrate with the Khalîfa:

“O Mu'âwiya! We are human beings like you. Do not divert from justice!” Even governors and commanders appointed by Prophets 'alaihi-us-salâm' had shed Muslims' blood unjustly. Hadrat Mu'âwiya 'radiy-Allâhu anh' cannot be blamed for some wrong behaviour exhibited by a governor appointed by him!

3- Qur'ân al-kerîm is **Wahy-i-metlû**. That is, the angel named Jebrâil 'alaihi-salâm' said the words and letters, which we know, and the Messenger of Allah 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wa sallam' memorized them as he heard them and then recited them to his As-hâb. This fact is informed by numerous âyat-i-kerîmas. Books written by separatists who distort the meanings of âyat-i-kerîmas should not be believed.

4- Some people allege that “Originally there are 6666 âyats in Qur'ân al-kerîm. Today's existing copies contain 6234 âyats. 432 âyats were annihilated by 'Uthmân, who would not let those âyats informing about the virtues of Hâshimîs be recorded in the Qur'ân. He changed the Qur'ân from the Hâshimî dialect to the Qoureishî dialect.”

They put forward their own books as documents to prove their allegation. On the other hand, that the Qur'ân al-kerîm contains six thousand and two hundred and thirty-six âyats is informed by hadrat Alî, a fact written in the hundred and forty-eighth chapter of the book **Bostân-ul-ârifîn**, by the great scholar hadrat Abû-l-leys-i-Semmerkandî.

In some copies, several short âyats are written in the form of a long âyat. So the number of âyats seem to vary. This numerical variation does not by any means indicate any interpolation in the âyats.

As is written in the book **Tuhfa-i-isnâ ash'ariyya**, the best response to this calumination directed towards the three Khalîfas is given by Allâhu ta'âlâ: the ninth âyat of Hijr sûra purports, “**We revealed this Qur'ân to thee. And We shall protect it.**” Can any man defile something protected by Allâhu ta'âlâ? The above-mentioned allegation of theirs show that they consider hadrat 'Uthmân to be more powerful than Allâhu ta'âlâ. On the other hand, these people take every opportunity to vilify the three

Khalîfas. And yet in this occasion they promote hadrat 'Uthmân to partnership with Allâhu ta'âlâ.

Kuleynî, a religious authority in Iran, says that Hishâm bin Sâlim and Muhammad bin Hilâlî stated that the Qur'ân had been changed. And scholars of Ahl as-Sunna write that Allâhu ta'âlâ purports, **“No one can change Qur'ân al-kerîm.”** The forty-second âyat-i-kerîma of Fussilat sûra purports, **“No change can reach that Qur'ân from any direction. For It has been revealed by One whose every deed is hakîm and mahmûd.”** Who could change something protected by Allâhu ta'âlâ? It was wâjib for our Prophet to communicate Qur'ân al-kerîm exactly as it was revealed. In the time of Rasûlullah 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wa sallam', when a person became a Muslim, he would first learn Qur'ân al-kerîm. And everyone who learned Qur'ân al-kerîm would teach it to others. There were thousands of Muslims who had memorized Qur'ân al-kerîm in the presence of the Messenger of Allah. It is written in history books that more than seventy hâfidh al-Qur'ân (people who had memorized the Qur'ân) were martyred in some Holy Wars. Until today hundreds of thousands of hâfidh have been educated in Muslim countries. Their reciting the Qur'ân was a great worship. Every Muslim recites Qur'ân al-kerîm both as he performs namâz and elsewhere. Every Muslim child, as soon as it reaches school age, is first taught passages from Qur'ân al-kerîm. Qur'ân al-kerîm is unlike the book written by Kuleynî or Abû Ja'fer Tûsî's book Tez-hîb, which are kept locked in chests and read secretly by one or two people! In fact, it is written in all Shiite books that all the Ahl-i-Bayt-i-Nabawî and the twelve Imâm's read this very Qur'ân al-kerîm. They put forward this Qur'ân al-kerîm as a document to friends and enemies alike. They explained its very âyats. The book of Tafsîr which they have been keeping as the Tafsîr of Imâm-i-Hasan Askerî is the tafsîr (explanation) of this Qur'ân. The twelve Imâm's would teach their children, their women and their disciples this very Qur'ân al-kerîm. It is for this reason that Shaikh Ibnî Bâbawayh, a Shiite scholar, says in his book **I'tiqâdât** that it would be wrong to attack hadrat 'Uthmân 'radiy-Allâhu ta'âlâ anh' in this matter.

5- A zindiq^[1] (a kind of heretic) studied Qur'ân al-kerîm for years. He saw the word (**Salât**) at more than sixty-five places. So he said that 'Salât' meant 'Prayer' and therefore one could make salât continually day and night. He confused the word Salât, which

[1] Terms of this sort are explained in various places of the book.

actually means Namâz, with the word Prayer. It is stated as follows in the thirty-eighth page of the Turkish book **Dürr-i yektâ şerhi**: “Recently some zindiqs have been misleading young people by disguising themselves as Shaikhs of dervish convents. They put forward some heretical beliefs in the name of Islam. They assert that ‘the word (**Salât**) which is written in âyat-i-kerîmas and hadîth-i-sherîfs does not mean actions of bowing, prostrating and getting up as practised by people today. It means Dhikr and Murâqaba. That is, it means mentioning the name of Allah, sitting, closing one’s eyes, and meditating on the existence and the greatness of Allah.’ The fact, however, is not so simple as that; Dhikr, which means to remember Allâhu ta’âlâ through the heart, is a very difficult job. Performing namâz facilitates making Dhikr. Murâqaba means to meditate over the fact that Allâhu ta’âlâ sees and knows you every moment. And this, in its turn, can be managed by performing namâz. The zindiq (mentioned above) puts forward the spiritual maturities that will be attained through the namâz and then denies the namâz. He who denies the namâz will be a disbeliever. He who believes in it but neglects it out of laziness will be a sinner. He is to be imprisoned until he begins to perform namâz again. Every Muslim should, before anything else, learn the procedures that are farz, wâjib and mufsid in namâz. If there are daily prayers of namâz he has omitted, he must perform them as soon as possible. It is equally sinful to delay such omitted prayers, which are called qadhâ (qazâ). When a child reaches the age of seven, it is necessary to teach him how to perform namâz by having him perform it in your presence. And when he is ten you should sort of force him – if he is unwilling to perform namâz – to perform it. This you can do, if necessary, by hitting him gently with your hand.” Other types of prayers can be done any time. But there are certain times prescribed for each of the daily prayers of namâz. This fact is detailed in the **Bukhârî** hadîth, which is an account of the night of Mi’râj. There are many hadîth-i-sherîfs commanding the five daily prayers of namâz. Our beloved Prophet would perform the five daily prayers of namâz even at the hardest times of trouble, during combats, for instance, and would command all those around him to follow his example. He was extremely ill before his death when he walked with utmost difficulty to the mosque, appointed hadrat Abû Bekr ‘radiy-Allâhu ta’âlâ anh’ imâm for his place, and performed namâz behind hadrat Abû Bekr.

That the meaning of the word Salât is Namâz is explained

clearly at the end of the Jum'a (Friday) sūra and in the âyat which purports, **“Do not approach Salât when you are drunk!”** Muslims, learning the times of the five daily prayers of namâz and how to perform them from their Prophet, have always performed namâz like the Messenger of Allah did all over the world for fourteen hundred (1400) years.

Qur'ân al-kerîm and hadîth-i-sherîfs state that prayers can be done openly as well as secretly. Yet it is a commandment that the five daily prayers of namâz be performed in jamâ'at in mosques. Enemies of Islam, by quoting the âyat-i-kerîmas stating that prayers are to be done secretly, are trying to extirpate the tradition of performing namâz in jamâ'at in mosques. While saying on the one hand that they obey only Qur'ân al-kerîm, they are, on the other hand, putting forward Biblical and Pentateuchal documents to prove that the namâz is superfluous. Pointing to the fabricated statements in the false copies of the Bible existing all over the world today, they are attempting to make away with the five daily prayers of namâz. Prayers of namâz that are farz must be performed in mosques even if there is the danger of pretention and ostentation. Mosques are made for performing namâz in them. Muslims do not believe books written by aberrant parvenus and enemies of religion. They perform their worships correctly as they learned from their fathers and grandfathers, who were true Muslims. Disbelievers and heretics follow the wrong courses they learned from their fathers. Allâhu ta'âlâ castigates such disbelievers in Qur'ân al-kerîm, and commands Muslims to learn what they do not know by asking those who know.

6- All the people without a certain Madh-hab attack the four Sunnite Madh-habs as if they had made an agreement among themselves to do so. They never seem to understand what **(Madh-hab)** means.

There cannot be differences of Madhhab in the religious principles to be believed. The belief held by Muslims throughout the world has to agree with the belief held by Rasûlullah and the As-hâb-i-kirâm. Anyone who believed otherwise would be either a heretic or a disbeliever. Some of the teachings which true Believers need in carrying on their worships and worldly affairs are not clearly stated in Qur'ân al-kerîm or in hadîth-i-sherîfs. Such covert teachings, (which have been trusted to the comprehension and explanation of Islamic scholars), must be taken for granted as Islamic scholars understand them. Thus a person who adapts himself to the understanding of a profound

scholar will be in his Madh-hab. In matters not clearly explained in Qur'ân al-kerîm or by hadîth-i-sherîfs, it is certainly more appropriate for Muslims to adapt themselves to a profound Islamic scholar who obeys Qur'ân al-kerîm in whatever he says and does rather than following the fabrications of heretics and enemies of religion.

People who adapt themselves to a Madh-hab will do their worships correctly. People without a certain Madh-hab, on the other hand, will be wrong both in belief and in deeds. They will swerve into various ways. They will arouse faction in society. They will instigate people against one another. Instead of adapting themselves to Muhammad's 'alaihîs-salâm' Islam, they will either follow their personal inadequate views or part into the corrupt and harmful ways invented by heretics, by enemies of religion.

Muslims love one another. They dislike separatists. Qur'ân al-kerîm and hadîth-i-sherîfs state that it is a great worship to dislike such people. People who are hostile to religion, to chastity, to life and to people will certainly be hated. Namâz of janâza will not be performed for a disbeliever (when he is dead).

Muslims do not accuse a person who is negligent in namâz and fasting with disbelief. However, a person who denies the fact that it is farz (a plain religious commandment) to perform namâz five times daily, becomes a disbeliever. Our master, Rasûlullah, curses such disbelievers regardless of whether they are dead or alive. A Muslim will be proud about adapting himself to his Prophet 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wa sallam'. Disbelievers, however, are proud about attacking Islamic scholars.

What we would like to tell those people attacking Islamic scholars is this: Islamic scholars observed the approval of Allâhu ta'âlâ in all their actions. Whatever they did, they did it for Allah's sake. They performed their duty of **Emr-i-ma'rûf** and **Nehy-i-anil-munker** towards rulers. In other words, they gave them advice for Allah's sake. They did not fear anyone in guiding to the right way. Hadrat Imâm A'zam Abû Hanîfa, the greatest Islamic scholar, sacrificed his life in this way, a fact that no one could deny to know. Likewise, all Islamic scholars had no hesitation whatsoever to state facts. Millions of books which they wrote with dedication and ikhlâs have spread knowledge and beautiful moral principles throughout the world and thus their blessed names have become known far and near. They have reflected the light of Qur'ân al-kerîm on all nations. On the other hand, people without a certain Madh-hab, somehow mixing with Muslim religious men, have

swerved from the way guided by Qur'ân al-kerîm and striven to hush up the truth. For these people are quite unaware of spiritual responsibility. Scholars of Ahl as-Sunna 'rahmatullâhi ta'âlâ alaihim ajma'in' have not left any religious fact covered or veiled. Yet those who are in the aberrant way have been planning to make sure that younger generations be quite ignorant in this respect. To this end, they have been endeavouring to eradicate the facts taught by scholars of Ahl as-Sunna.

7- To perform namâz five times daily is a commandment declared in Qur'ân al-kerîm and in hadîth-i-sherîfs. The seventy-second (72nd) âyat-i-kerîma of Ahzâb sûra purports, **“Verily, We offered the deposit (the responsibility) to heavens, to earth, to mountains. They refrained from assuming it. They shuddered with fear of it. Men shouldered it and thus did cruelty to their selves. They did not know the result.”** It is stated in the book of Tafsîr called Beydâvî that [This âyat-i-kerîma denotes the greatness of the felicity promised in the âyat-i-kerîma previous to itself. The previous âyat purports, **“Those who obey the commandments and prohibitions of Allâhu ta'âlâ will attain happiness in the world and in the Hereafter.”** The commandments and prohibitions mentioned in this âyat-i-kerîma are compared to a deposit. Since a deposit is to be returned to its owner, this comparison expresses the importance of doing the worships. Some scholars have stated that the word 'deposit' means 'wisdom and Islam' in this context. For a person who has wisdom will obey Islam]. This âyat-i-kerîma, whether the word 'deposit' used in it be interpreted as 'wisdom' or be it said to mean 'soul', points out the importance of doing the worships, e.g. performing the five daily prayers of namâz. The fifty-eighth (58th) âyat of Nisâ sûra purports, **“O Believers! Obey Allâhu ta'âlâ and His Messenger!”** The Messenger of Allah understood the word 'deposit' used in the âyat-i-kerîma as 'worship' and therefore commanded Muslims to perform namâz five times daily. Those who wish to obey the Messenger of Allah should perform namâz five times daily. Whatever those who do not want to perform namâz may say, Muslims should attach paramount importance to the namâz.

It is stated in the book of Tafsîr named Beydâvî, one of the most valuable books of Tafsîr, “Hadrat Abdullah ibni Abbâs 'radiy-Allâhu ta'âlâ anhumâ' was asked: In what part of Qur'ân al-kerîm is the âyat-i-kerîma commanding the five daily prayers of namâz? He answered: Read the seventeenth and eighteenth âyats of Rûm sûra. These two âyat-i-kerîmas purport, **“Make tesbîh of**

Allâhu ta'âlâ at evening and morning times. The hamds performed by heavenly and earthly beings and done in the afternoons and at noon times are for Allâhu ta'âlâ." The 'tesbîh' to be done 'at evening time' represents the prayers of namâz to be performed in the evening and at night. The tesbîh to be done in the morning stands for the namâz to be performed in the morning. The 'hamds done in the afternoons and at noon times' symbolize early and late afternoon prayers of namâz. The âyat-i-kerîmas command to perform namâz five times daily." Those who deny the five daily prayers of namâz become startled when they hear this âyat-i-kerîma. They say that this âyat-i-kerîma does not contain the word 'Salât'. When they are quoted the âyat-i-kerîma commanding to 'make salât' and told that there are more than sixty-five such âyats, they make a U-turn and say that "Salât means prayer. We obey these âyats and pray in seclusion. Namâz is not an Islamic commandment."

The two hundred and thirty-ninth (239th) âyat of Baqâra sûra purports, **"Protect the salâts and the salât of wustâ!** [That is, perform namâz continuously]. **Obey Allah and make salât!"** 'Protect the salât' means 'Perform the five daily prayers of namâz at their proper times and observing their conditions.' It is stated in a hadîth-i-sherîf, which is written in the book **Musnad** by Imâm-i-Ahmad and in Imâm-i-Munâwî's book **Kunûz-ud-deqâiq**: **"The salât of wustâ is the late afternoon namâz."** Hadrat Alî 'kerrem-Allâhu wejheh' narrated: Our Prophet stated in the combat of Hendek (Trench), **"The enemy did not let us perform the wustâ [late afternoon namâz]. May Allâhu ta'âlâ fill their abdomens and graves with fire!"** Salât means both prayer and namâz. Hence the word 'salât' used in this âyat-i-kerîma means the 'namâz' which we know. The âyat-i-kerîma says to perform the prayers of namâz and the late afternoon prayer. According to the Arabic grammar, the word 'salâts' means 'three salâts in the least'. Since the late afternoon salât is called (Wustâ), which means 'the namâz in the center', the number of salâts meant here cannot be only three. There have to be at least four salâts in addition to the late afternoon so that the late afternoon salât be exactly in the center, that is, between the second and the fourth salâts. Kemâleddîn-i-Shirwânî 'rahmatullâhi ta'âlâ aleyh' quotes the fifty-ninth âyat-i-kerîma of Nûr sûra in his book **Miftâh-us-sa'âda** to prove that the number of salâts to be performed daily is five. The names of morning and night prayers of namâz are written clearly, i.e. as **'Salât-i-fejr'** and **'Salât-i-ishâ'**, in the fifty-ninth âyat of Nûr sûra.

The hundred and second (102nd) âyat of Nisâ sûra purports, **“To perform namâz at certain times has become farz for Muslims.”** It is stated in a hadîth-i-sherîf, which exists in the books **Riyâd-un-nasihîn** and **Hulâsat-ud-delâil**: **“I was by the entrance to Ka’ba, when Jebrâil ‘alaihi-salâm’ came near me twice. He performed early afternoon prayer with me as the sun left its position at the zenith.”** In another hadîth-i-sherîf, which is written in Abulleys-i-Semer Kandî’s book **Muqaddimat-us-salât** existing with number [701] at the section called (**Es’ad efendi**) in the library of Süleymâniya and also recorded in the book **Fath-h-ul-qadîr** at the section named **Ayasofia** (Saint Sophia), our Prophet ‘sall-Allâhu alaihi wa sallam’ states: **“Jebrâil ‘alaihi-salam’ made me perform namâz for two days by the entrance to Ka’ba. The first day, we performed morning prayer as the fejr-i-thânî [whiteness] appeared, early afternoon prayer as the sun left it’s zenith, late afternoon prayer as shadows were as long as the real objects they represent, evening prayer as the sun set, and night prayer as dusk disappeared. The second day we performed morning prayer at daybreak, early afternoon prayer when everything had a shadow as long as itself, late afternoon prayer when the shadow of everything was twice as long as itself, evening prayer at the time of breaking fast, and night prayer when one-third of the night time had elapsed. Then he said: O Muhammad! These are the times of namâz for thee and for past Prophets and for thine Ummat.”** As Suleymân bin Berîda narrates from his father in the book **Muslim**, somebody asked Rasûlullah about the times of namâz. The Messenger of Allah said, **“Perform namâz with me for two days!”** As the sun left the zenith, he ordered Bilâl Habashî to call the adhân. We performed early afternoon prayer. It is stated in a hadîth-i-sherîf, **“Late afternoon prayer is performed before sunset.”**

It is stated in a hadîth-i-sherîf, which is reported by Jâbir bin Abdullah in the books **Bukhârî** and **Muslim**: **“As there would be no dirt left on your body if you washed yourself in a stream flowing by your house, so Allâhu ta’âlâ will forgive the faults of those who perform namâz five times daily.”** It is stated in a hadîth-i-sherîf, **“Namâz is the pillar of the religion. He who performs namâz will have fortified his religion. And he who does not perform namâz will have ruined his religion.”**

A hadîth-i-sherîf, which exists in the books **Bukhârî** and **Muslim** and belongs to the category called Mesh-hûr, states, **“Islam has five fundamentals. The first one is to utter the word**

Shahâdat. The second one is to perform namâz.” It is stated in another hadîth-i-sherîf, reported by Abû Dâwûd and written in the book Halabî: **“Allâhu ta’âlâ has commanded to perform namâz five times daily. Allâhu ta’âlâ will forgive those who make a proper ablution, perform these prayers of namâz at their proper times, and observe the rukû’ (bowing) and sajda (prostration) in them.”**

Another hadîth-i-sherîf reads as follows: **“Allâhu ta’âlâ has made it farz for His born slaves to perform namâz five times daily. If a person makes a beautiful ablution and performs namâz correctly, on the rising day his face will shine like the full moon and he will pass the bridge of Sirât as fast as lightning.”** The author of the book **Riyâd-un-nâsihîn** ‘rahmatullâhi aleyh’ relates, “I have studied books of Hadîth. I have seen that it is stated in various hadîth-i-sherîfs reported by more than twenty Sahâbîs: **‘A person who omits a prayer of namâz without any religiously sanctioned excuse will become a disbeliever.’**”

It is stated in a hadîth-i-sherîf, which is reported by hadrat Alî ‘radiy-Allâhu anh’ and exists in the books **Târîh-i-Bukhârî** and **Kitâb-ul-îmân**: **“He who gives up the namâz will become a disbeliever.”** That is, a person who is not sorry for neglecting the namâz and does not feel shame towards Allâhu ta’âlâ for this reason, will take his last breath without îmân.

There is detailed information in this respect in the (Turkish) book **Se’âdet-i ebediyye**.

A hadîth-i-sherîf, which the book **Bukhârî** reports from Abû Sa’îd-i-Hudrî, states, **“The thawâb that will be given for the namâz performed in jamâ’at is twenty-five times as much as that which is given for the namâz which one performs by oneself.”** However, according to a hadîth-i-sherîf reported by Abdullah ibni ‘Umar, it is **“twenty-seven times as much.”**

A hadîth-i-sherîf, which is reported by Dâr-i-Qutnî ‘rahmatullâhi aleyh’ and is written in **Kunûz**, states, **“A person who lives near a mosque should perform his namâz in the mosque.”**

It is stated in a hadîth narrated in the books **Firdaws-ul-ahbâr** and **Riyâd-un-nâsihîn**: **“Not to go to the mosque though one hears the adhân would be a sign of being a munâfiq.”**

It is stated in a hadîth-i-sherîf reported in Imâm-i-Ahmad’s ‘rahmatullâhi aleyh’ book **Musnad** and in **Kunûz**: **“If a person forgets something during his salât, he should make two additional sajdas!”**

The forty-third âyat of Baqara sûra purports, **“Perform the prayers of namâz and pay zakât and make rukû’ with those who make rukû’.”** It is explained in Beydâvî and in all books of Tafsîr that this âyat-i-kerîma commands to perform namâz in jamâ’at. The purpose in representing the namâz with the word rukû’ in this âyat-i-kerîma is to distinguish it from the Judaic namâz and to emphasize that it is the Islamic namâz. For the namâz performed by Jewry does not contain rukû’. It is stated in the book **Hulâsat-ul-fetâwâ**, “Accepting the muadh-dhin’s call (of adhân) is to be done by foot, not only orally. If a person who hears the adhân repeats it only and does not go to the mosque, he will not have accepted the muadh-dhin’s call.”

8- There were mosques in the time of Rasûlullah ‘sall-Allâhu alaihi wa sallam’ and in the times of the As-hâb-i-kirâm. There were imâm in these mosques. The namâz would be performed in jamâ’at. The imâm does not necessarily have to be innocent, sinless. For no one except Prophets ‘alaihim-us-salawâtu wa-t-taslîmât’ is innocent. Allâhu ta’âlâ commands to build mosques. Rasûlullah ‘sall-Allâhu alaihi wa sallam’ stated, **“If a person builds a mosque Allâhu ta’âlâ will bless him with a kiosk in Paradise.”**

The last âyat of Jum’a sûra purports, **“O Believers! When the adhân for salât is called on Friday, stop shopping and run for the Dhikr of Allah! Disperse when the salât is over!”** This âyat-i-kerîma also shows that salât means namâz. The namâz has been called Dhikr. Because Muslims assemble in mosques on Friday, the day has been called Jum’a.

People without a certain Madh-hab say, “There is no heavenly commandment concerning the construction of mosques. Since the demolition of mosques it has been considered more appropriate and more virtuous to do the worships in homes.” This assertion is an extremely odious lie, a very wicked slander. And their misinterpreting âyat-i-kerîmas in order to convince Muslims that they are telling the truth, is disbelief and heresy. The history book which they put forward as a document was written by a Hurûff of Shîrâz.

When the Messenger of Allah ‘sall-Allâhu alaihi wa sallam’ migrated from Mekka to Medina, his first stay was in the village called **Kubâ**, where he stayed for more than ten days. He built a mosque called **Kubâ Mesjîd** in this village. Carrying a big stone with his blessed hands, he put it under the mihrab as a foundation

stone for the mosque. Then he said, “**O Abâ Bekr! Bring another stone and put it beside my stone!**” Then he had hadrat ‘Umar and hadrat ‘Uthmân each put a stone. Hadrat ‘Umar and hadrat ‘Uthmân ‘radiy-Allâhu ta’âlâ anhumâ’ had arrived in Medîna before. Rasûlullah performed his prayers of namâz in this mosque. During his stay in Medîna he would come here every week and perform two rak’ats of namâz called **Tehiyat-ul-mesjîd**.

Mesjîd-i-dharâr: It was during the preparations for the Holy War of Tebuk when some munâfiqs in the village of Kubâ, such as Hizâm bin Khâlid and the sons of Abû Jayba and Ibni Âmir, namely Majmâ and Zeyd, and also such vagabonds as Tabtal and Tajruj and Bejad and Abâd and Wedîa, provoked by Abû Âmir, designated a place of meeting for themselves and termed this place the **Mesjîd-i-dharâr**. Abû Âmir was the maternal first cousin of Abdullah ibni Ebî, the chieftain of munâfiqs. They asked the Messenger of Allah to perform namâz in that mosque. The Prophet said he would do so on returning from the Holy War. When he was back from the Holy War they came to him and begged him. Allâhu ta’âlâ informed His Messenger that these people were munâfiqs and told him not to go there. So Rasûlullah sent Mâlik bin Dehshem, Sa’d bin Adî and his brother Âsim bin Adî to the so-called place and had it demolished. It is not known for certain today where the place exactly was. During the construction of the mosque, hadrat Abû Bekr, ‘Umar and ‘Uthmân were off in Medîna, with the Messenger of Allah. They were helping Rasûlullah with his preparations for the Holy War of Tebuk.

Mesjîd-i-Jum’a: is in the valley of **Ranona**, between Medîna and Kubâ. This is the place where the Messenger of Allah ‘sall-Allâhu alaihi wa sallam’ performed his first namâz of Friday.

Mesjîd-i-Fadîh: is to the east of Kubâ. In the Holy War of Benî Nadîr Rasûlullah ‘sall-Allâhu alaihi wa sallam’ had the army encamped somewhere around this place and he and his As-hâb performed namâz for six nights in this mosque.

Mesjîd-i-Benî Qureyza: Our master, the Messenger of Allah, performed namâz by the minaret of this mosque.

Mesjîd-i Ummi Ibrâhîm: is to the east of the mosque of Benî Qureyza (the previous one). The Prophet performed namâz here, too.

Mesjîd-i-Benî Zafer: is to the east of Bakî’ cemetery. The Messenger of Allah performed namâz in this mosque and then,

sitting on a rock, he had (some âyats from) Qur'ân al-kerîm recited and listened to it.

Mesjîd-ul-ijâba: is to the north of Bakî'. The Messenger of Allah, after performing namâz with his As-hâb in this mosque, prayed that his Ummat (Muslims) should not be afflicted with such disasters as famine and drowning.

Mesjîd-ul-Fat-h: is on top of a hill accessible through a set of stairs. In the Holy War of Hendek (Trench) the Messenger of Allah prayed very earnestly for victory from Monday till Wednesday in this mosque.

Mesjîd-ul-qiblatayn: is close to Mesjîd-ul-Fat-h. Two months before the Holy War of Bedr, the Messenger of Allah was conducting an early afternoon prayer in this mosque and they were making the rukû' in the second rak'at of early or late afternoon prayer, when (the order from Allâhu ta'âlâ arrived and) they changed their direction from Jerusalem to Ka'ba.

Mesjîd-i-Zuhâba: is somewhere on the way from Damascus to Medîna, on a hill on the left hand side. They (Rasûlullah and his As-hâb) were encamped and performed namâz here.

Mesjîd-i-Jebel-i-Uhud: On his way back from the Holy War of Uhud, the Prophet performed early and late afternoon prayers here. Also, âyat-i-kerîmas praising religious scholars were revealed here.

Mesjîd-i-Jebel-i-Ayniyya: is the place where hadrat Hamza (Rasûlullah's blessed paternal uncle) was martyred. Rasûlullah 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wa sallam' performed namâz with his weapons on his blessed body here.

Mesjîd-ul-wâdî: is the place where Rasûlullah performed morning prayer and the namâz of janâza for hadrat Hamza.

Mesjîd-ul-Bakî': is on the right hand side as you exit the Bakî' cemetery. Rasûlullah performed many prayers of namâz here.

Names and places of thirty-eight other mosques where the Messenger of Allah 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wa sallam' performed namâz are written in detail in the book **Mir'ât-i-Medîna**.

Mesjîd-un-Nebî: is the greatest mosque in Medîna-i-munawwara. It is the place where Rasûlullah's 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wa sallam' camel knelt down first when he migrated to Medîna. First he stayed as a guest at Khâlid bin Zeyd Abû Eyyûb al-Ansârî's home for seven months. With the ten golds donated by hadrat Abû Bekr they bought a building plot and leveled it. Construction of the mosque was completed by the Safer month of

the second year. It was roofed with branches and leaves of date. It had three entrances. The Mihrâb was at the place where the (entrance called) **Bâb-i-Tawassul** is today. The jamâ'at would go in and out through the entrance where the Mihrâb stands today. The depth of the foundation was three arshins [one and a half metres], the same size as the thickness of the walls. The foundation was laid with stones and the walls were built with sun-dried bricks. The mosque was a hundred arshin long and wide, and seven arshins tall. He (the Prophet) placed the first foundation stone with his blessed hands. Then he ordered hadrat Abû Bekr, 'Umar, 'Uthmân and Alî each to put a stone by this stone, respectively. When he was asked the reason why, he stated, **“This is to signify the order of their caliphates!”** On the right and left hand sides of the mosque nine additional rooms were made for his blessed wives. The room which was nearest the mosque was allotted to hadrat Âisha.

From the month of Safer till the time of his passing away, the beloved Messenger of Allah performed all his prayers of namâz in jamâ'at in this mosque whenever he stayed in Medîna. Despite the apparent fact that Rasûlullah and his As-hâb performed namâz in the abovenamed mosques, these communists assert that “Salât means prayer. Islam does not contain any commandment pertaining to the performance of namâz.” It is such a consternating assertion.

The hundred and twenty-fifth âyat of Baqara sûra purports, **“Perform namâz at the place called Maqâm-i-Ibrâhîm in the Mesjîd-i-harâm! We have ordered Ibrâhîm and Ismâ'îl to ‘Clean My Home for those who visit it and who make rukû’ (in it) and who sit (in it) and who make sajda in it!’ ”** In this âyat-i-kerîma Allâhu ta'âlâ calls Ka'ba ‘My Home.’ For this reason, Ka'ba is called ‘Baytullah’ (the Home of Allah). And in Hûd sûra Allâhu ta'âlâ calls Sâlih's ‘alaihîs-salâm’ camel ‘Nâqatullah’ (the Camel of Allah). These namings do not come to mean that Allâhu ta'âlâ is in Ka'ba or that the Camel is with Him. Even an ignorant idiot would not infer such stupid meanings. Like Ka'ba, all mosques are called Beytullah. This designation is intended to point out the value and honour of mosques.

The thirty-sixth âyat of Nûr sûra purports, **“Allâhu ta'âlâ has commanded that some homes be valued highly. He commanded that His Name be mentioned in these highly valued homes. Tesbîh of Allâhu ta'âlâ is made in these places in the morning and in the evening.”** On the other hand, in an âyat-i-kerîma which we

have quoted earlier Allâhu ta'âlâ calls namâz 'Dhikr'. So this âyat-i-kerîma shows that mosques are for performing namâz. Hadrat Abdullah ibni Abbâs said that [Mosques are called Baytullah. Therefore, to interpret the expression 'homes' in this âyat-i-kerîma as 'their homes' would mean to change the âyat-i-kerîma].

The hundredth âyat of Nisâ sûra purports, **“When you set out on a journey on the earth you may shorten the Salât!”** After the revelation of this âyat-i-kerîma the Messenger of Allah performed two rak'ats of his prayers of namâz during journeys. After this âyat-i-kerîma, another âyat-i-kerîma, which purports, **“When you and your As-hâb perform Salât during a combat, let a group of the jamâ'at perform it with you with their weapons on them. When one rak'at is completed they should resume their positions against the enemy. Then those who have not made Salât (because they have been fighting) should come and continue the Salât with you!”**, shows very plainly that Salât means Namâz, not (only) prayer.

A hadîth-i-sherîf reported in Tabarânî and Munâwî states, **“Do not make mosques into a (place that you walk through on your) route! Enter mosques (only) for Dhikr and Salât!”**

Another hadîth-i-sherîf, which states, **“The Salât's perfection depends on straightening the lines,”** points out that Salât means Namâz and that the namâz which is farz is to be performed in jamâ'at.

A hadîth-i-sherîf, which is cited in Ibni Âbidîn, at the end of its chapter dealing with acts of makrûh in the namâz, states, **“Your salât in your own home is more valuable than your salât in my mosque. However, this is not the case with (the salât which is) farz.”** As this hadîth-i-sherîf shows, Salât means Namâz and it is better to perform the namâz which is farz in a mosque and that which is sunnat at home. It is stated in another hadîth-i-sherîf, **“The salât performed in my mosque deserves a thousand times as much thawâb as the salât performed elsewhere. And the salât performed in the Mesjîd-i-harâm will be given a hundred times as much thawâb as the one performed in my mosque.”**

A group of those people without a Madh-hab and zindiqs do not perform namâz. They assert that “Salât is a commandment. It means prayer. Islam does not contain any worship consisting of such acts as bowing and prostration or building mosques. Prophets say not to attend mosques but to treat Allah in the mosque of your heart.” The âyat-i-kerîmas and hadîth-i-sherîfs quoted above

are plain evidences proving that these people are liars whose goal is to mislead Muslims.

9- Some of the people without a Madh-hab claim that adhân also means prayer. On the contrary, our Prophet taught Bilâl-i-Habeshî, his muadh-dhin, how to call the adhân (ezân). He had him mount a high place and call the adhân. The âyats that purport, **“When the call for salât reaches you (when you hear it),”** and **“When it is called for salât on Friday,”** denote the adhân. A hadîth-i-sherîf reported by Hâkim and Munâwî states, **“The namâz of those who do not come there although they hear the call, will not be accepted.”** Nidâ (the Arabic word used in the two hadîth-i-sherîfs quoted above) means calling the adhân. The first minaret for a mosque was built in Egypt, by hadrat Selmet-e-bni Halef, one of the Sahâba. He was Egypt’s governor in the time of hadrat Mu’âwiya.

It is a worship to make Dhikr of Allâhu ta’âlâ with a soft voice. It is for this reason that members of the group called Turuq-i-aliyya make Dhikr. Yet it would be nescience and heresy to confuse this Dhikr with adhân. Our master, the Messenger of Allah, praised muadh-dhins (people who called the adhân) by stating, **“On the Rising Day muadh-dhins will have long necks.”** This statement denotes that on that day they will rise with luminous foreheads and swollen chests. Another hadîth-i-sherîf, reported by Hâkim and Daylamî, states, **“Do not say the initial tekbîr for salât (do not begin to perform the salât) until the muadh-dhin has finished (calling) the adhân!”** Abû Dâwûd and Munâwî report a hadîth-i-sherîf which states, **“Do not call the adhân before dawn!”** Hurûfîs compare muadh-dhins’ calling the adhân to braying of an ass. People who make such a comparison become disbelievers. The next generation will remember these zindiqs with curses.

10- True Muslims, who are called **Ahl as-Sunna**, very well reconize the value of our Prophet’s Ahl-i-Bayt ‘ridwânullâhi ta’âlâ alaihim ajma’în’. They love the twelve blessed Imâms very much. They try to follow the fruitful way of the Ahl-i-Bayt, which guides to the luminous felicity. Words alone could not be the indication of love. One would have to adapt oneself to them.

Hadrat Abû Hanîfa ‘rahmatullâhi ta’âlâ aleyh’, the exalted religious leader and the greatest scholar among the Sunnite Muslims, left aside all his worldly occupations, his duties and his disciples, and attended the sohba of hadrat Imâm Ja’fer Sâdiq for two years. He obtained plenty of lore from Imâm Ja’fer Sâdiq’s

ocean of knowledge. He received fayz from his blessed heart, which reflected the spiritual lights coming from the Messenger of Allah. He stated, “If I had not served hadrat Imâm Ja’fer Sâdiq for two years, I would have been quite unaware of everything.” Hadrat Imâm A’zam Abû Hanîfa reached maturity through the knowledge and fayz which he acquired from Imâm Ja’fer Sâdiq. He attained high degrees that did not fall to the lot of other people.

It was from the Imâm of Ahl-i-Bayt that the leaders of Ahl as-Sunna learned most of their teachings pertaining to imân and fiqh, the majority of their ma’rifats pertaining to Tasawwuf, and even a major part of their knowledge pertaining to Tafsîr and Hadîth. In their training systems did they reach maturity. With their tawajjuh did they attain high grades. From them did they receive glad tidings. Shiite books acknowledge this fact, too. Ibni Mutahhir-i-Hullî, a Shiite scholar, writes in his books **Nahj-ul-haqq** and **Minhej-ul-kerâma** that Imâm-i-A’zam Abû Hanîfa and Imâm-i-Mâlik learned from Imâm-i-Ja’fer Sâdiq ‘rahmatullâhi ta’âlâ alaihim’ and attained high grades in his company. Imâm A’zam Abû Hanîfa was taught also by Imâm-i-Muhammad Bâqir and Zeyd-i-Shehîd. Why do Shiites, while advocating respect for their (false) dervishes who have not even seen any one of the Imâm of Ahl-i-Bayt, vituperate the scholars of Ahl as-Sunna who served those blessed Imâm for years and acquired knowledge and received fayz from them? Is it not farz for Shiites to obey also these scholars, who were authorized by those noble Imâm to give fatwâ and to perform ijtihâd? Shaikh-i-Hullî, a Shiite Imâm, states that Imâm-i-A’zam Abû Hanîfa was authorized (was given ijâzat) to give fatwâ by Imâm-i-Bâqir, by Zeyd-i-Shehîd and by Imâm-i-Ja’fer Sâdiq. That Imâm-i-A’zam possessed the requirements of ijâzat is testified by the (twelve) faultless Imâm. To speak ill of Imâm-i-A’zam would mean to deny the testimony of the twelve Imâm, who were sinless people. And this, in its turn, would be disbelief according to the Shiite credo. Since there is not a sinless Imâm today, is it not especially farz now for all Shiites to join the Madh-hab of Imâm-i-A’zam?

Shaikh Hullî reports from Abu-l-muhâsin, who reports from Abu-l-buhtur: Abû Hanîfa visited Abû Abdullah Ja’fer Sâdiq. Upon seeing Abû Hanîfa, Imâm Ja’fer Sâdiq said to him, “You will promulgate my father’s Sunna everywhere. You will show the right way to those who have lost their way. You will help those who are in peril. You will be a guide to salvation. May Allâhu

ta'âlâ help you!" Almost all Shiite books unanimously narrate the following event: Abû Hanîfa visited Abû Ja'fer Mensûr, the time's Abbasid Khalîfa. Îsâ bin Mûsâ was there, too. Upon seeing Abû Hanîfa, he said, "O Khalîfa! This newcomer is the world's greatest scholar!" Mensûr asked, "O Nu'mân! Who did you learn knowledge from?" "I learned it from Alî through Alî's disciples and from Abbâs through Abbâs's disciples," was the answer. Upon this the Khalîfa said, "The documents you have given are very tenable". Another episode narrated in Shiite books reads as follows: Abû Hanîfa was sitting in the Mesjîd-i-harâm. There were many people around him, asking him a variety of questions, and he was answering them. He scattered the answers as easily as if they were all ready in his pocket. Suddenly, Imâm-i-Abû Abdullah Ja'fer Sâdiq came near him and stopped. As soon as Abû Hanîfa saw the Imâm he stood up, and said, "O the grandson of the Messenger of Allah! If I knew you were here I wouldn't even attempt what I am doing now." Hadrat Imâm Ja'fer Sâdiq's answer was, "Please sit down, o Abû Hanîfa! Go on teaching Muslims what they do not know! Teach all people what you have learnt from my forefathers." The two narrations given above are written in Ibni Hullî's explanatory book **Tejrid**.

Question: Shiites may inquire about the paradox that Abû Hanîfa and other scholars of Ahl as-Sunna, although they were disciples of the twelve Imâms 'rahmatullâhi ta'âlâ alaihim ajma'in', gave fatwâs not agreeable with those given by the twelve Imâms. How can this be explained?

Answer: An answer to this question is written in the book **Mejâlis-ul-mu'minîn**, by Qâdî Nûrullah Shushterî. It reads as follows: "Abdullah Ibni Abbâs was a disciple to hadrat Emîr (Alî). Under his supervision he attained the grade of ijtihâd. He would perform ijtihâd in his presence. Most of the time the ijtihâd he performed would disagree with the ijtihâd of his master (hadrat Alî). Yet hadrat Emîr 'qaddas-Allâhu ta'âlâ wejheh' would accept such ijtihâds of his. Hence, a mujtahid is to answer (a religious matter requiring explanation) in accordance with his own inferences. It goes without saying that ijtihâd is not needed in teaching those âyat-i-kerîmas and hadîth-i-sherîfs the meanings of which are already clear. In other words, it is harâm to disagree with such plainly explained religious teachings. However, understanding those teachings that have not been stated clearly necessitates ijtihâd. Nevertheless, an Imâm who is impeccable will never err in his ijtihâd. Others may. Yet such errors of theirs will

be rewarded rather than punished, i.e. they will be given thawâb (for their painstaking performance of ijtihâd).” Identical statements are written in the Shiite book **Me’âlim-ul-usûl**. However, teachings inferred through ijtihâd should not disagree with Qur’ân al-kerîm or hadîth-i-sherîfs or the ijmâ’i ummat (unanimity of the Sahâba).

If it had been a sin to give a fatwâ disagreeable with the ijtihâd of the Ahl-i-Bayt, hadrat Huseyn would have been sinful. As it is stated by Abû Muhnel Ezdî, a Shiite scholar; Hadrat Husayn did not like his (elder) brother hadrat Hasan’s making peace with hadrat Muâwiya. He told his brother that he had made a mistake. If refusing the ijtihâd of one of the twelve Imâm’s and saying that he erred in his ijtihâd indicated enmity towards him, hadrat Hasan would necessarily have been inimical towards hadrat Huseyn. This is another point of view from which it is seen quite clearly that those who criticize hadrat Mu’âwiya ‘radiy-Allâhu anh’ and who wage a campaign of vilification against him, are following a profane course.

Sunnite scholars of Hadîth and mujtahids ‘rahmatullâhu alaihim’ are renowned for their taqwâ, equity, and piety. The hatred Shiites feel against scholars of Ahl as-Sunna originates from the fact that the belief held by these scholars does not agree with their credo. They cannot say that these scholars are sinful, mendacious or fond of worldly advantages. On the other hand, they censure some people whom they themselves call scholars.

The earliest people who called themselves Shi’î (Shiite) were unit commanders in hadrat Alî’s army in the Siffîn War. All the statements and behaviours quoted and described in Shiite books and ascribed to hadrat Emîr (Alî) were narrated by these people. On the other hand, it is written in Shiite books again, e.g. in **Nehj-ul-belâgha**, that these people were treacherous, sinful, mendacious, and disobedient to hadrat Emîr. Emîr ‘kerrem-Allâhu ta’âlâ wejheh’ informed that these people were munâfiqs. The beliefs held and the worships practised by the inhabitants of Kûfa city were all in accordance with the reports given by these people. The innocent (twelve) Imâm’s always uttered maledictions against them, cursed them. They always repelled these people. Let us take one of them, namely **Kesâî**. It is not known for certain whether he was a Muslim. Another one is **Zekeriyyâ bin Ibrâhîm**. Abû Ja’fer Muhammad bin Hasan Tûsî and others wrote what they had heard from them. However, this Zekeriyyâ was a Christian.

Abbasid Rulers put the Imâms of Ahl-i-Bayt into dungeons. It was forbidden to visit them or to talk to them. No one was allowed to go in and see them. Scholars of Ahl as-sunna would risk the danger and visit them. Thus they would acquire knowledge and receive fayz from them. It is stated in all history books that when hadrat Mûsâ Kâzim ‘rahmatullâhi aleyh’ was in dungeon, Muhammad bin Hasan Sheybânî and Qâdî Abû Yûsuf ‘rahmatullâhi alaihimâ’, two Sunnite scholars, frequently visited him, asking and learning from him what they did not know. Having the courage of visiting hadrat Imâm at such a critical time would require strong love and ikhlâs. These facts are written in Shiite books, too. A scholar belonging to the Imâmiyya group of Shiites wrote a book titled **Fusûl**, in which he relates hadrat Mûsâ Kâzim’s kerâmets. One of them, which he narrates from Imâm Muhammad and Imâm Abû Yûsuf, reads as follows: Hârûn Reshîd imprisoned hadrat Imâm Mûsâ Kâzim. One day we two visited him. We were sitting in his presence, when one of the guardians entered and said, “If you need something tell me! I’ll bring it with me tomorrow.” Hadrat Imâm answered that he did not need anything. When the man left the Imâm turned to us and said, “This man surprises me. He asks me if I need anything and says he will bring it tomorrow. Yet he is going to die suddenly tonight.” Later we heard that he had died that night.

It is stated in the book **Kâmûs-ul-a’lâm**, “Imâm-i-Ja’fer Sâdiq is a grandson of hadrat Alî’s grandson. His mother, Umm-i-Ferwa, was a daughter of Qâsim, hadrat Abû Bekr’s grandson. Therefore, the Imâm (Ja’fer Sâdiq) ‘rahmatullâhi aleyh’ attained not only the maturities of Wilâyat coming through hadrat Alî but also the perfections of Nubuwwat coming through hadrat Abû Bekr. He bestowed plenty of both sources of perfection on Imâm-i-A’zam Abû Hanîfa. Imâm-i-Ja’fer Sâdiq was learned in jeifr, chemistry and other sciences. Jâbir, the celebrated Muslim Chemist, was a pupil of Imâm Sâdiq’s. Abû Muslim Khorasânî, who had been fomenting an insurrection against the Umayyads, wanted to declare Imâm-i-Ja’fer Sâdiq Khalîfa in order to be successful in this attempt. Hadrat Imâm would not accept his suggestion. In fact, he burned Abû Muslim’s letters. Ismâ’îl, the oldest of his seven sons, had died before his father’s death. Therefore the Imâm was succeeded by his second son Mûsâ Kâzim ‘rahimahum-Allâhu ta’âlâ’. A group of people who called themselves Shiites took a different course and recognized Ismâ’îl and his sons as successors to the Imâm. These people were called

Ismâ'iliyya. It is written in the book **Esmâ'ul-muallifin** that Imâm-i-Ja'fer Sâdiq wrote three books, namely **Taqûm-i-ru'yâ**, **Al-jâmiat-u-fil-jefr**, and **Kitâb-ul-Jefr**. Jefr means a four month old lamb. In scientific terminology it means a branch dealing with guessing future events beforehand. Plato and ancient Indians had written books on Jefr. The first Islamic book written in this science was by hadrat Alî. Because the two of the three books mentioned above were written on sheepskin sheets, the science dealt with in the two books was called Jefr. This information is written in **Kâmûs**.

Imâm-i-Ja'fer Sâdiq did not write any books on religious teachings or worships. The book **Imâm-i Ca'fer Buyruğu** (Imâm-i-Ja'fer's Command), which is possessed by Shiites today, was written by Ja'fer bin Huseyn Qummî. This man died in Kûfa in 340 [A.D. 951]. It is informed in the well known book **Munjid** also that this man was the first to write on fiqh, on religious practices in the Shiite sect. Also, it is stated in **Kâmûs-ul-a'lâm** that the book **Risâla-i-Ja'feriyya** possessed by Shiites was written by Abû Ja'fer Muhammad Tûsî. This person died in 460 [A.D. 1068]. His Tafsîr is of twenty volumes. Putting forward the book written by these two Ja'fers, Shiites call themselves **Ja'ferî**, thus attempting to prove that they are following Imâm-i-Ja'fer Sâdiq. Exploiting the similarity between the words Ja'fer and Jefr, they assert that these (two) books also were written by hadrat Imâm-i-Ja'fer Sâdiq.

11- In order to ruin Islam from the interior, Hurûfîs assail hadrat Imâm-i-A'zam Abû Hanîfa 'rahmatullâhi aleyh', the great scholar, the most beloved leader of the Ahl as-Sunna. They do not feel shame at writing all sorts of abominable slanders and base lies in their efforts to malign this exalted Imâm.

A biography of this noble Imâm is written in the (Turkish) books **Se'âdet-i Ebediyye**, **Fâideli Bilgiler** and **Eshâb-ı Kirâm**. We have considered it appropriate to write a few more words by borrowing from the Arabic book **Khayrât-ul-hisân**, by the great Islamic scholar hadrat Ibnî Hajar-i-Mekkî 'rahmatullâhi ta'âlâ aleyh', from the Persian book **Tezkira-t-ul-Awliyâ**, by hadrat Ferîdeddîn Attâr, and from the Turkish book **Mevdû'ât-ül'ulûm**, by Taşköprü zâde.

Imâm-i-'Azam's name is Nu'mân 'rahmatullâhi ta'âlâ aleyh'. 'Abû Hanîfa' means 'Father of Muslims following the right way'. Contrary to some fabricated bruits, he did not have a daughter named Hanîfa. Nor did the name belong to his mother. If his

mother's name had been Hanîfa, he would have been called Nu'mân ibni Hanîfa, like Îsâ (Jesus) 'alaihi-salâm' has been called Îsâ-ibni Meryem (Jesus the Son of Mary). He has been called Nu'mân bin Thâbit (Nu'mân the Son of Thâbit) by all people, friends and enemies alike. His father's name is written in all books, with the exception of those written by enemies of Ahl as-Sunna, who assert that his mother's name was Hanîfa and forge abhorrent stories about him.

Hadrat Imâm-i-A'zam Abû Hanîfa's 'rahmatullâhi ta'âlâ aleyh' grandfather's name is **Zûtâ**, which is written as such in numerous books, e.g. in the book **Jâmi'ul-usûl**, by the great scholar hadrat Ibni Esîr Jezrî. This high person was a slave. Most scholars of fiqh have been from among slaves. Thâbit, the Imâm's father, was born through Muslim parents. Thâbit attended hadrat Alî's sohbat and thus received abundant fayz from hadrat Imâm (Alî). Imâm-i-Alî asked blessings on Thâbit and progeny in his prayers. Zûtâ's second name was Nu'mân. On a Nevruz Day, this Nu'mân offered hadrat Alî some jelly sweatmeat. Hadrat Imâm-i-A'zam was educated by Imâm-i-Sha'bî and, when the latter passed away in 104, by Hammâd. When Hammâd passed away in the hundred and twenty-fourth year of the Hegira, lovers of knowledge from all Islamic countries streamed into Imâm-i-A'zam's quarter. Thus he started to educate pupils. At that time there was not a scholar named Shaddar. Nor is it written in any Islamic book that he was taught by a person in that name.

Everything hadrat Imâm-i-A'zam Abû Hanîfa Nu'mân bin Thâbit said or did would be in agreement with Qur'ân al-kerîm and hadîth-i-sherîfs. It is stated in the book **Mîzân-ul-kubrâ**: If a person studies the statements made by the Imâm's of the four Madh-habs reasonably and without any prejudice or recalcitrance, he will see that they all were like celestial stars. He will look on their traducers as imbeciles who take stars' images in limpid water as stars themselves. Imâm-i-A'zam stated, "Qiyâs is not valid when there is nass [âyats and/or hadîths (with plain meanings)]. We do not perform qiyâs unless it is inevitably necessary. When we confront an enigmatic question, we first look it up in Qur'ân al-kerîm. If we cannot find an answer, we search through hadîth-i-sherîfs. If there is still no answer, we look the matter up in the statements made by any of the As-hâb-i-kerâm. If we cannot find a solution to the question in these documents, either, we find its answer through qiyâs." At some other time he said, "When we meet a question and cannot find its answer in Qur'ân al-kerîm or

among hadîth-i-sherîfs, and if the answers given to this question by the Sahâba vary, we choose one of the answers through qiyâs.” And once he said, “In matters to which we cannot find an answer through Qur’ân al-kerîm and hadîth-i-sherîfs, we choose one of the answers given by hadrat Abû Bekr, ‘Umar, ‘Uthmân, and Alî ‘radiy-Allâhu anhum’. We hold the hadîth-i-sherîfs coming from the Messenger of Allah on top of everything. We do not make a statement contradicting them.” When Imâm-i-A’zam performed qiyâs on a matter because he had not found its answer in any of the sources and then heard a statement made by hadrat Abû Bekr on that matter, he would give up his own ijtihâd and answer the question compatibly with that statement. He would follow this same policy when any of the As-hâb-i-kirâm was involved. Abû Mutî’ relates: One Friday morning Abû Hanîfa and I were in Kûfa mosque. Sufyân-i-Sawrî and Muqâtil and Hammâd bin Muslim and Ja’fer Sâdiq and others came in and questioned Abû Hanîfa: “We have heard that you have been answering questions on religious matters always by way of qiyâs. We are worried about you.” Imâm-i-A’zam discussed with them till noon. He explained his Madh-hab in detail. He told them how he would look up a religious matter first in Qur’ân al-kerîm, then in hadîth-i-sherîfs and finally in the unanimous statements of the Sahâba before answering a question asked on that matter. They all stood up, kissed the Imâm’s hand, and said, “You are the master of scholars. Please forgive us! We are sorry for annoying you, though inadvertently.” The Imâm’s response was: “May Allâhu ta’âlâ forgive us and you and have mercy on us!” All the mujtahids in the Hanafî Madh-hab followed their leader’s example and did not perform ijtihâd unless it was strongly necessary to do so. So was the case with the other Madh-habs. They would not have recourse to qiyâs in matters which had been explained through the nass (âyats and/or hadîth-i-sherîfs).

All the hadîth-i-sherîfs narrated to us by Imâm-i-A’zam Abû Hanîfa were reported from the As-hâb-i-kirâm to him by a group. He recorded each hadîth-i-sherîf together with a list of its reporters. Those who protest against the Imâm’s ijtihâd are people who did not realize the subtlety of his Madh-hab. Or they are a group of heretics inimical towards the Ahl as-Sunna. There are approximately twenty matters on which Hanafî and Shâfi’î Madh-habs differ from each other. And this difference originates from the methodical and regulational differences between the two Madh-habs. I have studied all the hadîth-i-sherîfs which Imâm-i-

A'zam 'rahmatullâhi ta'âlâ aleyh' put forward as documents. I have seen that his and his disciples' evidences are all tenable and true. I say these words not only as perfunctory statements or for the sake of courtesy like some people do, but as a result of long and painstaking observation. I have seen that all the hadîth-i-sherîfs reported by Imâm-i-A'zam were taken from the eminent ones of the Tâbi'în, who, as is stated in a hadîth-i-sherîf, were all virtuous and good people.

Hadrat Tâj-ud-dîn-i-Subkî 'rahmatullâhi aleyh' says in his book **Tabakât-ul-kubrâ**, "One should be watchful about one's attitude towards the Imâm's of the Madh-habs! One should not value the rumours and slanders spread about great religious scholars! A person who protests against the statements of the religious Imâm's will end up in catastrophes. Everything they say is based on an evidence, a document. People who are not like them cannot comprehend these evidences. What devolves on us is to praise these noble people and not to comment on their disagreeing on some matters. The disagreements between them are like the disagreements between the Sahâba. Rasûlullah 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wa sallam' prohibited us to censure the As-hâb-i-kirâm on account of the disagreements among them. He commanded us to mention them all with praises."

If you wish to realize that the hadîth-i-sherîfs reported by Imâm-i-A'zam 'rahmatullâhi ta'âlâ aleyh' are dependable and his Madh-hab is correct, join the way of Ahlullah (people who have completely trusted themselves to Allah and are therefore devoted to Islam). Make progress with ikhlâs in knowledge and worshipping! Attain Islam's ultimate essence! You will then see that the Imâm's of the four Madh-habs and those scholars who follow them are in the right way and all their statements are compatible with Islam.

Hadrat Shakîk-i-Belhî states that Abû Hanîfa had a great deal of wara' and religious lore and he was extremely pious [worshipping much], noble and very diligent in religious matters. He never made personal comments on religious matters. When he was asked a question, he would get his disciples together, discuss the question with them and, when a unanimous conclusion was reached, he would tell Abû Yûsuf or another disciple to "record it in such and such page of a certain book." Abdullah Ibnî Mubâarak relates, "During a stay in the city of Kûfa I visited various scholars and asked them each who (they thought) was the greatest scholar among them. The answer was the same: they all

thought Imâm-i-A'zam was the greatest. When I asked who was the most zâhid (person who has completely turned away from worldly interests), the unanimous answer was again: Abû Hanîfa. When I asked them who was the one who was most deeply devoted to knowledge, each and every one of them acknowledged that it was Abû Hanîfa." Here we end our translation from **Mizân-ul-kubrâ**.

The hundred and fifty-ninth (159) âyat of An'âm sûra purports, **"O My Messenger! You could not have anything to do with those who break into various groups in their religion. Allah shall punish them. On the Rising Day Allâhu ta'âlâ shall remind them of what they did in the world."** The various groups mentioned in the âyat are the groups of heretics. This âyat-i-kerîma states plainly that such people are out of Islam and without îmân. Since the Madh-habs of the four Imâms of Ahl as-Sunna do not differ from one another in matters pertaining to îmân, it is obvious that this âyat indicates heretical groups of bid'at.

12- It is alleged in a book written by a heretic without a certain Madh-hab that "the day of Qurbân, i.e. the day when (Prophet) hadrat Ibrâhîm attempted to sacrifice his son (to Allâhu ta'âlâ), is not certainly known, and the person to be sacrificed was Is-haq (Isaac), not Ismâîl (Ishmael)."

Alî Zeynel'âbidîn and Muhammad Bâqir and Abdullah Ibni Abbâs and Hasan-i-Basrî state that the intended sacrifice was Ismâîl. Our Prophet stated, **"I am the child of two (intended) sacrifices."** This hadîth-i-sherîf shows that the person intended to be sacrificed was hadrat Ismâîl. For our Prophet is a descendant of hadrat Ismâîl.

A hadîth-i-sherîf, reported by Abdullah Ibni Abbâs 'radiy-Allâhu anhumâ' and recorded in Bukhârî and in other books of Hadîth, states, **"No worship could be as virtuous as one performed during the first ten days of the month of Zilhijja."** It is stated in another hadîth-i-sherîf, **"Fasting performed on the day of Arafa will be kaffârat (will indemnify) for the sins belonging to the previous one year and the future one year."** This hadîth-i-sherîf can be paraphrased as follows: The fasting performed on the ninth day of Zilhijja will be useful for the acceptance (by Allâhu ta'âlâ) of the tawba you will make for the sins you have committed during the previous year and those you may commit the following year.

Putting forward the fake copies of the Torah possessed by

Jewry, they attempt to prove that the intended sacrifice was hadrat Is-haq. However, Qur'ân al-kerîm informs that the existing copies of Torah are defiled, interpolated copies. That the intended sacrifice was Ismâ'îl 'alaihîs-salâm' is indicated through Qur'ân al-kerîm. The hundredth and later âyats of Sâffât sûra purport, **“Yâ Rabbî (o my Allah)! Give (me) a son from among the good. So We gave him the good news of a halîm [very good-tempered] son. When the child reached the age to walk with Ibrâhîm 'alaihîs-salâm', Ibrâhîm said unto him: ‘O my dear son! I have been having dreams in which I am jugulating you. Lo, what would you say about it?’ (The son said), ‘O my dear father, do whatsoever you have been ordered to do! Inshâ-allah (If Allâhu ta'âlâ wills it be so), you will find me among the patient.’ Both of them being submissive to the decree of Allâhu ta'âlâ, Ibrâhîm had his son lie on his forehead on the ground. [The knife would not cut the child's throat]. We said, ‘O Ibrâhîm! You have proved true to the dream. So we reward those who behave well.’ This event was an open test. We gave him a big ram [to be jugulated] instead of his son.”**

“Thereafter we gave him the good news of Is-haq (Isaac) from among the good as a Prophet. We bestowed abundance on him and on Is-haq. Among their descendants there are good ones as well as those who are cruel to their nafs.”

These âyat-i-kerîmas show clearly that the would-be sacrifice was Ismâ'îl 'alaihîs-salâm'. For, when Ibrâhîm 'alaihîs-salâm' said, “I shall go wherever my Rabb (Allah) commands me to go,” and migrated, he was first blessed with Ismâ'îl 'alaihîs-salâm'. Is-haq 'alaihîs-salâm' was bestowed on him afterwards. We do not understand why they are trying to conceal this fact.

As it is stated in the book **Mir'ât-i-Mekka**: In the time of 'Umar bin Abdul'azîz, a Jewish rabbi became a Muslim. The Khalîfa, 'Umar bin Abd-ul'azîz asked him, “Who was the child to be sacrificed, Ismâ'îl or Is-hâq?” The new Muslim's answer was: “O Khalîfa! Jews know that the intended sacrifice was hadrat Ismâ'îl. Yet because Ismâ'îl 'alaihîs-salâm' was Muhammad's 'alaihîs-salâm' ancestor they say that their own ancestor, Is-hâq 'alaihîs-salâm', was the sacrifice.” And now these people, following the course guided by Jews and Christians, deny the fact that Ismâ'îl 'alaihîs-salâm' was the intended sacrifice.

To know which one of his sons Ibrâhîm 'alaihîs-salâm' intended to sacrifice is not one of Islam's principles of belief. Yet these people, in order to attack Sunnite scholars, put forward this

matter as if it were something important. They censure Umayyads, Abbasids and Ottoman Turks. For Mukhtâr-i-Sekâfî was razed by Umayyads, Qarmâtîs (Carmatians) and Fâtimîs (Fatimids) by Abbasids, Hurûfîs by Tîmûr Khân (Tamerlane), and Safawîs by the Ottoman Turks. It is stated at the end of the fifth book of Ibni Âbidîn, “It is not an approvable behaviour for Muslims to discuss religious matters that do not concern themselves. Such questions as “Who is more virtuous, (Prophet) Ismâ’îl or (Prophet) Is-hâq?”, “Who was going to be sacrificed?”, “Who is higher, hadrat Âisha (Rasûlullah’s blessed wife and hadrat Abû Bekr’s daughter) or hadrat Fâtima (Rasûlullah’s blessed daughter)?” We are not supposed to know the answer to these questions. Allâhu ta’âlâ has not commanded us to learn facts of this sort. May Allâhu ta’âlâ bless these heretics with wisdom and hidâyat so that they will give up their efforts to destroy Islam from the inside.

13- It is allegedly stated in a book that the Umayyads changed Islam. This allegation is a grave slander. There were scholars of **Ahl as-Sunna** in the time of Umayyads. The way taught by these scholars are the way guided by the Messenger of Allah and the Ash-hâb-i-kirâm. The book misleads Muslims by calling the way guided by the Messenger of Allah ‘a fabrication of Umayyads’.

14- A few of the sacred nights are named clearly in Qur’ân al-kerîm. Our Prophet taught all these nights to his Ash-hâb. And our religious Imâm, learning them from the Ash-hâb-i-kirâm, wrote them in their books. The Umayyad Khalîffas did not attack the Islamic religion. Today’s Islam is the very Islam itself taught by our master, the Prophet. Calling the holy nights ‘bid’at’, which some people do, means calling our Prophet’s hadîth-i-sherîfs ‘bid’at’. Islam is to be protected not by falling for the statements made by some ignorant idiots, but by following the instructions which scholars of Ahl as-Sunna learned from the Ash-hâb-i-kirâm and wrote for us in their books.

15- To say that “They were derelict in leaving Rasûlullah’s janâza unattended” would mean grave calumny against hadrat Alî. Yes, when the sad news was heard, hadrat Alî was no less deeply depressed than the others, so that he did not know what to do. He shut himself up in his home, weeping and lamenting.

Rasûlullah ‘sall-Allâhu alaihi wa sallam’ had appointed hadrat Abû Bekr ‘radiy-Allâhu ta’âlâ anh’ imâm for Muslims before he passed away. Upon Rasûlullah’s death, therefore, Muslims

unanimously elected Abû Bekr imâm for themselves. Hadrat Abû Bekr sent for hadrat Alî and commanded him to do the funeral services for Rasûlullah. Thus the Prophet's funeral was held.

Hurûfîs vilify the As-hâb-i-kirâm by alleging that "after our Prophet's 'sall-Allâhu ta'âlâ alaihi wa sallam' death they recruited soldiers against hadrat Alî and fought him." This allegation is another lie, another slander. The three Khalîfas cherished hadrat Alî very highly. They never did anything to hurt his blessed heart. Those who read Islamic histories know these facts. They will not fall for these lies.

Exploiting the insolent behaviour displayed by a couple of cruel idiots during Imâm-i-Hasan's funeral, they distort the events into grounds convenient for attacking Sunnite Muslims. Thereby they try to mislead pure Muslims. 'Umar, who fought against hadrat Huseyn at Kerbelâ and caused his martyrdom, was the son of Sa'd Ibnî Ebî Waqqâs, one of the Ashara-i-mubash-shara, i.e. the ten fortunate Sahâbîs who had been given the good news that they would go to Paradise. Now these enemies of Islam are trying to generalize this 'Umar's sin so as to include all Muslims and attempt to exploit it as an excuse for cursing even those Muslims who had died earlier than the perpetration of that sin. We should not fall for the mournful and exaggerated stories forged by these people and cause segregation among Muslims. It is harâm to have a bad opinion of a muslim, to backbite him, to slander him, or to hurt him. Each of these things is a grave sin in itself. Another sin is to nurse a grudge against a Muslim. Each of these sins is forbidden in Qur'ân al-kerîm. The interior enemies of Islam, Jewish converts, whose real purpose is to break Muslims into inimical groups and to set them against one another, rekindle covered historical events with exaggeration, try to dig out some sad events which, let alone being principles of belief to be learned, are to be covered, and provoke brothers against brothers. Let us not fall for the lies of these insidious enemies and break into groups. Let us be united in the right way taught by scholars of **Ahl as-Sunna**, who are praised through hadîth-i-sherîfs. Unity will produce power. And disunity will bring disasters.

These people sow disunity of imân and ideas among Muslims and make brothers hostile against one another.

The Sunnite Muslims' parting into four Madh-habs is not a disunity of imân and ideas. Muslims being in the four Madh-habs are in agreement with respect to imân and thoughts. They look on one another as brothers in Islam. They love one another. They

differ from one another only in a few unimportant matters that have not been taught clearly through Qur'ân al-kerîm or hadîth-i-sherîfs. And then they follow one of the other three Madh-habs when they have to in these matters.

It would be disastrous for Muslims to be broken into credal sects. Our master the Prophet informed that Muslims would be broken into seventy-three different groups and that seventy-two of these groups would go to Hell. The group called **Ahl as-Sunna** 'rahmatullâhi ta'âlâ alaihim ajma'in' is the one with the correct belief. These Muslims have parted into four Madh-habs, which differ only in some Islamic practices. This parting is a rahmat (Allah's compassion) on Muslims and facilitates matters for them.

Those who had copies of Qur'ân al-kerîm trampled by horses were a number of people without a certain Madh-hab living in Hidjâz, chiefly a heretic named Abû Tâhir Qarmatî. The names of the people who turned the Rawda-i-mutahhara into a battlefield and plundered the Messenger's treasury are recorded in **Mir'ât-ul-harameyn**. Yes, there were some tyrants among the governors appointed by Umayyads and by hadrat Alî. These people tormented Muslims. Yet these people cannot be grounds for censuring or blaming hadrat Alî or hadrat Mu'âwiya. For both of them are Sahâbîs and hadrat Alî is more virtuous than hadrat Mu'âwiya. Rasûlullah 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wa sallam' informed that none of the Sahâba would become a disbeliever afterwards and that they would all go to Paradise. He prohibited us to criticize any one of them. Allâhu ta'âlâ declares that He loves the As-hâb-i-kirâm and that He is pleased with them. The Attributes of Allâhu ta'âlâ are eternal. His loving them is eternal. As-hâb (or Sahâba) means Sahâbîs, that is, Companions. A person who has îmân and sees the Messenger of Allah (at least) once becomes a Sahâbî. The first three Khalîfas and hadrat Mu'âwiya and Amr Ibnî Âs were Sahâbîs. None of the As-hâb can be a renegade or a munâfiq. The fact that Allâhu ta'âlâ loves them will never change. If a person who states that one or more of the As-hâb-i-kirâm renegaded or became sinful after Rasûlullah's death makes this statement because he interprets a doubtful nass (âyat or hadîth) incorrectly, he will become an aberrant man of **bid'at**. If an ignorant person who is quite unlearned in such branches as Nass and Ta'wîl makes this same statement, he will become a disbeliever. Munâfiqs cannot have been Sahâbîs. That some munâfiqs revealed their hypocrisy afterwards does not mean that some of the Sahâba 'radiy-Allâhu ta'âlâ anhum ajma'in' became apostates afterwards.

Abd-ul-'azîz Dahlawî gives the following explanation about the sixty-eighth Shiite allegation in his book **Tuhfa-i-Isnâ-Ash'ariyya**: "There were munâfiqs among the As-hâb-i-kirâm. Formerly it was not known who they were. However, Muslims were distinguished from munâfiqs towards the termination of our Prophet's lifetime. A short time after Rasûlullah's 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wa sallam' passing away, there was none of these munâfiqs left still alive. The hundred and seventy-ninth âyat of Âl-i-'Imrân sûra purports, '**O munâfiqs! Allâhu ta'âlâ will not leave you to yourselves. He will distinguish true Believers from munâfiqs!**' It is stated in a hadîth-i-sherîf, '**The city of Medîna will sever munâfiqs from Believers. It will do so like a blacksmith's furnace severing rust from iron.**' The âyat-i-kerîma and the hadîth-i-sherîf quoted above show quite plainly that the four Khalifas and hadrat Mu'âwiya 'radiy-Allâhu anhum', whom our master the Messenger of Allah had praised till his death, did not become disbelievers afterwards."

Muslims will not curse, and have never cursed, Rasûlullah's Ahl-i-Bayt 'radiy-Allâhu anhum' anywhere, nonetheless in mosques. Muslims know that loving and praising the Ahl-i-Bayt will cause them to die as Believers. To generalize a wrongdoing committed by a couple of munâfiqs so as to involve all Muslims in it and thus to arouse fitna among Muslims, is an act of animosity against Islam. These treacherous people traduce Muslims as enemies of the Ahl-i-Bayt. To call the followers and lovers Ahl-i-Bayt 'enemies of Ahl-i-Bayt' is a horrifying attack launched by ill-willed, malevolent munâfiqs with the sheer purpose of breaking Muslims into groups.

Muslims love Rasûlullah's Ahl-i-Bayt 'radiy-Allâhu ta'âlâ anhum ajma'in' more than anyone else and they love also those who love the Ahl-i-Bayt. Muslims who love the Ahl-i-Bayt and follow the right way guided by the Ahl-i-Bayt are called **Ahl as-Sunna**.

As it is stated in the book **Tuhfa**, the twenty-fourth allegation made by Hurûffis is that the Ahl as-Sunnat Muslims are inimical towards the Ahl-i-Bayt. In order to convince others that they are right, they fable some sad stories. All these detestable stories are lies and slanders. Scholars of Ahl as-Sunna unanimously state that it is necessary, it is farz for every male and female Muslim to love all the members of the Ahl-i-Bayt. It is one of the principles of îmân to love them. Scholars of Ahl as-Sunna wrote numerous

books telling about the virtues of the Ahl-i-Bayt ‘radiy-Allâhu ta’âlâ alaihim ajma’în’. For their sake these scholars stood against Umayyad and Abbasid governors and even sacrificed their lives. Sa’d bin Jubeyr and Nesâf and many others were martyred on account of their struggles for the Ahl-i-Bayt. A considerable number of them suffered persecutions and spent their lives in dungeons. Meanwhile, those who did not belong to a certain Madh-hab concealed themselves in a hypocritical way termed **Taqiyya** and pretended to be against the Ahl-i-Bayt in order to attain their goals, which were either money or worldly positions. It is the Ahl as-Sunna who have always supported the Ahl-i-Bayt. All Sunnite Muslims have been asking blessings on the Ahl-i-Bayt in all their prayers of namâz.

Sunnite Muslims love all the members of the Ahl-i-Bayt without discriminating among them. This is not the case with people who do not have a certain Madh-hab. When one of their imâms died, his own brothers and relatives would call him a disbeliever. They would appoint one of their sons as their new imâm, cursing and vituperating the others. No one except Sunnite Muslims loved all the Ahl-i-Bayt and would always run to help any one of them in need of help. Our Prophet ‘sall-Allâhu alaihi wa sallam’ stated, **“I am leaving behind me two guides for you: I am leaving Allah’s Book and my Ahl-i-Bayt.”** As this hadîth-i-sherîf indicates, as it will be useless to believe a certain part of Qur’ân al-kerîm and to disbelieve the rest, so will it do one no good in the Hereafter to believe and love some of the Ahl-i-Bayt and to curse and vilify the others. As it is necessary to believe in Qur’ân al-kerîm as a whole, so is it a must to love all the members of the Ahl-i-Bayt. And loving all the members of the Ahl-i-Bayt, which is a blessing of Allâhu ta’âlâ, has not devolved to anyone’s lot except Muslims holding the belief of **Ahl as-Sunna**. For instance, Khârijîs entangled themselves in the opprobrium of harbouring a grudge against hadrat Alî and his pure children. Some Shiite groups tumbled into the curse of bearing hostility towards hadrat Aîsha-i-Siddîqa and hadrat Hafsa, who are Muslims’ blessed mothers, and towards Zubeyr bin Awwâm, who was Rasûlullah’s paternal aunt’s son. The Kirâmiyya group denied hadrat Hasan’s and hadrat Huseyn’s being Imâms. The Muhtâriyya group disbelieved Imâm Zeynel’âbidîn, the Imâmiyya group denied Zeyd-i-Shehîd, and the Ismâ’îliyya group would not accept Imâm Mûsâ Kâzim. These are only a few examples of numerous people who deprived themselves of the great fortune of

loving the Ahl-i-Bayt and obeying the hadîth-i-sherîf quoted above.

When Imâm Alî Ridâ arrived in Nishâpur, more than twenty scholars met him. They begged him to recite a hadîth-i-sherîf transmitted through his ancestors (coming from his earliest grandfather, Rasûlullah). The noble Imâm quoted the hadîth-i-qudsî that purported, “(The word) **Lâ ilâha il-l-Allâh, is My shelter. He who says this word will have taken asylum in the fortress. And he who has entered the fortress will be safe against My torment.**” Scholars of Ahl as-Sunna state that if this hadîth-i-qudsî is recited in the manner that will be prescribed below and blown unto an ill person, that person will heal. When the love which Sunnite Muslims have for the Ahl-i-Bayt is so exuberant, would it not be either sheer nescience or idiocy or blind hostility against the Ahl as-Sunna to suppose that Sunnite Muslims were inimical against the Ahl-i-Bayt? Here we end our translation from **Tuhfa**. The following prayer must be written in its (original) Arabic letters and read correctly: “Rawâ Aliy-yul-Ridâ, fe-qâla, Haddasanî Ebî Mûsal-Kâzim an ebîhi Jâ’fer-is-Sâdiq an ebîhi Muhammad-il-Bâqir an ebîhi Zeynel’âbidîn Alî an ebîh-il-Huseyn an ebîhi Alî bin Ebî Tâlib ‘radiy-Allâhu anhum’, qâla haddasanî habîbî wa qurratu aynî Rasûlullâhi ‘sall-Allâhu alaihi wa sallam’, qâla haddasanî Jibrîlu, qâla sami’tu Rabb-ul-’izzati yaqûlu, **‘Lâ ilâha il-l-Allâhu hisnî, man qâla-hâ dahala hisnî, wa men dahala hisnî emina min ’azâbî.’**”

16- Whenever we Muslims say or write the name of any of the beloved Ahl-i-Bayt or the virtuous As-hâb-i-kirâm ‘radiy-Allâhu ta’âlâ alaihim ajmâ’in’ of our master the Prophet, we say, “radiy-Allâhu anh.” This expression means, “May Allâhu ta’âlâ be pleased with him.” As is written in the section before the one dealing with Farâiz in the fifth book of **Durr-ul-mukhtâr**, one of Muslims’ most valuable books, and also in its commentary, “It is mustahab (an act which deserves much reward in the Hereafter) to say ‘radiy-Allâhu anh’ for the As-hâb-i-kirâm. For all of them struggled very hard to please Allâhu ta’âlâ. They welcomed everything coming from Allâhu ta’âlâ with pleasure. Allâhu ta’âlâ is pleased with them. The thawâb given to others for their alms in gold as big as a mountain could not equal the thawâb that would be given to these people for dispensing half a handful of barley as alms.”

The book **Mesâbîh-i-sherîf** and the book **Izâlat-ul-hafâ an khilâfat-il-khulafâ**, the latter by Shâh Waliyyullâhi Dahlawî

‘rahmatullâhi aleyh’, quote Abdullah Ibnî ‘Umar ‘radiy-Allâhu anhumâ’ as having said, “In the time of the Messenger of Allah we would say ‘radiy-Allâhu anh’ whenever we mentioned the names of hadrat Abû Bekr, ‘Umar and ‘Uthmân.”

We Muslims do not like people who do harm to the Islamic religion. We remember their names with hatred. Therefore we remember with hatred the names of such villains as Abdullah bin Saba’, Hasan Sabbâh, Abû Tâhir Qarmatî, Shâh Ismâ’îl Safawî, who caused thousands of Muslims to be martyred. We love very much hadrat Abû Bekr, hadrat ‘Umar, hadrat ‘Uthmân, hadrat Alî and hadrat Mu’âwiya, who dedicated themselves faithfully to the Islamic faith and who loved the Messenger of Allah very much and therefore would sacrifice their lives, property and homelands for his sake. We also love and praise people who love our Prophet’s Ahl-i-Bayt and these Sahâbîs ‘radiy-Allâhu ta’âlâ anhum ajma’în’. Could a Muslim sympathize with those who cast such preposterous aspersions and slanders on Sahâbîs such as hadrat Mu’âwiya and hadrat Amr Ibnî Âs, who rendered great services to Islam and fought against Byzantines, the enemies of Islam, for years? They are poisoning the pure young brains with their irrational, unfounded interpretations. This poison is evil property to be inherited. In order to transfer this property to the sinless, innocent generations of the future, they are publishing heretical books and aberrant magazines and distributing them everywhere. Have we forgotten the hadîth-i-sherîf, **“When fitnas and lies become widespread, may those who do not tell the truth though they know it be accursed!”**?

By the way, we would like to relate the following episode: As hadrat Jâbir bin Abdullah narrates, a villager came to hadrat Alî and asked, “O Emîr-al-mu’minîn! Is Abû Bekr in Paradise?” This question hurt hadrat Alî ‘radiy-Allâhu anh’ considerably. So he said, “I wish I had never come to the world. This statement has never been made by anyone else before, neither by Rasûlullah ‘sall-Allâhu alaihi wa sallam’ nor by any other Muslim after him. Abû Bekr as-Siddîq ‘radiy-Allâhu anh’ was always with the Messenger of Allah; he was his vizier and counsellor. He succeeded him as the Khalîfa after his passing away. He who denies this fact will become a disbeliever. O villager! Hadrat Abû Bekr as-Siddîq sent for me towards his passing away. He said to me, ‘O my darling brother! I am going to pass away soon. When I die, wash me with those blessed hands of yours with which you washed the Messenger of Allah! Wrap me in my shroud and put

me in my coffin! Take my corpse to the entrance of Hujra-i-sa'âdat! Say unto Rasûlullah: Abû Bekr is at the door. He asks for (your) permission to enter.' O my brother in Islam! When Abû Bekr as-Siddîq passed away, I did whatever he had told me to do. When we put his coffin in front of the door of Hujra-i-sa'âdat and I asked for permission, we heard a voice saying, **'Bring the darling near the darling!'** Therefore we buried hadrat Abû Bekr beside the Messenger of Allah!"

Hadrat Ali "kerrem-Allâhu wejheh' and all the twelve Imâms narrated hadîths from hadrat Abû Bekr and from the other Khalîfas and from Jâbir bin Abdullah 'radiy-Allâhu ta'âlâ anhum ajma'in'. This means to say that they confirmed the hadîth-i-sherîfs transmitted by them. They acknowledged that those noble people were just and faithful. For this reason, a person who follows hadrat Ali and Ahl-i-Bayt ought to have the same love for hadrat Abû Bekr 'radiy-Allâhu ta'âlâ anhum ajma'in'. For it is a generally known fact that a friend's friends will be liked, and a friend's enemies will be disliked. Qur'ân al-kerîm informs that all the As-hâb-i-kirâm loved one another very much. Our master, the Prophet, declared, **"He who loves me will love my As-hâb, too! Love all my As-hâb!"** Some people today have abandoned the way prescribed by Qur'ân al-kerîm and guided by Muhammad 'alaihi-salâm'. They say, "Among the Sahâba there were people inimical toward the Ahl-i-Bayt. So we are inimical to them." Such allegations – may Allâhu ta'âlâ protect us from believing them – are vilifications fabricated by the Jewish convert named Abdullah bin Saba'. We Muslims should not fall for such lies! We should love very much both the Ahl-i-Bayt and all the As-hâb-i-kirâm. For our master, the Prophet, stated, **"My As-hâb are like the stars in the sky. A person who follows any one of them will attain hidâyat!"** That is, a person who does so will go to Paradise.

They are trying to destroy Islam from the interior. These people deny the true teachings which scholars of Ahl as-Sunna learned from Qur'ân al-kerîm and wrote in their books. In order to deceive Muslims, they say that these teachings are extraneous to Qur'ân. In order to make their lies believable, they give wrong meanings to âyat-i-kerîmas and hadîth-i-sherîfs. They call these heretical meanings the true Islamic religion. According to these zindiqs, Muslims all over the world have been holding wrong beliefs and practising wrong worship for more than fourteen hundred years and now they are recovering the original correct forms.

17- Heretics attempt to call things that are forbidden to eat 'permissible' and vice versa.

It is stated in **Muslim** and **Abû Dâwûd**, "Rasûlullah 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wa sallam' prohibited to eat those wild animals that have canine teeth and birds that hunt their preys with their talons." It is not halâl (permitted) to eat insects, that is, small animals that have their nests in earth. It is haram to eat rats, lizards, hedgehogs, snakes, frogs, bees, fleas, lice, mosquitos, flies, ticks. For they are insects. It is not halâl to eat meat from domestic donkeys, which live among people. Meat and milk obtained from wild donkeys living in mountains are halâl. Meat from a mule is not halâl. Hyenas, foxes, tortoises, (turtles), carrion crows, vultures, wolves, elephants, mountain lizards, field mice, weasels, eagles, cats, squirrels, sables, polecats, other animals of this sort, insects without blood, maggots living in fruits, cheese or meat are not edible. A mountain lizard, which is termed 'dab' in Arabic, is similar to an ordinary lizard.

Field crows are halâl. For they eat field grains. It is halâl to eat rabbit meat, too.

It is written in the book **Multaqâ** that it is halâl to eat rabbit meat. It is not makrûh (prohibited by the Prophet). This fact is explained as follows in the book **Majmâ'ul-enhur**: It is halâl to eat rabbit meat. They brought some kebab made from rabbit meat to our master the Prophet. He said to his As-hâb, "Eat this!" It is stated in the book **Durr-ul-muntaqâ**, "It is halâl to eat rabbit meat. For the rabbit is not a beast of prey."

The author of the book **Qudûrî** 'rahmatullâhi ta'âlâ aleyh' states that it is halâl to eat all sorts of rabbit meat. Commenting on this, the book **Jawhara** states that "It is halâl to eat rabbit meat, for a rabbit is not a beast of prey and does not eat carrion. A rabbit is like a deer."

Mawlânâ Abd-ul-halîm Efendi 'rahmatullâhi aleyh', Qâdî of Damascus, states in his commentary **Durer**, "It is stated unambiguously (by scholars) that **erneb**, that is, rabbit meat, is munbâh (permissible) to eat. For a rabbit is not a beast of prey and does not eat carrion. It is like a deer. It is herbivorous. It is written plainly in books of fiqh that rabbit meat is halâl. This means to refute those who say that it is harâm."

As is seen, eating rabbit meat is halâl according to the unanimity of scholars. No Islamic scholar has said 'harâm' or even 'makrûh' about rabbit meat. Above all, since our master the

Prophet advised to eat rabbit meat, could a Muslim say that rabbit meat should not be eaten? Certainly, no Muslim could say that rabbit meat is harâm. There has never been a dispute among Muslims on whether or not rabbit meat can be eaten. Yet these people say that rabbit meat should not be eaten. No Muslim has taken any heed of this assertion of theirs. All Muslims have been eating rabbit meat for centuries. Our Prophet's stating "Eat the rabbit" has shed a light for all Muslims. This subject is not worth being dwelt on. Our master the Prophet has settled the matter. Hurûfîs' gossips could not change our Prophet's prescription.

They allege that rabbit meat should not be eaten because it is stated in the Torah that it should not be eaten. Muslims adapt themselves to Qur'ân al-kerîm and to the commandments of our master, the Prophet, in whatever they do. They do not follow the Torah. Qur'ân al-kerîm has abrogated, invalidated most of the commandments in the Torah. Moreover, nowhere in the world today is there left an original copy of the Torah revealed by Allâhu ta'âlâ. Is it worthy of a Muslim to say that rabbit meat is not edible only because it is stated so in the copies of the Torah manufactured by Jews? However, Hurûfîs, who are the followers of a Jew of Yemen named Abdullah bin Saba', imitate him and value the Torah highly.

The forty-first âyat of Baqara sûra purports, **"Believe in the Qur'ân, which verifies the Torah you possess in the knowledge pertaining to the unity of Allah, to the torments and rewards, and in (the teachings pertaining to) îmân!"** And its sixty-third âyat purports, **"We said: o the sons of Isrâîl! Adhere respectfully to the Book We have given to you!"** These âyats do not show that the Qur'ân is the Torah. Its ninety-first âyat purports, **"That Qur'ân is true. It confirms the Torah, which existed at that time."** Yes, teachings pertaining to belief are not different in the Torah than they are in the Qur'ân or in any other heavenly Book. Yet teachings pertaining to worships, halâls and harâms are different in every heavenly Book. The ninety-seventh âyat, which purports, **"The Qur'ân confirms the Books previous to itself,"** points out that teachings of belief are all the same in those heavenly Books that have not been interpolated.

The fifty-second âyat of Mâida sûra purports, **"We have revealed the Qur'ân as the right Book to thee. It confirms the previously revealed books."** The twelfth âyat of Ahkâf sûra purports, **"Before the Qur'ân, the Torah, the Book of Mûsâ (Moses), was revealed as the Book to guide to the way to follow**

and as (Allah’s) compassion on those who would follow it. And this Qur’ân, which has been revealed to threaten the cruel with Hell and to give the good news of Paradise to those who do good, is a Book that confirms the Torah.”

Imâm-i-Baydawî ‘rahmatullâhi ta’âlâ aleyh’, a scholar of Tafsîr, states that [The expression, “The Qur’ân confirms the Torah,” which is purported in these âyat-i-kerîmas, means, “The Qur’ân is the Book (whose revelation was) informed (beforehand) by the Torah. Yes, the two Books agree on principles of belief, episodes, information given on various events, on the torments in Hell and the blessings in Paradise, enjoining worships and justice and prohibiting wicked deeds. Yet, kinds of halâls and harâmms and forms of worships are not the same. These things could not be the same for different people living in different times. Each heavenly Book contains a formula of principles suitable and useful for the Ummat for whom it has been sent down. Our Prophet stated, **“If Mûsâ ‘alaihis-salâm’ were alive now, he would do nothing but follow me.”**]

The fiftieth âyat-i-kerîma of Âl-i-’Imrân sûra answers Hurûffis expressly. Allâhu ta’âlâ quotes the statements made by Îsâ ‘alaihis-salâm’ in the âyat-i-kerîma, which purports, **“I have come to confirm what was declared in the Torah before me. I have come to make halâl the things that were made harâm for you.”** This âyat-i-kerîma shows clearly that the Ijnîl of Îsâ ‘alaihis-salâm’ confirms the Torah on the one hand and makes halâl some of the harâmms in it on the other. By the same token, Qur’ân al-kerîm both confirms the Torah and abrogates its permissions and prohibitions. Most of these changes are explained in books written by the Islamic scholars.

Followers of Ibni Saba’ are called Hurûffis. These people attach wrong meanings to âyat-i-kerîmas and hadîth-i-sherîfs. He who gives wrong meanings to Qur’ân al-kerîm becomes a disbeliever. For instance, the fifth âyat of Jum’a sûra purports, **“Those who deny the Torah are likened to an ass loaded with a burden of books on its back.”** However, this âyat-i-kerîma is explained as follows in books of Tafsîr: **“People who have been commanded to carry the burden of obeying the Torah’s principles and yet only read it and do not observe its commandments and prohibitions, [i.e. Jews], are like an ass suffering the toil of carrying books of knowledge for nothing.”** We Muslims believe in the Torah as a heavenly Book revealed by Allâhu ta’âlâ. What we do not believe is that the book possessed by Jews today is the

original Torah itself. Jews defiled, changed many parts of that Torah. The fifteenth âyat of Mâida sûra, which purports, **“They changed the words in the Book of Allah, that is, in the Torah,”** informs with this fact. The seventy-fifth âyat of Baqara sûra purports, **“A group of Jews would hear the Torah. After understanding the commandments and prohibitions in it, they would change them.”**

A hadîth-i-sherîf, which is reported by Tabarânî and written in **Kunûz**, states, **“Israelites followed a religious book they themselves wrote. They deserted the Torah of Mûsâ ‘alaihi-salâm’.”** This hadîth-i-sherîf informs that the existing books named **Talmud, Mishna** and **Gemara**, which Jews have been keeping in the name of Torah, are not the Book of Mûsâ ‘alaihi-salâm’.

What animals are edible and which ones should not be eaten? Muslims learn this from Qur’ân al-kerîm and hadîth-i-sherîfs. Jews and heretics, however, look it up in the existing copies of the interpolated Torah. The Islamic religion has prohibited the consumption of carrion, liquid blood, pork, meat from beasts that hunt their preys with their canine teeth or paws (or talons), and insects. Others are halâl. If an animal that is halâl to eat is killed in the name of someone other than Allâhu ta’âlâ or by an unbeliever who does not believe in any heavenly Book, it becomes harâm to eat it.

The hundred and forty-fifth âyat of An’âm sûra purports, **“Say: things that are forbidden through the Qur’ân to eat are carrion and liquid blood and the foul pork and animals killed in any name except that of Allah.”** This âyat-i-kerîma informs that four things are harâm. And six more harâms were reported by our master the Prophet. It is narrated by Abdullah ibni Abbâs that the Messenger of Allah prohibited beasts of prey that have canine teeth and birds of prey that hunt with their talons. The liquid (running) blood mentioned in the âyat-i-kerîma is the blood running out of the veins of a living or newly butchered animal. It is halâl to eat meat with blood in it, such as a liver or a spleen.

Then, it is halâl to eat mutton, beef and rabbit meat even when they have blood in them. It would be wrong to say that a rabbit is wholly blood. After the blood is gone, the rabbit is cooked or roasted and then eaten. It has a delicious flavour. As a matter of fact, our master, the Prophet ‘sall-Allâhu ta’âlâ alaihi wa sallam’, had his As-hâb eat rabbit meat.

The hundred and forty-sixth âyat of An’âm sûra purports, **“We**

prohibited Jewry to eat all sorts of nailed animals. We also prohibited the suet of sheep and cattle.” Qur’ân al-kerîm informs that Jews were prohibited to eat suet. Would it be correct to say it should be harâm for Muslims because it was harâm for Jews? Of course, it would not. These zindiqs, who are the inner enemies of Islam, are misleading Muslims by saying that since nailed animals are harâm, the rabbit should be harâm, too. They are distorting the facts by giving the impression as if nailed animals were harâm for Muslims. Actually, Qur’ân al kerîm informs that nailed animals were made harâm for Jews, not for Muslims.

Their statement, “Meat of an animal with an ugly outward appearance should not be eaten,” is another lie. There is not a hadîth-i-sherîf saying so. Hurûfîs make this allegation in order to use it as a fulcrum for comparing the rabbit to an ass, which would automatically lead to the conclusion that rabbit meat should not be eaten inasmuch as the ass is not an edible animal. We would like to ask these heretics this question: Only a while ago you were saying that the rabbit was blood entirely and there would be nothing left when the blood was gone. And now you are saying that rabbit meat is like the meat of an ass. How can these two statements be reconciled?

A person may or may not like rabbit meat. Yet, calling something which one does not like ‘harâm’ and giving wrong meanings to âyat-i-kerîmas in order to prove this lie true would indicate heresy and sheer enmity towards Islam.

So far we have proved through âyat-i-kerîmas and hadîth-i-sherîfs that rabbit meat is halâl. We should not push aside âyat-i-kerîmas and hadîth-i-sherîfs and read and believe copies of the Torah defiled by Jews or misleading books written by enemies of Islam!

18- Allâhu ta’âlâ is the Rabb of both Muslims and disbelievers and zindiqs. However, He has informed that He likes Muslims and hates disbelievers and zindiqs.

Every Prophet ‘salawâtullâhi ta’âlâ alaihim ajma’in’ held the same îmân. Yet their Sharî’ats are different. Furthermore, the heavenly Books revealed to past Prophets were changed by vicious people afterwards. Yet the religion revealed to Muhammad ‘alaihi-salâm has never changed. Qur’ân al-kerîm informs that no one will be able to change it till the end of the world. Enemies of Islam are striving to change this religion. Books written by scholars of Ahl as-Sunna are spreading this religion in its correct form all over the world and protecting it against interpolation.

In order to deceive Muslims' children, these people put forward various âyats of Qur'ân al-kerîm, e.g. the sixty-second âyat of Ahzâb sûra, which purports, **“Munâfiqs are accursed. They are to be arrested and killed wherever they are found! Since the earliest times it has been the divine law of Allâhu ta'âlâ that people who do so should be killed. You will find no change in the divine law of Allâhu ta'âlâ.”** They say that this âyat-i-kerîma shows that all Prophets 'salawâtullâhi ta'âlâ alaihim ajma'in' taught the same religion. However, this âyat-i-kerîma shows that it is the divine law of Allâhu ta'âlâ to reward Believers and torment disbelievers and that this divine law will never change.

The sixty-sixth âyat of Âl-i-'Imrân sûra purports, **“Ibrâhîm 'alaihis-salâm' was neither a Jew nor a Nazarite. He was a Muslim with correct belief. Nor was he a polytheist.”** This âyat-i-kerîma shows that Jews and Christians are not Muslims. Ibni Âbidîn states in its chapter about the namâz for janâza that the word Islam has two distinct meanings: (1) the religion brought by Muhammad 'alaihis-salâm'; (2) obedience. The same definition is written in the books **Kâmûs** and **Munjid**.

It is purported as follows in Hujurât sûra: **“Those who came from the desert said, 'We believe'. Say unto them: 'You do not believe. Yet say that you have entered Islam and obey. Îmân has not settled in your hearts'.”** The word 'Islam' in this âyat-i-kerîma means 'to obey, to follow'. It does not mean 'to believe in Muhammad 'alaihis-salâm'. All Ummats had the same îmân. Yet not all of them are called Muslims. The eighty-ninth âyat of Nahl sûra purports, **“We have sent thee the Qur'ân, which informs with everything and which is hidâyat and rahmat for everybody and which gives Muslims the good news of Paradise.”** The nineteenth âyat-i-kerîma of Âl-i-'Imrân sûra purports, **“The religion which Allâhu ta'âlâ approves is the Islamic religion.”** The eighty-fifth âyat of the same sûra purports, **“If a person wishes any religion except Islam, the religion he wishes will be rejected. This person will be a loser in the Hereafter!”** The word 'Islam' used in these âyat-i-kerîmas covers both meanings at the same time; it means 'belief in the religion brought by Muhammad 'alaihis-salâm' and obedience to him.' Allâhu ta'âlâ gives Muslims the good news of Paradise. Each Muslim is a Believer.

19- Our Prophet Muhammad 'alaihis-salâm' was born in the city of Mekka towards a Monday morning on the twelfth night of the month of Rebî'ul-awwal, that is, on the night between the

eleventh and the twelfth days, fifty-three years before the Hijrat (Hegira). History books write that the Mawlîd-i-Nebî (birth of the blessed Prophet) took place on the twentieth of April five hundred and seventy-five years after Îsâ's 'alaihîs-salâm' Mîlâd (birth). Since Îsâ's 'alaihîs-salâm' birth-year is not known exactly, that the Hijrat took place in the six hundred and twenty-second year of the Mîlâd is not a scientifically proven fact.

Like all other Prophets, Îsâ 'alaihîs-salâm', too, said that Allâhu ta'âlâ is One. Plato, an ancient Greek philosopher contemporary with Îsâ 'alaihîs-salâm' proposed the doctrine of three gods. This doctrine, which was called **Trinity**, did not find much acceptance. Constantine the Great, East Roman Emperor, accepted Christianity. With a view to unifying Christianity, which had been broken into sects, he convened three hundred and nineteen priests in 325 A.D. He inserted into the Christian religion prepared by priests a number of idolatrous rites and Plato's doctrine of Trinity. In order to convince everyone that this doctrine of three gods was not Plato's invention but a teaching of Îsâ's 'alaihîs-salâm', he declared that Plato had lived three hundred years before the Mîlâd. Thus the beginning of the Christian era was pushed three hundred years backwards.

Our Prophet 'sall-Allâhu ta'âlâ alaihi wa sallam' passed away in the city of Medîna on a Monday afternoon, which was the twelfth of the month of Rebî'ul-awwal in the eleventh year of the Hijrat.

20- Mourning is not Islamic. Our master the Prophet prohibited mourning. A hadîth-i-sherîf reported in the book **Muslim** states, **"If a mourner has not made tawba before dying, he shall be subjected to severe torment in the Hereafter."** Our Prophet states in another hadîth-i-sherîf, which, too, is reported in Muslim, **"Two things would drift one to disbelief. The first one is to swear at someone's ancestors and the second is to mourn."**

It is written in the initial pages of **Tuhfa** that mourning, crying and wailing on the Ashûra day, the tenth of Muharram, is a practice invented by Muhtâr Seqâfî. The bid'at spread like a kind of worship among people without a certain Madh-hab. Actually, Muhtâr's real purpose was to exploit this as a stratagem to dupe the inhabitants of Kûfa into fighting against the Umayyads and thus to seize power.

If mourning had not been prohibited, our master the Prophet 'sall-Allâhu ta'âlâ alaihi wa salam' would have taken priority over anyone else to be mourned for upon his death. Then we would

have mourned over the martyrdoms of hadrat 'Umar, hadrat Alî and hadrat Huseyn. We love them all very much. We are deeply sad about their martyrdoms. Yet we do not mourn over them. We do not mourn although we do feel extremely sorry. We do not mourn because Muslims are forbidden to mourn or to curse others.

Islam licenses celebrating one's birthday and thanking Allâhu ta'âlâ for this. Our master the Prophet 'sall-Allâhu ta'âlâ alaihi wa sallam' would fast on Mondays. When he was asked the reason, he stated, **"It is my birthday. I am fasting to show my gratitude."**

21- Birthday celebrations and holy nights should be observed in accordance with the Hijrî calendar. The thirty-seventh âyat of Tawba sûra purports, **"The number of months have been twelve since Allâhu ta'âlâ created heavens and earth. Four of them are months that are harâm. It is a powerful faith, [that is, it has been known since the times of Ibrâhîm and Ismâîl 'alaihis-salâm'], that these four months are harâm. Do not torment yourselves in these four months!"** That the four harâm months are Rajab, Zilqa'da, Zilhijja, and Muharram was informed by our master the Prophet. The twelve months are the Arabic months whereby hijrî years are calculated.

The thirty-eighth âyat of Tawba sûra purports, **"To postpone a month's being harâm to another month would only aggravate the state of disbelief. Disbelievers deviate in this matter. In order to equalize the number of months made harâm by Allâhu ta'âlâ, they make a harâm month halâl for one year and make it harâm again in another year. Thus they make halâl what Allah has made harâm."** Before Islam it was a common practice among the Arabs; when they wanted to make war in a harâm month, say, in Muharram, they would give the name Muharram to the month following the actual month of Muharram, giving in turn this second month's name to the month of Muharram. Thus the month immediately coming after Muharram would become the harâm month. This âyat-i-kerîma prohibited to change months' places. To say that the observed months move ten days forward each year would be a void explanation of the matter. A more correct explanation would be that the Arabic year whose months are mentioned in Qur'ân al-kerîm and used in the Islamic technicalities is ten days shorter than a solar year. The hijrî lunar new year is therefore ten days earlier than the hijrî solar and the Christian new years. Consequently, Muslims' holy days and nights are ten days earlier each year when they are calculated by solar

years. After all, Muslims' sacred days are calculated and arranged not by solar months, but by hijrî lunar months. This is a commandment of our religion. A sacred day of the year means a certain day of the Arabic month, not a certain day of the week. For instance, the Day of Ashûra means the tenth of Muharram. This day cannot be the same day of the week every year. It can as well be other days. However, there are sacred ones among the days of the week, too. For instance, Monday is a valuable day on account of its always being the day when happy events took place.

The tenth of Muharram is a sacred day for Muslims. Our master the Prophet informed that that day was a holy day. He gave the good news that abundant thawâb would be given for worships performed on that day. It became sunnat to fast that day.

In Islam solar months do not contain a certain holy day. For instance, the Nevruz day, which is the twentieth of March, the Hidirelles day, the sixth of May, and the Mihrican (Mihrgân) day, which is the twenty-second of September, are observed as holy days in some places. These days are valuable not in Islam, but among disbelievers, i.e. non-Muslims. So is the case with Christmas day and eve. **Durr-ul-mukhtâr**, while giving information on miscellaneous matters towards the end of its fifth book, treats this matter as follows: "It is not permissible to offer anything to anyone in honour of the days of Nevruz on Mihrgân. In other words, it is harâm to give presents in the name of these days or with the intention of observing these days. If a person does so because he respects these days, he becomes a disbeliever. For these days are respected by polytheists. Abul-Hafs-i-kebîr states that if a person worships Allâhu ta'âlâ for fifty years and then gives an egg as a present to a polytheist in honour of the Nevruz day, he will become a disbeliever. The thawâb for all the worships he has performed will become null and void. However, if he gives a present to a Muslim on this day without paying a special attention to this day or because he has to follow the custom, he will not become a disbeliever. Yet it would be safer to give the present one day earlier or later. If a person who bought on that day something which he would not buy on any other day did so because he respected that day, he would become a disbeliever. If he bought it only for consuming it without specially observing that day, he would not become a disbeliever."

22- Hurûfis allege that "The conflicts between Sunnites and Shiites, which have been continuing throughout centuries, originated from the vulgar curses put upon hadrat Alî 'kerrem

Allâhu wejheh' and his Ahl-i-Bayt in the time of a person accursed by Allah, namely Mu'âwiya the son of Sufyân." This statement of theirs is not only false, but also vulgarly ignorant and idiotic. People called Alevî in Turkey should not believe these lies. The Islamic history does not contain any event in the name of Sunnî-Alevî conflict. What took place in the name of Sunnite-Shiite conflict was a result of provocations done for political and imperialistic considerations. Sunnites have proven in their books that Shiites are wrong. In these books of theirs they have shown their respect and love for Alevîs. They have borne the name Alevî like a crown on their heads. For Alevî means Sayyeds and Sherîfs. In other words, our noble Prophet's descendants were called Alevî. Who would not love these Alevîs? Certainly we all love them. Enemies of Islam, upon seeing that Muslims loved Alevîs very much, called Hurûfîs Alevî in order to dupe Muslims. Hurûfîs curse the four Khalîfas and hadrat Mu'âwiya. Hadrat Mu'âwiya 'radiy-Allâhu anh' is one of the As-hâb of our master the Prophet. At the same time, he is the Prophet's brother-in-law. That is, he is one of the Ahl-i-Bayt of our master the Prophet. He is a champion of Islam who served as the governor of Damascus and performed Jihâd against the Byzantine Greek armies during the caliphates of hadrat 'Umar, hadrat 'Uthmân and hadrat Alî. Hadrat Hasan relinquished his right of caliphate to hadrat Mu'âwiya of his own volition. He would not have yielded his right to him if he had not thought he would be worthy of it. On the contrary, he would have fought him. To say that hadrat Hasan waived his right of caliphate to someone who did not deserve it would mean to vilify hadrat Hasan.

Our master the Prophet stated, **“Love my As-hâb! He who is hostile to my As-hâb, is hostile to me.”** It is for this reason that we true Muslims love hadrat Mu'âwiya very much. For we true Muslims love Muhammad's 'alaihi-salâm' Ahl-i-Bayt very much. People without a certain Madh-hab claim that they love hadrat Alî's Ahl-i-Bayt. They love the Ahl-i-Bayt for the sake of hadrat Alî. On the other hand, we true Muslims call them Muhammad's 'alaihi-salâm' Ahl-i-Bayt. We love the Ahl-i-Bayt for the sake of Muhammad 'alaihi-salâm'. And we love hadrat Alî because he is one of the Ahl-i-Bayt.

No Muslim has slandered or would slander Muhammad's 'alaihi-salâm' Ahl-i-Bayt. A few of the Umayyad Khalîfas and most of the Abbasid Khalîfas did not recognize the value of some of the descendants of the Ahl-i-Bayt. They hurt those blessed

people on account of some worldly differences. Yet they never swore at them or vilified them. And their hurting the Ahl-i-Bayt was because of some meddlesome, provocative heretics. Some politicians, whose aim was to obtain high positions, to wield power and thus to disturb Muslims and defile Islam from the interior, pretended to be supporters of the Ahl-i-Bayt in order to allure partisans for themselves and become powerful. They went in for politics in the name of the Imâms of Ahl-i-Bayt. They aroused fitna and turbulences. They did get their deserts in the end, of course; yet the sad conclusions had to be shared by the blessed innocent Imâms, too.

Hadrat Mu'âwiya 'radiy-Allâhu anh' had deep respect for the descendants of Ahl-i-Bayt, so that he would frequently give them presents.

People who were disrespectful towards some of the descendants of the Ahl-i-Bayt cannot be censured; and they are not to be called disbelievers, either. Some of these descendants treated one another disrespectfully, persecuted and even vilified one another. These facts could not be any grounds for us to criticize any one of them. Commenting on the mistakes of those people who conveyed to us the religious information we possess now, could not devolve on us.

Muslim Alevîs in Turkey are far from the detestable attributes possessed by these people who do not have a certain Madh-hab. The following historical document exemplifies the abhorrent, vicious attributes of these attackers.

It is stated as follows in a fatwâ recorded in the book **Behjet-ul-fatâwâ**, by Abdullah Efendi of Yenişehir, who was the fifty-seventh Shaikh-ul-islâm of the Ottoman State: "Is a person who imputes fornication to Âisha-i-Siddîqa 'radiy-Allâhu anhâ', Muslims' mother, and who swears at and vituperates hadrat Abû Bekr and hadrat 'Umar and denies the fact that they are rightly-guided Khalîfas and who imputes disbelief to most of the As-hâb-i-kirâm and says that the twelve Imâms are more virtuous than Prophets and asserts that it is mubâh (permissible) to kill Sunnite Muslims and holds many other wrong, heretical beliefs, within Muslim community or not? Is it legal (in Islam) to fight them, and what will their position be if they are killed in a fight of this sort?"

Answer: Hurûfis, who live in certain parts of Iran, Iraq and Syria, are without the Islamic community. They are apostates. It is wâjib to fight them. It is not permissible to leave them to muddle through on their own unless there is some strong necessity to do so

or some benefits are anticipated from doing so. When they die they are to go to Hell. Namâz of janâza should not be performed for them. They should not be buried in Muslim cemeteries.”

He states in his fatwâ which is recorded two pages ahead:

Answer: “Being called ‘Sayyed’ would not save a person from the state of apostasy.” People who are excessively hostile to the Ahl as-Sunna have been (erroneously) called Sayyed. These Sayyeds are not real Sayyeds.

May Allâhu ta’âlâ protect our Sunnî and Alevî brothers from falling for corrupt, separatist allegations. May He bless us all with the lot of being united in the right way and loving one another! Âmîn.

***O owners of majestic property!
Who’s the first owner of thine property?***

PART FIVE

O MY BROTHER! IF YOU WISH TO DIE IN ÎMÂN, YOU MUST LOVE THE AHL-I-BAYT AND THE AS-HÂB

PREFACE

May hamd be to Allâhu ta'âlâ! May salât and salâm be to Rasûlullah! May benedictions be over each of his pure Ahl-i-Bayt and his just and faithful As-hâb, champions of Islam!

Our Prophet 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wa sallam' stated that his Umma (Muslims) would break into seventy-three different groups, that seventy-two of these groups would go to Hell, and that the remaining one group would not enter Hell owing to the correct belief they would hold. Al-Imâm ar-Rabbânî, on the other hand, informs in his book **Mektûbât** that the worst among these seventy-two groups are those who traduce the As-hâb-i-kirâm. These people harbor a grudge against most of our Prophet's As-hâb 'ridwânullâhi ta'âlâ alaihim ajma'în', and vituperate them. What these people are, when and how they appeared, what methods they have followed, and the harms they have done to Islam are explicated in this book of ours.

These sacrilegious people, who set brothers against one another and provoked a number of bloodbaths in the Islamic history, culminated in their gruesome atrocities from time to time, only to be intercepted just in time by the Islamic Sultâns such as Timûr Khân (Tamerlane) and Yavuz Sultân Selîm Khân, who inflicted on them such punitive blows that they never regained their energy to go on with their malignant activities. Nevertheless, "Water may sleep, but the enemy never will. Therefore, always keep an eye on your enemy." For many centuries, we have been doing our worships peacefully in this blessed country of ours (Turkey), yet in recent years it has been seen that these people have appeared in different new appellations here and there, making speeches and writing books. They have been striving to mislead the people and surreptitiously spoil the entirely pure belief of the younger generation. They have been perpetrating separatist activities. They have been sowing discord among the people. Our religion, however, commands us to love one another and to be kind to all people.

Of all the books and newspapers sent to us by our brothers in Islam, two were the most consternating. Their contents were the disgusting calumniations and lies fabricated by people called **Hurûfî**, who are, in actual fact, the followers of a Jewish convert of Yemen named Abdullah bin Saba'. We shuddered as we read them. The thought that Muslims, especially our young and callow children, might hear these profane slanders, their pure hearts might be blemished and their true belief might be shocked, compelled us to spend many a sleepless night. Therefore we decided to disclose their harmful writings, confuting them one by one by means of powerful and authentic documents which we borrowed from most valuable books. The result was a book of forty-four paragraphs. We strongly hope that upon reading this book of ours, wise, reasonable and discreet youngsters will follow the sacred advice emanating from their conscience and thus will not believe these separatists. People who had fallen for the subversive and destructive allegations of Abdullah bin Saba' had been gradually decreasing in number, when an Iranian heretic named Fadlullah, adding some more blasphemous elements to his sacrilege and giving it the name Hurûfî sect, began to spread it again, and this new catastrophic trend was supported by Shâh Ismâ'îl Safawî. Fortunately, Sunnite and Shiite Muslims would not be taken in by them.

May Allâhu ta'âlâ keep us true to the belief taught by scholars of Ahl as-Sunna 'rahmatullâhi ta'âlâ alaihim ajma'in' and steady in the lightsome way guided by these superior people! May He protect us from falling for the lies and slanders of those nescient people who exploit our sacred religion as a means for their worldly advantages! May He bestow on us the fortune of loving one another, working together in the way shown by our religion and laws, and thus living in peace and comfort and in mutual brotherhood in this blessed country of ours! Âmin.

O MY BROTHER! IF YOU WISH TO DIE IN ÎMÂN YOU MUST LOVE THE AHL-I-BAYT AND THE AS-HÂB

We have received possession of a magazine and a book. The former was a magazine printed in the Autumn of 1967. Its pages contained political and historical articles. These articles were not surprising, inasmuch as there is freedom of thought. However, some of its pages consisted of lies and slanders told by a Jewish

convert of Yemen who was contemporary with hadrat 'Uthmân. The slanders were directed towards the As-hâb-i-kirâm 'ridwânullâhi ta'âlâ alaihim ajma'în'. The purposeful allegations, which were like venomous daggers thrust into Muslims' hearts, were by far more of destructive, deleterious and condemnatory propagandas than of mere statements of thoughts. They were bare criminal activities. They were reminiscent of the story of "a wolf in sheep's clothing." They were intended to mislead young people who would, so to speak, read and believe them to be true and thus brothers would be inimical towards one another. We realized how right our friends and acquaintances had been in trying to persuade us. We knew that the tasks of awakening our darling compatriots and separating right from wrong had been awaiting us.

As for the book; it was printed on first quality paper, covered with cloth binding, and it had a gilded and interesting title. It had been printed in Istanbul in 1968. Its contents page was in no way informative about the book. So we had to go through its pages. It was a book of 'Ilm-i-hâl (book teaching about Islam, its tenets, worships, etc.). And it went into some delicate matters, too. It was a subject of curiosity as to how it was going to cover all those matters. And all of a sudden the real subject came into our sight. It was those old allegations of the Jewish convert contemporary with hadrat 'Uthmân, and they were disguised in such a way that few people could recognize them. They were staged insidiously. Yâ Rabbî! What a grisly murder! They were like poison offered in a sweet covering. They had been prepared elaborately with utmost diligence. Yet the dose administered was considerably too much! It seemed necessary to answer them. In fact, it was a religious obligation. For a hadîth-i-sherîf, which is recorded in the first page of the book **Sawâ'iq-ul-muhriqa**, states, **"When fitna and fasâd (mischievousness, instigation, tumult) become widespread, when Muslims are misled, let those who know the truth tell it to others! Otherwise, may the curse of Allâhu ta'âlâ, of angels, and of all people be on them!"**

Trusting ourselves to Allâhu ta'âlâ, we begin with the Autumn magazine and answer the lies of its Hurûfî writer:

1- *"As hadrat Muhammad fought against the likes of Abû Sufyân (on the one hand) and against the irreligious Meccan notables on the other hand, so hadrat Alî struggled against the same types of irreligious people contemporary with him. As a matter of fact, the unbelievers had been harbouring a grudge and*

animosity towards hadrat Alî since the so-called earliest times,” he states.

Islamic scholars have given valuable answers to Hurûffîs’ slanders and innumerable books have been written to this effect. One of them is the book **Izâlat-ul-hafâ an khilâfat-il-khulafâ**, by Shâh Waliyyullah Dahlawî, one of India’s greatest Islamic scholars. Together with its Persian and Urdu versions, it comprises two books. It was reproduced in Pakistan in 1382 [A.D. 1962]. It explains in a splendid style and in detail how superior each and every one of the As-hâb-i-kirâm was. We shall give our response with the translation of a passage from the book **Tuhfa-i-Isnâ Ash’ariyya**, which was written in Persian by Abd-ul-’azîz ’Umarî Dahlawî. This scholar was Shâh Waliyyullah Ahmad Dahlawî’s son. He passed away in Delhi in 1239 [A.D. 1824]. The book **Tuhfa** exists in the library of the University of Istanbul with the code number 82024. Its Urdu version was printed in Pakistan. Abd-ul-’azîz Dahlawî states:

In a hadîth-i-sherîf reported by hadrat Abû Sa’îd-i-Hudrî, our Prophet ‘sall-Allâhu alaihi wa sallam’ says to hadrat Alî, **“As I fight over the revelation of Qur’ân al-kerîm, so you will fight over its interpretation.”** This hadîth-i-sherîf shows that Sunnites are right. For it informs that in the combats of Camel and Siffîn there will be disagreements in the interpretation of Qur’ân al-kerîm, that is, there will be different ijtihâds. Their quoting this hadîth-i-sherîf for refuting Sunnites is an indication of sheer ignorance. For this hadîth-i-sherîf shows that those who fought against hadrat Alî (in the combats of Camel and Siffîn) were wrong in their interpretation of Qur’ân al-kerîm. And it is a fact admitted by Shiites as well that wrong interpretation of Qur’ân al-kerîm is not a cause of disbelief.

2- *“While one of them was vying for the office of caliphate, putting forward his old age, another was fighting to bring others into subjection,”* he says.

With the expressions ‘old age’ and ‘vying for the office of caliphate’, he casts allusions to hadrat Abû Bekr. That hadrat Abû Bekr was elected Khalîfa by the unanimous vote of the Sahâba and that hadrat Alî said, “I know Abû Bekr is superior to us all,” are naked facts written in full detail in books by all scholars. Many a time the Messenger of Allah ‘sall-Allâhu alaihi wa sallam’ appointed hadrat Abû Bekr as the Emîr. After the Holy War of Uhud some intelligence arrived informing that Abû Sufyân was going to attack Medîna. Rasûlullah ‘sall-Allâhu alaihi

wa sallam' sent forth hadrat Abû Bekr for a counteroffensive. During the Holy War of Benî Nadîr, in the fourth year of the Hegira, one night he (the beloved Messenger of Allah) appointed hadrat Abû Bekr as the commander and he (himself) honoured his home with his blessed presence. In the sixth year he (the Prophet) appointed hadrat Abû Bekr as the Emîr and sent him forth against the tribe of Kûrâ'. During the preparations for the Holy War of Tabuk, he (Rasûlullah) first commanded that the army should assemble outside Medîna. He appointed hadrat Abû Bekr as their commander. His blessed head ached during the Holy War of Hayber. He therefore rested and sent forth hadrat Abû Bekr to deputize him (as the commander-in-chief) and conquer the fortress. That day hadrat Abû Bekr displayed great heroism. In the seventh year he (Rasûlullah) sent an army under hadrat Abû Bekr's command onto the tribe of Benî Kilâb. There was a bloody combat, whereupon hadrat Abû Bekr killed many unbelievers and captured many others. After the Holy War of Tabuk, intelligence arrived that heathen troops were concentrating in the valley of Reml for a sudden raid into Medîna. The Messenger of Allah 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wa sallam' gave the banner to hadrat Abû Bekr, appointing him as the Emîr over the army. Hadrat Abû Bekr took on the task and routed the enemy utterly. They received intelligence reporting insurrection among the tribe of Benî Amr. So Rasûlullah honoured the place with his blessed presence in the afternoon. He stated to Bilâl (Habashî), **"Should I be late for the namâz, tell Abû Bekr to conduct the namâz (in jama'at) for My Sahâba."** In the ninth year he sent his Sahâba for Hajj, appointing hadrat Abû Bekr as their Emîr. There is no one unaware of the fact that towards his (Rasûlullah's) death he appointed hadrat Abû Bekr as the imâm for his Sahâba and the latter carried on this task from Thursday evening till Monday morning.

When the Prophet did not appoint hadrat Abû Bekr as Emîr, he would at least make him his vizier and field marshal. He would not manage religious affairs without his counsel. Hâkim, a scholar of Hadîth, reports from hadrat Huzayfat-ebni-Yemân: One day Rasûlullah 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wa sallam' said, **"As Îsâ 'alaihi-salâm' sent his Hawârîs far and wide, so I want to send my As-hâb to distant countries so that they teach Islam and its injunctions."** When we suggested, "O the Messenger of Allah! You have Sahâbîs who are capable of doing this task, such as Abû Bekr and 'Umar," he stated, **"I cannot do without them. They are like my**

sight and hearing.” He stated in another hadîth-i-sherîf, **“Allâhu ta’âlâ has bestowed four viziers on me. Two of them, Abû Bekr and ‘Umar, are on the earth. The other two, Jebrâil and Mikâil, are in heaven.”** If having not been appointed as Emîr frequently had been indicative of inaptitude for being an Imâm, hadrat Hasan and Huseyn would not have qualified as Imâm. Hadrat Alî never sent them away on any expeditions or wars during his caliphate. On the other hand, he would frequently appoint their paternal brother Muhammad bin Hanafiyya as Emîr. When Muhammad was asked the reason for this he said, “They are like my father’s eyes. I am like his hands and feet.”

Muhammad bin Uqayl bin Ebî Tâlib relates: One day my (paternal) uncle hadrat Alî ‘radiy-Allâhu anh’ said as he was making a (speech called) khutba, “O Muslims! Who is the bravest one among the Sahâba?” “O Emîr al-mu’minîn! It is you,” was my answer. “No,” he said. “Abû Bekr as-Siddîq is the bravest one among us. During the Holy War of Bedr we made a brushwood shelter for Rasûlullah ‘sall-Allâhu alaihi wa sallam’. We were asking one another which one of us was to stand guard in front of the shelter to protect it against the unbelievers’ attacks, when Abû Bekr sprang up in such alacrity as to leave hardly any time for anyone else to volunteer, drew his sword, and began to beat around the shelter. The enemy concentrated its attacks on the shelter. Yet Abû Bekr would not let any unbeliever approach the shelter, killing or wounding anyone who would try to do so.”

On the other hand, with the expression, “struggling to bring others into subjection,” he casts an allusion to hadrat ‘Umar. However, hadrat ‘Umar ‘radiy-Allâhu anh’ was influential in hadrat Abû Bekr’s becoming Khalîfa not by fighting but owing to his effective speech. Thus he protected Muslims against great catastrophic events. Later, upon hadrat Abû Bekr’s will and with the people’s unanimous vote, he became Khalîfa despite his disinclination.

3- *“One of them was hearing hadrat Alî, hadrat Hasan, hadrat Huseyn and Salmân Fârisî as witnesses for the case of (the date orchard called) Fedek, and then seizing the orchard from hadrat Fâtîmat-uz-Zehrâ, discrediting the testimonies given by the Ahl-i-Bayt,”* he says.

These remarks are intended to attack hadrat Abû Bekr ‘radiy-Allâhu ta’âlâ anh’. Would it be possible to cover the sun with mud? See below how elegantly the book **Tuhfa** confutes this slanderous fabrication and reproaches Hurûfîs:

When a Prophet passes away, the property he leaves behind is not inherited by anybody. This fact is written in Shiite books as well. It would have been irrational to make a will on uninheritable property. Consequently, it would be wrong to say that Rasûlullah ‘sall-Allâhu alaihi wa sallam’ bequeathed the orchard called Fedek to hadrat Fâtima. For Rasûlullah ‘sall-Allâhu alaihi wa sallam’ would not have done something which would have been wrong. It is stated in a hadîth-i-sherîf, **“What we leave behind is to become alms.”** The so-called allegation of will could not be true in spite of this hadîth-i-sherîf. If there had been such a will and hadrat Abû Bekr had not heard about it, he would have been held excusable unless it had been proven by testimony. If there had been such a will and hadrat Alî had known about it, it would have been necessary and permissible for him to fulfil it during his caliphate. However, he followed hadrat Abû Bekr’s example and dealt the property out to poor, destitute and stranded people. If it should be maintained that he dealt out his share, then why did he deprive hadrat Hasan and Huseyn ‘radiy-Allâhu anhumâ’ of the property they were to inherit from their blessed mother? Shiites answer this question in four different ways:

1) “Members of the Ahl-i-Bayt will not resume property usurped from them. As a matter of fact, when Rasûlullah ‘sall-Allâhu alaihi wa sallam’ conquered Mekka, he did not take his home back from the Meccans who had usurped it from him,” they say.

This answer of theirs is not sound. ‘Umar bin Abd-ul-‘azîz, during his caliphate, gave the orchard called Fedek to Imâm Muhammad Bâqir, who accepted it, so that it was possessed by the Imâms until it was seized by Abbasid Khalîfas. Then, in the two hundred and third year of the Hegira, Khalîfa Me’mûn wrote to his official Qusam bin Ja’fer and thus the orchard was given again to one of the Imâms, namely to Imâm Alî Ridâ, and upon his death the same year, it was given to Yahyâ, a grandson of Zeyd, who was hadrat Huseyn’s grandson. This person should not be mistaken for his namesake, Zeyd, who was hadrat Sayyidat Nefîsa’s grandfather and at the same time hadrat Hasan’s son. The orchard was usurped again by Khalîfa Mutawakkil, who was Me’mûn’s grandson. Later on Mu’tadid gave it back again. If members of the Ahl-i-Bayt would not take back their usurped property, why did these Imâms, (who were members of the Ahl-i-Bayt), take the orchard back? By the same token, it is asserted that hadrat Abû Bekr usurped the office of caliphate which

belonged to hadrat Alî by rights ‘radiy-Allâhu anhumâ’. Why did hadrat Alî accept this usurped right later? Furthermore, why did hadrat Huseyn ‘radiy-Allâhu ta’âlâ anh’ try to win his usurped right of caliphate back from Yezîd so earnestly that he attained martyrdom in the end?

2) “Hadrat Alî imitated hadrat Fâtima ‘radiy-Allâhu anhumâ’ and did not accept any share from Fedek,” they say.

This answer of theirs is even more unsound. Then why did the Imâmns who accepted Fedek (afterwards) not imitate hadrat Fâtima? If it was a farz to imitate her, why did they ignore this farz? If it was supererogatory and not farz, then why did hadrat Alî do this supererogatory act at the cost of omitting an act that was farz? For it is farz to give everyone his or her due. Moreover, it might be reasonable to imitate someone’s optional behaviour. If this behaviour is a result of coercion it should not be imitated. If hadrat Fâtima’s ‘radiy-Allâhu ta’âlâ anhâ’ not utilizing Fedek was due to someone else’s oppression, then she had to waive her right because she had no other way. In this case it would have been senseless to imitate her.

3) “Hadrat Alî ‘radiy-Allâhu ta’âlâ’ had witnessed Fedek’s being bequeathed to hadrat Fâtima. In order to show that this witnessing was done for Allah’s sake and not for worldly advantages, he did not accept any advantage from Fedek,” they say.

This answer of theirs is weak, too. Those who knew about hadrat Alî’s witnessing and those who rejected it were dead by the time he became Khalîfa. Furthermore, some Imâmns’ accepting the orchard named Fedek made the group called Khârijî consider that hadrat Alî might have done this witnessing in order to obtain advantages for his children. In fact, in matters concerning real estates, such as fields, houses, vineyards and orchards, one thinks of one’s children’s advantages rather than one’s own. Perhaps, hadrat Alî might have advised his children not to utilize Fedek lest his witnessing be tarnished. And his children might have refused Fedek both to imitate hadrat Fâtima and to fulfil this secret advice. Such is scholars’ commentation on the matter.

4) “Hadrat Alî’s not accepting the orchard called Fedek was intended for Taqiyya. **Taqiyya** is necessary for Shiites,” they say. Taqiyya means to get on well with people one does not like.

This statement of theirs is untenable, too. For, according to Shiites, “when an Imâm takes the battlefield and begins to fight it

is harâm for him to do Taqiyya. It was for this reason that hadrat Huseyn did not do Taqiyya.” To say that hadrat Alî did Taqiyya during his caliphate would mean to say that he committed harâm.

Ibni Mutahhir Hullî, a Shiite scholar, states in his book **Menhej-ul-kerâmâ**, “When Fâtima said to Abû Bekr that Fedek had been bequeathed to her, Abû Bekr wrote an answer asking for witnesses. When no witnesses were produced he dismissed the case.” If this report is correct, the case of Fedek, like any other case pertaining to inheritance, gifting or bequeathing, lapses from hadrat Abû Bekr ‘radiy-Allâhu anh’. So there is no reason for blaming hadrat Abû Bekr. At this point two questions occur:

A- The cases of inheritance, gift and will pleaded by hadrat Fâtima were found wrong by hadrat Abû Bekr, but why did he not prefer to please her by giving her the orchard she demanded? Thus the problem would have been settled by mutual concession, she would not have been offended, and there would not have been so many rumours.

This matter cost hadrat Abû Bekr very much hard thought and heavy excruciation, and he really did want to solve it in the manner suggested above. If he had chosen to appease hadrat Fâtima’s blessed heart by this way, two grave wounds would have gaped in Islam: people would have gossiped about him, saying, for instance, that “The Khalîfa shows favouritism in religious affairs. He prefers pleasing his acquaintances to doing justice. He fulfils his friends’ wishes in a case that has been lost. When it comes to workers and peasants, he makes all sorts of difficulty with respect to documents and witnesses before they win a case.” Such gossips, when widespread, would have caused tumults that would last till the end of the world. Moreover, judges and qâdîs would have followed the Khalîfa’s example, showing indulgence and partiality in their decisions. As for the second wound; if he had donated the orchard of Fedek to hadrat Fâtima, he would have made her repossess something of which the Messenger of Allah had dispossessed his inheritors of by saying that property left from Prophets is alms. He did not do so because he knew about the hadîth-i-sherîf that warned, “**A person who takes the alms (he has given before) back is like a dog eating its tale.**” He would not commit such a dreadful act deliberately. Aside from these two wounds which the Islamic religion would have suffered, a number of worldly problems would have emerged, too. Hadrat Abbâs and Rasûlullah’s blessed wives would have sued for their rights, too, each demanding a similar orchard or farm. All these problems

would have produced other problems which in turn would have been too difficult for hadrat Abû Bekr to cope with. He therefore risked the grief of having been unable to please hadrat Fâtima than venture upon these various catastrophic adventures. It is stated in a hadîth-i-sherîf, **“When a Believer confronts a dilemma, let him choose the alternative which seems less unwelcome.”** Hadrat Abû Bekr did so. For this alternative was remediable. And it was remedied, too. The other alternative, on the other hand, would have caused incurable wounds. Religious matters would have become complicated.

B- As for the second question: It is stated in both Sunnite and Shiite books that this disagreement between hadrat Abû Bekr and hadrat Fâtima ‘radiy-Allâhu ta’âlâ anhumâ’ was settled. Yet why did Fâtima-t-uz-zehrâ wish that hadrat Abû Bekr not attend her funeral? And why did she request in her last will that hadrat Alî bury her at night (after her death)?

This we would answer as follows: hadrat Fâtîma’s wish to be buried at night was a result of her excessive feeling of shame. As a matter of fact, she stated towards her death, “I feel very much shame whenever I remember that when I die they will take me among men without any cover.” In those days it was customary to wrap a dead woman’s corpse in a shroud only, so that the corpse in the shroud would be taken out of the coffin without any cover. Esmâ binti Umeyr relates: “One day I told her that I had seen people interlace date branches like weaving tents in Abyssinia. Hadrat Fâtîma said, ‘Let me see you do it.’ When I did it to show her, she liked it very much and smiled. She had never been seen smiling since Rasûlullah’s passing away. She made this will to me: ‘When I am dead, you wash me. Let Alî be present too. Do not let anyone else in.’ ” It was for this reason that hadrat Alî did not invite anyone to her funeral. According to a narration, after performing the namâz of janâza for her, (hadrat Alî), hadrat Abbâs and a few other members of the Ahl-i-Bayt buried her at night. According to other narratives, the following day Abû Bekr Siddîq, ‘Umar Fârûq and many other Sahâbîs came to hadrat Alî’s house to pay a visit of well-wishing. When they knew that hadrat Fâtîma had passed away and had already been buried, they expressed their sorrow, saying, “Why didn’t you send for us so that we could perform the (janâza) namâz for her and help the funeral services?” Hadrat Alî apologized and said that he had done so to carry out her will to be buried at night lest other men should see her. It is stated in the book **Fasl-ul-hitâb**: Abû Bekr as-Siddîq and

'Uthmân Zinnûreyn and Abd-ur-Rahmân bin Awf and Zubeyr bin Awwâm were in the mosque for night prayer, when (they heard that) hadrat Fâtima had passed away some time between evening and night prayers. It was the second day of the blessed month of Ramadân and the following day was Tuesday. She was twenty-four years old and the Messenger of Allah (her blessed, beloved father) had passed away only six months before. Upon hadrat Alî's request, hadrat Abû Bekr became the imâm and conducted the namâz (of janâza) for her with four tekbîrs:

Hadrat Abû Bekr's not being present at the burial was for the reasons explained above. If there had been disagreement between them, hadrat Abû Bekr would not have conducted the namâz of janâza for her. According to a report, which is written in Shiite books as well as in Sunnite ones, hadrat Huseyn beckoned to hadrat Sa'îd bin Âs, who was hadrat Mu'âwiya's governor in the blessed city of Medîna, to conduct the namâz of janâza for (his elder brother) Imâm Hasan, and said, "Were it not the sunna of my grandfather (Rasûlullah) that the Emîr should conduct the namâz of janâza, I would not let you conduct it." Hence, hadrat Fâtima did not state in her last will that hadrat Abû Bekr should not conduct the namâz for her. If she had made such a will, hadrat Huseyn would not have done something contrary to this will of hadrat Fâtima's. It is obvious that Sa'îd bin Âs was thousands of times lower than hadrat Abû Bekr in being an imâm. Only six months earlier hadrat Fâtima's superior father, Rasûlullah 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wa sallam' had appointed hadrat Abû Bekr as the imâm (to conduct the namâz in jamâ'at) in front of all the Muhâjirs and Ansârs. Hadrat Fâtima could not have forgotten this in such a short time as six months.

4- *"One of them broke the ribs and the arm of this beloved child of the Messenger of Allah. Not only that. Attacking our mother hadrat Fâtima because she refused to see his black face and tried to shut the door to him, he said, "I will burn and destroy your house if you do not pay homage." Pressing that defenceless mother between the door and the wall, he caused the (expected) innocent and pure baby, which had already been named Muhsîn, to be lost,"* he says.

Hasan Qusûrî attributes these lies to two books titled Najm-ul-qulûb and Qumru and alleged to have been written by a person named Dışıklı Hasan Efendi.

Through these slanders he strives to give a shock to those hearts that are full with love and respect for the noble Emîr of

Muslims, i.e. for our master hadrat 'Umar-ul-Fârûq 'radiy-Allâhu anh', who is very much loved by Muslims, who is praised and lauded in âyat-i-kerîmas, who was given the good news through hadîth-i-sherîfs that he would go to Paradise, and whose justice, honour and fame occupy vast spaces in the world's histories. Since the person he puts forward is not among scholars, neither Sunnite nor Shiite, and the two books he names appear to exist only in his repertory, we shall not smear our pen with them. Let us harken to what the book **Tuhfa** says in answer to these sordid lies:

These lies of Hurûffis meet with outright objection, not only by the Ahl as-sunna, but also on the part of Shiites, who acknowledge that they have been spread by a few lowly, ignoble, shameless heretics. Shiites, however, have insisted in their aberrant credo by saying, "He wished to burn the house, but he did not attempt to do it." On the other hand, wishing is a feeling, which in turn is the heart's business. No one except Allâhu ta'âlâ can know this. If these aberrant people mean to say that "He said he would burn the house in order to threaten them," yes, hadrat 'Umar threatened a few people by saying so. These people had crowded around hadrat Fâtima's house. "No one can harm us as long as we are here," they were saying. Their purpose was to disarray the caliphate election by arising fitna and tumult. Their noise annoyed hadrat Fâtima very much. Yet her excessive feeling of shame would not let her hold out her head and tell them to leave the place. At that moment 'Umar-ul-Fârûq, who was passing by, saw them and knew at once what was going on. In order to frighten them away, he said, "I'll pull the house down on you." This type of threat was customary in Arabia. As a matter of fact, Rasûlullah 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wa sallam' stated, **"If they do not rid themselves of this remissness I shall pull their houses on them,"** in order to warn those who would not attend public prayers of namâz. Hadrat Abû Bekr had been appointed by our master the Messenger of Allah 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wa sallam' as the imâm to conduct the public prayers of namâz. Some people, who considered that they might as well not follow him, did not join the jamâ'at. So Rasûlullah 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wa sallam' threatened them. Therefore, this statement of hadrat 'Umar's possesses expressive subtlety. Moreover, on the day when Mekka was conquered, an unbeliever named Ibn Hatal was reported to have been reciting poems of vituperation against our master the Prophet. Lest he should be punished, the heathen took asylum in Ka'ba-i-muazzama and hid himself under its cover. **"Do not**

hesitate. Kill him there, right away!” was the blessed Prophet’s order. When people who were against the religion of Allâhu ta’âlâ could not take asylum in the home of Allah, how could they take shelter behind hadrat Fâtima’s wall? How could it be possible for hadrat Fâtima not to feel worried about their sheltering there? For that pure daughter of the Messenger of Allah ‘radiy-Allâhu ta’âlâ anhâ’ had equipped herself with the beautiful moral values exemplified by Allâhu ta’âlâ. Also, authentic reports show that hadrat Fâtima, too, ordered them to leave the place.

When hadrat Alî became Khalîfa upon hadrat ‘Uthmân’s ‘radiy-Allâhu anh’ martyrdom, a few people from Mekka went to Medîna in order to cause tumult. Taking refuge in the home of hadrat Âisha the mother of Believers, they demanded retaliation against hadrat ‘Uthmân’s murderers and stated that they were ready for combat. There was not a single member of the As-hâbi-kirâm among them. As soon as hadrat Alî was reported to about this, he had these men killed there. He did not consider that doing so would be an act of irreverence towards the blessed wife of the Messenger of Allah. The statement which hadrat ‘Umar made as a mere threat would be quite insignificant when compared with this behaviour against the sacred wife of the Messenger of Allah were it considered as a sacrilege. Yes, hadrat Alî’s action was quite appropriate. He could not be expected to observe such insignificant subtleties while suppressing a fitna and instigation which would otherwise have infected all Muslims. If he had observed these trivialities at the cost of not nipping the fitna in the bud, all the religious and worldly states of affairs would have been jumbled into a mess. Respect was due not only to hadrat Fâtima’s house but also to the blessed wife of the Messenger of Allah. All hadrat ‘Umar did was to make a few dissuasive remarks. He did not take action. Hadrat Alî, on the other hand, took the gravest action. Since hadrat ‘Umar’s remarks were far less momentous than hadrat Alî’s action, censuring him on account of his remarks could be nothing but sheer bigotry and obduracy. Scholars of Ahl as-sunna say that hadrat Alî was the Khalîfa and therefore did not observe the respect due to hadrat Âisha because the people’s future was at stake. They do not justify criticizing him. According to Hurûffis’ lies, on the other hand, because hadrat Abû Bekr’s caliphate was not rightful it was a very grave sin to defend him at the sacrifice of the respect due towards hadrat Fâtima’s house. This opinion of theirs is the expression of an extremely ignorant and idiotic thought. For both caliphates were rightful according to

the Ahl as-Sunna. Furthermore, hadrat 'Umar knew that hadrat Abû Bekr's caliphate was rightful and no one was against his caliphate. It was the earliest days of Islam yet and the young tree of religion and faith was sprouting. Those who attempted to impair this rightful caliphatic order and thus to raise fitna and confusion deserved to be killed. And yet hadrat 'Umar only tried to dissuade them by verbal threat. Why should he be blamed for it? Another appalling paradox is some Shiite scholars' stating that Zubeyr bin Awwâm, the son of Rasûlullah's paternal aunt, was among those youngsters who were threatened by hadrat 'Umar. Do not these people ever think? How could it be possible that Zubeyr bin Awwâm, who was some time later killed on account of the harsh talks he made concerning the retaliation he and his friends demanded upon the martyrdom of hadrat 'Uthmân, not be blamed for being among the mutineers? While his arousing fitna and attempting instigation in hadrat Fâtima's house is tolerated, why is it considered a grave felony for him to complain about hadrat 'Uthmân's murderers in the presence of hadrat Âisha and to demand retaliation against them 'radiy-Allâhu ta'âlâ anhum ajma'in'? These inconsistencies are all results of wrong beliefs.

Performing the namâz in jamâ'at is for one's personal benefit. A person's not joining the jamâ'at will not harm any other Muslim. However, Rasûlullah 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wa sallam' threatened those who would not join the jamâ'at with pulling their houses down on them. Then, why should it not be permissible for hadrat 'Umar to threaten with burning their houses those instigators whose mutiny would have otherwise infected all Muslims and damaged Islam thoroughly? Our master the Messenger of Allah 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wa sallam' did not honour hadrat Fâtima's house with his blessed presence till after the curtains with pictures of living creatures on them had been removed. In fact, he would not enter Ka'ba-i-mu'azzama unless the statues which were said to be of hadrat Ibrâhîm and hadrat Ismâ'îl were taken out. Why should hadrat 'Umar be blamed for threatening the instigators with "pulling the house down on them" in order to dissuade them from arousing a strife near hadrat Fâtima's blessed and sacred thouse? If it should be said that he should have observed the rules of manner and should not have done this threat; no one can observe the rules of manner at times of very important problems and serious dangers. For instance, hadrat Alî 'radiy-Allâhu anh' did not observe the rules of manner

due to hadrat Âisha-i-Siddîqa. As it is seen, even the Shiite sect does not justify vituperating or criticizing hadrat 'Umar on account of behaviour agreeable with that of the innocent imâm (hadrat Alî).

5- *“The oppressors carried on their cruelty. Another one conferred governorship on his step brother, the ignoble and frothy-mouthed person named Uqba bin Walîd, who had spat at the face of the Messenger of Allah. On the other hand, he promoted people who had been banished by the Messenger of Allah to positions secondary to caliphate. He revenged for all these by throwing, and having others throw, arrows at the coffin of hadrat Hasan-i-Mujtabâ,”* he says.

This time he attacks 'Uthmân Zinnûreyn 'radiy-Allâhu anh'. Fortunately, the loop he tries to put round the neck of the Ahl as-sunna catches him by the feet and destroys him. He reveals his ignorance by attacking the third Khalîfa through the false accusation that he appointed his step brother Uqba bin Walîd as a governor although that person had spat at Rasûlullah's face. For one thing, the person who threw his filthy saliva at the blessed face of the Messenger of Allah was Utayba, Abû Leheb's son. Abû Leheb, who was hadrat Alî's paternal uncle, was an implacable enemy of the Messenger of Allah. When the **Tabbet yadâ** sûra was revealed to inform that this person and his wife Umm-i-Jemîl, who had heaped thorns in front of the door of Rasûlullah's house, would go to Hell, he went all the more berserk. He sent for his sons Utba and Utayba and ordered them to divorce Rasûlullah's daughters. These two villains were polytheists and missed the very high honour of becoming sons-in-law to the Messenger of Allah. Utayba not only divorced Umm-i-Ghulthum 'radiy-Allâhu anhâ', but also entered the blessed presence of the Messenger of Allah and said, “I do not believe you. I do not like you. And you do not like me, either. So I divorce your daughter.” He attacked the Messenger of Allah, pulled his blessed collar and tore his shirt. Pouring down his repulsive saliva, he went away. Rasûlullah 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wa sallam' supplicated to Allâhu ta'âlâ, **“Yâ Rabbî! Send one of Thine wild beasts onto this man!”** Jenâb-i-Haqq accepted the prayer of His Prophet. This abominable person was travelling to Damascus, when his caravan stopped to spend the night at a place called **Zerqa**. As everyone was asleep, a lion smelled him out and tore him to pieces, and only him in the group. It was before their wedding when these ignoble people divorced the two blessed

beauties. Their purpose was to put the Messenger of Allah into financial straits. Yet hadrat 'Uthmân 'radiy-Allâhu anh' seized the opportunity, marrying hadrat Ruqayya divorced by Utba virginal as she was and attaining the honour of becoming Rasûlullah's son-in-law. Hadrat 'Uthmân was very good looking. He was blonde haired and white complexioned. And he was much richer than Abû Leheb's bastards. Another person who tormented Rasûlullah very much was Uqba bin Ebî Muayt. The Messenger of Allah was performing namâz in the Mesjîd-i-harâm, when this villain came and put animal stomachs on his blessed head. At another time he attacked him and squeezed his blessed throat with his blessed shirt. Hadrat Abû Bekr, who was passing by, saw this and helped the Messenger of Allah, reproaching the unbeliever, "Are you killing a person who says: Allah is my Rabb?" Rasûlullah 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wa sallam' named the unbelievers being there and supplicated to Allâhu ta'âlâ, "**Yâ Rabbî! Put these people into a hole of torment in the ground!**" Abdullah Ibni Mes'ûd relates, "In the Holy War of Bedr I saw all these people being killed and thrown into a hole in the ground. Only Uqba bin Ebî Muayt was killed on his way back from the Holy War." As is seen, the unbelievers named Utayba and Uqba, who persecuted Rasûlullah 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wa sallam' very much, did not live long enough to see the times of Khalîfas. They went to Hell before. The allegation that the Khalîfa promoted them to caliphate is an acknowledgement of ignorance.

Yes, hadrat Mu'âwiya 'radiy-Allâhu anh' appointed his brother Utba's son as the governor of Medîna. Yet his name was Walîd bin Utba. After Walîd became governor in the year 57, he respected hadrat Huseyn and many other Sahâbîs very highly. In fact, when Yezîd became Khalîfa, he dismissed Walîd from office for failing to execute his order that the people of Medîna be made to obey him and setting hadrat Huseyn free.

It is obvious that this writing in the autumn magazine is an aspersion cast on hadrat 'Uthmân 'radiy-Allâhu anh'. For hadrat 'Uthmân appointed his step brother, that is, his brother from the same mother, as Emîr of Kûfa. Yet, contrary to this author's allegation, he was not Uqba bin Walîd. He was Walîd bin Uqba. That is, he was the son of the unbeliever named Uqba. He writes the name the other way round. This Walîd became a Believer at the conquest of Mekka. He was not the person who committed the despicable deed. In the ninth year (of the Hegira) the Messenger of Allah gave him the duty of collecting zakât from (the tribe of)

Benî Mustalaq. Supposing that the author confuses names, we shall answer this, too.

Sa'd Ibnî Ebî Waqqas 'radiy-Allâhu anh' borrowed some property from Abdullah Ibnî Mes'ûd 'radiy-Allâhu anh', who was in charge of the Bayt-ul-mâl (Treasury Department of the Islamic government). He failed to pay it back. This matter became a public rumour that spread throughout the city of Kûfa. Upon hearing about this, 'Uthmân 'radiy-Allâhu anh', who was the Khalîfa at that time, dismissed hadrat Sa'd from office as the Emîr. He appointed Walîd, whom he trusted, for his place. Walîd was a person gifted with administrative talents. He put an end to the gossips. He managed to become popular among the people. The people of Azerbaijan rose in rebellion. Walîd recruited soldiers and appointed competent commanders for the dispatch of troops. Hadrat Huzayfa-i-Yemânî, the Emîr of Medayn, joined the army, too. Walîd himself commanded the army and quelled the insurrection. Performing ghazâ against disbelievers, he obtained many booties. Intelligence came that a great Byzantine army was approaching towards Sivas and Malatya. Walîd sent forth Iraqi forces to help the Damascene forces. Many places were conquered in Anatolia. In the thirtieth year of the Hegira, those who envied Walîd brought a complaint against him to hadrat Abdullah Ibnî Mes'ûd, saying that he was addicted to alcohol. When Abdullah Ibnî Mes'ûd rejected the complaint he said that he "would not take action against a person who did not sin in public," they made another complaint, this time to the Khalîfa. Hadrat 'Uthmân called Walîd to Medîna. An investigation was conducted and it was found out that Walîd was a wine drinker. He was chastised with what was termed **Hadd** in the Islamic penal code, and Sa'îd bin Âs was appointed for his place. Earlier, Walîd had been assigned a duty in Jazîra by hadrat 'Umar. Later on we shall give detailed information about the governors appointed by hadrat 'Uthmân 'radiy-Allâhu ta'âlâ anh'. As for the slander that they threw arrows at hadrat Hasan's coffin; it is one of the blatant lies fabricated by Hurûffis, enemies of the Ahl as-Sunna. The truth is as follows, as it is communicated in the book **Qisâs-i-Enbiyâ**:

In the forty-ninth year of the Hegira Hadrat Huseyn 'radiy-Allâhu anh' was preparing to bury (the corpse of) his elder brother hadrat Hasan in the Hujra-i-sa'âdat, when Merwan, who had been dismissed from some office and was dwelling in Medîna, said that they would not let anyone to be buried there. He

gathered around himself all the Umayyads living in Medîna. Upon this the Hashimites took up arms to fight them. So hadrat Huseyn, advised by Abû Hureyra ‘radiy-Allâhu anhumâ’, took his brother to the cemetery of **Bâkî’**, thus preventing a tumult. Sa’îd bin Âs, the governor of Medîna, who was an Umayyad, attended the funeral. As it was customary, he conducted the namâz of janâza.

Another writer who criticizes hadrat ‘Uthmân ‘radiy-Allâhu anh’ is an Egyptian named Sayyed Qutb, whose style of criticism betrays the fact that he was misled by the Hurûfî publications. This man, who is being represented as an Islamic scholar, a mujtahid, and whose books are being translated into Turkish (and English) and proposed to the younger generation by a certain group of people, calumniates this blessed Khalîfa, who is loved very much by Muslims, through a very sordid and profane language in the hundred and eighty-sixth and later pages of his book **Al-adâlat-ul-Ijtimâ’iy-yat-u-fi-l-islâm**, printed in 1377 (A.D. 1958). Our Islamic education would not let us quote all his slanders. We shall therefore translate only a few lines from a few pages:

“‘Uthmân’s taking the office of caliphate at such an old age was an unfortunate event. He was incapable of administering Muslims’ matters. He was vulnerable to Merwân’s tricks and to the stratagems of Umayyads. He spent Muslims’ property in a haphazard way. This conduct of his was often a subject of common gossip. He appointed his relatives to positions to preside over the people. Among them was Hakem, who had been dismissed by Rasûlullah. When he married his son to the daughter of this man’s son Hâris, he gave them two hundred dirhams as a gift from the Bayt-ul-mâl. The following morning the treasurer of Bayt-ul-mâl Zeyd bin Erqam came to him, weeping, and asked to be dismissed from office. Realizing that Zeyd decided to resign because he (hadrat ‘Uthmân) was transferring property from the Bayt-ul-mâl to his relatives, he asked him, ‘Are you weeping because I am doing favours to my relatives?’ ‘No,’ was Zeyd’s answer. ‘I am weeping because I think you are taking these things in return for the property you donated for the sake of Allah when Rasûlullah was alive.’ Angered by this answer, ‘Uthmân said, ‘Leave the keys belonging to the Bayt-ul-mâl and go! I shall find someone else.’ There are many other events exemplifying ‘Uthmân’s extravagance. He gave six hundred thousand dirhams to Zubeyr, two hundred thousand to Talha, and one - fifth of the taxes

collected from Africa to Merwân. He was reproached for this behaviour by the Sahâba, particularly by Alî bin Ebî Tâlib.

“He enlarged Mu’âwiya’s personal property and gave Palestine to him. He appointed Hakem and his foster brother Abdullah bin Sa’d and his other relatives as governors. Seeing that he was gradually getting away from Islam’s essence, the Sahâba assembled in Medîna. The Khalîfa was very old and weary and things were in Merwân’s control. The people sent Alî bin Ebî Tâlib to advise ‘Uthmân. There was a long talk between them. ‘Uthmân asked, ‘Wasn’t Mughîra, who is a governor now, a governor in ‘Umar’s time, too?’ ‘Yes, he was,’ was Alî’s answer. ‘Uthmân asked again, ‘Didn’t ‘Umar appoint Mu’âwiya as a governor throughout his caliphate?’ Alî answered, ‘Yes, he did. But Mu’âwiya feared ‘Umar very much. Now he is carrying on intrigues without you knowing. He is doing all these by saying that they are your orders. You hear about all these but do not say anything to Mu’âwiya.’ In the time of ‘Uthmân right and wrong, good and bad were mixed with each other. If ‘Uthmân had become Khalîfa earlier he would have been young enough. If he had held the office later, that is, if Alî had become Khalîfa instead of him, it would have been better because in that case the Umayyads would not have interfered,” he says. Then he vituperates the Islamic Khalîfas, particularly hadrat Mu’âwiya, asserts that they squandered the Bayt-ul-mâl for their personal pleasures and dissipations, and adds that all these things were caused by hadrat ‘Uthmân.

It is proven with documents in the book **Tuhfa** that these allegations of Sayyed Outb’s are false and wrong. Hadrat ‘Uthmân ‘radiy-Allâhu anh’ was elected Khalîfa through the unanimous vote of the As-hâb-i-kirâm. And hadrat Alî was among those who voted for him. By censuring hadrat ‘Uthmân, Sayyed Qutb opposes the unanimity of the As-hâb-i-kirâm and even the hadîth-i-sherîf which states, “**My Ummat (Muslims) will not agree on something wrong.**”

It is stated as follows in the book **Mir’ât-i-kâinat**: “Hadrat ‘Uthmân bin Affân bin Ebil’âs bin Umayya bin ‘Abd-i-Shems bin ‘Abd-i-Menâf bin Quzay, who was the third Khalîfa, was the fourth man to have îmân in the Messenger of Allah. When hadrat ‘Uthmân’s paternal uncle Hakem bin Ebil’âs tied him and told him that he was not going to untie him unless he returned to his grandparents’ religion, he said he would rather die than go back (to the former false religion). Upon this his uncle gave up hope

and untied him. He was Rasûlullah's 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wa sallam' clerk of Wahy, (that is, it was his duty to write down the âyats revealed to the Prophet). The Messenger 'alaihis-salâm' married his daughter Ruqayya to him with the command of Allâhu ta'âlâ. When Ruqayya passed away in Medîna during the Holy War of Bedr, the Prophet gave him his second daughter Umm-i-Ghulthum. When she, too, passed away, in the ninth year of the Hegira, the Messenger stated, **'If I had other daughters I would give them, too, to 'Uthmân!'** When he gave his second daughter Umm-i-Ghulthum, he said to her, **'O my daughter! Your husband 'Uthmân resembles your ancestor Prophet Ibrâhîm and your father Muhammad 'alaihim-as-salâm' more than anyone else does.'** No one except hadrat 'Uthmân has had the lot of marrying a Prophet's two daughters. When hadrat 'Uthman came near the Messenger 'alaihis-salâm' the Prophet covered his blessed feet with his skirts. When hadrat Âisha asked him why he did so he stated, **'Angels feel shame before him. Should I not?'** He stated in a hadîth-i-sherîf, **'Uthmân is my brother in Paradise and will always be with me.'** In the Holy War of Tabuk the number of Muslim soldiers was too high for the food and equipment available. Trouble was ahead. Hadrat 'Uthmân brought three thousand camels, seventy horses and ten thousand golds out of his own commercial property. After distributing these to the soldiers, Rasûlullah stated, **'From today on, no sins will be recorded for 'Uthmân.'** It is stated in a hadîth-i-sherîf, which exists in the book **Jâmi'us-saghîr** by hadrat Imâm-i-Suyûtî 'rahmatullâhi ta'âlâ aleyh': **'With 'Uthmân's intercession, seventy thousand Muslims who are to go to Hell will enter Paradise without any questioning.'** Hadrat 'Uthmân possessed very much religious lore. He and hadrat 'Umar would have such ardent discussions on religious knowledge that people who heard them would think they were quarrelling."

It is stated in the book **Tuhfa**: During his caliphate hadrat 'Uthmân would employ everyone at a place suitable for his personality. He would assign everyone a duty within his capability. The Khalîfa is not supposed to know the unknown. Hadrat 'Uthmân appointed people he trusted, people he knew as good businessmen, people he considered to be trustworthy and just, and people he thought would obey his commands to administrative positions. No one has the right to censure him on account of this. People who are against him are trying to misrepresent his rightful behaviour as unrighteous. Hadrat

'Uthmân's governors and commanders were the choicest people in their attachments to him, in doing his commandments, in military skills, in conquering countries, and in their studious habits. In his time they widened the Islamic countries to Spain in the west and to Kâbel and Belh in the east. They carried the Islamic armies from one victory to another at sea and on land. Iraq and Khorasan had become hubs of fitna and instigation during the reign of the second Khalîfa. They purged these places so efficiently that it was impossible for the mischief makers to recover. If some of these governors displayed behaviour contradictory with hadrat 'Uthmân's expectations, why should the blame be put on him? He would never be silent when he saw such behaviour. Or he would make an investigation to find out whether it was only a matter of slander spread by the enviers. For statesmen naturally have many enemies and those who envy them. Replacing officials upon a mere complaint will throw a country's administrative system into disorder. Therefore, he would first investigate and, if the complaints proved true, immediately dismiss the official concerned. Indeed, he dismissed Walîd. Hadrat Mu'âwiya did not revolt against him. He was very popular in Damascus. No one under his authority suffered the smallest harm. He was governing Muslims with justice and performing Jihâd against disbelievers. Who would dismiss such a hero? Why should he have dismissed Abdullah bin Sa'd, the governor of Egypt? After hadrat 'Uthmân, this person resigned and stood away from commotions. The complaints against him which Medîna received from Egypt were all fabrications of the Jew named Abdullah bin Saba'. In short, hadrat 'Uthmân did his duty perfectly. However, destiny's disposition acted against his proposition and he failed to extinguish the fire made by Jews.

The case with hadrat 'Uthmân is similar in many respects to that of hadrat Alî. Various precautions taken by hadrat Alî, for instance, came to naught. Only, hadrat 'Uthmân's governors were always attached and obedient to him. They regularly sent the booties to the Khalîfa. All Muslims had sufficient property and lived in peace and comfort. In fact, these well-to-do conditions contributed to the arising of fitna. Hadrat Alî's governors, on the other hand, revolted against him. They did not do their duties. State administration was impaired. Hadrat Alî's own relatives, e.g. his paternal first cousins, joined this remiss. If those people who attempt to vilify hadrat 'Uthmân will not believe Sunnite scholars, let them read Shiite books. Then they will realize the facts. The

book **Nahj-ul-belâgha**, which is valued very highly by Shiites, quotes a letter which hadrat Alî wrote to his paternal first cousin. In this letter he expresses the trust he put on that munafiq. Then the book Nahj-ul-belâgha goes on and gives a detailed account of that man's acts of treason. Munzir bin Jârut, another governor appointed by hadrat Alî, turned out to be a traitor. The letter of threat which the Khalîfa wrote to him exists in most Shiite books. Hadrat Alî could not be vilified on account of these governors of his. Even Prophets fell for the soft words of munâfiqs. However, Wahy would be sent to Prophets and thus the inner malices of most munâfiqs would be revealed. Shiites maintain that Imâms have to be aware of the unknown. And they blame hadrat 'Uthmân for failing to do so. With this conviction of theirs, they denigrate hadrat Alî 'kerrem-Allâhu wejheh', too. According to their fallacy, hadrat Alî appointed traitors to positions over Muslims although he knew that they would turn into treason. The infamous villain named Ziyâd bin Ebîh was another governor appointed by hadrat Alî.

Another event they use as a ground for casting aspersions on hadrat 'Uthmân is his admitting Merwân's father Hakem bin Âs into Medîna. Rasûlullah 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wa sallam' had deported Hakem from Medîna because he had made friends with munâfiqs and aroused fitna among Muslims. During the reigns of the first two Khalîfas disbelievers were purged and there were no munâfiqs left. Therefore, it was not necessary for Hakem to live in exile any longer. The former two Khalîfas would not allow him to return home. For he was likely to resume his former mischievous acts. Hakem belonged to the Benî Ummayya tribe. And the two Khalîfas belonged to the Temîm and Adiy tribes. They could relapse into the tribal hostilities prevalent in the era of nescience (before Islam). Hadrat 'Uthmân, however, was Hakem's brother's son. There was therefore no longer any reason for such anxiety. Hadrat 'Uthmân explained this decision as follows: "I had had Rasûlullah's permission to bring him back to Medîna. When I told Khalîfa Abû Bekr, he asked me to prove it by witnesses. I was silent because I did not have any witnesses. Hoping that Khalîfa 'Umar would accept my statement, I told him, too. Yet he, too, asked for witnesses. When I became Khalîfa, I gave him permission (to return to Medîna) because I knew." Rasûlullah 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wa sallam' stated during his illness, "**I wish someone pious came to me and I said something to him.**" When they asked if they should send for Abû Bekr, the

Messenger said, “No.” They asked if he would like to see ‘Umar, he said, “No” again. Their third suggestion was Alî and the Prophet’s answer was again, “No.” Finally they suggested to send for ‘Uthmân. This time the answer was, “Yes.” When hadrat ‘Uthmân came, Rasûlullah said something to him. In the meantime, perhaps he interceded for Hakem and his intercession was accepted. It is a known fact that Hakem gave up his habits of instigation and mischief and made tawba towards his death. Besides, he was too old to do anything when he was back in Medîna.

On the other hand, the gifts he gave to his relatives were not from the Bayt-ul-mâl as is alleged by Hurûfî books and by Sayyed Qutb. They were from his personal property. Hadrat Abd-ul-ghanî Nablusî states as follows in the seven hundred and nineteenth page of the second volume of his book Hadîqa: “Three of the four Khalîfas received their salaries from the Bayt-ul-mâl, that is, from the state treasury. Hadrat ‘Uthmân would not accept a salary because he was very rich. He did not need a salary.” The book **Berîqa**, after giving the same information in its fourteen hundred and thirty-first page, adds the following statement: “On the day when ‘Uthmân ‘radiy-Allâhu anh’ was martyred, one hundred and fifty thousand dinârs of gold, one million dirhams of silver and clothes that were worth two hundred thousand golds were found among his servant’s personal belongings.” He was a cloth-merchant. His gifts were not only to his relatives. He was generous to everybody. He would do many charitable deeds for Allah’s sake. He would emancipate a slave every Friday. He would give a feast to the As-hâb-i-kirâm every day. No one would say that property given for Allah’s sake is property squandered. And it is stated in a hadîth-i-sherîf that alms given to one’s relatives will earn one twice as much thawâb. Hadrat ‘Uthmân convened the As-hâb-i-kirâm. Ammâr bin Yâser was among them. Hadrat ‘Uthmân said, “I call you to witness that the Messenger of Allah ‘sall-Allâhu alaihi wa sallam’ granted precedence to the Qoureish and Benî Hâshimî (tribes) among people who deserve kindness. If they gave me the keys to Paradise I would put them all into Paradise. I would not leave any one of them outside.” The As-hâb-i-kirâm ‘radiy-Allâhu ta’âlâ anhum ajma’in’ said nothing in response to these statements of hadrat ‘Uthmân’s. It would be sheer bigotry and pertinacity to suppose that he gave all his gifts from the Bayt-ul-mâl. It is a symptom of enmity against him. When he was asked, his answer was, “Do not

burden me with something incompatible with justice and taqwâ.” When hadrat ‘Uthmân married his son to Merwân’s brother Hâris’ daughter, he sent one thousand dirhams of silver out of his own property. As he married his daughter Rumân to Merwân he gave them one thousand dirhams, too. Neither of these gifts were from the Bayt-ul-mâl.

The allegation, “He donated one-fifth of the booties coming from Afrikiyya to Merwân,” which Sayyed Qutb adopts from Hurûfî books and Abbasid histories, is another falsification. In the (hijrî) year 29 hadrat ‘Uthmân sent Abdullah bin Sa’d to Africa with one thousand strong army of cavalry and infantry troops under his command. Upon this, bloody combats took place in the Tunisian capital city Afrikiyya. Muslims won and obtained many booties. Abdullah Merwân went to the Khalîfa with one-fifth of the booties. The number of coins alone was more than five thousand golds. It was a distance of several months’ travelling and therefore it would be difficult and dangerous to transport all these booties to Medîna. Merwân sold one thousand dirhams of these and brought the remainder to Medîna. He also reported the good news, which in turn earned him earnest benedictions. In return for Merwân’s onerous trek and the good news he gave, the Khalîfa forgave him for failing to deliver all the money he had received for the property sold on the way. It was within the Khalîfa’s authority to do so. Moreover, all this happened in the presence of the Sahâba ‘radiy-Allâhu ta’âlâ anhum ajma’în’. If a person is sent one thousand golds and he donates one or more golds as a tip to the person who brings them, no one will call this extravagance. As a matter of fact, Allâhu ta’âlâ commands that the zakât-collector be paid as much as he needs. Another slanderous allegation is that “he gave Abdullah bin Khâlid one thousand dirhams.” He ordered that this person be lent some money. Abdullah paid his debt later. When he heard that his son-in-law Hâris was doing injustice in collecting the zakât from the merchants in Medîna, he dismissed him from office and punished him.

‘Uthmân-i-Zinnûreyn ‘radiy-Allâhu anh’ would give the uncultivated lands in Hidjâz and Iraq to people he trusted and to his relatives, buy them agricultural implements and have them cultivate these lands, thus providing arable land for the people. He improved agriculture and reared vineyards and orchards. He had wells dug and canals opened. The arid lands of Arabia became the most fertile places in his time. This consequently brought safety and peace to the country. Thieves and wild beasts were now

historical topics. Guest-houses and inns were built in the places formerly occupied by their dens. And all these gave birth to consequent facilities in travelling and transportation. These were tremendously wonderful events for Arabia. These feats cannot be accomplished with the motorized tools of the twentieth century. It seemed as if the hadîth-i-sherîf, **“Crack of doom will not happen unless rivers flow in Arabia,”** had been uttered to point to the degree of civilization that would be attained in the time of hadrat ‘Uthmân. In another hadîth-i-sherîf the Messenger of Allah had stated to Adî bin Hâtem Tâî: **“If your life is long enough, you will see how a woman travels from the city Hira to Ka’ba easily and without fearing anyone except Allah.”** There are many hadîth-i-sherîfs foretelling that in the time of hadrat ‘Uthmân there will be an increase in property and wealth and improvements in business life. When the As-hâb-i-kirâm saw this prosperity and peace they admired hadrat ‘Uthmân’s administration and accomplishments. They began to work like the Khalîfa. Hadrat Alî tilled fields and made vineyards at places called Yenbû’ and Fedek and Zuhra, Talha followed his example at Ghâbed, and Zubeyr did so at Zihashab. The land of Hidjâz became prosperous. If hadrat ‘Uthmân’s caliphate lasted a few years longer, the rose gardens of Shîrâz and the woods of Hirat would have been surpassed. It is permissible for any person to till dead lands as if they were his own property, provided he be granted permission by the Khalîfa. Why should it not be permissible for the Khalîfa himself, then? And why should the crops he thus raises not be halâl for him? Hadrat ‘Uthmân enlivened many lands with his own property. He made vineyards and orchards. He had many wells dug. He had many irrigation systems built. He set an example for others. He provided business for people. He established a new precedent. As it is expressed in the saying, **“Property will breed property,”** the people’s revenues became many times more. In his time there was no one who did not cultivate the land or rear vineyards. If Mawdûdî of India or Sayyed Qutb of Egypt had read Islamic histories, or at least the book **Tuhfa**, which was written in India, they would feel shame to defame Rasûlullah’s Khalîfas ‘radiy-Allâhu ta’âlâ anhum ajma’in’. Realizing that they could not even praise and laud those great people in due manner, they would mind their manners.

The allegation that “he donated one thousand dirhams to Zeyd bin Thâbit ‘radiy-Allâhu ta’âlâ anh’ from the Bayt-ul-mâl” is an expression of looking at the events from the evil side. One day he

(hadrat ‘Uthmân) ordered distribution of property from the Baytul-mâl to those who deserved payment. His order was carried out. When it was seen that one thousand dirhams was in excess, he ordered that this money be used in public services. Zeyd used this money in repairing the Masjîd-i-Nabawî.

A hadîth-i-sherîf, which exists in the book **Meshîhât** written by Hâfiz Ahmad bin Muhammad Abû Tâhir Silafî, a Shâfi’î scholar who passed away in 576, and which is reported also by Ibnî Asâkir Alî bin Muhammad, states, **“Loving Abû Bekr and thanking him is wâjib for all my Ummat.”** Imâm-i-Munâwî also quotes this hadîth-i-sherîf from Daylamî. It is stated in a hadîth-i-sherîf, which exists in the book **Wasîla** by Hâfiz ‘Umar bin Muhammad Erbilî, **“As Allâhu ta’âlâ has made namâz, zakât and fasting farz for you, so He has made it farz for you to love Âbu Bekr, ‘Umar, ‘Uthmân and Alî.”** Another hadîth-i-sherîf, which is reported by Abdullah Ibnî Adî and written in Munâwî, states, **“Loving Abû Bekr and ‘Umar is from îmân. And enmity towards them is being munâfiq.”** According to a report given by Imâm-i-Tirmuzî, a janâza (dead person ready for interment) was brought to the Messenger of Allah. He would not perform the namâz of janâza for him, and said, **“This man felt animosity towards ‘Uthmân. Therefore, Allâhu ta’âlâ bears animosity towards him.”** The hundred and first âyat of Tawba sûra purports, **“Allah loves the early Believers among the Muhâjirs and Ansâr and those people who follow them. And they love Allah. Allah has prepared Gardens of Paradise for them.”** The first three Khalîfas are among the early Believers. And hadrat Mu’âwiya and Amr Ibnî Âs are among those people who followed them. Those who malign these great Islamic leaders are opposing the âyat-i-kerîma and the hadîth-i-sherîfs by doing so. And a person who opposes an âyat-i-kerîma or a hadîth-i-sherîf, in his turn, will go out of Islam and become a disbeliever. His claiming to be a Muslim will only betray the fact that he is a munâfiq or a zindiq.

6- *“Another old woman fabricated a story of a lost bracelet, with an attempt to cover the desert love affair she had had with Safwân. While doing so, she imposed the cause of divorce on hadrat Alî. This gave birth to the event of Camel,”* he says.

At this point the magazine shamelessly assails hadrat Âisha-i-Siddîqa ‘radiy-Allâhu ta’âlâ anhâ’, Believers’ mother and Rasûlullah’s beloved wife. See what hadrat Abd-ul-haqq Dahlawî, a scholar of Hadîth, says in his book **Medârij-un-nubuwwa:**

The merits and virtues possessed by Âisha-i-Siddîqa ‘radiy-

Allâhu ta'âlâ anhâ' are innumerable. She was one of the scholars of fiqh among the As-hâb-i-kirâm. She would speak very clearly and eloquently. She would give fatwâ to the As-hâb-i-kirâm. According to most scholars, one-fourth of the knowledge of fiqh was communicated by hadrat Âisha. It was stated in a hadîth-i-sherîf, **“Learn one-third of your religion from Humeyrâ!”** Because Rasûlullah ‘sall-Allâhu alaihi wa sallam’ loved hadrat Âisha very much, he called her **Humeyrâ**. Most people among the As-hâb-i-kirâm and the Tâbi’în reported the hadîth-i-sherîfs they had heard from hadrat Âisha. Hadrat Urwat-ubni Zubeyr states: I have not seen anyone more learned in the meanings of Qur’ân al-kerîm, in halâls and harâms, in Arabic poetry, or in genealogy. The following two couplets eulogizing the Messenger of Allah (translated into English) belongs to her:

Had the Egyptians heard about the beauty of his cheeks,

They would not have paid money for buying Yûsuf ‘alaihissalâm’.

(That is, they would have kept all their money for being able to see his cheeks.)

Had the women who blamed Zeliha seen his luminous forehead,

They would have cut their hearts instead of their hands.

(And they would not have felt pain at all.)

Another honour hadrat Âisha had was that she was Rasûlullah’s darling. Rasûlullah ‘sall-Allâhu alaihi wa sallam’ loved her very much. When Rasûlullah was asked who he loved most, his answer was: **“Âisha.”** When he was asked who was the man he loved most, he said: **“Âisha’s father.”** That is, he stated that he loved hadrat Abû Bekr most. When hadrat Âisha was asked who the Messenger of Allah loved most, she said (he loved) Fâtima (most). When she was asked who was the man he loved most, she said it was Fâtima’s husband. This comes to mean that among his wives, hadrat Âisha was the one he loved most; among his children he loved hadrat Fâtima most; among his Ahl-i-Bayt hadrat Alî was most beloved to him; and among his Sahâba hadrat Abû Bekr was his most beloved companion ‘radiy-Allâhu ta’âlâ anhum ajma’in’. Hadrat Âisha relates, “One day Rasûlullah ‘sall-Allâhu alaihi wa sallam’ was unfastening the thongs of his blessed sandals and I was spinning yarn. I looked at his blessed face. Sweat was dropping from his bright forehead. And each drop of sweat was spreading light all around. They were dazzling my eyes. I was

bewildered. He turned to look at me. **“What is the matter with you? What makes you so pensive,”** he asked. I said, ‘O the Messenger of Allah! Looking at the brightness of the haloes on your blessed face and the lights spread by the drops of sweat on your blessed forehead, I have lost myself.’ Rasûlullah stood up and came near me. He kissed between my eyes and said, **‘Yâ Âisha (O Âisha)! May Allâhu ta’âlâ bless you with goodnesses! I have not been able to please you the way you have pleased me.’** That is, he said, ‘Your pleasing me has been more than my pleasing you.’” His kissing between hadrat Âisha’s blessed eyes meant awarding and honouring her for her loving the Messenger of Allah, seeing and recognizing his beauty. A line:

I congratulate my eyes on seeing thine beauty!

And a couplet:

***How good those eyes are for looking at the beauty.
How fortunate that heart is for burning with His love!***

Imâm-i-Mesrûq, one of the greatest members of the Tâbi’în, whenever he was to give a report from hadrat Âisha, would begin as follows: “Hadrat Siddîqa the beloved one of the Messenger of Allah and the blessed daughter of Abû Bekr as-Siddîq, states that... .” Sometimes he would say, “The darling of the beloved ones of Allâhu ta’âlâ and of the inhabitants of heaven states that... .” Âisha ‘radiy-Allâhu anhâ’ would say that she was the highest one of the Azwâj-i-tâhirât (the Prophet’s pure wives) and boast about the blessings Allâhu ta’âlâ had bestowed on her. She would say, for instance, “Before the Messenger of Allah (told my father that he) wanted to marry me, Jebrâîl ‘alaihis-salâm’ showed (him) a picture of me and said: This is your wife!” Drawing pictures of living beings had not been made harâm yet. Besides, the picture was not drawn by a human being. Why should it be a sinful act, then? In a hadîth-i-sherîf which exists in the books **Bukhârî** and **Muslim**, Rasûlullah ‘sall-Allâhu alaihi wa sallam’ said to our mother Âisha ‘radiy-Allâhu anhâ’, **“For three nights I saw you in my dreams. The angel showed me your picture drawn on white silk. He said: This is your wife. I do not forget the picture the angel showed me in my dream. It is you, exactly.”** Our mother Âisha states, “Rasûlullah was performing tahajjud (after midnight) namâz and I was lying by his side. This honour was peculiar to me only. [She would boast with this honour.] As he prostrated, his blessed hands would touch my feet and I would pull my feet back.” One of the honours conferred on hadrat

Âisha was that they (Rasûlullah and she) made ghusl together and used the same container. This shows the degree of love the Messenger of Allah had for hadrat Âisha. Rasûlullah did not receive **Wahy** in any of his wives' beds except hadrat Âisha's. And this shows the degree of value Allâhu ta'âlâ has attached to hadrat Âisha. Hadrat Umm-i-Salama said something about Âisha to the Messenger of Allah. He stated, "**Do not hurt me through Âisha. I have received Wahy in her bed.**" Upon this Umm-i-Salama, "I shall never hurt you again. I make tawba, o the Messenger of Allah." One day he asked hadrat Fâtima, "**Will you love someone whom I love?**" When she said she would, the Messenger stated, "**Then, love Âisha!**" 'radiy-Allâhu ta'âlâ anhumâ'.

Hadrat Âisha would boast that "It was revealed by Allâhu ta'âlâ that the slander spread against me was a lie." Allâhu ta'âlâ sent down the seventeen âyats in the Nûr sûra to declare that those who calumniated hadrat Âisha would go to Hell. These âyat-i-kerîmas are another indication of the greatness and very high honour of hadrat Âisha.

Calumination of hadrat Âisha took place during the Holy War of **Mureysî'** in the fifth year of the Hegira. This Holy War is also called **Benî Mustaliq**. Rasûlullah left for this Holy War with a thousand strong army. He took hadrat Âisha and Umm-i-Salama along. A number of munâfiqs joined in order to get booties. The Messenger appointed hadrat 'Umar as the commander of the army. After a bloody combat, five thousand sheep and ten thousand camels were taken in addition to more than seven hundred captives. Juwayriyya was among them. Rasûlullah bought her and married her. Upon seeing this, the As-hâb-i-kiram said, "How can we keep relatives of the Messenger of Allah as our captives?" and emancipated the captives they had been keeping 'radiy-Allâhu ta'âlâ anhum ajma'in'. Juwayriyya must have been a very fortunate girl, for she caused her tribe to be saved from captivity. It was in the same year when the blessed Messenger bought Selmân-i-Fârisî from his Jewish owner and emancipated him. Hadrat Selmân became a Muslim in the first year of the Hegira.

The following account is given in the book **Altı-Parmak**, which is the Turkish translation of the Persian book **Me'ârij-un-nubuwwa**: Before leaving for a Holy War Rasûlullah would draw lots among his wives and would take along the winner. Hadrat Âisha relates, "It was after the revelation of the âyat commanding

women to cover themselves. A tent was made for me and I rode my camel in this tent. On our way back from the Holy War we made a halt at a place close to Medīna. At dawn the noises we heard meant that we were to move again. I left the encampment for a short while to relieve nature. When I was back I found out that I had lost my bracelet. I went back, looked for it, and found it. When I was back at the encampment I could not find the army. They were gone. They must have put my tent on the camel, thinking that I was in the tent. At that time I used to eat very little. I was weak. I was fourteen years old. I was confused. Then, saying to myself that they would soon notice my absence and come back to look for me, I began to sit and wait, falling asleep after a short while. Rasûlullah ‘sall-Allâhu alaihi wa sallam’ ordered Safwân bin Mu’attil Sulemî to go back and look for me. When this person found me sleeping he shouted. His shouting woke me. When I saw him I covered my face. He made his camel kneel down, walked away, and said, “Mount the camel!” I did. Safwân held the halter. It had already become hot when we caught up with the troops. The first people we met were a group of munâfiqs. They had some unpleasant conversation among themselves. They were provoked by Ibnî Ebî Selûl. Of the Muslims, Hassân bin Thâbit and Mistah joined them, too. When we were back, I became ill. The rumour spread everywhere. Yet I did not know about it. Only, Rasûlullah would not visit me as frequently as he had done before, nor at least would he come to see how I was. And I did not know why. One night I went out to the toilet, accompanied by Mistah’s mother. Her skirts entangled her feet and she fell down. She cursed her son [Mistah]. When I asked why she was swearing, she would not say why. I asked the same question several times. She said, ‘O Âisha! Haven’t you heard the rumours he is spreading?’ When I asked her what they were, she told me all about the calumination, whereupon my illness was aggravated at once. My fever was augmented, so that I felt as if my head were emitting fire. I became unconscious and fell down. When I recovered I went back home. I asked for Rasûlullah’s permission to go to my father’s home, which he accepted. My purpose was to find out what was going on. I asked my mother. She said, ‘My dear! Don’t worry! Things are easy for you. Every woman who is pretty and who is loved by her husband may undergo such calumniations.’ I was astonished. I wondered if these rumours had reached Rasûlullah’s blessed ears, and what was going to happen if my father had heard about them? These thoughts made me so sad

that I sobbed bitterly. My father was reading Qur'ân al-kerîm in the room. He heard my sobbing and asked my mother why. My mother told him how deeply distressed I had felt upon hearing for the first time about the gossips being spread. Upon this my father, too, began to weep. Then he came near me and said, 'My dear child! Be patient! Let us wait for the âyat which Allâhu ta'âlâ will reveal.' That night I did not sleep till morning. Nor did my tears come to an end."

Rasûlullah 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wa sallam' sent for hadrat Alî and Usâma 'radiy-Allâhu anhumâ' and said, "**How is this matter going to end?**" Usâma said, "O the Messenger of Allah! We have only a good opinion of your wife." And hadrat Alî said, "There are many women on the earth. Allâhu ta'âlâ has not made the earth narrow for you. Ask Âisha's jâriya Burayda about Âisha!" When she was asked she said, "I swear by Allah that I have never seen her do anything wrong. From time to time she took some sleep. When the sheep came, she kneaded dough with some flour and ate it. Most of the time I was with her. I did not see anything wrong with her. If the rumours had been true Allâhu ta'âlâ would have let you know." One day the Messenger of Allah was sitting in his home. He was very sad. Hadrat 'Umar-ul-Fârûq came. The Messenger of Allah asked him what he thought. He said, "O the Messenger of Allah! I know very well that the munâfiqs are lying. Allâhu ta'âlâ does not let a fly alight on your body. He protects you lest it should alight on something filthy and then smear the filth on you. Allâhu ta'âlâ, who protects you against a small filth, will definitely protect you against the worst filth." These statements of hadrat 'Umar's pleased Rasûlullah. His blessed face smiled. Then he sent for hadrat 'Uthmân and asked him. He said, "I do not doubt that this rumour is a lie spread by munâfiqs. It is a slander completely. Allâhu ta'âlâ never lets your shadow fall on the ground. He protects even your blessed shadow from falling on a dirty place or being trodden on by an abominable person. Would He let such a dirt enter your blessed home?" These statements also relieved his blessed heart. Then he sent for hadrat Alî and asked him. Hadrat Alî said, "These rumours are lies, slanders. They are munâfiqs' fabrications. (One day) you and we were performing namâz. You took off your blessed sandals during the namâz. And we took off ours, too, to follow you. You said, '**Why did you take off your sandals?**' When we answered that we had done so in order to follow you, you said, '**Jebrâil 'alaihis-salâm' came and informed**

me that there was some nejâsat^[1] on my sandals. So I took them off. Is it possible for Allâhu ta'âlâ, who protects you from dirt by sending you Wahy even during namâz, to allow your blessed wives to smear themselves with such a dirt? Had such an atrocity been committed, He would have let you know immediately. Let your blessed heart not feel sad. Allâhu ta'âlâ will definitely send the Wahy and inform you that your blessed wife is pure." These statements pleased Rasûlullah all the more. He immediately honoured hadrat Abû Bekr as-Siddîq's 'radiy-Allâhu ta'âlâ anh' home with his presence.

Hadrat Âisha relates: That day I wept continuously. I had a woman visitor from the Ansâr. She was weeping, too. My mother and father were sitting with me. All of a sudden Rasûlullah came and greeted us. He sat beside me. He had never come to see me since that event, which had taken place a month before. Nor had any Wahy been revealed. Sitting down, the Messenger of Allah paid hamd-u-thenâ (thanking, praising and lauding) to Allâhu ta'âlâ. He said the Word Shahâdat. Then he turned to me and said, **"O Âisha! They told me so about you: If you are not as they say, Allâhu ta'âlâ will inform soon that you are true. If a sin has taken place, then make tawba and istighfâr! Allâhu ta'âlâ will accept the tawba of those people who make tawba for their sins."** Upon hearing Rasûlullah's blessed voice, I stopped weeping. I turned to my father and told him to answer. My father said, "Wallahi (I swear on the name of Allah that) I do not know how I should answer the Messenger of Allah. We were idolaters in the era of nescience. We used to worship human statues. We did not know how to worship properly. No one could say such things about our women. Now our hearts have been brightened with the halo of Islam. Our homes have been illuminated with the light of Islam. And yet all people are spreading such rumours about us. What should I say to Rasûlullah?" Then I turned to my mother and told her to answer. She said, "I am astonished. I am at a loss as to what to say. You explain it." Then I began to talk. I said: I swear by Allâhu ta'âlâ that the rumours that have reached your blessed ears are all lies. If you believe them, you will not believe me whatever I say. Allâhu ta'âlâ knows that I am quite innocent. If I say 'Yes' about something I have not done, I will have

[1] Any sort of dirt which must be cleaned from one's clothes before performing namâz. Please see the sixth chapter of the fourth fascicle of **Endless Bliss**.

slandered myself. Wallahi I have nothing else to say. Only, I would like to quote Yûsuf's (Joseph) 'alaihi-salâm' statements: **"Patience is good. I hope for help from Allâhu ta'âlâ against what they say."** I was so badly confused that I said Yûsuf 'alaihi-salâm' instead of Ya'qûb (Jacob) 'alaihi-salâm'. Then I turned my face and leaned. I was always hoping for the sake of Allah that my Rabb would rehabilitate my reputation. For I was certain about myself. I was innocent. Yet I did not think Allâhu ta'âlâ would send âyat-i-kerîmas for me. I could not imagine that âyat-i-kerîmas would be read (and recited) for me everywhere till the end of the world. Because I was conscious about the greatness of Allâhu ta'âlâ versus my humility, I never expected that He would reveal an âyat-i-kerîma for me. I only hoped that He would inform His Prophet in his dream or inspire into his blessed heart that I was sinless, that my heart was clean. In the name of Allah I am telling the truth that Rasûlullah had not yet stood up from where he had been seated, and no one had left the room, when signs of Wahy appeared on his blessed face. All the people sitting in the room knew that Wahy had arrived. We had a leather cushion. When my father saw what was happening, he put this cushion under Rasûlullah's blessed head. He covered him with a muslin bed-sheet. When the revelation was over, he took the cover off his blessed face. He wiped the drops of sweat, which were shining like pearls, off his rose-red face with his blessed hands. Smiling, he said, **"Good news to you, o Âisha! Allâhu ta'âlâ has proven you innocent. He has borne witness to the fact that you are pure."** Presently, my father said, "Stand up, o my daughter! Thank the Messenger of Allah right away!" I said, "Wallahi I shall not stand up! Nor shall I thank anyone except Allâhu ta'âlâ! For my Rabb has revealed âyat-i-kerîmas for me." Then Rasûlullah 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wa sallam' recited ten âyat-i-kerîmas, which are now the ones beginning with the eleventh âyat-i-kerîma of Nûr sûra. My father got up at once and kissed my head.

Before the revelation of âyat-i-kerîmas about Âisha 'radiy-Allâhu anhâ', Abû Eyyûb Khalîd's wife had asked hadrat Khâlid what he thought about the rumours being spread about hadrat Âisha. Hadrat Khâlid said, "For Allah's sake, these rumours are lies. Would you do a vice of this sort against me?" When his wife, answered, "No, never, may Allah protect me against it," hadrat Khâlid said, "Then, could Âisha, whose faith is firmer than ours, do a vice of this sort against the Messenger of Allah? We have not

said so. These rumours are slanders.” And Haqq ta’âlâ sent down âyat-i-kerîmas exactly agreeable with these statements of hadrat Khâlid’s. Presently, Rasûlullah ‘sall-Allâhu alaihi wa sallam’ convened his Sahâba in the Mesjîd (or masjîd=mosque): He recited the âyat-i-kerîmas revealed to him. With the barakat of these âyat-i-kerîmas, the Believers were relieved from the doubts pestering their hearts. Mistah was a relative of hadrat Abû Bekr’s. He was poor. Formerly hadrat Abû Bekr used to help him with his subsistence. When Mistah joined the munâfiqs in this squalid act, he (hadrat Abû Bekr) took an oath not to help him any longer. Upon this, Allâhu ta’âlâ sent down the twenty-second âyat-i-kerîma of Nûr sûra. When Abû Bekr as-Siddîq heard this âyat-i-kerîma, he said, “I would love Allâhu ta’âlâ to forgive me,” and helped Mistah as he had done before. When the âyat-i-kerîmas restoring hadrat Âisha’s ‘radiy-Allâhu ta’âlâ anhâ’ reputation came, Rasûlullah ‘sall-Allâhu alaihi wa sallam’ ordered that the slanderers be chastised with the punishment called Hadd for the **Qazf** (accusing a woman with fornication). Four people were flogged with eighty stripes each. One of them was a woman and Rasûlullah’s wife’s sister. This is the end of the part we have borrowed from the book **Me’ârij**.

The book of **Tafsîr** called **Mawâkib** explains the first of the âyat-i-kerîmas about hadrat Âisha as follows: **“Slanderers of Âisha ‘radiy-Allâhu anhâ’ are only a few among you. Do not take this slander as a harm inflicted on you! It will be auspicious for you. [You have attained much thawâb because of this slander. Their falsification has been divulged and your honour has been promoted. The âyat-i-kerîma has declared your innocence]. The slanderers deserve punishment equal to the sin they have acquired. Those who cast the grave aspersion and say the very abhorrent thing shall be tormented bitterly in this world and in the Hereafter.”** After these people were clogged in accordance with (the prescribed punishment called) Hadd, Abdullah bin Ebî fell into utter disrepute. Hassân became blind and remained so till his death. And Mistah became one-handed. The twelfth âyat-i-kerîma purported, **“Upon hearing about this slander, Muslim men and women should have an optimistic opinion of their families. They should say that it is an obvious lie and slander.”** The nineteenth âyat-i-kerîma purported, **“Those who mean disrepute for Believers shall be tormented bitterly in the world and in the Hereafter.”** And the twenty-sixth âyat-i-kerîma purported, **“Uttering foul words is worthy of foul men. Foul speech befits foul**

men.” Rasûlullah and hadrat Âisha and Safwân are far from the allegations of those ignoble people. They deserve (Allah’s) forgiveness and compassion, and blessings in Paradise. Safwân is praised in a hadîth-i-sherîf. He was martyred at the conquest of Erzurum in (the hijrî year) 17.

Allâhu ta’âlâ states that He will subject the slanderers of hadrat Âisha to very painful torments. Since Allâhu ta’âlâ answers these base people exactly in a manner they deserve, we need not add anything. However, we shall present a fatwâ, which exists in the two hundred and ninety-second page of the book **Mir’ât-i-kâinât:**

It is stated in the book **Hasâis ul-habîb** that hadrat Abdullah Ibnî Abbâs has given the fatwâ that “A person who commits ‘Qazf’ against one of Rasûlullah’s blessed wives, (that is, who accuses one of them with an act of impurity), becomes a disbeliever, and his tawba will not be acceptable.” Accusing hadrat Âisha with impurity, on the other hand, means contradicting Qur’ân al-kerîm, which, in its turn, is disbelief according to a unanimous report. And imputing immodesty on the mother of one of the Sahâba, [e.g. on Hind] deserves chastisement double the punishment for Qazf. May Allâhu ta’âlâ protect our Alawî and Shiite brothers and all Muslims from falling into such a disastrous error! Âmîn.

7- *“Utba’s daughter Hind, the notorious heroine of numerous men’s love adventures, chewed hadrat Hamza’s lungs during the amorous hours she shared with an Abyssinian slave. She had been divorced by her husband Ibnî Mughîra on account of her prostitution and admitted as a wife by Abû Sufyân. Hind’s marriage with Abû Sufyân could not make her cease from other men. She continued her notorious way of life. This marriage gave birth to Mu’âwiya the accursed, who of all the probable fathers was finally ascribed to Abû Sufyân. This man grew to be a cruel tyrant and oppressed the people ruthlessly,”* he says.

One would feel shame to use such dirty and squalid language even against Abû Jahl and Iblîs (Satan), the two most implacable and accursed enemies of the Messenger of Allah ‘sall-Allâhu alaihi wa sallam’. Yet it is stated in Qur’ân al-kerîm that **“Foul speech befits foul men.”** One’s speech is one’s mirror. We could not expect fragrance from sewerage! The dirty, repulsive, slanderous writings quoted above cannot defame those people whom Allâhu ta’âlâ has forgiven and promised Paradise and blessings. They cannot be completely disigned, however, inasmuch as they

betray the abject characters of their utterers. The hadîth-i-sherîf, **“Îmân cleans, extirpates (one’s) past sins,”** is an unshakable evidence proving the fact that hadrat Mu’âwiya and his blessed father Abû Sufyân ‘radiy-Allâhu ta’âlâ anhumâ’, and the blessed woman Hind ‘radiy-Allâhu anhâ’, who proved her chastity and nobility in the presence of the Messenger of Allah on the day when Mekka was conquered, are extremely pure people.

There are innumerable books writing about the greatnesses and superior virtues of these three Sahâbîs. At this point we shall quote a few lines from **Qisâs-i-Enbiyâ** (A History of Prophets), since it is a book available for anybody:

“Among the Arabs, family life was very important and spirit of kinship was very strong. Every Arab would demonstrate wonderful zeal in guarding the honour of his tribe and relatives.” “The Arabs would recite poems and preach sermons at market places and meetings.” “Fakhr-i-’âlam ‘sall-Allâhu alaihi wa sallam’ climbed mount Safâ and sat there. Hadrat ’Umar-ul-Fârûq sat beside and below him. First men and then women came and became Muslims one by one. Hadrat ’Alî’s sister Umm-i-Hânî and hadrat Mu’âwiya’s mother Hind was among the women. When Rasûl-i-ekrem ‘sall-Allâhu alaihi wa sallam’ said to the women to **‘Promise not to steal,’** Hind came forward and said, ‘If I were the person to steal, I would have stolen a lot from Abû Sufyân’s property.’ Upon this, Fakhr-i-’âlam ‘sall-Allâhu alaihi wa sallam’ recognized Hind and said, **‘Are you Hind?’** ‘I am Hind. Forgive (for) the past (offences) so that Allah will forgive you,’ she said. When Rasûl-i-ekrem ‘sall-Allâhu alaihi wa sallam’ said the injunction of not committing fornication, Hind said, ‘Does a free woman commit fornication?’ And when the Messenger said that another injunction is not to kill one’s children, Hind said, ‘They were small and we raised them. They were grown up and you killed them at Bedr. It is between you and them now.’ Hadrat ’Umar was a stern and serious person. Yet he could not help laughing at these words of Hind’s. When the Messenger enjoined not to slander, Hind said, ‘Wallahi, slandering is a wicked deed. You enjoin beautiful morality on us.’ And finally, when he enjoined not to revolt, Hind promised, ‘We have not entered this exalted presence with the intention of revolting’ Thus Hind, who was to be killed according to an earlier directive, attained forgiveness and became a true Believer. Presently, she went home and broke to pieces all the idols and icons, saying, ‘We have been idiotically believing you for such a long time.’ Rasûl-i-ekrem ‘sall-

Allâhu alaihi wa sallam' pronounced benedictions over the women being there." Hind's attaining forgiveness and îman provided encouragement for all the other people who were considering to seek safety in flight. They came back and asked for forgiveness. Their request was accepted. It was so lucky for Hind that she caused many people to escape death and to become Believers. Another line from Qisâs-i-Enbiyâ states, "Abû Sufyân and his sons became staunch Muslims. Rasûl-i-ekrem 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wa sallam' employed them as clerks." 'radiy-Allâhu ta'âlâ anhum'

Hurûfîs, being at a loss as to how to traduce hadrat Mu'âwiya despite the services he rendered to Islam and his being praised through the Prophet's blessed utterances, rake his past and nag at his family life, thus to revile him. No matter how successful they could be in their efforts of vilification, they could not lower his father to the grade of the unbeliever named Abû Lahab (or Leheb)! Utba, who was the son of this unbeliever named Abû Lahab, (who was such an avowed enemy of the Messenger of Allah that) an âyat wherein his name was mentioned was revealed, would formerly persecute the Messenger of Allah very much. And not only that: He divorced his blessed daughter in order to put him into financial straits. As is stated in **Qisâs-i-enbiyâ**, "This very Utba became a Believer and begged for forgiveness of the day of Conquest (of Mekka). Rasûlullah forgave him and pronounced a benediction over him. Even at the hottest moments of the Holy War of Huneyn, Utba would not leave his guarding position in front of Rasûlullah." Now these people do not even criticize the disbeliever named Abû Lahab. Nor do they blame Utba for having been a son of that foul being or for having tormented the Messenger of Allah so much. For Utba was (one of those people who were) of the opinion that hadrat 'Alî should be the first Khalîfa. He would express this opinion of his in poetry. This comes to mean that the criteria applied by the author (of the calumnatory statements written in the so-called magazine) are not based on the essential matters such as Islam, disbelief, serving Rasûlullah, or persecuting him. They are based on the matter of voting for hadrat 'Alî. What he is after, then, is a political cause and has nothing to do with Islam. Or rather, all his endeavour stems from his obnoxious desire to misrepresent the As-hâb-i-kirâm as nasty people hard to get on with.

The above-quoted statements which we have borrowed from

various pages of the book **Qisâs-i-enbiyâ**, show clearly that the slanders in the autumn magazine are sheer falsifications. It is stated in the book **Kâmûs-ul-a'lâm** that “Hind bin Utba binti Rebî’a bin Abd-i-Shems was one of the nobility of Qoureish. She was Abû Sufyân’s wife. Before Abû Sufyân, she was Fâqih bin Mughîra’s wife. She persistently remained a Muslim and always conducted herself as a good one. She was a prudent, far-sighted administratrix. She and her husband Abû Sufyân joined the Holy War of Yermuk and encouraged the Muslims to make Jihâd against the Byzantines.”

It is written in all books how firm an î mân Hind ‘radiy-Allâhu anhâ’ had and what a noble feeling of chastity she had. Marriage and family life existed in Arabia before Islam, too. Please see the thirty-sixth paragraph! The author of the autumn magazine confuses family life with his own life of cohabitation termed Mut’a. He compares other people to himself and supposes that they are fornicators, too. It is stated in the book **Me’ârij-un-nubuwwa**, “After Hind ‘radiy-Allâhu anhâ’ became a Believer and broke all the statues in her house, she sent two lambs as a gift to Rasûlullah. The Messenger of Allah accepted the presents and pronounced a benediction over Hind, asking a blessing on her. Haqq ta’âlâ blessed her sheep with such barakat that it was impossible to know their number. Hind would always acknowledge that they were a blessing coming through the Barakat of the Messenger of Allah.” Abd-ul-ghanî Nablusî states in the hundred and twenty-sixth page of **Hadiqa**, “Everyone who has î mân in Rasûlullah realizes his greatness to some extent and bears a degree of love for him. Yet the amount of this realization and love varies. Many a heart overflows with this love. It has been reported unanimously that Abû Sufyân’s ‘radiy-Allâhu anh’ wife Hind ‘radiy-Allâhu anhâ’ said to Rasûlullah, ‘O the Messenger of Allah! I never used to like your blessed face. But now, that beautiful face of yours is more beloved to me than anything else.’”

The author alleges that hadrat Mu’âwiya oppressed the people. On the contrary, hadrat Mu’âwiya’s caliphate brought peace, order and quietude to the country and put an end to misunderstandings. Jihâd and conquests began. His justice and kindnesses spread far and wide. History books give detailed accounts of these facts.

8- *“Seeds of a mentality which caused superstitions for the purpose of reigning and thus turned the beautiful Islamic religion*

into a mere system of fanaticism and ummat (community) sprouted in the minds and hearts of some Ottoman emperors. All these things were intended for Shiites. For Shiites suggested unity. They knew that unity began with (Muhammad-Alî). Their aim was to love the Ahl-i-Bayt. When the trend of ummat (community) became dominant, the intellectuals and Shiites stood against it. Wasn't hadrat Alî the first Khalîfa (rightfully) elected?" he says.

Allâhu ta'âlâ calls Muslims **'My Messenger's Ummat (Community).'**" Our master, the Prophet 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wa sallam' states that Muslims are his Ummat. For instance, he says, **"I shall intercede (shafâ'at) for the grave sinners of my Ummat,"** and **"The learned ones of my Ummat are like the Israelite Prophets,"** and uses the expression **'My Ummat'** in many other hadîth-i-sherîfs. This author, on the other hand, censures Muslims' Khalîfas by saying that the Ottoman Sultans 'rahmatullâhi ta'âlâ alaihim ajma'in' turned the Islamic religion into a mere system of Ummat. He rejects the system of Ummat and misrepresents it as if it were a system forged afterwards. These statements of the author's are diametrically opposed to Islam and advocate the Hurûfî doctrines. All the stratagems of Hurûfîs are based on attacking Islam in disguise of Muslims. Their suggesting unity, for instance, is like the butcher's saying, "I love you very much. I hate having to hurt you," to the lamb he is going to slaughter. The author is trying to cloak the fact that he is a Hurûfî, that is, he is following in the footsteps of Abdullah bin Saba', who is the first instigator of all the so many events in which brothers killed one another. History books give long written accounts of the thousands of Muslims massacred by Hassan Sabbâh, a follower of Ibni Saba'. It only takes reading Hassan Sabbâh's murders and treacheries to realize that this Hurûfî is quite wrong in his writings.

It is stated as follows in the eight hundred and eighty-seventh page of **Qisâs-i-enbiyâ**: Hassan Sabbâh was a heretic, a mulhid following Ibni Saba'. Calling harâms 'halâl', he misled many people. The fortress called Elemut (or Alamut) and its neighborhood were infested with his adherents, most of them highwaymen. They called the Ahl as-Sunna 'Yezîdîs'. With the conviction that killing one Yezîdî would deserve more thawâb than killing ten unbelievers, they would slay hâdjis, judges, scholars and soldiers by stabbing them. These people are called **Batiniyya** or **Ismâiliyya**. They were godless, ferocious people. For

thirty-five years Hassan Sabbâh took many lives and misled many others out of their faith. Eventually he went to Hell in 518 [A.D. 1124]. Of his successors, his grandson Ahund Hassan, who became their chief in 557, was a zindiq, more base than all the others. It is this villain who first called his adherents **Alawî** in order to deceive Muslims. In 559, on the seventeenth of Ramadân, which was when hadrat Alî had been martyred, he mounted the minber and said, "I have been sent by Alî. I am the imâm of all Muslims. Islam does not have a foundation. Everything depends on the heart. If a person's heart is clean, sinning will not harm him. I have made everything halâl. Live as you wish!" Then they drank wine, men and women altogether. It was made their new year's day. This heretic was slain by his wife's brother in 561. His grandson Jelâl-ad-dîn Hassan gave up this aberrant way. He reported to the Khalîfa that he had entered the Madh-hab of Ahl as-Sunna. He collected the heretical books written by Hassan Sabbâh and had them burnt. He died in 618. He was succeeded by his son Ahund Alâaddîn Muhammad, the seventh ruler of the state of Ismâîliyya. This person chose his ancestors' heretical way and made harâms halâl. His son Ahund Ruqn-ad-dîn had this foul person killed in his bed in 652 and appointed the Shiite scholar Nasîr-ad-dîn Tûsî, who had been imprisoned by his father, as his vizier. However, he was executed by Hulâghu's brother in Transoxiana in 654. Hulâghu put the heretics of Ismâîlî to the sword and relieved Muslims from these zindiqs. Thus the saying, "To an ungodly fellow, a faithless brute," manifested itself once more.

The (encyclopedic) book **Kâmûs-ul-a'lâm** gives the following definition of the entry 'Ismâîliyya': "One of the heretical groups who infiltrated among Shiites. They have been called so because they recognized Ismâîl, Imâm Ja'fer Sâdîq's eldest son, who died as the noble Imâm was alive yet, as the last imâm. They follow Ibni Saba'. They believe in reincarnation. They call harâms 'halâl'. They commit all sorts of immoral acts without feeling slightest shame. The heretical group called **Qarâmîtîs**, who shed much Muslim blood, and the villain named Hassan Sabbâh, and the State of **Fâtîmîs**, who strove to demolish Islam in Egypt, were all Ismâîlîs. The extreme ones of heretical groups and Druzis and Hurûfîs are their continuations." It is written in the book **Munjid** that they call themselves **Alawî** (Alevî).

Hurûfîs claim to come together in the unity of (Muhammad-Alî). Accordingly, the As-hâb-i-kirâm, who are praised and lauded

in Qur'ân al-kerîm and in hadîth-i-sherîfs, must have been without this unity. The three Khalîfas, who were blessed with the good news that they would enter Paradise, and all those heroic fighters who spread Islam over three continents must have belonged to other unities. However, the author betrays his own insincerity in his using the term (Muhammad-Alî). For hadrat Alî loved very much the other three Khalîfas and even all the Sahâbîs he fought against. He would acknowledge in the speeches he made as well as during all his conversations that those people were valuable Believers and praised and lauded them. A person honoured with the name Alevî should be so, too. They say that they follow the Ahl-i-Bayt. They use the blessed name Alevî, which is loved by both Sunnites and Alevîs in our country, as a mask for themselves. All their writings and attitudes show, however, that they are not Alevîs. The book **Tuhfa**, which was written at that time, gives the following information with a view to divulging their inner purposes:

1- Under the pretext of (Muhammad-Alî unity), Hurûfîs hold the Messenger of Allah and hadrat Alî equal.

2- They say that “Everybody who loves hadrat Alî will enter Paradise, be he a Jew or a Christian or a polytheist. On the other hand, those who love the As-hâb-i-kirâm will go to Hell, however good worshippers they may be and even if they love the Ahl-i-Bayt.”

3- “Sinning will not harm those who love Alî,” they allege.

4- They call the Ahl as-sunna, who are the Ummat-i-merhuma (people who have attained Allah’s compassion), the Ummat-i-mel’ûna (people accursed by Allah.).

5- Asserting that Qur'ân al-kerîm was changed by hadrat 'Uthmân ‘radiy-Allâhu ta’âlâ anh’, they deny many âyats.

6- Cursing hadrat 'Umar deserves, according to them, more thawâb than dhikring or reading Qur'ân al-kerîm.

7- It is a worship, in their view, to curse the As-hâb-i-kirâm and Zawjât-i-zawil ihtirâm (the blessed and honourable wives of our Prophet). “It is farz to curse these people daily,” they say.

8- “Cursing (hadrat) Abû Bekr or (hadrat) 'Umar once is equal to seventy worships,” they believe.

9- According to them, hadrat Ruqayya and Umm-i-Ghulthum are not Rasûlullah’s daughters, because they married hadrat 'Uthmân.

10- They say that hadrat Abû Bekr and 'Umar and 'Uthmân

'radiy-Allâhu anhum' "were munâfiqs." Thus they deny the hadîth-i sherîfs praising these three Khalîfas. These hadîth-i-sherîfs are written together with their documents in the book **Izâlat-ul-hafâ**, by Shâh Waliyyullah Dahlawî.

11- Because hadrat Abû Bekr belonged to the tribe called **Temîm** and hadrat 'Umar was from the tribe called **Adî**, they say that Abû Bekr and 'Umar 'radiy-Allâhu ta'âlâ anhumâ' "worshipped idols secretly." However, hadrat Alî gave his daughter to hadrat Abû Bekr's son Muhammad and appointed him as a governor. And he gave his other daughter to hadrat 'Umar. While maintaining on the one hand that "hadrat Alî is free from errors," they vituperate on the other hand the great religious leaders to whom hadrat Alî gave his daughters and Rasûlullah's father-in-law and son-in-law, and say that these people were munâfiqs.

12- They think that Sunnite Muslims are inimical towards hadrat Alî and Ahl-i-Bayt. On the contrary, Sunnites love hadrat Alî 'radiy-Allâhu ta'âlâ anh' and the Ahl-i-Bayt very much and say that loving these people will cause one to die in îmân, (as a Believer, that is). Sunnites believe that being a Walî (a person loved by Allâhu ta'âlâ) requires loving these people (hadrat Alî and the Ahl-i-Bayt) and following them.

13- They allege that Sunnites look on Ibni Muljam, hadrat Alî's 'radiy-Allâhu ta'âlâ anh' murderer, as a just person and that "Bukhârî reports hadîths coming through him." This allegation is untrue. The book Bukhârî does not contain any hadîths narrated by Ibni Muljam.

14- Because they feel animosity towards the Ahl as-sunna, they curse the word 'Sunnat', too.

15- They say that if a person says, "wa ta'âlâ jad-duk," when performing namâz, his namâz will be annulled.

16- They say that Sunnites 'rahmatullâhu ta'âlâ alaihim ajma'in' "are worse and fouler than Jews and Christians."

17- They claim that all their groups, inimical as they are towards one another, will enter Paradise owing to their love for hadrat Alî.

18- "It is not necessary to do the worships taught by the Ahl as-sunna," they maintain.

19- When they begin doing something, they curse the three Khalîfas instead of saying the word Basmala. They argue that "a sick person who bears on himself a piece of paper containing a

written curse against the first two Khalifas, or drinks the water in which this paper has been dipped, will recover.”

20- According to them, cursing hadrat Âisha and hadrat Hafsa ‘radiy-Allâhu anhumâ’ five times daily “is farz.”

21- They say that the Messenger of Allah “gave proxy to divorce his wives. So Alî divorced Âisha (from Rasûlullah) by proxy.” On the contrary, âyat-i-kerîmas did not even give the right to end a marriage to anyone, be it the Messenger of Allah.

22- They say that “Prophets would not have been created had it not been for Alî.” They cannot think that a person who says that “a non-Prophet is higher than a Prophet” becomes a disbeliever.

23- They say that “on the rising day everything will depend on Muhammad and Alî’s decision.”

24- According to them, when ‘Umar ‘radiy-Allâhu ta’âlâ anh’ was slain, “angels did not record sins for anybody for three days.”

25- They say that the stones thrown on Minâ during every hajj are actually thrown towards Abû Bekr and ‘Umar ‘radiy-Allâhu anhumâ’.

26- “The âyat about Dâbbat-ul-ard was intended to inform that hadrat Alî will come back to earth,” they maintain.

27- According to them, and it is at the same time the twenty-second article in their false credo, it is a very thawâb-deserving act for the host to offer his wife and daughters to another Hurûfî who visits him. In Iran the Hurûfî fathers pay visits as they wish, and the families they visit offer them women to choose as they wish. Thus, they believe, the children conceived on Friday nights (nights between Thursdays and Fridays) are (called) Persian Sayyeds. Therefore the so called Sayyeds are abundant in Iran.

28- The eighteenth of Zilhijja (month) is their greatest day of celebration. It is the day when hadrat ‘Uthmân was martyred.

29- Another day they celebrate is the ninth of Reb’ul-awwal, the day when hadrat ‘Umar ‘radiy-Allâhu ta’âlâ anh’ was martyred.

30- Another day they hold sacred is the Nevrûz Day, which is actually a day celebrated by Magians.

31- According to them, prayers of namâz except those which are farz can be performed in any direction. For instance, when they visit Imâm-i-Alî Ridâ’s tomb in Mashhad they perform namâz towards the grave on whichever corner of the grave they are. It is

stated as follows in the three hundredth page of the summary of Tuhfa: “They perform namâz with their faces towards the graves of imâms, without even considering that they may be turning their backs to the qibla (Ka’ba) by doing so.”

32- They say that namâz can always be performed naked as you are. It is written in a frank language in their book **Minhâj-us-sâlihîn** that according to them no part of one’s body, with the exception of the saw’atayn (the two private parts, the urinary and the excretory organs), is awrat (parts of the body one has to cover). Fifteenth edition of the book was published in Nejef (or Najaf) in 1386 [A.D. 1966].

33- They maintain that eating and drinking (during namâz) will not abrogate the namâz.

34- It is written in the two hundred and eighteenth page (of the book cited above, i.e. Tuhfa) that they do not perform Friday prayer and that they perform early and late afternoon, evening and night prayers all at the same time.

35- Their seventeenth credal tenet is that things touched by the innocent imâm are thousands of times as valuable as Ka’ba.

36- “Immersing oneself in water will nullify one’s fasting,” they say.

37- On the tenth of Muharram they fast until afternoon.

38- “Jihâd is not a worship, nor is it permissible,” they say.

39- They call it **Mut’a Nikâh** to cohabit with a woman for a certain period of time in return for money. According to them, this kind of nikâh (marriage) causes much thawâb. It is written in the two hundred and twenty-seventh page that life in brothels, which they call ‘Mut’a-i-dawriyya (devriyye)’, is permissible.

40- “It is sahîh (acceptable canonically) to hand over a jâriya to other men,” they say.

41- It is stated as follows in the three hundred and twenty-fifth page of the Arabic book **Muhtasar-i-Tuhfa-i-Isnâ-ashariyya**, which was prepared by Sayyed Mahmûd Shukru Alûsî in (the hijrî year) 1302 and printed in Cairo in 1373: According to these people, “Meat or any similar kind of food cooked in water that has been used for cleaning after stool is edible and permissible to eat.” It is written in their book **Minhâj** that water used in istinjâ (cleaning oneself canonically) is clean. Likewise, they say that “Water that has been used by a number of people for cleaning themselves or into which a dog has urinated is clean; it is permissible to drink it or to cook something in it. So is the case

with water half of which is blood or urine.”

42- “It is permissible for a hungry person to kill another person who has bread enough but will not give him any,” they say.

43- Their seventy-fifth stratagem, which is written in the second chapter of the book, (Tuhfa) is their saying that “Prostration in namâz must be done on earthen sun-dried bricks. Sunnites are like devils because they do not do their prostrations on earth.”

44- It is stated as follows in the two hundred and ninety-ninth page of the abridged version of Tuhfa: “As Christians forge pictures of Îsâ ‘alaihi-salâm’ and hadrat Maryam (Mary) and prostrate themselves in front of these pictures in churches, so Hurûfîs draw or paint imaginary pictures of imâms and venerate, and even prostrate themselves in front of, these pictures.” It is still observed in Iran and Iraq today that they hang forged pictures of bearded people wearing turbans on walls in mosques, in their homes and shops and worship them, saying that they are pictures of hadrat Alî.

45- It is stated in the fourteenth page of the abridged version of Tuhfa that the most excessive groups of Hurûfîs say that hadrat Alî is a god. These excessive groups have been broken into twenty-four sub-groups. The twentieth group says that “God has entered Alî and his children. Alî is a god.” People belonging to this group are mostly in Damascus, Aleppo, and Lazkiyya. Votaries of this group do not exist in Turkey.

The book **Tuhfa-i-Isnâ-ashariyya** gives a detailed account of the Hurûfî beliefs explained shortly in the forty-five paragraphs above, names of the books in which most of these beliefs are recorded, and proves through corroboratory documents that each and every one of these beliefs is wrong and aberrant. Alevîs, who are aware of hadrat Alî’s honour and value and the services he rendered to Islam, are Muslims who love that lion of Allah in a manner advised by our master, the Prophet. On the other hand, we Sunnite Muslims are Alevîs, too, because we love hadrat Alî in this manner. We love other Alevîs who share this same love. We know them as our brothers. It should be our debt of conscience to cooperate and love one another on these lands, which offer us freedom of worship and peace.

It has been explained in the lines above that one of the groups of religion reformers who endeavour to demolish Islam from within, and perhaps the most dangerous one, is the group called Hurûfîs. These people are not Shiites. Being a Shiite means

disliking the three Khalifas; it does not mean feeling hostility against them. **Shi'ah** means jamâ'at, community, group, party. People belonging to this party are called **Shi'is**. **Qisâs-i-enbiyâ** gives the following information:

The first inventor of the fitna of bearing hostility against the Ahl as-Sunna is a Jew of Yemen named **Abdullah bin Saba'**. This Jew pretended to be a Muslim. First he went to Basra, where he began to spew his venomous malices, which can be outlined as "Îsâ (Jesus) 'alaihi-salâm' will return to earth. Why should it not be possible for Muhammad 'alaihi-salâm' to do so, too. He also will come back. He and Alî will rescue the world from disbelief. Caliphate belonged to Alî by rights. The three Khalifas used force to deprive him of his rights." He was deported from Basra. He went to Kûfa and began to mislead the people. Then, being deported from Kûfa, too, he went to Damascus. The Sahâbîs in Damascus would not tolerate him. So he fled to Egypt, where he managed to gather a number of ignoble and eccentric bandits around himself, such as Khâlid bin Muljim, Sûdan bin Hamrân, Ghâfikî bin Harb and Kinâna bin Bishr. He presented himself as a lover of the Ahl-i-Bayt. The first step he took to deceive people around him was to advise them to "Love hadrat Alî and bear animosity towards people who are opposed to him." When people began to believe him, he would go a step further and say that "Hadrat Alî is the highest man after Prophets. He is the Prophet's protector, brother, and son-in-law." He would convince these people by giving wrong meanings to âyat-i-kerîmas and fabricating hadîth-i-sherîfs. People who do so are called **Zindiq**. And the final step he took with people who went on believing him would be to convince them that "The Prophet commanded that hadrat Alî should be Khalîfa after him. The Sahâba disobeyed the Prophet. They deprived Alî of his right. They traded their faith for worldly advantages." While doing all these, he was cautious enough to warn his adherents not to reveal these secrets to strangers for his purpose was "not to make fame, but to guide people to the right way." Thus he caused hadrat 'Uthmân's martyrdom. Then he tried to spread feelings of animosity against the three Khalifas among hadrat Alî's army. He was successful in this, too. People who believed him were called **Saba'iyya**, [and later, they began to be called Hurûfis]. Upon hearing about the rumours, hadrat Alî mounted the member and castigated the slanderers of the three Khalifas in a heavy language. He threatened some of them with flogging. Seeing his own success, Ibni Saba' managed to exploit

this situation, too. He secretly intimated hadrat Alí's miracles to people he chose, interpreting "these extraordinary accomplishments (of hadrat Alí's)" as symptoms of "the fact that he is a god" and putting forward the words which hadrat Alí uttered when he was in an ecstasy called **Sekr-i-tariqât** as evidences. Hadrat Alí was wise to this, too. He declared that he would burn Ibn Saba' and his believers. He exiled them to the city of Medâyn. Ibn Saba' would not give up there, either. Sending his men forth to Iraq and Azerbaijân, he promulgated enmity against the Ashâb-i-kirâm. Hadrat Alí was too busy fighting Damascene rebels to struggle against these people or to carry out his administrative duties as the Khalîfa.

9- **Question:** If hadrat Alí had made an agreement with the Sahâbîs who were against him in the events of Camel and Siffîn, if he had not made war against them, if he had united and cooperated with those beloved Muslim brothers of his and together they had fought the disbeliever named Ibn Saba' and the munâfiqs who had gathered around him, he would have added another one to the services he had rendered to Islam. Thus the Saba'iyya group, who have shed Islamic blood throughout history, would have been annihilated. How would this question be answered?

Answer: His ijtihâd was not so. The destiny foreordained by Allâhu ta'âlâ was inspired into his blessed heart. So he submitted himself to the qader-i-ilâhî. Scholars of Ahl as-sunna explain that hadrat Alí's ijtihâd was correct. The same was experienced by Abd-ul-hamîd Khân II 'rahmatullâhi aleyh'. As an army of pillagers prepared with Masonic plans were on their way towards the palace to dethrone the Sultân, the generals in Istanbul suggested to resist. The barracks in Istanbul were full of trained soldiers. Yet Abd-ul-hamîd Khân imitated hadrat Alí's 'radiy-Allâhu anh' ijtihâd. He submitted himself to qader-i-ilâhî (Allah's divine foreordination). He did not resist the rebels. Thus he thwarted the Party of Union's plans to avenge on him and thousands of Muslims.

Day after day the number of separatists increased and consequently hadrat Alí's 'radiy-Allâhu anh' army was broken into four groups:

1- The first group was the Shî'ah, who followed hadrat Alí 'radiy-Allâhu anh'. They did not criticize any of the Ashâb-i-kirâm. On the contrary, they spoke about them with love and respect. They were free from the doubts inspired by the devil.

They knew the group they were fighting against as their brothers. (After a very short time) they stopped fighting them. Hadrat Alí accepted their judgements. The name Shí'ah was attached to this group first, and people who followed this group were called **Ahl as-Sunna wa'l-jamâ'at**.

2- The group who held hadrat Alí 'radiy-Allâhu anh' higher than all the other Sahâbîs were called **Tafdîliyya**. Hadrat Alí tried to dissuade them by threatening them with flogging. The word Shí'ah represents this group today.

3- The group who said that all the Sahâba 'radiy-Allâhu ta'âlâ anhum ajma'in' were sinners and disbelievers. These people were called **Saba'iyya** or **Hurûfî**.

4- The group called **Ghulât**, who were the most unreasonable, were the most heretical of the four groups. They asserted that Allah had entered hadrat Alí.

When hadrat Huseyn's son Imâm Zeynel'âbidîn Alí passed away when he was forty-eight years old in the ninety-fourth year of the Hegira, his son **Zeyd bin Alí** 'radiy-Allâhu ta'âlâ anhum ajma'in' revolted against Khalîfa Hishâm and marched to Kûfa with an army. Yet, when hadrat Zeyd heard that his soldiers were swearing at the As-hâb-i-kirâm, he advised them to stop doing so. This made most of his soldiers abandon him. Having to defend himself with the very few soldiers who remained faithful to him, he was finally martyred in 122. Those who left him called themselves **Imâmiyya**. And the faithful ones who stayed with Zeyd were called **Zeydiyya**.

According to the Ahl as-sunna, who were Alí's Shí'ah, hadrat Alí was the highest of his time. Caliphate was his right. Those who disagreed with him were wrong and became bâghîs (rebels against the Khalîfa). Hadrat Âisha, Talha, Zubeyr, Mu'âwiya, Amr Ibni Âs and the other Sahâbîs 'radiy-Allâhu ta'âlâ anhum ajma'in' who fought hadrat Alí did not do so for the office of caliphate. They protested him because hadrat 'Uthmân's murderers had not been found and retaliated against. They were about to come to an agreement, when **Abdullah bin Saba'** and his men started the fight, and everything happened after that. All the Sahâbîs fighting hadrat Alí were saying that caliphate was his right and that he was higher than themselves. They were praising him. And hadrat Alí loved and praised those Sahâbîs who fought him.

10- Hurûfîs say that "The Ahl-i-Bayt castigated the As-hâb-i-kirâm 'radiy-Allâhu ta'âlâ anhum ajma'in' and lamented over the

persecutions inflicted by them.” They add that “Most of the Sahâba, especially (hadrat) Mu’âwiya and his father and (hadrat) Amr bin Âs, were apostates, and that those who love and praise those apostates will go to Hell together with them.” It is true that after the As-hâb-i-kirâm there were governors who perpetrated cruelty and persecution. The torments inflicted in the time of Abbasids were very much worse than those done in the time of Umayyads. Some imâms of the Ahl-i-Bayt criticized those governors. Yet these people (Hurûfîs) distorted these criticisms of the imâms of the Ahl-i-Bayt and represented them as if they had been intended for the As-hâb-i-kirâm. This act of theirs is treacherous both against the Ahl-i-Bayt and against the As-hâb-i-kirâm.

They misled ignorant people by misrepresenting books censuring the Ashâb-i-kirâm as literature belonging to the scholars of Ahl as-sunna. For example, the author of the book of interpretation entitled Keshshaf is a supporter of the groups called Tafdîliyya (see the second group explained above) and Mu’tazila. Ahtab Hârezmî, on the other hand, is an unbridled Zeydî. **Ibni Qutayba**, the author of the book Maârif, and **Ibni Ebilhadîd**, who wrote an explanation of the book Nahj-ul-belâgha, are in Mu’tazila sect. **Hisham Kelebî**, a writer of Tafsîr, is a bid’at holder. **Mes’ûdî**, the author of Murawwij-uz-zeheb, **Abulferej Isfehânî**, author of the book **Eghânî**, and **Ahmad Taberî**, author of Riyâd-un-madara, are a few of the fanatical adversaries of Ahl as-sunna. These people are being presented as scholars of Ahl as-sunna and thus younger generations are being deceived. In order to practise their deceit easily, they withhold the fact that they are holders of bid’at. Most of them masquerade completely. They pretend to be Sunnites. They praise scholars of Ahl as-sunna and yet vituperate the greater ones of the As-hâb-i-kirâm. And, in the name of documents, they refer to such books as the ones we have named above. Then, Muslims will have to be extremely vigilant. They should not read books and magazines quoting or translating from these corruptive books. No matter how earnestly they may seem to be praising Islam and the scholars of Ahl as-sunna, any religious book containing the names of the so-called books should be known as a venom, a snare prepared behind the scenes by zindiqs, whose sole purpose is to destroy Islam from within.

There are two men of religion named **Suddî**. One of them is Ismâil Kûfî. He is Sunnite. The other man, who is better known

with his nickname Saghîr, is a vulgarly bigoted holder of bid'at. Also, there are two Ibni Qutaybas. **Ibrâhîm ibni Qutayba** is a bid'at holder. Abdullah bin Muslim bin Qutayba, on the other hand, is Sunnî. Each of these people has a book entitled **Me'ârif**. Another name shared by two people is **Muhammad ibni Jerîr Taberî**. One of these two people is Sunnî and wrote a great history book. The other is a bid'at holder. The history book named **Taberî** was abridged by a bid'at holder named **Alî Shimshâtî**.

The book Tuhfa quotes the twenty-seventh falsification of Hurûfîs:

11- *"A black maiden, a jâriya, praised the Shi'ah and censured the Ahl as-sunna in Hârûn-ur-reshîd's palace. There were scholars of Ahl as-sunna, particularly Qâdî Abû Yûsuf. None of them could answer her,"* they say. The maiden's name, as they forge, was Husniya. Now a book named after her, **Husniya**, is being sold throughout Anatolia. This story, contrary to their expectations, is depreciatory to those scholars of their own aberrant way. For it naturally leads one to the conclusion that "for many centuries none of these people had been able to do what the jâriya did. In no debate had they managed to refute the scholars of Ahl as-sunna 'rahmatullâhi ta'âlâ alaihim ajmâ'in' as did the jâriya. They had always been beaten. Had they learned the jâriya's methods earlier, they would have saved themselves from embarrassment." It has been clear that the stories in the book Husniya were written by a person named **Murtadâ**. And that this Murtadâ was a Jewish convert is written in the book **Esmâ-ul-muallifîn**.

12- After hadrat Alî's martyrdom, followers of the Jew named Ibni Saba' infiltrated among the Muslims supporting hadrat Hasan. Forty thousand people elected him Khalîfa among themselves and provoked him to fight hadrat Mu'âwiya. Their aim was to do the same thing with him as they had done with hadrat Alî and to martyr him. They were showing disrespect to him. In fact, in one of such occasions Mukhtâr Seqafî pulled his prayer rug from under his blessed feet. At some other time another accursed villain hit him on the foot with a pickaxe. When the two armies met, they saw that hadrat Mu'âwiya was going to win and deserted hadrat Hasan's army. One of their own men, a zindiq named Murtadâ, writes about these treacheries of theirs shamelessly in his book **Tenzîh-ul-enbiyâ**. In fact, it is stated in their book **Kitâb-ul-fusûl** that followers of Ibni Saba', who were on hadrat Hasan's side in the beginning, wrote a letter to hadrat Mu'âwiya, saying, "Attack now! We shall leave Hasan to you." Being wise to these villains'

intentions, Hasan ‘radiy-Allâhu ta’âlâ anh’ offered peace. So hadrat Mu’âwiya ‘radiy-Allâhu ta’âlâ anh’, who had been anxious that hadrat Hasan’s blessed body should not be hurt, answered that he was ready to make peace on any terms hadrat Hasan would propose.

13- These people would not give up their mischievous activities after Mu’âwiya’s ‘radiy-Allâhu ta’âlâ anh’ time, either. For it was the right time for them to deal Islam the destructive blow from within. They sent a message to hadrat Huseyn ‘radiy-Allâhu ta’âlâ anh’, promising their support for his caliphate. They invited him to Kûfa from Mekka. Let us see what the book **Qisâs-i-Enbiyâ** has to say in this connection:

Abdullah bin ‘Umar ‘radiy-Allâhu ta’âlâ anh’ tried to dissuade him imploringly from going to Kûfa. Yet hadrat Huseyn would not listen to him. So Abdullah bid farewell to him in tears. Then Abdullah bin Abbâs took his turn and said, “O my (paternal) uncle’s son! I fear that the people of Kûfa may hurt you. They are malicious people. Don’t go there! Go to Yemen if you must go somewhere!” Hadrat Huseyn answered him, “You are right. But I have decided to go there.” Abdullah craved, “At least, do not take your household! I am afraid you will be martyred before the eyes of your children like hadrat ‘Uthmân.” Hadrat Huseyn would not listen to this advice either. These statements cited from Qisâs-i-enbiyâ show that the Sahâbîs in Mekka knew that people who invited hadrat Huseyn to the city of Kûfa were malevolent and that their purpose was to dupe him into their snare.

14- Scholars of Ahl as-sunna state that after hadrat Alî’s martyrdom caliphate belonged to hadrat Hasan by rights. On his own volition he demitted his right to hadrat Mu’âwiya. For at that time he was the person suitable for caliphate. Hadrat Hasan abdicated the office of caliphate not out of fear or because he was left alone, but to protect Muslims from a grave bloodbath, and out of his magnanimous compassion for Believers. It is not permissible to make peace with disbelievers or renegades in order to prevent fitna. It is the worst fitna to give up fighting them at the cost of offering the victory to them. Yet it is permissible to make peace with rebels (in such circumstances). Until that time hadrat Mu’âwiya’s position was that of a rebel. That year he became Khalîfa rightfully. A bâghî (rebel) cannot be cursed. Instead, benedictions must be pronounced over him and one must supplicate to Allâhu ta’âlâ to “forgive this person.” An âyat-i-kerîma in Muhammad sûra purports, **“Make istighfâr for**

Believers' wrongdoings!" Commanding **istighfâr** (invoking Allâhu ta'âlâ for forgiveness) means prohibiting cursing. This âyat-i-kerîma commands to make istighfâr for those who commit grave sins. It may be permissible to curse wrongdoing, yet this does not mean that wrongdoers can be cursed, too. The tenth âyat of Hashr sûra purports, **"Do not feel hostility towards earlier Believers. Pronounce benedictions over them."** It is a fact written even in Shiite books that hadrat Alî prohibited to curse Damascenes. This indicates that they were Muslims. It is stated in a hadîth-i-sherîf addressed to hadrat Alî, **"Fighting you is fighting against me."** Yet this hadîth-i-sherîf is intended to alarm against the risk of fighting against those great people. This hadîth-i-sherîf is explained in detail in the forty-first paragraph. In reality, the position occupied by hadrat Mu'âwiya 'radiy-Allâhu ta'âlâ anh' and his successors was that of a Ruler, a Sultân. They were doing only one of the three different duties of a Khalîfa.

Hurûfî books state that hadrat Mu'âwiya's governor's oppressed the people. One of them was Ziyâd, the governor of Shîrâz. He was Abû Sufyân's illegitimate son, whom he had from a concubine named Sumayya belonging to a doctor named Hâris in the time of Nescience (before Islam). As he grew up, he became legendary for his noble conduct, eloquence and intelligence. Amr ibni Âs, who was one of Arabia's geniuses, said about him, "If this child were a Qoureshî, he would become a great man." Hadrat Alî was there, too. Abû Sufyân said, "He is my son." When hadrat Alî became Khalîfa, he appointed Ziyâd governor of Iran. He managed perfectly and conquered a number of lands. Hadrat Mu'âwiya heard about these accomplishments of his brother's and invited him. Yet Ziyâd did not leave office till hadrat Alî's martyrdom. After hadrat Mu'âwiya became Khalîfa lawfully, he declared, in the forty-fourth year (of the Hegira), that Ziyâd was Abû Sufyân's son and appointed him governor of Basra. Thus he protected hadrat 'Uthmân and hadrat Alî from being criticized for having appointed someone without a father as a governor. Ziyâd was intending to take revenge on Qâdî Shureyh's son Sa'id for (what he had done against) hadrat Alî. To this end he seized his house and property. Sa'id went to Medîna and complained to hadrat Huseyn about him. Hadrat Huseyn 'radiy-Allâhu anh' wrote a letter to Ziyâd, advising him to return the property he had seized from Sa'id. In his reply to hadrat Huseyn, Ziyâd wrote rather insolently and said, for instance, "O the son of Fâtima! You wrote your name above mine. Yet you are

the petitioner and I am the Sultân.” Hadrat Huseyn sent this letter to the Khalîfa in Damascus, adding a file of complaint against the governor. Upon reading the letters, Mu’âwiya became very sad. He sent a harsh order to Ziyâd: “O Ziyâd! Know that you are a son of both Abû Sufyân and Sumayya! Abû Sufyân’s son will be mild and discreet, and so will Sumayya’s son be. You slander Huseyn’s father in your letter. I swear that you have all the attributes you impute to him. And he is pure from all such stains. Your name’s being below that of Huseyn is more of an honour than of a disgrace for you. As soon as you receive my order give Sa’îd’s property back to him! Build him a house better than the one he had before. I am reporting this order of mine to Huseyn, too, apologizing to him and requesting him to inform Sa’îd, too. He may stay in Medîna if he likes. Or he may go to Kûfa if he chooses to do so. Never molest them, neither with your hands nor with your tongue! You wrote to Huseyn ‘radiy-Allâhu anh’ addressing him with his mother’s name. Shame on you! Do not forget that his father is Alî bin Ebî Tâlib. And his mother is Rasûlullah’s daughter Fâtima ‘radiy-Allâhu ta’âlâ anhâ.’ Can anyone else have the same honour he has? Why do you not think?”

Everybody knows about the harms Ziyâd and his son Ubaydullah caused to Muslims. Yet it would never be correct to blame hadrat Mu’âwiya for appointing him as a governor. He had been appointed as a governor earlier, both by hadrat ‘Uthmân and by hadrat Alî ‘radiy-Allâhu ta’âlâ anhum ajma’in’. Please read the thirty-sixth paragraph!

16- Question: Our Prophet ‘sall-Allâhu alaihi wa sallam’ stated, **“He who torments Alî will have tormented me** (by doing so).” Some people exploit this hadîth-i-sherîf in their reasoning that “Since it is disbelief to hurt the Messenger of Allah, all those people who fought hadrat Alî ‘radiy-Allâhu ta’âlâ anh’ are disbelievers.”

Answer: Munâfiqs who came together in Kûfa and Egypt marched to Medîna and martyred hadrat ‘Uthmân. Hadrat Alî, who became Khalîfa upon this event, thought it would be wiser not to hurry in trying to find the murderers for retaliation. This delay spoiled the raiders and caused them to go on with their eccentricities. They began to curse hadrat ‘Uthmân and propagate the statements expressing their rightfulness everywhere. This state of affairs was a source of deep grief for the greater ones of the Sahâba, such as Talha, Zubeyr, Nu’mân bin Beshîr, Qa’b bin

bin Ajra, and others. They expressed their sorrow by saying, “If we had known that the results would be so bad, we would have protected hadrat ‘Uthmân against these bandits.” Upon hearing about this, the murderers decided to martyr these Sahâbîs, too. So the Sahâbîs went to the blessed city of Mekka, where hadrat Âisha, who had come to Mekka earlier for the purpose of making hajj, gave them asylum. They told her what was going on in Medîna and said, “The Khalîfa has to tolerate the bandits till he has suppressed the mutiny completely. This spoils them and causes them to aggravate their inimical and oppressive conduct. Bloodshed will not be prevented unless a retaliation is realized and the oppressors are punished.” Hadrat Âisha advised them, “It will not be wise for you to go back to Medîna as long as these bandits remain in Medîna and around the Emîr-ul-mu’minîn. Go to a safer place for the time being. Wait for a favourable opportunity and in the meantime search ways of rescuing Alî from the hands of these bandits. Exploit the first situation offering you the opportunity to cooperate with the Khalîfa and march against the bandits. Then it will be easy for you to arrest the murderers for retaliation. Thus you will teach the cruel a lesson whose effects will remain till the end of the world! It will not be easy now. Do not hurry.” The Sahâbîs approved these words of hadrat Âisha’s. They decided to go to places such as Iraq and Basra, where were the assembly areas for Muslim troops. They begged hadrat Âisha, “Please protect us until this fitna has been eliminated, the tumults have been suppressed and we have joined the Khalîfa. You are the mother of Muslims and the venerable wife of the Messenger of Allah. You are closer and more beloved to him than anyone else is. Since everybody respects you, the bandits cannot march against you. Stay with us and support us!” For the sake of convenience for Muslims and to protect Rasûlullah’s Sahâba, hadrat Âisha joined them and together they left for Basra. On the other hand, the murderers, who had been surrounding the Khalîfa and meddling with many administrative matters, gave hadrat Alî quite a different and false report of this movement. They persuaded the Khalîfa to go to Basra. Some Sahâbîs such as Imâm-i-Hasan, Imâm-i-Huseyn, Abdullah bin Ja’fer Tayyâr and Abdullah bin Abbâs advised the Khalîfa not to hurry and not to believe the munâfiqs’ reports. Yet the munâfiqs overpowered and managed to take hadrat Emîr to Basra. First he sent someone named Qa’qa’ to ask the people with hadrat Âisha what they thought. They answered that their purpose was peace and to

prevent fitna and that the murderers should be arrested first. The Khalîfa accepted their wishes. Upon this, Muslims from both sides rejoiced and agreed to come together three days later. As the time of their meeting became closer, the murderers heard about this agreement. At a loss as to what to do, they assembled around their leader, the Jew named Abdullah bin Saba', and asked him what they should do to prevent this meeting. "Our last resort is to attack the Khalîfa's army tonight and then go to the Khalîfa and tell him that people with Âisha did not keep their promise and raided us," was the Jew's plan. The plan was executed successfully and then, as it was planned, another troop of horsemen raided the other party. Upon this the spies who had infiltrated among them beforehand clamoured as if they were their friends: "The Khalîfa did not keep his promise. We have been raided." So the war began. This was how the event called Camel war broke out. Qurtubî and other Sunnite historians write so, and it is true. Enemies of the As-hâb-i-kirâm, on the other hand, falsify the facts in order to defend the murderers. Their lies should not be believed.

Another person who was of the opinion that the murderers should be arrested and retaliated against, was Mu'âwiya 'radiy-Allâhu anh', the governor of Damascus. Because the tumult had not been suppressed yet and the Khalîfa was too busy with the event of Camel to do anything else, he had to refuse his suggestion. And Mu'âwiya, in his turn, refused to recognize him as the Khalîfa. As it is written also in the Shiite book **Nahj-ul-belâgha**, the Khalîfa stated, "We shall (have to) fight our brothers in Islam. They have deviated from the right way." As is seen, those who fought the battles of Camel and Siffîn never thought of hurting hadrat Alî 'kerrem-Allâhu wejeh'. The only feeling fostered by both parties was obeying the commandments of Allâhu ta'âlâ and preventing the fitna. Yet talons of Zionism managed bloodbaths on both sides.

In the hundred and twenty-third page of the book **Tezkire-i Kurtubî Muhtasari**, a hadîth-i-sherîf reported by Muslim is quoted. It reads as follows: "**If Muslims fight one another, the ones who are killed as well as their killers will go to Hell.**" According to scholars, this hadîth-i-sherîf means those who fight for worldly advantages. It does not mean fighting for an Islamic cause, for eliminating vices or for subduing rebels. As a matter of fact, another hadîth-i-sherîf states, "**If you fight for worldly advantages, both the killer and the one killed will be in Hell.**" This

is not the case with the war between hadrat Alî and hadrat Mu'âwiya 'radiy-Allâhu ta'âlâ anhumâ'. It was not fought for worldly advantages. It was done for the purpose of executing Allah's command. It is stated in a hadîth-i-sherîf, which exists in Muslim, **"Fitnas will arise among my As-hâb. Allâhu ta'âlâ will forgive them for the sake of the Sohba they have had with me. However, people who come later will criticize my Sahâbîs involved in these fitnas and will go to Hell (because of their criticisms)."** This hadîth-i-sherîf indicates that all the As-hâb who fought one another will be pardoned.

17- Hurûfîs, who are bitter enemies of the As-hâb-i-kirâm, say that all the Ahl as-sunna 'rahmatullâhi ta'âlâ alaihim ajma'în' are accursed. The hundred and tenth âyat of 'Imrân sûra purports, **"You are the best of Ummats."** And these people (Hurûfîs) call this Ummat (Muslims) 'accursed'. They consider it a great worship to curse the greater ones of the As-hâb-i-kirâm after every prayer of namâz. It does not even occur to them to curse such people as Abû Jahl, Abû Leheb, Pharaoh and Nimrod, who are enemies of Allâhu ta'âlâ and Prophets. They say that âyat-i-kerîmas praising the three Khalîfas and the As-hâb-i-kirâm are (among those âyats called) Muteshâbihât and therefore they cannot be understood.

18- They look on the Ahl as-sunna as enemies of the Ahl-i-Bayt. On the contrary, books written by scholars of Ahl as-sunna teem with writings advising to love the Ahl-i-Bayt and commending the great virtues they have. Bahâ-ud-dîn Âmilî, a Sunnite scholar, states in his book **Keshkul** that a person who denies the Ahl-i-Bayt is not a Believer. All the tarîqats of Ahl as-sunna receive fayz (or faidh) from the Ahl-i-Bayt. Imâms of the four Madh-habs of Ahl as-sunna are the disciples of the Ahl-i-Bayt. Ibnî Mutahhir Hullî, a Shiite scholar, acknowledges in his books **Nahj-ul-haqq** and **Minhaj-ul-kerâma** that Abû Hanîfa and Mâlik bin Enes were taught by Imâm-i-Ja'fer Sâdiq. Imâm-i-Shâfi'î was a disciple to Imâm-i-Mâlik as well as to Imâm-i-Muhammad Sheybânî. Imâm-i-a'zam Abû Hanîfa attended the Sohbas of Imâm-i-Muhammad Bâqir, too, and acquired religious lore from him. Ibnî Mutahhir acknowledges this fact plainly. Consequently, Imâm-i-a'zam must be a mujtahid capable of ijtihâd according to the Shiite credo. It is according to them, again, that a person who denies his testimony must be a disbeliever. As Imâm-i-Mûsâ Kâzim was a prisoner in a dungeon belonging to the Abbasids, Imâm-i-Abû Yûsuf and Imâm-i-Muhammad Sheybânî

would come to his dungeon and he would teach them. This fact is written in Shiite books, too.

It is farz for every Muslim not to like disbelievers. There are many âyat-i-kerîmas commanding this. Believers, on the other hand, have to love one another even if they are sinful. Every Believer should love Allâhu ta'âlâ more than anything else. Love and hatred have degrees. After Allâhu ta'âlâ, a Believer has to love His Messenger most. And who he loves third best must be those Believers who are close to the Messenger. Three classes of people are closest to him:

1- His children and relatives 'radiy-Allâhu ta'âlâ anhum ajma'in'.

2- His blessed wives 'radiy-Allâhu ta'âlâ anhum ajma'in'. Jenâb-i-Haqq mentions relation through genealogy and relation through nikâh (marriage) together in Qur'ân al-kerîm.

3- His As-hâb 'radiy-Allâhu ta'âlâ anhum ajma'in'. These people would run for his help even at the sacrifice of their lives. This type of closeness is superior to all other types.

Next comes loving all the other Believers 'rahmatullâhi ta'âlâ alaihim ajma'in'. If any one of these people loses his îmân he will no longer deserve this love. Îmân and kufr (disbelief) are determined at one's final breath, (that is, whether a person is a Believer or a disbeliever) becomes certain at the time of death. A Believer's sinning is not something liked. But he himself is loved.

It has been reported unanimously that after Rasûlullah's passing away none of his blessed wives and none of his As-hâb 'radiy-Allâhu ta'âlâ anhum ajma'in' became a disbeliever. Nasîr-ad-dîn-i-Tûsî, a Shiite scholar, asserts that "Those who opposed Imâm-i-Alî became sinners. And people who fought him became disbelievers." According to the unanimous report mentioned above, however, those who revolted against the Emîr and disobeyed him must be loved, too.

19- The combats of Camel and Siffîn were not the fruits of an intention to fight against hadrat Alî. Their motive was the (Islamic) thought that the murderers of hadrat 'Uthmân should be retaliated against. These wars would have been fought even if hadrat Alî had not been among them. None of the people who took part in these battles felt any feeling of animosity whatsoever towards hadrat Alî. A person who commits a forbidden act will be remunerated in accordance with his intention. For instance, supposing a person said, "If someone breaks this glass I shall

punish him,” and someone walking by tripped over something and broke the glass. Now the first person should not punish him. So is the case with those who fought hadrat Alí. Hadrat Âisha’s opposing hadrat Alí is like hadrat Mûsâ’s (Moses) rebuking hadrat Hârûn (Aaron). Qur’ân al-kerîm declares that hadrat Âisha is Believers’ mother. A mother cannot be blamed for chastising her son even if it is a mistake. The Sahâbîs who fought hadrat Alí are praised through âyats and hadîths. There is the hope of shafâ’at (intercession) and salvation for each and every one of the As-hâb-i-kirâm, and even for all Believers. If a person feels enmity towards hadrat Alí, curses and swears at him, he becomes a disbeliever. However, none of the Sahâbîs (who fought him) is reported to have done so. A person who calls hadrat Alí a disbeliever or asserts that he will not enter Paradise or alleges that he cannot be a Khalîfa on account of his shortcomings in knowledge, justice, wara’ and taqwâ, becomes a disbeliever himself. Khârijîs and Yezîdîs (Yazîdîs) hold such a belief about him, yet this belief of theirs originate from their erroneous interpretation of dubious evidences. If a person fights him out of sensuous desires such as property and position or as a result of erroneous ijtihâd, he will not become a disbeliever. In the former case, the person concerned will become a sinner, and in the second case he will become a bid’at holder. It is stated in a hadîth-i-sherîf, **“Cursing a Believer is like slaying him.”** To curse someone means to wish that he be far from Allah’s compassion. Feeling of hatred felt against a person will continue after his death, too. It is stated in a hadîth-i-sherîf, **“Do not swear at the dead.”**

20- As it is seen, there is a Jewish finger in the wars of Camel and Siffin. They are disasters manipulated by Zionism. They are consequences of atrocious plans conceived to set brothers against one another and to demolish Islam from within by arousing a civil war. As it was Jews who arranged hadrat ‘Uthmân’s ‘radiy-Allâhu ta’âlâ anh’ martyrdom, so it was these same people again who organized and dispatched the army which dethroned Sultân Abd-ul-hamîd Khân II ‘rahmatullâhi aleyh’.

Muslims still do not wake up. They cannot see these facts. Books written by the enemies of Islam, who martyred hadrat ‘Uthmân, (and) who caused the As-hâb-i-kirâm to destroy one another, and who caused the freemasons called the Union Party to become a nuisance to Muslims and thus dragged thousands of religious men to gallows or into dungeons, are selling in great

numbers and being sent even to villages. Religion reformers supported by freemasons and communists are endeavouring assiduously. Muslims, on the other hand, are quite oblivious and sound asleep. They are translating and advertising books written insidiously for the purpose of demolishing Islam from within.

21- We saw an advertisement being run for a religious book in a daily newspaper. We were told that the newspaper had been praising the book for several days. A Muslim brought us a copy of the book. It is richly embellished with praisals of the Ahl as-sunna, very probably intended to camouflage the lies and slanders placed here and there. We would like to announce these to our brothers in Islam. Thus we will have rendered a great service to our faith and to our people if we can save our younger generations from falling into bottomless chasms.

22- *“It is stated in books that even Âisha-i-Siddîqa remained penitent till the end of her life for having erred in her ijtihâd,”* he says.

On the contrary, books do not contain any writings stating that such and such a scholar repented of his ijtihâd. For it is not sinful to perform ijtihâd on religious teachings which require ijtihâd. There is at least one thawâb (reward) for ijtihâd. Those great people ‘rahmatullâhi ta’âlâ alaihim ajma’in’ were sorry not because they had erred in their ijtihâd but because Muslim blood had been shed.

23- He writes such things as *“After a long and insistent period of fitna, mischief, warfare and devastation, it was finally realized that the As-hâb had been erroneous in their ijtihâd.”* As we have stated earlier, the ijtihâd reached by the As-hâb-i-kirâm ‘radiy-Allâhu ta’âlâ anhum ajma’in’ indicated that the murderers of hadrat ‘Uthmân should be retaliated against, that the bandits in Medîna should be deported, and that peace and order should be restored as soon as possible. Their ijtihâd had nothing to do with warfare. The so-called combats were caused by munâfiqs. Later, the same munâfiqs said that the combats had been consequences of differences in ijtihâd. Thus they managed to break Muslims into two groups.

24- He quotes a hadîth-i-sherîf which quotes, *“Some people from my As-hâb will come near me (as I rest) by my Pond (in Paradise). I will see them and recognize them. Then they will separate them from me. I will say, “Yâ Rabbi! These people are my As-hâb.” Upon this, I shall be replied, “These people did this and that after you.”* Then he names various books in order to

prove that it is a true hadîth-i-sherîf.

A longer form of this hadîth-i-sherîf exists in Sunnite books called **Sahîh**, [that is, books of hadîth whose authenticity have been ratified unanimously by scholars of Hadîth]. All the sahîh hadîth-i-sherîfs of this sort point to the munâfiqs among the As-hâb-i-kirâm. It is stated in a hadîth-i-sherîf that a few people among the As-hâb-i-kirâm turned renegades in the time of the Messenger of Allah. They are not included in the honour of being Sahâbîs. These people were dispatched as envoys by tribes such as Benî Hanîf and Benî Saqîf, said that they had become Muslims, and left. Afterwards, they lapsed back into apostasy. Another person in the category is Harqus bin Zubeyr, who was with hadrat Alî in the combats of Camel and Siffîn and joined the group Khârijîs afterwards. Scholars of Ahl as-sunna unanimously agree that all the Sahâbîs who performed pious deeds and made Jihâd against disbelievers passed away as Believers. The Sahâbîs who took part in the wars of Camel and Siffîn on both sides are included in these fortunate people. None of them called another a disbeliever. The hadîth-i-sherîf that states, “**Ammâr bin Yâser will be slain by rebels,**” and hadrat Alî’s statement, “Our brothers have revolted against us,” prove that hadrat Mu’âwiya and all the As-hâb-i-kirâm who were with him were Muslims. In our (Turkish) book **Eshâb-i-Kirâm**, we quote the statements which hadrat Mu’âwiya and hadrat Amr Ibni Âs made towards their deaths, and give detailed examples of the excessive love and the deep respect they had for the Messenger of Allah. Those who read the book will realize that both of them had very firm îmân and will never speak ill of them. Scholars of Ahl as-sunna do not defend renegades. On the contrary, they state the superior merits possessed by those people who fought against renegades in the time of Abû Bekr. They explain how honourable those heroic people were who routed renegades, fought Iranian and Byzantine armies for Allah’s sake and beat them to the ground. These heroes caused thousands of people to become Believers. They taught them the Qur’ân, the namâz, and Islam. Qur’ân al-kerîm gives them the good news that they shall all go to Paradise and promises them infinite blessings. Allâhu ta’âlâ declares that He is pleased with them all. This good news and promise testify that all the As-hâb-i-kirâm ‘radiy-Allâhu ta’âlâ anhum ajma’in’ passed away as Believers and none of them became a renegade.

Shâh Waliyy-ullâh-i-Dahlawî ‘rahima-hullah’ quotes this hadîth-i-sherîf and explains it at the end of his book **Qurrat-ul-**

aynayn. We have summarized and translated this book from Persian into Turkish and titled it **Eshâb-ı Kirâm.**

25- *“In the interpretation of the âyat, ‘You are a beneficent Ummat produced for (the good of) humanity,’ Imâm Ibni Jerî-i-Taberî quotes (through authentic narration) ‘Umar-ul-Fârûq as having said, ‘This noble attribute includes the earlier ones among us, not the later generations.’ According to Ahmad bin Hanbel and Ibni Shîrîn, the earlier ones are those who performed namâz towards two qiblas. According to Sha’bî, on the other hand, they are people who paid and promised homage (to the Prophet) under the tree of Ridwân,”* he says.

Thus he tries to pave the way to a position whence to attack hadrat Mu’âwiya. Yet the fulcrum whereon he bases his theory is quite untenable. By writing that the people called Sâbiqûn and praised in the âyat-i-kerîma are the early Believers, he tries to hint that hadrat Mu’âwiya and hadrat Amr İbni Âs, being among later Believers, are not included in the group praised. He quotes only the former part, which reads as **“Sâbiqûn-al-awwalûn”**, of the hundred and first âyat of Tawba sûra, and withholds the latter part. After beginning as “Sâbiqûn al-awwalûn,” the âyat-i-kerîma purports, **“Allâhu ta’âlâ is pleased with those who follow these people in îmân and ihsân. And they are pleased with Allâhu ta’âlâ, too. Allâhu ta’âlâ has prepared Gardens for them.”** All books of Tafsîr unanimously state that all the As-hâb-i-kirâm and people who will follow them till the end of the world are included among them. The Tafsîr named Tibyân, after stating this fact, quotes Muhammad bin Qa’b as having said, “All the As-hâb-i-kirâm, including the ones who committed sins, are in Paradise,” and adds that he quoted the aforementioned âyat-i-kerîma after making this statement. A Hurûfî father was asked why he did not perform namâz at all. His answer was that he obeyed the âyat, “Do not be close to the namâz!” By withholding the final part of the âyat-i-kerîma, which terminates as, “... when you are drunk,” he changed the commandment of Allâhu ta’âlâ quite the other way round and thus became a disbeliever. Likewise, the author of the aforementioned book writes only the beginning part of the âyat-i-kerîma and conceals the fact that hadrat Mu’âwiya and hadrat Amr İbni Âs are among those people who are to go to Paradise.

26- Then he launches his first offensive by saying, *“The leaders of disbelief are Abû Sufyân, who was Hind’s husband and Mu’âwiya’s father, and his coterie.”* He seems to forget that in those days Abbâs, Rasûlullah’s ‘sall-Allâhu alaihi wa sallam’

paternal uncle, was among the unbelievers, too. He was one of the commanders of the troops marching towards Bedr to fight the Messenger of Allah. When he was taken as a captive, he boasted to hadrat Alî that they were “repairing the Mesjîd-i-harâm, providing covers for the Ka’ba, and supplying water for the Hadjis.” Upon this, Allâhu ta’âlâ revealed an âyat-i-kerîma, which purports, **“Polytheists’ repairing mosques is not sahîh (valid, acceptable). We shall annihilate the deeds they boast about and put them into Hell.”** Thus Abbâs received the answer he deserved. Later, however, Allâhu ta’âlâ continued His revelation, which purports, **“There are high grades for those who believed, migrated from Mekka to Medîna, and performed Jihâd for Allah’s sake. I offer the good news of My Rahmat (Compassion and forgiveness), My Ridwân (Being pleased and loving), and My Gardens of Paradise. They shall attain eternal blessings in Paradise.”** Abbâs and Abû Sufyân ‘radiy-Allâhu ta’âlâ anhumâ’ joined the Believers. They migrated from Mekka to Medîna in the year of the Fat-h (conquest). Abû Sufyân lost his eye in the Holy War of Tâif. Rasûlullah ‘sall-Allâhu alaihi wa sallam’ gave him the good news that he will go to Paradise. In the Holy War of Yermuk, which was fought during Abû Bekr’s ‘radiy-Allâhu anh’ caliphate, he lost his second eye and attained martyrdom a short time later in the same battle.

27- *“In the combat of Siffin, seventy thousand people died from each army. Twenty-five thousand of these people were supporting Aliyy-ul-murtadâ. Who is the cause of this horrendous fight,”* he asks.

Translating a chapter from the book **Tuhfa**, we explained in detail in the sixteenth chapter above that this war was a result of the provocations perpetrated by a Jew named **Abdullah bin Saba’** and a group of zindiqs led by him and named after him as **Saba’iyya**. Nevertheless, followers of the Saba’iyya group are endeavouring to impute this Jewish turpitude to hadrat Mu’âwiya, thus to break Muslims into groups.

28- *“Talha and Zubeyr, two members of the Ashara-i-mubashshara, who were on the side of Âisha-i-Siddîqa in the war of Camel, retracted their earlier erroneous ijthâd and left the battle area,”* he says.

These two Sahâbîs, who had been given the good news that they would go to Paradise, did not perform ijthâd for fighting hadrat Alî. With this allegation, these people are trying to blemish

these two noble persons, whom the Messenger of Allah loved very much and gave the good news of Paradise. When hadrat Alí met them and said that he did not want to fight Muslims, they realized that they had been duped by Jews. So they gave up fighting.

29- *“As Talha was dying, he recognized a follower of Aliy-ul-murtadá passing by and said to him, “Hold out your hand! I shall pay homage (to you) in the name of Alí,” he says.*

Hadrat Âisha and those who were with her said that they were in Basra not to fight hadrat Alí but to make an agreement with him, to pay homage to him, and to put an end to fitna and mischief. It is stated as follows in the four hundred and eighteenth page of Qisâs-i-Enbiyâ: “After Rasûlullah’s passing away, it was being discussed who would take office as the K̄halifa, when Zubeyr bin Awwâm drew his sword and said he was not going to put his sword back into its sheath unless Alí is paid homage to.” It was this same Zubeyr, one of the ten fortunate people given the good news of Paradise, who was among those who accompanied Âisha-i-Siddîqa against hadrat Alí”. This writing quoted from Qisâs-i-Enbiyâ proves that all those Sahâbîs whose ijtihâd disagreed with that of hadrat Alí knew hadrat Alí as higher and more suitable for caliphate than they were and wished to make an agreement with him. We explained in the sixteenth paragraph how the event of Camel started as a result of Jewish intrigue. The writing quoted from the book shows that this translation of ours is true. It is not a sin for mujtahids to perform ijtihâd. Then why should it be a virtuous act for them to change their ijtihâd?

30- *“It is advised in the âyat-i-kerîma to ‘Stay in your homes. Do not go out. Do not engage in warfare.’ She realized her mistake from this âyat-i-kerîma,” he says.*

If this âyat-i-kerîma commanded never to go out, the Messenger of Allah would not have taken along his wives when he went on Hajj, ‘Umra or Holy War after the revelation of this âyat-i-kerîma. Nor would he have permitted them to visit their parents, sick people or bereaved families. It is obvious that the fact is quite to the contrary. Then, the âyat-i-kerîma commands them (women) not to go out without covering themselves. It does not prohibit them to go out for religious reasons, provided that they will cover themselves. Hadrat Âisha was one of the greatest ones of the As-hâb-i-kirâm ‘radiy-Allâhu ta’âlâ anhum ajma’în’. Upon the requests of the As-hâb, she went out to demand retaliation for the

rightful Khalîfa (hadrat 'Uthmân). According to Shiite books, during hadrat Abû Bekr's caliphate, hadrat Alî made hadrat Fâtima mount an animal and took her out for a tour in Medîna. In the time of the second Khalîfa Sahâbîs would take the Zawjât-i-tâhirât (the Messenger's pure wives) on hajj.

31- "*Rasûl-i-ekrem 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wa sallam' stroked Ammâr bin Yâser's face and said, 'You will be slain by a group of rebels.' This report shows that Mu'âwiya and his coterie were rebels. When Ammâr was martyred, those who knew about this report deserted Mu'âwiya and sided with Aliyy-ul-Murtadâ. Bâghî means rebel, insurgent,*" he says, and adds that he borrowed this information from Qisâs-i-Enbiyâ.

We have looked up the matter in the book **Qisâs-i-Enbiyâ**. We have not seen any writing stating that those who heard about hadrat Ammâr's death transferred to hadrat Alî's side. The book writes that the combat became even more heated and some differences began in hadrat Alî's army. The hadîth-i-sherîf about hadrat Ammâr, which is quoted by this author, too, proves that hadrat Mu'âwiya and other Sahâbîs like hadrat Amr Ibni Âs were not disbelievers. All these people had joined the Messenger of Allah in his Jihâd against unbelievers.

It is stated in **Qisâs-i-Enbiyâ**: The same year when Mekka was conquered, Rasûlullah 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wa sallam' wrote a letter to Ja'fer, the ruler of Ammân, and sent it through hadrat Amr Ibni Âs 'radiy-Allâhu anh'.

When the people of Tâif became Muslims, Rasûl-i-ekrem sent Abû Sufyân bin Harb to Tâif and had him break the idol called **Lat**. Abû Sufyân and his sons Yezîd and Mu'âwiya were Rasûlullah's secretaries. Khâlid ibni Zeyd Abâ Ayyûb al-ansârî and Amr Ibni Âs, too, were two of the honourable people who served as secretaries (to the Messenger of Allah). Amr Ibni Âs was appointed as the army commander by the Messenger of Allah. Rasûlullah 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wa sallam' also appointed Abû Sufyân as governor of Najrân and his son Yezîd as a judge in Teyma 'radiy-Allâhu ta'âlâ anhumâ'.

Hadrat Amr Ibni Âs was in Ammân when Rasûlullah passed away. Upon his arriving in Medîna, the Sahâba crowded around him and asked him to tell them what he had seen on his way. He said, "I saw that Arabs living in places from Ammân to Medîna had already become renegades and ready to fight us." Hadrat Abû Bekr sent forth different groups of Sahâbîs against different

groups of renegades. He sent a troop under Amr Ibni Âs' command 'radiy-Allâhu ta'âlâ anhum ajma'in' against the renegades of Hudâ'a.

In the period of Sa'âdat, hadrat Amr Ibni Âs was formerly assigned the duty of collecting zakât from the tribes of Sa'd and Huzayfa and Uzra. Later he was appointed as a judge in Ammân and was promised that on his return he would be given his former position again. When he was back from Ammân, hadrat Khalîfa sent him out to collect zakât as he had been doing before, thus fulfilling the promise made by the Messenger of Allah. When the number of renegades increased, the Khalîfa wanted to give him command over a community. He wrote to him, saying, "I gave you your former duty so that the promise made by the Messenger of Allah be fulfilled. Now I plan to assign you a duty which will be more useful for you both in the world and in the Hereafter." Amr Ibni Âs' answer was: "I am one of Islam's arrows. After Allah, you are the person who will throw and recollect these arrows. Throw the one which is more powerful and more effective." So hadrat Khalîfa appointed him commander over a community. He sent him to Palestine via Eylâ. And Abû Sufyân's son Yezîd was given command over another community and sent to a region in the vicinity of Damascus by way of Belqa. Abû Sufyân's second son Mu'âwiya was made Emîr over another community under his brother's command. Emperor Heraclius sent his brother with a hundred thousand strong army against hadrat Amr Ibni Âs and another powerful army commanded by a general named Yorgi against Yezîd. He remained in Hums. The Islamic troops, upon the orders they received from the Khalîfa, assembled in **Yermuk**. The Byzantine troops also assembled against the Muslim troops. The Muslims preferred defense and in the meantime sent messengers to the Khalîfa, asking for help. Upon the orders sent by the Khalîfa, hadrat Khâlîd, who was (called) The Sword of Allah, left Iraq with a ten thousand strong army to reinforce Amr Ibni Âs' army under his command. After a bloody battle fought in Ejnâdin, the Byzantine army suffered a humiliating defeat. Then in Yermuk another difficult battle took place between a two hundred and forty thousand strong Byzantine army and a forty-six thousand strong Islamic army, among whom were a thousand Sahâbîs. And one hundred of these noble people were heroes who had been in the Holy War of Bedr. Hadrat Khâlîd was unanimously voted as the Commander-in-chief. Amr Ibni Âs and Sherhabil commanded the right wing and Yezîd bin Ebî Sufyân

and Qa'qa' commanded the left wing. Abû Sufyân bin Harb encouraged the soldiers with his heroic accomplishments. The battle cost much blood. One hundred thousand Byzantines, including the Emperor's brother, were put to the sword. An arrow pierced through Abû Sufyân's blessed eye and made him blind. The Byzantines launched another offensive with an eighty thousand strong army in Jordan. Khâlîd took his place in the center, while Amr Ibni Âs and Abû Ubayda shared the two wings 'radiy-Allâhu ta'âlâ anhum ajma'in'. The Byzantines were routed. Very few of them survived.

During the caliphate of hadrat 'Umar ul-Fârûq, Muslims besieged Damascus. One gate was held by Khâlîd bin Walîd, another by Amr Ibni Âs, and a third one by Yezîd bin Ebî Sufyân. Yezîd appointed his brother commander of the forward column. So he conquered the cities of Saydâ (Sidon) and Beirut, while Amr Ibni Âs conquered Palestine. Hadrat Amr Ibni Âs was the commander of the army in Palestine. Hadrat Emîr ul-mu'minîn frequently sent help to Amr Ibni Âs. Amr Ibni Âs was a well-known genius and a clever administrator. He sent a troop to Jerusalem, and one to Ramla. On the other hand, Mu'âwiya besieged the city of Qaysâriya. There were many soldiers in the city. They went out to attack the siege forces. Yet hadrat Mu'âwiya broke all their offensives. In the meantime, Amr Ibni Âs fought the Byzantine commander-in-chief and gave him an utter rout. He conquered the cities of Ghazza and Nablûs. Hadrat 'Umar left for Jerusalem, bidding hadrat Alî to take his place in his absence. He was met by Khâlîd, Amr Ibni Âs and Sherhâbil, all of whom hugged him cordially. The Byzantines surrendered Jerusalem to hadrat 'Umar. The booties taken in Iran were transported to Medîna by Ziyâd bin Ebîh. He gave the Khalîfa a very clear and eloquent report about the combats in Iran. Yezîd was appointed governor of Damascus. Mu'âwiya conquered the city of Qaysâriya. Yezîd, the governor of Damascus, died of plague. His brother Mu'âwiya was appointed to take his place as the governor of Damascus. Also, Abû Ubayda, the commander of Syria, and Mu'âz bin Jabal, who took his place, died of plague. When hadrat Amr Ibni Âs became commander-in-chief, he made all the people to go to the mountains, thus putting an end to the epidemic. Hadrat Amr Ibni Âs was appointed commander for the military expedition to Egypt. The Byzantine army was routed after a war of one month. The Muslims entered Egypt. Hadrat Amr Ibni Âs used mangonels in this war. Heraclius had prepared

a great army in Istanbul and was marching against Amr Ibni Âs, when he died on the way. Amr Ibni Âs conquered Alexandria after a war which lasted for three months. Then he moved towards Trablus (Tripoli), which he conquered after one month's war. When hadrat 'Umar was martyred, his son Ubeydullah killed Hurmuzân, a former Persian Shâh, thinking that he was the murderer (of his father). Hadrat Alî said that a retaliation should be inflicted on Ubeydullah. The governor of Egypt Amr Ibni Âs, who was on leave at that time, disagreed with him, saying, "How could it be justifiable to kill a son only a short time after the murdering of his father?" 'Uthmân 'radiy-Allâhu anh', who was the Khalîfa, approved this statement and extenuated the punishment from retaliation to indemnification, paying the indemnity from his personal property. This was a disagreement of ijtihâd. Hadrat Mu'âwiya launched a series of Holy Wars in Asia Minor and marched up to the city of **Amûriyya**. The Khalîfa dismissed Amr Ibni Âs from the governorship of Egypt. The Khalîfa's plan was to conquer Istanbul by way of Andalusia (Spain). He landed troops in Andalusia. Mu'âwiya 'radiy-Allâhu ta'âlâ anh', who was the commander of the army in Damascus, sent ships transporting troops to Cyprus. These troops, reinforced by the forces sent as an aid from Egypt, conquered the island after incessant battles.

Constantine III, the kaiser of Istanbul, became the Byzantine Emperor in 47 [A.D. 668] and died in 66 [A.D. 685]. Organizing a great fleet, he hoisted the sails into the Mediterranean. On the other hand, hadrat Mu'âwiya 'radiy-Allâhu ta'âlâ anh' and Abdullah the governor of Egypt formed a fleet each and set sails. An illustrious sea war ended in the Muslims' victory. In the thirty-third year of the Hegira, hadrat Mu'âwiya, who was the governor of Damascus at that time, fought his way through Byzantine territories till he came to the Bosphorus. This Mu'âwiya bin Ebî Suyân 'radiy-Allâhu anhumâ' was an honourable Sahâbî who had served as a secretary to the Messenger of Allah.

Hadrat Alî 'radiy-Allâhu anh' risked his life and fought like a lion against enemies for the establishment and implantation of Islam. Many an unbeliever succumbed to his sword. Hadrat Mu'âwiya 'radiy-Allâhu anh' was another hero who did not hesitate to put his life in jeopardy for the promulgation of Islam and fought the Byzantine armies so that Islam spread its luminous lights in the west as well as in the east. Many a country yielded to his conquests.

A Jewish convert named Abdullah bin Saba' misled many people in Egypt. He provoked the people into insurrection by instilling into them the idea that the office of caliphate belonged to hadrat Alî by rights. If Amr Ibni Âs had been the governor of Egypt in those days he would not have let this fitna arise. A few people in Kûfa, taking offense with their governor for some reason, began to backbite hadrat 'Uthmân. The Khalîfa banished them to Damascus, and wrote to Mu'âwiya the governor of Damascus to "Admonish these people!" Mu'âwiya praised the Qoureishîs to these people and said, "Rasûl-i-ekrem employed me in his service. Then his three Khalîfas appointed me as a governor and were pleased with me." He advised them very earnestly. They would not listen to him. So he sent them to the city of Hums. Abd-ur-rahmân bin Walîd, the governor of Hums, treated them harshly and threatened them to make tawba. The Khalîfa summoned Mu'âwiya, Amr Ibni Âs and the other three governors to Medîna and asked them their opinions. Mu'âwiya was of the opinion that the Khalîfa should "Give the governors initiative." However, Amr Ibni Âs 'radiy-Allâhu ta'âlâ anhumâ' said, "O Khalîfa! You and Benî Umayya (Umayyads) have placed your trust in the people. You have been rather (too) compassionate to them. Either oppress or withdraw or wield more authority!"

Meanwhile, Ibni Saba', who was in Egypt, was conducting timely correspondence between himself and his men in other provinces. They were fabricating lies, such as "Governor so and so is oppressing the people", multiplying these slanders by thousands, and promulgating them far and near. The Khalîfa heard about the (fabricated) complaints (most of them about the governors). He convened the governors and asked them the reasons for the complaints. Mu'âwiya said, "You appointed me governor. And I appointed many people as officials. You will receive goodness from them. Everybody knows and governs his country better." Sa'îd said, "The rumours are all slanderous. They are being spread secretly. And people believe them. Those who fabricate them ought to be found and killed." Amr Ibni Âs said, "You have behaved too softly. You have to be harsh when necessary." The Khalîfa went to Medîna together with the governors. He sent for Alî and Talha and Zubeyr. (When they met), Mu'âwiya began to talk, "You are the highest members of the As-hâb. You have elected the Khalîfa. He is old now. Do not rush forward." Grieved over these statements, hadrat Alî said,

“Be quiet.” They dispersed. Mu’âwiya invited the Khalîfa to Damascus. The Khalîfa refused. “Then, let me send a detachment to protect you,” was Mu’âwiya’s next suggestion, which the Khalîfa replied, “I do not want to oppress Rasûlullah’s neighbours.” When Mu’âwiya finally tried to warn, saying, “I fear that they might contrive to kill you,” the Khalîfa said, “Whatever Allah decrees will happen.” Upon this, Mu’âwiya put on his travelling clothes, talked with Alî and Talha and Zubeyr and other Sahâbîs, entrusted the Khalîfa to their care, bid farewell to them, and set out for Damascus. As he left, he said, “Abû Bekr did not wish the world. Nor did the world attempt to approach him. The world approached ’Umar. He refused the world. ’Uthmân received a little of the world. As for us; we have dived into the world.”

Ibni Saba’s men assembled in Egypt and Kûfa and several thousand of them left for Medîna under the pretext that they were going to make hajj. After their arrival in Medîna, hadrat ’Uthmân ‘radiy-Allâhu ta’âlâ anh’ was martyred. The rescue forces sent from Damascus and Kûfa were too late.

The writings above, which we have borrowed from the First World War edition of Qisâs-i-Enbiyâ, show clearly how faithful and true Muslims hadrat Mu’âwiya and hadrat Amr Ibni Âs were, how high their statuses among the As-hâb-i-kirâm were, how greatly they served Islam and how zealously they fought against unbelievers. Although the book Qisâs-i-Enbiyâ was written under the influence of false stories in the histories written by prejudiced Abbasid historians whose motive was to censure the Umayyads and ingratiate themselves with their government, it provides the true information we have given above. In its account of the events called Camel and Siffin, it adds the slanders that exist in Abbasid histories and which are quite incompatible with the honours of these two Sahâbîs and hadrat Abû Sufyân ‘radiy-Allâhu ta’âlâ anh’. However, the selections we have written above should suffice for people keen-sighted and understanding enough to recognize the greatness of the As-hâb-i-kirâm and realize that allegations that exist in Qisâs-i-Enbiyâ and which blemish them are forgeries and calumniations.

32- *“Mu’âwiya bin Hadîdj, who was a Sahâbî and one of the commanders whom Mu’âwiya had sent to Egypt in company of Amr Ibni Âs, slew Muhammad bin Ebî Bekr, one of the messengers of Aliyy-ul-murtadâ, placed him in a donkey’s carcass and burned him. One cannot decide what to say about this*

monstrosity,” he says, and adds that he borrows this information from the book *Rawdat-ul-Ebrâr*.

Now let us see what **Qisâs-i-Enbiyâ** has to say in this connection: “Muhammad bin Ebî Bekr, hadrat Alî’s governor of Egypt, perpetrated so much oppression on the people that the people finally took up arms. On the other hand, Mu’âwiya bin Hadîdj ‘radiy-Allâhu anh’, one of the Sahâba, who was in Egypt in those days, attempted to conduct feud for the blood of hadrat ‘Uthmân and gathered many people around himself. Hadrat Mu’âwiya sent hadrat Amr Ibni Âs to resume control of Egypt. Yet Muhammad bin Ebî Bekr put up a military resistance. Mu’âwiya bin Hadîdj arrived and joined his forces into the army led by Amr Ibni Âs. The Egyptians were routed and Muhammad bin Ebî Bekr hid himself. Mu’âwiya bin Hadîdj found and killed him. He put his body into a donkey’s carcass and burned it. For Muhammed bin Ebî Bekr had joined the bandits marching from Egypt to Medîna and provoked the people against hadrat ‘Uthmân. He was one of those who had crowded around hadrat ‘Uthmân’s house. Hadrat Hasan bin Alî, who was among the people guarding hadrat ‘Uthmân, was wounded by an arrow. Panicking at the blood running from hadrat Hasan’s body, Muhammad bin Ebî Bekr said, ‘If the sons of Hâshim see this, they will attack us and spoil everything. Let us try and find a shorter way.’ He took two people with him and together they climbed over the wall of an adjacent house and entered hadrat ‘Uthmân’s room. Muhammad bin Ebî Bekr was the first to enter. Saying, ‘Mu’âwiya cannot save you,’ he held the Khalîfa by the beard. The Khalîfa, who was reading the Qur’ân, looked at Muhammad on the face and said, ‘If your father saw you in this manner, how sorry he would be.’ Being ashamed, Muhammad left the place. Then his friends entered the room and martyred the Khalîfa.” As is seen, this retribution was visited on him for having caused the Khalîfa’s martyrdom. The author of the so-called book laments over the burning of this person and relates the event to young people. However, if he wrote how most of the Umayyad Khalîfas had been burnt by the Abbasids and how Hurûfîs had burnt scholars of Ahl as-sunna, especially Shirwanshâh and the governor of Baghdâd Bekir Paşa, both of whom were burnt alive, and how they had exhumed hadrat Beydâwî’s bones and burnt them, it would be easier to decide which people were more savage. When hadrat Mu’âwiya took control of Egypt, he appointed Amr Ibni Âs governor of the province. Amr had already served as the governor

of Egypt, for four years during hadrat 'Umar's caliphate, and for another four years in the time of hadrat 'Uthmân. When Amr passed away in the year forty-three, hadrat Mu'âwiya appointed Amr's son Abdullah as the governor for his place. Two years later he dismissed him and appointed Mu'âwiya bin Hadîdj as the governor. In the year 50, he dismissed Mu'âwiya bin Hadîdj and for his place appointed Maslama, one of his men and at the same time a Sahâbî, as the governor of Egypt and Afrikiyya. Hadrat Mu'âwiya bin Hadîdj passed away in the seventy-third year (of the Hegira).

33- *“Mu'âwiya sent a troop under Busr bin Ertâd's command onto the Haramayn (the blessed cities of Mekka and Medîna and their territories) and had women and innocent children put to the sword. In this event, Abbâs' grandsons, Abd-ur-Rahmân, who was five years old, and Qusam, six years old, were martyred. These children were slain before the eyes of their mother Âisha. Terrorized by this horrendous murder, the helpless mother, Âisha, went mad and rambled around with naked head and feet till the end of her life,”* he alleges, and says that he has acquired this information from the books Al-kâmil and Al-Beyân wa-t-tabyîn.

The books he puts forward to corroborate his allegation betray his own shame. Al-Beyân wa-t-tabyîn was written by a Mu'tazilî hostile to the Ahl as-sunna. The abridged version of Tezkira-i-Qurtubî gives a true account of this matter on its hundred and thirty-first page, as follows: “After hadrat Mu'âwiya was elected Khalîfa by the unanimous vote of the arbitrators, he sent Busr bin Ertâd Âmirî with a three thousand strong army to Hidjâz in order to exact obedience from its people. His first stop was in Medîna. In those days hadrat Khâlîd Abâ Ayyûb al-Ansârî was the governor of Medîna appointed by hadrat Alî. This governor secretly left for Kûfa to take his place with hadrat Alî. Busr mounted the minber and said, ‘What have you done to the Khalîfa, [that is, hadrat ‘Uthmân], to whom I paid homage here at one time? I would put all of you to the sword if Mu'âwiya had not forbidden me to.’ People of Medîna, led by hadrat Jâbir, paid homage. Then Busr exacted obedience from Meccans, too. Busr's stating that he was commanded by hadrat Mu'âwiya ‘not to kill anyone’ shows that he did not kill anybody in Mekka or Medîna. Then he went to Yemen. Ubeydullah bin Abbâs, who was the governor of Yemen at that time, fled to Kûfa, hadrat Alî's dwelling place. According to scholars, upon Ubeydullah's flight, Busr slew his two sons. Hadrat Alî sent a two thousand strong force under Hârisa-t-abni

Qudâma's command to Yemen against Busr. [Busr was not a Sahâbî]. Hârîsa came to Yemen and stayed here as governor until hadrat Alî's martyrdom. He killed many people. When he went to Medîna, hadrat Abû Hureyra, who was the Emîr there, took flight. Hârîsa said, 'I would kill that father of cats if I found him.' " As is seen, hadrat Alî's commander meant to kill a Sahâbî loved very much and praised by the Messenger of Allah and made fun of his nickname (father of cats), which had been given by the Messenger of Allah. It would be extremely unfair to attempt to blemish hadrat Alî and hadrat Mu'âwiya 'radiy-Allâhu ta'âlâ anhumâ' on account of the cruel acts perpetrated by governors appointed by those great people and to exaggerate the events through fabricated stories.

34- "*Mu'âwiya sent circulars to all his governors, wherein he commanded them to curse Aliyy-ul-murtadâ and his children on members. 'Umar bin Abd-ul-'azîz put an end to this business of cursing. Hajer bin Adî, one of the Sahâba, and seven companions were martyred on account of their refusing to curse Alî,*" he says, and puts forward as documents the book Eghânî, and Nahj-ul-belâgha and Aqd-ul-Ferîd, two commentaries written by Abulhadîd.

This is a peerless degree of shamelessness and an unprecedented sordidness in vilification. For one thing, the books he puts forward as documents are, as we have stated earlier in our translation from Tuhfa, among Hurûfîs' publications. It is written in the book **Esmâ ul-muallifîn** that the author of the book Eghânî, namely Abul-faraj Alî bin Huseyn Isfahânî, is a holder of bid'at. This man assails the greater ones of the As-hâb-i-kirâm and vituperates them in an insolent language in his book **Muqâtil-i-âl-i-Ebî Tâlib**. We have stated in the tenth paragraph that Ibni Abdulhadîd is an eccentric Mu'tazilî. It is seen with regret that these slanders have infiltrated into Sunnite books as well. Hadrat Imâm-i-Muhammad Ma'thûm-i-Fârûqî 'qaddas-Allâhu sirreh-ul-'azîz', a great Sunnite scholar and at the same time one of the leaders of Awliyâ-i-kirâm, confutes these slanders very well through documents. Translating this valuable answer of his, we have added it to the second part of our book. Please reread it.

To say that hadrat Mu'âwiya cursed hadrat Alî would mean to slander hadrat Mu'âwiya. It is not permissible to censure hadrat Mu'âwiya. Yes, a few of the Umayyad Khalîfas had certain people cursed. Yet, Mu'âwiya 'radiy-Allâhu anh' cannot be blamed for this only on account of his being one of the Umayyad Khalîfas.

Hurûffîs vituperate the three Khalîfas and hadrat Mu'âwiya and those who followed him. They say that all the As-hâb-i-kirâm became renegades afterwards. They censure all of them. According to the Ahl as-sunna, however, no statements except praisals can be made of the As-hâb-i-kirâm 'radiy-Allâhu ta'âlâ anhum ajma'in'.

Hadrat Emîr (Alî) said about hadrat Mu'âwiya and his supporters, "Our brothers do not agree with us. But they are not disbelievers or sinners. They act on their ijtihâd." This statement of his clears them of disbelief and sinfulness. Cursing is not among the worships prescribed by the Islamic religion, and cursing the worst of unbelievers is no exception. Is it possible for any of the As-hâb-i-kirâm to have engaged his tongue with cursing instead of praying at the end of each of the five daily prayers of namâz? Who on earth would believe such a monstrous lie?

If it were a pious act, a worship to curse a person, it would be one of the Islamic requirements to curse the accursed devil, Abû Jahl, Abû Leheb and the other implacable unbelievers of Qoureish, who hurt, tormented and molested our master the Prophet 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wa sallam' and did harms and treacheries to this true religion. When it is not a commandment to curse the enemies, could it be thawâb to curse the friends? There is more detailed information in this respect in the thirty-seventh chapter of the second fascicle of **Endless Bliss**.

35- "*Mu'âwiya had hadrat Hasan martyred by giving his wife plenty of jewellery and cajoling her into poisoning her husband,*" he says. In the tenth paragraph we touched upon the slanders in the history book named Taberî. The grand book titled **The History of Taberî** (or Tabarî) is very valuable. It was written by a scholar of Ahl as-sunna, namely Muhammad bin Jerîr Taberî 'rahmatullâhi aleyh', who passed away in 310 (H.). A Hurûffî came forward under the same name, wrote an abridged version of the book, and titled it **Târîh-i-Taberî** (the History of Taberî). The existing Turkish version of the History of Taberî is a translation of the abridged version. The original version of the book is much larger. As we have explained in the passage we translated from the book Tuhfa and added in the tenth paragraph, Murawwij-uz-zahab is a history book full of slanders. Is it worthy of a Muslim to dirty a religious book with such abhorrent and wicked lies which are quite counter to hadrat Mu'âwiya's 'radiy-Allâhu anh' honour and to add the two (abovenamed) gutter publications in the name of documentation?

An âyat-i-kerîma in Fat-h sûra purports, **“Thine As-hâb are always very compassionate with one another. They are always very vehement towards unbelievers.”** Islam’s enemies, on the other hand, assert that the As-hâb-i-kirâm were inimical towards one another, that they had one another poisoned. Certainly, Muslims will (prefer to) believe Allâhu ta’âlâ. We say that the As-hâb-i-kirâm loved one another very much. The As-hâb-i-kirâm performed ijtihâd on the question whether retaliation was necessary against the murderers of hadrat ’Uthmân. This was a religious matter. They disagreed in their ijtihâd. Such disagreements of ijtihâd took place in Rasûlullah’s time as well. In fact, their ijtihâd would sometimes disagree with that of Rasûlullah. And this disagreement would not be considered a sin. On the contrary, it was informed that all of them would be given thawâb (for their ijtihâd). A couple of times the âyat-i-kerîmas revealed through Wahy informed that the ijtihâd contrary to Rasûlullah’s ijtihâd was correct. For Islam has granted men the freedom of thought and the freedom to express their thoughts. Islam is the source of human rights and human freedoms. The disagreement among the As-hâb-i-kirâm was based on their ijtihâd on the question of retaliation. Disagreement of this sort is not considered a sin, neither by Allâhu ta’âlâ, nor by His Messenger, nor by a person with common sense. They consider it a right conferred on humanity. Those who disagreed with one another in their ijtihâd did not think of fighting, nor even of offending, one another. For it was not the first time that such disagreements took place. Disagreements had taken place several times before. And it had not even occurred to them that they should hurt one another. Some of their children, misunderstanding the disagreements of ijtihâd among their fathers, had had tiffs with one another from time to time. Yet their fathers, who could not tolerate even such petty huffs among their children, had stopped them, each father rebuking his own child. This fact is known very well by Shiites as well. Yet zindiqs are trying to convince other people that the As-hâb-i-kirâm felt enmity against one another and that they perpetrated sordid and abominable deeds. Thus, they plan, they will manage to spread the conviction that the As-hâb-i-kirâm were thoughtless, unlearned and bad-tempered people, which consequently will give them the chance to demolish, extirpate Islam. For Islam consists of the total of the narrations reported by the As-hâb-i-kirâm. Qur’ân al-kerîm and hadîth-i-sherîfs were conveyed to us

by the As-hâb-i-kirâm. All the teachings of Islam were derived from Qur'ân al-kerîm, from hadîth-i-sherîfs, and from the statements and behaviours of any one of the As-hâb-i-kirâm. The sources and the documents of Islamic lore are the words of the As-hâb-i-kirâm. Vilification of the As-hâb-i-kirâm would naturally lead to rejection and degradation of what they conveyed to us, i.e. Islam. All the As-hâb-i-kirâm are higher than all the past, present and future people in all respects, with the exception of Prophets. For recognizing the value of Islam and being a true Muslim one has to discern this subtlety very well. A person who knows Rasûlullah's 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wa sallam' superiority, value and honour and who is able to comprehend what it means to be the Messenger of Allah, will easily realize the fact that these distinguished people, whom that exalted Prophet 'sall-Allâhu ta'âlâ alaihi wa sallam' educated and employed in all his services, must have occupied very high grades.

Neither hadrat Alî nor hadrat Mu'âwiya, nor any of the Sahâbîs who were with them thought of hurting one another. Both in the event of Camel and in the event of Siffîn, their meeting was intended to make an agreement and to secure peace and comfort among Muslims. Members of both sides stated their purposes as such. Books of Kelâm and history written by Sunnite scholars are in the open. Stories fabled by Hurûfîs and books and magazines published by upstart men of religion are of no value. A close search into history will show that the Sahâba never killed one another. They always felt sorrow and wept over one another's death.

It is written in the hundred and seventieth page of Qisâs-i-Enbiyâ: That hadrat Hasan was poisoned by his wife Ja'da is a widely known fact. Hadrat Hasan 'radiy-Allâhu ta'âlâ anh' had made a habit of entering into marriages and divorcing his wife soon after each marriage, so much so that his father (hadrat Alî) had to warn the people in (a speech he made in) Kûfa, saying, "Do not give your daughters to Hasan! He will divorce them." The answer he received from the audience was, "We shall give them the girl he likes. Let him live with her or divorce her." Hadrat Hasan was extremely good looking. He resembled Rasûlullah (his grandfather). A girl he married would fall in love with him. For some reason whatsoever, she decided to kill him.

It is stated in the book **Mir'ât-i-kâinât**: Hadrat Mu'âwiya decided to see to it that hadrat Hasan should succeed him as Khalîfa. He announced his decision to the people. Yezîd, (hadrat

Mu'âwiya's son), was expecting to succeed his father to caliphate. He sent some poison to hadrat Hasan's wife Ja'da, saying, "If you poison Hasan with this, I shall marry you and overwhelm you with jewellery and property from head to foot." Falling for this false promise, the woman administered poison several times. Yet hadrat Hasan recovered each time. He would not say anything though he knew that it was his wife who was doing this. He separated his bed and began to take good care of his food. One night Ja'da secretly entered his room and put diamond powder in his drinking glass. When hadrat Hasan drank the water at night, his stomach began to break into pieces. In his dying bed, hadrat Huseyn, (his brother), tried in vain to make him name the person who had given him the poison. Hadrat Hasan asked, "Would you retaliate if you knew who it was?" "Certainly," was the brother's answer. "I would kill him." Upon this, hadrat Hasan said, "The punishment he has deserved will suffice," without hinting in the least that it was his wife's perfidy. He passed away forty days later. He was buried near his mother hadrat Fâtima 'radiy-Allâhu ta'âlâ anhâ' in Bakî' cemetery. Imputing the murder committed by Yezîd to his father is a felony no less wicked than the murder itself. For this slander is identical with imputing the disbelief of Nûh's 'alaihîs-salâm' son Ken'ân (Canaan) to his father, the exalted Prophet.

36- He says, "*Mu'âwiya, as a stage for his extremely perfidious and cruel future aims, took into his family an extremely cruel, treacherous and murderous villain, namely Ziyâd bin Ebîh, his father Abû Sufyân's illegitimate child. By appointing this villain's son, Ubeydullah, a master of banditry, as a governor as he himself was still alive, he intentionally, purposely prepared him for the planning and execution of the horrendous Kerbelâ slaughter. How can these tricks and schemes be errors of ijtihâd?*" He states that he is quoting these statements from Qisâs-i-Enbiyâ.

Unfortunately, Qisâs-i-Enbiyâ contains some disrespectful and ill-mannered criticisms and comments made about Mu'âwiya. The insolent words quoted above could not find their way through Cevdet Paşa's 'rahmatullâhi ta'âlâ aleyh' faithful pen, nor was he the kind of person to let them foul the pages of his book. Let us see how he expresses these events in Qisâs-i-Enbiyâ:

The people of Fâris revolted against hadrat Alî. They refused to pay (taxes called) Ushr and Kharâdj. In the thirty-ninth year of the Hegira, hadrat Alî appointed Ziyâd bin Ebîh, who was an official of Bayt-ul-mâl in Basra, as governor of the provinces of

Fâris and Kermân. Abdullah bin Abbâs, who was the Emîr of Basra, sent Ziyâd to Fâris with some forces under his command. Ziyâd was a very clever, talented, far-sighted administrator. Owing to his skillful management, he handled the affairs without having to use the forces under his command. In a short time he restored peace and order in the provinces of Fâris and Kermân. He subdued the rebels. When hadrat Alî received some complaints about the Emîr of Basra Abdullah bin Abbâs, he asked Abdullah to send him the book of accounts for the property of Jizya. Offended, Abdullah Ibn Abbâs wrote him an answer saying that he 'might as well send someone else for his service.' He left Basra. After hadrat Alî's martyrdom, Ziyâd would not pay homage to Mu'âwiya. Ziyâd was an extremely intelligent and most eloquent orator. Formerly he was a secretary to **Abû Mûsa-l-Esh'arî**, the governor of Basra. Hadrat 'Umar, during his caliphate, assigned him some duties. After the event of Camel, hadrat Alî appointed him head of the finance office in Basra and then Emîr of Fâris. Being a good administrator, he established order in the province. Seeing his accomplishments, hadrat Mu'âwiya declared him his real brother. Hadrat Alî 'radiy-Allâhu ta'âlâ anh' wrote a letter to Ziyâd, warning him as follows: "I have appointed you governor to this province. You are the expert of this job! Yet you cannot attain Abû Sufyân's genealogy or inheritance only on a word he expresses. Mu'âwiya (is a person who) will cleverly approach a person from the opposite direction, from his back, from his right and left. Guard yourself against him." In the pre-Islamic period there were various types of marriage in Arabia. Islam prohibited them. Ziyâd was born from a marriage established according to the customs valid in those days.

In the year 45 (H.), hadrat Mu'âwiya appointed Ziyâd governor to Basra, Khorasan and Sijistan. That year debauchery was widespread in Basra. Ziyâd mounted the minber. He made an extremely eloquent and clear speech. He admonished the people against sinning, debauchery and vices. He threatened them with heavy punishments. (Whenever it was time for night prayer), he would conduct the namâz (in jamâ'at) very slowly and reciting long sûras and then send them to their homes late, prohibiting them to go out after that time of night. By means of this martial law he established order in Basra, thus consolidating hadrat Mu'âwiya's government. He established such strict discipline that a person who dropped something in a street would find it there if

he came back a long time later. No one would lock his doors. He established a ten thousand strong police organization. He established order and security in rural areas and on highways, too. All people enjoyed safety, as it had been in the time of hadrat 'Umar. He appointed many notables of the Sahâba, such as **Enes bin Mâlik**, to important positions. Thus he utilized them. Meanwhile, the Khârijîs, i.e. enemies of hadrat Alî, rose in rebellion. Having no mercy on them, Ziyâd forestalled them and had most of them killed, including their chief. Their names were forgotten. Hadrat Mu'âwiya sent an army to Istanbul in the (hijrî) year 49. He ordered his son Yezîd to join the army. A spoilt child brought up in riches, Yezîd was too late. Hadrat Mu'âwiya forced Yezîd to catch up with the moving army. **Abdullah Ibni Abbâs, Abdullah Ibni 'Umar, Abdullah Ibni Zubeyr and Abû Ayyub al-Ansarî Khalîd** were in this army. In the year 53, Ziyâd passed away in Kûfa, when he was fifty-three years old. Upon Ziyâd's death, his son Ubeydullah came to Damascus. Hadrat Mu'âwiya appointed him commander of the forces of Khorasan. Ubeydullah was twenty-five years old at that time. He went to Khorasan. Crossing the Oxus river (Amu Darya), he made numerous conquests in Bukhâra. He brought many booties back with him. In the year 55, he became governor of Basra. Basra was an assembly area of Khârijîs. The new governor of Basra, **Ubeydullah bin Ziyâd**, marched against them and routed them.

When Yezîd became Khalîfa in the year 60, Ubeydullah bin Ziyâd was governor of Basra. People of Kûfa wrote to the Khalîfa, petitioning for an authoritative governor. So Yezîd sent Ubeydullah bin Ziyâd to Kûfa. Upon arriving in Kufa, Ibni Ziyâd found the city in utter disorder. He called the people to obedience. In the meantime, upon an invitation he received from the people of Kûfa, hadrat Huseyn 'radiy-Allâhu ta'âlâ anh' had sent his paternal first cousin Muslim to Kûfa. Nearly thirty thousand people convened in Kûfa and elected hadrat Huseyn Khalîfa. They crowded around Ibni Ziyâd's house. Ibni Ziyâd dispersed them and had their chief Muslim executed. The same day hadrat Huseyn 'radiy-Allâhu anh' left Mekka for Kûfa.

'Umar, who was a son of Sa'd Ibni Ebî Waqqâs, one of the Ashara-i-mubashshara, was appointed Emîr to the city of Rey. 'Umar was about to set out with four thousand people, when it was heard that hadrat Huseyn was on his way to Kûfa in order to become Khalîfa. Ibni Ziyâd told 'Umar to march against Huseyn, which 'Umar refused. Upon this Ibni Ziyâd threatened him with

revoking the order of his governorship of Rey. 'Umar asked for a day's permission to consider the matter and came back with an affirmative answer. The two parties met at Kerbelâ (or Karbala). Hadrat Huseyn said that he was ready to "go back." Ibn Ziyâd's answer was that he could go back provided he should "pay homage to Yezîd" and that "otherwise he should not be given any water." Hadrat Huseyn refused to pay homage. So 'Umar drove forward his forces. In the year 61, on the tenth of Muharrem, hadrat Huseyn and seventy other people with him attained martyrdom. Two days later, 'Umar bin Sa'd took the women and Zeynel'âbidîn Alî to Kûfa. Ibn Ziyâd convened the people in the mosque. Mounting the minber, he addressed, "Gratitude and praise be to Allah for making the right prevalent and helping the Emîr al-mu'minîn Yezîd." When the women and the report of hadrat Huseyn's martyrdom arrived in Damascus, tears filled Yezîd's eyes. "May Allah curse Ibn Sumayya," he said. Ubeydullah bin Ziyâd was called 'Ibn Sumayya' and 'Ibn Merjâna', too. He pronounced a benediction over hadrat Huseyn, and added, "I would have forgiven Huseyn if he came to me." He did not give any presents to Zubeyr, who had brought him the news. "May Allah damn him. Ibn Ziyâd hastened and killed him," he said. Then, inviting the people brought from Kûfa to his place, he had the following conversation with them: "Do you know why Huseyn lost his life? Huseyn said, 'My father Alî is better than his (Yezîd's) father Mu'âwiya. My mother Fâtima is better than his mother and my grandfather Rasûlullah 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wa sallam' is better than his grandfather. Therefore, I am better than he. Caliphate belongs to me by rights.' His father and my father left the solution to arbitrators. Everybody knows who was elected. Let me say this for Allah's sake: His mother Fâtima is better than my mother. As for his grandfather; a person who has îmân in Allah and in rising after death will not hold anyone equal with the Messenger of Allah. However, Huseyn said (and acted) on his knowledge of fiqh and on his ijtihâd, forgetting about the âyat that purports, '**Allâhu ta'âlâ is the owner of everything. He will bestow sovereignty on anyone He chooses.**'" People in Yezîd's palace mourned and wept very much for hadrat Huseyn. The property taken away from him was paid back in multiples. In fact, hadrat Huseyn's daughter Sukayna acknowledged, "I have not seen a person more beneficent than Mu'âwiya's son Yezîd." [This fact cannot be denied even by people without a certain Madh-hab. Yet in their quotation of this statement they substitute the word 'person' with

the word ‘disbeliever’]. Yezîd would invite hadrat Zeynel-’âbidîn to eat with him every morning and every evening, and they would have breakfast and dinner together. As they bid farewell to each other, he said, “May Allâhu ta’âlâ curse Ibni Merjâna! Wallahi, if I had been in his place, I would have accepted all your father’s wishes. It was Allah’s foreordination, after all! Write to me if you need something. I will send it immediately whatever it is.” Yezîd died in the year 64, when he was thirty years old. And Ibni Ziyâd was slain by the chief of bandits Mukhtâr during the bloody combats he fought in the month of Muharrem of the year 67. Hadrat Abdullah bin Zubeyr ‘radiy-Allâhu ta’âlâ anh’, who occupied the seat of caliphate at that time, appointed his brother Mus’ab governor of Basra. And Mus’ab sent one of his Emîrs, one named Muhaleb, against Mukhtâr. At the end of a bloody battle, Mukhtâr was killed in 67.

If these writings borrowed from Qisâs-i-Enbiyâ are read with reason, it will be seen that hadrat Huseyn’s ‘radiy-Allâhu ta’âlâ anh’ martyrdom was not a result of a grudge against him or his blessed father, but it was a consequence of worldly ambitions. Whatsoever the reason, even Yezîd would not shoulder accountability for this ignominious savagery. He cursed Ibni Ziyâd for this abominable deed. Grave as Yezîd’s felony is, it would be injustice equally grave to attempt to blemish his father on account of this guilt. It would be like blaming Âdem ‘alaihis-salâm’ for his son Cain’s slaying his brother Abel.

To allege that hadrat Mu’âwiya’s appointing Ubeydullah Ibni Ziyâd a governor was intended to have hadrat Huseyn martyred, would mean to gainsay the events. As it is stated in Qisâs-i-Enbiyâ, he appointed him governor because he had fought against disbelievers successfully and suppressed the Khârijis, who were hostile to hadrat Alî. Seeing that he was serving Islam, he appointed him to Basra. Hadrat Huseyn ‘radiy-Allâhu anh’ was in Medîna then. If hadrat Mu’âwiya had had malice towards hadrat Huseyn, he would have appointed Ibni Ziyâd governor of Hidjâz. Why do not those people who blame hadrat Mu’âwiya for (his son) Yezîd’s guilt, put the blame for ’Umar’s martyring hadrat Huseyn, instead of setting him free, on his father? ’Umar’s father Sa’d Ibni Ebî Waqqâs is one of those fortunate people who were given the good news that Allâhu ta’âlâ promised Paradise to them (Ashara-i-mubashshara). They know that if they criticized this person their secret plans and lies would be noticed.

Abd-ul-wahhâb-i-Sha’rânî states as follows in the hundred and

twenty-ninth page of the abridged version of **Tezkîra-i-Qurtubî**: Yezîd sent hadrat Huseyn's blessed head and the captives from Damascus to Medîna. Upon the order of 'Umar bin Sa'd, the governor of Medîna, his blessed head was shrouded and buried beside the blessed grave of hadrat Fâtima-t-uz-zehrâ in the cemetery of Bâkî'. Fâid, the thirteenth Fâtimî (Fatimid) ruler, was brought to the throne in 549 [A.D. 1154], when he was five years old, and died in 555. In his time the state was under the control of his vizier Talâyi' bin Ruzayk. When this person had the cemetery called **Mashhad** (or Meshhed) built in Cairo, he had hadrat Huseyn's blessed head brought from Medîna to Cairo by spending forty thousand golds. It was wrapped in green atlas, put in a coffin made of ebony, and buried beside the tomb of Imâm-i-Shâfi'î 'rahmatullâhi aleyh' and the grave of Sayyed-at-Nefîsâ in Mashhad.

This event also has been distorted by Hurûfîs. They say that forty days after the martyrdom his blessed head was brought to Kerbelâ and buried beside his body.

Mawlânâ Hâfid Hakîm Abd-ush-shekûr Ilâhî Mirzâpûrî Hanafî, a great scholar of Pâkistan, wrote a book titled **Shehâdat-i-Huseyn** (Huseyn's Martyrdom) 'radiy-Allâhu anh'. This book, which was originally in the Urdu language, was translated into Persian by Mawlawî Ghulâm Haydar Fârûqî, a student in the **Madrasa-i-Islâmiyya** in Karachi. This great madrasa, which is located at Newtown 5 in Karachi, offers a higher education in the Islamic sciences. Students come here from all over the world and are educated and trained as scholars of Ahl as-sunna. Muhammad Yûsuf Benûrî, a great scholar and at the same time the founder of the Madrasa, wrote an eulogy commending the information provided in the book. Yûsuf Benûrî passed away in Karachi in 1400 [A.D. 1980]. The book contains one hundred and two pages. The author states that enemies of Islam have been disguising themselves as Muslims in order to destroy Islam from within and arousing hostility against the Ahl-i-Bayt by pretending to be "lovers of the Ahl-i-Bayt." Throughout the pages of the book, he presents documents from Shiite books and corroborates this fact. He states in the eleventh page: Muhammad Bâqir Khorasânî, a Shiite scholar better known by the name Molla Muhsin, died in Mashhad in 1091 [A.D. 1679]. He says in the three hundred and twenty-first page of his book **Jilâ ul-uyûn**, "Mu'âwiya 'radiy-Allâhu anh' gave his son Yezîd the following advice as he was passing away: You know Imâm-i-Huseyn's closeness to

Rasûlullah ‘sall-Allâhu alaihi wa sallam’ and that he is of the Messenger’s sacred blood. The people of Iraq will call him to their country, promising that they will help him. Yet they will not help him. They will leave him alone. If you should be victorious over him, pay him due respect. Never hurt him in retribution for his offences towards you! Do him the same favours I have done to him!” Muhammad Taqî Khân, a Shiite historian, passed away in 1297 [A.D. 1879]. He says in his Persian book **Nasikh-ut-tawârîh**, “His advice was as follows: My son, do not follow your nafs! Do not enter the presence of Allâhu ta’âlâ with your hands smeared with Huseyn bin Ali’s blood! Otherwise, you will suffer eternal torment! Do not forget the hadîth-i-sherîf, ‘**Allâhu ta’âlâ will not give barakat to a person who violates the veneration due to Huseyn.**’” It is written in the thirty-eighth page of the same Shiite history book, “Sympathizers of Imâm-i-Alî, that is, Shiites, would come to Damascus and speak ill of hadrat Mu’âwiya. Mu’âwiya ‘radiy-Allâhu ta’âlâ anh’ would do nothing to punish his censurers. Instead, he would give them plenty of gifts from the **Bayt-ul-mâl.**” It is stated in the three hundred and twenty-third page of the book **Jilâ-ul-uyûn**, “Imâm-i-Hasan bin Ali ‘radiy-Allâhu anhumâ’ said: Wallahî, hadrat Mu’âwiya is better than those people who gather around me in the name of supporters. These people claim to be Shiites on the one hand, and await an opportunity to kill me and lay their hands on my property on the other hand.”

As for Yezîd; he did not forget his father’s advice. So he did not call Imâm Huseyn ‘radiy-Allâhu ta’âlâ anh’ to Kûfa. He did not command to kill him. Nor did he rejoice at his death. On the contrary, he wept when he heard about the sad news, and commanded mourning. He respected the Ahl-i-Bayt. It is stated in the three hundred and twenty-second page of the Shiite book **Jilâ-ul-uyûn**, “Yezîd appointed **Walîd bin Aqaba**, who was well-known for his love for the Ahl-i-Bayt, governor of Medîna. He dismissed Merwan, an enemy of the Ahl-i-Bayt, from governorship. One night Walîd sent for Imâm-i-Huseyn and said that Mu’âwiya had died and that Yezîd was to be obeyed. Imâm-i-Huseyn said: You would not be contented with my paying homage to him secretly. You would like me to pay homage in public.” This writing from the Shiite book shows that Imâm-i-Huseyn did not call Yezîd a sinner, a debaucher or a disbeliever. If he had considered him as such, he would not have accepted to pay homage to him secretly. His avoiding homage in public was because he did not want to incur

Shiites' animus. As a matter of fact, they had deserted his father and become Khârijîs on account of his making peace with Mu'âwiya. They had fought against his father. And they had become hostile to his (elder) brother hadrat Hasan because he had relinquished caliphate to Mu'âwiya.

It is stated in the same Persian book of history: "When Zejr bin Qays brought the news of hadrat Huseyn's death to Yezîd, he bowed his head and remained so for a while. Then he said, 'Your having paid homage to him would be better news for me than your having killed him. If I had been there I would have forgiven him. When Mahdar bin Sa'laba began to censure Imâm-i-Huseyn, Yezîd frowned and said, 'I wish Mahdar's mother had not delivered a child so cruel and so mean. May Allah destroy Merjâna's son [Ibni Ziyâd]!' Shemmer brought hadrat Huseyn's blessed head to Yezîd and said, 'I have killed the son of the best of mankind. Therefore you must fill the saddle-bags of my horse with gold and silver.' Exasperated, Yezîd exclaimed, 'May Allah fill your saddle-bags with fire! For what reason have you killed the best of mankind? Get out of here! Clear out! You won't be given anything.'" It is written as follows in the three hundred and ninety-third page of **Hulâsat-ul-mesâib**, a Shiite book: "Yezîd wept bitterly, not only in the presence of other people, but also when he was alone. His daughters and sisters also wept with him. Putting Imâm-i Huseyn's blessed head in a gold bowl, he said, 'O Huseyn' May Allah have mercy on you! How sweet is your smile!'" As it is seen clearly from this acknowledgement in the Shiite book, some people's allegation that "Yezîd hit Imâm-i Huseyn's blessed teeth with a stick," is a whopping lie. It is stated in **Jilâ-ul-uyûn**, "Yezîd accomodated Imâm-i Huseyn's household in his palace. He showed them very kind hospitality. He would have his breakfast and dinner with Imâm-i-Zeynel'âbidîn." It is stated in **Hulâsat-ul-mesâib**, "Yezîd asked Imâm-i-Huseyn's household, 'Would you like to be my guests and stay here in Damascus or go back to Medîna?' Umm-i-Ghulthum said that they wanted to mourn in seclusion. Yezîd gave them a large room in his palace. They mourned one week in this room. The eighth day Yezîd sent for the Ahl-i-Bayt and asked them what they wished. They said they wanted to go to Medîna. He gave them much property, decked animals, and two hundred golds. He said, 'Let me know whatever you need. I will send them immediately.' Giving Nu'mân bin Beshîr and five hundred horsemen under their command he saw them off in the direction of Medîna after a respectful and grand

farewell ceremony due to their honour.”

As is shown in the writings above, and many other books written by reasonable and unbiassed Shiite scholars, hadrat Mu'âwiya was never inimical towards Imâm-i-Huseyn 'radiy-Allâhu ta'âlâ anhumâ'. Yezîd did not command that Imâm-i-Huseyn should be killed, nor did he wish such a thing. Enemies of the Ahl-i-Bayt and people who martyred Imâm-i-Huseyn slandered these two Khalîfas, thus to cover their own animosity.

Abd-ur-rahmân Ibni Muljem was a Shiite formerly. Later he joined Khârijîs, and martyred Imâm-i-Alî 'radiy-Allâhu ta'âlâ anh'.

There were no soldiers from Damascus among those people who martyred Imâm-i-Huseyn in Kerbelâ. These people were from Kûfa. Qâdî Nûrullah Shushterî, a Shiite scholar, writes this fact plainly. It is written in **Jilâ-ul-uyûn** as well that when Imâm-i-Zeynel'âbidîn 'radiy-Allâhu ta'âlâ anh' was brought to the city of Kûfa, he said that the murderers were Shiites.

In order to demolish Islam from the inside, enemies of Islam drifted the Ahl-i-Bayt-i-nabawî 'radiy-Allâhu ta'âlâ anhum ajma'in' into disasters and calamities. Imputing these murders of theirs to the Ahl as-sunna, they assailed the As-hâb-i-kirâm 'radiy-Allâhu ta'âlâ anhum ajma'in', the strongholds of Islam, and via them their followers, i.e. scholars of Ahl as-sunna. Muslims have to be extra careful lest they should fall victims to their traps.

37- *“Mu'âwiyâ's governor to Egypt, Amr bin Âs, during his stay in office, which lasted four years plus four months, embezzled three hundred and fifteen thousand golds and appropriated the territory called Reht,”* he asserts, adding that he has acquired this information from the Shiite books titled Murawwij-uz-zahab and Al-îjâz.

The lines quoted above are naked examples of how these people without a certain Madh-hab insert their lies into books in the name of religious information like amusing a child. He tries to blemish hadrat Amr Ibni Âs by saying that he was a governor of hadrat Mu'âwiya. The fact, on the other hand, is that he served as governor of Egypt for four years in the time of hadrat 'Umar and for four more years during the caliphate of hadrat 'Uthmân. Hadrat Mu'âwiya appointed Ziyâd, who had been one of hadrat Alî's governors, as a governor again. Likewise, he appointed hadrat Amr, chosen as a governor of Egypt by these great people, as a governor again. Besides, Amr Ibni Âs had been one of his

military colleagues in the Holy Wars he had made in Syria. Unable to find a tangible fault or shortcoming to impute to hadrat Mu'âwiya, they are trying to distort his entirely right deeds and accomplishments into faults. Rasûlullah's 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wa sallam' and his Khalîfas' employing hadrat Mu'âwiya and hadrat Amr in choicest duties would suffice as an indication for their high value. Imâm-i-Rabbânî 'rahmatullâhi aleyh' states in the hundred and twentieth letter of the first volume of his **Mektûbât**, "Hadrat Mu'âwiya's mistakes, owing to the barakat of the sohba he had had with the Messenger of Allah, were more useful than the right deeds accomplished by Weys al-Qarânî and 'Umar bin Abd-ul-'azîz, (who had not had the fortunate honour of seeing the Messenger of Allah during his lifetime). By the same token, a mistake made by Amr Ibni Âs was more virtuous than a discreet act managed by these two people." The Turkish version of the hundred and twentieth letter exists in the (Turkish) book **Müjdecî Mektûblar Tercemesi**. The only reason for such heavy criticisms levelled at these two Sahâbîs is their having disagreed with hadrat Alî in their ijtihâd. So these people represent all their deeds, and even their worships, as vices.

Hadrat Amr Ibni Âs 'radiy-Allâhu anh' never appropriated the people's rights in Egypt. He left masterpieces for the Islamic history in Egypt. Let us give an example of these services, each of which would be a surprise for friends and slanderers alike. This great service is his opening the **Emîr ul-mu'minîn Canal**, connecting the Nile and the Red Sea. In the eighteenth year of the Hegira Arabia was stricken by a widespread famine. The Khalîfa, 'Umar ul-Fârûq 'radiy-Allâhu anh', sent orders to provinces, demanding food provisions from them. Aid from Egypt and Damascus was considerably late because these two provinces were rather distant. The Khalîfa summoned the governor of Egypt, hadrat Amr Ibni Âs, and his assistants to Egypt. "If a canal is opened between the Nile and the Red Sea, this will put an end to the dearth in Arabia," he said. Hadrat Amr Ibni Âs returned to Egypt. He began to have a canal opened from the city of **Fustat**, twenty-four kilometres from Cairo, in the direction of the Red Sea. The hundred-and-thirty-eight kilometres long canal was completed in six months' time. Ships sailing through this **Emîr ul-mu'minîn Canal** arrived in the Red Sea from the Nile, and docked alongside of the wharf named **Jâr** in Medîna. The first cargo they brought from Egypt to Medîna was twenty big shiploads of cereals, which amounted to sixty thousand **Irdebs**. One irdeb is

equal to twenty-four **Sâ's**. And **sâ'** is a unit of volume equal to 4.2 litres. One **irdeb** is (around) one hundred litres. Accordingly, the first cargo transported from Egypt to Medîna by way of sea was six million litres, that is, six thousand cubic metres of cereals. After 'Umar bin Abd-ul-'azîz, this canal was stopped up for lack of care. In 155 (H.) Khalîfa Mensûr had it cleaned and it was used for many long years. Amr Ibni Âs 'radiy-Allâhu anh' was considering to connect the Mediterranean and Red Seas. He let the Khalîfa know about this thought of his. Hadrat 'Umar 'radiy-Allâhu ta'âlâ anh' would not give permission for military considerations. There is detailed information about the canal in the book **Fârûq**, written by Shiblî Nu'mânî, an Indian professor. We have borrowed the information above from its Persian translation printed in 1351.

It should not be presumed that these zindiqs' incessant endeavours to vilify hadrat Mu'âwiya and the Sahâbîs with him originate from their love for the Ahl-i-Bayt! They say so; yet their purpose is to use this lie as a means for reviling thousands of Sahâbîs whose ijtihâd did not agree with hadrat Alî's ijtihâd, to disgrace those superior religious leaders, and thus to shock the trust in Islam's foundations and essential sources and destroy them piecemeal. At one time Jews demolished hadrat Îsâ's religion with the same insidious methods. They annihilated the Injîl (original form of the Bible). They forged false Gospels. They turned the **Isâwî** religion, which had been sent by Allâhu ta'âlâ, into today's wrong, ridiculous **Christianity**. The genuine form of Injîl, called (the Gospel of) **Barnabas**, which re-appeared in 1393 [A.D. 1973], divulges the fact that Christianity is a human fabrication. The (Turkish) book **Herkesê Lâzım Olan İmân**, which was printed in Istanbul and translated into English, French and German, contains detailed information about Christianity. Their aim was to change Islam into a similar system of absurdities by using the same methods. Fortunately, Muslims of the right way were wise to these base Jewish plans. Writing hundreds of thousands of books for fourteen centuries, they promulgated Rasûlullah's religion all over the world. They announced the Jewish turpitudes and lies, and refuted them with documentary evidences. These enemies of Islam may call themselves **Alevî's** (or Shiites). Our benevolent Alevî (or Shiite) brothers should be extra careful not to fall into the traps of these enemies who may be using this sacred appellation as a cloak for themselves.

Alevî (Alawî) means a true Muslim who loves hadrat Alî.

Hadrat Alî is a foundation pillar of Islam. He is the leader of those fighters and heroes who spread Islam. During the most difficult, the most horrendous, the darkest moments of Rasûlullah's Holy Wars, he rushed forward like a lion, thus pleasing the Prophet of Allah and rescuing Islam and Muslims from dangerous situations. Islam's enemies do not like hadrat Alî, who was a lion of Allah. True Muslims, who are called **Ahl as-sunna**, love him. Every Sunnite Muslim's heart is full with love of hadrat Alî. Scholars of Ahl as-sunna inform unanimously that love of Ahl-i-Bayt is a sign that one will die as a Believer. Then, the appellation **Alevî** would befit the Ahl as-sunna. This blessed name belongs to the Ahl as-sunna. It is property of Ahl as-sunna. Zindiqs, who are enemies of Islam, are stealing this sacred name Alevî from the Ahl as-sunna. They are trying to hide themselves under this valuable name.

O our brothers who are called Alevî! Be conscious of the value of your name. A person who loves this name sincerely, who knows what this name means, and who realizes the high honor contained in this name, will also love the Ahl as-sunna, who are the real and true owners of this name! The only true and sincere lovers of hadrat Alî and the truthful followers of that exalted imâm are scholars of Ahl as-sunna. Then, a person who wishes to be Alevî has to learn hadrat Alî's way by reading books written by scholars of Ahl as-sunna. A Muslim who learns hadrat Alî's way well, will see easily that some books and magazines being written under the designation Alevî are wrong and heretical.

38- *"The fitna and mischief caused by Mu'âwiya himself, by his children and grandchildren, by his kith and kin, by his officials and supporters, had their evil effects not only in their time but throughout centuries. Mu'âwiya, especially, appointed his son (Yezîd), who was an alcoholic, a dissolute idiot, a next heir to the office of caliphate, (although he was aware of his bad habits), thus causing a nuisance to Muslims,"* he says.

Cevdet Paşa also is influenced by these statements and says, "This was one of the greatest mistakes Mu'âwiya made." On the other hand, in Qisâs-i-Enbiyâ, he treats the matter quite impartially, as follows:

"Hadrat Mu'âwiya was considering to dismiss Mughîra from governorship of Kûfa. Upon hearing about this, Mughîra went to Damascus, saw Yezîd, and said to him, 'The greater ones of the As-hâb and the Qoureish are dead now. Their sons are alive. You are the most superior of them and you know the Sunna and

politics best. Wouldn't your father like you to become the Emîr-ul-mu'minîn?' Yezîd told his father about this. Hadrat Mu'âwiya sent for Mughîra and asked him. Mughîra was one of the greatest of the Sahâba and one of those who promised homage (to the Prophet) under the tree. Mughîra said, 'O Emîr al-mu'minîn! You have seen all the so many tumults that have broken out and so much blood that has been shed after hadrat 'Uthmân. Make Yezîd Khalîfa! He will be an asylum for people. It will be an auspicious deed. You will have prevented fitna.' Mughîra chose ten people from Kûfa and sent them to Damascus with his son. They persuaded the Khalîfa. When Ziyâd heard about this, he gave advice to Yezîd. Yezîd corrected his manners, habits and attitudes. Hadrat Mu'âwiya convened many of his governors in Damascus and consulted with them. One of them, Dahnâk by name, asked for permission and said, 'O Emîr al-mu'minîn! After you, a person will be needed for the protection of Muslims. Thus Muslims' blood will not be shed. They will live in peace and comfort. Yezîd is very clever. In knowledge and mildness he is superior to us all. Make him Khalîfa!' A few other outstanding Damascenes made similar talks. Damascenes and Iraqis agreed in Yezîd's caliphate. Upon hearing these statements, hadrat Mu'âwiya thought it would be auspicious to do so. He came to Mekka, where he had sweet conversations with hadrat Huseyn, Abdullah bin Zubeyr and Abdullah bin 'Umar. After making hajj, he called them again and said to them, 'You see how much I love you. Yezîd is your brother. He is your paternal cousin. I want you to accept his caliphate for the salvation of Muslims. Yet I shall put the following stipulations: Appointment and dismissal of governors, collecting zakât, ushr and other taxes, and delivering the arriving property to the right places shall be under your control. Yezîd shall not interfere with any of these procedures.' [This meant to say that he was going to make a constitution]. They were quiet. He asked them once more to answer him. They would not answer this time, either. Then the Khalîfa mounted the mienber and made a speech: 'Eminent ones of this Ummat have accepted Yezîd as Khalîfa. (I offer you to) accept him, too.' So they accepted him. Then hadrat Mu'âwiya came to Medîna and made the same proposition to its people. They, too, agreed. Then he went back to Damascus."

As it is seen, hadrat Mu'âwiya did not think of making Yezîd Khalîfa. It was first suggested to him by people he trusted, then advised by the eminent ones, and eventually approved by the

people. Only after these stages did he make his final decision. For he had experienced the tumults that had happened after hadrat 'Uthmân and seen the Muslim blood shed. And now the number of those who supported the Jewish plans had increased, Khârij'îs, who were the enemies of Ahl as-sunna, had gained strength and become a grave nuisance to Muslims. He thought this out and obtained the people's approval. If the constitution he conceived had been supported, a perfect Islamic democracy would have arisen. And consequently all Muslims would pronounce benedictions over him till the end of the world on account of this service.

To assert that "The fitna and mischief caused by hadrat Mu'âwiya's 'radiy-Allâhu ta'âlâ anh' children and grandchildren lasted for centuries," would mean to deny history. For his grandson Mu'âwiya II was renowned for his wisdom, piety, attachment to Islam, and justice. Unfortunately, he passed away after only two months' service in the office of caliphate. Because he had no children left alive, he was succeeded by Merwân bin Hakem, again by military force. Merwân was hadrat Mu'âwiya's paternal cousin, yet they were not close to each other. No other attitude could be so senseless as blaming hadrat Mu'âwiya for the blunders committed by this person or by some Umayyad rulers succeeding him. The oppressions and cruelties inflicted on the Ahl-i-Bayt by the Abbasids were much heavier than those perpetrated by the Umayyads. Readers of history are well aware of this fact. As it would be a very base slander to blame and curse the Abbasids' great grandfather hadrat Abdullah and his father hadrat Abbâs on account of the barbarous felonies which Abbasids perpetrated against the Ahl-i-Bayt, so it would obviously be an even more stupid and baser vilification to blame hadrat Mu'âwiya for the less significant mismanagements executed by those Khalîfas who were Merwân's descendants. Another fact we would like to impart to those who allege that hadrat Mu'âwiya's sons and grandsons carried on their atrocities for centuries, is that none of that great Sahâbî's relatives occupied a commanding position after his celebrated grandson, (Mu'âwiya II), who made a fame for his justice and fear of Allah. Hadrat Mu'âwiya had another son, who was named Khâlid. This person was not fond of sovereignty. He had been raised as a scientist by his father. Jâbir, the celebrated chemist, was a disciple of this Khâlid's. He learned chemistry from his master Khâlid. Then these wicked calumniators, thinking that there was no one to stop them,

insolently assailed this innocent Khalîfa and cast aspersions incompatible with mind and knowledge on him.

Allâhu ta'âlâ created thousands of Sunnite scholars 'rahmatullâhi ta'âlâ alaihim ajma'in' to defend that innocent Khalîfa and to disgrace his foes. These great scholars wrote numerous books defending hadrat Mu'âwiya's right and announcing throughout the world the virtues and values possessed by this great Sahâbî.

39- *"It is not something believable that Mu'âwiya did not plan or know or estimate or at least imagine when he was alive the inconceivably horrendous and hideous turpitude that would later be inflicted on hadrat Huseyn,"* he alleges.

It is impossible to imagine a Muslim not deeply grieved over the disaster of Kerbelâ caused by Ziyâd's son Ubeydullah. Each and every individual Sunnite Muslim sheds bitter tears whenever he recollects those gloomy days. (Some people) mourn over the catastrophe of Kerbelâ on the tenth of (the month of) Muharram. So, while these people mourn only for one day in a whole year, we mourn all the year round. While these people mourn for hadrat Huseyn only because he is hadrat Alî's son, we mourn because he is a grandson of Muhammad's 'alaihis-salâm', the Messenger of Allah. We Sunnîs love hadrat Alî because he was Rasûlullah's son-in-law and because at the Messenger's command he fought disbelievers like an angry lion. And we love hadrat Mu'âwiya because he was Rasûlullah's brother-in-law and because he made Jihâd against disbelievers for the sake of Allah. Rasûlullah 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wa sallam' stated, **"Love my As-hâb! He who loves them does so because he loves me. Do not be hostile towards my As-hâb! He who is hostile towards them is hostile towards me."** We love hadrat Alî and hadrat Mu'âwiya very much because they are Sahâbîs. We have explained in the previous matter that it would be a very loathsome calumny to impute the calamities that happened in the time of Yezîd to hadrat Mu'âwiya. It would be a more loathsome and baser vilification to assert that hadrat Mu'âwiya arranged these calamities before his death. Mu'âwiya's attitudes indicating his love and respect for hadrat Hasan and hadrat Huseyn and his generous kindnesses towards them are recorded in books. Those who have the habit of reading should know these facts well. If hadrat Mu'âwiya had considered to hurt Rasûlullah's beloved sons, who had been blessed with the glad tidings of Paradise by their hallowed grandfather, he could have done so quite easily during his caliphate, when everything was

under his command. Or, at least, he would have said so. On the contrary, he always did them good. He always respected them. He always praised them for their value and honour wherever he was. For asserting that the bloody events that occurred after hadrat Mu'âwiya's passing away were the consequences of hadrat Mu'âwiya's clandestine prearrangements, one has to be either hard-hearted or mortally inimical or stark raving mad. Hadrat Alî 'radiy-Allâhu anh' appointed Qays bin Sa'd governor of Egypt and told him to fight those who would not accept him (hadrat Alî) as Khalîfa. Among those Egyptians who were opposed to hadrat Alî's caliphate were Sahâbîs such as Yezîd bin Hâris and Maslama, – the latter had joined the Holy War of Bedr –, who were outstanding members of the tribe of Hazraj. Qays wrote an answer to hadrat Alî, saying, "You order me to fight people who are not harmful to you. It would be more appropriate not to annoy those who sit silently." The Khalîfa dismissed Qays from governorship of Egypt and appointed Muhammad bin Ebî Bekr for his place. Muhammad told those who were impartial to "Either obey or leave the country!" They said, "Do not disturb us! Let us wait till the end." When Muhammad refused their excuse, they took up arms, thus dragging the country into a catastrophic nuisance, which ended in Muhammad's being killed and burned. At one time, this Muhammad had cooperated with Ibni Saba's men, revolted against the Khalîfa hadrat 'Uthmân, entered his house through a window by climbing over the wall of the house next door, attacked the Khalîfa with his sword drawn, and left, leaving the business of martyring the Khalîfa to his friends, as we have related in the thirty-second paragraph. After writing about hadrat Alî's appointing this Muhammad as governor of Egypt for Qays' place, the book Qisâs-i-Enbiyâ adds, "Hadrat Alî was cajoled into making this mistake by his brother Ja'fer's son." Now, let us be reasonable. Could hadrat Alî, the exalted Imâm loved very much by the Messenger of Allah, be censured for appointing as governor of Egypt a person who had had an abhorrent role in the martyrdom of hadrat 'Uthmân? It could not devolve on us, who are very much inferior to those exalted Sahâbîs in religious lore and by far the more sinful, to call hadrat Alî to account by imitating those who attempt to hold hadrat Mu'âwiya responsible for the unsightly events that took place after his death. Our duty is not to judge those great people, but to love and respect them. This is what becomes a Muslim. It is natural, however, that people who have fallen into the snares set by Islam's enemies and become

Islam's enemies themselves, cannot think as we do. They have taken the way of demolishing Islam by reviling the As-hâb-i-kirâm.

40- *“His governing and enlarging the country successfully and establishing peace and order would not alleviate or make excusable his innumerable murders. The atrocious, cruel and base treatment which the Ahl-i-bayt-i-Nabawî and Muslims supporting them were subjected to by Mu'âwiya's officials, relatives and supporters continued for centuries. These fitnas, mischiefs, treacheries, murders and turpitudes went on in a deplorable, blood-curdling manner,”* he says.

As we have stated earlier, zindiqs stigmatize all the deeds of hadrat Mu'âwiya as cruel and murderous. They do not feel shame to impute even those incessant murders committed in the time of Abbasids to that blessed person. It is clear that those who invent the writings quoted above are sources of depravity who form suds like dry wine and who dirty whatever they come into contact with. Books written by Islamic scholars give long and detailed accounts of the events which testify to the fact that that exalted Sahâbî, whom they stigmatize as a source of fitna, mischief, treason, murder and perfidy, is as untainted as pure water. The following citation from the book **Mir'ât-i-kâinât** is a good example:

Hadrat Mu'âwiya 'radiy-Allâhu anh' is a son of Abû Sufyân, who is a son of Harb, who is a son of Umayya, who is a son of Abd-u-Shems, who is a son of Abd-u-menâf. Abd-u-menâf is Rasûlullah's fourth grandfather. Hadrat Mu'âwiya was born when Rasûlullah was thirty-four years old. He was nineteen years old when he and his father Abû Sufyân became Believers on the day when Mekka was conquered. The belief they had was firm. He was tall, white, good-looking, and majestic. He was Rasûlullah's brother-in-law and one of the secretaries employed in the job of writing copies of Qur'ân al-kerîm. Several times he attained the fortune of being blessed with Rasûlullah's benedictions. Examples of these benedictions are, **“Yâ Rabbî (O my Allah)! Keep him in the right way and make him a guide leading others to the right way!”** and **“Yâ Rabbî! Teach Mu'âwiya how to write and calculate well! Protect him from Thine torment! Yâ Rabbî! Make him dominant over countries!”** Furthermore, by giving him the advice, **“O Mu'âwiya! Do good to all people when you become a ruler!”** the Messenger hinted the good news that he was going to be a ruler. The following statement is his own observation: “After hearing this good news

from the Messenger of Allah, I was hoping to become Khalîfa.” One day Rasûlullah ‘sall-Allâhu alaihi wa sallam’ was riding an animal with hadrat Mu’âwiya sitting behind him, when the Messenger asked, **“O Mu’âwiya! Which of your limbs is closest to me.”** When the latter answered that it was his stomach, the Prophet asked a blessing on him, saying, **“Yâ Rabbî! Fill this with knowledge and make him a mild person!”** Hadrat Alî said about hadrat Mu’âwiya, “Do not criticize Mu’âwiya’s administration! When he is gone, you will see that heads are gone.” Hadrat Mu’âwiya was a person of wisdom, intelligence, forgiveness, kindness and circumspection. He had the prowess and excellence of tackling matters of great importance and difficulty. His mildness and patience made an epigrammatic fame. His forgiveness and kindness constituted episodes, so much so that two books were written about these episodes. Four geniuses made fame in Arabia. They are hadrat Mu’âwiya, Amr Ibni Âs, Mughîra-t-ebnî Shu’ba and Ziyâd bin Ebîh. Our superiors state that Mu’âwiya was majestic, brave, skillful in managing, studious, generous, zealous and persevering. It was as if he had been created for presidency. In fact, whenever hadrat ‘Umar looked at hadrat Mu’âwiya he would say, “What a beautiful Arab Sultan this man is.” He was so generous that one day, when hadrat Hasan said that he was badly in debt, he presented him eighty thousand golds. He rewarded Amr Ibni Âs with governorship of Egypt and six years’ revenue of Egypt for having won the battle of Siffîn. He would ride pulchritudinous horses, wear valuable garments, and enjoy sovereignty. Yet, owing to the barakat of having attained the sohbat of the Messenger of Allah, he would never deviate from the way prescribed by the Sharî’at. One day the Messenger of Allah sent for Mu’âwiya. They said he was eating. So the Messenger waited for some time and sent for him again. “He is eating,” was what he heard again. Upon this the Prophet said, **“May Allâhu ta’âlâ never make him full (with eating)!”** And hadrat Mu’âwiya always ate enormously ever since. He served as governor of Damascus for four years in the time of hadrat ‘Umar, for twelve years in the time of hadrat ‘Uthmân, five years in the time of hadrat Alî, and six months in the time of hadrat Hasan ‘radiy-Allâhu anhum ajma’în’ and, after hadrat Hasan abdicated caliphate, he became the lawful Khalîfa of all Muslim countries, occupying the caliphate and reigning for nineteen and a half years.

It is written as follows in Qisâs-i-Enbiyâ: After making the

(speech called) khutba in the sixtieth year of the Hegira, hadrat Mu'âwiya terminated his speech as follows: "O men! I have governed you long enough. I have made you tired of me. And I am tired of you, too. I want to leave. And you want me to leave, too. Yet no one better than me will come after me. As a matter of fact, those people who were prior to me were better than me. If any person wishes to be with Allâhu ta'âlâ, Allâhu ta'âlâ, too, will wish to be with him! Yâ Rabbî! I wish to be with Thee. Bless me with the fortune of being with Thee! Make me blessed and happy!" A few days later he became ill. He sent for his son Yezîd and said to him, "My son! I did not tire you in wars or on roads. I softened the enemies. I subdued the Arabs to obey you. I collected the amount of property which very few people have managed to collect. Protect the people of Hidjâz well! They are your origin. They are the most valuable of those who will come to you. Take care of the people of Iraq, too! If they ask you to dismiss your officials, do as they wish! Take care of the people of Damascus, too, for they are your helpers. I do not fear anyone for you. Yet Huseyn bin Alî 'radiy-Allâhu anhumâ' is an airy person. The people of Kûfa may provoke him against you. When you beat him, forgive him. Treat him well! For he is close to us, he has rights over us, and he is Rasûlullah's grandson." As his illness became worse, he said, "Hadrat Rasûlullah 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wa sallam' made me wear a shirt. I have preserved this shirt till today. One day I put the pieces of finger nails he had cut into a bottle. I have kept the bottle ever since. When I die, put the shirt on me. And put the nails on my eyes and in my mouth. Perhaps Allâhu ta'âlâ will forgive me for the sake of these valuable articles." Then he added, "After my death there will not be any generosity or kindness left. Incomes of many people will be cut off. People in need will go back empty-handed." His final statement was the following, which expresses his regrets: "I wish I had been a Qoureishi living in the village named Zî-tuwâ, rather than having busied myself with such things as commandership or governorship." He passed away in the month of Rajab. His blessed grave is in Damascus 'radiy-Allâhu anh'.

As is seen, hadrat Mu'âwiya 'radiy-Allâhu ta'âlâ anh' was a blessed Sahâbî.

41- *"It is the safest and the firmest way for every Muslim to know these facts exactly as they are, to take lessons, and to act upon the hadîth-i-sherîf, 'Do not criticise my As-hâb'. It is obvious that the treacherous and murderous events, the sources of which have been shown above, could not be interpreted in terms of*

genuine ijtihâd. There is no doubt as to the fact that acts and behaviours of this sort would incur vehement divine retribution. It cannot be thought that having attained the Prophet's sohbat would protect one from the divine reproach," he says.

See how he babbles nonsense! On the one hand, he quotes the hadîth-i-sherîf, **"Do not swear at my As-hâb!"** And on the other hand he imputes inconceivably base motives to the greater ones of the As-hâb-i-kirâm and casts aspersions which others would feel shame to express. Strict dieting on the one hand, and pickled cabbage on the other! He knows that he could hardly blemish an Islamic hero such as hadrat Mu'âwiya, who was one of those people closest and most beloved to the Messenger of Allah and whose goodnesses and virtues, as we have cited above, are undeniably well-known. He therefore attempts to impute the son's atrocities and murders to the father, i.e. to that exalted Sahâbî, disignoring the hadîth-i-sherîf he himself quotes. During the war of Siffîn hadrat Alî said, "Our brothers have revolted against us." It is written in Qisâs-i-Enbiyâ that during the hottest phase of the combat hadrat Alî, with his sword in his hand, broke through the forces of the other side like a lion, entered hadrat Mu'âwiya's tent, and talked with him. It is not something a Muslim would do to attack that noble Sahâbî by putting forward the disagreement between his ijtihâd and that of hadrat Alî. Some other malicious intentions must be underlying this attitude. To stir up the feelings by relating in a sad language the murders committed by Yezîd, by Ibnî Ziyâd, and by Sa'd Ibnî Ebî Waqqâs' son 'Umar, and then to attack and blemish that virtuous and innocent Sahâbî, who has nothing to do with those unfortunate events and yet who is defenceless because he is dead; what could all this be if it were not the executional step of a clandestine plan? And it is such a plan as to blur a person's mind and make him so blind that he fails to follow Rasûlullah's hadîth-i-sherîf. We would like to stress one point lest we should be misunderstood: We do not mean that hadrat Mu'âwiya is a faultless person as innocent as Prophets. On the contrary, as every Sahâbî, including hadrat Alî, may have made mistakes, so hadrat Mu'âwiya cannot be said to have had no mistakes. Yet Allâhu ta'âlâ purports that **"Those Sahâbîs who performed pious deeds and made Jihâd against disbelievers for the sake of Allah have been forgiven their past and future sins. Those selected and loved people will not become disbelievers; they shall enter Paradise."** These demented people contradict âyat-i-kerîmas. They say that the Prophet's sohbat will not save him.

Some âyat-i-kerîmas revealed by Allâhu ta'âlâ about people who have attained the Prophet's sohbat purport:

“Allâhu ta'âlâ is pleased with them. And they are pleased with Allâhu ta'âlâ, too.”

“I have prepared Paradise for them. They shall stay in Paradise eternally.”

“Those who suffer troubles and who die or get killed in their Jihâd against disbelievers for My sake, shall be forgiven their sins.” The hadîth-i-sherîf quoted at the end of the sixteenth paragraph gives the good news that the Prophet's sohbat will save hadrat Mu'âwiya from the divine reproach.

Because they cannot directly contradict these âyat-i-kerîmas and hadîth-i-sherîfs, they assert that the good news purported in them does not include hadrat Mu'âwiya 'radiy-Allâhu ta'âlâ anh'. They say that he became a disbeliever because he tormented hadrat Alî. As a proof for their allegation, they put forward the hadîth-i-sherîfs, **“He who torments Alî will have tormented me.”** and **“He who annoys you will have annoyed me.”** The book **Tuhfa** confutes their thesis as follows:

The events termed Camel and Siffîn were never results of animosity against hadrat Alî. They never considered to hurt him. The real causes of these wars are written correctly in books of Kelâm and Islamic histories. [We have explained them in a brief and concise manner in the sixteenth paragraph]. Nasîr-ad-dîn Tûsî, a Shiite scholar, states in his book *Tejrîd* that “It is sinful to disobey Alî. It is disbelief to fight him,” and adds that “A person who denies his imâmat (religious leadership) will not become a disbeliever.” For hadrat Alî's grandsons also denied one another. One of his sons, namely Muhammad bin Hanafîyya, denied the imâmat of Zeynal'âbidîn, hadrat Huseyn's son. He did not give him any of the booties sent by Mukhtâr. Zeyd-i-shehîd, who declared himself as the Imâm, rejected the imâmat of hadrat Muhammad Bâqir. After his martyrdom, his sons Yahyâ and Mutawakkil did not get on well with Imâm-i-Ja'fer Sâdiq's children. This Yahyâ, who was hadrat Sayyed-at-Nefîsa's paternal uncle, was martyred in the battle he fought against Walîd's forces in 125 (H.). Also, hadrat Imâm-i-Ja'fer's children struggled with one another over imâmat. Deplorable events took place between Abdullah Eftâh and Is-haq bin Ja'fer. If we were to write about the struggles for imâmat among hadrat Hasan's sons, a separate book would come into being. Muhammad Mehdî bin Abdullah bin Hasan Musennâ, better known by his nickname **Nafs-i-**

Zekiyya, declared his imâmat in Medîna in 145, denying other imâms. He was martyred as he was fighting Mensûr's forces. If it were disbelief to deny imâmat like denying prophethood, all these imâms would necessarily be called disbelievers. They (the slanderers mentioned above) could not say that "Hadrat Alî's grandsons do not become disbelievers when they deny one another's imâmat. Yet others will become disbelievers if they deny these people's imâmat." However, denial will cause fighting. In other words, (these) wars are the results of (the) denials. For, when the lawful Imâm uses his authority, the other party will not like this. Thus fighting will follow. Unable to answer this, they had to say, "It is not disbelief to fight a person who is denied (as the Imâm), either. Yet the case is not so with those who fought hadrat Alî." They put forward the hadîth-i-sherîf, "**To fight you is to fight me.**" However, this hadîth-i-sherîf means, "**To fight you is like fighting me.**" Obviously, fighting hadrat Emîr could not be fighting the Messenger of Allah. This hadîth-i-sherîf signifies that fighting hadrat Alî 'kerrem-Allâhu wejheh' is an offensive and wicked deed. Yet it does not mean that it is disbelief. Two things compared to each other are not necessarily identical in all respects. As a matter of fact, Rasûlullah 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wa sallam' said this hadîth-i-sherîf about other Sahâbîs as well, and even about the tribes named Eslem (or Aslam) and Ghifâr, too. And yet, according to a unanimous report, it is not disbelief to fight them.

Accordingly, this hadîth-i-sherîf means, "To fight you out of animosity without any good reason to do so, means to fight me." Fighting the murderers of hadrat 'Uthmân Alî would not mean to fight the Messenger of Allah (only) because hadrat Alî also was involved in the fight. Supposing a person said to another person, "Whoever is your enemy, is my enemy." A third person who had a row with a group over something in which the second person also were involved, would not necessarily be an enemy of the first person. None of the Sahâbîs who were against hadrat Alî in the events of Camel and Siffin had an intention of fighting hadrat Alî. They demanded retaliation against the murderers of hadrat 'Uthmân. The war was made because the murderers had gathered around hadrat Alî.

The hadîth-i-sherîf, "**To fight you is to fight me,**" means, "Animosity towards you is animosity towards me." It is quite evident that people who partook in the events of Camel and Siffin were not hostile towards hadrat Alî. They did not fight out of

animosity. All they wanted was to eliminate the faction that had been aroused among Muslims and to enforce the duty of talion. It ended in war. Voluntary actions are done of one's intention and free will. An action's being good or bad depends on the intention's being good or bad. For instance, if a person said, "I shall beat anyone who breaks this container," and if another person walking by the container slipped and fell down, breaking the container, it would not be appropriate for the first person to beat the second person. The case with those who fought hadrat Emîr "kerrem-Allâhu wejheh' was similar to this example.

Even if we were to admit that fighting hadrat Alî would be fighting the Messenger of Allah, then fighting the Messenger would not always be disbelief. It would be disbelief if it were done in denial of his prophethood. Yet it would not be disbelief if it were done out of worldly ambitions, such as for obtaining property. For Qur'ân al-kerîm contains an âyat-i-kerîma which purports about highwaymen, **"They are fighting Allah and the Messenger of Allah and striving to arouse turbulence on the earth."** On the other hand it has been reported unanimously that highwaymen are not necessarily disbelievers. The âyat-i-kerîma uses the expression, "fighting Allah and the Messenger of Allah." The hadîth-i-sherîf, on the other hand, contains the phrase, "fighting the Messenger of Allah." When it is not disbelief to fight Allah and His Messenger, how can it be disbelief to fight only against the Messenger? Yes, it is definitely disbelief to fight the Messenger in order to deny the religion and to affront Islam. Yet any war not made with an intention of this sort would not be disbelief. Hadrat Mûsâ's (Moses') holding (his brother) hadrat Hârûn's (Aaron's) hair and beard with anger is a kind of fight. Such things happen in warlike situations. What would be said if a person came forward and lodged the hadîth-i-sherîf, **"Your position with me is like that of Hârûn with Mûsâ,"** against the background of this warlike situation? Rasûlullah's beloved and blessed wife (hadrat Âîsha) was of the opinion that hadrat Alî was indulgent towards the murderers (of hadrat 'Uthmân) and slack in executing the law of talion. So she was offended with him. Likewise, hadrat Mûsâ, seeing that hadrat Hârûn was indulgent towards the people who had been worshipping a calf and slack in punishing them, hurt his brother, who was a Prophet. If any kind of war against a Prophet were disbelief, hadrat Mûsâ would have become a disbeliever then and there (may Allâhu ta'âlâ protect us from saying so)! By the same token, Yûsuf's (Prophet Joseph's) 'alaihîs-salâm' brothers

hurt their father, Ya'qûb 'alaihis-salâm', by committing the known offense against their brother. This was a behaviour no less serious than fighting. Therefore, one should be reasonable in matters concerning those superior people's actions.

Hadrat Âisha 'radiy-Allâhu anhâ' is a mother of Muslims and a wife of the Messenger of Allah. It is stated in Qur'ân al-kerîm that she occupies a position on a par with motherhood to hadrat Alî. If a mother scolds or hurts her child, will it be justifiable for the child to make a retort even if the mother's behaviour is unfair? As a matter of fact, no one has criticized hadrat Mûsâ or Yûsuf's 'alaihis-salâm' brothers. In addition, relations between brothers is not comparable with relations between a mother and a son. A line:

A person who fails to observe the values is a heretic!

As is seen, the hadîth-i-sherîf, "**To fight you is to fight me,**" cannot be put forward as a supporting document for calling the Ashâb-i-kerâm disbelievers. It is neither logical nor Islamic. Those who fought him did not lose their îmân or pious deeds for having done so. Their îmân, their pious deeds, their being Sahâbîs, their being praised and lauded through âyat-i-kerîmas and hadîth-i-sherîfs are all factors deterrent to being hostile towards them or swearing at them. Qâdî Nûrullah Shushterî, a Shiite scholar who has realized these subtleties, states in his book **Mejâlis-ul-mu'minîn**, "Shiites do not curse the three Khalîfas. Ignorant Shiites' cursing is not important."

We would like to add that some Shiite scholars, such as Abdullah Mashhadî and others, after a thorough study of Sunnite and Shiite books and a judicious reasoning of the matter, said that "Those who fought hadrat Alî did not become disbelievers. They became sinners. For they did not deny the hadîth-i-sherîf. They interpreted it." Because Shiites consider Nasîr-ad-dîn Tûsî a very great scholar, they have to explain the statements made by this scholar and other similar scholars. They say that "According to the hadîth-i-sherîf, '**To fight you is to fight me,**' fighting hadrat Alî must be disbelief. However, those who fought him did not become disbelievers because they had not planned it. On the other hand, it is a sin, not disbelief, to revolt against the time's Imâm. If it results from a doubt or misinterpretation, it is not a sin, but only a mistake of ijtihâd."

Thus far, we have quoted from Shiite scholars. Now we shall make some quotations from scholars of Ahl as-sunna:

It is never disbelief to disagree with hadrat Alî's ijtihâd in the teachings of fiqh. It is not a sin, either. For hadrat Alî, like all the As-hâb-i-kirâm, was mujtahid. In the (religious) teachings which require ijtihâd, it is permissible for mujtahids to disagree with one another, and in this case each mujtahid will earn one thawâb. A person who fought out of animosity would certainly become a disbeliever. In fact, some scholars of Ahl as-sunna called Khârijîs 'disbelievers' on account of this principle. The hadîth-i-sherîf, "**To fight you is to fight me,**" is intended for Khârijîs. After all, these people could not be said to be 'definitely disbelievers'. For their fighting was not intended as an acknowledgement of disbelief. For this reason, these people cannot be called renegades. Nevertheless, their doubts were idiotic, and because they contradicted those âyat-i-kerîmas and hadîth-i-sherîfs with clear meanings, they will not be excused, since it is not permissible to interpret âyats with overt meanings. According to the Ahl as-sunna, Khârijîs will stay with disbelievers in the Hereafter. It is not permissible to pray for their being pardoned or to perform the namâz of janâza for them. This is not the case with those who were against hadrat Alî in the combats of Camel and Siffin. They fought him as a result of their doubts and interpretation. Because theirs was a mistake of ijtihâd, they did not become disbelievers. Nor can they be blamed for this. For they are praised in âyat-i-kerîmas and hadîth-i-sherîfs. These people struggled not to fulfill the desires of their nafs, but for the sake of Allah. A person who will not admit this fact should at least hold his tongue, keep quiet. Thinking that these people were the As-hâb-i-kirâm and the Mujâhidîn-i-Islâm, he should avoid committing an act of disrespect against them. In fact, âyat-i-kerîmas and hadîth-i-sherîfs praise all Believers. The hope of attaining shafâ'at (intercession) and salvation through the forgiveness of Allâhu ta'âlâ includes every Muslim. If any one of the Damascenes who joined the combats of Camel and Siffin is known definitely to have been hostile towards hadrat Alî, to have called him a disbeliever and to have cursed him, we will call that person a disbeliever. Yet no one has been reported to have done so until now. Ignorant people's fabrications cannot be of scientific or documentary capacity. Since those Sahâbîs are definitely known to have been Believers in the beginning, we have to know them as such. If a person disbelieves the fact that the four Khalîfas will go to Paradise or says about any one of them that he is not worthy of being a Khalîfa or denies his knowledge or justice or taqwâ, this person becomes a disbeliever. Yet if a person fights

these blessed people as a result of his sensuous indulgence or for worldly advantages such as property or out of doubts or because of misinterpreting âyats and hadîths whose meanings are not clear or definite, he will not become a disbeliever. He will become a sinner.

Hadrat Mu'âwiya and hadrat Amr Ibni Âs' 'radiy-Allâhu ta'âlâ anhumâ' fighting hadrat Alî 'kerrem-Allâhu wejheh' was never based on base motives or malicious reasons. They said that they were of the opinion that the murderers of hadrat 'Uthmân should be arrested and retaliated against and acknowledged that hadrat Alî was higher and more virtuous than themselves. Whatever they did and said till their death was an indication of a strong îmân. All their thoughts and toils were for Allah's sake, for Islam. It is explained clearly in the hadîth-i-sherîfs quoted in the four hundred and ninety-fourth page of the book **Izâlat-ul-hafâ** that both parties fought for the same purpose.

42 – It is stated in the book **Tarîqat-i-Muhammadiyya**, by Imâm-i-Muhammed Birghivî, and in the two books **Berîqa** and **Hadiqa**, which are explanations of the former: A hadîth-i-sherîf quoted by Imâm-i-Bukhârî and Imâm-i-Muslim states, **“Certainly there will come a time when my Ummat will be like the sons of Isrâîl [Jews and Christians]. They will resemble them like a pair of shoes, which are exactly identical with each other; to the extent that if one of them (Jews and Christians) commits fornication with his mother, there will be people doing the same among my Ummat. Sons of Isrâîl parted into seventy-two groups. My Ummat will part into seventy- three groups. Seventy-two of these groups will go into Hell on account of their heretical creeds. Only one group will not enter there.”** When the Messenger was asked who were in that group, he said, **“They are those people who follow me and my As-hâb.”** It is written in the books **Milel ve Nihâl** and **Berîqa** that sons of Isrâîl parted into seventy-one groups after Mûsâ 'alaihis-salâm' and seventy-two groups after Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm'. This unique group, who will be safe from entering Hell owing to their (correct) belief, are called the Madh-hab of **Ahl as-sunna wa'l-jamâ'a**. Each of the seventy-two groups claim to be the group of Ahl as-sunna and believe that they will go to Paradise. However, this is not something to be judged by sheer words or suppositions. It is judged in accordance with words' and deeds' being agreeable with âyat-i-kerîmas and hadîth-i-sherîfs.

The Madh-hab of Ahl as-sunnat parted into two sub-groups called **Mâ-turîdî** and **Esh'arî**. Yet, since they are of the same origin

and do not criticize each other, they can be said to be the same. On the other hand, the Madh-hab of Ahl as-sunna parted into four Madh-habs in matters pertaining to worships and deeds. All these four Madh-habs hold the same belief; in actual fact, they are one Madh-hab. These four Madh-habs disagreed with one another in their interpretation of matters that are not explained clearly in âyat-i-kerîmas and hadîth-i-sherîfs. All of them performed ijtihâd to understand these matters, exerted themselves, and arrived at different conclusions. They do not disagree in matters that are explained clearly in Qur'ân al-kerîm and hadîth-i-sherîfs. Ijtihâd is not performed in âyats and hadîths with clear definite meanings. If a person errs in his ijtihâd of principles of belief that are not stated clearly (in âyats and hadîths), he will not be pardoned. The seventy-two groups who have deviated from the right way as a result of erroneous ijtihâd are called holders of **Bid'at** or people of **Dalâlat** (aberration) or **Heretics**. However, these people are not to be called disbelievers. If a person denies only one of the tenets of belief stated clearly by Islam, he loses his î mân and becomes a disbeliever. People who lose their î mân as a result of erroneous ijtihâd are called **Mulhid**. It is written in the books **Radd-ul-muhtâr** and **Ni'mat-i-Islâm** that, of the seventy-two aberrant groups, some members of the groups called Batinî, Mujassima, Mushabbihâ and Wahhâbîs, and the group called Ibâhîs are mulhids.

The hadîth-i-sherîf quoted above shows that a person is either a Muslim or a disbeliever. And a Muslim is either in the Madh-hab of Ahl as-sunna or a holder of bid'at, that is, a heretic. This means to say that a person who is not in the Madh-hab of Ahl as-sunna, that is, who is without a certain Madh-hab, is either a heretic or a disbeliever.

Î mân means to be fearless and Islâm means submission and salvation. Yet î mân and Islâm are the same in Islam. The heart's believing all the information which Muhammad 'alaihi-salâm' brought from Allâhu ta'âlâ through Wahy, is called **Î mân** and Islâm. All this information has been summarized in six tenets. A person who believes in these six tenets will have believed all the information. These six tenets are expressed in the credo termed **Âmentu**. Every Muslim has to memorize the Âmentu and have his children memorize it, teaching them the meanings it purports. To this end, he should send his children to authorized courses of Qur'ân al-kerîm. The meaning of Âmentu is explained in detail in the book **Belief and Islam**. A person who believes these tenets is called a

Mu'min (Believer) or a **Muslimân** (Muslim). Performing the (prescribed) worships and avoiding the harâm (all acts, behaviours, thoughts, statements forbidden by Islam) is called **Obedience to Islam**. Muslims who obey Islam are called **Sâlih** (pious) and **Âdil** (just). All the As-hâb-i-kirâm were âdil and sâlih Believers. A person who disobeys Islam out of sloth is called **Fâsiq** (sinner, sinful). A fâsiq also is a Muslim. In other words, a Muslim will not lose his îmân by sinning or by not doing the worships. However, if a person slights the concepts of worship and sin, that is, if he does not respect Islam in due manner, he will lose his îmân. And a person who does not have îmân is not a Muslim, that is, is called a **Kâfir** (disbeliever, unbeliever). A person who is not in the Madh-hâb of Ahl as-sunna is called **out of Madh-hab**, or **without** (a certain) **Madh-hab**. A person without a certain Madh-hab is either a heretic or a disbeliever.

Qâdî-zâda Ahmad Efendi 'rahmatullâhi ta'âlâ aleyh', in his explanation of the book **Birgivî Vasıyyetnâmesi**, gives the following account, beginning on the forty-fourth page: We believe in the fact that Allâhu ta'âlâ has human Prophets on the earth. All Prophets taught the people in their times the **Ahkâm**, i.e. the commandments and prohibitions which Allâhu ta'âlâ conveyed to them by Wahy, that is, taught them through the angel. People living in a Prophet's time and being taught by him are his **Ummat**. People who believe a Prophet are called **Ummat-i-ijâbat**, and those do not believe him are termed **Ummat-i-da'wa(t)**. The final Prophet is **Muhammad** 'alaihis-slâm'. No Prophet will come after him. He is the Prophet of all people, wherever and in whatever time they live, and of all genies. All of them have to believe him.

A Prophet who brought a new religious system is called a **Rasûl**. On the other hand, a Prophet who invites people to adapt themselves to the religious system brought by the Prophet previous to him is called a **Nebî**. Every Rasûl is a Nebî at the same time. Yet, every Nebî is not a Rasûl. According to some (scholars), the number of Rasûls is three hundred and thirteen. The number of Prophets in general, however, is not known. It is stated in a hadîth-i-sherîf termed **Haber-i-wâhid** that their number is one hundred and twenty-four thousand. A hadîth reported by only one person is of suppositional capacity. Therefore, it would be more judicious not to comment on their number. It is stated at the end of the thirty-sixth letter of the second volume (of **Mektûbât**) by Muhammad Mathûm-i-Fârûqî, and also in the book of eulogy titled **Emâlî** as well as in the books **Berîqa** and **Aqâid-i-Nesefiyya**

and **Hadîqa**, that saying the number of Prophets may mean to make a non-Prophet a Prophet or to deny the prophethood of a Prophet, which, in its turn, is disbelief. For it is written in all books that denying one Prophet means denying all of them. Furthermore, it is written in the commentary of the eulogy of **Emâli** and in the three hundred and nineteenth page of **Berîqa**, “No Walî can attain the grade of prophethood. To belittle a Prophet is disbelief and aberration.”

Mawdûdî of Pakistan, who died in 1399 [A.D. 1979], interprets the twenty-fourth âyat of Fâtir sûra in his book, **Islamic Civilization**, as follows:

“Among each and every Ummat, without any exception, has there come a threatening Prophet.” Then he adds, *“A Prophet has come for every Ummat. The hadîth-i-sherîf, ‘One hundred and twenty-four thousand Prophets have come,’ confirms this fact. Some passed Prophets are known about partly. It is very well possible to know the countries of some of them, such as hadrat Ibrâhîm, hadrat Mûsâ, Confucius, Zoroaster (Zarathustra) and Krishna. Each of them was sent to his own tribe. None of them claimed that his prophethood was universal.”*

It is written in Beydâwî and Mawâkib and in many books of Tafsîr that the word ‘threatening’ used in the âyat-i-kerîma signifies Prophets or scholars, not (only) Prophets. This person strives to corroborate the wrong meaning he attaches to the âyat-i-kerîma by means of a weak hadîth. No Islamic scholar has treated this weak hadîth in documentary capacity. Also, inserting the names of some disbelievers such as Confucius, Zoroaster and Krishna, he attempts, as it were, a stratagem to impress young people with the conviction that these people were Prophets. All corrupt religions are the remnants that came about as a result of interpolations and defilements of true religious systems which Allâhu ta’âlâ had revealed to Prophets. Likewise, Confucius (d. 479 B.C.) made a fame for his commendations of such ideas as worship and ethical values, which he had somehow appropriated out of what had remained from the ancient true religions prevalent in China. Consequently, his philosophy became a sect. Books teaching his sect were translated into various languages. One of them is the German book **Wörter des Konfuzius (Statements of Confucius)**. This book is not only devoid of the six tenets of îmân, which are commonly taught by all celestial religions, but also contains many statements indicating sheer disbelief. A person whose disbelief is evident cannot be said to be a Muslim, none the

less for calling him a Prophet. Krishna is one of the ancient gods of Hindu disbelievers called Brahmins. Formerly, they used to worship a stream by the same name. Later they began to worship this man, about whom there are long legends.

It is stated in the book **Berîqa**, “The number of Prophets ‘salawâtullâhi ta’âlâ alaihim ajma’în’ is not certainly known. For the hadîth-i-sherîf stating that their number is one hundred and twenty-four thousand or two hundred and twenty-four thousand is reported by only one person. And then it is not known whether this hadîth is (in the authentic category called) sahîh. If the number of Prophets is stated definitely, people who are not Prophets may have been made Prophets, or some Prophets may have been denied. Both cases are disbelief. Even if this hadîth were sahîh, it would be of suppositional capacity. Supposition is of no value in matters pertaining to belief, especially when the information is given in two alternatives like in this example.”

There are two main groups of disbelievers: Disbelievers with a holy book; disbelievers without a holy book. Disbelievers who believe a certain Prophet and the holy book revealed to him are called **Ahl-i-kitâb** (people of the Book), or **Disbelievers with a holy book**. Even if their book is an interpolated and defiled one, the animals they have killed by cutting their throats and uttering the name of Allah in the manner prescribed by their religion can be eaten, with the exception of pork, which can by no means be eaten. A Muslim may marry their daughters. Yet a Muslim girl cannot be married to them. Of today’s Jews and Christians, those who are attached to their changed religion are disbelievers with a holy book.

Those disbelievers who do not believe any Prophet’s book or any celestial book are called **Disbelievers without a holy book**. Animals slaughtered by these people cannot be eaten. Their daughters cannot be married, nor can Muslim girls be married to them. Polytheists, Atheists, Idolaters, Magians, Brahmins, Buddhists, Mulhids, Zindiqs, Munâfiqs, Renegades are all disbelievers without a holy book. People who worship beings other than Allâhu ta’âlâ are called **Mushriks** (polytheists). Mushriks are of two types: Mushriks in divinizing, and mushriks in worshipping. A group of mushriks in divinizing are **Magians**. These people (divinize and) worship fire. They say, “There are two creators: One of them, Yezdân (or Ahura Mazda=Ormazd), is the creator of goodness. The other one, Ahriman, creates evils.” Ancient naturalists said that nature itself was the creator of all beings. Mushriks in worshipping are **Idolaters**, who worship

statues (idols and icons) they themselves have made. They believe that these idols will intercede for them with Allah. Most Christians believe in **Trinity**, which means belief in three gods. Many of them divinize Îsâ ‘alaihi-salâm’. On the other hand, a group of Jews say that “Uzeyr is the son of God.” All these people become mushriks. However, they believe that the book they possess is heavenly. Communists, freemasons, and the nescient atheists of the modern era are disbelievers without a holy book. A person who is not a Muslim though he is borne from Muslim parents is called a **Murtad** (renegade). A person who does not believe in the prophethood of Muhammad ‘alaihi-salâm’ and yet who pretends to be a Muslim among Muslims for worldly interests, is called a **Munâfiq**. A munâfiq may belong to another religion. Yet when he is among Muslims he worships like Muslims, always utters the name of Allah, and conceals his wrong belief. A person who is not a Muslim and yet who pretends to be a Muslim, tries to change Islam and to spread irreligiosity in the name of Islam, is called a **Zindiq**. A zindiq says that he believes in the existence of Allah and in the prophethood of Muhammad ‘alaihi-salâm’ and that he agrees with the Qur’ân and hadîths. Yet he interprets Qur’ân al-kerîm and hadîth-i-sherîfs in accordance with his ignorant mentality and short sight. He tries to spread his erroneous interpretations in the name of Islam. He dislikes the correct statements made by scholars of Ahl as-sunna. He calls the Islamic scholars ignoramuses. Today's people call these zindiqs ‘**enlightened men of religion**’, ‘**mujaddids**’ and ‘**religion reformers**’. We should not believe these ignorant zindiqs, these fake men of religion, and we should never read their books and magazines.

A person who says that he is a Muslim and utters the statement called **Kalima-i-shahâdat** can not be stigmatized as a disbeliever only on suspicion. As the book Ibnî Âbidîn explains in its discourse on renegades in the third volume, it is written in **Hulâsa** and other books that “If a person says that he is a Muslim and yet one of his actions or words shows numerous signs of disbelief with only one element that signifies belief or which is at least not certainly disbelief, this person should not be called a disbeliever. For we have to have a good opinion of a Muslim.” The book of fatwâ called **Bezzâziyya** adds that “If it is understood clearly that this person does or says that thing which causes disbelief intentionally, he becomes a disbeliever. It would be futile for us to interpret his action or statement otherwise.”

Lexical meaning of the word Din (religion) is way, work and reward. Millet (nation, people), on the other hand, means 'to write'. Tenets of belief which a Prophet has brought from Allâhu ta'âlâ are called **Din** and **Millet**, or **Usûl-i-din**. Every Prophet brought the same Din and Millet in this sense. Din means source of water. Commandments and prohibitions enjoined by a Prophet are called **Ahkâm-i-sher'fiyya** or **Furû'i din**. Each Prophet has a different religion in this sense. (In other words, each Prophet brought a different code of commandments and prohibitions). Today the word Din (religion) covers the tenets of belief and Islam altogether. Muhammad's 'alaihis-salâm' religion is called the **Islamic religion** or **Islam**.

It is wâjib (compulsory) for every Muslim to learn the tenets of îmân and to accord his belief to them. A person who believes them in summary becomes a true Believer. Yet he becomes sinful because he has not learnt their reasons. On the other hand, it is not an Islamic command to learn the evidences and reasons of the commandments and prohibitions. It is not sinful not to know their reasons.

A person who commits a grave sin does not lose his îmân. However, if he calls a harâm 'halâl', his îmân is gone. There are two categories of sins: (I) Grave sins, called **Kebâir**. The seven gravest sins are 1- To attribute a partner to Allâhu ta'âlâ. This sin is called şirk (polytheism). Şirk is the worst type of disbelief. 2- Homicide or suicide. 3- To practice sorcery. 4- To appropriate an orphan's property. 5- To accept or to give interest. 6- To desert the combat area when one is face to face with the enemy. 7- To commit (the offence called) Qazf against a chaste woman. In other words, to impute an unchaste motive to her. Any sin may be grave. All kinds of sins must therefore be avoided. Committing a venial sin continuously will develop it into a grave sin. A grave sin will be pardoned when the sinner makes tawba. If the sinner dies without having made tawba, Allâhu ta'âlâ may forgive him through or without intercession (of a Prophet or another person He loves), depending on His Will. If the sinner is not forgiven, he will go to Hell.

It is disbelief to abhor anything held sacred by Islam or to respect anything which is to be scorned, such as to wear a rope girdle called Zunnâr, which is worn by priests, or similar things, to respect idols, to scorn religious books, to make fun of religious scholars, to utter an expression that causes disbelief. These things signify denial of the Islamic religion. They are signs of disbelief.

Allâhu ta'âlâ loves those who make tawba. He forgives them. If the sinner (who has made tawba) sins again, his tawba will not be cancelled. However, he will have to make tawba again. If a person remembers a sin with pleasure although he has made tawba for that sin, he will have to renew his tawba. It is farz to pay back the debts and dues one owes to other people, to apologize to people one has backbitten, if any, and to perform all sorts of prayers one has omitted in their prescribed times, if any. These things, however, are not the tawba itself, but the conditions for tawba. Returning one pound to its owner is better than performing supererogatory worships for a thousand years or making supererogatory hajj seventy times. It is not right not to make tawba for the fear that one's tawba will be cancelled if one sins again. It is ignorance. It is a delusion instilled by the devil. It is farz to make tawba after each sin. When the tawba is delayed for one hour, the sin is doubled. This comes to mean that the sins of those people who postpone the performance of the prayers of namâz they have omitted become doubled as each spare time as long as to permit the performance of namaz is spent.

Tawba is not made only by saying that one has made tawba (or that one is sorry about one's sin). Acceptability of tawba is dependent on fulfilment of three conditions:

- 1- The sinner has to cease from the sin concerned.
- 2- Fearing Allâhu ta'âlâ, the sinner must feel shame and repentance for having sinned.
- 3- The sinner must make a heartfelt promise not to commit again the sin concerned. Allâhu ta'âlâ promises that He shall accept the tawba made properly and observing its conditions.

Habits can change. One should do one's best to develop good habits.

Whether a person will migrate to the Hereafter as a Believer is a matter which will be certain at his last breath (the time of death). If a person who has lived as a disbeliever for sixty years becomes a Muslim only a short time before his death, he will rise as a Believer in the Hereafter. With the exception of Prophets 'alaihim-us-salawâtu wa-t-teslîmât' and a number of certain people who have been blessed with the promise (of Allâhu ta'âlâ) that they will definitely go to Paradise, no one can be said to be 'due for Paradise'. For it cannot be known beforehand how a person will be at his last breath.

If a Believer who has migrated to the Hereafter has left in the

world a permanent fruit of piety or useful books or pious children to pray for him after him, he will go on receiving thawâbs. When a person dies, the book wherein his goodneses and vices are recorded will not be closed. Sa'd bin Ubâda 'radiy-Allâhu anh', one of the As-hâb-i-kirâm, asked (our Prophet), "Yâ Rasûlallah (O the Messenger of Allah)! My mother is dead. How can I still please her?" The blessed Prophet replied: "**It is good to give water as alms.**" When praying, one should ask blessings on the souls of all Believers. All of them will receive the blessings. Praying will ward off an approaching catastrophe. Giving alms will appease the wrath of Allâhu ta'âlâ, protect one from afflictions, and help an ill person whose time of death has not come yet to heal. Allâhu ta'âlâ does not like a person who does not pray.

Every Muslim has to learn his Madh-hab in **Creed** and that which pertains to **Deeds**. **Madh-hab** means way. Islamic teachings told in a covert language in Qur'an al-kerîm and hadîth-i-sherîfs are clarified through (an extremely painstaking and knowledge-requiring process called) ijtihâd by profoundly learned scholars, who are called **Mujtahid**. Our Madh-hab in creed is the Madh-hab termed **Ahl as-sunna wa'l-jamâ'a(t)**. 'The Madh-hab of Ahl as-sunna wa'l-jamâ'at' means 'the credo, the belief held by Rasûlullah's As-hâb and their jamâ'at (people following them)'. Each and every one of the As-hâb-i-kirâm is a Mujtahid, a halo, a light of Islam. They are Muslims' imâms, leaders, guides, and documents. Any person who strays from the way shown by them will end up in Hell. The group of Ahl as-sunna have two imâms, leaders: One of them is **Abû Mansûr Mâ-Turîdî** 'rahmatullâhi ta'âlâ aleyh'. He is a profound scholar raised in the Madh-hab of hadrat Imâm-i-a'zam Abû Hanîfa 'rahmatullâhi ta'âlâ aleyh'. The scholars of Hanafî Madh-hab are in his Madh-hab. The other leader is **Abu'l Hasan-i-Esh'arî** 'rahmatullâhi ta'âlâ aleyh'. He is one of the greatest scholars in Shâfi'î Madh-hab. He is a very profound scholar. There is very small difference between these two Madh-habs.

Today, there is no scholar so profoundly learned as to perform ijtihâd. Every Muslim has to learn one of the four Madh-habs by reading one of the books that are called 'Ilm-i-hâl and which teach the requirements of the Madh-hab and then adapt his belief and all his actions to that Madh-hab. Thus he will have affiliated himself with that Madh-hab. A person will not be a Sunnite Muslim unless he enters one of the four Madh-habs. He will be a person without

a Madh-hab. And a person without a Madh-hab, in his turn, is either in one of the seventy-two miscreant sects, or a disbeliever. The book of Tafsîr titled **Es-Sâwî** gives the following account in its explanation of the twenty-fourth âyat of Kahf sûra: “It is not permissible to follow a person who is not in any one of the four Madh-habs even if his statements are agreeable with the statements of Sahâbîs or with hadîdh-i-sherîfs that are sahîh (authentic) or with âyat-i-kerîmas. A person who is not in one of the four Madh-habs is aberrant. He will mislead others as well. Deviating from the four Madh-habs will finally lead one to disbelief. It is a custom of disbelievers to give those figurative âyat-i-kerîmas termed Muteshâbihât their façade meanings.” If a man of religion states that he is in the Madh-hab of Ahl as-sunnat and spreads the teachings of his Madh-hab, his statements and books will be of value. Those who read them will acquire use from them. Religious books written by people without a Madh-hab are harmful. They will spoil the faith and îmân of those who read them. Our advice to our friends and brothers in Islam is this: Try to learn the Madh-hab of Ahl as-sunna and to teach it to your children! Each of the books listed in the final pages of our books were translated from the books of scholars of Ahl as-sunna. You must buy these books, read and learn them, recommend them to your acquaintances, and try to spread them to all Muslims. Thus you will earn thawâb for Jihâd.

Jihâd does not mean to stage a coup d’etat, to disobey one’s commanders, to revolt against the government, to beat, to destroy, to break, or to curse. Such things would serve no end but arouse fitna. In other words, doing such things means separatism. It will bring oppression and imprisonment to Muslims and cause prohibition of the teachings of religion and îmân. Our master the Prophet ‘sall-Allâhu alaihi wa sallam’ has cursed people who arouse such fitna. Imprisonment is not an honour to be desired by a Muslim. The honour to be yearned for by a Muslim should be to equip himself with the beautiful moral qualities commended by Islam, to do good to everybody, to adapt himself to Islam, and to be useful to all creatures. It is idiocy, a sinful behaviour, to expose oneself to dangers. Allâhu ta’âlâ declares, **“Do not expose yourselves to dangers!”**

Jihâd means to try to convey the religion of Allâhu ta’âlâ to His born slaves. There are three ways of making Jihâd. The first way is to fight, overcome and annihilate cruel tyrants who dominate people, use them like slaves, prevent them from hearing about the

Islamic religion and persecute and oppress them, and thus to help people hear about the Islamic religion. Once people have heard about Islam, it will be up to them whether or not they should accept it. Depending on their free choice, they may become Muslims or go on doing their own worships, provided that they should observe Islam's rules and regulations. This type of armed Jihâd is performed only by the (Islamic) government, (if there is any). The state's army is in charge of this duty. All Muslims will join this duty by doing the duties assigned by the state and thus attaining the thawâb for Jihâd. The state performs Jihâd also to defend our religion and nation against those disbelievers attacking in order to annihilate them, as well as against heretical, aberrant and seditious forces who prepare traps for defiling and demolishing Islam. All Muslims will attain thawâb of Jihâd by contributing to the government's services.

The second type of Jihâd is to propagate Islam's teachings, the beautiful moral qualities it infuses, and the rights and freedoms it confers on humanity through preaches, books, radio and television broadcasts.

The third type of Jihâd is to support those who carry on the first two types of Jihâd by praying for them. Doing the armed Jihâd for the promulgation of Islam is **farz-i-kifâya**.^[1] When the enemy attacks, however, it becomes farz-i-ayn for every man, and even for women and children when the number of men is inadequate. If they still cannot stop the enemy, it becomes farz-i-ayn for Muslims all over the world to help them. The second type of Jihâd is farz-i-ayn for Muslims who are able to do so, and the third type is always farz-i-ayn for everybody. For performing the second type of Jihâd, it is necessary to try to spread the books of Ahl as-sunna within the laws. We are working for this world incessantly. A Muslim should work ceaselessly for the Hereafter, too. Enemies of Islam are exerting themselves to destroy Islam. For surviving their attacks, Muslims have to do two things: First, they should send their children to courses where they teach Qur'ân al-kerîm. Second, they should try to spread books written by scholars of Ahl as-sunna 'rahmatullâhi alaihim ajma'in'. It is stated as follows in the

[1] Islam's definite commandments are called **farz**. When a commandment is incumbent on every individual Muslim, it is termed farz-i-ayn. There are those types of commandments, however, which lapse from other Muslims when it is carried out by one Muslim or by a group of Muslims. They are termed **farz-i-kifâya**.

fourteenth paragraph of the chapter about Waqf in the book **Fatâwâ-yi-Hindiyya**: “For people who wish to do pious acts of charity, it is better to construct buildings of public use, [such as hospitals], than emancipating slaves. Publishing useful books [teaching Islam, morals and science] is the best of all. To prepare and publish books of fiqh is better than doing supererogatory worships.”

43- Another insidious enemy who attacks Islam’s foundation with sly methods and tries to mislead Muslim children is an Egyptian named Muhammad Qutb. See how nonsensically he writes in an article which he names ‘Line of Deviation’:

“The first chink in Islam’s basis showed itself in the Umayyad policy in administrative and financial areas. For the ‘Melik-i-adûd’ established a hereditary system (of sovereignty) and began to perpetrate a series of cruelties. Sultans’ and governors’ relatives became sort of feudal chieftains.

“Then came the Abbasid era. Buildings of caliphate and governorship became drinking and fornication dens instead of offices for civil services. They were arranging musical revels with belly dancers and carrying their injustice and egoism to their lower extremities.”

The book **Tuhfa** states as follows in its answer to the seventieth lie fabricated by people without Madh-hab: “If a person’s caliphate is declared clearly through Nass, that is, by âyats and hadîths, this kind of caliphate is called **Khilâfat-i-Râshida**. It is for this reason that the four great Khalîfas are called **Khulafâ-i-râshidîn**. If a person’s caliphate is inferred through reasoning or through implication of Nass, his caliphate is termed **Khilâfat-i-’âdila**. If a person whose caliphate is neither declared clearly nor implied seizes power by using force, his caliphate is called **Khilâfat-i-Jâira**, and this kind of Khalîfa is called **Melik-i-adûd**.”

A hadîth-i-sherîf, which exists in the five hundred and twenty-eighth page of the book **Izâlat-ul-hafâ**, by Shâh Waliyyullah Dahlawî, states, “**We began this work with prophethood and with Allah’s compassion. After now there will be caliphate and (Allah’s) compassion. Then will come the (time of) Melik-i-adûd. Then there will be torments, cruelties and mischiefs among my Ummat. Wearing silk clothes, drinking alcohol and fornication will be made halâl and (this state) will be supported by many people. Things will go on like this till the end of the world.**” This hadîth-i-sherîf states clearly that hadrat Mu’âwiya will seize power by force

and that cruelty and mischief will begin after him, not in his time. Shâh Waliyyullah, by writing that the cruelty and mischief began with the establishment of the Abbasid state, foils Muhammad Qutb's slander.

Hadîth-sherîfs imply that hadrat Mu'âwiya will become a Ruler. Therefore, hadrat Mu'âwiya became the **Khâlifa-i-âdil** after hadrat Hasan abdicated caliphate to him and the As-hâb-i-kirâm voted for him. It would be a very grave calumny to call this great Sahâbî **Melik-i-adûd** and to attach wrong meanings, such as oppressor, disbeliever, to this word. And a person who translates this word as 'king' must be quite unaware of Islam.

Sovereigns in disbelievers' countries are called 'kings'. King of France, King of England, King of Bulgaria were examples of this. To call a Muslim Melik 'King' would mean to belittle a blessed person Muslims respect, love and call Khalîfa and to say that that Melik (Ruler) and all his people are disbelievers. Our master, the Messenger of Allah 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wa sallam', called hadrat Mu'âwiya '**Melik**'. And billions of Muslims call him Melik and Khalîfa. No one ascribed cruelty to this honourable Sahâbî, to this renowned fighter for Islam, hadrat Mu'âwiya, one of those fortunate people who are praised and prayed for in hadîth-i-sherîfs and who, as it is stated in âyat-i-kerîmas, have been forgiven and will go to Paradise. To compare these fighters for Islam, these lions of those auspicious times praised in hadîth-i-sherîfs, to Europe's cruel and faithless feudal chieftains, would mean to thrust a dagger into the soul of Islam. These hadîth-i-sherîfs are well-known: **"In the Hereafter, the angels of torment will torture those men of religion whose knowledge is useless before torturing disbelievers."** And **"In the Hereafter, the worst torment will be inflicted on that man of religion whose knowledge is useless."** These hadîth-i-sherîfs warn younger generations. They state that people who are presented as religious scholars by false religious magazines are thieves of îmân and wretched sinners who will be subjected to vehement torment in Hell.

The writing above reminds of Lawrence, the notorious spy during the First World War. This perfectly Arabic-spoken bearded British spy, who wore a turban and a long gown (worn by Muslim religious men), pretended to be an Islamic scholar and reviled great scholars of Ahl as-sunna. Blemishing the As-hâb-i-kirâm, the Islamic Khalîfas and the Ottoman Turks, he misled hundreds of thousands of Muslims. Thus he helped people who tried to change and defile Islam to separate themselves from the

Turks and establish an independent state. Wahhabite books call true Muslims ‘polytheists’. They stigmatize us Sunnite Muslims as disbelievers. The spy named Lawrence is dead now. He is in Hell. They are employing their native spies for his place now. Distributing thousands of golds, they are publishing magazines and books praising them in every country. In these books of theirs, they are censuring scholars of Ahl as-sunna ‘rahmatullâhi ta’âlâ alaihim ajma’in’. However, Islamic scholars have unanimously affirmed the high grade of those scholars, thus settling this matter and leaving not even a smallest particular for the later generations to discuss. To attempt to rake up past events that have already been discussed, agreed on and settled from both historical and religious points of view, is an indication of destructiveness rather than that of service. It is a sign of malevolence.

All the Umayyad, Abbasid and Ottoman Khalîfas were believing, good-charactered, just and blessed people. Yes, a very few of them succumbed to their nafs and fell for the temptations of the devil. Yet these people did not harm Islam. Their harm was to their own nafs. The worst of them abandoned the Sunnî way and became a Mu’tazilî. And then this was caused by aberrant men of religion. The fiends who misled them were degenerated members of mankind, rather than descendants of the accursed devil. Imâm-i-Rabbânî ‘rahmatullâhi ta’âlâ aleyh’ states in his book **Mektûbât** that “Muslims’ and statesmen’s deviation from the right way has always been caused by malicious men of religion.” A worse act of immorality is to try to stigmatize Islamic Khalîfas as immoral and irreligious people by publicizing their private lawful harem lives in books and newspaper columns. It is something that will shock and perturb honest people. A person may have read the lies and calumniations in European histories or books written by priests and freemasons and believed them. We recommend to them that they also read at least a few Islamic histories and books written by scholars of Ahl as-sunna. Thus the truth will be known. In fact, an article which is a collection of sheer judgements without any documentary events or evidences must have been written by a person with no background in Islam’s teachings. They write that people in the times of Umayyads, Abbasids and Ottomans observed Islam. This shows that statesmen in those times were believing and just people. For our master, the Prophet ‘sall-Allâhu alaihi wa sallam’, stated, **“People’s religion is like their president’s religion.”** Throughout

history we Muslims have taken many warning lessons from mendacious, slanderous men of religion. At one time Ibni Teymiyya attempted to ruin the îmân of the middle east. Scholars of Ahl as-sunna taught him his lesson. Thousands of books of knowledge refuted his untenable ideas and disgraced him. Later, someone named Abdoh of Egypt cooperated with freemasons. Like the mongrel sect which was produced with the name Protestantism in Christianity, this heretic attempted to eliminate the Ahl as-sunna, which he disliked, and to insert the West's irreligious philosophy into Islam. This man, too, was given the answer he deserved. Yet, shameful to say, on the one hand president of Cairo Masonic lodge Abdoh's venomous ideas spread in Egypt's Jâmi'ul az-har. Thus a number of **Religion Reformers** appeared in Egypt. Rashîd Ridâ, Mustafâ Merâghî, who was the rector of the madrasa of Az-har, Abd-ul-mejîd Selîm, who was Muftî of Cairo, Mahmûd Sheltut, Tantâwî Jawharî, Abdur-râziq Pâsha, Zekî Mubârak, Ferîd Wajdî, Abbâs Aqqâd, Ahmad Emîn, Doctor Tâhâ Huseyn Pâsha and Qâsim Emîn were only a few of them. On the other hand, like their teacher Abdoh, these people were represented as modern Islamic scholars and their books were translated into Turkish, thus causing many religious men to slip out of the right way.

Sayyed Abd-ul-hakîm Efendi 'rahmatullâhi aleyh', the great Islamic scholar and the mujaddid of the fourteenth (Islamic) century, stated, "Abdoh, Muftî of Cairo, did not recognize the greatness of Islamic scholars, sold himself to Islam's enemies, and eventually became a freemason, joining those unbridled disbelievers atrophying Islam from within. Ismâ'îl Hakkî of Izmir, Ömer Rıza Doğrul, Hamdi Akseki, Şerâfeddîn Yaltkaya, Şemseddîn Günaltay, Mustafâ Fevzî, Vehbî of Konya, Muhammed Âkif, and many other men of religion read their books, were badly influenced by them, and deviated into various ways."

Abdoh and other people like him, who had drifted into disbelief or aberration, raced with one another in their efforts to mislead younger generations of religious men, thus pioneering the disasters predicted in the hadîth-i-sherîf, "**Catastrophes befalling my Ummat will be through heretical [aberrant] men of religion.**"

In the meantime, Abdoh's disciples would not sit still. They published very many harmful books in a nature to incur divine wrath and vengeance. One of them is Reshîd Ridâ's book **Muhâwerât**, which was translated into Turkish by Hamdi Akseki,

given the title **Islâmda Birlik** (Unity in Islam), and published in Istanbul in 1332 [A.D. 1914]. In this book of his he followed his teacher's example, attacked the four Madh-habs of the Ahl as-sunna and, thinking that the Madh-habs originated from differences of opinions and representing the Madh-habs' differing methods and conditions as bigotted controversies, went so far in aberration that he accused them of "deranging Islam's unity." This attitude of his means to deride millions of true Muslims who have been imitating one of the four Madh-habs for fourteen hundred years, and to turn away from Islam and look for the ways of coping with the time's requirements in changing Islam and î mân. What is common about these religion reformers is that they represent themselves as highly intellectual Islamic scholars who have comprehended real Islam perfectly and are at the same time quite aware of the time's requirements, while calling those truly pious Muslims who have read and learned Islam's books and who have been following scholars of Ahl as-sunna praised in the hadîth-i-sherîf, "**The best of times is their time,**" 'mobbish-minded imitators'. That these **religion reformers** are vulgarly ignorant people who are quite unaware of Islam's credal and technical teachings is completely blatant in their own oral and written statements. To clarify this point, let us see what our Prophet 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wa sallam' states in the following hadîth-i-sherîfs: "**The highest people are scholars with î mân.**" "**Religious scholars are Prophets' inheritors.**" "**Knowledge pertaining to heart is one of the secrets belonging to Allah.**" "**Scholars' sleep is a worship.**" "**Respect my Ummat's scholars! They are stars of the earth.**" "**Scholars will intercede (for sinful Muslims) in the Hereafter.**" "**Scholars of fiqh are valuable. It is a worship to be in their company.**" "**A scholar among his disciples is like a Prophet among his Ummat.**" Who do these hadîth-i-sherîfs praise; scholars of Ahl as-sunna, who have been teaching Islam for fourteen hundred years, or Abdoh and his disciples, who have appeared recently? This question also is answered by our master, the Messenger of Allah 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wa sallam': "**Every century will be worse than the one previous to itself. Thus they will be all the worse by the end of the world.**" "**As the end of the world draws near, men of religion will be worse and more putrid than a donkey's carrion.**" These hadîth-i-sherîfs are written in the abridged version of **Tezkira-i-Qurtubî**. As it is unanimously stated by all the Islamic scholars praised and lauded by Rasûlullah 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wa sallam' and confirmed by all the Awliyâ, the only group of

Muslims promised to be free from Hell are those who are in the Madh-hab of scholars termed **Ahl as-sunna(t) wa'l jamâ'a(t)**. People who are not in the Sunnite group shall go to Hell. Another fact they state unanimously is that unification of Madh-habs is wrong. In other words, the scholars and the Awliyâ mentioned above state unanimously that it would be an iniquitous and ridiculous attempt to try to make one unified Madh-hab by selecting the facilities offered by the four Madh-habs.

There is detailed information in this respect in the book **The Sunni Path**.

Which case will a person with wisdom prefer; to adapt himself to the Madh-hab of Ahl as-sunnat, which has been commended unanimously by so many Islamic scholars for one thousand years, or to believe these cultured (!), modern, religiously ignorant parvenus, whose existence is a matter of the recent hundred years? The prominent and loquacious ones among the seventy-two groups of people who it is stated in hadîth-i-sherîfs will go to Hell, have always assailed scholars of Ahl as-sunna 'rahmatullâhi ta'âlâ alaihim ajma'in' and did their utmost to tarnish these blessed Muslims. Yet they have been answered and disgraced through âyat-i-kerîmas and hadîth-i-sherîfs. Seeing that knowledge could not be the way recommendable for them to follow for the attainment of their vicious ends, they have had recourse to banditry and violence, thus causing innumerable Muslim bloodbaths in every century. On the other hand, Muslims in the four Sunnite Madh-habs have always loved one another and lived as brothers.

Rasûlullah 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wa sallam' states that "**Muslims' parting into Madh-habs** (in daily worships and procedures) **is compassion of Allâhu ta'âlâ** (over Muslims)." However, religion reformers, e.g. Reshîd Ridâ, who was born in 1282 [A.D. 1865] and died suddenly in Cairo in 1354 [A.D. 1935], say that they will establish unity in Islam by unifying the Madh-habs. In actual fact, our Prophet 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wa sallam' commanded Muslims throughout the world to be united in one belief, the true way of îmân guided by his four Khalîfas. Islamic scholars studied hand-in-hand and discovered the true way of belief taught by the four Khalîfas and recorded it in their books, naming this way commanded by our Prophet **Ahl as-sunna wa'l jamâ'a**. Muslims all over the world have to be united in this unique way called **Ahl as-sunna**. And those who claim to be aspirant after unity in Islam ought to join this already existent unity, if they are sincere in their claim.

It is a shame, however, that this book of Reshîd Ridâ's, whose real purpose is to sow discord among Muslims and to annihilate Islam from the inside, was printed with the title **İslâmda Birlik ve Fıkh Mezhepleri** (Unity in Islam and the Madh-habs of Fıqh) and the publication number 157 in 1394 [A.D. 1974] by some miscreant political party members who had infiltrated into Ministry of Religious Affairs in order to mislead younger generations of religious men. Thanks be to Allah that Ministry of Religious Affairs was purged of these people without a Madh-hab, leaving their place to reasonable, pure-hearted, knowledgeable scholars 'rahmatullâhi ta'âlâ alaihim aĵma'în'. These people have been writing books to warn youngsters against such miscreant publications. An example of these books is **İslâm Dîmini Tehdîd Eden En Korkunç Fitne Mezhebsizlikdir** (The Most Horrendous Threat Against the Islamic Religion Is The Fitna of Being Without A Madh-hab), by Durmuş Alî Kayapınar, a member of **İslâm Enstitüsü** Teaching Staff in Konya, Turkey. The book was printed in Konya in 1976. Zindıqs have always tried to deceive Muslims through falsely-adorned statements and to destroy (Islam's unity) under the mask of (unification). For more detailed information, please see the (Turkish) book **Fâideli Bilgiler** (Useful Information)! Zindıqs, lurking under various Islamic appellations, have been striving to defile, to atrophy Islam. Although they are fruitless with respect to knowledge and mental capacity, they have enough money to be in the limelight by means of mercenary men of religion.

44- We would like to embellish our book by appending a letter by İmâm-i-Rabbânî, Mujaddid-i-elf-i-thânî Ahmad Fârûqî Serhendî 'rahmatullâhi ta'âlâ aleyh', thus receiving barakat from the blessed soul of the exalted imâm, who was loved so much by Islamic scholars and who was and is the guide of Awliyâ and of all the people walking in the paths of Tasawwuf and who has been selected from among selected people:

THIRD VOLUME, HUNDRED and TWENTY-FOURTH LETTER

This letter, written to Molla Murâd-i-Keshmî, explains the greatness of the As-hâb-i-kirâm and the fact that they loved one another:

Allâhu ta'âlâ declares at the end of Fat-h sûra, "**Muhammad 'alaihîs-salâm' is the Prophet whom Allâhu ta'âlâ has sent to mankind. Those who are in his company are very harsh towards disbelievers and extremely compassionate towards one another.**" This âyat-i-kerîma is fairly long and ends as "**Lest disbelievers should resent them... .**" Allâhu ta'âlâ praises the As-hâb-i-kirâm by stating that they loved one another very much. The word '**Rahîm**' used in the âyat-i-kerîma signifies exceeding mutual love. Such words are called **Sifât-i-mushabbihâ** in the Arabic grammar. They signify both muchness and continuance. It shows that the As-hâb-i-kirâm loved one another permanently, and that they always loved one another after the Messenger of Allah honoured the Hereafter with his presence as well as when he was alive. It is inferred from this âyat-i-kerîma that anything incompatible with mutual love never existed or happened among the As-hâb-i-kirâm. Allâhu ta'âlâ states plainly in this âyat-i-kerîma that such unlovely feelings as grudge, hatred and jealousy toward one another did not even occur to them. Each and every one of the As-hâb-i-kirâm possessed this common attribute. The expression "**Wallazîna**" in the âyat-i-kerîma indicates this fact. When this is the case with all of them, how can anything be said against the highest ones? Certainly, these great people had the most and the highest of virtues. It is for this reason that the Sarwar 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wa sallam' stated, "**Abû Bekr 'radiy-Allâhu anh' is the most merciful of my Ummat!**" He stated in another hadîth-i-sherîf, "**No Prophet shall succeed me. If there were a Prophet to come after me, 'Umar 'radiy-Allâhu anh' would certainly be the Prophet.**" This hadîth-i-sherîf is recorded in Daylamî and Kunûz-ud-deqâiq. This hadîth-i-sherîf shows that hadrat 'Umar possessed all kinds of superiority peculiar to Prophets. The only virtue he was not given was the rank of prophethood, and this was because Rasûlullah was the final Prophet. One of the virtues possessed by Prophets is to love Muslims very much and to have mercy on them. Such bad habits as envy, grudge, enmity, resentment are quite incompatible with love and mercy. Could these bad habits be thought to have existed in those people who

were spiritually educated by the best and the highest of mankind, Muhammad ‘alaihi-salâm’, and who were the highest members of the best of all Ummats? The As-hâb-i-kirâm ‘alaihim-ur-ridwân’ are ahead of all these people (Muslims), who, in their turn, have replaced all (past) peoples. The century in which they lived is the best of all times. Their educator is the highest of Prophets ‘sall-Allâhu ta’âlâ alaihi wa sallam’. The lowest individual in this Islamic Ummat would be disgusted with these bad habits. If the As-hâb-i-kirâm had had these bad habits, could they have been the best of this Ummat, and then could this Ummat be said to be the best of Ummats? Could such merits as having been the earliest Believers, the earliest alms-givers, having made Jihâd and sacrificing their own lives for the sake of Allah be said to be honours and superiorities? How could their time have been the best of times? And what would be the significance, the value of having been educated by the Messenger of Allah? While a person educated by a Walî or by a scholar of this Ummat gets rid of bad habits and becomes extremely clean, could it ever be possible for these bad habits to have remained on those people who spent all their lives in Rasûlullah’s company, serving him, sacrificing their property and lives for helping and supporting him and his religion, and who were always ready to dive into death upon a signal he would give? To believe it would mean to deny the greatness of the Messenger of Allah ‘sall-Allâhu alaihi wa sallam’. [May Allâhu ta’âlâ protect us from such denial]. It would mean to hold his educating inferior to the educating of a Walî or any other educator. On the other hand, it is stated unanimously by scholars that no Walî in an Ummat can be as high as any of the Sahâbîs of that Ummat. Then, how could they ever be as high as the Prophet of that Ummat? Abû Bekr-i-Shiblî states that a person who does not respect a Prophet’s ‘sall-Allâhu alaihi wa sallam’ As-hâb has not become a Believer of that Prophet.

Many people think that Rasûlullah’s ‘sall-Allâhu alaihi wa sallam’ As-hâb parted into two groups. They say that one group were against hadrat Alî while the others sided with him. According to these people, “These two groups were nursing a grudge against each other. Most of them withheld their inimical feelings for worldly interests. They were doing **Taqiyya**, which means hypocrisy. These atrocities continued for a hundred years.” Because of this bad opinion, they vilify those Sahâbîs who they think were against hadrat Alî, and accuse them of atrocities quite incompatible with their high honour. It would take only a little

reasoning, a little consideration to realize that people who think or say so are reviling both groups of Sahâbîs and accusing them of being bad-tempered by doing so. People who make such allegations are striving to represent all the best people of this Ummat as the worst of this Ummat, even as the worst of all people. They are trying to change an era which was praised as **“the best era”** in a hadîth-i-sherîf into the worst era. What sort of wisdom or reason should one have to let hadrat Abû Bekr and hadrat ‘Umar, the two archstones of Islam who are loved and respected so much by Muslims, to be censured and stained? Our’ân al-kerîm informs that hadrat Abû Bekr is the most valuable, the most virtuous member of this Ummat. It is stated unanimously by Abdullah Ibnî Abbâs and other Sahâbîs and all scholars of Tafsîr that the âyat-i-kerîma that purports, **“He who fears Hell’s fire very much will give his property for the sake of Allah for attaining the blessings Allah promises,”** in Wa’l-layl sûra, denotes hadrat Abû Bekr. It needs no stretch of the imagination to discern the fact that it would be an utterly despicable attitude to impute disbelief, wickedness or aberration to a person who it is declared by Allâhu ta’âlâ is the most pious and the most valuable member of this Ummat, the best of Ummats. Hadrat Imâm-i-Fakhr-ad-dîn Râdî, one of the greatest scholars of Tafsîr, states that **“This âyat-i-kerîma shows that hadrat Abû Bekr is the highest member of this Ummat (Muslims).”** For the thirteenth âyat of Hujurât sûra purports, **“The highest one among you is the one who fears Allah most.”** Since it is declared in the former âyat-i-kerîma that in this Ummat hadrat Abû Bekr is the one who fears Allâhu ta’âlâ most, this second âyat-i-kerîma denotes that he is the highest of this Ummat. It is stated unanimously by the As-hâb-i-kirâm and by the Tâbî’in that hadrat Abû Bekr and hadrat ‘Umar are the highest ones among this Ummat. This unanimity is reported to us by the greatest ones of our religious imâms. One of the reporters is hadrat Imâm-i-Shâfi’î. Another person who acknowledges that hadrat Abû Bekr and hadrat ‘Umar are the highest ones in this Ummat is hadrat Alî. Imâm Zehebî, a great scholar of Hadîth, states in his book that **“This statement of hadrat Alî’s has been reported to us by more than eighty people.”** Therefore, that hadrat Abû Bekr and hadrat ‘Umar are the highest ones of this Ummat has been acknowledged even by some Shiite scholars, e.g. by Abd-ur-Razzâq, who is one of the most prominent. He made this statement: **“I say so because hadrat Alî stated that hadrat**

Abû Bekr and hadrat 'Umar were superior to him. Otherwise, I would not say so. It would be very sinful if I did not agree with hadrat Alî as a person who loved him." That these two people (hadrat Abû Bekr and hadrat 'Umar) are the highest ones of this Ummat, the best of Ummats, is denoted by the **Book**, i.e. Qur'ân al-kerîm, explained by the **Sunna(t)**, i.e. hadîth-i-sherîfs, confirmed by the **Ijmâ'**, i.e. unanimity of the As-hâb-i-kirâm 'radiy-Allâhu ta'âlâ anhum ajma'in', and acknowledged by hadrat Alî. So, it is not something a Muslim or any reasonable person would do to blemish or revile these people. If these people are reviled, what goodness will be left in this Ummat for us to praise? If it were a good deed, a worship to curse or vituperate a person, it would be a commandment to curse Abû Jahl and Abû Leheb, who are declared to be evil, accursed people in Qur'ân al-kerîm. Cursing these people would deserve much thawâb. It is something unpleasant to curse a person. It means repugnance towards him. What good could there be in such behaviour? And if it is done unjustly, if the person who is cursed is a good one, it would mean to put something in the wrong place, which is cruelty. No two things, no two places are the same as each other. And each kind of cruelty is different from another.

Hadrat 'Uthmân Zinnûreyn also was elected Khalîfa by the unanimous vote of the As-hâb-i-kirâm 'radiy-Allâhu ta'âlâ anhum ajma'in'. All of them, men and women alike, agreed to his caliphate. It is for this reason that Islamic scholars said, "The degree of unanimity in the voting for hadrat 'Uthmân's caliphate was not reached in the election of any of the other three Khalîfas." For at that time there were various rumours and therefore the election was important for everybody. All the As-hâb-i-kirâm joined the election. [If the writer named Sayyed Qutb had realized this truth, he could not have said, "'Uthmân's becoming Khalîfa was an unfortunate event for Muslims."]

The Book and the Sunna(t), i.e. Qur'ân al-kerîm and hadîth-i-sherîfs, were taught to us by the As-hâb-i-kirâm. **Ijmâ'i ummat**, which is one of the four sources of Islamic knowledge, means the unanimity of the As-hâb-i-kirâm. Censuring all or some of these people, or saying that they turned bad afterwards, means mistrusting all or some of the Islamic knowledge. And this, in its turn, means denying the ultimate divine cause in Allâhu ta'âlâ's sending the final Prophet and the highest Messenger. Qur'ân al-kerîm was arranged by hadrat 'Uthmân. Or, rather, it was arranged by hadrat Abû Bekr Siddîq and hadrat 'Umar Fârûq

‘radiy-Allâhu ta’âlâ anhum’. Now, if these people are vituperated and accused with injustice, will Qur’ân al-kerîm have any authenticity left? And will there be any Islam left? We have to realize how unsightly this attitude is. All the As-hâb-i-kirâm are just people. And all the teachings of Qur’ân al-kerîm and hadîth-i-sherîfs they reported to us are true.

The disagreements and disputes that took place among the As-hâb-i-kirâm in the time of hadrat Alî ‘radiy-Allâhu ta’âlâ anh’ were not intended to satisfy the desires of nafs, for pleasure or for obtaining posts and positions. They originated from disagreements in ijtihâd. They were based on differences of reasoning. The ijtihâd reached by one of the parties was wrong. These people could not reach a correct decision. Scholars of Ahl as-sunnat wa’l jamâ’at state that hadrat Alî was right and those who fought against him were wrong. However, since their mistake was based on ijtihâd, none of them can be criticized. None of them can be castigated. We say that hadrat Alî was right and those who were opposed to him were wrong. For scholars of Ahl as-sunna say so. Yet it would be an outrageous behaviour to curse or criticize those who were against him. It would serve no useful purpose, in addition to the most likely harm it would cause. For these people, too, are Rasûlullah’s Sahâbîs. Among them were people who had been blessed with the good news of going to Paradise directly after death, as well as those who had partaken in the Holy War of Bedr. Those who had joined this Holy War were forgiven their sins. It is informed that these people will not be tormented (in the Hereafter). It is stated in a hadîth-i,sherîf that **“Allâhu ta’âlâ said to those who joined the Holy War of Bedr: Do whatever you like! I have forgiven you all your deeds.”** Among these people were also those who had been present in the solemn covenant termed **Bî’at-i-ridwân**. Our Prophet ‘sall-Allâhu alaihi wa sallam’ stated that none of the people who had joined this covenant would go to Hell. According to Islamic scholars, it is inferred from Qur’ân al-kerîm that all the As-hâb-i-kirâm ‘radiy-Allâhu ta’âlâ anhum ajma’în’ will go to Paradise. The tenth âyat of Hadîd sûra purports, **“Those who gave their property and performed Jihâd for the sake of Allah before the conquest of Mekka are unlike those who did so after the conquest. These people (the former ones) occupy higher grades. Allâhu ta’âlâ has promised the Husnâ to those who did so, before or after the conquest.”** Husnâ means Paradise. As is seen, those who gave their property and made Jihâd before or after the conquest of the blessed city of Mekka are blessed with the

good news that their destination is Paradise. The expressions ‘giving property’ and ‘performing Jihâd’ in this âyat-i-kerîma are not put as stipulations for entering Paradise. They are laudatory additions intended to praise these blessed people. For these qualifications were shared by all the As-hâb-i-kirâm. All of them gave their property and made Jihâd for the sake of Allah. Consequently, all the As-hâb-i-kirâm are blessed with Allah’s promise of Paradise. It must be realized now that it would be quite far from common sense and from Islam to vituperate or execrate these great religious guides.

Question: Some people say and write that after Rasûlullah’s ‘sall-Allâhu alaihi wa sallam’ death a few Sahâbîs abandoned the right way, degenerated, had recourse to atrocities for becoming Khalîfa or for seizing posts and positions, and deprived hadrat Alî ‘kerrem-Allâhu ta’âlâ wejheh’ of his right to caliphate. They say that some of those people turned disbelievers. According to such oral and written statements, many Sahâbîs will be deprived of Paradise. Attaining the honour of being a Sahâbî requires being a Muslim. Can a person who is said to have turned a non-Muslim or deviated from the right way still have the honour of being a Sahâbî?

Answer: That these three Khalîfas ‘radiy-Allâhu ta’âlâ anhum’ will go to Paradise is informed through the most authentic hadîth-i-sherîfs termed ‘Sahîh’. No one can contradict these hadîth-i-sherîfs. Nor can anyone think of the possibility of these people’s having turned disbelievers or deviated from the right way. Furthermore, hadrat Abû Bekr and hadrat ‘Umar ‘radiy-Allâhu anhumâ’ were blessed with the honour of having joined the Holy War of Bedr. It is informed through hadîth-i-sherîfs that people who fought in the Holy War of Bedr would be forgiven all their past and future sins. On the other hand, these two Khalîfas were also among those fortunate people who took the so-called solemn oath called Bî’at-i-ridwân. And that those people who were present at the place of this covenant will go to Paradise is informed through ‘Sahîh’ hadîth-i-sherîfs. Hadrat ‘Uthmân did not join the Holy War of Bedr, because he had been ordered by the Messenger of Allah to stay in Medîna and look after his ailing wife Ruqayya, [Rasûlullah’s daughter]. The Messenger had told him that (by staying in Medîna to help with his wife’s medical treatment) he would attain the same blessings as if he had joined the Holy War. Also, his failing to join the solemn oath called Bî’at-i-ridwân was because he had been sent on a mission to Mekka by the Messenger

of Allah, who deputized him in the covenant and took the oath on his behalf. This is a generally known fact. Greatness of these three Khalîfas is informed in Qur'ân al-kerîm. Their high grades are apprized in âyat-i-kerîmas. Sheer stubbornness of those people who are unaware of Qur'ân al-kerîm and hadîth-i-sherîfs is of no value. A couplet:

***If a person is unconscious of the Qur'ân and Hadîth,
He deserves no answer; no other answer could be better!***

Shame on those people who speak ill of hadrat Abû Bekr! If that great Sahâbî had had doubts of disbelief or aberration, thousands of Rasûlullah's Sahâbîs, with all their knowledge and justice, would not have elected him as Rasûlullah's representative by unanimous vote. To deny hadrat Abû Bekr's caliphate would mean to deny the thirty-three thousand people living in that time which has been declared in a hadîth-i-sherîf to be the best of all times. A person with the smallest thinking capacity could not make such a false accusation. A time in which thirty-three thousand Muslims agreed on an erroneous decision and elected an aberrant and sinful person for Rasûlullah's place could not be a good time, let alone being the best of times. Such an accusation would mean to say that the hadîth-i-sherîf which declared it as the best of times is nonsential. [May Allâhu ta'âlâ protect us from saying so!] May Allâhu ta'âlâ give those people who say or write so enough sense and reason to give up traducing these great Islamic persons! May He give them the understanding to realize the value of having attained Rasûlullah's 'sall-Allâhu ta'âlâ alaihi wa sallam' sohbet and teaching! It is stated in a hadîth-i-sherîf, **“Fear Allah as you talk about my As-hâb! Fear Allah lest you should show any disrespect in a conversation about my As-hâb! After me, never have a bad opinion of them. He who loves them does so because he loves me. And he who bears hostility towards them is my enemy.”** What more should I write? What else should I say to explain something so manifest? Qur'ân al-kerîm is full of laudatory statements praising hadrat Abû Bekr. **Wa'l-layl** sûra was revealed as a whole to inform about his superior virtues. 'Sahîh' hadîths reporting his high merits are innumerable. His beautiful moral character, his valuable demeanour, and the distinguishing goodnesses possessed by all the As-hâb-i-kirâm had also been mentioned in the heavenly books revealed to past Prophets. Allâhu ta'âlâ informs about this fact at the end of Fat-h sûra, which purports, **“Goodnesses of thine As-hâb were stated also in the Torah and in the Injîl.”** Hadrat Abû Bekr 'radiy-Allâhu anh' is the

best and the foremost member of this Ummat, who are the best of all people and who have been blessed with the compassion of Allâhu ta'âlâ. If he is called a 'disbeliever' or a 'miscreant', what are the bad names that cannot be attached to others? What level of language can be used to talk about them? O my Allah, who created earths and heavens from nothing and who knows all, secret and open alike! You know the right one in the disagreements among Your born slaves! May our salutations be to those people who are in the right way.

***Do not take pride in your property!
Don't ever say, "No one is like me!"
A disastrous wind will winnow all,
Making only a defenceless chaff of thee!***

PART SIX
WHAT IS PROPHETHOOD
MUHAMMAD ‘alaihi-salâm’ IS THE LAST
PROPHET

Bismi’llâhi ’r-rahmâni ’r-rahîm
FOREWORD

Allâhu ta’âlâ, pitying all the people on the earth, creates and sends useful things to them. In the next world, He will forgive whomever He chooses of those disobedient Believers who are to go to Hell and will bless them with direct access to Paradise. He, alone, is the One who creates every living being, keeps all beings in existence every moment and protects all against fear and horror. Trusting ourselves to the honourable name of Allâhu ta’âlâ, we begin to translate this book.

Infinite gratitude be to Allâhu ta’âlâ! Peace and blessings be upon His most beloved Messenger, Muhammad (‘alaihi ‘s-salâm)! Beneficent prayers be upon the pure Ahl al-Bayt and upon all the just and devoted companions (as-Sahâbat al-kirâm) of this exalted Prophet!

Allâhu ta’âlâ has had great mercy upon His human slaves and wishes them to live in comfort and peace in the world and to attain eternal felicity in the Hereafter. To this end, He has made the most superior and best of mankind into Prophets and, by revealing holy books to them, has shown the way to peace and happiness. He has declared that attaining happiness requires first believing in Him and His Prophets and then obeying the commandments in His holy books. Any person who possesses this belief and accepts the commandments is termed a **Mu’min** (Believer) and **Muslim**.

To explain the Existence and Oneness of Allâhu ta’âlâ and the way to believe in Prophets, Islamic scholars wrote many books in almost every language. Among the ones that have been written in a compendious, explicit and comprehensible style so as to remove doubts and misgivings, the Arabic book **Ithbât an-nubuwwa** is very useful. The great Islamic scholar al-Imâm ar-Rabbânî Ahmad al-Fârûqî (quddisa sirruh) wrote this book when he was eighteen years old. It contains selections made by him and their explanations from the last part of the book **Sharh-i Mawâqif**. It

was first published together with its Urdu translation in Pakistan. Al-Imâm ar-Rabbânî was born in the city of Sirhind, India, in 971 H. (Hijrî) (1564 A.D.) and passed away there in 1034 H. (1625 A.D.).

We humbly pray so that all people, by avoiding the misleading effects of subversive and deceptive writings, will read this book with concern and common sense, and thereby attain comfort and peace in this world and eternal felicity in the Hereafter.

In the text, the translated âyats of the Qur'ân al-kerîm are given as ma'âl sherîf (meanings concluded by Mufasssirs), which may or may not be the same as what Allâhu ta'âlâ means in the âyat.

ITHBÂT AN-NUBUWWA **(THE PROOF OF PROPHETHOOD)**

P R E F A C E

Infinite gratitude be to Allâhu ta'âlâ, who has sent Prophets to guide people to the way of salvation and who has revealed four of His major Books to them; these Books contain no aberration or abnormality. The Book He has revealed to His Last Prophet, Muhammad 'alaihi 's-salâm', is **Qur'ân al-kerîm**, wherein everything necessary for His human slaves has been revealed. Unbelievers have been warned of Hell's torment while Believers who carry out the requirements of Islam have been given the good news of Paradise. By sending Muhammad 'alaihi 's-salâm', Allâhu ta'âlâ has completed the faith (dîn) of His human slaves. He has declared that He will be pleased with those who are in the Islamic religion (Dîn). For His slaves of earlier times, too, He sent Prophets with clear revelations and great miracles. He has declared in the Qur'ân al-kerîm that no Prophet will succeed Muhammad 'alaihi 's-salâm'. He has decreed that, as a blind person entrusts himself to those who will lead him or as a helplessly ill person commits himself to the care of compassionate doctors, people must submit themselves to Prophets He has sent so that they will attain benefits beyond mind's grasp and escape calamities. He has made Muhammad 'alaihi 's-salâm' the highest, the most merciful of Prophets, and his Umma the most equitable people. He has made his religion the most perfect of all. He has announced through âyats in His Book that his conduct has no excess or defect, that his grade is very high and that he is the Prophet for all creatures. He has sent him as the Last Prophet to

communicate the fact that Allâhu ta'âlâ is One and without any likeness, to correct the knowledge and deeds of His slaves, and to treat their sick hearts. May abundant blessings and good wishes, from us, be upon him, his household (Âl), and companions (as-Sahâba) day and night! They are the stars guiding to the right way and the sources of light illuminating darkness.

Let it be known that this slave, that is, [al-Imâm ar-Rabbânî Mujaddid al-alf ath-thânî] Ahmad ibn 'Abd al-Ahad, who is greatly in need of Allâhu ta'âlâ's compassion, the first of them being to protect him, his ancestry, masters and disciples against the troubles of the Rising Day, for which I offer Him my invocations, has seen with regret that the people of our time have become increasingly slack in believing in the necessity of Prophets' coming, in the twenty-five Prophets whose names are given in Qur'ân al-kerîm, and in obeying the religion brought by the Last Prophet. Moreover, some powerful people with authoritative positions in India have been persecuting pious Muslims who diligently follow Islam. There have appeared people who mock the blessed name of the Last Prophet and substitute the blessed names given to them by their parents with absurd names. Sacrificing a cow, which is wâjib for Muslims to butcher during 'Îd al-Adhâ, has been prohibited in India. Mosques are either being demolished or turned into museums or stores. Islamic cemeteries are being made into playgrounds or places for rubbish. Disbelievers' churches are being restored in the name of monuments. Their rituals and festivals are being celebrated by Muslims, too. In short, Islam's requirements and Islamic customs are being abhorred or totally abandoned. They are being called "retrogressive". Disbelievers' and atheists' costumes, false religions, immoral and shameless acts are being praised. Efforts are being made to spread them. Depraved and squalid books, novels and songs of the Indian disbelievers are being translated into the languages of Muslims and sold. In this way efforts to annihilate Islam and Islam's beautiful ethics, which result in Muslims' îmân weakening, are being carried on while unbelievers and nihilists are increasing. Moreover, even men of religion, who must be healers for the disease of disbelief, are falling for this disaster and drifting into calamity.

I have studied the causes for this corruption in Muslim children's belief and have scrutinized the origin of their doubts. I have come to the conclusion that there is only one reason for the slackness in their îmân. And the reason is that much time has

elapsed since Rasûlullah ('alaihi 's-salâm), while at the same time some fanatical, short-sighted, religiously nescient politicians and some ignoramuses, who pass themselves off as scientists, talk on religious matters and have their words accepted as true. I have spoken with people who read and believe the writings of such sham scientists and who therefore describe themselves as enlightened, modern people. I have seen that they err mostly in comprehending the rank of prophethood (nubuwwa). I have heard many of them say, "Prophets endeavoured so that people should get on well with one another and form beautiful habits. This has nothing to do with life in the next world. Books of philosophy, too, provide ways of getting on well and forming good habits. Imâm Muhammad al-Ghazâlî divides his book **Ihyâ 'ulûm ad-dîn** into four sections. In the first section he explains beautiful habits, which he terms **Munjiyyât** (things that save). In the other three sections, he writes about salât, fasting and other 'ibâdât. This book of his resembles books of philosophy. And this shows that 'ibâdât are not munjî (able to save) and that salvation depends upon beautiful habits." Others say, "One who has heard of the Prophet, his âyats and miracles but who disbelieves this information because centuries have passed ever since, is like a person who lives in the mountains or in a desert and has not heard about the Prophet at all. Like the latter, the former may not have îmân, either."

In response to them, we say that, Allâhu ta'âlâ pitied human beings in the eternal past and willed to send them Prophets to guide them to perfection and to cure the diseases in their hearts. In order to fulfil these duties of theirs, Prophets must threaten the disobedient and give good news to the obedient. They must inform the former of the torment and the latter of the rewards in the Hereafter. Man desires to attain things that come sweet to him. In order to attain them, he goes astray, sins and harms others. The sending of Prophets was necessary for protecting men from doing evil and for providing them with a peaceful and comfortable life in this world and the next. Life in this world is short. Life in the next world is endless. For this reason, attaining happiness in the next world takes precedence. Some ancient philosophers, in order to sell more of the books they had prepared with their own views and imaginations, embellished them with ways of beautifying one's morals and doing useful acts, which they had read in heavenly books or heard from those who believed in these books. Concerning Hujjat al-Islâm Imâm Muhammad Ghazâlî's

(rahmatullâhi 'alaih) explaining 'ibâdât in his book; scholars of fiqh explained how to carry out 'ibâdât, but they did not describe their subtle particulars because their purpose was to state the conditions for and manners of performing 'ibâdât properly. They did not look to men's souls and hearts. The task of describing devolved on scholars of tasawwuf. Al-Imâm al-Ghazâlî combined the knowledge of religion that provided for physical betterment and outward deeds with the knowledge of tasawwuf, which enables one to attain inner cleanliness. He explained both of them in his book. He named the latter **Munjiyyât**, that is, teachings that prevent calamity, yet he said that 'ibâdât, too, were munjî. The way of making 'ibâdât a means of salvation can be learned from books of fiqh. Those teachings of salvation which pertain to the heart cannot be learned from books of fiqh. They can be understood better by reading the explanations of that exalted imâm.

We have not seen the medical scientist Calinos or the grammarian 'Amr Sibawaih. How do we know that they were experts in those branches of knowledge? We know what the science of medicine means. We read Calinos's books and hear some of his statements. We learn that he gave medicine to the ill and cured them. Hence we believe that he was a doctor. Likewise, when a person who knows the science of grammar reads Sîbawaih's books or hears some words of his, he knows and believes that he was a grammarian. By the same token, if a person knows well what prophethood is and studies Qur'ân al-kerîm and the Hadîth ash-sherîf, he will understand thoroughly that Muhammad ('alaihi 's-salâm) was in the highest grade of prophethood. As one's belief in the above-mentioned scholars would never be upset, so the slanders and vilifications of the ignorant and deviated will never undermine one's îmân in Muhammad ('alaihi 's-salâm), since all the sayings and behaviours of Muhammad ('alaihi 's-salâm) guide people to perfection, make their beliefs and behaviours correct and useful, and illuminate their hearts so as to cure them of diseases and purify them of bad habits. This is what prophethood (nubuwwa) means.

A person who, due to living in mountains or in a desert [or a communist country], has not heard of Prophets is called **shâhiq al-jabal**. It is impossible for such people to believe in prophethood or that Prophets were sent. It is as if no Prophet has come for them. They are excusable. [After their accounts are settled following death, they, like animals, will be eternally annihilated

without entering Paradise or Hell. The same is the case for disbelievers' non-adolescent children.] They are not commanded to believe in Prophets. Concerning them, Sûrat al-Isra declares: **“We do not torment unless We send a Prophet before!”**

With the intention of removing the doubts and suspicions of those who acquired their religious knowledge from the books of religiously ignorant people and from the venomous pens of the enemies of the religion, I have thought of writing what I know. In fact, I have deemed this a task, a debt which I owe to humanity. By writing this book, I have tried to explain what prophethood means, to verify that Muhammad (‘alaihi ‘s-salâm) was in full possession of prophethood, to eliminate the doubts of the unbelievers concerning this fact, and to display the wickedness and harms of a few bigots of science who attempt to suppress this fact with their personal thoughts and opinions. Citing documents from the books of Islamic scholars and adding my humble thoughts, I have tried to rebut their thoughts. The book consists of an introduction and two articles. And the introduction is divided into two topics. Trusting myself to Allâhu ta’âlâ, I begin writing.

Hijrî Kamarî 900

Mîlâdî 1582

AHMAD IBN
'ABD AL-AHAD
AS-SIRHINDÎ

INTRODUCTION I

WHAT DOES PROPHETHOOD MEAN?

It is written at the end of the book **Sharh-i Mawâqif** by Sayyid Sherîf al-Jurjânî that, according to the scholars of Kalâm, a person to whom Allâhu ta'âlâ says, "I have sent thee to the people in such and such a country or to the whole of mankind," or "Reveal [My will] to my slaves!" or gives a similar command, is called a "**nabî**" or "**payghambar**" (Messenger or Prophet). Being a Prophet does not require fulfilling certain conditions like riyâda or mujâhada or having been born with qualities suitable for prophethood. Allâhu ta'âlâ can bestow this gift upon anyone He chooses. He knows everything and does what is best. He does whatever He wills to do. He is the Almighty. According to scholars of Kelâm, it is not necessary for a Prophet to display a **mu'jiza** (miracle), either. It was said that he had to display miracles so that people would know that he was a Prophet, but this still is not a condition for him to be a Prophet. According to ancient Greek philosophers, to be a Prophet requires three conditions: firstly, to reveal the **ghaib** (unknown, mystery), that is, to explain past and future events when required; secondly, to do extraordinary things, that is, things that are mentally and scientifically impossible; thirdly, to see an angel in object and body and to hear Allâhu ta'âlâ's wahy from the angel.

Neither for us nor for them [philosophers], is it necessary for a Prophet to know all of the unknown. And knowing some of it is not peculiar only to Prophets. It is admitted also by philosophers that those who undergo **riyâda**, that is, those who isolate themselves in a room and eat only enough so as not to die, some sick people who have lost consciousness, and some people while asleep disclose some mysteries. In this respect such people are not different from Prophets. Perhaps, what philosophers call the "ghaib" are the extraordinary and unusual things which are rarely seen. However, these are not the real unknown. Knowing them or reporting them once or twice does not mean to transcend the ordinary. This point keeps Prophets and others distinct. Scholars of Kalâm also report that Prophets will know the real mysteries revealed to them by Allâhu ta'âlâ, but they say that knowing mysteries is not a requirement for being a Prophet. Also, the aforesaid grounds which philosophers put forward with respect to knowing the unknown are not correct. They are incompatible with Islam's fundamentals. Furthermore, knowing the unknown on

such grounds is quite a different subject. They are extraordinary wonders. There is no use in particularly dwelling on this.

Extraordinary events, such as, affecting objects and substances as one wishes; effecting the wind, earthquakes and fires when one likes or a ship's sinking; a man's dying or a tyrant's going to his doom upon one's wish are the human soul's influence on matter. In fact, Allâhu ta'âlâ, alone, is the One who affects matter. Allâhu ta'âlâ creates this effect on whomever He wills, whenever He wills. For this reason, it cannot be said that extraordinary things or wonders are peculiar to Prophets only. This is admitted by philosophers, too. Therefore, how could this ever be the distinction between Prophets and others?

Although ancient Greek philosophers said that wonders could also happen through non-prophets, they did not accept the frequency or the degree of wonders reaching the capacity of **i'jâz** (miracle). They said that because such extraordinary things happen through Prophets a Prophet is distinguishable from others.

Philosophers' stating that an angel manifesting itself to Prophets and revealing Allâhu ta'âlâ's wahy as a condition for prophethood contradicts their own philosophy. Their saying such things are intended to mislead holders of îmân, for, according to them, angels are immaterial and speechless. To produce sounds requires being material, they say. Sound is produced through waves of air. We can say that these conditions put forward by philosophers might come to mean that angels can show themselves and talk by taking material forms.

INTRODUCTION II

WHAT DOES MU'JIZA MEAN?

To us, a **mu'jiza** is something that proves the truthfulness of a person who said he was a Prophet. There were conditions for a mu'jiza:

1- Allâhu ta'âlâ made it in the absence of ordinary means, whereby to help His Prophet be confirmed.

2- It had to be extraordinary. Ordinary things, such as the sun's rising in the East every day or flowers blooming in the spring, could not be mu'jizas.

3- Others had to be incapable of doing it.

4- It had to happen whenever the person who announced his prophethood wished it to.

5- It had to agree with his wish. For example, if he said that he would enliven a certain dead person and if some other marvel took place, for example, if a mountain was broken into two, instead, it would not be a mu'jiza.

6- The mu'jiza happening upon his wish should not belie him. For example, while he was miraculously talking with a certain beast, if the beast said, "This man is a liar," it would not be a mu'jiza.

7- The mu'jiza should not happen before he said he was a Prophet. Wonders that happened before [the announcement of his prophethood], such as 'Îsâ's^[1] ('alaihi 's-salâm) talking when he was in a cradle, his being handed dates when he asked for dates from a withered-up tree, and in Muhammad's ('alaihi 's-salâm) childhood, the cleavage of his chest and his heart being cleansed by washing, there being a cloud over his head continuously and his being greeted by trees and stones were not mu'jizas, but karâmas. They are called **irhâsât** (preparatory signs of a Prophet). They emphasized prophethood. It is possible for such karâmas to happen through Awliyâ as well. Before Prophets were informed of their prophethood, their status was not lower than that of the Awliyâ'. Karâmas were seen from them. A mu'jiza could happen immediately after a Prophet was informed of his prophethood. For example, if he had said that such and such an event would take place a month later, the event would become a mu'jiza when it

[1] Jesus.

took place. But it would not be necessary to believe in his prophethood before it took place.

A mu'jiza demonstrating that a Prophet is telling the truth is not only a requirement of the intellect. That is, it is unlike the case of some work denoting the existence of its agent. For the intellect's realizing that something is the proof of something else requires some relationship between the two things. When the proof is seen, the existence of the related thing, not the existence of something else, is realized. The case is not so with a mu'jiza. For example, heavens being broken into pieces, stars being scattered and mountains being pulverized will take place when the end of the world comes, at the time of Doomsday. This will not be the time for the coming of a Prophet. These are the mu'jizas foretold by every Prophet. But, it is not necessary for those who hear about them to know that they are mu'jizas. So is the case with a Walî's karâma being the mu'jiza of a Prophet, though it does not have any connection with that Prophet. What we have stated so far is explained in detail in the book **Sharh-i mawâqif** by Sayyid Sherîf al-Jurjânî.

According to most 'ulamâ', though open **tahaddî** (challenge), that is, saying, "Go ahead and do the same! But you can't!" is not a condition for a mu'jiza, the meaning of a mu'jiza contains tahaddî. Because a tahaddî is not a matter of question in the reports made about the states of the Rising Day and future events, these are not mu'jizas against disbelievers. Believers believe that these reports are mu'jizas. The karâmas of Awliyâ' are not mu'jizas because they do not claim prophethood and because there is no tahaddî in them. The fact that such non-challenging wonders do not prove the truthfulness of a person claiming prophethood does not necessarily show that mu'jizas do not prove it. On the contrary, this is what is expected from a mu'jiza.

Question: "Mu'jizas prove the truthfulness of the person claiming prophethood because they are wonders. Does a mu'jiza have a special effect on proving [prophethood]?"

Answer: Such is not the actual case. A mu'jiza's proving the validity of a claim of prophethood is due to the fact that others cannot do it, which means a mu'jiza has a special effect. In fact, this is the real proof.

Question: "In **Sharh-i Mawâqif**, Sayyid Sherîf al-Jurjânî says, 'Naql (narration) cannot be a proof by itself because it is necessary also to believe in the truthfulness of the person who says that he is a Prophet, and this takes place by the intellect's admitting it. Upon

seeing a mu'jiza, the intellect believes that a Prophet has told the truth.' This passage from al-Jurjânî says that a mu'jiza demonstrating a Prophet's truthfulness is judged through the intellect, whereas a while before he said that it would not be judged through the intellect. Don't these two statements of his contradict each other?"

Answer: The passage immediately above says that the intellect studies the mu'jiza that proves the truthfulness of a Prophet. It does not say whether or not the intellect has an effect on the mu'jiza's proving his truthfulness. Even if we were to admit that it says that it has some effect, it still does not say that this is judged only through the intellect. Since there is no one saying that the intellect has no effect in this matter, such a contradiction is out of place. Sayyid al-Jurjânî's statement was made while explaining a narrated (naqlî) mu'jiza, for which such a statement is most appropriate.

A mu'jiza's denoting a Prophet's truthfulness is not a belief resulting out of hearing, either. It is a natural indication. That is, when a mu'jiza is seen, Allâhu ta'âlâ creates in the person who sees it the knowledge that the person announcing his prophethood is telling the truth. Such is Allâhu ta'âlâ's divine law. This is so because, though it is possible for a liar to display a mu'jiza, it has never happened. If the person announcing his prophethood lifts up a mountain and says, "If you believe me, this mountain shall go back to its place. If you don't believe me, it will fall on your heads," and if they see that the mountain moves back towards its place when they want to believe and towards them when they think of not believing, it will be understood, through divine law, that he is telling the truth. Yes, it is possible – in view of the intellect – for such an absolute mu'jiza to happen from a liar, but it is not the divine law of Allâhu ta'âlâ. That is, it has never been seen.^[1] This is exemplified as follows: A man claimed to be a ruler's messenger and said, "If

[1] Intellect admits a liar's displaying mu'jizas and says, "Since Allâhu ta'âlâ is Almighty, He can do this, too." This conclusion, which is not compatible with divine law, or even the rare occurrence of events suitable with this conclusion, does not harm our knowledge of events that are compatible with the divine law of Allâhu ta'âlâ. For example, killing or revivifying by the ad-Dajjâl, the liar who will come towards Doomsday, does not change our knowledge about his being a liar. The fact that Nimrod's fire did not burn Ibrâhîm ('alaihi 's-salâm) does not change Allâhu ta'âlâ's law that gives a burning capacity to fire. However, the occurrence of events contradicting information acquired by the intellect through proofs gives harm to this information.

you don't believe me, take my letter to the ruler." The letter read: "If it is true that I am your messenger, get down from your throne and sit on the floor!" They took the letter to the ruler, who read it and did as it was written. Those who saw this believed definitely that he told the truth. This belief is unlike the case of "likening the unknown to the witnessed," that is, understanding [the existence of] something not seen by seeing something else. For, a mu'jiza definitely proves truthfulness. According to the Mu'tazila, it is not possible for a liar to display a mu'jiza.

Magic and similar things are the occurrence of certain events by doing the things that are their causes, or, sometimes, they are illusions which figure up in one's imagination though they do not really exist. They are not wonders.

ARTICLE I

B' THAT: THE SENDING OF PROPHETS AND ITS NECESSITY

Man is aware of nothing at the time of his creation. The creation around him, however, is so vast that only Allâhu ta'âlâ knows its extent. This is reported in the thirty-first âyat of Sûrat al-Muddaththir.^[1] A child begins to perceive classes of beings through its sense organs. Each class of beings is termed an '**âlam**. The sense organ created first in man is the tactile organ; with the ability of touch, man perceives cold, hot, wet, dry, soft, hard and the like. The tactile organ cannot perceive colours or sounds, and these are thought to be nonexistent. Then his organ of sight is created, and with it colours and shapes are perceived. The world perceived by this organ has more variety and more numerous beings than the tactile world. Next his auditory organ functions. With this sense organ sounds and tunes are perceived. Afterwards, his ability to taste and then his ability to smell are created. Thus the five senses which reflect the world of perception are completed. Towards the seventh year of life, his power of discretion (tamyîz) is created by which things that cannot be comprehended through the sense organs are realized. This power differentiates things that are perceived by the sense organs from one another. Then his intellect or wisdom is created. What is useful, harmful, good or bad is ascertained by the power of discretion; wisdom distinguishes the necessary, permissible, possible or impossible from one another. Wisdom comprehends things that cannot be grasped by the powers of perception and discretion. Besides wisdom, Allâhu ta'âlâ creates one more power in some of His chosen slaves. With this, things that cannot be understood or learnt thru wisdom and things that will happen in future are known. This is called the power of prophethood (**nubuwwa**). Because the power of discretion cannot comprehend the things within the cognitive area of wisdom, it is oblivious to them. And because wisdom cannot understand the things comprehended by the power of prophethood, it disbelieves and denies them. Denial of what cannot be comprehended is the result of not comprehending, not knowing. Likewise, a person born blind will know nothing of colours or shapes if he does not

[1] "...: and none can know the forces of thy Rabb [Allâhu ta'âlâ], except He. ..." (74-31)

hear about them. He will not believe in their existence. To reveal to His slaves that the power of nubuwwa also exists, Allâhu ta'âlâ created dreams in men similar to this power. In dreams, man might see what will happen in future clearly or in its vision in the âlam-i mithâl. If a person who does not know what dreams are is told, "When man's consciousness is suspended and thoughts and senses are gone like that of a dead person, he sees unknown things that are beyond mind's grasp," he will deny it. He will even attempt to prove that such a thing is impossible, saying, "Man perceives his surroundings with his sense organs. With these organs suspended, especially when they do not function at all, he will perceive nothing." He will reason rather coarsely. As sense organs cannot comprehend things that are known by wisdom, likewise, wisdom cannot perceive things that are known with the power of prophethood.

Those who doubt the existence of the power of prophethood doubt its possibility or, if its possibility is accepted, its occurrence. Its existence or occurrence shows that it is possible. And its existence is demonstrated by Prophets' giving information beyond the intellect's ability. This information, which cannot be acquired through the intellect, calculation or experimentation, was acquired only from Allâhu ta'âlâ's **ilhâm** (inspiration placed upon the heart by Allâhu ta'âlâ or His angels, that is, through the power of prophethood). The power of prophethood has also other peculiarities. Since dreams, which resemble one of its peculiarities, exist in men, we have given it as an example. Its other peculiarities are revealed through dhawq (tasting, sensitivity) to those who strive in a path of Tasawwuf. The peculiarity we have given must suffice as a proof to make one believe in prophethood. Imâm Muhammad al-Ghazâlî, too, wrote this peculiarity as a proof for believing in prophethood in his book **Al-munqidh min ad-dalâl**.

According to ancient Greek philosophers, it is useful to believe in prophethood. They said, "To believe in prophethood helps wisdom. Meditating over the existence, power and knowledge of Allah is similar to this. Also, many useful things beyond the intellect's ability are learned from Prophets. Examples of this are the Rising Day, teachings pertaining to the next world, revelation of what things are good and what others are bad, and knowing whether some foods and medicines are harmful or not."

Those who do not believe in prophethood say:

1- "A person sent as a Prophet should have known that the one who said, 'I have sent thee as a Prophet. Communicate my

(message!' was Allah. And knowing Allah, in its turn, is in no) way (possible). It may be a genie who uttered these words. All religious people believe in genies."

Answer: The person who was sent (as a Prophet) would prove by mu'jizas that he was sent as such. Allâhu ta'âlâ is the One who creates the mu'jiza. Genies cannot perform it. Nor can any other creature.

2- "If the angel who brought wahy to the Prophet was an object, it must have been seen by all those who were present there. You, too, say that it was not seen. If it wasn't an object but a spirit, it would have been impossible for it to speak or to be heard. If your answer is: 'The angel that brought wahy from Allâhu ta'âlâ to the Prophet was an object. Allâhu ta'âlâ willed that it would not be seen, which is within His power,' then we would necessarily not see a mountain before us or hear a drum played near us, which is ridiculous."

Answer: The one who brought the wahy was an angel. An angel is a fine, transparent object. It is not Allâhu ta'âlâ's law for colourless and transparent things to be seen. Air is a substance. Yet because it is transparent and colourless, it is not seen. It would be ridiculous if we said that solid things are not seen. It is possible for a spirit to take a visible shape, to speak and to be heard, which has happened many times.

3- "To believe in a Prophet, it is necessary to understand that he is a Prophet. And this is possible only after long observation. The obligation to confirm him on the spot is nonsensical."

Answer: After seeing a Prophet's wonders and mu'jizas, it becomes impossible not to acknowledge that he is telling the truth. Those who see or hear about them must acknowledge and believe the fact immediately.

4- "It is a Prophet's task to command useful things and to prohibit harmful things. And this, in its turn, would be unfair for it means enforcement or compulsion upon mankind. You say, 'Allâhu ta'âlâ creates man's actions; man has no role in these actions.' Therefore, it means to compel the human slave to do what he could not do."

Answer: The slave's power has no effect on the creation of his actions, but he may wish their creation and prepare their causes. This is called "**kasb**" (acquirement). The human slave is encumbered to use his capacity called kasb. It is just that he is commanded to do so.

5- “Doing the command will tire the human slave, and he shall be tormented if otherwise. Both choices are harmful to the slave. Allah is Hakîm (All-Wise), He does not do harmful things.”

Answer: Our response to this is that all the commandments are useful both in this world and in the Hereafter. Their usefulness surpasses multiple times over the exhaustion they require. It is unwise to miss so many benefits by trying to avoid so little labour.

6- “If there is no advantage in the recompense for the exhaustion caused by doing the command, it is nonsensical to give the command. If there are benefits in it and if all of them are useful for Allah, this means that He needs His slaves, which is contrary to fact. If they are useful to men, it is unreasonable to command something useful and then to punish those who do not do it. In other words, this command means, ‘Either do what is useful to yourself or I shall torture you eternally!’ “

Answer: The intellect’s finding something beautiful, ugly or nonsensical is not always valid. Nor is it correct to say that all the creations of Allâhu ta’âlâ must be useful. We shall prove this later on. Eternal punishment will be given not because something useful is not acquired, but because the slave did not carry out the command of his Owner and Creator. Not doing His command is infidelity, sacrilege and irreverence towards Him.

7- “Even though Allah knows that His slave cannot do it or that he will not want to do something useful for himself, why does He command it? Wouldn’t such a command be ugly and harmful to His servant?”

Answer: As we have stated above, even if we were to admit that such a command might be harmful to His slave, attaining great rewards necessitates putting up with insignificant difficulties. According to the Mu’tazila, one of the seventy-two heretical groups in Islam, there is also some value in proposing [Allâhu ta’âlâ’s] commands and prohibitions to a disbeliever. Encouraging him to earn thawâb is valuable. Thawâbs are blessings resulting from the performance of the commandments by the one who is propositioned. They are not blessings arising from the proposition. [For example,] a person invites someone to dinner though he is certain that he will not come. Thus, he wants to show his generosity and kindness. If he does not invite him, he will not be able to express his intentions. At this point I find it useful to report the statements of Muslim thinkers:

Allâhu ta'âlâ has created men weak and needy. They need clothes, food, lodging, protection against their enemies, and many other things. A person cannot procure his needs by himself. His life is too short for this. Men have to cooperate and live together. One man gives an implement he has made to another, who in return gives him something else he needs. This need for cooperation is expressed as "Man has been created civilized." Living in civilization, that is, in societies, requires justice. Everyone desires to get what he needs. This desire is called **shahwa**. He becomes indignant with anyone who takes his advantages away. Quarrels, cruelties and torture between them ensue. Society disintegrates. To regulate all kinds of business transactions and to establish justice in a society, many principles have to be known, each of which becomes a law. They must be made known in the most equitable manner. If men cannot come to a mutual agreement in preparing them, chaos starts again. Therefore, they must be prepared by One who is equitable and above mankind. In order for his decisions to be accepted, He has to be powerful, and it must be understood that the decisions came from Him. Mu'jizas are the means by which this is proven. Those who run after their own pleasures and shahwa and behave arrogantly do not like the rules of Islam. They do not want to obey these rules. They violate others' rights and commit sins. By declaring that those who obey Islam shall be given thawâb and those who do not obey them shall be tormented, the system of Islam becomes stronger. Therefore, the One who has ordained these rules and who will inflict the punishment must be known. For this end, worship ('ibâda) has been commanded. By worshipping every day, He is remembered. Worship begins with confirming, believing in His existence, His Prophet and the blessings and torments in the next world.

Three things arise from believing in them and performing 'ibâdât: Firstly, one becomes safe against following one's lust; the heart and soul get purified, and one does not get angry any more; lust and anger are hindrances against remembering the Creator. Secondly, one enjoys different information and pleasures that are unrelated with those obtained through the sense organs or thru experiments with matter. Thirdly, as it is meditated upon that the good shall be given blessings and the evil-doers shall be tormented, justice gets established among men. These statements of Muslim thinkers are similar to the statement of Mu'tazilas: "It is reasonable that proposals are useful."

8- “If the performance of the duty enjoined by Allah was predestined in the eternal past, such an injunction would be unbecoming, nonsensical and unreasonable. It would be a useless injunction to propose a duty which is absolutely inevitable. On the other hand, it would be torture to enjoin the performance of a duty which has not been predestined in the eternal past. It would mean to imply, ‘Do the impossible!’ ”

Answer: Since man has the power to carry out the duty, it would not be torture to command it. All Allâhu ta’âlâ’s commandments are within man’s ability. Our answer to this question concerning the commandments will be the same as the answer given to the question asked about Allâhu ta’âlâ’s creating. That is, it cannot be said that Allâhu ta’âlâ has to create something which has been predestined in the eternal past. Nor can it be said that He is incapable of creating something which has not been predestined.

9- “Injunctions that are difficult for the body will deter man from considering and realizing Allah’s existence. And it will not leave time for doing many other things.”

Answer: The benefits in the injunctions induce meditation and an understanding of Allâhu ta’âlâ’s existence and regulation of life. We have explained this in detail in the answer to the seventh quotation above.^[1]

[1] It is essential in îman to accept the commandments, that is, to believe that it is necessary to do the commands and to abstain from the prohibitions. One who believes most of the commandments but disbelieves only one of them and does not want to obey it will have disbelieved Muhammad (‘alaihi ’s-salâm). He will become an unbeliever. Being a Muslim requires believing in all the commandments. If a Muslim, though he believes the commandments, disobeys them, e.g. does not perform salât out of laziness, or, following his bad friend or nafs, has alcoholic drinks, or, in case of a woman or girl, goes out with her arms and /or head uncovered, he or she does not lose their îman or become an unbeliever. A person of this sort is a sinful, disobedient Muslim. If he does not want to obey even one of the commandments, that is, if he disapproves it, does not esteem it as a duty or slights it, he loses his îman and becomes a **murtadd** (renegade). Such statements as, “What if I do not perform salât and go out with a bare head? Living and doing favours to people have precedence over salât” mean to approve some of the commandments and disapprove others. Every Muslim must pay attention to this subtle point, and those who disobey the commandments must be vigilant lest they should lose their îman. Neglecting the commandments is different from wishing not to obey them. These two should not be confused!

10- “The intellect does the thing it finds useful and does not do the thing it thinks harmful. When it cannot understand whether something is useful or harmful, it does it when there is need to do it. In view of this function of the intellect, sending Prophets is unnecessary.”

Answer: There are many things which are misunderstood or which cannot be understood by the intellect, and they have to be taught by Prophets. A Prophet is like a specialized doctor. He knows the effects of medicines well. Effects of some medicines might be found by laymen through the intellect after long experiences, but men of intellect might face risks and harms before learning them, and it would require a great deal of time and work. They would have no time left for using their intellect in doing other necessary jobs. By giving the doctor a little recompense, however, they attain the benefits of medicines and rid themselves of their illnesses. To say that Prophets are unnecessary is like saying that doctors are unnecessary. Since the commandments taught by a Prophet are wahy revealed by Allâhu ta’âlâ, they are all true and beneficial. The doctor’s knowledge, although being the result of thought and experience, cannot be said to be wholly true.

11- “The mu’jiza’s existence is not admissible. Since it is a wonder outside of normal events, it is not something which the intellect can accept. For this reason, prophethood is not something reasonable, either.”

Answer: Creation of earths and heavens from nothing has much more wonder in it than a mu’jiza does. If it is impossible for certain things to happen outside of the laws of nature, this does not mean that wonders cannot happen outside of these laws. Wonders have happened through Prophets and Awliyâ’ for centuries. A man of intellect cannot deny these events. A mu’jiza is intended to demonstrate that a Prophet has told the truth. It has to be a wonder; something done within the laws of nature cannot be a mu’jiza.

12- “A mu’jiza cannot prove that a Prophet is telling the truth. It is not certain whether a mu’jiza is created by Allah or made by a Prophet himself. Magic is a wonder, too. You also believe in magic and incantation.”

Answer: The intellect putting forward various possibilities, i.e. hypotheses and theories, does not refute the knowledge acquired by the sense organs or experimentation. The occurrence of a certain thing does not prevent us from thinking of its nonexistence. Allâhu ta’âlâ, alone, is the One who effects everything’s coming into

existence, as explained above. In other words, a mu'jiza is created by Allâhu ta'âlâ, not by a Prophet. Even though everybody cannot perform magic and incantation, they do not resemble the wonders of [a Prophet's] splitting the sea, bringing a dead person back to life, restoring sight to a blind person, or curing a person whose illness has become hopeless from the medical point of view. Therefore, they are not confused with mu'jizas, which are wonders.

13- "Occurrence of a mu'jiza is known either by seeing or by hearing reports which are tawâtur.^[1] A report cannot be considered factual even if it is tawâtur. Therefore, those who have not seen a mu'jiza will not know of a Prophet, for there may be liars among those who report it as tawâtur: that is, commonly known.

Answer: In most worldly affairs, reports that are communicated through tawâtur are believed. For example, such facts as there being a city named Delhi, that the earth is larger than the moon and smaller than the sun, that Muhammad the Conqueror conquered Istanbul from the Byzantine Greeks are believed by hearing them from others.

14- "We have studied religions. We have found things that are contradictory to reason and science. Thus, we have concluded that they have not been revealed by Allah. Examples of these are the permission given to cause pain to an animal for the purpose of eating; fasting at certain times; the prohibition of eating and drinking some delicious foods and drinks; the commandment imposing troublesome journeys for the purpose of visiting a certain place; performing sa'y and tawâf like insane people or children; throwing pebbles without any certain target; kissing a valueless stone; the prohibition of looking at an independent but ugly woman, and the permission to look at pretty jâriyas."

Answer: Even if the intellect could distinguish good from bad and if we were to admit that Allâhu ta'âlâ must command His human slaves to do useful things, it is obvious that the intellect could not have the ability to grasp the benefit of the things mentioned in this question. This inability of the intellect does not show the absence of their value. Allâhu ta'âlâ has given these commandments because He knows their worth. As we have

[1] **Tawâtur** is the state of being widespread or being reported by most people, which is a document for authenticity and makes denial impossible.

explained before, there are many things that the intellect cannot comprehend but which are comprehended by the power of prophethood. We shall explain this with more detail at the beginning of the second article.

ARTICLE II

THE PROOF OF MUHAMMAD'S (‘alaihi ’s-salâm) PROPHETHOOD

Deeds and events carry a number of benefits that are so beyond the comprehension of the intellect, that it sometimes even denies these benefits. We shall deal with the evidences proving the existence of these benefits. Some medicines kill some people when they are given in small doses, while they do not harm others even when they are given in much greater amounts.^[1] Many people do not believe this, though it is a fact established by experience. They even attempt to prove to the contrary. So did the ancient Greek philosophers and worshippers of matter, who denied the existence of Prophets and put forward some reasons for their disbelief. Supposing the information about Allâhu ta’âlâ, Prophets, genies, angels, Paradise and Hell to be like the things that can be comprehended by their intellect, they denied their own suppositions. If you attempt to describe dreaming to a person who has never dreamt and add, “Man sometimes gets into a state in which all his senses, reason and thoughts are suspended; in this state he sees things the intellect cannot grasp,” he will not believe it; he will say that it is impossible. If he is told, “There is a small thing in this world which, when put in a city, will consume the entire city. Then it will consume itself,” he will answer that it is impossible. However, these words describe fire. Those who deny the heavenly religions and life in the Hereafter resemble him. They believe and take the necessary precautions when a scientist of doubtful trustworthiness says, out of supposition and suspicion, that a catastrophe is impending; but they do not believe the dangers in this world and the next as foretold by Prophets, whose truthfulness is well-known and who have displayed many mu’jizas. They do not take any measures in order to escape indescribably bitter and eternal torment. They liken ’ibâdât, the

[1] Examples of these are given in the (Turkish) book **Se’âdet-i-ebediyye**; refer to ‘idiosyncrasy’ and ‘allergy’.

value of which is clarified by Prophets, to childish plays and insane actions.

Question: “Useful things reported by philosophers, materialists and doctors are believed because they have been discovered by experience. 'Ibâdât are not believed in because their usefulness has not been experienced.”

Answer: Scientists' experimentations are believed when they are heard of. Things reported and experienced by Awliyâ' are communicated in the same manner. Also, the benefits of most things enjoined by Islam have been seen and experienced.^[1]

Even if the advantages within the rules of Islam were not revealed by experimentation, it would still be reasonable to believe in them and to fulfill their requirements. Let us suppose that a physician's wise son, who does not know anything about drugs, becomes ill. He has heard from many people and has even read in newspapers about his father's achievements and knows that his father loves him very much. His father gives him some medicine and says that if he takes it he will recover immediately, for he has tried it several times. But when he sees that the medicine will be injected and hurt him, would it be reasonable for him to react to his father by saying, “I have never tried this way.” Who in the world would approve such an answer?

Question: “How can it be known that the Prophet loves his umma as much as a father loves his son and that his commands and prohibitions are useful?”

Answer: How can a father's love for his son be known? This love itself is not something visible or tactual. It can be known only from his behavior, attitude and words towards his son. If a wise and fair person pays due attention to Rasûlullah's (sall-Allâhu

[1] Furthermore, some medicinal preparations which have been found useful by scientists and doctors by means of experimentation and bought eagerly for considerable sums of money by everybody are frequently found out to be harmful afterwards. Lists of such preparations, each concluded with a sentence banning their sale, are regularly dispatched by health authorities to drugstores. Factories manufacturing such drugs are closed down by governments. It has become a usual topic for daily newspapers that some much-sought-after medicines have proven to be harmful afterwards. It has appeared again in daily newspapers repeatedly in recent years that hundreds of popular medicines that are called antibiotics cause heart disease and cancer and that some detergents are deleterious to health.

‘alaihi wa sallam) utterances and studies the reports describing his efforts to guide men to the right course, his strictness in protecting everybody’s rights, and his magnanimous and compassionate efforts for the establishment of beautiful morals, he will clearly see that his love for his umma is much more than that of a father for his son. A person who realizes his astounding accomplishments, the astonishing reports in Qur’ân al-kerîm, which were revealed through his tongue, and his utterances foretelling the bewildering events that will happen at the end of the world, will certainly see that he attained high grades above the intellect’s capacity and comprehended facts beyond the intellect’s limit of comprehension and realization. Thus, it will be apparent to him that his words are all true. A reasonable person who learns and meditates over the knowledge revealed in Qur’ân al-kerîm and who studies his life will see this fact clearly. Imâm Muhammad al-Ghazâlî (rahmatullâhi ‘alaih) said, “A person who doubts whether or not someone is a Prophet should either see his life or study objectively the reports about his life. A person who knows the science of medicine or fiqh acquires information about a scholar of medicine or fiqh by studying the reports about his life. For example, knowing whether or not al-Imâm ash-Shâfi’î (rahmatullâhi ‘alaih) was a scholar of fiqh, or whether or not Calinos was a physician, requires learning the concerned branches of knowledge well and then studying their books in these branches. Likewise, a person who acquires knowledge of prophethood and then studies Qur’ân al-kerîm and the Hadîth ash-sherîf will perfectly understand that Muhammad (‘alaihi ‘s-salâm) is the Prophet and occupies the highest degree of prophethood. And if he learns of the effectiveness of his words in purifying the heart and then obeys his revelations, by which his own heart begins to see the truth, his belief in his prophethood will become absolutely certain (yaqîn). He will gain continuous realization of the truth in the hadîths, **“If a person lives up to his knowledge, Allâhu ta’âlâ teaches him what he does not know”**; **“He who helps a cruel person will suffer harm from him,”** and, **“The person who only thinks of attaining Allâhu ta’âlâ’s love every morning will be given his wishes for this world and the Hereafter by Allâhu ta’âlâ.”** Thus his knowledge and îmân will be strengthened. For the îmân to become dhawqî, that is, to improve it into a state wherein one feels as if one sees the reality, requires endeavouring in a path of Tasawwuf.

The scholars of Islam have proven by various methods that

Muhammad (‘alaihi ‘s-salâm) is Allâhu ta‘âlâ’s Prophet. We will explain some of them:

Muhammad (‘alaihi ‘s-salâm) proclaimed that he was the Prophet and displayed mu‘jizas to prove his word. This fact has been transmitted up to the present time with tawâtur, i.e., with unanimity. The greatest mu‘jîza is Qur‘ân al-kerîm.

Qur‘ân al-kerîm is **mu‘jiz**, that is, no one can produce its equivalent. He challenged: **“Go ahead and say the like!”** Famous poets of Arabia did their best, but could not say the like. The 34th âyat of Sûrat at-Tûr declared: **“Then, say the like of it!”** The 13th âyat of Sûrat al-Hûd declared: **“Tell them: ‘Now you try and say ten sûras like the sûras of the Qur‘ân, which you suppose I said by myself!’ ”** The 23rd âyat of Sûrat al-Baqara declared: **“If you have any doubts about [what We have stated in] the Qur‘ân, which We have revealed to Our slave [Muhammad (‘alaihi ‘s-salâm)], you, too, try and say one sûra like it! For doing this, ask for help from all those you trust. You will not be able to say one sûra like it!”** In those days, the Arabs had a special interest in poetry. There were many poets among them. They organized poetry contests and were proud of the winners. They all cooperated to compose a short sûra that would resemble those of Qur‘ân al-kerîm. They strove hard. Before taking these poems to Muhammad (‘alaihi ‘s-salâm), they compared them with a sûra in Qur‘ân al-kerîm. Because they could see the eloquence in the sûra, they were ashamed of their own poetry and could not take them to Rasûlullah (‘alaihi ‘s-salâm). Nonetheless, they could not find a solution other than giving up opposition through knowledge and taking up coercive measures. They drew swords and attacked Muslims. They decided to kill Rasûlullah (‘alaihi ‘s-salâm). They attempted to fulfill the plot they had prepared to this end, but, as everybody reads in history, they suffered an ignominious defeat. If after being challenged so defiantly by Muhammad (‘alaihi ‘s-salâm) and after striving collectively they had been able to say something as laconic and as eloquent as one of the sûras, they would have read it to him and made a clamour. That inordinate action of theirs would have become a general topic of conversation and would have been recorded in history. It would have become as famous as an orator’s being killed on a platform. Their failure openly shows that Qur‘ân al-kerîm is mu‘jiz and that it is not human words.

Question: “Poets outside of Mekka might not have heard of

the âyats declaring: ‘**You, too, try and say the like of it,**’ or a similar challenge of Muhammad (‘alaihi ’s-salâm). Or, perhaps, they kept themselves aloof in return for some advantage or for the realization of some other agreement or goal we do not know of. For example, they might have fallen for a promise of being given some privileges in the state he was going to establish. Or, at the outset they paid little heed to his proclamations and did not deign to answer him; but later, seeing that he was gaining power and his followers were increasing in number, they did not dare to answer him. Or, competent poets might have had problems in earning their livelihood and they therefore found no time to answer him. It is also probable that due answers were given, but their success was forgotten or could not be passed on to later generations for some reasons. For example, after increasing in number, getting stronger and spreading over three continents, Muslims might have annihilated the reports of such accomplishments. Or, such reports might have been lost, being forgotten in the long course of time.”

Answer: Answers to these various doubts have been given briefly in the previous article. I have stated that if the things created by Allâhu ta’âlâ within His laws [of causation], that is, some of the teachings acquired through the sense organs and by experience, are contrary to reason, this does not prevent them from being taught. I have said that the teachings acquired thru the sense organs are so. Now we will give answers to each of the above-quoted doubts separately. First of all, it must be concluded that the person who said he was a Prophet spoke the truth if he displayed a mu’jiza demonstrating his prophethood and challenged others to do the same and no one could stand against him. That is, it is necessary to believe him. Anything said later against him is nonsensical, invalid and worthless. It is also inappropriate to say that they did not respond to him since they had slighted him at the outset and feared afterwards. Because it would have been a great honour and a dignifying act of superiority acceptable to everybody to counter someone’s challenge and excellent work; everyone would have praised, loved and followed such a person. Who on earth would not have liked it? If a person who could do it had not wanted to do it, this would have shown that his opponent was right and truthful. As for the third doubt, it is known well that a person who has competence needs not only to answer him but also to demonstrate it; it is only by demonstration that the purpose will be attained. Existence of conditions limiting

some people at some place and at some time does not necessarily show that the same conditions always existed everywhere. In fact, this is openly witnessed. It is impossible for a written answer to remain secret. Therefore, the doubts stated in the question are groundless.

Islamic authorities gave different explanations concerning the **i'jâz** of Qur'ân al-kerîm. Many said that the poetry in Qur'ân al-kerîm was very astonishing (gharîb) and its style was very wonderful ('ajîb); it was mu'jiz because its poetry and style did not resemble those of the poets of Arabia. It is also the case with the prose in the beginning and closing sections as well as in the narrations in the sûras. The openings between the âyats are like the saj's in them.^[1] These literary elements existing in Qur'ân al-kerîm are unlike those in the Arab poets' utterances, who could not use them as exhibited in Qur'ân al-kerîm. A person who knows Arabic well sees its i'jâz clearly. Qâdî Bâqillânî^[2] said that its i'jâz stemmed both from its lofty eloquence and from its astounding poetry. In other words, its poetry is quite unusual. Some said that its i'jâz originated from its giving information about the unknown. For example, the third âyat of Sûrat ar-Rûm, **“Though they have won, they shall be defeated in ten years,”** foretold that the Byzantine emporer Heraclius^[3] would defeat the army of the Iranian Shah Husraw Perwiz within ten years. And it happened as it was foretold. According to some 'ulamâ', the i'jâz of Qur'ân al-kerîm is in its possessing no contradictions or inconsistency, though it is very long and repetitive. It is for this reason that the 81st âyat of Sûrat an-Nisâ declares in brief: **“Were this Qur'ân al-kerîm the word of someone other than Allâhu ta'âlâ, it would contain many incongruities.”** According to some others, the i'jâz of Qur'ân al-kerîm lies in its meaning. Before our Prophet ('alaihi 's-salâm), the Arabs could compose statements similar to those of Qur'ân al-kerîm, but Allâhu ta'âlâ prevented them from writing like Qur'ân al-kerîm. How He prevented them has been explained in various ways. Abu Is'haq Ibrâhîm al-Isfarâ'înî,^[4] a master among the Ahl as-Sunna, and Abû Is'haq Nizâm al-Basrî of the

[1] **Saj'** means the continuous cooing of the dove. In prose, it means the rhyming that occurs at the end of sentences.

[2] Abû Bakr Baqillânî died in 400 A.H.

[3] Heraclius died in 20 A.H.

[4] Ibrâhîm Nishaburî passed away in 400 After Hijra.

Mu'tazila say that the fear of losing worldly advantages prevented them. [The author of the book **Husniyya**] Ali Murtadâ, a Shî'ite scholar, says that Allâhu ta'âlâ made them forget their knowledge which would have enabled them to compete with Qur'ân al-kerîm.

Those who do not accept that Qur'ân al-kerîm is mu'jiz say, "I'jâz must be obvious. The fact that there are various explanations of i'jâz shows that its meaning is not known for certain. In answer to this, scholars have said that the explanations in some respects does not show that the whole Qur'ân al-kerîm is not mu'jiz. Eloquence of Qur'ân al-kerîm, its unequalled poetry, the information describing the unknown and the wisdom it contains about knowledge and practices and many other elements of i'jâz, like those mentioned above, are quite manifest. Differing explanations, which originate from the differences in men's views and understandings, should not indicate that it is not mu'jiz. If one of the qualities we have mentioned above is not found by someone to be a cause for it being mu'jiz, this should not come to mean that all of them are not causes for it being mu'jiz. Many a poet can produce extremely eloquent prose and verse, but cannot do it at another given time. That is, achieving it once does not mean that one can do it any time. A group does not necessarily have to have the properties of each of the units within it. This answer implies that Qur'ân al-kerîm is mu'jiz as a whole but its short sûras may not be mu'jiz. But this is not true; as we have previously explained, its shortest sûra is also mu'jiz. It might be said that the answer means that the whole Qur'ân al-kerîm is mu'jiz in every respect but its sûras are mu'jiz only in some respects. However, this would not be the answer to the question above. The question demands a clear explanation of the cause of the i'jâz. So, such interpretation of the answer would not uncover the cause of the i'jâz.

Their second antithesis states: "The Sahâba were in doubt about some parts of Qur'ân al-kerîm. 'Abdullah ibn Mas'ûd [radiy-Allâhu 'anh] said that sûrat al-Fâtiha and the sûras of Mu'awwizatain^[1] did not belong in the Qur'ân. However, these three sûras are the most renowned sûras of the Qur'ân. If the eloquence in them were in a degree of i'jâz, they would not so manifestly resemble texts other than that of the Qur'ân, and no one would doubt that they belonged to the Qur'ân."

[1] The two sûras beginning with "Qul-a'ûdhhu."

Answer: The Sahâbat al-kirâm's doubt about some sûras' belonging to Qur'ân al-kerîm was not because of their eloquence or i'jâz; it was because each of these sûras was only reported by one person. According to the principles of usûl al-hadîth, information transmitted by one reporter is not certain, but doubtful. Something transmitted by tawâtur becomes certain information. Qur'ân al-kerîm was corroborated entirely by tawâtur, that is, with unanimity. For this reason, it is known with certainty that Qur'ân al-kerîm is the Word of Allâhu ta'âlâ. It is known with certainty also that those sûras transmitted by only one reporter were revealed by Allâhu ta'âlâ to Muhammad ('alaihi 's-salâm) and had eloquence within a degree of i'jâz. However, there was disagreement as to whether or not they belonged to Qur'ân al-kerîm, which brings no harm against our cause.

Their third antithesis states: "While Qur'ân al-kerîm was being compiled [after Rasûlullah (sall-Allâhu 'alaihi wa sallam) passed away and while Hadrat Abû Bakr as-Siddîq (radiy-Allâhu 'anh) was the caliph], if a person not known well reported an âyat, he would be required either to take an oath or to bring two witnesses since his integrity was uncertain; therefore, only after it was understood that it belonged to Qur'ân al-kerîm would it be included in Qur'ân al-kerîm. If the eloquence in an âyat were in a degree of i'jâz, it would be concluded from its eloquence that it was an âyat and this would confirm the integrity of the person who reported it; an oath or two witnesses would not be needed."

Answer: These conditions were put in order to determine the places of the âyats in Qur'ân al-kerîm and to know if an âyat preceded or followed others. They were not intended to indicate whether or not they belonged to Qur'ân al-kerîm. Rasûlullah (sall-Allâhu 'alaihi wa sallam) used to recite Qur'ân al-kerîm and listen to those who recited it. It was definitely known that each âyat revealed was from Qur'ân al-kerîm. An oath or witnesses were required for ascertaining the sequence of âyats. Furthermore, their eloquence being in a degree of i'jâz showed that they were âyats. If the eloquence of one or two âyats are not in a degree of i'jâz, it is not important. Since the shortest sûra contains three âyats, all the sûras of Qur'ân al-kerîm are mu'jiz.

Their fourth antithesis states: "Every branch of art has a boundary, a limit. It cannot be exceeded. There always exists a

master surpassing his colleagues in his art. So Muhammad (alaihi 's-salâm) might have been the most eloquent of the poets of his time. He might have uttered things that could not be expressed by the poets of his time. If this were supposed to be mu'jiz, anything that were done by a pre-eminent master of any branch at any time but which could not be done by his colleagues, would necessarily be said to be mu'jiz, which, in its turn, would be an absurd statement."

Answer: Mu'jiz means that which happens at one time and bears a great value because it cannot be done by most people of that time and which has been done at the highest level by those who have been able to do it and which it is unanimously admitted will not be surpassed by human power and which could be surpassed, if ever, only by a person who is believed to manage it by Allâhu ta'âlâ's Will. Something without these qualities cannot be called a mu'jiza. Magic was known as such during the time of the Prophet Mûsâ^[1] ('alaihi 's-salâm); in those days, those who practised sorcery knew that the highest degree of magic was to conjure up unreal, nonexistent things or illusions in [others'] imagination as if they were existent. When they saw that the rod of Mûsâ ('alaihi 's-salâm) became a large serpent and ate the snakes which were of their own witchery, they saw that it was beyond the boundaries of magic and above human power. Thus they believed [in the prophethood of] Mûsâ ('alaihi 's-salâm). Pharaoh, being unaware of this reality, had the wrong impression that Mûsâ ('alaihi 's-salâm) was the leader of the wizards and taught them magic. The same was the case with medicine during the time of 'Îsâ ('alaihi 's-salâm); it was at a very advanced level. Doctors took pride in their achievements. Famous specialists said that their medical knowledge would not suffice to revivify the dead or to open the eyes of congenital blind people. They believed that such people could be cured only by Allâhu ta'âlâ. During the time of Muhammad ('alaihi 's-salâm) the arts of poetry and eloquence had reached the highest levels. Poets boasted to one another about the eloquence in their poetry. In fact, the seven odes with the best prosody won the admiration of poets and were hung on the door of the Ka'ba. No one could write the like of them. This is written in detail in history books. When Rasûlullah (sall-Allâhu 'alaihi wa sallam) brought Qur'ân al-kerîm, conflicts arose among the people. Some denied the fact that it was the Word of Allâhu ta'âlâ and died as unbelievers. Some poets, seeing the i'jâz in Qur'ân al-

[1] Moses.

kerîm's eloquence, realized that it was the Word of Allah and became Muslims. Some others had to follow their example and became Muslims unwillingly, and they were called **munâfiqs** (hypocrites). Some attempted to defy the truth by giving some vague responses; they only brought derision upon themselves in the eyes of those who reasoned. For example, as a rejoinder to the âyat, "Wazzâriyât-i zar'an," they said, "Fal-hâsilât-i hasdan wattâhinât-i tahnân wattâbikhât-i tabkhan fal-âkilât-i aklan."^[1] And the remaining people took to fighting. In avengeful effort to kill Muhammad ('alaihi 's-salâm), they risked their properties, lives, wives and children. Thus it was understood with certainty that Qur'ân al-kerîm was revealed by Allâhu ta'âlâ.^[2]

Their fifth antithesis states: "There have been disagreements concerning both the recitation and the meaning of Qur'ân al-kerîm among the scholars of Islam. On the other hand, Allâhu ta'âlâ intimates that Qur'ân al-kerîm contains no points open to disagreements. For example, He declares in the eighty-first âyat of the Sûrat an-Nisâ: **'Were this Qur'ân al-kerîm the word of someone other than Allâhu ta'âlâ, it would contain many incongruities.'** The phrase '**kal'ihni 'l-man-fûsh**' in the fifth âyat of Sûrat al-Qâri'a was read as '**Kassâfi 'l-manfûsh**' by some. In the

[1] They themselves did not like this, so they could not read it in the presence of Muhammad ('alaihi 's-salâm).

[2] As it is seen in the previous passage, a mu'jiza is created by Allâhu ta'âlâ. Everything is created by Allâhu ta'âlâ. There is no creator other than Allâhu ta'âlâ. Only, in order for there to be order in the world and in worldly affairs, He has made the creation of everything dependent upon some causes. A person who wishes something to be created applies the cause related to that thing. Most causes are things that can be found by thinking, experience or calculation. When the cause of something is applied, Allâhu ta'âlâ creates it if He wills to. The case is not so with a mu'jiza or karâma. Allâhu ta'âlâ creates these in an extraordinary way, without causes. Holding fast to the causes means to follow His law of causation. When He creates something without causes, He suspends His law and creates it extraordinarily. A mu'jiza happens only through Prophets. It does not happen through other people. Saying, "He performed a miracle," or "He was saved miraculously", which are said to praise someone, is the same as saying that the person in question is a Prophet. In this matter, not the intention but the expression should be considered. It causes disbelief to ascribe prophethood to someone. He who does so loses his imân. So is the case with calling anyone other than Allâhu ta'âlâ "Creator" or saying that somebody has created such and such a thing. Muslims must avoid uttering such dangerous words.

ninth âyat of Sûrat al-Jum'a, **Fas'aw ilâ dhikri' llâh'** was said as 'Famdu ilâ dhikrillâh.' The 74th âyat of Sûrat al-Baqara says, **'Fahiya kalhijârati'**; there were those who said it as 'fa-kânat kalhijârati.' The 61st âyat of Sûrat al-Baqara says, **'alaihimu 'dh-dhillata wa'l-maskanata'**; there were those who read it as 'alaihimu'l-mas-kanata wa'dh-dhillata.' The disagreements pertaining to meanings in Qur'ân al-kerîm can be exemplified as follows: the 19th âyat of Sûra Saba' states, **'Rabbânâ bâ'id baina asfârinâ.'** It means, 'O our Rabb! Take our books away from us.' It is an invocation to Allah. Some read it as 'Rabbunâ bâ'ada baina asfârinâ' which means, 'Our Rabb has taken our books away from us.' The 115th âyat of Sûrat Mâ'ida says, **'Hal yastatî'u Rabbuka,'** which means, 'Will your Rabb accept your prayer?' Some read this âyat as 'Hal tastatî'u Rabbaka,' which means 'Will you pray to your Rabb?' ”

Answer: The above-cited disagreements were caused by one person each. The scholars of tafsîr and qirâ'a refused the forms of reading of those who caused these disagreements. They accepted the form of reading on which there was consensus. Our Prophet (sall-Allâhu 'alaihi wa sallam) said, **“Qur'ân al-kerîm was revealed on seven harfs,^[1] each of which is curative and sufficient.”** For this reason, the disagreements arising from the readings and the meanings of Qur'ân al-kerîm do not undermine its being mu'jiz.

Their sixth antithesis states: “The Qur'ân contains useless melodies and iterations. For example, **'Inna hâdhâni la-sâhirâni'** is such a melody. An example of an iterative reading is Sûrat ar-Rahmân. An example of iterations in meaning are the stories about Mûsâ and 'Îsâ ('alaihi 's-salâm).”

Answer: ...^[2] As for the iterations, the fact that their repetition serves to fix the meaning into mind is indisputable. The value of the art of explaining some meaning through various expressions is

[1] The word 'harf', as it is written in the book **Riyâd an-nâsîhîm**, means dialect, reading. The copy of Qur'ân al-kerîm compiled by Hadrat Abû Bakr contained all of the seven different kinds of readings. When Hadrat 'Uthmân became Khalîfa, he convened the Sahâbat al-kirâm and it was unanimously decided that the new copies of the Qur'ân would be written as Rasûlullah ('alaihi 's-salâm) had recited it in the last year of his life. It is wâjib to read the Qur'ân as such. It is also permissible to read it in the other six ways.

[2] Here, al-Imâm ar-Rabbânî (quddisa sirruh), referring to the book **Sharh-i mawâqif**, writes in detail that, according to a branch of knowledge called balâghat (rhetorics), the âyat **“Hâdhâni la-sâhirâni”** is in a degree of i'jâz. We have not translated that part.

known by those who are cognizant of literary stylistics. Even in a single story covering various events, its repetition at various places lays stress on different facts.^[1]

Rasûlullah (sall-Allâhu 'alaihi wa sallam) had many mu'jizas; such as, the moon's splitting into two parts when he made a sign with his blessed finger, stones and trees talking and moving with him, his making beasts speak, satiating many people with a small amount of food, water flowing from between his fingers, his describing past and future facts not known by anyone, and many others. Although not all his mu'jizas were reported by consensus, he had many mu'jizas that were reported by consensus. They have been general topics of conversation just as the bravery of Hadrat 'Alî and the generosity of Khâtam-i Tâi [and the cruelties and tortures of Nero, the fifth Roman emperor] have been. We would be contented with this much evidence to believe in his prophethood.

The second way of proving the prophethood of Muhammad ('alaihi 's-salâm) is to study his manners, beautiful moral qualities and utterances that were full of wisdom before he was declared a Prophet, when he announced his prophethood and after his prophethood was known. For example, he never lied, neither for worldly affairs nor concerning matters of the Hereafter. If he had lied once in his lifetime, his furious enemies would have raced with one another in spreading it far and near. Before or during his prophethood, he was never seen doing something unseemly. Though he was ummî, [that is, he had never received an education from anybody], his speech was fluent and sweet. For this reason he said, **"I am gifted with jawâmi' al-kalîm** (ability to give much information in a few words)." He put up with many inconveniences for communicating Allâhu ta'âlâ's religion. In fact, it was for this reason that he said, **"No other Prophet suffered the tortures I have suffered."** He suffered them all. He never gave up his duties. After his enemies were subdued and everyone accepted his commandments, no change took place in his beautiful morality, compassion or modesty. Throughout his lifetime, he pleased everyone. He never felt superior to anybody. To all his umma, he was as compassionate as a father [to his children]. It was on account of his extraordinary compassion that he was commanded,

[1] People who study the English literature and linguistics must be familiar with types of verbal parallelism such as anaphora, cataphora, epistrophe, symplece, anadiplosis, epanalepsis, antistrophe polyptoton, and so forth.

“Do not feel sorry about their wrong acts!” in the eighth âyat of the Sûrat al-Fâtir, and, **“Should you destroy yourself by sorrowing over their wrong deeds?”** in the sixth âyat of the Sûrat al-Kahf. His generosity was beyond limit. To brake this, the twenty-ninth âyat of the Sûrat al-Isrâ was revealed to him: **“Do not be so open-handed as to give away all your property!”** He never looked at the world’s temporary and deceptive beauties. During the days when he first announced his prophethood, the notables of Quraish said to him, “We shall give you as much property as you like. We shall marry you to the girl of your choice. We shall give you any position of authority you want. But give up this sort of thing.” He did not even turn to look at them. He was merciful and modest towards the poor and the destitute, and dignified and serious towards those who owned much property and land. It did not ever occur to him that he had the choice to turn back even during the most horrifying moments of such desperate battles as Uhud, Ahzab (Trench) and Hunain. This shows the strength of his blessed heart and the degree of his courage. If he had not had full trust in Allâhu ta’âlâ’s Protection, e.g., in His promise in the seventieth âyat of Mâida sûra, **“Allâhu ta’âlâ protects you against men’s harms!”**, it would have been impossible for him to show such extraordinary courage. Changing circumstances and conditions did not make any change in his beautiful morality or behavior towards others in the smallest degree. Those who read true and objective history books written by competent hands will understand our statements better. One of these attributes, alone, could not be documentary evidence for prophethood, that is, a person’s differing from others by having one of these superiorities would not indicate his prophethood, yet only Prophets could have an accumulation of all of these superiorities. Muhammad’s (‘alaihi ‘s-salâm) having an accumulation of all of these superiorities is one of the strongest evidences demonstrating the fact that he is Allâhu ta’âlâ’s Prophet.^[1]

The third proof verifying that Muhammad (‘alaihi ‘s-salâm) is Allâhu ta’âlâ’s Prophet is the one that was reported by Imâm

[1] For those who wish to know about the beautiful life of Muhammad (‘alaihi ‘s-salâm), we recommend the Turkish books **Qisas-i Anbiyâ** and **Mawâhib-i ladunniyya**. Also, there is detailed information in the first part of the Turkish original, and in the first fascicle of the English version (Chapter 56) of **Endless Bliss**, under the heading Hilye-i Se’âdet, and also in the fourth, fifth and sixth sections of the sixth chapter of **Why Did They Become Muslims**.

Fakhr ad-dîn ar-Râzî. Muhammad (‘alaihi ‘s-salâm) became the Prophet among a community who were quite unaware of heavenly books and stranded in knowledge and science. It was such a community that, having dissented from the true way, the polytheists were worshipping idols [statues and human figures they had made from stones or metals]; some of them had been deceived by Jews and had adopted their false, superstitious stories as a religion; magians, a minor group, worshipped two gods and married their own daughters and immediate relatives; and the others, Christians, believed that ‘Îsâ (‘alaihi ‘s-salâm) was the “Son of God” and worshipped three gods. Among such deranged people, Muhammad (‘alaihi ‘s-salâm) became a Prophet. A book titled **Qur’ân al-kerîm** was revealed to him by Allâhu ta’âlâ. He sorted out the beautiful habits from the ugly ones and the good deeds leading to felicity from the bad ones leading to perdition. He taught true îmân and ‘ibâdât. Those who believed him were enlightened by this îmân and ‘ibâdât. He rescued humanity from distorted, concocted religions. He attained the victory promised by Allâhu ta’âlâ. All his enemies soon perished. Depraved, factious, provocative words and actions came to an end. People were rescued from dictators, usurpers and the cruel. Every place became illuminated with the sacred lights of the sun of tawhîd and the moon of tanzîh. This is what prophethood implies, for ‘Prophet’ means the superior person who beautifies people’s morals and offers medicine for illnesses of hearts and souls. Most people are the slaves of their nafses. Their souls are sick. A specialist of the soul and ethics is necessary to cure them. The religion brought by Muhammad (‘alaihi ‘s-salâm) became a medicine for these illnesses. It eradicated the evils and malignancies in hearts. This case absolutely demonstrates that he is Allâhu ta’âlâ’s Prophet and is the Highest of Prophets (sall-Allâhu ‘alaihi wa ‘alahim wa ‘alâ âli wa as’hâbi kullin ajma’în). Hadrat Imâm Fakhr ad-dîn ar-Râzî explains in his book **al-Matâlib al-‘âliyya** that this case is the most obvious evidence proving his prophethood.

At the beginning of my book, I have explained what prophethood means and proved that it did not happen to anyone as it did to Muhammad (‘alaihi ‘s-salâm). Thus, it has been understood that he is superior to the others. This superiority can also be proven by studying his mu’jizas. But this approach is more similar to the way chosen by thinkers for proving prophethood. Their way can be summarized to mean that men need a code of law

sent by Allâhu ta'âlâ for attaining comfort and peace in this world and the next.

This is the end of the second article of my book. Thus it has become clear that the ancient Greek philosophers were on the wrong way and that those who read the harmful books which they have written with their personal points of view on religion and prophethood will acquire wrong religious information and will drift towards perdition.

Hijrî
989

Mîlâdî
1581

AHMAD bin
'ABD AL-AHAD
AS-SIRHINDÎ

PART SEVEN

A BIOGRAPHY of IMÂM-I- AHMAD RABBÂNÎ ‘quddisa sirruh’

This part is a translation from the book **Manâqib wa Maqâmât-i-Ahmadiyya-i-Saïdiyya**, written by Muhammad Maz-har ‘quddisa sirruh’, a son of Ahmad Sa’îd Fârûqî ‘quddisa sirruh’:

Ahmad-i-Fârûqî Serhendî ‘quddisa sirruh’, an acme for ârifis, a guide for owners of haqîqat, a paragon for the Awliyâ-i-kirâm, a darling of Allâhu ta’âlâ, the revitalizer and illuminater of the second thousand (Islamic) years, a qibla for the hearts of those who advance in the way leading towards Allâhu ta’âlâ, a peerless link in the Silsila-i-Zeheb, was fathered by Abd-ul-ahad. And this noble person, in his turn, was fathered by Zeynel’âbidîn, whose father was Abd-ul-hayy, whose father was Muhammad, whose father was Habîbullah, whose father was Refî’uddîn, whose father was Khawâja Nûr, whose father was Nasîr-ud-dîn, whose father was Suleymân, whose father was Yûsuf, whose father was Shu’âyb, whose father was Ahmad, whose father was Yûsuf, whose father was Shihâb-ud-dîn (better known with the name Ferrûh Shâh), whose father was Nasîr-ad-dîn, whose father was Mahmûd, whose father was Suleymân, whose father was Mes’ûd, whose father was Abdullah Wâ’iz-i-esghar, whose father was Abdullah Wâ’iz-i-ekber, whose father was Nâsir, whose father was Abdullah ibni ‘Umar, and whose father, finally, was hadrat ‘Umar ul-Fârûqî ‘radiy-Allâhu anhum ajma’în’.

Each and every one of Imâm-i-Rabbânî’s ‘quddisa sirruh’ fathers and grandfathers possessed ‘ilm and ikhlâs and was at the same time one of the Shaikhs and notables of his own time. All of them were extremely venerable persons and were among the Awliyâ-i-kirâm.

Great Walîs such as Mawlânâ Ahmad Nâmiqî Jâmi and Halîlullah-i-Bedahshî had foretold the advent of Imâm-i-Rabbânî ‘quddisa sirruh’. In fact, our master, the Messenger of Allah ‘sall-Allâhu alaihi wa sallam’ had given the good news that he would

come. The hadîth-i-sherîf expressing this good news is written in the book **Jam'ul jawâmî'**, by Imâm-i-Suyûtî, who quotes it from Ibni Mes'ûd Abd-ur-Rahmân ibni Yezîd, and who quotes it from hadrat Jâbir 'radiy-Allâhu anhum'. The hadîth-i-sherîf purports: **"From among my Ummat (Muslims), someone called Sila will appear. Many, many people will enter Paradise through his shafâ'at (intercession)."** 'Sila' means 'conjoiner', 'uniter', 'unifier'. Later, he was called so on account of his unifying two branches of knowledge, i.e. Tasawwuf and Fiqh. Scholars contemporary with him addressed him with this nickname. As a matter of fact, in a letter he wrote to his son Muhammad Ma'thûm 'quddisa sirruh', he says, "I pay my hamd (gratitude, laud and praise) to my Rabb (Allâhu ta'âlâ), who has made me a sila between two oceans."

He honoured the world with his presence in the hijrî lunar year 971, and passed away on the twenty-ninth, Tuesday, of the month of Safar in 1034 [A.D. 1624]. He was only a child when lights of maturity, wilâyat and hidâyat shone on his blessed, pure forehead. As a small child he was honoured with fruitfull inspirations to the heart from Shâh Kemâl Kihâlî-yi-Qâdirî 'rahmatullâhi aleyh', who directly inspired into him the nisbat-i-qâdiriyya.

It took him only a short time to memorize the Qur'ân al-kerîm. Then, acquiring knowledge from his father and from the time's greatest scholars, he became a great scholar. He derived great benefit from his father and attained ma'rifats of Tawhîd in his presence. He received the ijâzat (certificate) of Irshâd (guiding disciples in the way of Tasawwuf) in the paths of Cheshtiyya and Qâdiriyya. He became a substitute for his father. When he was seventeen years old he became a master in zâhirî and bâtinî (pertaining to heart) knowledge. He began to publish his knowledge and educate disciples in the two great branches. He would read books written by great leaders of Naqshbendiyya order with great enthusiasm and looked forward to meeting one of the superiors of this order. He kept this yearning and zeal in his heart till he eventually attained the matchless sohbat and company of Khwâja Muhammad Bâkî 'quddisa sirruh', one of the greatest leaders of this order, an owner of irshâd (guidance) and hidâyat (guidance to and attainment of the right way), a corroborator of Islam, an owner of haqiqats.

Having attained this blessed company, which draws one

towards Allâhu ta'âlâ and lifts one up to very high ranks, he joined the order of these great people. Holding fast to their services and strictly observing the âdâb (subtle standards) of sohbat, he attained nisbat-i-Naqshbandî in two months plus a few days. Showers of knowledge and ma'rifat, like April rain, began to pour into his blessed heart. His master, Khwâja Bâkî-billâh 'qaddas-Allâhu sirrahul'azîz' frequently said about him, "Ahmad is one of the Murâds and Mahbûbs." This was the reason for his rapid progress. He became like a sun illuminating the entire world. His master gave him the good news that he had attained very high ranks and would be able to make others attain these ranks, that he was very close to Allâhu ta'âlâ, and said, "On my way back to India after having received my ijâzat from my master Emkenghî 'quddisa sirruh', I came to the city of Serhend where you were. I had a dream, wherein they told me I was in the vicinity of a qutb (a person who occupies the highest rank) and showed a vision of that high person. You are that high person (whose vision I saw in my dream). It was during another of my travels through Serhend when I saw a torch extending up to heavens and illuminating the entire world from the farthest east to the remotest points in the west. I beheld that the light coming from the torch became brighter and brighter and crowds of people lit their own candles from the torch. I know this dream as good news, a harbinger of your coming to the world."

As Khwâja Bâkî-billâh 'quddisa sirruh' sent Imâm-i-Rabbânî 'qaddas-Allâhu sirrahul'azîz' with ijâzat-i-mutlaq (full authorization) to the city of Serhend, he withdrew from his own position and trusted the business of educating and training his disciples, including his sons, to him, and said, "Ahmad is a sun outshining thousands of stars like us. There have been only one or two like him in this Ummat. And today there is next to no one like him under the celestial dome. I look on myself as one of his satellites [pupils]. All his ma'rifats are correct and approved by Prophets 'alaihimus-salâm'." In fact, his master as well as his disciples would attend his sohbat in order to receive fayz and nûr from him.

Having attained high grades and unequalled ranks, Imâm-i-Rabbânî came to Serhend and set about educating people who yearned for attaining love of Allâhu ta'âlâ. Echoes of guidance spread throughout the world. Calls of hidâyat inspired spring weather into hearts, producing many a renovation and green foliage. The drum of Qutb-ul-aqtâb was beaten in his name. A

mere compliment received from him would suffice for one to attain high grades of Wilâyat. Abdâls and Awtâds ran for his company. His lights of Wilâyat, his barakats of karâmat are too occult to express in words or writing. People who were stranded in the desert of aberration and bewilderment attained hidâyat in his sohbat.

People who were about to drown in the sea of remoteness reached the shore of closeness through his favour. Pursuers of haqîqat and ma'rifat crowded around him like ants. Sultans, commanders, governors shone with the light emanating from this source of Hidâyat. The fayz pouring like April rain on the disciples in his presence was an object of envy for angels in the seven skies. Upon hearing about his greatness and kerâmats, learned and eminent people far and near hastened to rub their faces on his threshold, which radiated Wilâyat. Owing to his fruitful tawajjuh and attention, which attracted one towards Allâhu ta'âlâ, they attained spiritual peace and nûr and tawhîd without any mushâhada or effort, without taking pains. Without having to dive into the sea of Wahdat, it became possible for them to disappear into the ocean of Ahâdiyyat without any toil. Slightest care on his part would result in the mushâhada of Wahdat in the kathrat, jazbas (raptures) of love and ma'rifats of heart. The nisbat (order) of Ahrariyya became strong again, so that it spread throughout the world owing to his fruitful efforts. Other nisbats beyond the already known sulûk and jazba were discovered. Self-abnegations, such as fasting without making iftâr (eating at the time of breaking fast), subjecting oneself to mortifications for forty days, doing without food and drink, keeping away from people, methods commonly used by people preceding him, were no longer things to be aspired after for people matured in his company. These arduous methods left their places to moderations such as being temperate in worships and observing the Sunnat strictly in prayers and deeds. Perfections that would normally cost years' mortifications would be attained in a moment owing to his barakat and tawajjuh. His blessed person 'rahmatullâhi ta'âlâ aleyh' became a great gift from Allâhu ta'âlâ and a representative of His Messenger 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wa sallam'. He was entrusted with the duty of guidance and leadership of unending paths. He became the mujaddid of the second thousand years. Thus, any sort of fayz and barakat coming to anyone till the end of the world will be coming through him. With his quite new teachings, unheard - of ma'rifats, secrets that

had never been revealed by anyone before him, and extraordinary kashfs which no one else had attained, he started a new trend; this fact is as obvious as the sun.

At the beginning of every hundred years a **Mujaddid** (person to reconsolidate, to restore Islam) will come. However, there is a great difference between mujaddids coming every hundred years and those who come every thousand years. Difference between these two kinds of mujaddids is equal to and even more than the difference between a hundred and a thousand.

Mujaddid is the person who serves as the medium for all sorts of fayz and barakat coming to people in his time. Even those lucky people called Qutb, Awtâd, Budalâ and Nujabâ ‘qaddas-Allâhu ta’âlâ esrârahum-ul-’azîz’ receive their fayz through him.

The time of Imâm-i-Ahmad Rabbânî ‘quddisa sirruh’ can be described as follows: During the earlier dispensations, whenever an Ummat degenerated and the earth was covered with zulmat, a new great Prophet called Ulul’azm would come and a new religion would be revealed to him. The most useful Ummat is the Ummat of Muhammad ‘alaihi-salâm’. And the Prophet of this Ummat is the finality of all Prophets ‘alahim-us-salawâtu wa-t-taslîmât’. Scholars among this Ummat are like the Prophets of Benî Isrâ’îl (Children of Israel). This fact is stated in a hadîth-i-sherîf. It was decided (by Allâhu ta’âlâ) that existence of scholars in this Ummat would be sufficient (for Muslims). Therefore, one thousand years after our master the Prophet ‘sall-Allâhu alaihi wa sallam’, a noble person with perfect ma’rifat, knowledge and wisdom would be necessary to take the place of one of the past Prophets called Ulul’azm. For the latest period of the Muslim dispensation would begin one thousand years after our master the Prophet’s ‘sall-Allâhu alaihi wa sallam’ death. Elapse of one thousand years is a matter of paramount importance and it is a major factor in the changing of situations. Since there would not be any change in this Ummat and in this religion, it would, beyond doubt, be necessary that the standard of spirituality and the firmness of guidance possessed by the earlier Muslims be reinstated in the later generations. Thus, Imâm-i-Ahmad Rabbânî’s ‘quddisa sirruh’ blessed person was equipped with all the perfections peculiar to prophethood and messengership and distinguished from others. People who observe his astoundingly unusual information, his ma’rifats pertaining to the Zât-i-ilâhî (Person of Allâhu ta’âlâ), his purely beautiful moral quality and

his oral and written statements describing hâls, mawâjids, tajallîs and zuhûrs, will see this fact well. For these things are the essentials of the Islamic religion and make up an epitome of the teachings pertaining to Allâhu ta'âlâ, His Person and Attributes. Innumerable secrets and meanings, the haqîqat (the essence, the real inner meaning) of Kâ'ba-i-mu'azzama, the haqîqat of Qur'ân al-kerîm, the haqîqat of namâz, ma'bûdiyyat-i-sirfa, degrees of muhabbat (love) called hillat, muhibbiyyat and mabhûbiyyat, the grades termed ta'ayyun-i-wujûdî, ta'ayyun-i-hubbî, lâ-ta'ayyun, the zuhûr (manifestation) of properties called mabda-i-ta'ayyun in creatures, mabda-i-ta'ayyuns belonging to Prophets and angels, to which of the Divine Attributes or Names the idiosyncratic talents of each of his disciples were related, to what Prophet each of the Awliyâ was related as a result of natural identity (mashrab), e.g. Muhammadi-ul-mashrab, Ibrâhîm-ul-mashrab, etc., their own wilâyat related to muhibbiyyat and mabhûbiyyat-i-zâtiyya, their inner natures and peculiarities, the haqîqat of being a qayyûm, secrets of sabâhat and malâhat and combination of these two graces, and many other secrets and meanings were bestowed on him by Allâhu ta'âlâ. None of the Awliyâ 'rahmatullâhi ta'âlâ alaihim ajma'in' had mentioned these values. A summary of these values is written in his three books titled **Mektûbât** and in his other seven pamphlets.

The Imâm 'quddisa sirruh' had innumerable kashfs and karâmats. We will write a few of them in order to become blessed:

1- One of the Imâm's disciples wrote a letter to him, asking, "Did the Ashâb-i-kirâm attain these ranks which you have been telling about? If so, did it occur at once or gradually?" The Imâm said that a question of this sort could be answered only in a sohbat (by being together). The questioner visited him for his sohbat. The imâm made tawajjuh to him (turned his attention towards him), bestowing on him all the nisbats he possessed, and said, "What did you see?" Upon this the person threw himself down to hadrat Imâm's feet and said, "Now I know that the Ashâb-i-kirâm 'alaihim-ur-ridwân' attained all the ranks of wilâyat with only one sohbat with Rasûlullah 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wa sallam'."

2- Mawlânâ Yûsuf was ill. It seemed that he was to die soon. Imâm-i-Rabbânî visited him. Mawlânâ Yûsuf requested tawajjuh and himmat. So the Imâm 'quddisa sirruh' went in murâqaba (contemplation, profound meditation) and made him attain the

grades of Fanâ and Baqâ. Upon this, the latter, badly ill as he was, informed with the realized improvements taking place in his heart. As soon as his progress reached its zenith he attained Allâhu ta'âlâ (passed away).

3- Some of the Imâm's disciples expressed their wish to visit the Ghaws-ul-a'zam Abd-ul-qâdir-i-Geylânî 'quddisa sirruh'. The Imâm remained silent and made tawajjuh towards the soul of the Ghaws-ul-a'zam 'radiy-Allâhu anhumâ'. Hadrat Abd-ul-qâdir-i-Geylânî's blessed soul appeared and he and some of his senior disciples honoured the place with their presence. Those disciples of the Imâm's who were present at the place visited the guests and received fayz from them.

4- Someone suffering from leprosy begged the Imâm to pray for the restoration of his health. When the Imâm made tawajjuh the person regained his health completely.

5- A hâfid whose duty was to recite Qur'ân al-kerîm in the circle became badly ill. Everybody was hopeless. Imâm-i-Rabbânî said, "I have admitted him under my protection." The person recovered immediately.

6- He was on a safar (voyage, travel). The weather was unbearably hot and heavy. Exhausted, his companions and disciples begged him to intercede for mercy. The Imâm 'quddisa sirruh' trusted himself to Allâhu ta'âlâ. Presently, a cloud appeared and poured some light rain. It was no longer hot. Nor was there any dust left.

7- Some of his adherents found a Hindu idol temple empty at a remote place and broke the idols. They had hardly finished doing this when they found themselves surrounded by fully armed idolaters awaiting them with their swords drawn. The adherents sought asylum with the Imâm, begging him for help. Imâm-i-Rabbânî 'qaddas-Allâhu ta'âlâ sirrah-ul-'azîz' appeared at the place and said, "Don't worry! You will soon be receiving help from the unknown." A number of horsemen came into sight and protected the beloved born slaves from the unbelievers.

8- One of his disciples met a lion in the country. There was no place to shelter. He sought asylum with the Imâm and begged for help. The Imâm appeared with a walking stick in his hand and hit the fierce animal hard. The lion ran away and the disciple was saved.

9- A pious person living in a far away country heard about the

Imâm's fame and came to the city of Serhend. Someone invited him to his house to spend the night there. When he said that he was there to receive fayz from the Imâm and that he was very happy because he was going to be blessed with the honour of joining his disciples, the host began to vituperate hadrat Imâm, using filthy language about him. Deeply saddened and embarrassed, the pious person committed himself to the Imâm's soul and begged him through his heart: "I am here only with the intention of serving you for Allah's sake. This person wants to deprive me of this happiness." Imâm-i-Rabbânî appeared, exasperated and with his sword drawn, and cutting the denier to pieces he left the house. When the pious person was blessed with the Imâm's presence the following morning and attempted to relate the previous night's event, the Imâm preferred to conceal his kerâmat, saying, "Do not relate by day what happened at night."

10- One of the Imâm's 'quddisa sirruh' deniers invited one of the Imâm's disciples to his home. Putting something to eat in front of the guest, the host began to speak ill of Imâm-i-Rabbânî 'rahmatullâhi ta'âlâ aleyh'. The disciple was vexed and wished to go back to the Imâm's place. This stirred the Ghayrat-i-ilâhî, whereupon all the limbs of the denier's body broke and the body was torn to pieces. Terrified, the disciple left the house and made for the Imâm's place. The Imâm was standing at the door, as it was his blessed habit. Holding his disciple by the hand, he took him to the denier's house. They entered the house. The Imâm supplicated to Allâhu ta'âlâ for the resuscitation of the dead person. Allâhu ta'âlâ accepted his supplication. When they stood up some time later, he said to his disciple, "Don't tell anyone about this event as long as I am alive."

11- One day ten of the Imâm's disciples invited him to have (the dinner called) Iftâr with them and all the ten invitations happened to be for the same evening. Accepting all the invitations, he had Iftâr with all the ten families at the same time in the same evening.

12- He said one day, "The desire I had had to visit the Ka'ba-i-mu'azzama became so overwhelming that it was all but impossible for me to endure it any longer. By the grace of Allâhu ta'âlâ, this zeal and devotion generated so powerful an attraction that I found the Kâ'ba-i-mu'azzama by my side and was honoured with tawâf (visiting the Kâ'ba)."

We shall quote a few of the sayings that emanated from Imâm-i-Ahmad Rabbânî's 'qaddas-Allâhu ta'âlâ sirrah-ul'azîz' blessed heart and were expressed through his blessed pen's tongue:

He stated: All things seen and known are muqayyad. [They are dependent on other things.] They are not [worth being] maqsûd (thing(s) wished for) or matlûb (thing(s) aspired after). What is [worth being] matlûb is what is free and far from all bounds and dependencies. Then, it must be looked for beyond seeing and knowing.

He stated: Sayr and Sulûk consist of progress in knowledge.

He stated: What camouflages the Awliyâullâh 'rahmatullâhi ta'âlâ alaihim ajma'in' from others' sight, and prevents them from being identified, is their human properties. These people need what other people need. Being Awliyâ will not exempt them from this need.

He stated: Allâhu ta'âlâ has concealed His Walî born slaves in such a way that their own zâhir (physical senses) are unaware of the perfections in their hearts, nonetheless for others' identifying them.

He stated: Yâ Rabbî (o my Allah)! What a mystery it is that Thou hast made them Awliyâ (beloved born slaves) for Thine Self. Their bâtin (hearts) are like nectars. A person who tastes one tiny drop of them will find endless life and attain eternal felicity. Their outward appearances, on the other hand, are like fatal poison. He who evaluates them only by looking at their outward appearances will end up in eternal death.

He stated: Man's creation is intended for him to do his duties as a born slave. The highest of the ranks of Wilâyat is the rank of 'abdiyyat (being a born slave). There is no rank above it.

He stated: They bless only one out of thousands of people with the honour of Ikhlâs and the rank of Ridâ. This faqîr (hadrat Imâm-i-Ahmad Rabbânî means himself) was blessed with Ikhlâs and Ridâ, which are the ultimate goals, only after ten years' progress in this way. As alms from our master the Prophet 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wa sallam', the essence, the inner nature (haqîqat) of these mysteries was entirely explained to me. May hamd-uthanâ (laud, praise and gratitude) be to Allâhu ta'âlâ for this blessing.

He stated: The way taken (and guided) by these superior

people ‘rahmatullâhi ta’âlâ alaihim ajma’in’ is extremely valuable and very sacred. It has been based on the principle of adapting yourself to the Sunnat. Now I have no desire but to revive one of the Sunnats of Rasûlullah ‘sall-Allâhu alaihi wa sallam’. Let those who aspire after hâls, mawâjids and zawks have them. The heart should be enriched with the nisbat [following the way] of our superiors and the zâhir (body, outward appearance, actions) should be decorated with (obeying) the Ahkâm-i-Islâmiyya. [Ahkâm-i-Islâmiyyâ means Islam’s commandments and prohibitions].

He stated: Prophets ‘alaihim-us-salawâtu wa-t-taslîmat’ were sent to India. I see bright nûrs (lights, haloes) on their graves. I could show their graves one by one if I wanted to. Yet people are mostly disinclined to believe such statements.

He stated: The word ‘riyâzat’ (mortification) has meant ‘subjecting oneself to hunger’, ‘fasting’ to (most) people. However, steady strictness about eating as much as our religion prescribes is more difficult and more useful than performing supererogatory fast for thousands of years.

He stated: If delicious, sweet food is offered to a person and if he eats as much of it as our religion prescribes and leaves the rest though he has appetite and wishes to eat it all, this abstention of his is a powerful way of riyâzat and it is much better than the other methods of riyâzat.

He stated: I saw the Sarwar-i-kâinât ‘sall-Allâhu alaihi wa sallam’. He wrote an ijâzat for me, saying, “I have not written an ijâzat like this for anyone after my As-hâb.” Then he gave me the good news: “On the rising day thousands of people will enter Paradise through your shafâ’at.” He made me a mujtahid in the ‘Ilm-i-Kelâm.

He stated: “I saw Islam. It stopped at our place like a caravan stopping at a caravanserai.” As he said so he pointed to his mosque and to his convent.

He stated: One morning I saw Imâm-i-a’zam ‘rahmatullâhi aleyh’ and his teacher and his disciples arriving. I found myself immersed in their haloes. I attained a special Fanâ in the nisbat of those great people. Likewise, at some other time Imâm-i-Shâfi’î ‘rahmatullâhi aleyh’ and his teacher and his disciples appeared. This time their haloes covered me all over. I attained Fanâ in their nisbat, too.

He stated: Ghaws-ul-a'zam (Abd-ul-qâdir Geylânî) 'quddisa sirruh' and the great Shaikhs of Qâdirî path 'rahmatullâhi alaihim' visited me. With the arrival of these great people, I found myself in the haloes of Qâdirî nisbat (path). I thought to myself, "I was educated by the superiors of Naqshbandî. How is it that the Qâdirî order seems to have had more effect on me?" As soon as this thought passed through my heart, hadrat Khwâja-i-jihân Bahâ-ad-dîn Bukhârî 'quddisa sirruh', accompanied by his disciples, honoured the place with his presence and sat against the Ghaws-us-saqaleyn. Addressing the other group, he said, "Ahmad is one of us. He attained perfection and maturity through our methods of education." In the meantime, leaders of the orders Cheshtiyya and Kubrawiyya arrived, too. They poured their own nisbats into my heart. They gave me new ijâzats. I already was in possession of the nisbats of those superior people, and now they became firmer and brighter. If I wish, I can make my disciples reach perfection through all these paths.

He stated: One day I was pervaded with a feeling of seeing my deeds deficient. I was in a mood of utter penitence and contrition, when I heard a voice saying, "I have forgiven thee and those who invoke through thee, whether through another means or without any intermediary in between, till the end of the world," as it had been expressed in the hadîth-i-sherîf, **"If a person humiliates himself for the sake of Allâhu ta'âlâ, Allâhu ta'âlâ will exalt him."**

He stated: "They have shown me all those men and women who have joined our order as well as those who will join us through means or directly till the end of the world. They have given me their names, family names, and countries. I could name them all one by one if I liked to. All these people have been forgiven for my sake.

He stated: I have been given the good news, "If you attend a person's funeral he shall be forgiven." I was also inspired, "If you ask for a dead person's forgiveness, his torment shall be stopped once and for all." At some other time I was inspired, "If a handful of soil from your grave is put on a grave, the person lying in this grave shall attain maghfirat-i-ilâhiyya (Allah's forgiveness)." [This shows how great the person who lies in this grave (hadrat Imâm Rabbânî) must be].

He stated: The essence of the path with which Allâhu ta'âlâ has specially blessed this faqîr (Imâm-i-Rabbânî) is the path of Ahrâriyya, in which all the hâls (spiritual states), which are

normally attained at the end (in the other orders of Tasawwuf), have been placed in the beginning. Edifices, kiosks have been built on this foundation. If this foundation had not been so strong, the situation would not be as it is today. This valuable seed was brought from Bukhârâ and Semerkand and sown in India, whose essence descends from the soil of Medîna-i-Munawwara and Mekka-i-mukarrama. It was watered with water of fazîlat (virtue) and ikrâm (kindness, blessing) for years. It was grown with ihsân (grace, kindness, blessing). When it matured and reached perfection, today's fruits of knowledge and ma'rifat came into being.

He stated: We have been inspired that hadrat Mahdî 'alaih-ir-rahma' will be in this nisbat of ours; he will read and accept what we have written in ma'rifat and haqîqat.

He stated: Allâhu ta'âlâ, with his Fadl and Kerem, has endowed on us (hadrat Imâm-i-Rabbânî means himself) all sorts of perfection that a born slave could possess, [with the exception of the rank of Prophethood].

The virtues and peculiar values Imâm-i-Ahmad Rabbânî 'qaddas-Allâhu ta'âlâ sirrah-ul'azîz' was invested with are beyond the limits of enumeration. As a singular blessing, Allâhu ta'âlâ honoured him with the fortune of adapting himself to our master the Messenger of Allah 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wa sallam' in all the seven categories. [The seven categories of following our master Rasûlullah 'sall-allâhi alaihi wa sallam' are explained in detail in the thirtieth (30) chapter of the first fascicle **Endless Bliss**]. He (Allâhu ta'âlâ) made him privy to the mysterious secrets hidden in the (âyats called) Mutashâbihât and Muqattaât in Qur'ân al-kerîm. He made him attain to the perfections peculiar to (people called) Sâbiqs. [Prophets 'alaih-im-us-salâm' and the highest ones of their As-hâb are called Sâbiq]. He was blessed with the rank of Qayyûm-i-'âlam. Some of his disciples attained the rank of Qutb dependent on him. A new path beyond (the stages called) the Jazba and Sulûk and the Sayr-i-âfâqî and the Sayr-i-enfusî came into being.

With the barakat of his management, the Islamic religion became very powerful, especially in India. Islamic works of art, which had been destroyed and neglected in the time of Ekber Shâh, were restored. Many disbelievers became Muslims in his hands. Thousands of sinners made tawba. Writing effective letters to the time's powerful governors and commanders, among whom

were his adherents and disciples such as Abd-ur-Rahîm Khân, who was famous for his name Khân-i-Khânân, and Nawwâb Ferîd Murtadâ Khân and Muhammad a'zam Khân, he encouraged them to promote and spread Islam and to promulgate the belief of Ahl as-sunna wa-l-jamâ'a. And these people, obeying his blessed advice, put forward efforts for the fulfilment of this purpose and served for the maintenance of the religion. They did this so successfully that the darkness of bid'at and disbelief turned into light of Îmân and Sunnat. He assigned his highly educated disciples to the task of teaching the zâhirî teachings (teachings pertaining to worships) and the bâtinî ma'rifats (occult knowledge pertaining to heart and soul) to people and sent them everywhere. A few of them are: Mawlânâ Hamîd-i-Benghâlî, Mawlânâ Muhammad Siddîq-i-Bedahshî, Shaikh Muzammil, Mawlânâ Tâhir-i-Bedahshî, Mawlânâ Ahmad-i-Riwanbî, Kerîm-ad-dîn Hasan-i-Abdâlî, Hasan-i-Berkî, Mawlânâ Abd-ul-Hayy-i-Belhî, Mawlânâ Hâshim-i-Kishmî, Mawlânâ Bedreddîn-i-Serhendî, Yûsuf-i-Berkî, Hâdji Hidir-i-Afghânî, Khwâja Muhammad Sâdiq-i-Kâbilî, Mawlânâ Yâr Muhammad Qadîm-i-Talkânî, and others 'rahmatullâhi ta'âlâ alaihim ajma'in'.

These people are some of the Imâm's distinguished disciples. Millions of people received fayz through these people's sohbat and attained the rank of Wilâyat. He gave very sublime good news to these exalted disciples of his and inspired people to attaining the sohbat of these distinguished people. To some of his disciples he gave the good news that they had attained ranks of Wilâyat and Qutb.

Nûr Muhammad Puntî 'rahmatullâhi aleyh' is one of his greatest disciples. He (the Imâm) said about him, "He is one of the rijâl-ul-ghayb. He is either among the Nuqabâ or one of the Nujabâ."

Bedî'ud-dîn-i-Sehârenpûrî 'quddisa sirruh' received many kindnesses and praisals from our master the Prophet 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wa sallam' in his dreams. In one of these occasions the Messenger of Allah 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wa sallam' said to him, "You are the sirâj, the candle of India." He was also blessed with the fortune of becoming the time's qutb.

Mawlânâ Ahmad-i-Berkî 'quddisa sirruh' passed all the stages of sulûk in one week. He, too, attained the honour of becoming the qutb of his country.

Mawlânâ Muhammad Tâhir-i-Lâhorî ‘quddisa sirruh’ was another one who was honoured with the blessing of becoming the qutb for his country. Allâhu ta’âlâ sent him the following message through inspiration: “I have salvaged from Hell fire all of those people to whom thou hast made tawajjuh. I have forgiven anyone who pays homage to thee.”

Sayyid Âdam-i-Bennûrî ‘quddisa sirruh’ would make the disciple attain the grade of Fanâ-i-qalbî and the Nisbat-i-khâssa at first tawajjuh, even during the telkîn. Allâhu ta’âlâ blessed him with a special methodology, a special path. This methodology is termed **Ahsaniyya**. Through this methodology, which was peculiar to him, he would attract people towards Allâhu ta’âlâ. The good news informing about this fact had been given to him by Imâm-i-Rabbânî ‘quddisa sirruh’, who had said, “Through an unknown way you shall be given more than you have received from us. Anyone who joins your way has been forgiven. On the Rising Day you shall be given a banner. People who have recourse to you and follow your way shall enjoy comfort in the shade of your banner on the Rising Day.” More than four hundred thousand people made tawba in his hands. He had one thousand disciples who had attained perfection. On his arrival in Medîna-i-Munawwara, (he greeted the Messenger of Allah ‘sall-Allâhu alaihi wa sallam’ and) his salâm (greeting, salutation) was acknowledged by the Prophet and he had the honour of musâfaha (shaking hands) with the Prophet, a blessing which has not even fallen to the lot of a few distinguished people. At that lucky moment, a voice was heard to say, “**O my son! Stay with me!**” Indeed, he passed away in Medîna-i-munawwara.

Another one was Sayyid Muhammad Nu’mân-i-Bedahshî ‘quddisa sirruh’. Imâm-i-Rabbânî wrote to him in one of his letters: “The crescent of your perfection has become like the full moon against the sun. All the values given to the sun have been reflected on it.” Also, he gave him the good news that he was a qutb. He had very effective and abundant guidance. He attracted hundreds of thousands of people to Allâhu ta’âlâ. The time’s emperor was alarmed at the great number of his disciples. Inviting him from Dakka, he took him under his protection. Once he said, “I saw our master the Prophet ‘sall-Allâhu alaihi wa sallam’ in my dream. Abû Bekr as-Siddîq ‘radiy-Allâhu anh’ was with the Sarwar. The Messenger said, ‘O Abâ Bekr! Tell my son Muhammad Nu’mân: Anyone liked and accepted by Ahmad (Imâm-i-Rabbânî) is liked and accepted by me and by Allâhu

ta'âlâ. Anyone disliked and rejected by Ahmad is disliked by me and by Allâhu ta'âlâ.' Because I was one of the people liked and accepted by Imâm-i-Ahmad Rabbânî, I rejoiced greatly at this good news. I was still enjoying this peaceful joy, when the Messenger of Allah stated again: 'Tell my son Muhammad Nu'mân: Anyone liked and accepted by you is liked and accepted by Ahmad. And anyone liked and accepted by him is liked and accepted by me and by Allâhu ta'âlâ. Anyone you dislike and reject, Ahmad and I and Allâhu ta'âlâ will dislike and reject, too.

EXALTED SONS of IMÂM-I-RABBÂNÎ 'quddas-Allâhu ta'âlâ erwâhahum'

Imâm-i-Rabbânî has eight sons and two daughters:

Muhammad Sâdiq 'quddisa sirruh' is the Imâm's 'quddisa sirruh' eldest son. He was born in the hijrî year 1000. He was only eight years old when Imâm-i-Rabbânî attained Khwâja Bâkî-billâh's sohbat. He took him along. So he was blessed with hadrat Khwâja Bâkî-billâh's looks at that very young age. With the barakat of his tawajjuh he attained hâls, raptures and unbelievable valuables. He was flooded with kashfs, zawks, ecstacies and immersion into haloes, so much so that his blessed father (Imâm-i-Rabbânî) told his disciples to "Buy Muhammad Sâdiq some food from the market place [because food from a market place would be somewhat doubtful]. This will deplete the inundation of hâls to some extent!"

He acquired most of the teachings pertaining to mental (scientific) and traditional (religious) knowledge in the presence of his father. By the time he was eighteen years old he had completed his education in zâhirî knowledge and taken up teaching in due diligence and perseverance.

His father 'quddisa sirruh', in a letter he sent to him, wrote as follows: "It has been inferred from your letter that you have an affinity with the Wilâyat-i-khâssa-i-Muhammadiyya 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wa sallam'. I thank Allâhu ta'âlâ for this. For I have been desiring for some time that you attain this great blessing. One day, I made tawajjuh towards you so that you should reach this fortune. I happened to find you in the Wilâyat-i-Mûsawiyya. So you were made to progress in that path and were transferred into Wilâyat-i-Muhammadiyya. I pay my hamd to Allâhu ta'âlâ for this."

His blessed father said about this son of his, "My esteemed son Muhammad Sâdiq 'rahmatullâhi aleyh' has become an abstract of the ma'rifats which this faqr (Imâm-i-Rabbânî) possesses. He has passed beyond the grades of Jazba and Sulûk. My son is among those who are privy to my subtle, occult and secret ma'rifats. He has been protected against erring."

When he was twenty-four years old, bubonic plague broke out and spread in the place he lived, killing many people. His blessed father made tawajjuh for the elimination of the nuisance. However, it was understood that the plague would not go back without receiving the high premium it had come there for. So this son of Imâm-i-Rabbânî's bowed to his destiny and sacrificed himself for Allah's born slaves. He passed away on the ninth day of Rabî'ulawwal in 1025 [A.D. 1615]. Some time later the plague lost its grip. One of our superiors had a dream wherein a voice said, "If a person suffering from bubonic plague writes the name Muhammad Sâdiq on a piece of paper, melts it or only dips it in water and drinks the water, he will get rid of the plague." The news spread in the city. People suffering from plague did so and recovered. In fact, even a bit of soil from his grave would be enough as a cure against the epidemic. Imâm-i-Rabbânî was very deeply grieved at the death of this son of his. He says in one of his letters, "The death of my late son was a great catastrophe. He was one of the âyats of Allâhu ta'âlâ, a sign from him. He was one of the Rahmats (acts of compassion) coming down from the Rabb of 'âlams (worlds). Very few people have obtained equal amount of zâhirî and bâtinî knowledge he acquired within these twenty-four years." He was in a continuous state of hudû' and khushû' and always considered himself humble and imperfect. He would supplicate Allâhu ta'âlâ bemoaningly. He stated, "Each Walî has asked for something from Allâhu ta'âlâ. What I have asked for is tazarru' and iltijâ (supplication and taking refuge)."

Khwâja Muhammad Sa'îd 'quddisa sirruh' was born in the hijrî year 1005. He passed away on the twenty-seventh of the month of Jamâz-al-âkhir in 1070 [A.D. 1659]. He was very small in the time of Khwâja Muhammad Bâkî billâh 'quddisa sirruh'. Therefore, it may seem that he did not attain the blessing of the Khwâja's khuzûr. However, the Khwâja (Bâkî billâh) said, "Muhammad Sa'îd is such a person that he received nisbat from me in my absence." He attained zâhirî and bâtinî perfection in the presence of his father. He was seventeen years old when he perfected himself in mental and traditional knowledge. Like his noble father, he was perfect in observing the religious rules, graced with taqwâ, immaculate in adapting himself to the Sunnat, and determined in acting upon the 'azîmat. He was soft-spoken and modest. He did not attach any importance to worldliness. He was a documentary source and occupied a very high rank in the knowledge of Hadîth.

And in the knowledge of Fiqh he was the very authenticity itself. Whenever Imâm-i-Rabbânî meant to inquire into a matter pertaining to the knowledge of Fiqh, he would commune with this son of his. He admired his true and sound answers and uttered benedictions over him. He reached all the ranks of kemâl (perfection) and tekml (perfecting) in the elevated presence of his father. He was given ijâzat and commanded to guide the disciples. He was prudent and far-sighted not only in matters pertaining to the Hereafter, but also in worldly affairs. In fact, Imâm-i-Rabbânî ‘quddisa sirruh’ would consult with him in many questions. He was his magnificent father’s companion in batinî knowledge (knowledge pertaining to heart and soul). Very few people were informed with the mysteries imparted to him. People physically afflicted would seek remedy in him, and people with unhealthy hearts would attain presence of soul and tranquility in his tasarruf (power of disposal). This state of his was fully concordant with the following statement made by Bahâ-ud-dîn-i-Bukhârî ‘quddisa sirruh’, who was one of the (spiritual) inheritors of our master the Prophet ‘alaihi-salâm’: “We have attained a grace, a blessing from Allâhu ta’âlâ.”

Imâm-i-Rabbânî ‘qaddas-Allâhu ta’âlâ sirrah-ul’azîz’ stated: “Muhammad Sa’îd is one of the ’Ulamâ-i-râsikhîn. Muhammad Sa’îd is one of the Sâbiqûn. Muhammad Sa’îd is a Halîl of Allâhu ta’âlâ. The rank of Hullat was transferred from me to him. Muhammad Sa’îd is a treasure of Allâhu ta’âlâ’s compassion. On the Judgement Day he will be granted the privilege of dealing out shares from the treasury of compassion. He has a great share from the rank of Shafâ’at (intercession). Muhammad Sa’îd passed beyond the circle of nafy (negation) like Ibrâhîm ‘alaihi-salâm’. Now he is with me in ithbât (proving true). One day I saw Muhammad Sa’îd running fast along the Sirât Bridge in order to enter Paradise.”

His statement, “My nisbat is like the Mujaddid’s nisbat,” would suffice to express his greatness. He has a book of one volume titled **Mektûbât**. This book is a collection of the subtle and occult pieces of knowledge poured into his blessed heart.

There was a woman who could not have a child because of old age. She came to him and said, “Please pray to Allâhu ta’âlâ to give me a child. Your prayer will be accepted.” He made tawajjuh and then said, “Allâhu ta’âlâ is going to give you a male child.” Indeed, she did have a male child some time later.

Someone had a son who was about to die. Bewailing in tears,

he entered his presence and begged: “Hadrat Îsâ ‘alaihîs-salâm’ resuscitated dead people. You are Prophets’ inheritors. Please do make tawajjuh so that my son should recover from this plight.” The answer was a pregnant silence. A while later hadrat Muhammad Sa’îd said, “Your son’s soul left his body; yet it has come back; he is alive and in good health now.” When the man was back in his home, he found his son full of life and health.

Khawâja Muhammad Ma’t’hûm ‘quddisa sirruh’ is well known as the Imâm-i-Ma’t’hûm, the ‘Urwa-t-ul-wusqâ, renovator of the Religion. He is the Imâm’s third son. He was born in 1009 and passed away on the ninth of the month of Rebî-ul-awwal in 1079 [A.D. 1668]. Imâm-i-Rabbânî ‘rahmatullâhi ta’âlâ aleyh’ stated, “Muhammad Ma’t’hûm’s birth brought about plenty of barakat. It was in the same year when he was born that I attained the blessing of kissing my exalted teacher’s threshold, whereupon all this riches of knowledge and ma’rifat was unleashed.”

He was only three years old when he began to utter words of Tawhîd such as, “I am the earth,” “I am the sky” “I am this,” “I am that,” “That wall is the Haqq,” “That tree is the Haqq.” He memorized the whole Qur’ân al-kerîm in three months. And he was sixteen years old when he completed his education in the mental and traditional branches of knowledge and began to teach his disciples. During his education he acquired the method of dhikr and murâqaba from his noble father. Then he attained all sorts of blessings that could, or, rather, could not be imagined. Imâm-i-Rabbânî said about him, “This son of mine has idiosyncratic propensity towards the Wilâyat-i-Muhammadiyya ‘alaihîs-salâm’. He is Muhammad-ul-mashrab and is one of the Mahbûbs. The case of my son Ma’t’hûm’s obtaining our nisbat is identical with that of the author of the book **Sherh-i-Wikâya**, who memorized all the books written by his grandfather.” I am afraid that, if his speed during the stages of Sayr and Sulûk and in transcending the grades on his way and the ranks he attained were described, those who consider themselves close would flee to a distance; those who think they have arrived at their goal would run in the course of separation. When he attained hâls, high ranks, peerless values and perfections, his blessed father gave him mutlaq ijâzat (full authorization). So this son fell behind his noble father and followed him step by step in the knowledge of zâhir and bâtin. His Kashf was precisely correct and powerful; he would say what grades of Wilâyat his disciples living in far-away countries had reached and what their mashrabs (dispositions, natures) were.

One day, as he was in the presence of his blessed father, he said, "I see myself as a nûr illuminating the world." Imâm-i-Rabbânî 'qaddas-Allâhu ta'âlâ sirrah-ul-'azîz' said, "O my son! You will become the Qutb of your time. Do not forget this word of mine!" Afterwards, some time towards the death of his exalted father, the rank of **Qayyûm** was taken back from his father and given to him. Thus he became the **Qayyûm-i-zamân** and the **Qutb-i-devrân**. Imâm-i-Rabbânî said to this son of his: "My attachment to this world was due to my duty as the Qayyûm. Now you have been given this duty. All of the whole world has turned their faces in full enthusiasm towards you. The time of my transition to the Hereafter is close by." At some other time he said, "A share from nobility is seen in you. As the dough of our master the Prophet 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wa sallam' was being kneaded, they added a remaining piece into the leaven of your dough of creation." At another occasion he said, "This son of mine is one of the Sâbiqûn."

In short, his blessed body was, like his father, one of the âyats, signs of Allâhu ta'âlâ. The world, which had been dark for some time, was illuminated with their barakat.

His letters, which were elucidations of abstruse mystic knowledge and ma'rifats, were compiled in three books. He explained those parts of his exalted father's letters that were too difficult to understand, in its original language, Persian. Thus no secret was left unexplained. His Mektûbât (Letters) was written again in 1340 [A.D. 1922] and was printed in a splendid form in Pakistan in 1395 [A.D. 1985].

His kerâmats are beyond the limits of enumeration. A day before his passing away, a mysterious voice was heard at the door of every house in Serhend and in the neighboring cities. It said: "Tomorrow the Qayyûm-i-zamân Muhammad Ma'thûm will pass away. Those who wish to see him must hurry!"

The miracles and wonders that happened during his visit to the Kâ'ba-i-mu'azzama and the Rawdat-ul-mutahhara are narrated in a book that was published under the title **Al-yawâkit**. The compliments made to him by the haqîqat of Kâ'ba-i-mu'azzama, the conversations he had with our master the Prophet 'alaihis-salâm', his attaining various graces and kindnesses and many new grades in that presence are depicted in a sweet and pulchritudinous language.

The number of his disciples and the people who derived benefit

from them cannot be tallied. The fayz and perfections caused by his effective tawajjuh are the best evidences proving his high rank. More than nine hundred thousand people are said to have attained the happiness of becoming his disciples. He gave ijâzat to seven thousand of his disciples. In his presence, a disciple would attain the grade of Fanâ-i-qalbî in a week and perfection in Wilâyat in a month's time. He would make some people attain all these grades with only one tawajjuh. All his six sons were honoured with the rank of Qutb. They filled the whole world with nûr. In fact, his honourable father had said to him, "Your sons will become like me."

Hadrat Muhammad Ma'thûm 'rahmatullâhi ta'âlâ aleyh' had six sons and five daughters.

Muhammad Ferrûh and Muhammad Îsâ, two other sons of Imâm-i-Rabbânî, passed away of bubonic plague on the same day as did their eldest brother Muhammmad Sâdiq 'quddisa sirruhum'; the former was eleven and the latter was seven years old 'rahmatullâhi ta'âlâ alaihim ajma'in'.

His youngest son was Muhammad Yahyâ 'quddisa sirruh'. He memorized the whole Qur'ân al-kerîm when he was nine years old. The same year hadrat Imâm (Rabbânî) 'rahmatullâhi aleyh' passed away. He was very merciful, very compassionate to this son of his, too. After memorizing Qur'ân al-kerîm, he studied Arabic teachings. He learned most of mental and traditional knowledge from his elder brothers, and was twenty years old when he completed this education. He became a documentary source in the knowledge of Hadîth. He was an absolute document in the knowledge of Fiqh. Before he was born, the âyat-i-kerîma, "We give thee the good news of a (coming) son, whose name shall be Yahyâ," was inspired to his noble father (Imâm-i-Rabbânî). Therefore he named this son of his 'Yahyâ'. He acquired the grades of Tarîqâ-i-ahmadiyya from his elder brothers.

Muhammad Alamghîr Evrengh-i-Zîb, the time's emperor, would visit him and derive benefit from him. He made Hajj twice.

Mawlânâ Khâlid-i-Baghdâdî 'quddisa sirruh', who was the Mujaddid of the thirteenth century, the paramount and peerless scholar of his time, who had attained the spiritual grades of Ahmadiyya and who had reached perfection and had the competence to make others reach perfection, states, "In this Ummat (among Muslims), with the exception of the As-hâb-i-kirâm, I cannot see another person as good as Imâm-i-Rabbânî

‘rahmatullâhi aleyh’ in adhering to the Sunnat-i-seniyya, in having accurate and true views on the Names, Attributes and Person of Allâhu ta’âlâ, and in possessing very high, very exact and extremely subtle ma’rifats. Only Prophets ‘alaihim-us-salâm’ could recognize his haqîqat. How could Awliyâ comprehend this?” One of our superiors ‘rahmatullâhi aleyh” asked our master the Messenger of Allah ‘alaihis-salâm’ in his dream: “What would you say about the Mujaddid?” The beloved Prophet’s answer was: “I have four Khalîfas. Ahmad is the fifth.” Likewise, when Maz-har-i-Jân-i-Jânân ‘quddise sirruh’ asked our master the Prophet ‘alaihis-salâm’ a similar question in his dream, he received this answer: “Is there anyone else like him in this Ummat?”

Abdullah Dahlawî ‘rahmatullâhi aleyh’ states in the hundred and ninth letter of his **Mekâtîb-i-sherîfa**, “All Muslim countries have been covered with the fayz and nûr emanating from Imâm-i-Rabbânî Mujaddid-i-Elf-i-thânî Ahmad Fârûqî. It is wâjib for all Muslims to be grateful for his fayz. None of the other Awliyâ has informed about any ma’rifat or fayz similar to the new ma’rifats and fayz communicated by him. Formerly, Mawlânâ Khâlîd-i-Baghdâdî, Mawlawî Hirâtî and Mawlawî Qamer-ud-dîn Pishwarî were totally against him. When they visited this faqîr and attained the fayz from the Mujaddid, they realized the very high grades and ranks in this path. Muhammad Abd-ur-rasûl Berzenjî (1103 [A.D. 1690] was drowned in the sea on his way back from hajj. His book, titled **Refuting the Ignoramuses of Serhend**, cannot be an evidence for the deniers (of the Imâm). Someone named Ârif translated **Mektûbât** from Persian into Arabic without he himself understanding the subtle messages given in the book and thus changing them. When Berzenjî came across this erroneous translation in Medîna-i-munawwara he, being a person quite unaware of Tasawwuf, was disconcerted and wrote that refutation of his without thinking at all that he should inquire into the matter before doing so. On the other hand Mirzâ Muhammad Burhanpûrî, who was profoundly learned in the zâhirî and bâtinî branches of knowledge, saw the refutation and, translating Mektûbât into Arabic correctly, proved that the writings in the blessed book were perfectly concordant with the Sharî’at, naming his correct version **Atiyat-ul-ahbâb fi-r-redd-i-alal-mu’tarid-i-ala-sh-shaikh Ahmad Fârûqî**, and having Meccan scholars endorse his book.

Urwa-t-ul-wusqa Muhammad Ma'thûm, (as we have already stated), is Imâm-i-Rabbânî's son 'rahmatullâhi alaihimâ'. His book, **Mektûbât**, is in Persian and consists of three volumes. There are 239 letters in the first volume, 158 letters in the second volume, and 255 in the third. Thirty-two of these six hundred and fifty-two letters have been translated (into Turkish and thence into English) and written below. Muhammad Ma'thûm 'quddisa sirruh' passed away in the Serhend city of India in 1079 [A.D. 1668].

TWO HUNDRED AND THIRTEENTH LETTER

This letter, written to Hadrat Naqîb Shaikh Ferîd, preaches, gives advice, and recommends following the scholars of Ahl as-sunnat:

May Allâhu ta'âlâ protect you against anything that would be incommensurate with your personality. May He accept this prayer of mine for the sake of your honourable forefather 'alaihi wa 'alâ âlihis-salawâtu wa-t-taslîmât'! The sixtieth âyat of ar-Rahmân Sûra purports: **"Goodness will be returned only with goodness."** I am at a loss as to what kindness I should offer in return for all your kindnesses. Only, I have been trying to take every sacred time as an opportunity to pray for your religious and worldly salvation. Al-hamdu-li-llâh, this task, beyond me as it is, falls to my lot. Another kindness (on our part) that would (only) mean a reward (for us) would be (to offer you some) preaches and advice. It would be such a great blessing for us if you would be kind enough to accept it.

O my noble and honourable sir! The essence of all preaches and the most valuable piece of advice is to meet men of Allah and to keep them company. And being a man of Allah, and adhering to Islam, in its turn, depends on holding fast to the right way guided by the Ahl as-sunnat wa'l jamâ'at, who, among various groups, are the only group blessed with the good news that they are the group of salvation. Unless you follow the way guided by these great people, there cannot be salvation. Unless you adapt yourself to the principles that these people inferred (from Qur'ân al-kerîm and hadîth-i-sherîfs), you cannot attain happiness. These statements of ours are confirmed by owners of wisdom, by scientists, and by the kashfs of Awliyâ. There is no mistaking. One should deem it lethal poison to be friends with a person who has swerved as trivially as a grain of mustard from the right way of

these great people. One should deem it as horrifying as a snake's bite to talk to him. Men of knowledge who do not fear Allah are thieves of religion, regardless of the branch they belong to. Such people also should be kept away from. All sorts of mischief that have been undermining Islam, all the ferocious attacks directed against the religion are the evils aroused by these people. In order to obtain worldly advantages, they have assisted in the demolition of the religion. The sixteenth âyat of Baqara Sûra purports, **"They have bought dalâlat (misguidance, aberration) by paying hidâyat (guidance). They have earned nothing in this (business of) buying and selling. They have not found the right way."** This âyat-i kerîma describes these people. One day an exalted person saw the devil sitting idly and happily without trying to deceive anyone, and asked him why he was sitting idly instead of misleading people. His answer was: "Today's malicious men of religion are doing my job very well; they have left no work for me to do to deceive people." Mawlânâ 'Umar, one of the disciples stationed there, is a good person by creation. Only, he should be backed and supported so that he can tell the truth. Also, Hâfid Imâm has committed all his thoughts to the spreading of Islam. In fact, every Muslim has to be so. It is stated in a hadîth-i-sherîf, **"Unless a person is said to be crazy, his îmân will not be perfect."** You know that I, the faqîr, have been striving to explain the importance of talking with good people in all my speeches and writings. Without becoming weary, I keep saying time and again to avoid vicious company. For, these two things form the basis of the matter. It is our business to give advice and yours to take it. Or, rather, all the business belongs to Allâhu ta'âlâ. How lucky for those people whom Allâhu ta'âlâ employs as benefactors!

The greatness of the number of your generous kindnesses causes us to write all these things and makes us oblivious to the fact that we might give you a headache and boredom. Was-salâm.

TWO HUNDRED AND TWENTY-SIXTH LETTER

This letter, written to his brother Shaikh Mawdûd, reminds that the world is short-lived and that it might end in eternal torment:

My brother's cherished letter has arrived here. It has made us happy. My brother! May Allâhu ta'âlâ bless us and you with successes! Life in this world is very short. Endless torments are its

pays. Shame on a person who spends this sojourn obtaining useless, fruitless things, thus ending up in unending pains!

My brother! People from far and near are leaving aside their worldly advantages and swarming towards us like ants and locusts. And you are willingly diving into the despicable profits of this world, disignoring the value of the honour of being from the same family. You are struggling to attain those profits. The saying, “**Shame is a part from îmân,**” is a hadîth-i-sherîf.

My brother! This gathering of men of Allah, this coming together for the sake of Allah, which falls to our lot in the city of Serhend (is such a great blessing that), you would not even find another blessing a hundred times less blessed if you travelled all over the world. Nowhere else could you attain the profits that you would gain here. You have missed the blessing for nothing. Like children, you have bartered precious jewels for pieces of glass or walnuts. A Persian line rendered in English:

Shame, thousands of shame!

My brother! This fortune is hardly come by another time. The fortune may exist, yet such meetings will not take place. How will you find and obtain this blessing then? Where will you find something you have missed? With what will you compensate for the losses? You are making a mistake. You are pursuing a misunderstanding. Do not lose your heart to sweet, fatty morsels! Do not fall for sequined, lurid raiments! Such indulgences will bring repentance and lamentation in the end, both in the world and in the Hereafter. Getting oneself into troubles or risking the endless torments of the Hereafter for the sake of pleasing one’s friends and acquaintances is not something that a wise person would do. May Allâhu ta’âlâ bless you with a sound reasoning and awaken you from that slumber!

My brother! The world is notorious for its unfaithfulness. Everybody knows about the abject and niggardly ways of those who are indulgent towards the world. Shame on the person who squanders his valuable lifetime on such a worthless mendacity! What devolves on a messenger is only to deliver the message. Was-salâm.

***The sugarcane avowed to be hollow, and was sugared;
The poplar rose high, to be hewn down for firewood.***

FIRST VOLUME, 21st LETTER

If a Muslim who holds the belief of Ahl as-Sunna and obeys the Sharî'at loves the friends of Allâhu ta'âlâ, he becomes one of them. May Allâhu ta'âlâ bless us all with the lot of loving them! May He make us attain the fayz and nûrs in their hearts owing to this love! May He fill our hearts with these nûrs! A lover will always attain his darling. He will become like his darling. From the position of lover he will shift into being the loved one. The more he loves, the freer will he become of the limitations of his human properties, and the safer will he become from his harmful sensuous desires. He will attain love of Allâhu ta'âlâ. Love caused creation of the universe and uncovered the hidden treasure.

[Islam means to believe in the prophethood of Muhammad 'alaihi-salâm' and to adapt yourself to his Sharî'at. The commandments which Allâhu ta'âlâ declares in Qur'ân al-kerîm are called **Fard** (or farz). His prohibitions are called **Harâm**. Collectively, they are called the **Sharî'at**. To obey the Sharî'at means to obey Qur'ân al-kerîm. A person who believes that all the utterances of Muhammed 'alaihi-salâm' are true words dictated by Allâhu ta'âlâ is called a **Muslim**. His utterances are classified in three groups: 1- Utterances that are directly from Allâhu ta'âlâ both in wording and in meaning. These utterances of his are called **Qur'ân al-kerîm**. 2- His own utterances whose meanings were inspired into his blessed heart by Allâhu ta'âlâ. His utterances of this sort are called **Hadîth-i-qudsî**. 3- His utterances that are from him in wording and meaning. These utterances of his are termed **Hadîth-i-sherîf**. Allâhu ta'âlâ revealed Qur'ân al-kerîm to His beloved Messenger in a period of time that lasted for twenty-three years. After his passing, (all the âyats of) Qur'ân al-kerîm were compiled in one book, which was named **Qur'ân al-kerîm** or **Mus-haf**. Qur'ân al-kerîm is entirely in Arabic. Not everyone can understand its meaning. Only Muhammad 'alaihi-salâm' understood the divine meaning from the divine word and explained it to his Sahâba. A Muslim who saw the beautiful face of Muhammad 'alaihi-salâm' is called a **Sahâbî**. Altogether, they are called the **As-hâb-i-kirâm** (Or the Sahâba). The As-hâb-i-kirâm conveyed all the teachings they had acquired from the Messenger of Allah to their disciples, who in their turn explained them in their books, which number in the thousands. These people are called **Scholars of Ahl as-sunna**. Imâm of the four Madh-habs and Imâm-i-Ahmad Rabbânî and his son

Muhammad Ma'thûm are scholars of Ahl as-sunna. As it is seen, a person who wishes to learn the correct meanings purported in Qur'ân al-kerîm should read the books of **Fiqh** and **Îmân** written by scholars of Ahl as-sunna, and particularly the two sets of books that are called **Mektûbât** and which consist of three volumes each, written by two Islamic scholars in India, namely Imâm-i-Rabbânî [d. 1624] and his son Muhammad Ma'thûm 'rahimahumullah'. Books of îmân contain the pieces of knowledge to be believed with the heart. Books of fiqh contain the acts to be performed physically, i.e. the teachings of the Sharî'at. The **Qalb** is not the piece of flesh in the left half of the human chest, which is called **Yürek**, (also called heart in English). The yürek exists in animals, too. The qalb is a force embedded in the yürek. It cannot be seen. It is like the existence of electricity in a light bulb. We call it the Gönül. The gönül exists in human beings. Animals do not have it. All the limbs of the body are under the command of the heart. All the pieces of knowledge perceived by our sense organs assemble in the heart. Believing, loving, fearing are all the heart's business. It is the heart that believes or disbelieves. A person with a pure heart will obey the Sharî'at. And a person with a wicked heart will fight shy of the Sharî'at. The heart is the place of beautiful, good moral qualities as well as the wicked ones. Allâhu ta'âlâ sent down His religions and Prophets for the purpose of purifying the heart. A person with a pure heart will be good to everybody. He will be useful to his state and to his nation. He will live in comfort and peace in the world, and he will attain eternal, unending happiness in the world to come. Parents who read and learn books written by scholars of Ahl as-sunna and who try to teach them to their children are a great blessing for their children. Books, magazines and newspapers that are so are a great blessing for their readers. No matter what a person's title or position is, if he is ignorant and stupid and has not read the books written by scholars of Ahl as-sunna, or if he has not understood them though he may have read them, his words and writings, which strike out of his addle head in the name of Islam, are worthless. They are like pelting the unknown with stones. They are harmful to Islam and to the entire humanity. After the scholars of Ahl as-sunna, some ignorant and heretical people and some Jews who had mixed with them blended the ideas of Greek philosophers with the scientific teachings of their times and, adding their personal miscreant and malicious thoughts, wrote misguiding religious books. Thus, seventy-two heretical groups of **Bid'at** appeared in the Islamic

religion. Most of them disappeared in the course of time. Only the (group called) the **Shiites** survived. Today, books from three different sources are being spread over the world in the name of serving Islam: the Sunnite books, which are the true Islamic books; the Shiite books; the books published by the Wahnâbis, who are the votaries of a sect that the British founded in Saudi Arabia in the hijrî year 1150 [A.D. 1737] in order to undermine Islam from within].

FIRST VOLUME, 22nd LETTER

May Allâhu ta'âlâ bless thee with the honour of making progress in the true way of the Sharî'at! The end of the world has drawn near. Darkneses of disbelief and wrongdoing have covered everywhere. All people are caught in the storms caused by these darkneses. We have been looking for a hero to recover one Sunnat and to eliminate bid'ats. The right way cannot be found without the lights of our Prophet's Sunnats. There cannot be salvation without adapting ourselves to the Messenger of Allah. Making progress in a path of Tasawwuf and thus attaining love of Allâhu ta'âlâ requires following the Habîb (Darling, Beloved one) of Allâhu ta'âlâ. The thirty-first âyat-i-kerîma of Âl-i-'Imrân sûra, which purports, **"If you love Allâhu ta'âlâ adapt yourselves to me! Allâhu ta'âlâ loves those who follow me,"** is a witness confirming our statements. A person's attaining happiness depends on his adapting himself to the chief of all religious and worldly leaders in all his habits and worships and, in short, whatsoever he may be doing. As we so often witness in worldly affairs, one always feels a strong affection for those who resemble one's darling. One likes the people liked by one's darling and hates the darling's enemies. All the perfections and high ranks to be attained physically and spiritually are dependent upon loving the Messenger of Allah. This is the only criterion to assess the degree of a person's maturity. By the same token, the most valuable deed and worship is to love the Awliyâ, the people loved by Allâhu ta'âlâ, and to hate His enemies. For this is the greatest sign of love. The feeling of sympathy for the friend's friends and antipathy for his enemies occurs spontaneously. A lover is like a mad person in this respect. It was said: **"Unless a person is said to be insane, his îmân will not be perfect."** A person who is not so cannot have had a share from love. In this

respect, the saying, “There cannot be closeness (to one of two opposites) unless one is far (from the other).” Some ignorant people say in this connection that a person who loves hadrat Alî ought to hate the greater ones of the Ashâb-i-kirâm. This allegation is quite wrong. For, what a lover should hate is the darling’s enemies, not the darling’s friends. Allâhu ta’âlâ says about the As-hâb-i-kirâm, as is purported in the twenty-ninth âyat of the Fat-h sûra: **“They are very merciful towards one another.”** He informs that they are merciful to one another. This âyat-i-kerîma shows clearly that the As-hâb-i-kirâm had very tender and continuous mercy on one another and informs that such things as animosity, grudge, envy and hostility, which are quite incompatible with love, never existed among them. A hadîth-i-sherîf states, **“The most merciful person among my Ummat is Abû Bekr.”** Could it ever be supposed that the most merciful member of this Ummat had fostered hatred and enmity towards this Ummat?

Allâhu ta’âlâ said to Mûsâ (Moses) ‘alaihi-salâm’: **“Hast thou ever performed a good deed for Mine sake?”** He replied, “Yâ Rabbî! I have performed namâz, fasted, given the (alms called) zakât, and made dhikr of Thine Name for Thine sake.” Upon this Allâhu ta’âlâ declared, **“Thine namâz is burhân for thee [it is a token to show that you are a Believer]. Fasting is a curtain [protecting you from Hell fire]. Zakât is a zil (shadow). Dhikr is a nûr (light, halo). What hast thou done for Me?”** When hadrat Mûsâ asked, “Yâ Rabbî! What is the good deed to be done for Thee,” the divine answer came: **“Hast thou loved those whom I love? Hast thou become hostile to Mine enemies?”** Upon this, Mûsâ ‘alaihi-salâm’ realized that the deed Allâhu ta’âlâ loved best was Hubb-i-fi’llâh and bughd-i-fi’llâh (Love for the sake of Allah and enmity for the sake of Allah).

If any Wafî appears to you or helps you (when you are in a difficult position), you should ascribe this to your own Murshid. You should focus your tawajjuh on one source (Murshid).

It is sunnat to attend an invitation. However, there are stipulations for this. For instance, the dinner party should not be intended for ostentation or fame; the food offered should be halâl; there should not be any lahw [musical instruments] or lu’b [dances, women]; the feast should be open to the public. If these conditions are observed in a dinner party, one should attend it with the intention of performing a deed which is sunnat and not in order,

for instance, to satiate one's hunger or for other purposes. Sufyân-i-Sawrî^[1] states, "If a person invites (others) to a dinner without making niyyat (intention), one sin will be recorded (in his book of deeds). If a person attends an invitation for dinner without making niyyat, two sins will be recorded for him." It is not sunnat to attend an invitation one of whose conditions has not been fulfilled.

You write that your darling son has passed away. **"Innâ lillâh wa innâ ilaihi râjî'ûn."** May Haqq ta'âlâ bless you with great rewards in return (for your bereavement)! May He equip you with patience and bless you with complete acquiescence in the Qadâ-ilâhî (destiny preordained by Allâhu ta'âlâ)! The real loss would be to deprive oneself of the thawâb (which Allâhu ta'âlâ gives Believers for patience). It is stated in a hadîth-i-sherîf, **"The qadâ befalling a Believer is (an) amazing (event). When something good befalls him he makes hamd and thanks. When a disaster befalls he makes hamd and shows patience. A Believer is given thawâb for everything, even for offering a piece of food to his wife's mouth."**

FIRST VOLUME, 23rd LETTER

Tawhîd, i.e. belief in the unity of Allâhu ta'âlâ, is of two sorts: Tawhîd of the awâm, and tawhîd of the khawâss. What is termed Tawhîd of the awâm is the tawhîd held by common Muslims. Tawhîd of the awâm consists of uttering the expression **"Lâ ilâha il-l-Allah"** and knowing and believing in its meaning. It naturally comprises rejecting and denying the wrong and false idols worshipped by disbelievers, not calling anyone 'God', and believing that Allâhu ta'âlâ alone is to be worshipped. While holding this belief, the awâm (common people) feel deep affection for some creatures, too, and their nafs-i-ammâra denies and defies Allâhu ta'âlâ. The Khawâss, or Ârifis, hold the same belief. However, in addition to this naked belief, they occupy two different grades:

Those who are in the first grade do not feel affection for anything except Allâhu ta'âlâ. Their hearts do not see or know any being except Him. In other words, when an intelligent and vigilant disciple carries on his dhikr and religious contemplation steadily

[1] Sufyân-i-Sawrî passed away in Baghdâd in 161 [A.D. 778].

and keeps away from such things as musical instruments and merrymaking which the human nafs likes and yet which hinder a person from focusing his attention on Allâhu ta'âlâ, that is, from making tawajjuh to Him, and if Allâhu ta'âlâ bestowed the blessing of inâyat on him in the eternal past, the effect of dhikr will gradually cover his heart. His heart will begin to make dhikr of Allâhu ta'âlâ continuously. His zâhir's, that is, his mind's and sense organs' busying themselves with worldly matters will not interfere in his heart's dhikr. No matter whether his zâhir is absent or present, awake or asleep, his heart will always be making dhikr of Him. He will always be in the hudhûr-i-ilâhî, when he is alone as well as when in company. A distich:

***My body and mind are busy shopping,
Yet my heart is with Allah.***

When the heart is always in the divine company, the mâ-siwâ, i.e. love of creatures, will gradually leave the heart. It will begin to forget about all other beings. This oblivion will finally reach the extent that the heart will not remember anything, no matter whether the owner of the heart wishes to do so or not. Others' happinesses or sorrows will not affect it at all. This stage is termed **Fanâ-i-qalb** and is the first of the grades of Wilâyat. In this grade the bâtin, i.e. the heart, is always in the hudhûr-i-ilâhî and has completely forgotten about the mâ-siwâ. Yet the nafs is still itself; it is aware of everything and maintains its insubordination to Allâhu ta'âlâ.

In the second grade, the nafs of the Khawâss begins to forget about itself and about everything. Its desires decrease, both in number and in their command over the heart. Eventually it reaches a state in which it can no longer express the word 'I' (Ana) about itself. At this time the Ârif becomes completely nonexistent. He is now in his own company. These statements of ours do not come to mean that the Ârif becomes Haqq or that he unites with Allâhu ta'âlâ. Hallâj-i-Mansûr's^[1] utterance, "Ana'l-Haqq=I have united with my Rabb," took place before he reached this grade. For the nafs cannot say 'I' in this grade. So is the case with the utterance, "Subhânî=I am not one of creatures." This stage is called **Fanâ-i-nafs**. In the Fanâ-i-qalb, the figures, the images of the mâ-siwâ are no longer seen on the heart's mirror. Reflections of

[1] Hallâj-i-Mansûr was martyred in Baghdâd in 306 [A.D. 919].

the beings in the anfus (in man) and in the âfâk cease to exist. The **tajallî-i af'âl** comes into being. In the second grade of Fanâ the **Tajallî-i-sifât** comes into being, the 'ilm-i-hudûrî of the nafs ceases to exist and the Ârif forgets about himself. This is the end of the progress called Sayr and Sulûk in Tarîqat.

FIRST VOLUME, 49th LETTER

May Haqq subhânahu wa ta'âlâ bless thee with the bliss of attaining all your religious and worldly wishes! The only effective hygienic treatment against the harms of the world's transitory flavours and blessings is to use them in a manner and amount prescribed by the Sharî'at; i.e. to obey the commandments of Allâhu ta'âlâ. These flavours will be harmful if they are not enjoyed compatibly with the Sharî'at. They will incur wrath and torment on the part of Allâhu ta'âlâ. To ensure perfect salvation, these flavours must be enjoyed as little as possible. Those who cannot do without them should use protective medicament against them. Thus they will be safe against their harms. Shame on those people who can neither do without them nor apply the prescribed medication against their harms and thus drift into disasters and afflictions and deprive themselves of happiness! Those who obey the desires of their nafs and run after worldly pleasures and thus run away from the genuine and everlasting flavours of Paradise are so wretched. Do they not know that Allâhu ta'âlâ sees everything? Have they not heard that safety against harms depends on utilizing worldly enjoyments as prescribed by the Sharî'at? The day of questioning and judgement will certainly come and everybody will be confronted with what he has done in the world. How lucky for those who avoid their Rabb's prohibitions in the world and therefore will find themselves having attained His love that day. How lucky, how lucky for those who do not fall for the sequined life of this world, who fear the torment promised by their Rabb and curb the desires of their nafs, and who advise people under their command to perform namâz. May salâm be to those who follow the way to salvation shown by Allâhu ta'âlâ and who adapt themselves to Muhammad 'alaihîs-salâm'!

FIRST VOLUME, 50th LETTER

Ma'ârif-i-ilâhî, i.e. knowing Allâhu ta'âlâ and His Attributes, is more valuable than performing wonders and discovering mysteries. Difference between ma'rifats and wonders is similar to the difference between the Creator and the creature. Authentic ma'rifats signify perfection of îmân and contribute to its perfection. Man's perfection has by no means any dependency on wonders. Only, wonders happen on some people who have attained perfection. Awliyâ's superiority to one another is assessed by their ma'rifats and by their kashfs on the Zât-i-ilâhî (Divine Person) and on the **Sifât-i-ilâhî** (Divine Attributes), not by their kashfs on the mysteries about creatures or by their displaying kerâmats (wonders). If wonders were preferable to Ma'ârif-i-ilâhî, Hindu priests called Jûkiyya and Brahmins, who perform wonders by subjecting themselves to mortifications, would necessarily be superior to the Awliyâ who have attained very high grades of Ma'ârif and who avoid making a show of wonders. Wonders and miracles may happen also through those disbelievers who subject themselves to mortifications such as hunger. They are not symptoms of being loved by Allâhu ta'âlâ. A person who wishes to have kerâmats and kashfs inclines towards creatures. He does not wish to attain love of Allâhu ta'âlâ. A short poem:

***The devil, accursed as he is,
Shows wonders, wherever he is.
He'll enter under doors or roofs alike,
And lodge in hearts as in bodies!***

***Never believe in false stories!
Avoid all extraordinaries!
Real wonders are in true worships,
And the rest are all calamities!***

Man's perfection lies in his realization of his being fânî (transitory, subject to nonexistence). The ultimate objective of the Sharî'at and the Tarîqat is to lead man to the realization that he is a mere nothing. Making a fame by displaying wonders and miracles, on the other hand, caters to feelings of self-conceit, which in turn deprives one of the benefits of the Sharî'at and the Tarîqat. A person who is in this state will not attain any ma'rifats. Abû

Sa'îd Abu-l-khayr,^[1] one of the greatest Awliyâ, was asked: "So and so walks on water (without sinking. What do you think)?" He replied, "It is quite easy. Seagulls walk on water, too." They said, "So and so flies in air." He said, "Birds and flies can fly, too." When they said, "So and so goes from one city to another in a flash," his answer was: "The devil also can travel from the far east to the far west in the same breath. Such things are of no value. A manly person will lead a life like anybody else. He will do shopping. He will get married. And he will not forget Allâhu ta'âlâ even for a moment."

Shihâb-ud-dîn Suhrawardî,^[2] a great Walî, after giving detailed information about wonders and miracles in his book **Awârif**, brings his discourse to the following conclusion: "All these wonders and kerâmats are almost nothing when compared to the heart's drilling dhikr of Allâhu ta'âlâ."

Shaikh-ul-islâm Hirawî Abdullah Ansârî^[3] states, "Intuition attained by a person with ma'rifats is to see whether a person is sâlih, (pious, obedient to Islam) or fâsiq (sinful, wrongdoing) at first sight. Intuition possessed by people who subject themselves to hunger and other methods of mortification is to see where (secret) things are and to inform about, (say), lost property. People in the latter category inform about (things pertaining to) creatures. For they are unaware of Allâhu ta'âlâ. People of Ma'ârif, on the other hand, recognizing the pieces of information, the hâls and ma'rifats coming to their hearts from Allâhu ta'âlâ, always inform about (facts inspired by) Allâhu ta'âlâ. People are mostly oblivious of Allâhu ta'âlâ and their hearts are occupied by worldly thoughts; consequently, they wish to know about material beings, to find out about unknown things. They look on people who inform about these things as Ahl-ullah, as Awliyâ, as people loved by Allâhu ta'âlâ. They do not attach any importance to the kashfs of the people of haqîqat, of the Awliyâ. They do not believe in the information these people convey from Allâhu ta'âlâ. They say, 'If these people were men of Allah (Ahlullah), they would know and inform about facts about creatures. How can a person who is unaware of facts about creatures know about things of higher level, how can he be an ârif of Allâhu ta'âlâ?' As

[1] Abû Sa'îd Abu-l-khâyir passed away in 440 [A.D. 1048].

[2] Shihâb-ud-dîn 'Umar Suhrawardî Shâfi'î Siddîqî passed away in Baghdad in 636 [A.D. 1234].

[3] Abdullah Ansârî passed away in Hirât in 481 [A.D. 1088].

a result of this wrong reasoning they deny the Ahlullah and reject the Awliyâ. Because Allâhu ta'âlâ loves His Awliyâ very much, He does not want them to waste their time on creatures, to think of anyone except Him. If they had busied themselves with states of creatures they would not have reached grades of Wilâyat. As those people who busy themselves with states of creatures will be deprived of ma'rifats pertaining to Allâhu ta'âlâ, the Ahlullah do not think of states pertaining to creatures. If the Ahlullah concentrated their attention on states about creatures, they would understand these states better than the others. Because Allâhu ta'âlâ does not care about the firâsat (intuition, insight) which some people attain by polishing the mirror of their nafs by way of mortifications, this firâsat happens on Jews and Christians, [on Shiites and Wahhâbîs] as well as on Muslims. That is, this firâsat is not peculiar to the Ahlullah (men of Allah, people loved by Allah).”

Some Awliyâ are permitted to display wonders in case of necessity or if it will be useful. Incompetent people's talking on matters pertaining to Ma'ârif-i-ilâhî will not detract from the value of ma'rifats. These talks are like a dustman's handling a precious jewel, which will not deplete the jewel of its value at all. Depraved people's informing about the ma'rifats they have heard from the Awliyâ is of no value. If they attribute this information to their own kashfs and hâls instead of acknowledging that they have heard it from others, the devil will show them false things in the guise of true ones, representing each of them as Haqq.

Imâm-i-Rabbânî states, “Very frequently, the sâlik (disciple making progress in the grade of Sulûk) is shown the world of souls. Because this world is very fine and immaterial, he thinks what he sees is Allâhu ta'âlâ. The soul's containing and penetrating this world (of souls) appears to him as though it were a containing and penetration done by Allâhu ta'âlâ.” A great Shaikh of Tasawwuf said, “For thirty years I mistook my own soul for Haqq ta'âlâ and worshipped my soul.” Imâm-i-Rabbânî states in one of his letters, “One of the Meshâikh wrote me a letter, saying, ‘I have reached a grade in the rank of Fanâ, and it is such a grade that when I look at the earth I cannot see it. When I look at the sky I cannot find it, either. I cannot know about the Arsh, the Kursî, Paradise and Hell, either. Nor can I find myself. When I go near someone I cannot find him, either. Existence of Allâhu ta'âlâ is beyond limitations. No one has found the end of His existence. ... I know this state of mine as the end of the way of

Tasawwuf. Also, the Meshâikh-i-kirâm have said that the way ended here. It is quite all right if you, too, know this state as the last grade. Yet if you say that there are other higher grades, please write to me, so that I shall visit you and attain Haqq ta'âlâ.' ” In his answering letter Imâm-i-Rabbânî wrote to this person, “A person who has reached this grade has reached only a fourth of the grades of heart. This state is to become Fânî (to attain Fanâ) in the element of air, one of the four elements. Because air contains (and penetrates) everything, he (the person in this grade) sees air wherever he looks, and thinks that all this thing he sees is Haqq ta'âlâ.” Most people thought this kind of tawhîd to be a kashf and a hâl. However, the thing that reveals itself to the heart is not a kashf. It is an image. It happens in the imaginations of people who are preoccupied in this thought. As a matter of fact, Imâm-i-Rabbânî states in a letter of his, in which he elaborates on Tawhîd-i-shuhûdî and Tawhîd-i-wujûdî: “Tawhîd-i-wujûdî mostly happens on a person when he meditates on Tawhîd very much and when he interprets the word ‘Lâ ilâha il-l-Allah’ as ‘There is no being except Allâhu ta'âlâ’. It occurs in the imaginations of those who make dhikr in this manner. It is not a kashf or hâl coming to the heart. A person in this state is quite unaware of grades pertaining to the heart. When a man of Tasawwuf who is in the right way is so much vulnerable to erring, one should imagine the degree of deviation in the utterances of those depraved people who have fallen into the devil’s trap.”

The Murshid is a vehicle transporting fayz. [He is like a tap allowing the fluid coming from the basin, from the main source.] How can one attain one’s goal if the vehicle is not a true one [if the tap is not connected to the main source]? Then, for attaining the rank of **Fanâ fillâh** it is necessary to become fânî in a Murshid who is connected to the main source, [to attain his love and to forget about everything]. To love a Murshid is to adapt oneself to him. The fayz coming through the Murshid’s heart is received in proportion to the amount of love felt for the Murshid. If one has the luck of sohbat (being in the Murshid’s company), the fayz received will be much more. When fayz comes, love of the mâ-siwâ [creatures] leaves the heart. Names of Allâhu ta'âlâ begin to make tajallî [manifest]. Beqâ (annihilation of self) takes place with these Names. Kemâlât and Esmâ-i-ilâhî (Divine Names) are endless. Their tajallîs in the heart are endless. If the Râbita is powerful and the Murshid’s outward appearance manifests itself permanently, the fayz will be abundant and it will be easy to receive

it. The same amount of fayz cannot be received by making dhikr. If one gets blessed with serving (the Murshid), being in his presence and attaining his sohbat, it will be much easier to receive fayz. It was owing to the blessing of hudûr and sohbat (being in the presence of the Messenger of Allah) that the As-hâb-i-kirâm became (the Prophet's) As-hâb. Weys-al-qarânî received plenty of fayz through spiritual contact [connection of love]. Yet he could not attain the degree reached by the As-hâb-i-kirâm. The outward appearance, the image seen during the Râbita is not the Murshid himself. The Murshid himself has such peculiarities as cannot exist in his image.

There are conditions to be fulfilled, such as being given to worship and dhikr, avoiding useless talk, secluding oneself in order to protect oneself from seeing nâ-mahram. While doing all this, it is a must, of course, to observe other people's rights.

Seeing souls is a matter of heart and insight. So is the case with seeing them when the eyes are open. Seeing souls is not a sign of perfection.

FIRST VOLUME, 72nd LETTER

Attaining high religious grades requires [having the î mân taught by the scholars and then obeying the Sharî'at and then] a strong affectional attachment to the the scholars of Ahl as-sunna. A true devotee, owing to his affection towards the Murshid, receives the fayz coming from the Murshid's bâtin [heart]. Gradually, he becomes like the Murshid. It has been said that Fanâ fi-sh-shaikh (being Fânî in one's Shaikh, Murshid) is the beginning of Fanâ-i-haqîqî. Without Râbita and Fanâ fi-sh-shaikh, one cannot attain Haqîqat only by way of dhikr. Dhikr is one of the ways of attaining, yet it has to be accompanied by Fanâ fi-sh-shaikh, that is, excessive love for the Murshid. If the Murshid, too, makes tawajjuh, Râbita without dhikr will make one attain the goal. In other paths, there are compulsory practices such as dhikring, reciting portions from Qur'ân al-kerîm at stated times, mortifications and going into forty-day retreats. Strong attachment to the Murshid is not a condition. This order of Tarîqat, however, is the way of As-hâb-i-kirâm. In this order, ifâda and istifâda [the procedure of receiving and giving fayz] takes place by way of reflection [from heart to heart]. Attending the (Murshid's) sohbat will do, provided one shall observe the rules of adab. Dhikring and reciting portions from Qur'ân al-

kerîm and doing pious deeds will be helpful. Attending Rasûlullah's sohbat, only on the condition that they had îmân, submission and obedience, was enough for the As-hâb-i-kirâm to attain perfection. For this reason, the Naqshbendî path leads to perfection fast. In receiving fayz from the Murshîd-i-kâmil, it does not make any difference whether a person is young or old or an infant or dead. Perfections given at the end are also given in the beginning in this path. The riyâzat to be performed in this way is to hold fast to the Sunnat-i-seniyya and to avoid bid'ats. Khwâja 'Ubaydullah-i-Ahrâr^[1] states, "The belief held by the sâliks making progress in this path is the belief of Ahl as-Sunnat wa-l-jamâ'at. Their riyâzat is to obey the Shari'at. People who do not perform the worships will not receive any fayz. Nor will they make any progress. The end of this path is to forget about creatures and to attain permanent Hudûr-i-ilâhî. This happiness cannot be attained without excessive affection and jazba. The most powerful vehicle that will make one attain this blessing is the Murshid's sohbat." Man, a helpless being, is bogged down in worldly pleasures and the desires of nafs. He is unaware of the desires of heart and soul. It is impossible to receive fayz from Allâhu ta'âlâ without a connector. Allâhu ta'âlâ sends His fayz through Rasûlullah. A Murshid-i-kâmil, who can receive through his Murshids the fayz continuously streaming out of Rasûlullah's blessed heart and scatter it around himself, is requisite. What connects one's heart to the Murshid's heart is a strong affection and love one has for him. This love necessitates observing the rules of adab and adapting oneself to one's Murshid in worships, habits and manners. The most effective of all these things is to do Râbita. When the Râbita is powerful, one sees one's Murshid wherever one looks. A person who wishes to attain love of Allâhu ta'âlâ must be sincere. He must wish only His love, find a Murshid who will make him attain Him, and attach himself to that Murshid. The bigger the number of people he is attached to, the farther will he get from unity in his wish, in knowledge and love and the more badly will he be deprived from the real Wâhid (One). The farther he gets from kathrat (creatures), the closer will he be to the real unity. A person who tries to get away is on the way yet. A person who has freed himself from kathrat, that is, who has manumitted his self from the fetters of seeing, knowing and loving the mâ-siwâ [creatures], has attained haqîqat. His

[1] Ubaydullah-i-Tashkendî passed away in Semmerkand in 895 [A.D. 1490].

heart is now so oblivious of the mâ-siwâ that he would not be able to remember them even if he exerted himself for years to do so. This is called **Fanâ-i-qalb**. It is the first grade of Kemâlât-i-Wilâyat.

FIRST VOLUME, 80th LETTER

May Allâhu ta'âlâ bless thee with attaining thine wishes! Or, rather, may He rescue thee from thine wishes and make thee conformable with His Irâda-i-ilâhiyya (Divine Will)! The rank of 'abdiyyat (being a born slave) is adamiyyat (nonexistence). There is no existence in 'abdiyyat. Nonetheless for will. Will originates from existence, from self. Existence as big as a mote in the heart of a lover of Allah becomes as big as a mountain. It is impossible to get rid of this state unless Allâhu ta'âlâ blesses one with His special Kindness. Unless the heart is attracted, worships performed only physically will not free the heart from these mountains. Unless a fire of love flares up in the heart and unless one is blessed with a fire of love to burn away any traces of polytheism in the heart, it is out of the question to attain freedom from and safety against this heavy burden. As long as a sâlik (person who makes progress in one of the orders of Tasawwuf) has a will [or wish], he is to be called Murîd. When he is freed from the enthrallment of his will and wish and set on the Irâda-i-ilâhiyya, he will become suitable for the rank of Irshâd (guidance). This blessing, which is the initial grade in the kemâlât-i-wilâyat, along with all the other grades of kemâlât-i-wilâyat, is sprinkled bounteously from a source of haloes now, i.e. from the grave of Imâm-i-Rabbânî Ahmad Fârûqî Serhendî, our Murshid. Those who have gathered around this Rawda-i-munawwara (garden of blessings), even those faithful adherents coming from other places, when they rub their heads on the soil of its entrance, attain plentiful fayz. Today India's city of Serhend is a source of abundant fayz and nûr and occult, mystical manifestations and therefore it has become an object of envy not only for the other cities of India but also for all other countries. This blessed city should not be considered (only) as a part of India. Here is the gate of Wilâyat. The land of India has become dough kneaded with the nectar of Wilâyat and has become a hub of Hidâyat and Irshâd. Those who have been burned to ashes by the sparks emitted from this fire have become incapacitated from describing the pulchritude of this land. They have been rendered short of disclosing its plenteous fayz,

unfathomable mysteries and immeasurable blessings. Those who visit the place and attach their hearts receive this fayz. Those who are true and just realize this. The precious jewels they are honoured with obtaining from this occult source of nûr are seldom come by in countries where other Walîs are. People who are blessed with a draught of love from this spring of Wilâyat are disenthralled from âfâqî and enfusî dependencies.

FIRST VOLUME, 128th LETTER

Spiritual states experienced by saliks who have not reached the rank of Fanâ and Baqâ are of no value. A person who wishes to attain Haqq ta'âlâ should retreat from His mâ-siwâ [creatures]. A person who wishes ahwâl (hâls) and mawâjîd (raptures, ecstasies) wishes the mâ-siwâ. Fanâ and Baqâ are necessary. One has to try to obtain these two. Wilâyat is attained through these two. The kind of ma'rifat which is the cause of our discovery is attainable by way of these two. The spiritual states which are caused in the heart by zeal and love are not necessary. When the beauty is incomprehensible, love for that beauty will also be of the incomprehensible sort. Some raptures may be experienced. One may cry and wail, for instance. Loving one's nafs very much is common to everybody. All sorts of love, including one's love of property, love of one's wife and children, are the results of one's love for one's nafs. One's love for one's nafs does not produce any raptures such as crying. Mahbûb-i-haqîqî (The genuine, real darling) is loved more than the nafs. Fanâ is the outcome of this love. So is the case with loving the Messenger of Allah 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wa sallam'. It is stated in a hadîth-i-sherîf, **“Unless a person loves me more than (he loves) his nafs and household and all other people, he will not have had full îmân in me.”** The Murshid is the representative of the Messenger of Allah. Love for the Murshid, therefore, should be of the same sort.

***Whatsoever is beautiful, except remembering Him,
Is a poison to the soul, be it sweetmeat with cream!***

FIRST VOLUME, 130th LETTER

All sorts of perfections, visible or invisible, are within this brilliant Sharî'at and inherent in adapting oneself to the Last One of Prophets 'alaihi wa alaihim-us-salawât wa-l-barakât'. Only those who follow his way are blessed with Jazba and Sulûk. Fanâ

and Baqâ are his attributes. **Wilâyat-i-sughrâ**, **Wilâyat-i-kubrâ** and **Wilâyat-i-ulyâ** are only drops from his ocean of Wilâyat. Nubuwwat and Risâlat (Prophethood and Messengership) are the harvest of his nûrs. The signs and symbols in Qur'ân al-kerîm are mysteries belonging to him 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wa alâ Âlihi wa Ansârihi wa sallam'.

FIRST VOLUME, 195th LETTER

Our Prophet's having been commanded to adapt himself to the people of Ibrâhîm 'alaihis-salâm' and to aspire after the reminiscences of the salawât and barakât bestowed on him (Ibrâhîm 'alaihis-salâm') was intended so that he (Muhammad 'alaihis-salâm') should go through the rank of Ibrâhîm 'alaihis-salâm' and attain higher ranks. Going through Ibrâhîm's 'alaihis-salâm' rank requires adapting oneself to his people. For attaining his rank there is no other way than adapting oneself to his people. Difference between these two ranks is like the difference between a mosque and its mihrâb (niche in a mosque which shows the direction of qibla and where the imâm stands to conduct the namâz in jamâ'at). The imâm has to walk through the mosque in order to reach the mihrâb, his rank. The mihrâb is like the center of a circle. The mosque is like the area surrounded by the circle. When Rasûlullah reached Maqâm-i-Ibrâhîm (the rank of Ibrâhîm 'alaihis-salâm') and then entered the rank of Mahbûb, which was exclusively peculiar to him, he pulled hadrat Abû Bekr Siddîq up to take his place beside him.

FIRST VOLUME, 202nd LETTER

In this short span of life, do the most important things! Know it a great blessing to spend your nights worshipping and to weep through early mornings! Illuminate dark nights with lights of dhikr! Be honest and reliable in your trade affairs! It is stated in a hadîth-i-sherîf, "**Allâhu ta'âlâ loves a faithful tradesman.**" Do not make business contracts that are fâsid or which are based on interest! This is one of the dangers which scholars are vulnerable to. Imagine how perilous a situation non-scholars are in! I wonder if anyone is free from such corrupt contracts? Learn how to make contracts conformable with the Sharî'at from true men of religion [or from their books]! Be extra cautious in this respect! Pray and trust yourself to Allâhu ta'âlâ to protect you against this risky deed! We send our salâm to those who are in the right way!

SECOND VOLUME, 36th LETTER

One does not need anyone's permission for doing with the intention of earning thawâb those practices which our Prophet described and did himself and yet which are not exclusive to him (as the Prophet). Rasûlullah's having done them is already a permission and a document, too, to prove that they are permissible practices. On the other hand, effectiveness of some special practices, dhikrs, benedictions and amulets, which are intended to attain certain wishes or to elude certain hardships, is liable to a special permission on the part of one's Master and Murshid.

After Rasûlullah's death, some people saw him and talked to him, wide awake as they were. His blessed body never leaves his grave. His blessed grave is never left empty. Greater ones of this Ummat have also been seen in various countries at the same time. For example, Shâh-i-naqshbend Muhammad Bahâ-ud-dîn^[1] reportedly has been present at seven different places at the same time of Iftâr and joined the meal called Iftâr at each of these seven places. These appearings are spiritual. The soul reveals itself in physical form. Prophets are alive in their graves. However, the life they lead is not worldly life. They have left the world and entered the Hereafter. They perform namâz in their graves. Transition from this world to the world to come is termed **mawt** (death). The situation martyrs are in is even better. Their life in the Hereafter is more powerful. Whereas (dead) Prophets are called **emwât** (dead) in Qur'ân al-kerîm, an âyat purports about martyrs: **“Do not say ‘emwât’ about those who have been killed in the way of Allah! They are alive. Yet you do not know.”**

The thawâb for alms given [or for âyats of Qur'ân al-kerîm recited] should first be sent as a gift to the blessed soul of our Prophet and then sent to the souls of dead Muslims. Pious deeds are more likely to be accepted if this procedure is followed. However, doing so is not a condition stipulated for the acceptability of alms. It will be good also to send the thawâb as a gift to the souls of all Believers. Each and every Believer will receive all the thawâb (earned for the pious deed performed, e.g. the alms given). This will by no means detract from the thawâb which the dead person for whom the pious deed is intended will receive.

[1] Shâh-i-naqshbend passed away in 791 [A.D. 1389].

No one except our Prophet was taken to (heaven in an event called) Mi'râj (as he was) awake. There have been people whose souls only have been lifted up when they were awake and their eyes were open. Such things are of no value when they happen in dreams.

Hadrat Alî 'kerrem-Allâhu wejeh' was (Allah's) compassion completely. He can never have cursed anybody — may Allâhu ta'âlâ protect us from such an assertion! [This part of the thirty-sixth letter is fairly long. Its translation exists in the eleventh paragraph of the fifth subdivision of the second part of our book].

Khâtima [the last breath, (that is, whether a person will die as a Believer or a disbeliever,)] cannot be known. It is not valid to render judgement on the khâtima of people who have passed away. It is permissible to have a good opinion on the khâtima of Murshids and other great religious superiors in accordance with the fairly prevailing presumption [inferred from the symptoms of good end seen on them as they died]. A judgement in this respect cannot be based on inspirations. The number of Enbiyâ (Prophets who did not bring a new Sharî'at but were assigned the duty of revitalizing the Sharî'at brought by a former Prophet) is not known. It is widely known that the number of Rasûls (Prophets to each of whom a new Sharî'at, a new Canon was revealed) is three hundred and thirteen.

SECOND VOLUME, 37th LETTER

A fatwâ has been given that it is permissible for a person who does not have one day's food to ask for it. However, it is taqwâ and azîmat not to ask at all. It is mubâh (permitted) in cases of strong necessity such as a danger of illness or death. It is mubâh for a person who does not have clothes to ask for clothes under these conditions. If a person is healthy enough to work and earn his living, it is not permissible for him to beg. If a person studies religious knowledge and does not have time to make a living, it is permissible for him to ask from others. It is not permissible for a person who could earn his living by writing to ask from others. It is stated in the explanation of **Mishkât**,^[1] "If a person is too ill

[1] Mishkât is a commentary of Mesâbîh. Huseyn Beghâwî, the author of Mesâbîh, passed away in 516 [A.D. 1122], and Muhammad Waliyy-ud-dîn, the author of Mishkât, passed away in 749 [A.D. 1348]. There are Arabic and Persian explanations of Mishkât.

to work, it is permissible for him to earn his daily food by begging. It is not permissible (for this person) to beg for more (than a day's food). If a person cannot find time to work because of supererogatory namâz and supererogatory fasting, it is not permissible for him to ask for zakât or alms. It is permissible for someone else to ask (for zakât and alms) on behalf of this person.

There are three different harms in asking for help. First, it means to imply that Allâhu ta'âlâ sends His blessings in small amounts, which is harâm. Second, it means to humiliate oneself; it is not permissible for a Believer to humiliate himself before anyone except Allâhu ta'âlâ. Third, it means to annoy someone by asking from him, which is harâm, too, unless there is strong necessity to do so. For this reason, people of taqwâ have not asked for anything from anybody. Bishr-i-Hâfi^[1] would not ask for anything from anyone except Sirr-î-Seqatî. And he explained this exception as follows: "I know he will be happy when he gives something to someone. I am asking in order to make him happy." Bishr stated, "There are three groups of poor people: The first group will not ask (for anything) and will not accept anything offered to them. These people are with angels in the Illiyyîn (the highest of the eight Gardens of Paradise mentioned in Qur'ân al-kerîm). The second group will not ask, yet they will accept what is given to them. These people are with the Muqarrabs in the Gardens of Paradise. The second group will ask when they need. These people are called Sâdiq and they are with the As-hâb-i-yemîn." In conclusion, we say that it is harâm and very ugly to beg without any strong necessity. It is mubâh in case of strong necessity or need. Yet it will cause one's demotion. It becomes wâjib in case of danger of death. If one does not ask from others and dies as a result of this, one dies as a sinful person. Rasûlullah 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wa sallam' sent a present to hadrat 'Umar 'radiy-Allâhu anh'. 'Umar 'radiy-Allâhu anh' would not accept the present and sent it back. When they met some time later, the Messenger of Allah asked, **"Why didn't you accept it?"** Hadrat 'Umar answered, "O the Messenger of Allah! You said, **'The most beneficent among you is the one who would not take anything from anyone.'** " Upon this Rasûlullah said, **"That statement of mine was about asking and taking. If something comes to you without your asking for it, it is rizq (sustenance) sent**

[1] Bishr-i-Hâfi and Sirrî passed away in Baghdâd, the former in 227 [A.D. 841] and the latter in 251 [865].

by Allâhu ta'âlâ.” Hadrat 'Umar answered, “I swear by Allâhu ta'âlâ that I shall never ask for anything from anyone and I shall take anything that will come without my asking for it.” It is stated in a hadîth-i-sherîf, **“If a person who is hungry or who needs something does not ask from anybody and expects his need from Allâhu ta'âlâ, Allâhu ta'âlâ will open gates of one year's sustenance for him.”**

SECOND VOLUME, 38th LETTER

The most adamant blind between man and Allâhu ta'âlâ is man's nafs. It was stated, **“Leave your nafs and come to me! You are the very cloud covering the sun you have been looking for! Recognize yourself!”** Removal of the nafs from between is a business for the conscience [heart] and a matter of zawk. It cannot be explained by means of oral or written statements. Nor can it be understood by reading books. First of all, one has to have been blessed with it in the eternal past and therefore it requires jazba [being attracted] by Allâhu ta'âlâ. In this world of causations, the Murshid-i-kâmil's sohbat will be enough on the condition that one should love (one's Murshid). Depending on the degree of love one has (for the Murshid), one will take as much as one can of the fayz being broadcast by the Murshid-i-kâmil's heart and coming to him and thus attain perfection. The hadîth-i-sherîf, **“One will be with whomever one loves,”** informs with this fact.

SECOND VOLUME, 39th LETTER

Bodies of the Ahlullah [Awliyâ] are Allah's compassion, alive or dead alike. The fayz and barakat which they broadcast through their lifetime go on after their death, too. Their fayz and barakat continue to pour into people who continue following them. The case is like that of the haloes of sunnats, which are annihilated by the (noxious rays produced by the) bid'ats invented and inserted into Islam (in the name of worships and pious deeds). Try to perform beneficial deeds! Row a race in doing pious deeds and worships! Deem it a fortune [advantage] to serve the children of the deceased! Please them in a manner compatible with the Sharî'at!

SECOND VOLUME, 42nd LETTER

May Allâhu ta'âlâ protect thee against the evils of the cruel! Disasters come from Him. And again, He, alone, is the savior from calamities. There is a (preordained) length of time for each (disaster). Lamenting [and complaining] will therefore be futile. Trusting oneself to Him [and supplicating Him] will eliminate all sorts of griefs. Not to pray is the worst grief. [He loves those who pray. So one should look on cares and afflictions as blessings inasmuch as they cause one to pray and consequently to be loved by Him].

SECOND VOLUME, 45th LETTER

My dear son! Apparently, the world is sweet, delicious. Inwardly, however, it is poisonous and worthless. He who falls into its trap can never save himself. He who dies with this poison will become a carrion. It is lunacy to lose your heart to it. It is like lacquered filth, sugar-coated poison. A person with wisdom will not fall for such false, spurious beauty. He will not set his heart on impure, hurtful pleasures. He will spend this short life of his endeavouring to ingratiate himself with his Owner. He will do the things that will be useful for him in the Hereafter. He will do his duties as a born slave. He will hold fast to the commandments of Allâhu ta'âlâ. He will avoid His prohibitions. Shame on those people who do the opposite and chase after harmful things!

***Offending the true friend is what I fear;
It burns me day and night, so hard to bear!***

[The world (in this context) means harmful things hated and prohibited by Allâhu ta'âlâ. A person who avoids the harâms has protected himself from the world's deceptions. Allâhu ta'âlâ has not prohibited any pleasure, any flavour in the world. What He forbids is to enjoy these pleasures in excessive and inordinate measures and injurious manners. He commands us to utilize them in salutary and modest doses and prescribes these doses.]

SECOND VOLUME, 59th LETTER

Muhammad 'alaihissalâm' is the origin of all the sûrî [visible, outward] kemâlât [perfections, advantages] and the ma'nawî [invisible, spiritual] ranks. Physical practices and

prohibitions, worships coming from him reached us through a succession of scholars. And we received the occult and mystical knowledge pertaining to the bâtin [heart] via the chain of Sôfiyya-i-kirâm. Abû Hureyra ‘radiy-Allâhu anh’ stated, “I acquired two kinds of knowledge from the Messenger of Allah ‘sall-Allâhu ta’âlâ alaihi wa âlihi wa sallam’. I have conveyed one of them to you. You would kill me if I divulged the second one.” When ‘Umar ‘radiy-Allâhu anh’ passed away, his son Abdullah said, “One-ninth of knowledge is dead.” Upon seeing that his statement aroused feelings of doubt in some of the people around him, he added, “By knowledge I mean ‘knowing Allâhu ta’âlâ’, not the teachings on matters of menstruation and lochia.” All the Tarîqat [paths] originate from Rasûlullah. Walîs received them through their Murshids. None of them opened their paths. Molla Jâmî says in **Nefehât**, “The first person to mention the term was Abû Sa’îd-il-harrâz.^[1] The essence of Tarîqat were derived from Rasûlullah’s blessed heart. Their names were given afterwards. Rasûlullah ‘sall-Allâhu alaihi wa sallam’ would make dhikr with his blessed heart before the Bî’that [before he was forty years old]. It would not be right to say that such things as making tawajjuh to Allâhu ta’âlâ, doing dhikr through nafy and ithbât [Kelima-i-tawhîd] and doing muraqaba (religious meditation) did not exist during the ‘Asr-i-sa’âdat or in the time of As-hâb-i-kirâm. The blessed Messenger was busy with these things during those well-known moments when he remained silent. These names did not exist in those days, yet what they represented did. The Prophet’s blessed utterances were dhikr and his silence was fikr (thought, meditation, thinking). Tafakkur means thought’s improvement from wrong to right. This hadîth-i-sherîf is well known: “**A little tafakkur (for a short while) is more useful than one year’s worship.**” Those who assert that these things did not exist at that time ought to put forward their proofs.

The dhikr of nafy and ithbât, which exists in Tarîqat, was taught by Hidir ‘alaihis-salâm’ to Abd-ul-khâliq Ghonjduwânî.^[2] Something taught by Hidir ‘alaihis-salâm’ could certainly not be something which was bid’at or which did not contain nûrs or lights or which would not be a remedy for illnesses. Should it be

[1] Abû Sa’îd-i-Harrâz passed away in Baghdâd in 277 [A.D. 890].

[2] Abd-ul-khâliq Ghonjduwânî passed away in Bukhârâ in 575 [A.D. 1180].

asked, “If all spiritual paths called Tarîqat were derived from Rasûlullah’s nûrs and are drops from his esrâr (secret, occult, mystical manners and knowledge), why are there different paths, then, and why are they dissimilar in their sahw (recovering from rapture), sekr (ecstasy), telwîn (rapture), temkîn (composure), and their ravings that are called [shat-h] and which appear to be incompatible with the Shari’at,” our answer is that these dissimilarities arise from idiosyncratic dissimilarities and differences in men’s creation. It is like that of the same kind of food or medicine which has different effects on different people. This can also be illustrated in that the same person’s image will be different in different mirrors. Rasûlullah ‘sall-Allâhu ta’âlâ alaihi wa sallam’ would communicate occult and mystical meanings in various ways, depending on the tendencies and talents of his As-hâb. Water takes the shape of a container it is poured in. The same water will appear in different shapes, depending on the container it is in. A hadîth-i-sherîf states, **“Teach everybody as much as (and in a manner) their mental capacities will embrace.”** One day, Rasûlullah ‘sall-Allâhu ta’âlâ alaihi wa sallam’ was telling Abû Bekr ‘radiy-Allâhu ta’âlâ anh’ about secret spiritual knowledge. When ‘Umar ‘radiy-Allâhu ta’âlâ anh’ came, he changed the discourse a little. Some time later ‘Uthmân ‘radiy-Allâhu ta’âlâ anh’ arrived. This time the Prophet changed the way of his discourse even more. And when Alî ‘radiy-Allâhu ta’âlâ anh’ came a while later, he began to say quite different things. He made these changes because each newcomer had a different nature and different dispositions.

In answer to the second question; all the spiritual orders [Tarîqat] come from Imâm-i-Ja’fer Sâdiq ‘radiy-Allâhu ta’âlâ anh’.^[1] This Imâm is attached to two different ways. The first one, the way of his ancestors, comes from hadrat Alî ‘radiy-Allâhu ta’âlâ anh’. The second, which is the way of his mother’s father, comes from Siddîq-i-ekber ‘radiy-Allâhu ta’âlâ anh’. On account of these two outward and spiritual Wilâyats, this great Imâm said, “Abû Bekr has caused me to have double existences.” These two ways possessed by the Imâm are different from each other. The Awliyâ belonging to the Naqshbandî order were given the way

[1] Ja’fer Sâdiq is the sixth of the twelve Imâms. He is hadrat Alî’s grandson’s grandson and is at the same time Mûsâ Qâzim’s father. He passed away in 148 [A.D. 765].

coming from Siddîq-i-ekber and through the Imâm. Awliyâ affiliated with the other spiritual orders were blessed with the way coming from Alî 'kerrem-Allâhu wejheh' (and, again, through the Imâm).

SECOND VOLUME, 61st LETTER

The purpose in our creation is our obtaining the ma'rifat pertaining to Allâhu ta'âlâ. There are two sorts of ma'rifat. The first one is obtained through scientific methods, e.g. observation and inference [reasoning, thinking]. The second one occurs in the heart through kashf and shuhûd. This kind of ma'rifat comes from experts of Tasawwuf [Awliyâ]. The first one is science and is obtained mentally. The second one is a state (of heart) and occurs involuntarily. The first one does not annihilate the Ârif (person who has obtained this kind of ma'rifat). The second kind will annihilate him. For this kind of ma'rifat means to lose one's existence in the ma'rûf (the one whose ma'rifat, knowledge is obtained).

***Qurb (closeness) is not the movement known,
Qurb-i-Haqq is disenthralment from existence!***

The first type is 'ilm-i-husûlî (acquired knowledge) and means to know on a certain setting. The second one is idrâk-i-basît (simple, mere realization) and does not have setting. For what is present here is Haqq. The sâlik (the person himself) has become fânî [nonexistent]. In the first type of ma'rifat the nafs is in the state of negation. For the nafs still exists with its evil attributes. Its obstinacy and desires have not ceased to exist. It has not freed itself from its eccentricities and inordinate appetites. The îmân, if there is any, is only in appearance. Deeds, worships are only superficial. The nafs maintains its unbelief and retains its enmity towards its Mawlâ [Owner]. It is declared in a hadîth-i-qudsî, **“Know thine nafs as an enemy! For it is an enemy of Mine.”** This type of îmân (the îmân held by the person who has obtained the first kind of ma'rifat) is called **Îmân-i-mejâzî** (figurative belief). This type of îmân may disappear (any time). In the second kind of ma'rifat the nafs has come round to (having) îmân because the sâlik has ceased to exist. This sort of ma'rifat [îmân] will never disappear. This îmân is termed **Îmân-i-haqîqî** (real îmân). Now

deeds are real, too. It is stated in a hadîth-i-sherîf, **“Yâ Rabbî! I request that Thou shouldst grant me îmân that will not end in disbelief!”** The hundred and thirty-sixth âyat of Nisâ sûra, which purports, **“O you who have had îmân! Have îmân in Allah and His Messenger!”**, points to this kind of îmân. Imâm-i-Ahmad ibni Hanbel^[1] occupied a highest grade in knowledge and ijtihâd. However, he had recourse to Bishr-i-Hâfî and humbly expressed his wish for this ma’rifat. When people (around him) asked him why he had done so, he said, “He (Bishr-i-Hâfî) is more ârif (has closer knowledge) of Allâhu ta’âlâ than I am.” Abû Hanîfa Nu’mân-i-Kûfî ‘rahmatullâhi aleyh’^[2] gave up ijtihâd and lived in seclusion in the last two years of his lifetime. After his death, he is reported to have said in (someone’s) dream, “Had it not been for the last two years, Nu’mân would have perished.” The purpose in his seclusion was to perfect this ma’rifat, and to attain perfect îmân, which is a result of this ma’rifat. His grade in knowledge and deeds was already very high. No deed could reach the grade of ijtihâd. No worship could equal the grade of teaching. Maturity of (one’s) deeds depends on the maturity of (one’s) îmân. Luminousness of worships depends on the degree of ikhlâs (one has). And the maturity of îmân and the degree of ikhlâs, in their turn, depend on ma’rifat. Since this ma’rifat and real îmân depend on attaining Fanâ and the nafs’s death before one dies, the better fanâ is the more perfect îmân. For this reason, the îmân possessed by Siddîq-i-ekber exceeded the total îmân held by this Ummat (Muslims). It is stated in a hadîth-i-sherîf, **“If Abû Bekr’s îmân were to be weighed against the îmân of this Ummat, Abû Bekr’s îmân would weigh heavier.”** For he was peerless in Fanâ. It is stated in another hadîth-i-sherîf, **“If you would like to see a dead person walking, see Abû Kuhâfa’s son!”** Abû Bekr’s having been presented as an exemplification of Fanâ is an evidence for his perfection in Fanâ. For all the As-hâb-i-kirâm attained Fanâ. How lucky for the person who has attained this ma’rifat! One should run towards this blessing wherever it is. Shameful to say, what is to be aspired after is being turned away from. What one has been commanded to smash is being meliorated. Where will we find the face and the excuse to answer with on the Judgement Day?

[1] Ahmad ibni Hanbel passed away in Baghdâd in 241 [A.D. 855].

[2] Abû Hanîfa passed away in Baghdâd in 150 [A.D. 767].

SECOND VOLUME, 62nd LETTER

Man's honour is in his *îmân* and *ma'rifat*, not in his property or rank position. Endeavour for the solidification of *îmân*! Redouble your efforts for the attainment of grades of *ma'rifat*! It is stated in a *hadîth-i-sherîf*, **"If a person works for the Hereafter, Allâhu ta'âlâ will make him attain all his wishes. If a person runs after worldly affairs only, He will destroy him."** If a person has to struggle for a living, it is permissible for him to get a job and work. It will be good for him if he earns well. If he cannot earn well he should not insist. His efforts will be in vain. In addition, he will suffer harm.

SECOND VOLUME, 63rd LETTER

If a person misses his daily prayers of *namâz* because of illness and does not know the number of prayers he has missed, he makes *qadâ* of the prayers he has missed in lieu of the supererogatory prayers of *namâz* such as (those prayers of *namâz* termed) *Tahajjud* and *Ischrâq* as well as the *sunnats* of the five daily prayers of *namâz*; the prayers of *namâz* he performs with the intention of *qadâ* though he has finished his debts of *namâz* will become supererogatory. He will be given the *thawâb* (blessings promised) for supererogatory worships. For it is not necessary to make a certain *niyyat* for supererogatory prayers of *namâz* performed at certain times. Prayers of *namâz* made *qadâ* at certain times become supererogatory prayers belonging to those times.

[It is a grave sin to omit the five daily prayers of *namâz*, that is, not to perform them (within the times allotted to them) without any *'udhr* (a good excuse for doing or not doing something). *Fawt* [missing or omitting them] because of illness or another *'udhr* is not sinful. For this, it is necessary to make *qadâ* of them, (that is, to pay one's debts pertaining to *namâz*), instead of the *sunnats* of the five daily prayers of *namâz* except the *sunnat* of morning *namâz*. That these *sunnats* are supererogatory prayers is explained in the books **Jawhara** and **Futûh-ul-ghayb** as well as in **Newâdir-i-fiqhiyya**, by Muhammad Sâdiq Efendi, the Qâdi of Jerusalem, and in **Eshbâh** and in **Se'âdet-i Ebediyye** (Endless Bliss)].

SECOND VOLUME, 67th LETTER

Namâz is the Believer's Mi'râj.^[1] The following hadîth-i-sherîfs are well-known: **“Who Allâhu ta'âlâ loves most is His born servant making the sajdâ.” “If a person performs namâz in jamâ'at and then prays, Allâhu ta'âlâ will give him whatever he wishes.” “There is one thawâb for a namâz performed at home, twenty-seven thawâbs for a namâz performed in the mosque belonging to one's quarter, five hundred thawâbs (for one performed) in the Great mosque, five thousand (for the namâz) in the Mesjîd-i-aqsâ, fifty thousand thawâbs (for a namâz performed) in this mosque of mine in Medîna, and one hundred thousand thawâbs (for one performed) in the Mesjîd-i-harâm.” “A person who is steady in performing these five daily prayers of namâz in jamâ'at shall cross the Bridge of Sirât as fast as lightning. Allâhu ta'âlâ shall make him join (those fortunate people called) Sâbiqûn when people rise and gather (for the Last Judgement). Allâhu ta'âlâ shall protect him against afflictions and disasters. He shall give him the (same amount of) thawâb He gives to one thousand martyrs who died in their struggle for the sake of Allah.” “Ahl-i-Qur'ân are Ahlullah (People of Qur'ân are people of Allah).” A hâfid (person who has committed Qur'ân al-kerîm to his memory) who is fond of the world cannot be among the people of Qur'ân. What they read earlier was a deed peculiar to the Ebrâr. It is very useful to repeat the Kelima-i-tawhîd and will cause progress. With the barakat of this blessed word, the heart will be purified [of the love it has for creatures]. One will become (a person who is) Ahl (qualified to read) Qur'ân al-kerîm. The âyat al-kerîma which purports, **“Only those who are pure are to hold it (Qur'ân al-kerîm),”** in Al-wâqi'a sûra, includes purity of heart, too. Also, there are the following hadîth-i-sherîfs: **“Those who are in love with Allâhu ta'âlâ should listen to the word of Allah!” “He who wants to talk to Allâhu ta'âlâ should read Qur'ân al-kerîm!” “Allâhu ta'âlâ loves hâfids. He who bears enmity towards them will have borne enmity towards Allâhu ta'âlâ. He who loves them will have loved Allâhu ta'âlâ.”****

SECOND VOLUME, 68th LETTER

Latest members of the Sôfiyya-i-aliyya stated that Allâhu ta'âlâ can be perceived in the world. Perceiving (in this connection) means seeing through the heart. Author of the book

[1] Hadrat Muhammad's ascent to heaven. There is detailed information about Mi'râj in **Se'âdet-i Ebediyye** (Endless Bliss).

Taarruf, [namely, Abû Is-haq Muhammad Ghulâbâdî^[1]], states, “It has been stated unanimously (by scholars) that Allâhu ta’âlâ cannot be seen in this world, neither with the eyes, nor through the heart.” As it is seen, the early members of Sôfiyya-i-aliyya said that Allâhu ta’âlâ cannot be seen through the heart, either. Imâm-i-Rabbânî said so, too. That is, one of the zils (shades) is perceived in the world. A zil is by no means the Zât-i-ilâhî (Divine Person) Himself. This fact is very well expressed by Shâh-i-Naqshibend, who states, “Everything said or heard or seen or known is not He. All these things should be annihilated as one says, ‘Lâ’.” Molla Jâmî states in **Nefehât**, “Our Prophet was asked what **Tawhîd** was in (someone’s) dream. He answered, ‘**Everything that comes to your heart or imagination is not He**.’” (We would like to ask) those who convey this (event of) perceiving from some great men of Tasawwuf: how do they know that those great people were not promoted from that grade and that state of perception did not come to an end?

SECOND VOLUME, 80th LETTER

Cruelties and harassments coming from government officials and others have their impact only on the zâhir [on the body and brain]. They do not penetrate the bâtin [heart]. They will cause benefits such as thawâb in the Hereafter and an increase in the splendence of the bâtin in the world. One will not lose one’s attributes as a human being. Whereas the bâtin will accept the incidences because they are created by Allâhu ta’âlâ, the zâhir will grieve over them. It is very useful to say **istighfâr** for the elimination of afflictions and disasters. It has been experienced many times. It is stated in a hadîth-i-sherîf, “**If a person says the istighfâr steadily and very often, Allâhu ta’âlâ will save him from cares and troubles. He will send him sustenance in a way he does not expect at all.**” [It is stated in a hadîth-i-sherîf, which is quoted in **Merâq-il-felâh**, “**If a person says the following prayer after every namâz, all his sins will be forgiven: “Estaghfirullah al ’azîm al-lezî lâ ilâha illâ huw-al-hayy-al-qayyûma wa etubu ileyh.’ ”** This faqîr [Muhammad Ma’thûm] says the istighfâr seventy times after every farz namâz. Following (the recipe given in) the hadîth-i-sherîf, I first say, “**Estaghfirullah al ’azîm al-lezî lâ ilâha illâ huw-al-hayy-al-qayyûma wa etubu ileyh,**” three times, and say only

[1] Ghulâbâdî Hanafî passed away in 384 [A.D. 994].

“**Estaghfirullah**” the rest of the number. Alí bin Ebí Bekr says in **Maârij-ul-hidâya**, “Of all the ways of istighfâr, the most common one is the one taught by our Prophet: **“If a person says the following prayer twenty-five times, no accident or misfortune will befall on his room, on his family, on his home or town: ‘Estaghfirullah al-lezî lâ ilâha illâ huw-ar-rahmân-ir-rahîm al-hayy-ul-qayyûmal-lezî lâ-yemûtu wa etubu ileyh Rabbi-ghfirli’.**” This prayer must be said every morning and every evening. Most scholars advised their disciples and children to say this prayer. They derived much benefit from this prayer.”

SECOND VOLUME, 83rd LETTER

Scholars of the Madh-hab of **Ahl as-sunnat wa'l-jamâ'at** explained the knowledge of **Qadâ** and **Qader** as follows: All the deeds of human beings, regardless of whether good or evil, come about only through the Decree and Will of Allâhu ta'âlâ. **Taqdîr** (Decree), (in this sense), means to invent, to create. There is no khâliq, mûjid, creator except Allâhu ta'âlâ. Allâhu ta'âlâ declares, as is purported in the ninety-sixth âyat of **Sâffât** sûra, **“Allah creates you and all your deeds.”** The group called **Mu'tazila**, being mostly ignorant and stupid people, deny qadâ and qader. They say that man does his deeds with his own power and option [choice]. They think that man creates his own deeds. [These people are also called **Qaderiyya**]. Scholars of **Ahl as-sunnat** say, “Magians [fire worshippers] are not so evil as the group called **Qaderiyya**. For the former group attribute one partner (to Allâhu ta'âlâ). The group called **Qaderiyya** attribute many partners.”

Although good and evil are created by Haqq ta'âlâ, (man's) will and option have a share of responsibility in the deeds performed. First, man uses his will. Then, if Haqq ta'âlâ, too, activates His Will agreeably with man's, He creates his deed. This option of man's is called **Kasb** (acquiring, acquisition). Allâhu ta'âlâ is the creator of man's deed, and man himself is acquirer. The statement, “Nothing can move without His permission!”, points to (His) creation.

Punishments, such as death penalty inflicted on the murderer and torture meted out to sinners (in Hell), are administered because man has (the option called) kasb. The group called **Jebriyya** (Necessitarians) say that the born slave (man) does not have an option [choice]. They say that man is compelled to do his

deeds. They say that men's actions are like movements of leaves. They go even further; they do not say that these actions are men's actions. They say that they are Allah's actions. These statements of theirs cause **kufr**. By saying so, they are denying Qur'ân al-kerîm. They say, "Thawâb will be given to those who carry out the commandments of Allâhu ta'âlâ. However, those who commit harâm will not be tormented. Disbelievers and wrongdoers are excusable. They will not be questioned or tormented. For Allâhu ta'âlâ is the agent of deeds. Men are compelled." These statements of theirs are disbelief. Allâhu ta'âlâ declares in the twenty-fourth âyat of Sâffât sûra, **"Keep them at the place of judgement! They shall be called to account."** And it is purported in the ninety-third âyat of Hijr sûra, **"For the haqq of thine Rabb, We shall question them all on what they have done."** The group called **Murjiya**, who are declared to be accursed, hold the same belief (as the one held by the group named above). Seventy Prophets cursed them. The credo held by these foul people is not compatible with reason, either. There is difference between the trembling of one's hand and one's moving it. Nusûss-i-qat'iyya [âyats and hadîths] rebut these people. The fourteenth âyat of Ahkâf sûra purports, **"It is the retribution of their deeds."** And the twenty-ninth âyat of Kahf sûra purports, **"Let him who wishes to have îmân do so. And let him who wishes to deny do so, too. We have prepared Hell fire for the cruel."** If the born slave did not have will and option, Allâhu ta'âlâ would not call these people cruel. The hundred and seventeenth sûra of Âl-i-'Imrân sûra and the thirty-third sûra of Nahl sûra purport, **"Allâhu ta'âlâ does not torment them. They have tormented themselves."** Most mulhids [people who hold disbelief and îmân equal] disobey the Sharî'at under the false pretext that "Man does not have option." They want to escape the interrogation and torment promised for those who commit harâm. They say that they are excusable and compelled.

Men have been given as much option and power as will enable them to obey the Sharî'at. The difference between trembling and moving is obvious. Allâhu ta'âlâ has very much mercy. He did not command His born slaves things which they would not be able to do; He gave them commandments which they would be able to carry out. He declares in the last âyat of Baqara sûra, **"Allâhu ta'âlâ has commanded His born slaves what they will be able to do."** These people bear enmity towards those who annoy them. They educate their sons and servants by beating them (when

necessary). They become angry when other men see their wives. They do not say that these people are excusable. On the other hand, they use this false pretext to escape Hell torment, which is clearly stated in âyats and hadîths. They say that they should be free to do whatever they wish and all sorts of evil and should not be interrogated at all. Allâhu ta'âlâ declares, as is purported in the seventh âyat of Tûr sûra, **“Verily, thine Rabb shall inflict torment. There is no escape from it.”** If these people see an insane stranger in their home, they will not become angry and will say that he is mentally deranged and does not have an option. On the other hand, if they see a sane person they will become angry. They will not say that this person is excusable. While in worldly matters they distinguish between a person who has an option and one who does not, they deny the existence of option when it comes to obeying the Sharî'at.

The groups of Qaderiyya and Jebriyya have deviated from haqq [the right way], because the former deny qadâ and qader and the latter say that man does not have an option [choice]. They have become people of bid'at and dalâlat (aberration). The moderate way without any excess or deviation is (the one taken by people who make up) the Madh-hab (called) **Ahl as-sunnat(t) wa'l-jamâ'a(t)**. Imâm-i-a'zam Abû Hanîfa asked Imâm-i-Ja'fer Sâdiq, “O the grandson of the Messenger’s grandson! Has Allâhu ta'âlâ left men’s deeds to themselves?” “Allâhu ta'âlâ will not make His born slaves partners to Himself in being Rabb,” was the answer. This time the former asked, “Will He compel His born slaves?” The Imâm said, “It is incompatible with His Justice to compel His born slaves and then to torment them.” And when Imâm-i-a'zam finally asked, “How should we believe, then?”, the latter replied, “Between these two extremes. He does not have actions done by force. Nor does He completely let them act as they wish.” All good and evil deeds are dependent upon the Taqdîr and Irâda of Allâhu ta'âlâ. The disbelievers called Jebriyya not only assert that they are compelled to do their evil deeds, but also disignore the fact that the state of disbelief and disobedience they are in is evil in itself. They say that “Allâhu ta'âlâ likes whatever He wills (creates). He would not will it if He did not like it. Even the state of being a polytheist is something Allah likes. He will not torment anyone for having done something He likes.” However, Allâhu ta'âlâ belies them through âyats, such as the hundred and forty-eighth âyat of An'âm sûra, which purports, **“Earlier ones (people) also disbelieved.”** Allâhu ta'âlâ informs that He hates disbelief, that disbelief is evil,

in Qur'ân al-kerîm and in the (heavenly) Books He revealed to other Prophets. He declares that disbelievers are accursed, that they are far from forgiveness and mercy, and that their punishment shall be eternal torment. He states that the assertions of Jebriyya are sheer ignorance. For will and liking are quite different things. Something willed is not necessarily something liked. Allâhu ta'âlâ wills and creates disbelief and sins. Yet He does not like them, He hates them. [By the some token, man does not necessarily like something he does by using his will. For instance, a person who is led to a place where he knows he is going to be beaten, killed or imprisoned, takes his steps by using his will. Yet he does not like the idea of going there]. The assertions made by the group called Jebriyya are expressions of their beliefs. They are intended for derision. Also, they are wrong to say, "Because men's deeds are dependent upon the Will of Allâhu ta'âlâ and because good and evil were foreordained in eternity, there is no will left for man to use, and he is compelled to do what he is doing." For what was foreordained in eternity is that man would do his deeds by using his will. Qader does not mean Jebr-i-mutahakkim (domineering compulsion). It is 'ilm-i-mutaqaddim (knowing beforehand). This taqdîr (qader) shows that man has an option. If this taqdîr in eternity had abrogated option, Allâhu ta'âlâ also would be devoid of option in His deeds and creations. He would be compelled to create conformably with His Taqdîr and Will in eternity. However, this is not the case.

THIRD VOLUME, 6th LETTER

This letter is (a piece of) advice to the Sultân.^[1] Mu'âz bin Jebel relates: (One day) the Messenger of Allah 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wa sallam' held me by the hand. After walking for a few steps, he said, **"Yâ Mu'âz! Act with taqwâ steadily. Always tell the truth. Abide by your promises. Never commit a breach of trust. Have mercy on orphans. Observe the rights of your neighbor. Do not become angry with anyone. Always talk softly. Greet every Muslim. Know that an Imâm is necessary. Learn the knowledge of fiqh, which is the way taught by Qur'ân al-kerîm, and never turn away from these teachings. Whatever you do, think of the**

[1] The sixth Sultân of India, Alemghîr Muhammad Evrenghzîb, passed away in 1118 [A.D. 1707]. He ruled over India fifty years with justice and served Islam.

Hereafter. Prepare yourself for the Judgement Day. Do not set your heart to the world. Always do what is beautiful and useful! Do not backbite any Muslim. Never bear false witness. Admit the right word. Do not revolt against an Imâm (religious leader) who administers justice. Do not arouse fitna on the earth. Always make dhikr of Allah. Make secret tawba for your secret sins. Make open tawba for your open sins!” Abdullah ibni ‘Umar relates: Someone asked the Messenger of Allah, “How many times should I pardon my servant?” There was no answer. So the person asked again. The Messenger stated, **“Pardon him seventy times daily!”** O Emîr-ul-mu‘minîn! I present my regards and love to you. I should like to express my gratitude. I am very thankful to see you in safety and peace and also for the services you have rendered to Islam and for the supports you have given to the Sharî‘at. My disciples and I have been wishing you a long life and praying very earnestly day and night that you be given more strength and that you be victorious over your enemies. Relying on the fact that sincere benedictions pronounced (over a person) in absentia are more likely to be accepted, we carry on our prayers. May thine sun of sultanate and sovereignty always shine on high horizons! Âmin.

THIRD VOLUME, 34th LETTER

Do not leave the way guided by our superiors! Serve the disciples and guests very well! Hold fast to the Sharî‘at! Adhere to Rasûlullah’s Sunnat! Avoid bid’ats! Do not keep company with bid’at holders. Run away from them! It is stated in a hadîth-i-sherîf, **“Bid’at holders will be dogs for people tormented in Hell.”** Never forget this hadîth-i-sherîf! Never make bid’at [changes] in the way shown by our superiors! Fayz and barakat will keep coming from our superiors as long as bid’ats are not made. Always look for ways to please Allâhu ta’âlâ! Endeavour to attain His ma’rifat! Run in the direction whence you sense the smell of this blessing! The purpose of one’s coming to this world is to attain this blessing. It is a shame to have to say that what should be yearned for is being vacated. Other things are being run after, instead. May Allâhu ta’âlâ save you and us from the slumber of busying ourselves with creatures. May He bless us with the lot of looking for Him! May he protect us against falling for the sequined beauty of creatures! The cruelties and misfortunes befalling us are the

consequences of our ill deeds. The statement, **“Your commanders are your deeds,”** is a hadîth-i-sherîf. Try to correct yourself! Cling to wara’ and taqwâ! The second âyat of Talâq sûra purports, **“We (shall) save people of wara’ from troubles.”**

THIRD VOLUME, 55th LETTER

The twenty-eighth âyat of Âl-i-’Imrân sûra purports, **“Believers should not love people other than Believers, i.e. disbelievers. A person who likes them will not have loved Allâhu ta’âlâ. It is permissible to be friends with them outwardly in case of strong necessity in the Dâr-ul-harb.”** The author of Tafsîr-i-kebîr^[1] explains this âyat-i-kerîma very well, and states, “This âyat-i-kerîma prohibits us from liking disbelievers.” The hundred and eighteenth âyat-i-kerîma of Âl-i-’Imrân sûra purports, **“O Believers! Do not be friends with non-Believers, disbelievers!”** The twenty-second âyat-i-kerîma of Mujâdala sûra purports, **“If a person believes in Allâhu ta’âlâ and in the Hereafter, he will not like the enemies of Allah and His Messenger.”** The fifty-fourth âyat-i-kerîma of Mâida sûra purports, **“O Believers! Do not like Jews and Christians!”** The first âyat of Mumtahina sûra purports, **“O Believers! Do not like My and your enemies.”** The seventy-second âyat of Tawba sûra purports, **“Believing men and women like one another.”** These âyat-i-kerîmas, too, forbid to like disbelievers.

There are three kinds of a Believer’s liking a disbeliever. The first kind is his liking him on account of his disbelief. This kind of liking is forbidden because it means to like his disbelief, his (wrong) religion. A person who likes disbelief will become a disbeliever. This kind of liking eliminates one’s îmân. The second kind of liking is to pretend to be friends with the disbeliever only for the sake of getting on well with everybody. This kind of friendship is not forbidden. The third kind is something between the former two kinds. The person concerned is inclined towards them (disbelievers). Though he knows that their religion is invalid, he makes friends with them on account of his kinship or business relationship with them. This kind of closeness is not permissible although it will not cause disbelief. For this

[1] Title of the book Tafsîr-i kebîr is Mefâtiḥ-ul-ghayb. Its author, Muhammad Fakhr-ud-dîn Râzî, Shâfi’î, passed away in Hirât in 606 [A.D. 1209].

relationship will cause one to like their religion in the course of time. The âyat-i-kerîma quoted above means this (third) kind of liking. Should it be asked, “Does not this âyat-i-kerîma prohibit from hating Believers and liking disbelievers? Will it not be permissible if one likes Believers, too (that is, while liking disbelievers)?”; then, the other âyat-i-kerîmas forbid it, too. Two Sahâbîs were captivated by men of Musaylamat-ul-kezzâb.^[1] When Musaylama asked one of them, “Do you believe in Muhammad’s prophethood?”, he said, “Yes.” This time the former asked, “Do you believe that I am a Prophet also?” The answer was, “Yes,” again. Musaylama believed that he was a prophet for the tribe of Benî Hanîfa and that Muhammad ‘alaihi-salâm’ was a prophet for the tribe of Qoureish. He set him free. When they brought the other Sahâbî, he asked him the same questions. While answering in the affirmative to the first question, this Sahâbî said, “I am deaf,” when he was asked the second question. Musaylama killed him. When the event was reported to Rasûlullah ‘sall-Allâhu ta’âlâ alaihi wa sallam’, he stated, **“The second one attained martyrdom on account of his îmân. The first one utilized the permission given by Allâhu ta’âlâ.”** The hundred and sixth âyat-i-kerîma of Nahl sûra, which purports, **“If a person whose heart is full with îmân says (something that causes) disbelief as a result of ikrâh [under duress], he will be pardoned,”** gives permission for disbelief under duress.

Taqiyya means to say (or do) the opposite of what one has in one’s heart. This is also called **Mudârâ**, which means to conceal one’s belief and Madh-hab. It has various types: The first type is for a person who is among disbelievers and therefore fears for his property or life to sympathize with them though his heart does not like it. This (type of taqiyya) is permissible. The second type is to say frankly what one has in one’s heart, which is preferable. An

[1] A liar who appeared with the claim of prophethood in Yemâma. Formerly he was a Believer. It was during the second year of Abû Bekr as-Siddîq’s ‘radiy-Allâhu anh’ caliphate when this person became a renegade and announced that he was a prophet. The Khalîfa sent an army under Khâlid bin Welîd’s command against this squalid apostate. Twenty thousand apostates were killed and two thousand Muslims tasted the flavour of martyrdom in the battle that took place between the two armies. Musaylama suffered a humiliating defeat and was killed by Wahshî, who accomplished the celebrated deed with the same sword he had used in martyring hadrat Hamzâ ‘radiy-Allâhu anh’, our Prophet’s blessed uncle.

example of this type is the way chosen by the Sahâbî martyred by Musaylama. The third type embodies harmful deeds such as homicide, fornication, usurpation, false witness, qazf of a chaste woman [imputing unchaste motives to her], betraying Muslim women to disbelievers, which are forbidden. The fourth type of taqiyya is permissible at places where there are disbelievers. In Shâfi'î Madh-hab it is permissible also when one is among cruel Muslims. The fifth type of taqiyya is done in order to protect one's property and it is permissible. The hadîth-i-sherîf, "**The Believer's property is as valuable as his life,**" confirms this fact. Another hadîth-i-sherîf in this connection is: "**A person who is killed in his struggle for protecting his property attains martyrdom.**" Property is extremely necessary for a person. For instance, when water (is so scarce that it) is sold at exorbitant prices called Ghaban-i-fâhish, it is not farz to make an ablution (for types of worship, e.g. namâz, which require ablution). In such cases it becomes permissible to make tayammum. The sixth type is the one which, as Imâm-i-Mujâhid^[1] states, was employed during the initial years of Islam. For at that time Muslims were lonely and weak. When an Islamic state was established this rule was modified. There are scholars who say that taqiyya is permissible till the end of the world. This inference of theirs is preferable. For a Believer has to do his best to elude harms.

Ignorant pantheistics and **Mulhids**, whose credal eclecticism has exceeded the limits of belief laid down by Islam, do not hesitate to be friends with disbelievers. They say, "The essence of Tasawwuf is to get on well with everybody." Rasûlullah 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wa sallam' was the leader of Awliyâ and said, "**I am proud of poverty.**" However, Allâhu ta'âlâ commanded (him) as is purported in the seventy-fourth âyat of Tawba sûra: "**O My Prophet! Make Jihâd against disbelievers! Do hostility against them!**" The way taken and guided by the Messenger of Allah 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wa sallam' was hostility towards disbelievers and Jihâd against them. What kind of sufis are these people? They have strayed from the way guided by the Messenger of Allah and wandered away into an altogether different way. The way taken by these people is sheer aberration, which means abandonment of the right way. It is stated plainly in Qur'ân al-kerîm and in hadîth-i-sherîfs that Allâhu ta'âlâ is hostile against disbelievers. Is it possible for a person who sympathizes with His

[1] Mujâhid passed away in 104 [A.D. 723] in Mekka.

enemies to love Him? If disbelievers and fâsiqs were not enemies of Allâhu ta'âlâ, **Bughd-i-fillâh** (enmity for Allah's sake) would not be wâjib. It would not be the most superior way to make one attain Allâhu ta'âlâ and the most effective cause of perfection of î mân. It is stated in a hadîth-i-sherîf, **"If a person does not love Allâhu ta'âlâ and does not know enemies of Allâhu ta'âlâ as his enemies, his î mân will not be true. If he loves Believers for Allah's sake and knows disbelievers as enemies, he will attain love of Allâhu ta'âlâ."** It is stated in another hadîth-i-sherîf, **"If a person loves Allah's friends and knows His enemies as his enemies, too, and gives for Allah's sake and does not give, again for Allah's sake, his î mân will be mature."** And another hadîth-i-sherîf: **"Become close to Allah by doing hostility towards the disobedient!"** Another hadîth-i-sherîf states, **"Allâhu ta'âlâ intimated to a Prophet through Wahy: Say to such and such âbid (a person who worships very much): 'By making zuhd in the world you have provided peace for your nafs and made yourself valuable. What have you done for Me?' When the âbid asked, 'Yâ Rabbî! What should be done for Thee,' Allâhu ta'âlâ said: 'Have you done hostility to My enemy for My sake and have you loved My darlings for My sake?'"** A person who loves should love whomever the darling loves and hate whomever the darling hates. This state of love and hostility is not within his will. It is a consequence of love. In this case, will and acquisition, which are necessary in other sorts of behaviour, are not needed. It is an involuntary state. Friend's friends will look amiable. And friend's enemies will seem unlovely. If a person claims love for someone, he will not be believed unless he estranges himself from his darling's enemies. If he does not do so, he will be called a hypocrite. Shaikh-ul-islâm Abdullah-i-Ansârî says: I do not like Abu-l-Hasan Sem'un because he annoyed my master Hidrî. If a person annoys your teacher and you are not upset by this, you must be lower than a dog. Allâhu ta'âlâ purports in the fourth âyat of Mumtahina sûra, **"Take lessons from the statements made by Ibrâhîm 'alaihis-salâm' and those Believers who were with him! They said to the disbelievers: 'We are far from you and your idols. We dislike your religion. There is enmity between you and us until you believe in Allâhu ta'âlâ.'"** And the âyat-i-kerîma following it purports, **"These statements of theirs contain lessons for you and for those who wish love of Allâhu ta'âlâ and the blessings in the Hereafter."** Hence, this tabarrî [keeping away] is necessary for those who wish to attain love of Allâhu ta'âlâ.

Allâhu ta'âlâ purports, **“To love disbelievers means not to love Allâhu ta'âlâ. One could not love both of two opposites.”** Two enemies cannot be loved at the same time. If a person claims to love someone and at the same time does not keep away from his enemies, this claim of his will not be believed. The twenty-eighth âyat of Âl-i-'Imrân sûra purports, **“Allâhu ta'âlâ threatens those who love disbelievers with His torment.”** This grave threat shows how critical the offense is. One day they said to Khalîfa 'Umar 'radiy-Allâhu ta'âlâ anh', “There is a Christian from the people of Hîra here. He has a very strong memory and beautiful handwriting. He will be very useful for you if you employ him as a secretary for yourself.” He refused and said, “I cannot make friends with a non-Believer,” quoting the aforementioned âyat-i-kerîma. One day Abû Mûsal Esh'arî said to Khalîfa 'Umar, “I have a Christian secretary. He is a great hand.” The Khalîfa chided him, saying, “May Allah not perish you! Why don't you employ a Muslim secretary? Haven't you heard the âyat, **‘O Believers! Do not like Jews and Christians,’** in Mâida sûra?” (Abû Mûsal Esh'arî relates the rest of the conversation as follows): “Upon this I said, ‘His religion is his and his service as a secretary is mine.’ The Khalîfa said, ‘Do not honour a person degraded by Allâhu ta'âlâ! Do not cherish a person scorned by Allâhu ta'âlâ! Do not get close to a person repelled by Allâhu ta'âlâ!’ When I finally said, ‘I am administering (official matters of) Basra with his help,’ the Khalîfa commanded, ‘Now do what you would do if the Christian died! Replace him immediately!’ ” Imâm-i-Rabbânî 'radiy-Allâhu ta'âlâ anh', who is our Murshid and the cause of our happiness, states in the two hundred and sixty-sixth letter, “Ibrâhîm 'alaihis-salâm' attained the rank of Halîlullah and became the tree of Prophets owing to his strictly keeping away from the enemies of Allâhu ta'âlâ. The fourth âyat of Mumtahina purports, **‘There are lessons for you in Ibrâhîm 'alaihis-salâm.’** According to this faqîr, none of the things that will make one close to Allâhu ta'âlâ could equal tabarrî (keeping away from disbelievers). The hostility which Allâhu ta'âlâ has against disbelief and disbelievers originates from His Person. He Himself is hostile towards idols such as Lât and Uzzâ and those who worship these idols. Burning eternally in Hell is the retribution for this abominable deed. This is not the case with the desires of nafs and all other sorts of sins. For the enmity and wrath Allâhu ta'âlâ has for these things do not come from Himself. His Wrath is one of His Attributes and His Torment is

one of His Deeds. Therefore, the punishment for these sins is not burning eternally in Hell. On the contrary, He will forgive these sins if He wishes.”

THIRD VOLUME, 153rd LETTER

Whatever was preordained in eternity shall certainly exist. The fortieth âyat of Ra'd sîra purports, “**There is a hukm** (decision, divine ordinance) **for every moment.**” Maintain your searching for Allâhu ta'âlâ! Run towards the place from where you smell its scent. These days when you have the chance are the only convenient days for gains. There is no coming to the world a second time. Our way is based on sohbat. Is it possible for one who is near you and another one who is far away to be equal? Weys-al-qarâni could not attain the grade of any of the As-hâbi-kirâm because he failed to see the Messenger of Allah. A person who is close and one who is far away are held unequal in all the other paths (of Tariqat); yet sohbat, being together, that is, is the basis of our path. This is not the case with the other paths. A disciple who is discreet enough will receive the fayz and barakat emanating from his Murshid's heart and coming to his heart with proportion to the degree of love he has for his Murshid regardless of the distance between him and his Murshid. Due to the spiritual connection [love], he will receive the fayz coming to him from the distance; yet sohbat is an indispensable condition for attainment of Mâ'rifat and the grades of Wilâyat. Thus Allâhu ta'âlâ will bless us with the lot of receiving the fayz gushing out from the hearts of our superiors. [Religious knowledge coming from Rasûlullah parts into two groups: Knowledge pertaining to body and knowledge pertaining to heart. Knowledge pertaining to body is called **Sharî'at**. This knowledge is learned from books of **Kelâm**, **Fiqh**, and **Akhlâq** (morals). Knowledge pertaining to heart is called **Ma'rifat** or **Fayz**. Ma'rifat and fayz (are the kind of occult knowledge which) emanate from the hearts of Awliyâ and flow into one's heart].

THIRD VOLUME, 154th LETTER

May Allâhu ta'âlâ bless you with high ranks! This requires obeying the luminous Sharî'at and sticking to the way of Muhammad 'alaih-salâm'. We should love the Murshid who

guides us in this way and adapt ourselves to him. At times of disasters and afflictions we should submit ourselves to the Will and eternal predestination of Allâhu ta'âlâ and comply with His Doings! Remember and help the dead by praying, giving alms and doing acts of charity! Wait for the deceased Murshid's fayz and barakat! Visit his grave and beg him for fayz! We expect that our friends will enrich that blessed city and hold firmly to the way guided by the deceased and continue with their dhikrs and duties. Serve the guests well! Try to please the deceased's children by serving them! Do not fail in teaching children their religion and in training them compatibly with Islamic manners and education! Perform the five daily prayers of namâz within the allotted times and in jamâ'at! Keep on saying the Adhân (Azân) and reading Qur'ân al-kerîm without taghannî (melody)!

***My heart bleeds with separation of friends,
Remembering them, marrow of my bones burns!***

THIRD VOLUME, 156th LETTER

What a shame that a whole lifetime is gone by, and without me having done anything useful! It has only now become clear that the world is a faithless liar. Life in it has become a mere vision. And yet its fitnas^[1] and cares still hold on. Friends and acquaintances are all dead, gone. With all these palpable facts before our eyes, we do not seem to wake up from our slumber or take any warning. Nor do we make any tawba. The oblivion abides, adding sins to our sins. Allâhu ta'âlâ declares, as is purported in the hundred and twenty-seventh âyat of Tawba sûra, **“Do they not see how calamities and afflictions befall them once or twice yearly? They still will not make tawba, nor do they feel remorse.”** What kind of îmân is this? Is this how a Muslim should be? They do not take advice, neither from the Book nor from the Sunnat. Nor do they learn any lessons from disasters and other events. Let them think about their friends and acquaintances with whom they lived together, went out together, ate and drank together and even slept together for many years. Do they not see what happened to those people with whom they sympathized, enjoyed themselves together and helped one another? Is there any trace left of any one of them? Are there any people to inform you about them? Their lives, like husk, have been winnowed away by the wind.

[1] Mischiefs, harms.

***O thou, the base world, so perfidious are all thine boons,
The grandeur thou offer with a gale of wind swoons!***

Yâ Rabbî! Do not deprive us of their rewards and fayz! Do not let us fall into fitna after them! We gharîb (poor, lonely) people; let us endeavour not to waste our sojourn of a few days in this world in slumber. Let us not lead a life like rabbits' sleep! Let us not set our hearts to transient, sequined, deceitful flavours. Let us not fall for these poisonous sweetnesses! Let us do the worships and good deeds Allâhu ta'âlâ commands and likes! Let us not believe the lies of the nafs and the devil and evil people! Let us think of the torment in grave and in the Hereafter and protect ourselves by now! Turning away from this short life and unreal vision, let us attain the honour of dying before death! Let us consider that our origin is a mere nothing! Everybody will laugh at an idiot who adorns himself with ornaments trusted to him and boasts about having them. No one will like a person who sells defective, deceitful goods. Everything that befits existence and anything that exists, belongs to the One who exists in reality. Maturity of someone before and behind whom there is nonexistence is in his realizing his nonexistence.

No knowledge could equal one's being aware of one's imperfection!

THIRD VOLUME, 168th LETTER

There is no interval or pause in Allâhu ta'âlâ's sending fayz. He sends fayz, barakats, nûrs continuously. [He sends the power and energy necessary for substantial life through the sun. And He sends the fayz necessary for spiritual life through Muhammad's 'alaihi-salâm' blessed heart. This fayz comes to Murshids' hearts and then it is radiated from their hearts. Murshids' hearts are like substances with phosphorescent properties]. The fayz radiated from a Murshid's heart comes to every Muslim's heart in an amount in proportion to his capacity. It never comes to some people. Likewise, clearness of a person's image on a mirror depends on the brightness of the mirror. No image will be seen on an opaque mirror. It is the mirror that reflects the image perfectly. The owner of the image has no role in the clearness of the image. [The more ikhlâs and love one has for one's Murshid, the more will he receive of the fayz coming from his heart. In some cases, though very seldom, the whole fayz is received].

THIRD VOLUME, 252nd LETTER

The fayz and nûr radiated by a Murshid every moment spreads in all directions and everybody receives as much of it as he is ready for. Readiness (in this sense) means holding the belief of Ahl as-sunna, avoiding bid'ats and obeying the Sharî'at. The more ready a person is the more fayz will come to him. And the amount he will receive of the fayz coming to him will be in proportion to his ikhlâs and love for his Murshid.

[The Imâm's of four Madh-habs and those exalted scholars who were educated by these (four) Imâm's and who reached the grade of ijtihâd in religious knowledge are called 'Ulamâ (scholars) of **Ahl as-sunna(t)**, and the knowledge of îmân taught by these scholars is called **P'tiqâd** (belief) of **Ahl as-sunna(t)**. There were other Madh-habs who also held the belief of Ahl as-sunna(t). Yet their books of fiqh do not exist today. There are three kinds of Imâm's: The Imâm (who conducts collective namâz) in a mosque; the Imâm (leader) of a Madh-hab; the Imâm of all Muslims, who is also called Emîr-ul-mu'minîn. This last kind of Imâm does not exist today. Today's Muslims have various states and governments. Wherever a Muslim lives, be it a country with a government of disbelievers, such as Germany and France, he should not revolt against the state or government or violate the laws; he should avoid acts of separatism and pay taxes. Even in a country of disbelievers, he should not act in defiance of anyone's property or life; on the contrary, he should be kind to everybody. It is harâm to disturb peace or to arouse fitna. He should not join liars, slanderers, fraudulent or treacherous people. Allâhu ta'âlâ declares, "**I love people of ihsân** (kindness, generosity, favour)." A person who does not hurt anybody and who always does favours will be liked both by Allah and by people].

The following is a poem written upon Sayyid Abdulhakîm-i-Arwâsî's acquittal in the military court in Menemen in 1931:

***Today Hudâ has given us two festivals;
One is physical cure, the other soul's victuals.***

***One is maghfirat-i-hadrat-i-Hudâ, no doubt;
The other will cure the ailing heart, an antidote.***

***Tempest of separation exposed us to destruction;
Kerem-u-Rahmat-i-Haqq gives us fresh animation.***

***Do not go, do not die, do not kill us; always be with us!
This life would be a mere balderdash without you for us!***

***All those days that I spent in great grief, deep distress,
No language could say, nor even the best pen could express.***

***How disastrous those days were, what a great sadness!
Lights of compassion were gone, the whole world in darkness!***

***My mind was utterly out of thoughts, my soul restless,
Moan was all my breath, lament only my tongue'd express.***

***I only hope, Lutf-i-Mawlâ will have mercy on me,
Not to record in my deed book those days of frenzy!***

***Two feasts at the same time today has given us Hudâ;
To Haqq, the Absolute Ruler, let's pay hamd-u-thenâ!***

PART EIGHT
TRANSLATION OF THE BOOK
EYYUHELVELED (O SON) BY
HUJJAT-UL-ISLÂM IMÂM-I GHAZÂLÎ

The first Turkish edition of this celebrated book of 'Ilm-i-hâl, which Allâhu ta'âlâ has blessed us with the lot of printing in Latin alphabet, was accomplished in 960 [A.D. 1552] by hadrat Suleymân bin Jezâ. This book, a major part of which has been borrowed from the book **Ihya-ul-'Ulûm** by Hujjat-ul-islâm Imâm-i-Ghazâlî and the rest from other authentic religious books, was by mistake entitled **Hujjat-ul-islâm**, which caused it to be confused with Hujjat-ul-islâm Imâm-i-Ghazâlî's book **Eyyuhelveled** (Eyyuh-al-walad), so that most people think that the version is a Turkish translation of that book.

The book Eyyuhel Veled is in Arabic and copies of it exist in our various libraries, e.g. in Belediye Kütübhânesi at Bâyezit, with serial numbers 812 and 941. Its Turkish version as well exists in libraries, for instance in Nuriosmaniyye Kütübhânesi. We have translated into Turkish some parts from a Persian version, which is registered with the serial number 97-1437 in the Emîniyye section of the Umûmî Kütübhâne in Bursa.

If any person thanks or praises any other person in any way at any place at any time for any reason, this thanksgiving completely belongs to Allâhu ta'âlâ by rights. For He, alone, is the One who creates everything, educates and brings up everything, causes and sends every sort of goodness. He, alone, is the owner of power and might.

May all benedictions and goodnesses be over Muhammad 'alaihi-salâm', His Messenger and beloved darling, and over those who are close and beloved to him and over all his As-hâb!

Hadrat Muhammad Ghazâlî, a great Imâm, a great leader of Muslims, an authentic document proving that Muslims are right and correct, (may Allâhu ta'âlâ have plenty of mercy on him), was born in the city of Tus in the hijrî year 450, and passed away there in 505 [A.D. 1111]. One day one of his disciples, who had served him for many years and learned all kinds of knowledge from him, thought to himself, "For all these years I have endeavoured hard and learned a lot of things. I wonder what part of all this

knowledge is the most necessary and the most useful for me? What is the knowledge that will come to my rescue in the Hereafter, which will be my companion in grave when all my friends go away and leave me alone, and will save me on the Rising Day when mothers will forsake their children, brothers will run away from one another, worldly friends will overlook each other and everybody will be in a flurry of saving his head? And what knowledge is unnecessary in the world and in the Hereafter? I wish I knew it and discard it? For our Prophet ‘sall-Allâhu alaihi wa sallam’ stated, **‘May Allâhu ta’âlâ protect us against learning useless knowledge, against a heart who does not fear Allâhu ta’âlâ, against a nafs that will not be satiated with worldlies, against eyes that will not weep for Allah, and against a prayer that will not deserve acceptance’.**” After thinking for a long time, he decided to learn the answers to his questions and wrote a letter to his teacher Hujjat-ul-islâm Imâm-i-Ghazâlî (may Allâhu ta’âlâ fill his grave with nûr). Begging his teacher to pronounce benedictions over him, he added, “The answer to this question of mine is written in your books, i.e. in **Ihyâ-ul-’Ulûm, Kimyâ-yi-sa’âdat, Tafsîrs, Hadîth-i-Erba’in, and Minhâj.** However, will you please write me a concise, clear and useful answer so that I shall read it every morning and act accordingly.”

Hujjat-ul-islâm Imâm-i-Ghazâlî wrote the following answer and sent it:

FASL

1- O my beloved son and faithful friend! May Allâhu ta'âlâ give you a long, long life and bless you with the fortune of spending your lifetime worshipping and following the way He has prescribed! All sorts of teachings have been taken from our Prophet Muhammad 'alaihi-salâm'. Any teaching not coming from him will be of no use. If you have not taken any of these pieces of advice that have spread all over the world, why have you stayed with me and studied with me so many years?

2- One of the worldwide teachings of our Prophet 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wa sallam' is this:

“An omen signifying that Allâhu ta'âlâ will not have mercy on a born slave of His and that He will treat him with wrath and torment is his busying himself with things that will not be useful in this world or in the Hereafter and his killing his time in useless occupations. If a person spends one hour of his lifetime doing something disliked by Allâhu ta'âlâ, any degree of grief he would feel over it would not be too much. If a person is over forty years old and his pious deeds, i.e. thawâbs are not more than his wrongdoings, i.e. sins, let him prepare himself for Hell.”

3- This advice would be enough for those who understand well the meaning of this hadîth-i-sherîf.

4- Advice is easy to give and difficult to take. For advice is bitter and harâms taste sweet to those who follow their sensuous desires and run after worldly pleasures. As a matter of fact, Allâhu ta'âlâ purports in Qur'ân al-kerîm, **“Make war with disbelievers! War will be bitter and troublesome for you. Things that come difficult to you, that is, commandments of Allâhu ta'âlâ, are beneficial, good for you. Things that come easy to you and which you like, i.e. harâms, are harmful and bad for you. Allâhu ta'âlâ knows those that are beneficial, and you do not know them.”** Advice will have no effect on people like you, who learn useless things called knowledge and disguised in knowledge and who do not think of their life in the Hereafter but learn knowledge in order to make a show of superiority to others and only for worldly advantages instead of learning it in order to be useful to yourselves and others in this world and in the Hereafter. You think that knowledge without practice will save you and that having knowledge will exempt you from religious practices. Your case is an appalling paradox. For a learned person ought to know that

mere knowledge without any practices will be harmful to him in the Hereafter and he will not be able to put forward the excuse that he did not know. Have you not heard our Prophet's 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wa sallam' hadîth-i-sherîf? He states, **“On the Rising Day the most vehement torment shall be inflicted on the scholar who has not benefited from his knowledge.”** One of our superiors 'rahmatullâhi aleyh' saw Juneyd-i-Baghdâdî 'qaddas-Allâhu rûhah' in his dream and asked how he was doing (after death). Juneyd answered, “All my statements, kashfs, ishârats, that is, all my zâhirî and bâtinî knowledge came to naught; they were all gone. I had performed a namâz of two rak'ats one night. That namâz came to my rescue.”

5- Do not be slack in your practices, worships! Do not forget states and knowledge pertaining to heart! Your actions should be agreeable with your knowledge and your spiritual states should be in concordance with Tasawwuf.

Be it known very well that (religious) knowledge will not save a person unless it is put into practice. Let me clarify this point with an example for you: Supposing someone fully armed suddenly met a lion in the mountains. No matter how brave and how good he might be in using a gun and a sword, could he save himself from this lion unless he used his weapons? He could not, as you, too, know very well. By the same token, however deeply learned a person may be, his knowledge will come to naught if he does not act upon his knowledge. Another example is about a doctor who becomes ill himself. Supposing he diagnosed his illness and knew a medicine which really would cure his illness, sheer knowledge would not cure him unless he took the medicine. You know this very well, too. The poet says:

***You may have made thousands of physics;
To no avail, unless you use them.***

However much a person may have learned and however many books he may have read, all this will be an exercise in futility unless he practices what he knows.

6- Unless you earn mercy of Allâhu ta'âlâ by doing His commandments and acting in the way He likes, you shall not attain His compassion. An âyat-i-kerîma purports, **“One will attain happiness only by working and worshipping.”** If someone should say that this âyat-i-kerîma was changed by another âyat, may the person who makes such an allegation be changed,

demolished! If you assert that this âyat was changed, what will you say about the other âyats, then? An âyat-i-kerîma purports, **“Let those who wish to attain Allah’s compassion do His commandments.”** Another âyat-i-kerîma purports, **“They shall attain the recompense for what they have done in the world.”** Another âyat-i-kerîma purports, **“Those who have îmân and do the worships and avoid the harâms shall certainly enter Gardens of Paradise and attain blessings.”** Another âyat-i-kerîma purports, **“Paradise is only for those who have îmân and do the worships.”** Another âyat-i-kerîma purports, **“Those who obey Allâhu ta’âlâ and His Messengers shall have a share in the blessings that shall be given to Prophets and to Siddîqs and to Martyrs and to Pious Muslims in the Hereafter.”** Our Prophet ‘sall-Allâhu alaihi wa sallam’ states in a hadîth-i-sherîf, **“Islam has been founded on five fundamentals: First, to believe in Allâhu ta’âlâ and that Muhammad ‘alaihis-salâm’ is His Messenger; second, to perform namâz five times daily; third, to give zakât to poor Muslims once yearly, that is, to give one-fortieth of one’s property; fourth, to fast every day in the month of Ramadân-i-sherîf; fifth, to go to Mekka-i-mukarrama and perform Hajj once in one’s lifetime.”** He states in another hadîth-i-sherîf, **“Îmân means to believe in six facts through heart and to express this belief with tongue and to like the commandments of Allâhu ta’âlâ.”** Îmân comes into being by believing and expressing and it shines into perfection by worshipping. Imâm-i-a’zam Abû Hanîfa ‘rahmatullâhi aleyh’ [80-150, in Baghdâd], leader of the Ahl as-sunnat and the greatest scholar in the Islamic religion, states in his will: **“Îmân is to express with the tongue and to believe with the heart.”** The documents showing that Islam’s practices are necessary are as numerous as you could tally them. Yet, alas, you are sound asleep! If, from all these statements of mine, you infer that, “Then, men will enter Paradise on account of their own deeds and not as a mercy, as a blessing of Allâhu ta’âlâ,” then, you must not have understood my words at all. I mean, men will enter Paradise through Allah’s kindness and generosity. However, if a person does not prepare himself for attaining Allah’s compassion by obeying and worshipping Him, he will not deserve His compassion and therefore His mercy and kindness will not reach him. As a matter of fact, an âyat-i-kerîma purports, **“My Compassion is for muhsins, that is, for those who accept My Commandments and obey them.”** No one can enter Paradise unless Compassion of Allâhu ta’âlâ reaches him. If it

should be said that entering Paradise depends only on (having) *îmân*; yes, it is true. Nevertheless, not before having weathered a considerable number of dangers. A person who does not go to the next world with *îmân* shall not enter Paradise. Entering Paradise requires moving to the Hereafter and surviving the other dangers. And then one will attain only the lowest grades of Paradise.

7- You have to know very well that you shall not obtain any *thawâb* unless you work and follow the way shown by the religion! Once there was an Israelite who had been worshipping for many years. Allâhu ta'âlâ wished to show his worships to angels. He sent him an angel and had the angel ask him: "How long are you going to go on worshipping like this? Haven't you already deserved (entering) Paradise?" The worshipper answered: "My duty is to act like a born slave. He has the Commanding Post." Upon hearing this answer, the angel said: "Yâ Rabbi! Thou art the Omniscient. Thou hast heard how Thine born slave hath answered." A hadîth-i-qudsî purports, "**That born slave of Mine, lowly and humiliated as he is, will not turn away from Us; so We, being Generous and Compassionate, shall certainly not forsake him. O Mine angels! Be witnesses: I have forgiven him!**"

8- Behold what our Prophet Muhammad 'alaihîs-salâm' states: "**Before you are called to account in the Hereafter, call yourselves to account in the world; and before you are weighed, weigh yourselves!**" Alî Murtadâ 'radiy-Allâhu anh' states: A person who expects to attain Paradise without endeavouring and taking pains is building castles in the air. And a person who claims to attain by working ought to exert himself and shoulder the burden of worships. Hasan Basrî 'rahmatullâhî aleyh', one of hadrat Alî's 'radiy-Allâhu anh' disciples, states: It is a grave sin to ask for Paradise from Allâhu ta'âlâ without worshipping. One of our superiors states, "A person whose knowledge is useful is a person who ceases not from worshipping but from estimating the *thawâb* he will earn by worshipping." Our master the Prophet 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wa sallam' states, "**A wise person will crush his nafs and work for (earning) what he will need in the Hereafter. And an idiot will run after the desires of his nafs and then pray to Allâhu ta'âlâ to take him to Paradise.**"

9- You have sacrificed many a night and forgone many a luscious sleep for the sake of learning and reading books. I cannot see why you should have ruined yourself so badly? If

your learning was intended to hoard worldly advantages, to make a fame, to obtain a position or to make a show of superiority to other Muslims, shame upon you! You have made a big mistake and thrown yourself into torment! However, if your purpose was to help Islam and Muhammad's 'alaihis-salâm' religion and to purify your morals and to tame your nafs, how lucky for you! You have prepared a lovely eternal future for yourself. The future to be prepared is to attain eternal felicity. A distich:

***Sleepless nights not intended for thineself are in vain;
Crying for others' sake is only fruitless pain.***

10- Live as you please! Yet this life of yours will not last long; you will certainly die one day. You will certainly part with those flavours which you think of day and night and which you hold so fast to. Whatever you are fond of in the world, you will have to bid farewell to all! Do whatever you can! But do not forget that you will have to account for all your doings!

11- It would mean to waste one's lifetime to try to make the tenets of belief agreeable and sympathetic to mind, to dispute with ignorant and irreligious people and to grapple with their corrupt thoughts, to try to earn money before learning Qur'ân al-kerîm, how to perform namâz and ablution, how to fast, what are farz and what are harâm, or to busy oneself with such studies as medicine, engineering, literature and law in order to surpass others financially.

I swear on Allâhu ta'âlâ that I have read in Îsâ's 'alaihis-salâm' Injil (original, pristine copy of the Bible): After a (dead) person is put into his coffin, Allâhu ta'âlâ will ask him forty questions until he is left into his grave. The first question will be, **“O My born slave! As long as you lived, you adorned yourself for the world and learned many things so that others should like and respect you. Did you learn My commandments and do what I asked you and avoid what I prohibited?”**

12- Allâhu ta'âlâ asks you every day: **“Why do you work so hard for others? Do you not see that you are covered from head to foot with My goodnesses and blessings?”** But you do not hear this. Like a child who is too preoccupied in its playing to notice what is going on around it, you have been made deaf and blind by worldly pleasures and sensuous desires!

13- It is insanity to learn knowledge and then not to use it. And it is equally wrong and unacceptable to practise (religious commandments) without knowing (them). A line:

Acquire knowledge, and never be negligent in worships!

These two will save you from burning in fire.

Knowledge that does not protect you from sins and does not encourage you to worship today, will not protect you from Hell fire on the morrow.

If you cannot have your past sins forgiven by worshipping, in the Rising Day, when your hand and tongue become incapable, you will be one of those who will say, “Yâ Rabbî! Send us back to the world. We shall spend all our lives worshipping.” And you will be answered, **“O idiot! You have come from there!”**

14- You should work earnestly, put up a vehement opposition against the nafs, which is an enemy of Allâhu ta’âlâ, and subjugate it and prepare yourself in a way as if you were going to be lying in the grave the next moment. Those who have gone to the next world before you are wondering when and in what state you are going to join them. Come to your senses and do not go there without any resources! Abû Bekr as-Siddîq ‘radiy-Allâhu anh’ stated: The human body is either like a bird’s cage: when the cage is opened the bird will fly away; or like a stable: it is opened to put some burden on the animal, which means trouble for the animal. Think! Which one of these are you? If you are a bird’s cage, you will fly up as soon as you hear the voice saying, **“Attain to thine Rabb!”** As a matter of fact, it is stated in a hadîth-i-sherîf, **“The Arsh shook upon Sa’d bin Mu’âdh’s ‘radiy-Allâhu anh’ death.”** If, – may Allâhu ta’âlâ protect from being so –, you are like a stable, that is, if you are one of those people about whom Allâhu ta’âlâ states, **“Because they do not consider what they are going to undergo, they are like animals, or rather, lower (than animals),”** do not doubt that you will fall from your dwelling place down to the abyss, that is, straight into Hell. One day hadrat Hasan-i-Basrî ‘rahmatullâhi aleyh’ took a glass of cool sherbet in his hand and was about to drink it, when he suddenly swooned and dropped the glass onto the floor. When he recovered they asked him what had happened. He explained, “When I remembered how those people burning in Hell will call to their friends in Paradise and ask them to **‘Give us some from the water you drink,’** I was so afraid that I almost lost my mind.”

15- If knowledge alone would be sufficient and there were no need for worships, it would not be announced towards morning every night, **“Isn’t there anyone to ask, so that I shall give? Isn’t there anyone to make tawba, so that I shall forgive?”** One day Abdullâh bin ‘Umar was commended in our Prophet’s ‘sall-Allâhu alaihi wa sallam’ presence. The Prophet stated, **“He is a good person. He would be a better one if he performed namâz of tahajjud [namâz at midnight].”** At some other time he advised to one of the As-hâb: **“O...! Do not sleep too long! Sleeping too long will cause deprivation on the Rising Day.”**

16- The âyat-i-kerîma, **“Perform tahajjud at night,”** is a command. The âyat, **“Make istighfâr at the time of Seher,”** is a shukr (thanksgiving). In other words, Allâhu ta’âlâ praises those who make istighfâr. Those who make istighfâr at the time of Seher will also attain the thawâb for dhikr. Our Prophet ‘sall-Allâhu alaihi wa sallam’ states, **“Allâhu ta’âlâ loves three kinds of voices: the voice of those who read (or recite) Qur’ân al-kerîm respectfully and with tajwîd, (that is, following the rules of pronunciation); the voice of those who make istighfâr at the time of Seher; the voice of those who make dhikr of Allâhu ta’âlâ.”** Sufyân-i-Sawrî ‘rahmatullâhi aleyh’ [95-161, in Basra] stated: Allâhu ta’âlâ makes a wind which blows mixing with the voices making istighfâr and dhikr at the time of Seher. He stated at another time: Every night a voice saying, **“Aren’t there people who (would like to) worship Allâhu ta’âlâ? Let them get up,”** suffuses the whole universe. ‘Âbids (worshippers) get up and worship until Seher. When the time of Seher comes, a voice says again, **“Aren’t there people who (would like to) make istighfâr?”** These people get up and make istighfâr. When dawn breaks and it is time for morning prayer, a voice says, **“Will none of the unaware get up?”** So these people get up like the dead rising from their graves.

17- Loqman Hakîm ‘rahmatullâhi ta’âlâ aleyh’ gave the following advice to his son: My son, I wonder if the rooster is wiser than you are! He makes dhikr and tesbîh every morning, whereas you sleep. The following two couplets would be appropriate at this point:

***In the darkness of the night, pigeon in the tree
Cries out dhikr; and, oh, alas, as for me;***

***I am so fast asleep, shame on me! If I loved Thee,
Before pigeons, the earliest mourner I would be.***

18- Essence of advice is to explain what it means to worship and obey Allâhu ta'âlâ. Tâ'at and 'ibâdat means to adapt oneself to our Prophet Muhammad 'alaihi-salâm'. In other words, it means to modify all one's speech and behaviour so as to be in compliance with his commandments and prohibitions. That is, whatever one says or does and whatever one does not do or say should be intended to carry out his commandments. You should know very well that the deeds which you perform in the name of worships are not worships at all, perhaps they are sins, if they are not His commandments. This is the fact, even if those deeds are in the form of namâz or fasting. In fact, as you know, it is sinful and an act of disobedience to fast on the first day of 'Iyd of Ramadân and/or on any or all of the four days of 'Iyd of Qurbân. Although fasting is a kind of worship, it is sinful (to fast on those days) because it is not a commandment. Likewise, it is sinful also to perform namâz in clothes or at a place usurped from others. Although namâz is a kind of worship, it becomes an act of disobedience because it is not a commandment (to usurp others' clothes or place in order to perform namâz). Likewise, it is a kind of worship and causes thawâb to play and joke and entertain oneself with a girl with whom one is married through nikâh (marriage contract prescribed by Islam). It is stated in a hadîth-i-sherîf that there are many blessings in this act, although what is done is merely entertainment. Yet it causes much thawâb because it is a commandment. As it is seen, to worship does not mean only to perform namâz or to fast. To worship means to obey Islam's commandments. For the same reason, namâz and fasting become worships when they are performed compatibly with Islam's prescription.

19- Then, adapt all your words, all your actions to Islam! For all sorts of learnings and studies that are disagreeable to Islam, whosoever does them, are deviations from the right way and will incur estrangement from Allâhu ta'âlâ. It is for this reason that our Prophet 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wa sallam' revoked, replaced the teachings and customs that were the continuations of the era previous to him. Then, one should not open one's mouth without Islam's permission, and you must know very well that the way shown by Allah cannot be followed under the guidance of the knowledge you have acquired. You must know also that this way

cannot be followed, either, under the guidance of the non-Islamic statements made by those ignorant people who name themselves Sufis and mystics and who claim to be followers of the superior leaders of Tasawwuf and yet who would fail to explain the meanings of their own statements. Only those who carry on a struggle against the nafs can follow this way. The desires and lusts of the nafs should not be allowed to overflow Islam's limits. This way cannot be followed with hollow words. Words and teachings that have no place in Islam and an oblivious heart mixed with lust are symptoms of wickedness and (that one is heading towards) a disaster.

20- You ask questions some of which can be explained neither by talking nor by writing. Their answers are known only by those who reached and obtained those levels. It is impossible for those who have not obtained those levels to know them. For they are blessings which can be known by tasting. Flavours that can be known only by enjoying them cannot be explained or described by telling or writing about them. Sweet, sour, bitter or salty tastes cannot be depicted by writing.

21- Supposing a sexually impotent man asked a married person what kind of a pleasure it was to have sexual intercourse, the answer he would deserve is this: "I knew that you were sexually impotent. Now I know also that you are an idiot. This flavour can be known only after it is tasted. It cannot be described to those who do not know it by telling or writing about it."

22- Some of your questions were of this sort. As for those that can be explained in words and writings; their answers are written in detail in my books **Ihyâ-ul-'ulûm**, **Kimyâ-yi-sa'âdat**, **Minhâj**, and others. Read these books of mine! However, I shall write shortly for the nonce.

You want to know what a person who wishes to follow the way guiding to Allâhu ta'âlâ ought to do first. First of all, he will have to have a pure credo, an îmân agreeable with the teachings of the scholars of Ahl as-sunnat. Next, tawba-i-nasûh, that is, making tawba for your sins and promising not to commit them again, is necessary. Thirdly, you should cleanse yourself from all sorts of debts by paying back all the rights belonging to creatures or at least by pleasing the owners of these rights in such a way that they forgive you. The fourth condition is to learn Islam well enough to carry out the commandments of Allâhu ta'âlâ. It is not wâjib for everyone to learn more of Islam than will be necessary for himself. Other branches of knowledge should be learned as much as

necessary. Necessity in this respect varies, depending on each person's art, profession and specialization. The following story will help you grasp this better.

Story: Hadrat Shiblî 'rahmatullâhi aleyh' [247-334, in Baghdâd] states: I studied with four hundred teachers and learned four thousand hadîth-i-sherîfs from them. Of all these hadîths, I chose one and adapted myself to it, leaving the others aside. For I saw that it would suffice for me to attain salvation and eternal happiness and that it embraced all sorts of advice. The hadîth-i-sherîf I chose is this: Our Prophet 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wa sallam' says to a Sahâbî: **"Work for the world as much as (you will need for) the length of time you will spend here! Work for the Hereafter as much as (it will be necessary for) your endless stay there! Obey Allâhu ta'âlâ as well as you need to! Commit sins as much as you will endure (the punishment you will be given for them in) Hell!"**

23- This hadîth-i-sherîf shows that you do not need knowledge more than necessary. For it is farz-i-kifâya to learn knowledge. It is not farz-i-ayn. Others have done this job, thus relieving you of your burden. You will understand this better if you read the following story:

Story: Hâtim-i-Esam [He was born in Belh and passed away in Tirmuz in 237 (A.D. 852)] was one of the disciples of Shaqîq-i-Belhî [passed away in 174]. One day Shaqîq-i-Belhî asked him, "How long have you been coming here and listening to me?" "Thirty-three years." "What have you learned, benefited from me during this long time?" "I have benefited (learned) eight things." Upon hearing this, Shaqîq was appalled and said, "Shame on you, o Hâtim! I have spent all my time for you, and you have not benefited more than eight things from me." Hâtim said, "O my teacher! It is the truth, and I do not want more. They will be enough for me. For I know very well that escaping disasters in the world and in the Hereafter and attaining eternal happiness will be possible with these eight pieces of knowledge." His teacher said, "Tell me what they are. I want to know them, too."

Hâtim said, "First, I observed other people and saw that everybody has chosen an object to turn his affections towards and that most of these objects, like faithless lovers, abandon their friends to their fate after accompanying them for some time, until they are on their deathbed, dead or buried. No one would accompany a person as far as into his grave or share the troubles

he is likely to face in the grave. Upon seeing this fact, I deliberated and said to myself: 'I must choose myself such a friend who will come with me to my grave and accompany me there, too.' After searching for a long time, I saw that no other friend would be as darling and as faithful as the worships performed towards Allâhu ta'âlâ. I chose them as friends and clung fast to them."

Upon hearing this, Shaqîq said, "Very well done, o Hâtim! Tell me the second benefit, too. Let me know what it is."

Hâtim said: "O my teacher! The second benefit is this: I observed other people and saw that everybody was running after the sensuous desires and pleasures of the nafs. This reminded me of the blessed meaning of an âyat-i-kerîma, which purports, **'Verily, those who fear Allâhu ta'âlâ and desist from** (the sensuous desires of) **their nafs shall enter Paradise.'** I pondered hard. All my learnings, experiences, as well as my mind and conscience, agreed on the fact that Qur'ân al-kerîm is thoroughly correct and came to a full belief in this truth. Knowing my own nafs as a foe, I resolved that I would never believe it and began to pursue a course of rejecting its desires and lusts. Eventually, I saw that the nafs, who had been shunning worships, was now beginning to run towards worshipping Allâhu and cease from its passions." When Shaqîq heard these, he said, "May Allah bless you with goodnesses. You have done very well. Now let me hear the third benefit.

Hâtim 'rahmatullâhi ta'âlâ aleyh' said, "My third benefit is this: I observed other people and saw that everybody in the world has gotten himself into trouble of some sort striving to stash away worldlies. Then I recollected an âyat-i-kerîma, which purports, **'Whatever of worldly property you hold fast to and** (try so hard to) **retain shall not stay with you, but** (all that belongs to this world) **shall leave you. Only the goodnesses and worships you have performed for the sake of Allah shall abide with you.'** All the things I had collected for worldly purposes I spent for the sake of Allah; I meted them out to the poor! In other words, I lent them to Allâhu ta'âlâ so that they should remain (in my possession) eternally!" Shaqîq-i-Belhî 'qaddas-Allâhu ta'âlâ sirrah ul 'azîz' said, "You have done so well and how beautiful is the way you put it, o Hâtim! Now let me hear the fourth benefit."

Hâtim 'radiy-Allâhu ta'âlâ anh' said, "My fourth benefit is this: I observed other people and saw that they loathed one another. I knew that it was because they envied one another and coveted

one another's position, possessions and knowledge, which reminded me of an âyat-i-kerîma, which purports, **'We have divided all their substantial and spiritual sustenances in the world and given them their shares.'** So I realized that kinds of sustenance such as knowledge, property, rank position and children which were to be allotted to everybody's share had been preordained in eternity, that no one could do anything about it, that it was necessary to work since He (Allâhu ta'âlâ) had commanded us to work, and that jealousy, alongside its multiple harms, would be quite futile, contented myself with the distribution Allâhu ta'âlâ had foreordained in eternity and with what my Rabb would send me in return for my work, and thus became friendly with all people around me, liked other people and was liked by them." Upon hearing these, Shâqîq said, "So well done and so well said. Now tell me the fifth benefit, o Hâtim!"

Hâtim said, "My fifth benefit: I observed other people and saw that most people thought that man's honour and value as a human being lay in occupying a commanding post and seeing how other people needed him and humiliated themselves in front of him and that they boasted with such things. Some of them, on the other hand, thought that the human value consisted of abundant property and progeny and boasted about possessing these qualities. And others, thinking that the honour of humanity was in spending one's property and money on things that would please and entertain other people, deprived themselves of utilizing their possessions at places and in manners prescribed by Allâhu ta'âlâ and that in addition they were proud of this folly of theirs. I remembered an âyat-i-kerîma, which purports, **'The most honourable and the most valuable one among you is the one who fears Allâhu ta'âlâ very much'** Realizing that people were wrong, I dedicated myself to taqwâ. In order to attain the forgiveness and blessings of Allâhu ta'âlâ and fearing Him, I did not go out of Islam and always avoided harâms." Shaqîq's response to these words was: "Very well said. Say the sixth benefit."

Hâtim said, "My sixth benefit is: I observed other people. I saw that they coveted one another's property, status and knowledge, parted into inimical groups and parties. I thought of an âyat-i-kerîma which purports, **'Your enemy is the devil. That is, the enemy is those who will strive to misguide you out of Islam. Know them as your enemy.'** I knew Qur'an al-kerîm as the true word, and the devil and those who like him tried to mislead

Muslims as enemies; I never believed their words or followed them. I did not worship their idols. I obeyed Allâhu ta'âlâ's commandments. I never strayed from the way shown by the scholars of Ahl as-sunnat. I believed that the only way to salvation, the true way is the Sunnî way. As a matter of fact, an âyat-i-kerîma purports, **'O you sons of Âdam! Did I not say: Do not worship the devil, and (did I not) make you promise! Obey and worship Me! This is the only way to salvation.'** So I did not listen to those who would try to deceive Muslims. I did not cease from the books of the scholars of Ahl as-sunna, who are the guides of the way taught by Muhammad 'alaihîs-salâm.'" Upon these statements, Shaqîq said, "So well done. Now say the seventh benefit."

Hâtîm said, "My seventh benefit is: People are working in order to eat and drink and earn money. This is blinding them to harâms and dubious practices and making them insensitive to humiliations and insults. Observing this made me recollect an âyat-i-kerîma, which purports, **'The earth does not carry a living being whose sustenance is not sent by Allâhu ta'âlâ'.** I knew that I was one of those living beings and Qur'ân al-kerîm is absolutely correct. Placing my reliance on His promise to send me my sustenance, which He would definitely send, I worked as He commands." Hearing these, Shaqîq said, "How lovely you have done and how beautiful are the facts you express. Now say the eighth benefit, too."

Hâtîm 'rahmatullâhi ta'âlâ aleyh' said, "The eighth benefit I derived is this: I observed other people and saw that everybody had someone or something to put his trust in. Some people relied on their property and possessions, some depended upon their crafts and earnings and some on their ranks and positions, while others pinned their hopes on beings that were mere human beings like themselves. So I recollected an âyat-i-kerîma, which purports, **'Allâhu ta'âlâ shall always come to the rescue of those who rely only on Him.'** Then I always and only relied on Allâhu ta'âlâ in whatever I did. I worked and held fast to (His) law of causation because He commanded so. However, I relied only on Him, asked only from Him, and expected only from Him."

Upon hearing these explanations, Shaqîq 'rahmatullâhi ta'âlâ aleyh' said, "O Hâtîm! May Allâhu ta'âlâ come to your rescue in whatever you do! I studied hadrat Mûsâ's Taurah (Torah), hadrat Îsâ's Injîl (Bible), hadrat Dâwûd's Zebûr (Psalms) and hadrat Muhammad's 'alaihîm-us-salawâtu wa-s-salâm' Furqân (Qur'ân). I

saw that these four heavenly books are based on these eight fundamentals. Those who follow these fundamentals and establish a life style based on them will have adapted themselves to these four books and performed their commandments.”

Murshid-i-kamil

***In appearance, he seems to need being served;
Innerly, though, he pays himmat to those who deserved.***

***It will sure be misleading to judge by appearance;
Receiving the himmat requires seeing the essence.***

***Haqq ta'âlâ has His beloved ones concealed;
Their inner with appearance He covered.***

***Their appearance is the Sharî'at's mirror;
Haqq's Attentions will be reflected in their inner.***

***The lover will get from afflictions such pleasure
As will not be in anything, be itself pleasure.***

***People unaware will not believe this; yet,
In Qur'ân Haqq ta'âlâ says so by âyat.***

***If a person attends a Wali's luminous sohbat,
His heart will open, nûrs will his inner illuminate.***

***Desires of the nafs will no more titilate him;
Secrets of this way will at once open before him.***

***Adhere to the Sharî'at, then search for a Murshîd!
Cannot find one? Then love is enough if you are candid!***

***Those who have attained these two blessings,
Will receive fayz from the heart of Murshid's.***

***Haloos gushing out from the Messenger's heart,
Will flow into them due to loving regard.***

***Abd-ul-hakîm Arwasî was a Walî;
His words and manners was its testimony.***

***From Sayyid Fehîm he took over caliphate;
In his every behaviour was seen kerâmat.***

***Do not think that the Murshid is hard to recognize!
His behaviour will always be Sharî'at-wise!***

***If a person is without the Sharî'at in deeds and statements,
Quick, run away from him, whatever stories he invents!***

***Sharî'at prescribes how deeds are to be done;
Sharî'at and Îmân make up Islam; the rest, none.***

***Îmân means to believe, Sharî'at means practices;
Being Muslim requires these two performances.***

***Believers have parted into groups, seventy-three;
Ahl as-sunna is the single right group, blame-free!***

PART NINE

ANSWER TO A RELIGIOUSLY IGNORANT PERSON

Our Prophet (sall-Allâhu ‘alaihi wa sallam) declared: **“Every child comes to the world with a pure soul suitable for becoming a Muslim. Later their parents make them irreligious.”** This implies that it is necessary to teach Islam to children. Their pure souls are suitable for Islam. A child who has not learned Islam will misunderstand Islam by falling for the lies and slanders of the enemies of religion. He will think that it is retrogressive or vicious. If a person who is religiously unlearned and who has never received any religious instruction or notion of Islam falls into the traps of the enemies of Islam, he will learn quite a different, altogether contrary system instead of Islam. He will fall victim to the poisonous inoculations and shamelessly fabled writings directed to him. He will not find peace in this world. And he will be drifted into endless calamities and tortures in the next world.

Every Muslim, even every person, must know how low, how base the slanders which are fabled by the enemies of Islam in order to deceive the youth are. And in order not to drift into calamity by believing these lies, we should comprehend the sublimity of Islam, realize that it helps knowledge, science, morals and health, and that it commands working, advancement, cooperation and mutual love. A wise, vigilant and cultured person who has understood Islam correctly and well, will not believe in the lies of the enemies of Islam. Seeing that they are religiously ignorant, uneducated, deceived and wretched people, he will pity them. He will wish that they could get rid of that disastrous state and come round to the right course.

We have come across a pamphlet of several pages scribbled shamelessly by such a deceived ignoramus of the religion with a view to spreading the poisonous slanders he had been taught in order to inoculate healthy souls with the spiritual disease that drags him to endless calamity; he wants to corrupt and degenerate good people. Confusing the title of a writer with competence, those who see its content, which slanders truth, goodness and virtue, may think that it is based upon observation or knowledge and that it contains value. To eliminate the sorrow it causes, it has

been deemed necessary to write the truth as an answer to the squalid slanders quoted in the following 12 paragraphs. The innocent youth, seeing these base, made-up lies and the truth of the matter, will see clearly the tactics and tricks of the enemies of Islam and will easily identify those block-headed, corrupt-souled disbelievers, who claim to be progressive:

1- *“The religious thought and method that have interfered in social life are like shackles restricting progress in society,”* he says.

Answer: Rasûlullah (sall-Allâhu 'alaihi wa sallam) declared: **“Work for your worldly advantages as if you would never die!”** A hadîth quoted by al-Imâm al-Manâwî says, **“Al-hikmatu dâllat al-mu'min.” (Scientific knowledge is the lost property of the Believer. He should get it wherever he finds it!).** All men of science, enemies and friends alike, unanimously state that the Islamic religion supports social progress and sheds light on the way to civilization. For example, British Lord John Davenport stated, “No people have ever appeared who respect knowledge and culture more deeply than Muslims do,”^[1] and explained with detailed examples and documents that Islam guided societies to progress and prosperity.

In a speech to an enormous audience in 1972 Dr. Kris Traylor, an American professor of history at the Technical University of Texas, stated that the source of inspiration and development for the European Renaissance was Islam; that Muslims, coming to Spain and Sicily, had laid the foundations for modern techniques and developments and had taught that scientific progress would be possible only through improvement in chemistry, medicine, astronomy, navigation, geography, cartography and mathematics; and that these branches of knowledge had been brought to Europe from North Africa and Spain by Muslims. He also stressed the contribution of written Islamic knowledge on valuable parchments and papyri as an important link in the development of the modern press.^[2] The lies of an immoral, vicious enemy of Islam, who has no share in knowledge except a title, certainly cannot cover up this fact. The sun cannot be plastered with sticky mud.

2- *“It is necessary,”* he says, *“to rescue the State from the fetter of religion. To catch up with contemporary Western civilization, establishment of a real secular system is required.”*

[1] **Hadrat Muhammad and the QUR'ÂN**, Part 2, Chapter 2; London.

[2] Weekly periodical, **The Muslim World**, Pakistan, August 26, 1972.

Answer: In Islam, completely liberal, democratic States based upon knowledge, morals, righteousness and justice have been established. It protects the State against being a plaything in the hands of political swindlers. Capitalists, dictators and servants of communism deem such a free regime as a chain, a fetter, impeding their own acts of cruelty, torture and immorality. Murderers, thieves and dishonest people see justice and criminal codes as chains upon themselves. There is no need to describe the ignorance and idiocy of a disbeliever who uses secularism as a means for expressing his enmity against the religion and who tries to demolish Islam under the camouflage of secularism. What this man wants is not the separation of the religion from the State, but the destruction of the religion. It is obvious that a blockhead who expects the nations' or the State's progress not from knowledge, science, hard work and morals, but instead from the destruction of Islam, which represents all these virtues, and who longs for the West's immorality, obscenity and egoism, is devoid not only of wisdom and knowledge but also of morals.

3- He says, *“By anaesthetizing people with Islam’s philosophy of contentment, they expect to turn individuals into a passive state of not demanding their own rights. With the pretext that they will prevent communism, they defend the concepts of slavery and the next world believed in by the people. Contentment is a euphemism for exploitation. Followers of Islam propagate this exploitation.”*

Answer: There could be few phrases as absurd as the phrase “Islam’s philosophy of contentment.” We have explained what philosophy means in **Endless Bliss** and clarified that there is no philosophy in Islam. Such an incorrect phrase shows that the person who uses it knows nothing of Islam or philosophy and that he, by memorizing a number of phrases without being aware of their meanings, makes up many words in order to spread his enmity towards Islam. For centuries the enemies of Islam have been disguising themselves as religious men and have been perpetrating their attacks behind such a mask. But today they attack under the guise of being the master of a profession or art after obtaining a title or position. Those liars who, in order to deceive Muslims, disguise themselves as scientists and present their non-scientific statements as facts, are called **“impostors of science.”** Not only Islam, but also the ethical books possessed by every nation praise contentment. Contrary to what this impostor of science fables, contentment does not mean giving up one’s

rights and being idle. Contentment means being content with one's rights, with what one earns, and not violating others' rights. Moreover, this does not make people idle, but encourages them to work and make progress. Islam, contrary to this impostor's falsification, does not defend slavery but commands the emancipation of slaves. Slavery exists not in Islam, but in the regime of a dictatorship and in communism. Heavenly books and Prophets ('alaihimu 's-salâm), whose miracles were seen, reported the existence of the next world and wisdom; knowledge and science cannot deny it. The words of this deviated ignoramus, however, are merely emotional and obstinate sophistry. He provides neither a reference nor a scientific basis. Belief in the next world causes order, justice, mutual love and unity in societies and countries. Disbelief in it leads to vagabondage, inactivity, loss of the feeling of responsibility, egoism, discord and hostility. It is certainly good to believe in something useful. It is reasonable and necessary to avoid something unsubstantiated, baseless and vain. Islam rejects exploitation and negligence of human rights. Just as exploitation is a sin, so it is not permissible to approve being harmed. In Islam, ignorance, laziness, neglecting one's rights and being deceived are not excuses; they are crimes. There is a famous saying that goes, **“He who is content with being harmed is not to be pitied.”** How can exploitation ever exist in Islam? How can a person with knowledge and reason ever say so? Hasn't the ignorant person who said so ever heard about the âyats and the various hadîths defending human rights? Not knowing or not having heard of them is not an excuse for him!

4- *“The East, absorbed in and intoxicated with religion, has become ill. Having imân means slavery,”* he says.

Answer: Any reader of history will clearly see the superiorities of the Sahâbat al-kirâm ('alaihimu 'r-ridwân) and the fact that Islam has formed active, studious, equitable and courageous nations. Thousands of examples and millions of books exposing this fact are available. It is a shame that a blind person does not see the sun. Is it the sun's fault that he does not see it? What is the value of an ignorant, deceived person's calumny of this exalted religion, this source of happiness and civilization, which is admired by all wise and cultured men whether friends or enemies? What is said and written reflects its owner. Many people, when they get angry with their enemies, impute their own evil behavior to them. Every container leaks what it contains. So the words of a base person are like him. The object to which these

abhorrent imputations are directed is like a diamond that has fallen into the dirt. An evil person's attacking Islam is not surprising. What is surprising is that some people take these groundless, absurd vilifications as true, believe them and fall into calamity. These slanders are not worth answering. It is useless to try to tell a blind person about the sun's existence or to tell a person with a sick bile or liver how sweet sugar is. Perfection and superior things cannot be described to sick, dirty souls. Answering them is intended to prevent others from believing them. Medicine is for protecting the patient against death, not for enlivening the dead.

Let us quote two of the millions of passages praising how Islam illuminated the way of civilization. We will select them not from the East, which he slanders and dislikes, but from the West, which he admires. Mocheim^[1] said, "It is an absolute fact that scientific knowledge, physics, chemistry, astronomy and mathematics that has spread over Europe since the tenth century was adopted from Islamic schools, especially from Muslims in Andalusia (Spain), who were Europe's masters. The Romans and the Goths had struggled for two hundred years in order to capture Andalusia; on the other hand, the Muslims conquered the peninsula in twenty years. Going beyond the Pyrenees, they advanced up into France. Muslims' superiority with respect to knowledge, wisdom and morals was no less effective than their arms." Lord Davenport said, "Europe is indebted to Muslims today, too. Hadrat Muhammad ('alaihi 's-salâm) said, **'Dignity, honour and superiority are measured not by property, but by knowledge and wisdom.'** Islamic States have been administered by the most powerful hands for centuries. Muslims' spreading over three continents has become the most honourable victory in history."

While an ignorant psychopathic person writes in his pamphlet that the East was absorbed in and intoxicated with religion, these non-Muslim but impartial writers, such as John Davenport, the British Lord, wrote with their reason: "As the Muslims in Andalusia were sowing seeds of knowledge and science in the West, Mahmûd al-Ghaznawî was spreading knowledge and wisdom in the East, and his country had become a center for scientists. The Islamic Ruler increased production, and the wealth

[1] Jean Mocheim, German theologian and historian, died in 1169 (1755).

he had gathered from his resources was used for doing good deeds and for developing the country. As prosperity and civilization made progress in the East, Louis VII of France captured the town of Vitri, set it on fire and burned thirteen hundred people. In those days, civil wars sprinkled death in England, where the land was not cultivated, and everything was destroyed. In the fourteenth century, Anglo-French wars were so tragic, so destructive that history has not seen their like. But in the East, in Muslim countries, Firûz Shâh Tughluq III, who became the Emperor of Delhi in 752 (A.H. 1351), built fifty barrages and canals, forty mosques, thirty schools, a hundred public lodgings, a hundred hospitals, a hundred public baths, and a hundred and fifty bridges until his death in 790. In India, prosperity and happiness reigned in the country of Shâh Jihân. He had 'Alî Murâd Khan, an engineer, build the Delhi Canal. Marble fountains with water jets and public marble baths were built in every party of the city. Each house was supplied with water. The whole country enjoyed security.”

5- *“Religion is an expression of fatalism and contentment. It is an idea pertaining to the next world, which benumbed the oppressed and the hungry. It teaches that, in order to attain the blessings of the next world, it is necessary not to be very desirous of things in this world. The joy and need to live have broken fatalism and contentment and engendered a struggle to earn a better living. Religions are afraid of those who are against the systems that are dependent upon frozen and moulded customs. The opium of religion renders a man insignificant, subordinate and without a means to earn a living,”* he says.

Answer: Such lies and abominable slanders are not worth answering, for a wise person who knows the truth does not believe them. Yet, though the enemies of Islam are not wise, they are cunning. In order to deceive the youth, they busy them with vain and useless things, give them the drugs that are pleasant for the nafs and suitable for their lust. In this way, they prevent them from learning religious knowledge. To protect the innocent youth, who are preoccupied and benumbed, from believing these lies and from drifting into calamity, it has become necessary to briefly write the truth. A fortunate young person who reads our book **Endless Bliss** well, will learn Islam correctly and precisely; he will not believe falsifications. Our Prophet (sall-Allâhu alaihi wa sallam), by stating, **“He who has knowledge becomes a Muslim. He who is ignorant will get deceived by the enemies of the**

religion,” advises us to become well-informed.

It is correct to say that religion is the belief in fate and contentment. But fate, contrary to what this poor ignoramus thinks, does not mean not to work or not to aspire. **Qadar** means that Allâhu ta'âlâ knows beforehand what people will do. Allâhu ta'âlâ commands men to work. He praises those who work. He declares in the ninety-fourth âyat of the Sûrat an-Nisâ: **“Those who perform jihâd, work and struggle are higher and more valuable than those who sit and worship instead of performing jihâd.”** Rasûlullah (sall-Allâhu 'alaihi wa sallam) said, **“Allâhu ta'âlâ likes those who earn a living by working.”** As it is understood well from historical studies and from the chapter titled **Earning and Trade** in the Turkish version of **Endless Bliss**, Islam is the religion of work and development. Rasûlullah (sall-Allâhu 'alaihi wa sallam) commanded progress and improvement each day, by saying, **“He who has remained in the same grade on two [successive] days or has not made progress has deceived himself.”** He also declared, **“Do not postpone your work until tomorrow, or else you will perish!”** and **“Learn foreign languages. Thus you will be safe against the malices of the enemy!”**

It is very unfair and base to say that thinking of the blessings of the next world prevents working. The hadîths, **“He who earns by working will be shining like the full moon on the Day of Resurrection”**; **“Scholars' sleep is worship”**; **“Earn what is halâl and spend it for useful purposes”**; **“The sins of the person who lends money to his brother-in-Islam will be forgiven”**, and **“There exists a way which leads to everything. The way leading to Paradise is knowledge,”** command us to earn by working and states that those who earn a living by legitimate methods and spend their earnings on useful things in the world will earn the next world. **“Religion prevents people from revolting. Therefore, it is opium,”** he says. This nonsense of the author very well explains his lack of understanding concerning religion and civilization. It is obvious that these words are not expressions of knowledge or research. They are nothing but a form of exploitation which is intended to flatter communist leaders in order to obtain a post by means of blind enmity against religion. Those who give their faith away in order to obtain what is worldly are called **“impostors of religion.”** They have always been wrong and drifted into calamity. Their chiefs, with whom they have tried to ingratiate themselves, have fallen from their

positions. Like every mortal being, these chiefs, being judged in the just presence of Allâhu ta'âlâ, whom they disbelieved and resisted obstinately, have rolled down into endless torture. Their flatterers have forgotten about them and, transferring to other parties for their personal advantages, they have begun to worship other mortals.

6- *“In Arab countries, where the laws of the desert have been dominant, they have been attacking materialism and materialistic philosophy,”* he says.

Answer: Formerly, enemies of religion used to memorize a few valuable words from the great men of tasawwuf, write and say them recklessly without understanding their meanings, and pretend to be men of tarîqa to entrap the youth. But now, by memorizing a few of the words of Western men of science and ideas, by holding overcoats and filling the wine glasses of their masters, and by toadying, they get a diploma and seize a post. Playing the part of cultured and learned men of knowledge, they disgorge their enmity against Islam by means of the words which they have memorized, present them to the youth and attempt to deceive Muslim children by displaying them as the attractive offerings of masons and communists.

Those ignoble people who lack scientific knowledge but have obtained diplomas through unlawful means and who have attacked Islam under the mask of a “scientist” are called **“impostors of science.”** At one time, one such fake scientist became the authority of a district with the help of his dubious diploma. Seeing that the people did not regard him as a person of consequence, he held a meeting, gathered the villagers and the men of religion, and spewed out such terms as ‘materialistic philosophy,’ ‘modern,’ and ‘illuminated men.’ Seeing that everybody respected men of religion but took no notice of him, he fell into a fit. He uttered base terms exposing his dirty character and evil thoughts. Meanwhile, alluding to men of religion, he said, “He who has not been to Europe is an ass.” The Muftî Efendi, running out of patience, said, “Has your exalted father ever honoured Europe with his presence?” When the other deigned to give the reply “No” with a coarse voice, the Muftî Efendi concluded, “Then, your exalted person is an ass through your father,” thus making this authority figure fall into his own trap. The “progressive” and “illuminated” but block-headed and ignorant people, who do not know of the greatness of Islamic scholars or of the famous and honoured superiority of the Islamic

civilization that fills libraries worldwide, have attacked Islam's steel fortress with popguns, so to speak, and they have all disgraced and routed themselves.

7- *“Those who caused the decline in the economy took advantage of the circumstances by suggesting that everyone be content with a fatalist morsel and only a coat. This demonstrates the intoxicating effect of the religion. Civilization means to aspire for more economic prosperity and to struggle for this. But religion broke and benumbed these movements for the development of society with such expressions as contentment with fate, the next world and spirituality,”* he says.

Answer: Here is another living picture of toadying, which we have portrayed in the preceding paragraph! What a great lie it is to say that Islamic fighters, who immigrated over three continents in thirty years, defeated the armies of Persia and Rome (the two greatest empires of that time and especially brought the whole Persian Empire to an end), and who won the love of every nation owing to their justice and beautiful morals, were benumbed, drowsy people who were given opium! One who knows even a little history will only sneer and become disgusted at this ignoble, base slander. Islam commands people to work and make progress and promises Paradise to those who become rich and help the poor. If this writer had seen the works of Islamic art, which Europeans and Americans marvel at, and their articles praising Muslim accomplishments in knowledge and science, he would have perhaps been ashamed to scribble these lines. We say ‘perhaps’ for it is a virtue to bear the feeling of shame, and it is out of place to expect shamefulness from a non-virtuous person.

Islam commands Muslims to work and to develop. Contentment does not mean to be content with “only a coat” and sit idly. Muslims are not this way at all. Contentment means to be content with one's own earnings and not to cast covetous eyes on others' earnings. It was Islam which brought civilization to Europe, for Islam shows the way to economic prosperity and commands people to work to attain it. The following hadiths, as well as many others, show that the above-quoted words are gross fabrications: **“The benevolent, the highest of people are those who are more useful to others”;** **“The best of favours is to give alms”;** **“The most benevolent of you is the one who supplies people with much nourishment,”** and **“The most benevolent among you is the one who does not expect anything from others but works and earns his living.”**

8- *“What has handicapped efforts to reach a common civilization in the course of history is the imperative power of religion. The imperative authority of religion, which hinders the purposes of revolutions, should be annihilated,”* he says.

Answer: This fake scientist repeats “civilization” and strives to hypnotize young brains with this magical word. He thinks it is civilization to establish enormous, heavy industries and to make electronic machines and nuclear-powered factories as a means to facilitate fornication and using women as diversions. He also wants to become a boss by smuggling foreign exchange, lying, deceit and speculation, or to satisfy bestial desires by living at the expense of the working class. The civilization that the scholars of Islam described and commanded Muslims to attain is **“Ta’mîr-i bilâd wa tarfîh-i ’ibâd”**, that is, it is to develop countries by constructing buildings, machines and factories and to utilize technology and all kinds of revenues for the people’s freedom, welfare and peace. In the twentieth century, only the first of these two aspects of civilization exists. Though the improvements in technology are dazzling, economic and technical discoveries are being used to enslave people, to perpetrate cruelty and torture. Communist states and dictatorial regimes exemplify this. The twentieth century is a century of technology. It is far from being a century of civilization.

This socialist writer is very serious about his desire to annihilate the religion, for Islam prohibits immorality, dishonesty, exploitation, hypocrisy, dictatorship, condemnation and, in short, every kind of bad behavior that gnaws at humanity. A malicious person with a corrupt character certainly does not wish that goodness to be done. Low-life defeatists certainly fear the constructiveness of Islam. This dishonest disbeliever calls on history to perjure itself in order to make it believable that Islam has handicapped civilization. If he had a little knowledge of history, perhaps he would refrain himself a little. Even non-Muslim historians admit the fact that Islam has served civilization and has shed light upon modern development in Europe and America.

It is clear that this ignorant impostor of science is not so intelligent or literate as to fable these lies by himself. He strives to belittle Islam by quoting the attacks that have been rightfully directed against Christianity in Europe. But, because he is wrong and because his seeing and understanding as well as his knowledge are inadequate, he makes a mess of it.

It will be pertinent here to write about those who are hostile towards Christianity and why they attack it and to explain that these attacks cannot be directed towards Islam.

Christianity, which lost its divine value altogether during the time of Constantine the Great, became a means for political advantages. The clergy opened bloody wars against non-Christians. They forced everybody to become a Christian blindly. Luther went to extremes in these crazy attacks. He was furiously angry with any religion, any nation that was not Protestant. Missionary organizations, on the other hand, tried to confuse everyone, mislead everyone's conscience and then propagandized Christianity through new articles each day. Christian attacks, which were compatible neither with knowledge nor with science and which were perpetrated sometimes with bloodshed and sometimes through deceit, incurred great hatred towards Christianity in Europe in the eighteenth century. It was written that priests were deceiving the people, forcing them to believe in superstitions and striving to enslave everybody to their ideas. But this enmity did not remain directed against the Christian religion only. There appeared those who attacked every religion. Instead of seeing that the priests' evil deeds originated from the defilement and alteration in the religion, they thought it originated from religion. Without studying religions, they attributed the evils inherent in Christianity to religion and attacked religions. One of those who went the furthest in their enmity towards religion was Voltaire. Like Luther, he, too, slandered Islam and, thinking that our Master Rasûlulah (sall-Allâhu 'alaihi wa sallam) was as Luther described him, he spoke ill of him. Without studying Islam, these people, too, like Christians in general, attacked all religions.

For the first time in the nineteenth century, Von Herder, a German, said that bearing enmity against religions blindly was as wrong as Christianization by force. He put forward the necessity to study religions, particularly Islam. Thus, people in Europe began to understand Muhammad's ('alaihi 's-salâm) life and the astonishing superiorities of the lightsome way shown by Islam for the administration of individuals, families and societies. Carlyle, a British thinker, praised Muhammad's ('alaihi 's-salâm) life, moral qualities and accomplishments under the heading **A Hero Who is the Prophet** in his book **The Heroes**, which he wrote in 1841. In this book he wrote, "An exalted person who administered hundreds of millions of people for twelve centuries and who caused the establishment of civilized States in the East and in the

West could never be a counterfeiter as Luther and Voltaire wrote. A low person cannot realize Hadrat Muhammad's ('alaihi 's-salâm) accomplishments. Only a perfect person who possesses faith and morals can give faith to others. Muhammad ('alaihi 's-salâm) was born to exalt mankind. If it had not been so, no one would have followed him. Muhammad's ('alaihi 's-salâm) words are true, for a liar cannot establish even a home, let alone a religion." During the time of Carlyle, there were no reliable Islamic books in Europe. But, with the help of his keen insight and studying, which took many years, he did not believe the lies of Christians or of enemies of religion and was able to see the historical truth. Today, many Islamic books are being translated into European languages, and the misunderstanding and uncertainties in Carlyle's historical writings are being clarified.

If Luther's abominable articles against Qur'ân al-kerîm and the horrible story fabled by Voltaire about Muhammad ('alaihi 's-salâm) are compared with the article **A Hero Who is the Prophet** by Carlyle, one will understand well how differently Islam is viewed by fanatical Christians or ignorant enemies of religion and men of knowledge and observation. After Carlyle, the British scholar Lord Davenport detailedly explained the beauty of Muhammad's ('alaihi 's-salâm) life and moral character and the fact that Qur'ân al-kerîm is a source of knowledge that guides people to happiness. He gave responses that silenced those who slandered Qur'ân al-kerîm and Muhammad ('alaihi 's-salâm).

As it is seen, today, enemies of Islam, for inciting the fire of slander, receive poison from three sources: Christian missionaries; those who attack religions blindly like Voltaire; and communists who use people like animals and machines by eliminating every kind of truth and goodness.

9- *"Religion means to put up with what one has, to accept contentment, sufferings and inequalities. It is to fix the existing limits on a society. It prevents the attainment of a better life that decreases differences between [social] classes and hinders exploitation. This oppression is accomplished with the fear of Hell. Those who suffer are consoled with Paradise. It has killed the personalities of individuals,"* he says.

Answer: He wants to inoculate Muslim children with the poisons he has received from the above-mentioned three sources, but he cannot manage it. Today, young people read Islamic books and learn their faith correctly. Rasûlullah (sall-Allâhu 'alaihi wa sallam) declared: **"A person with equal earnings on two**

[successive] days has suffered a loss. A Muslim must make **progress every day.**” A wise youth who has heard of this command and carefully reads the command **“Forward!”** by Hadrat ‘Umar, the Caliph of Rasûlullah (‘alaihi ‘s-salâm), will certainly not believe the lies of this ignorant person, who passes himself off for a “progressive” man. Islam does not command the approval of inequalities, but justice and their eradication. The hadîth-i-sherîf, **“I came during the time of a just ruler,”** praises even the justice of disbelievers without holy books. A hadîth-i-sherîf written in **Al-Manâwî** and **Ad-Dailamî** declares: **“Those who will be the first to enter Paradise are the just judges and the just statesmen.”** Does this hadîth sherîf command and promote suffering and inequalities or avoiding suffering and inequalities? Our readers’ conscience will certainly answer this correctly, and it will be understood very well how deviated the disbelieving author is and whom he is striving to serve.

Islam commands zakât, lending and mutual help. It informs us that those who do these commands, which eliminate differences between social classes, will go to Paradise. Not those who suffer pain, but those who resign themselves to the Giver of pain, the Creator, will enter Paradise. Islam is a progressive, dynamic religion that guides everyone to the best life. Islam does not “fix existing limits” but gives freedom to statesmen to keep in step with contemporary conditions of trade, industry, agriculture and war technology, and in applying every kind of scientific discovery for making progress. Allâhu ta‘âlâ ordered even His Beloved Prophet (‘alaihi ‘s-salâm), the highest and wisest human being in every respect, to **“Consult with the Sahâbat al-kirâm! Hold counsel with them!”** Each caliph of Islam had counsellors, councils and men of knowledge. It was not permissible for them to do anything without consulting. There should be no changes or reforms in ‘ibâdât; but advancement and progress in technology and worldly affairs are commanded. It was for this reason that Islamic States, established anywhere in the East or West, became advanced in every respect. Islam is a religion that facilitates individuality and freedom of idea. Each Muslim is more valuable than the entire world.

10- *“The religion resulted in internal and external exploitation. Contentment and putting up with fate caused indolence and exploitation. The resources of production were accumulated in certain hands. The great masses were not considered to deserve worldly happiness. The philosophy of ‘a morsel and only a coat’ did away with the strength to live and struggle. Hope for the next*

world caused suffering and inconvenience,” he says.

Answer: Talking about religion requires at least having a smattering of religious knowledge. By likening Islam to today’s capitalists and communist exploiters, his attacks upon the religion indicate his enmity against Islam, an enmity which is so excessive that it blinds his eyes and covers his intellect with anger. While saying nothing against Western capitalists and cruel communists, who accumulate the means of production in certain hands and exploit the people, his attacking Islam, which commands social equality, is sheer hatred towards Islam and open servility to Russia. Because he does not have any Islamic knowledge, time and again he attacks contentment and belief in qadar. In the name of civilization, he talks only about economics and earning money. He does not understand that contentment is a factor that prevents psychiatric diseases, removes incompatibility and hostility, and maintains order in societies. Contentment has expedited Islam’s spreading all over the world and the erecting of monuments of knowledge and science. Do the âyats, “**He who works will earn,**” and, “**Everybody will find [the recompense for] what he does,**” and also many hadîths, such as, “**Allâhu ta’âlâ likes those who earn by working,**” and “**Allâhu ta’âlâ absolutely dislikes those young people who do not work,**” which are written in *Al-Munâwî*, command Muslims to work and make progress or to be lazy? Are the Umayyad, Abbâsid, Ghaznawî, Indian Tamerlaines, Andalusian and Ottoman civilizations, which were established by Muslims, indicators of studiousness or indolence? Can a dervish’s uttering the words “a morsel and only a coat” change the commands of Qur’ân al-kerîm and the hadîths? The utterance of a dervish in an ecstatic state is suitable and appropriate for his own state, but it is not the whole of Islam. Belief in the next world engenders not suffering but order and ease for individuals, families and society. History shows clearly that this is so. Islam commands not self-infliction, but the ending of material and spiritual sufferings and avoiding inconveniences and sorrows.

11- “*These countries are still being administered with the laws of the desert,*” he says.

Answer: The commands and teachings that are stated in Qur’ân al-kerîm, which was revealed by Allâhu ta’âlâ, and in hundreds of thousands of hadîths arouse admiration within men of knowledge and wisdom from all over the world. In order to explain the superiority and value of these teachings and commands, scholars of Islam have written thousands of books, some of which

are cited in this book. Even non-Muslim men of knowledge readily express this truth. Goethe said, “He who reads Qur’ân al-kerîm for the first time does not derive pleasure, but it attracts the reader to itself afterwards. Later on, it conquers him with its beauty.” Gibbon said, “Qur’ân al-kerîm reveals not only a belief in Allâhu ta’âlâ and in the next world but also civil laws and criminal codes. It has brought the unchangeable commands of Allâhu ta’âlâ and the laws that govern all the affairs and states of human beings.”

Davenport said, “Qur’ân al-kerîm regulates religious duties, daily affairs, the soul’s purity, the body’s health, men’s duties and rights towards one another and towards the society, things that are useful to people and to societies, and the knowledge of morals and punishment. Qur’ân al-kerîm is a political system. Every state of the living and of the lifeless is regulated. On morals, it is very tidy and very strong. Qur’ân al-kerîm commands to always be helpful. It strengthens social equality. It exerts a favorable effect on civilization. There can be no behavior as unfair and as ridiculous as to confront, out of stubbornness and hostility, the Qur’ân al-kerîm with ignorant criticism; it is the most valuable book sent by Allâhu ta’âlâ for the benefit and happiness of mankind.”

As it is seen, every wise and reasonable person gets attached to Qur’ân al-kerîm and respects it as much as he understands it. No immorality, baseness or idiocy can be worse than saying “the laws of the desert” about this holy book.

12- *“Other Eastern countries have been directing themselves towards a national, Western ideology by throwing away the laws of the desert, and they are becoming conscientious by abandoning the opium of religion,”* he says.

Answer: Even non-Muslims express their admiration for Islam, which this ignorant, eccentric writer calls opium. Mocheim said, “No time can be thought to be worse than those black days which obscured Europe during the tenth century. Even the Latin nations, the most advanced of the age, had nothing other than logic in the name of knowledge and science. Logic was thought to be superior to all other branches of knowledge. At that time, Muslims built schools in Spain and Italy. Young European men assembled at these places to learn knowledge. After learning the teaching methods of Islamic scholars, they opened Christian schools.”

The dazzling Islamic civilization, which is written and praised unanimously by the world’s history books, was established by those who followed Qur’ân al-kerîm. Today, science has progressed and gigantic industries have been established in

Europe, America and Russia. Space travel has begun, but in none of these countries has peace of mind been provided. Employers' prodigality and dissipation and workers' poverty have not been removed. In communism, the State exploits the people; millions of people work for their food only, hungry and naked as they are; and a cruel, blood-shedding minority live at their expense. They lead a pleasurable life in palaces and commit every atrocity. Since they do not obey Qur'ân al-kerîm, they cannot attain comfort and peace. To be civilized, it is necessary to imitate them in science and technology, to work and accomplish things as they do, since Qur'ân al-kerîm and hadîths command us to make progress in science and arts. For example, a hadîth reported by Ibn Adî and al-Munâwî (rahmatullâhi ta'âlâ 'alaihi) declares: **"Allâhu ta'âlâ certainly likes His slave who makes progress and has a craft,"** and a hadîth written in **Hakîm at-Tirmidî** and **al-Munâwî** declares: **"Allâhu ta'âlâ certainly likes to see that His slave has a craft."** Accomplishing solely this, however, does not suffice for being civilized. The blessings that are earned should be shared equitably, and the worker should get the equivalent of his labour. And this justice can be obtained only by following Qur'ân al-kerîm. Today, Europe, America and Russia are successful in those areas wherein they work in conformity with Islam. However, since the advantages are not distributed in accordance with the principles of justice in Qur'ân al-kerîm, the people cannot attain comfort and peace and class conflicts cannot be avoided. Those who do not obey Qur'ân al-kerîm can never become happy. Those who obey it with or without belief in it, that is, whether they are Muslims or not, get as much benefit from it in this world as the extent of their obedience to it. Those who believe in and obey it get benefit from it both in this world and in the next; they live in comfort and prosperity in this world and will attain endless felicity, infinite blessings in the next. Both history and daily events show clearly that this word is true. As for those who do not follow the way shown by Qur'ân al-kerîm, no matter whether they are Muslims or not; the farther away they get from the way it prescribes the worse harm will they suffer and the more disastrous will their future be.

Belief in Allah, fearing Him, and the religion of Islam are the essentials that will give hope and determination to work for those who have remained helpless concerning material problems.

It has been understood that spiritual development is needed in order for economic development to be useful.

Religion and science are two very necessary, very useful aids

for men. Scientific knowledge prepares the means and causes that are necessary for peace, prosperity and civilization. Religion facilitates the usage of these means for peace, prosperity and civilization. Communists have founded giant industries, enormous factories, dazzling rockets, and satellites with the help of the scientific knowledge they stole from Germany and America. Yet, only science exists in them; there is no religious component. That is why they use scientific products to torture their people, to attack others, and to raise rebellions and revolutions in other parts of the world. They are turning every place into a dungeon. Their advancement in science results not in civilization but in savagery. Peace, prosperity and human rights are violated. Millions of people are put into destitution for the sake of a minority's pleasure. For this reason, we must endeavour to learn the real religion and to be true Muslims.

See what Qur'ân al-kerîm says about true Muslims:

“Know well! There is no fear for the friends of Allâhu ta'âlâ. They will not be troubled!” (Sûra Yûnus, 62nd âyat)

Let us believe in the rules of Islam, that is, the commandments and prohibitions of Allâhu ta'âlâ. By obeying these rules, our dear readers, we shall be able to help one another, help our country attain peace, prosperity and happiness.”

PART TEN

COMMUNISM AND COMMUNISTS' ENMITY AGAINST RELIGION

Social justice is a concept that has been considered since ancient times and has been advocated and promised by all religions, regimes and social sects. Only with social justice is it possible to establish a well-organized and systematic society without any hatred or grudge among its individuals and classes.

Social justice means that everyone gets his due in proportion to his work, knowledge, talents and success, and no one is misused or exploited. Social justice means to recognize the right to live, even for a person who does the least amount of work. It is a primary requirement of social justice that each working individual shall reach a minimum living standard.

Social justice does not mean social equality. It would not be justice but injustice for everybody to have the same income, just as it is for all the students in a class, whether successful or not, to pass their courses. Neither in nature nor in society, nor elsewhere, does absolute equality exist.

Judicial equality means to apply the same treatment to people in the same cases and conditions. It is both unnecessary and impracticable to look for or to desire social and especially economic equality, since it does not conform to the concept of justice. The point under consideration is not how to divide and distribute the existing stock according to the number of heads, but how to provide the conditions for working and earning for everyone equally and to ensure that everybody shall get the equivalent of his labour and shall receive his due.

Social justice secures the most appropriate distribution of the national income and eliminates exploitation and violation. It prevents the accumulation of capital in the hands of only a certain and very small group. It gives every one the right to lead a life according to his own standards. It establishes a society with no

hostility among its classes and communities. Individuals of such a society feel secure concerning their present and future.

Social justice can be realized through a nationalistic view and a system of a mixed economy with a greater emphasis on its liberalistic component.

Nationalism is the zeal used to improve a nation. Nationalism means to love the nation one belongs to, to work for its progress, to defend and maintain its national values, institutions, religion and traditions. The system that produces the best and the most fruitful form of social justice is the religion of Islam. Muslims believe that they are brothers to one another and love one another as such. They do not even attack non-Muslims' property, life and chastity. The religion of Islam provides mutual love and help among people, prevents disunion, commands working and earning money in a halâl way, gives every working person his due and protects everybody's property. Every Muslim, being contented with his earnings, lives in comfort and peace. Nobody harms others' property and lands. Those who know what social justice is and who are sincere in their cause must revere and support Islam.

Socialism does not mean social justice. Despite their common nomenclature, they are different and even quite opposite. They are like *îmân* and *kufr* (unbelief), that is, one of them cannot exist where the other is.

Socialism defends enmity against individual ownership, centralized state control of all the means of production and trade, establishment of a dictatorship, enmity against religion, turning all the working people into labourers, and annihilating the ideas of religion, history, nation, country and state. Except for very little food, clothing, essentials of a home life and one or two rooms, which can only keep a person alive, all the income and earnings of an individual are taken away from him. Thus, people are deprived of every kind of enterprise, competition, exploration, belief and improvement. All their talents and personalities are done away with. Like slaves or robots controlled with severe oppression and torture by a single, cruel and merciless center, they are employed until exhausted of all their energy.

Today, socialism has become a mask and a tool for the dictatorship of red and yellow imperialisms. If one or more of the above-mentioned principles of socialism are applied mildly or not applied at all, it is called **national socialism**. If all of them are applied with torture and murder, it is called **revolutionary**

socialism or communism. The terms socialism and communism are, so to speak, the first and last names of the philosophy of nihilism. Both of them make man worship matter and sensuous desires. Making him unaware of Allâhu ta'âlâ and of his own soul and conscience, they let him live only for food, like beasts. And the governing, dictatorial minority, like mad dogs, attack and murder the people and one another insidiously, perfidiously. Thus, millions of people are murdered in Russia and China every year.

Communism is not only cruel and barbarous but also insidious, beguiling and contagious. With cunning methods and devilish persistence, it works relentlessly and without getting exhausted. It not only can assume various guises but also knows how to hit the weak, loose points of its target area. Taking advantage of distress and poverty and spoiling the social order through provocative methods, it brings about class conflicts. It spins networks of espionage and propaganda like a spider's web. Distributing money, it easily entraps base, mean, ignoble people in its red net. Then, threatening them with death, it makes them commit every evil. It plays well its devilish, fine trick of getting the utmost use out of them in disintegrating and destroying its target from within.

Once a country falls under its terrible talons, there is no hope for salvation. Communism is a political catastrophe as dangerous and as fatal to a country and its people as cancer is to individual life.

One should not deceive oneself by supposing communism to be a system of one of those political parties that are founded on democracy and, under the roof of freedom with its future destiny completely dependent upon the people's will, will come to power and fall by their votes and, as observed in the free world, follow a civilized and humanitarian approach. By believing its attractive and alluring words, one should not get placed in the position of a poor frog seized by the venomous teeth of a big snake.

What communists try to show as a brilliant "Garden of Paradise" to credulous people at a distance is the pitfall of murder concealed with the cover of propaganda, but full of the bones from millions of innocent people.

Those who take too much and become intoxicated out of their curiosity to taste the doses of propaganda scattered on the lands of the free world by red enchanters, who fall in love with

communism under the influence of the illusions and fancies caused by this intoxication, turn away in remorse and regret when they recover.

In 1952, Masentso, a communist leader in Italy, was sentenced to three years of imprisonment by an Italian court for his destructive activities. Somehow he managed to escape from prison and fled to Czechoslovakia, which had already attained the "Garden of Paradise." Upon waking up in the midst of his dream and seeing the bitter, naked truth, he could not stay there long. For a while, he tried to conceal his regret and disillusionment, but at last he fled to a free country, Austria, where he asked to be handed over to Italy with a view to completing the three years of imprisonment he had been rightfully sentenced to. He said, "Life in Italian prisons is more comfortable and better than living in communist countries, which we have assumed to be Paradise." A number of the names of those who, with the same regret and disillusionment, have escaped from that red pitfall of murder are known by the free world: Kravchenko, Sakharov, Kasyanova, and many others. It is a well-known fact that nearly one and a half million distressed people, most of whom were villagers and workers, fled to the West and took refuge in various free countries by taking their chance when the Second World War tore a gap in the iron curtain. Then, how will those eccentric leftists explain the lamentations of these doomed people who managed to escape from the red world, which they try to misrepresent as "Paradise"?

The masked big red serpent promises factories and other industrial lines to the workers, vast land areas to the peasants, and peace, freedom and prosperity to the people of the countries it aims to swallow. Let us now see what it bestowed upon the Russian people and upon Caucasus, Turkestan, Ukraine, Latvia, Lithuania, Estonia and its other satellites. Instead of the factories and lands it had promised to the workers and peasants, it offered not only the vast, blank Siberia, which is covered with its perpetual snow and ornamented with its fifty-degrees-below-zero temperatures, it also gave them the chance of easily dying by felling trees in wild forests, with a hungry belly, in that unaccustomed cold. Instead of the freedom promised, there was handcuffing and gagging slavery; instead of welfare, it gave tearful destitution, wretchedness and hunger. And it made countries into prison camps surrounded by walls of shame and isolated behind

iron curtains. From 1927 to 1939, seventeen million innocent people were annihilated in Russia, alone, where freedom, peace and prosperity were promised. These are no stories, but naked facts.

Before the revolution and civil war in Russia, many socialist parties appeared all of a sudden. Labourer Democrats, Peasant Democrats, Bolsheviki, Mensheviki, Rightist and Leftist Liberals, and the Kadet Party were amongst them. Each of them came forward with different ideas and propaganda. They made speeches before every gathering whether big or small. These activities were persistent in villages, factories, small workshops, squares and even on narrow streets. Explaining their programs with attractive words and with all kinds of promises to the people, these parties deceived and gathered well-to-do people as well as the unemployed. This turmoil went on for months. The unending speeches and noise amazed the people, who became too stupefied to distinguish between right and wrong. The people were next to being unconscious and intoxicated.

The most powerful of these parties was the one that made the most promises, i.e. the Bolshevik Communist Party. They addressed only the workers and peasants. They said that the workers and peasants would take the places of their employers and become equal shareholders in businesses and lands, that there would no longer be slavery to the rich, that they would live in the apartments where the rich lived, that the rich would clean and sweep up the streets, that the peasants would be made landowners, and that the lands of the farmers would be distributed to the working peasants.

What was common in the propaganda of the Bolshevik Party and the Labourers Party was the promise of ending their servility and slavery to the rich. They forecasted that the day of salvation was near at hand.

These socialist and communist parties repeatedly said that they struggled to protect the rights of the workers and peasants so as to provide them with a high standard of life. If the workers and peasants followed them, they would share the honour of being saviors.

“O you workers and peasants! If you wish to be saved from claws of the bourgeoisie, capitalists, lords and all other exploiters, vote for the Communist Party and gather around it,” they said.

Especially ignorant workers and peasants could not

differentiate between what would be good and what would be bad for themselves, so it was easy for them to fall victim to the lies. The wretched and disastrous situation of today's Russian workers is, sad to say, the consequence of their inattentiveness and stupidity.

At the beginning of the revolution, the communist authorities pushed around many gullible people like mad dogs and had everything ruined. They butchered innocent people without interrogation. Most communist leaders were Jewish, who revengefully made great efforts in setting the Russian people against one another. Lenin (d. in 1342/1924) and Trotsky (sent by Stalin into exile in Mexico where he died in 1358/1940), following in the footsteps of Karl Marx (d. in 1300/1883), carried on his policy of massacre under the banner of communism. The murders they committed were so unsightly that people with a conscience could not admit or even believe them. First social classes were made hostile to one another. Then it became hard to differentiate the friends from the enemies all over Russia, so much so that it was not known who was with whom. This gave birth to civil war, which made fathers fight against their sons and brothers against brothers, and Russia was thoroughly covered with blood. The civil war lasted for years, and millions of people died. The country was burned and ruined everywhere. All public works stopped, and unemployment, destitution and illnesses destroyed people.

Before the revolution, however, communists, with the view of dominating the whole of Russia, had founded a cruel administration and established a dictatorship that had given so many promises to the workers and peasants that their ignorant heads had assumed that they would attain a paradise life. It took the workers and peasants a few years to realize that they had obtained nothing, that they had been fooled, trapped, and plundered from head to foot. Yet it was too late. Now the dictatorial state was preventing them from even sympathizing with one another and was organizing massacres from time to time.

Soviet Russian President K. Vocoshilov described the following event to American Ambassador William C. Bulitt during a feast given in Russia in 1934: "In 1919, I persuaded ten thousand officers of the Czar to surrender together with their spouses, promising that they would not be harmed if they would surrender. They believed me and surrendered. I had all ten

thousand officers executed together with their sons. And I sent their wives and daughters to brothels so that they would be used by Russian troops.” He also added that the destitute women could not endure the horrible treatment they had been subjected to and died within three months.

Shortly after the 1917 revolution, Czar Nikola and all his household, including his children in cradles, were killed in the forests of Bryansk. The number of people who were killed or died of hunger and destitution, as a result of the bloody revolution that reigned over Russia from 1917 until 1947, was 63,800,000. The following figures and documents are given to demonstrate manifestly what an irreligious regime, founded on blood and bones, will bring to the countries it invades. These documents are collected from very reliable sources. How unfortunate those are who do not wake up!

THE TEMPLES RUINED IN RUSSIA

Fourteen thousand large and small mosques in Turkestan, 8,000 in Caucasus and Crimea, and 4,000 in Tataristan and Main Kurdistan were destroyed. In Bukhara city alone, 360 mosques were destroyed. Only one madrasa (school) was left and it is now used as a museum of atheism. And in Semerkand city, the Ulugh Bey madrasa survives as a museum of atheism, and two churches are used for indoor basketball and volleyball.

MEN OF RELIGION MURDERED

More than 270,000 Muslim religious scholars were killed. Others were exiled to camps in Siberia, where a cold temperature of 65°C below zero reigns. As for religious people, more than three million people were martyred on account of their religious beliefs in Turkestan, alone. When they entered Afghanistan in December 1979, the Russians immediately attacked the villages. They confiscated all sorts of food, clothing, household utensils and jewellery. They killed the Muslims they came across, women or children alike. For example, when they entered the town of Kunday with tanks, they bombarded the great mosque with artillery and martyred hundreds of Muslims while they were praying.

The above-given figures on the communists’ terrible massacre or banishment to Siberian camps of those who opposed the

revolution and paganism portray an alarming scene of savagery that should be a lesson for all humanity.

DESTRUCTION OF RELIGIOUS BOOKS AND MONUMENTS

In the cities of Bukhara, Semerkand, Kakant, Kazan, Khiva, Ufa, Baku, Tashkent, Bakhchisarai, Derbent, Timirhan, Kashgar, Almasta, Tirmi, etc., which had been ornamented with monuments by the Turks after their embracing Islam and had been turned into masterpieces of the East by Islamic architecture, the communists seized all religious works, mainly copies of Qur'ân al-kerîm and books of Hadîth-i-sherîf, and shamelessly and mercilessly tore, trampled, and burned them in the streets. Also, after ordering the people to give the religious, national and historical books they had been keeping to the State, they confiscated these books and likewise destroyed them. Meanwhile, some Muslims ran the risk of life and, instead of giving their books to this murderous and villainous gang, buried them in chests. In the process of these events, thousands of religious people who would not hand over their books were martyred.

OPPRESSION AND PROPAGANDA AGAINST RELIGION

The pagan communist State, established on the corpses of millions of innocent people after a heavy blow to religion and the massacre of men of religion, carried on mainly the following oppression and propaganda against religion:

- 1- Teaching religion in schools was prohibited.
- 2- Praying in mosques and in all kinds of temples was prohibited.
- 3- Men of religion were given no place in State affairs.
- 4- Religious or national education of youngsters in their homes was strictly prohibited.
- 5- Systematic propaganda against religion was carried on through newspapers, magazines, TV and radio broadcasts, and slanderous plays were performed.
- 6- It was constantly explained that Allâhu ta'âlâ – may He

protect us from saying so! – did not exist and that holy books were superstitious fables.

7- Conferences were held in cities and villages by organizations called The Godless Society and The Association of the Young Godless. Religions, Allâhu ta'âlâ and Prophets ('alaihimu 's-salâm) were mocked, and regular night courses were arranged for imbuing people with atheism.

8- At places of entertainment, such as theatres and cinemas, Allâhu ta'âlâ, Islam, Qur'ân al-kerîm, Prophets, men of religion and pious people were continuously made an object of derision; thus, young brains were being poisoned.

9- The main religious duties of Muslims, such as salât, fast, hajj and zakât were prohibited definitely; it was considered a crime even to utter the Kalimat ash-shahâda or to mention the name of Allâhu ta'âlâ. Pious people were under relentless prosecution from the secret police of the above-mentioned duties and, being accused especially of “propagating superstitions”, “opposition to the State,” and “opposing the regime and revolutions,” were driven to death camps.

DISRESPECT TOWARDS THE DEAD

1- Performing the namâz of janâza and washing corpses were thoroughly prohibited.

2- One who died was simply thrown into a ditch and covered first with lime and then with earth.

3- Human bones unearthed from cemeteries in the cities and rubble from monuments were used to fill depressed areas of the city.

4- Human bones unearthed from village cemeteries were used in manuring the fields.

Dear Readers! With all their persecutions, massacres, banishments and oppressions, communists have not been able to expunge the divine love that exists in human beings; they have not been able to break that sacred bond. Of the present 140 million Muslim brothers under communist regime, the number of those whom they have managed to bring to their side and make irreligious does not exceed 5 per cent, despite all their systematic efforts and tortures. Then no material power will be able to annihilate the religion or îmân, which are innate. They can be prohibited, but not annihilated. A Muslim will rather give his life

away than sacrifice his religion and chastity. This was very well understood by the Russians in the Afghan tragedy of 1986; hundreds of thousands of red troops attacked with rockets and aircraft and killed villagers, including women. Muslim children were taken to Moscow to be made irreligious. Mosques, schools, houses and foodstuffs were burnt. The number of Muslims killed from 1979 through 1986 was over one million. But the Muslim warriors, though thousands of them fell martyrs, did not surrender to the irreligious. In order to conceal this vulgarity of theirs from Muslim nations, Russians have prepared and distributed, in Muslim countries freely, books explaining that there is freedom of religion, Islamic sciences and rituals in Russia. Muslims in Russia are unaware of these books since they are only distributed outside Russia. Their distribution in Russia is prohibited; otherwise, it would be treachery against communism. Some of these books, distributed among the people of Algeria in 1986, were sent to us. High quality paper and gilded bindings were used in these offset-processed Arabic books on which "1400 A.H., Tashkent" is written. In them, some communists wearing a Muslim turban and robe are portrayed in pictures as if they were muftís, imâms or heads of a religious office. This communist propaganda contradicts the cruelty done to Muslims by Russians in Afghanistan. It was prepared so cunningly that one who does not know of the Islamic religion and the inner aspects of communism will get deceived by these tricks and lies easily and, thinking that this excessive enemy of Islam is a friend, will fall into endless calamity.

Whether it be called socialism, republic, democracy or even disguised in the furcoat of a kingdom, or however sweet and deceitful its propaganda is, communism is a regime that proves itself to be the opposite of freedom at all times and everywhere. It is a dictatorship of an irreligious, merciless and cruel minority. That is why it is the merciless enemy of Islam. In fact, the name of Russia was "The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics," which did not contain the word 'communism.' The name of communist East Germany was "The German Democratic Republic," and that of Yugoslavia was "The Federal Republic." Poland and all other communist countries carry some sort of republic in their names. Communism conjures up a dangerous meaning to the world's humanity and those who have fallen into its trap hate it so much that even communists themselves abstain from using this name and consider it necessary to camouflage the title of their own states

by attaching the titles of free states to them.

Whatever fur communism puts on itself, the red and cruel regime reveals itself as soon as the guise opens a little. What is the mark that represents communism at first sight? Despite its various titles, namely Democratic, Republic, People's or Kingdom, how is it that communism is recognized at first sight? Let us explain: The single distinctive characteristic of communism is its policy of centralized state control and enmity towards religion. A country wherein everything is controlled by the State, where Muslims are called retrogressive and fanatical, and where non-communists are marked as "faschists" is a communist country whatever its name is. The further away from the policy of state control and the more respectful a country is to Allâhu ta'âlâ and the Prophet (sall-Allâhu 'alaihi wa sallam), the further away will it be from communism. State control with enmity towards religion is the real name of communism.

The purpose of those who support the excessive policy of state control and who try to remove religious lessons from schools is to establish communism. The technical definition of communism is to "bring everything under state control, by means of collectivization and enmity towards religion." Once everything has been brought under state control, the Godless Society is established within hours.

To the comrades bought by communism beforehand, the World Communism Organization gives 18 directives with the purpose of introducing and settling communism in free countries. Ten of them are as follows:

1. "Try to encourage the establishment of communist or socialist parties in your countries. If they are already present, cooperate with them."

2. "Divide your nation into as many classes and communities as possible."

3. "Always try to establish disagreements between the employee and the employer."

4. "Fight and endeavour until the communist regime is established. Make everybody believe that there is no such a threat in your country by the time the communist regime becomes deeply rooted. Accuse those who notice your intention and objectives and those who attempt to reveal the facts, of being illusive and provocative."

5. "Instigate madhhab and tarîqa conflicts. Practise enmity

towards religion, openly and secretly.”

6. “Make banners for yourselves of the heroes who are loved much by the people. Show them to be on your side.”

7. “Through novels, poetry, articles, and cartoons write systematically using exaggerations that the laborers and villagers are in poverty.”

8. “Maintain an antagonistic attitude towards free countries and promulgate enmity against the West.”

9. “Get control over labour unions, youth organizations, and art establishments.”

10. “Search for reasons for discomfort and find them; try to popularize them.”

In order not to be caught up in the calamity of communism, even the slightest opportunity must be made use of in rendering these seeds of communism harmless.

It is necessary to cooperate, to get organized and to be on the alert against communist instigation. Greeting communists, smiling at them, buying, exhibiting in shop windows or selling their books, newspapers and magazines, or supporting their magazines and newspapers thru advertisements, will sharpen the knife of communism.

The Czar used to invite insidious Russian communists to his palace, compliment them, admit them to dinner, and listen to their ideas. But when the revolution took place, it was those same friends who butchered the Czar, the Czarina, their children and grandchildren, including the infants.

Communism does not have understanding, fidelity, human values, mercy, faith or reason.

Air raids on Afghan villages carried out by Russians in 1980 are a new and terrible proof of communist atrocities and barbarism.

The communist is hostile to those who believe in Allâhu ta’âlâ, conscience and morals. He considers these humane feelings as an illness, idiocy and treachery against his regime and principles. His password is “Divide and rule!”

There is a single formula for defending ourselves against the evils of communism:

To counter-attack it with the same method it uses, that is, by force, to spit in its face, to maintain severe control over it, to keep it away from honest people, and to leave it alone with its red-stained face.

The Russian revolution slaughtered 52 million people, 40 million of whom were agricultural and industrial workers. It came forth with the promise that it would “give peasants land and make workers shareholders in businesses”, but it even grabbed the few acres of land belonging to poor peasants and the cottages owned by penniless workers and killed those who had faith and belief or who said Allah.

The red revolution is a greedy monster that eats workers under the guise of workers’ power! It produces such massacre and plunder that even those who practise this massacre and plunder cannot escape its massacre and plunder.

With communism, the grudge which was at the outset held against life, property, chastity, religion and faith, turned into a sadism borne against humanity and began to work for the plans of a handful of cruel chiefs. At that point it was realized how great a lie it was, yet it was too late.

The following is the fourth paragraph of the constitution of the secret communist party:

“The Communist Party is the irreconcilable enemy of the native servants of imperialism, of the owners of land, factories and buildings of the bourgeois artisans and tradesmen, of all pious people and their priests and scholars, of all working and retired military officers, policemen and civil servants, and, in short, of those who are outside the lines of the revolution.”

Lenin’s password for the revolution was: “Kill the active personnel as soon and in as great a number as possible so that there will be little work left for us to do.”

As it can be concluded, excluding those who were to be butchered, only the red leaders themselves remained in one hundred per cent safety.

According to Lenin, “Maintenance of Red dominance is dependent upon the continuation of the Red revolution.” This is the reason for the unending massacre of workers by the regime. In Red China, with the order of communist dictator Mao, 300,000 labourers were shot dead during each liquidation movement. These murders were committed by a minority hostile to religion and belief in the next world.

What level has Russia reached today? To what degree are the people happy? Without clarifying these things, it will be narrow-mindedness to evade the question by simply saying, “They are travelling in space,” or to admire the luxurious, excellent,

delightful and pleasing life of a cruel minority. The Pyramids in Egypt, too, were masterpieces at one time. Can we point out signs of social welfare in the factories and rockets, which were built on the blood and corpses of millions of people and with the money grabbed from hungry, wretched workers and labourers with the view of satisfying the desires of a despotic minority? Displaying the means as the aim of life is treacherous to life itself.

We wonder if some writers or others could even utter one per cent of what they write or say now, were they in a communist country?

O, Youth! Your pure hearts and green souls are quite susceptible to the enchantment of such illusive promises. But you will repent for it later.

The only remedy for protecting humanity against the calamity of communism is not to fall for its sweet poisons and varnished filth. And this, in turn, requires people to have a firm faith, an unbending trust in Allâhu ta'âlâ, a peaceful heart, and to live in justice and freedom. But this can come about only by following a divine, unyielding and unchangeable book, and by purifying the morals and intentions. This purity can be provided by Islam, which is free from all sorts of prejudices and oppression. Islam supplies perfect social justice, a strong shield to protect people against the claws of the dragon of communism. Destruction of communism can be achieved by serving Islam. Islam and communism cannot stay together. It is a known fact that some dictators, who have appropriated power and preside over Muslim nations, have given their states such names as "The Socialist Islamic Republic." The word "Socialism," used as such, is a term not for Muslims, but for communists. Their putting this word and Islam side by side is one of the traps devised for deceiving Muslims, for Islam and socialism cannot stay together. A Muslim cannot be a socialist. It is for this reason that communist barbarians, in order to make the people of the Muslim countries they capture communists, first attack Islam, laying much stress on it. The same reason lies under communists' enmity towards the religion.

In every nation, there exist ignoble, irreligious, immoral, and base people who may be tempted, deceived and cajoled into becoming communists. Through the tricks prepared by red and yellow centers, they may plot a communist revolution. Protection of the nation against the bursting and spreading of such a dark and bloody revolution can be accomplished by instructing the youth

with religious knowledge and with Islamic ethics. Every father must teach his children how to read Qur'ân al-kerîm; send them to religious courses; teach them how to perform wudu', ghusl and salât; how to fast; what is halâl and what is harâm; and have them practise them. Communists cannot mislead a person who is brought up to be such a Muslim. Apparent examples of this are the millions of Muslims moaning under Russian and Chinese persecution and savagery. They endure all kinds of oppression, torture and even death, but do not become communists. They either die or escape.

Seeing that they will never be able to deceive Muslims or bring revolution to Islamic countries, cruel communists try to improve heavy industry and means of war to use it for invading Islamic countries. They make preparations to attack with weapons, rockets, fusion bombs, new jet-fighters and chemicals to destroy all Muslims on the earth. Therefore, Muslims all over the world must cooperate, do away with sectarian differences, and become united under the Ahl as-Sunna, the only way to salvation. They must use all their energy to make new weapons in order to surpass communists.

When unity in faith, unity in morals, and unity in justice are established and sophisticated weapons are made, communist raid will no longer be a threat.

Through the gate opened in 1982 by **Roger Garaudy**, a famous man of letters in Europe, **Cousteau**, Captain of the Oceans, turned the course of his ship towards Islam. **Bejart**, one of the well-known figures of the ballet world, stepped into the Muslim community. The great scholar and writer **Roger Garaudy** said in a Conference Hall of Garyunes University in Benghazi on April 8, 1983:

“It is true that I have embraced Islam. You ask why I chose Islam; by choosing Islam, I chose the modern age.”

This was the same **Roger Garaudy**, aged 70, who had fervently defended the communist system for France for decades. At universities and political platforms, he had repeatedly explained Marxism to Frenchmen and to the West, thinking that salvation of men lay in that unique system. He had been known as the **‘Spiritual Architect’** of modern French communism. Where there was a meeting, conference or seminar organized by communists, there was **Garaudy**. He carried on a serious struggle against Catholicism and Christianity with his ideas, pen and rhetoric.

One day a bomb exploded in the midst of the West's world of arts, letters and politics: **“Roger Garaudy embraces Islam!”** With the spread of this news to the whole world through telexes of news agencies, the Kremlin was terribly shocked, since the Kremlin was losing its greatest master of French communists; **Garaudy** was a well-known scholar, with whose pen Marxism had been disseminated for years.

This great man was now telling the truth: **“Islam is the religion that drags the ages behind itself. Other religions, however, were dragged behind the ages. That is, all religions except Islam were altered according to the time and reformed, and their holy books were distorted to conform to the conditions of the time. However, Qur’ân al-kerîm has dominated over the ages ever since its descent. Not Qur’ân al-kerîm, but time followed behind. As time got older, it became younger. This is an event that occurs beyond the ages. This is an event much greater than all the terrible social, political and economic disasters that followed so many wars in history. Islam prevails against not only materialism or positivism, but also existentialism. However, none of them prevailed over Islam.**

“The Great Prophet of Islam (‘alaihi ’s-salâm) explained everything by saying, ‘Work for the next world as if you were to die tomorrow, and work for this world as if you would never die!’ Islam has control over not only the material but also the spiritual. Therefore, these two cannot be separated from each other. How can they be separated since Islam states: ‘Learn knowledge even if it is in China,’ and ‘Scientific knowledge is the lost property of the Believer; he should get it wherever he finds it!’ Knowledge and working are not limited in Islam. Possessing no limits concerning these two facts, which bewilder the world, Islam has bewildered the world.

“By defining man to be ‘the superior and the most honourable creature,’ Islam means that he should not be exploited. It is a conglomerate of systems that disapproves extravagance, ostentation and luxury, defines income as earnings obtained thru the sweat of one’s brow, transfers growing capital to the poor by means of a well-balanced and moral rule, prohibits interest, a cause of laziness, and thereby destroys unlawful wealth. Islam has made it obligatory that the Caliph and the slave shall share the same rights. There was the case of the ‘camel’ which is a reality sharper than a king’s sword: Hadrat ’Umar and his slave rode a camel by taking turns as they travelled from one town to another,

the halter being held by the Caliph and by the slave alternately... Here is the revolution of Islam in the field of justice and law.

“Both Marxism and capitalism are systems that exploit man. In contrast to them, Islam is a heavenly religion that restores human prestige to humanity.”

HÜSEYN HİLMİ İŞİK,
‘Rahmat-Allahi ’alaih’

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

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

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

BOOKS PUBLISHED BY HAKİKAT KİTABEVİ

ENGLISH:

- 1- Endless Bliss I, 304 pp.
- 2- Endless Bliss II, 400 pp.
- 3- Endless Bliss III, 336 pp.
- 4- Endless Bliss IV, 432 pp.
- 5- Endless Bliss V, 512 pp.
- 6- Endless Bliss VI, 352 pp.
- 7- The Sunni Path, 128 pp.
- 8- Belief and Islam, 128 pp.
- 9- The Proof of Prophethood, 144 pp.
- 10- Answer to an Enemy of Islam, 128 pp.
- 11- Advice for the Muslim, 352 pp.
- 12- Islam and Christianity, 336 pp.
- 13- Could Not Answer, 432 pp.
- 14- Confessions of a British Spy, 128 pp.
- 15- Documents of the Right Word, 496 pp.
- 16- Why Did They Become Muslims?, 304 pp.
- 17- Ethics of Islam, 240 pp.
- 18- Sahaba 'The Blessed', 560 pp.
- 19- Islam's Reformers, 320 pp.
- 20- The Rising and the Hereafter, 112 pp.
- 21- Miftah-ul-janna, 288 pp.
- 22- Book of Namâz, 240 pp.
- 23- O Son, 352 pp.

DEUTSCH:

- 1- Islam, der Weg der Sunniten, 128 Seiten
- 2- Glaube und Islam, 128 Seiten
- 3- Islam und Christentum, 352 Seiten
- 4- Beweis des Prophetentums, 160 Seiten
- 5- Geständnisse von einem Britischen Spion, 176 Seiten
- 6- Islamische Sitte, 288 Seiten

EN FRANCAIS:

- 1- L'Islam et la Voie de Sunna, 112 pp.
- 2- Foi et Islam, 160 pp.
- 3- Islam et Christianisme, 304 pp.
- 4- L'évidence de la Prophétie, et les Temps de Prières, 144 pp.
- 5- Ar-radd al Jamil, Ayyuha'l-Walat (Al-Ghazâli), 96 pp.
- 6- Al-Munqid min ad'Dalâl, (Al-Ghazâli), 64 pp.

SHQIP:

- 1- Besimi dhe Islami, 96 fq.
- 2- Libri Namazit, 208 fq.
- 3- Rrefimet e Agjentit Anglez, 112 fq.

ESPAÑOL:

- 1- Creencia e Islam, 112.
- 2- Libro Del Namâz, 224.

ПО РУССКИ:

- 1- Всем Нужная Вера, (128) стр.
- 2- Признания Английского Шпиона, (128) стр.
- 3- КИтаб-ус-Салат (Молитвенник) Книга о намазе, (224) стр.
- 4- О Сын Мой, (256) стр.
- 5- Религия Ислам, (320) стр.

BOSHNAKISHT:

- 1- Iman i Islam, (128) str.
- 2- Odgovor Neprijatelju Islama, (144) str.
- 3- Knjiga o Namazu, (192) str.
- 4- Nije Mogao Odgovoriti, (432) str.
- 5- Put Ehl-i Sunneta, (128) str.
- 6- Ispovijesti Jednog Engleskog Spijuna, (144) str.

اسماء الكتب الفارسية التي نشرتها مكتبة الحقيقة

اسماء الكتب	عدد صفحاتها
١ - مکتوبات امام رباني (دفتر اول)	٦٧٢
٢ - مکتوبات امام رباني (دفتر دوم و سوم)	٦٠٨
٣ - منتخبات از مکتوبات امام رباني	٤١٦
٤ - منتخبات از مکتوبات معصومية و يليه مسلك مجدد الف ثاني (با ترجمه اردو)	٤٣٢
٥ - مبدأ و معاد و يليه تأييد اهل سنت (امام رباني)	١٥٦
٦ - كيميائي سعادت (امام غزالي)	٦٨٨
٧ - رياض الناصحين	٣٨٤
٨ - مكاتيب شريفه (حضرة عبدالله دهلوي) و يليه المجد الثالث و يليهما نامهای خالد بغدادی	٢٨٨
٩ - در المعارف (ملفوظات حضرت عبد الله دهلوي)	١٦٠
١٠ - رد وهابي و يليه سيف الابرار المسلول على الفجار	١٤٤
١١ - الاصول الاربعة في ترديد الوهابية	١٢٨
١٢ - زبدة المقامات (بركات احمدية)	٤٢٤
١٣ - مفتاح النجاة لاحمد نامقي حامي و يليه نصايح عبد الله انصاري	١٢٨
١٤ - ميزان الموازين في امر الدين (در رد نصارى)	٣٠٤
١٥ - مقامات مظهرية و يليه هو الغني	٢٠٨
١٦ - مناهج العباد الى المعاد و يليه عمدة الاسلام	٣٢٠
١٧ - تحفه اثني عشرية (عبد العزيز دهلوي)	٨١٦
١٨ - المعتمد في المعتقد (رساله توريشتي)	٢٨٨
١٩ - حقوق الاسلام و يليه مالابده منه و يليهما تذكرة الموتى و القبور	١٧٢
٢٠ - مسموعات قاضي محمد زاهد از حضرت عبيد الله احرار	١٩٢
٢١ - ترغيب الصلاة	٢٨٨
٢٢ - أنيس الطالبين و عدّة السالكين	٢٠٨
٢٣ - شواهد النبوة	٣٠٤
٢٤ - عمدة المقامات	٤٨٠
٢٥ - اعترافات جاسوس انگليسي به لغة فارسي و دشمنی انگليسيها به اسلام	١٦٠
الكتب العربية مع الاردوية و الفارسية مع الاردوية و الاردية	
١ - المدارج السنية في الرد على الوهابية و يليه العقائد الصحيحة في ترديد الوهابية النجدية	١٩٢
٢ - عقائد نظاميه (فارسي مع اردو) مع شرح قصيدة بدء الامالي و يليه احكام سماع از كيميائي سعادت و يليهما ذكر ائمه از تذكرة الاولياء و يليهما مناقب ائمه اربعه	١٦٠
٣ - الخيرات الحسان (اردو) (احمد ابن حجر مكّي)	٢٢٤
٤ - سر كسي كيلئے لازم ايمان مولانا خالد بغدادی	١٤٤
٥ - انگریز جاسوس کے اعترافات	١٦٠

- ٤٤ - النعمة الكبرى على العالم في مولد سيد ولد آدم و يليه نبذة من الفتاوى الحديثة و يليهما كتاب جواهر البحار ٣٢٠
- ٤٥ - تسهيل المنافع و بهامشه الطب النبوي و يليه شرح الزرقاني على المواهب اللدنية و يليهما فوائد عثمانية و يليها خزينة المعارف ٦٢٤
- ٤٦ - الدولة العثمانية من الفتوحات الاسلامية و يليه المسلمون المعاصرون ٢٧٢
- ٤٧ - كتاب الصلاة و يليه مواقيت الصلاة و يليهما اهمية الحجاب الشرعي ١٦٠
- ٤٨ - الصرف و النحو العربي و عوامل و الكافية لابن الحاجب ١٧٦
- ٤٩ - الصواعق المحرقة و يليه تطهير الجنان و اللسان ٤٨٠
- ٥٠ - الحقائق الاسلامية في الرد على المزايم الوهابية ١١٢
- ٥١ - نور الاسلام تأليف الشيخ عبد الكرم محمد المدرس البغدادي ١٩٢
- ٥٢ - الصراط المستقيم في رد النصارى و يليه السيف الصقيل و يليهما القول الثبت و يليها خلاصة الكلام للنبهاني ١٢٨
- ٥٣ - الرد الجميل في رد النصارى و يليه ايها الولد للغزالي ٢٢٤
- ٥٤ - طريق النجاة و يليه المكتوبات المنتخبة لمحمد معصوم الفاروقي ١٧٦
- ٥٥ - القول الفصل شرح الفقه الاكبر للامام الاعظم ابي حنيفة ٤٤٨
- ٥٦ - جالية الاكدار و السيف البتار (مولانا خالد البغدادي) ٩٦
- ٥٧ - اعترافات الجاسوس الانكليزي ١٢٨
- ٥٨ - غاية التحقيق و نهاية التدقيق للشيخ السندی ١١٢
- ٥٩ - المعلومات النافعة لأحمد جودت باشا ٥٢٨
- ٦٠ - مصباح الانام و جلاء الظلام في رد شبه البدعي النجدي و يليه رسالة فيما يتعلق بادلة جواز التوسل بالنبي و زيارته صلى الله عليه وسلم ٢٢٤
- ٦١ - ابتغاء الوصول لحب الله بمدح الرسول و يليه البنيان المرصوص ٢٤٠
- ٦٢ - الإسلام و سائر الأديان ٣٣٦
- ٦٣ - مختصر تذكرة القرطبي للشعراني و يليه قرّة العيون للسمرقندي ٣٥٢

- ٢٢ - الحبل المتين ويليهِ العقود الدرية ويليهِما هداية الموفقين ١٣٦
- ٢٣ - خلاصة الكلام في بيان امراء البلد الحرام ويليهِ ارشاد الحيارى في تحذير المسلمين من مدارس النصارى ويليهِما نبذة من الفتاوى الحديثة ٢٨٨
- ٢٤ - التوسل بالنبي وبالصالحين ويليهِ التوسل لمحمد عبد القيوم القادري ٣٣٦
- ٢٥ - الدرر السننية في الرد على الوهابية ويليهِ نور اليقين في مبحث التلقين ٢٢٤
- ٢٦ - سبيل النجاة عن بدعة اهل الزيغ والضلال ويليهِ كف الرعاع عن المحرمات ويليهِما الاعلام بقواطع الاسلام ٢٨٨
- ٢٧ - الانصاف ويليهِ عقد الجيد ويليهِما مقياس القياس والمسائل المنتخبة ٢٤٠
- ٢٨ - المستند المعتمد بناء نجاه الابد ١٦٠
- ٢٩ - الاستاذ المودودي ويليهِ كشف الشبهة عن الجماعة التبليغية ١٤٤
- ٣٠ - كتاب الايمان (من رد المختار) ٦٥٦
- ٣١ - الفقه على المذاهب الاربعة (الجزء الاول) ٣٥٢
- ٣٢ - الفقه على المذاهب الاربعة (الجزء الثاني) ٣٣٦
- ٣٣ - الفقه على المذاهب الاربعة (الجزء الثالث) ٣٨٤
- ٣٤ - الادلة القواطع على الزام العربية في التوابع ويليهِ فتاوى علماء الهند على منع الخطبة بغير العربية ويليهِما الحظر والاباحة من الدر المختار ١٢٠
- ٣٥ - البريقة شرح الطريقة (الجزء الاول) ٦٠٨
- ٣٦ - البريقة شرح الطريقة ويليهِ منهل الواردين في مسائل الحيض ٣٣٦
- ٣٧ - البهجة السننية في آداب الطريقة ويليهِ ارغام المريد ٢٥٦
- ٣٨ - السعادة الابدية فيما جاء به النقشبندية ويليهِ الحديقة الندية ويليهِما الرد على النصارى والرد على الوهابية ١٧٦
- ٣٩ - مفتاح الفلاح ويليهِ خطبة عيد الفطر ويليهِما لزوم اتباع مذاهب الائمة ١٩٢
- ٤٠ - مفاتيح الجنان شرح شرعة الاسلام ٦٨٨
- ٤١ - الانوار المحمدية من المواهب اللدنية (الجزء الاول) ٤٤٨
- ٤٢ - حجة الله على العالمين في معجزات سيد المرسلين ويليهِ مسألة التوسل ٢٨٨
- ٤٣ - اثبات النبوة ويليهِ الدولة المكية بالمادة الغيبية ١٢٨

اسماء الكتب العربية التي نشرتها مكتبة الحقيقة

اسماء الكتب	عدد صفحاتها
١ - جزء عم من القرآن الكريم	٣٢
٢ - حاشية شيخ زاده على تفسير القاضى البيضاوى (الجزء الاول)	٦٠٤
٣ - حاشية شيخ زاده على تفسير القاضى البيضاوى (الجزء الثانى)	٤٦٢
٤ - حاشية شيخ زاده على تفسير القاضى البيضاوى (الجزء الثالث)	٦٢٤
٥ - حاشية شيخ زاده على تفسير القاضى البيضاوى (الجزء الرابع)	٦٢٤
٦ - الايمان والاسلام ويليهِ السلفيون	١٢٨
٧ - نخبه الآلى لشرح بدء الامالى	١٩٢
٨ - الحديقة الندية شرح الطريقة المحمدية (الجزء الاول)	٥٩٢
٩ - علماء المسلمين وجهلة الوهابيين ويليهِ شواهد الحق ويليهِما العقائد النسفية ويليها تحقيق الرابطة	٢٢٤
١٠ - فتاوى الحرمين برحف ندوة المين ويليهِ الدرّة المضيفة	١٢٨
١١ - هدية المهديين ويليهِ المتنبي القادياني ويليهِما الجماعة التبليغية	١٩٢
١٢ - المنقذ عن الضلال ويليهِ الجام العوام عن علم الكلام ويليهِما تحفة الارب	٢٥٦
١٣ - المنتخبات من المكتوبات للامام الرباني	٤٨٠
١٤ - مختصر (التحفة الاثني عشرية)	٣٥٢
١٥ - الناهية عن طعن امير المؤمنين معاوية ويليهِ الذب عن الصحابة ويليهِما الاساليب البديعة ويليها الحجج القطعية ورسالة رد روافض	٢٨٨
١٦ - خلاصة التحقيق في بيان حكم التقليد والتلفيق ويليهِ الحديقة الندية	٥١٢
١٧ - المنحة الوهبية في رد الوهابية ويليهِ اشد الجهاد ويليهِما الرد على محمود الألوسي ويليها كشف النور	١٩٢
١٨ - البصائر لمنكري التوسل باهل المقابر ويليهِ غوث العباد	٤١٦
١٩ - فتنة الوهابية والصواعق الالهية وسيف الجبار والرد على سيد قطب	٢٥٦
٢٠ - تطهير الفؤاد ويليهِ شفاء السقام	٢٥٦
٢١ - الفجر الصادق في الرد على منكري التوسل والكرامات والخوارق ويليهِ ضياء الصدور ويليهِما الرد على الوهابية	١٢٨