

Hakikat Kitabevi Publications No: 10

ANSWER TO AN ENEMY OF ISLAM

THIS IS A REFUTATION
OF THE LIES AND SLANDERS WHICH THE
LÂ-MADHHABÎ
RASHÎD RIDÂ OF EGYPT, WHO APPEARED IN
THE DISGUISE OF A RELIGIOUS MAN AND WROTE
AGAINST THE SCHOLARS OF ISLAM IN HIS BOOK

MUHÂWARÂT

EIGHTEENTH 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: bilgi@hakikatkitabevi.com

NOVEMBER-2012

The hadîth ash-sherîf reported by ad-Dârimî:

“KNOW THAT THE WICKED ‘ULAMÂ’ ARE THE WORST AMONG THE WICKED! AND THAT THE GOOD ‘ULAMÂ’ ARE THE BEST AMONG THE GOOD!”

This hadîth sherîf is explained in Hadrat al-Imâm ar-Rabbânî’s **Maktûbat, I**, 53rd letter (**Endless Bliss, Second Fascicle**, Chapter 10).

Publisher’s Note:

Those who wish to print this book in its original form or to translate in 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.

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.

TYPESET AND PRINTED IN TURKEY BY:

İhlâs Gazetecilik A.Ş.
29 Ekim Cad. No. 23 Yenibosna-İSTANBUL/TURKEY
Tel: 90.212.454 3000

Bismi'llâhi'r-rahmâni'r-rahîm

P R E F A C E

Allâhu ta'âlâ pities all the people on the earth. He sends useful and necessary things to everybody. He shows the ways of keeping away from harm and attaining happiness. In the next world, He will forgive whomever He likes of those guilty Believers who are to go to Hell, and He will bring them to Paradise. He, alone, is the One who creates every living being, who keeps every being in existence every moment, and who protects all against fear and horror. Trusting ourselves to the honourable name of Allâhu ta'âlâ, we begin to write this book.

We offer up our prayers and salâms for Hadrat Muhammad ('alaihi's-salâm), the most beloved Prophet of Allâhu ta'âlâ. We offer auspicious prayers for the pure Ahl al-Bayt of that exalted Prophet and for each of his just and devoted Companions (radiy-Allâhu 'anhum).

Allâhu ta'âlâ is very merciful to His creatures. He wills the entire mankind to live in ease and peace in this world and to have an eternal life in favors and blessings after they die. To attain this bliss, He orders them to believe, to become Muslims, to join the path of His Prophet Muhammad ('alaihi 's-salâm) and his Companions, to love and help one another. Our Prophet (sall-allâhu alaihi wa sallam) stated, **“As the stars guide throughout dark nights, my As-hâb are the guides along the way leading to felicity. Follow any one of them, and you will attain to felicity.”** All of the As-hâb-i-kirâm learned the Holy Qur'ân from the Messenger of Allah. As they travelled later on, they propagated what they had learned. They did not insert their personal ideas into what they had heard from the Messenger of Allah. The Islamic scholars, in their turn, wrote in their books whatever they had heard from the As-hâb-i-kirâm. These scholars are called **“Scholars of Ahl as-sunna(t).”** Afterwards, there appeared some scholars who interpolated into these teachings. These people conglomerated ideas from the ancient Greek philosophers, concoctions from Jews and Christians, and, especially, lies fabled by British spies. Also, adding their personal impressions and whatever they had acquired of the

scientific teachings of their times, they invented new religious teachings. Speaking in the name of ‘Islamic Scholars’ they tried to demolish Islam from within. Of these people, those who changed âyats and hadîth-i-sherîfs with clear meanings — âyats and hadîths of this sort are called Nass— became **Kâfirs** (disbelievers). Those who misinterpreted the ones with hidden meanings were termed **Groups of Bid’a(t)**. There appeared a number of heretical groups of bid’a carrying the name of Muslims. Exploiting this situation, the British are inventing groups of disbelief and heresy and trying to annihilate original Islam. Today, Muslims in the world have separated into three groups: Ahl as-Sunna, the Shi’ites and the Wahnâbîs. Their beliefs are different from one another. Since this difference originates from the mistakes made in the interpretation of nasses [âyats and hadîths] whose meanings cannot be understood clearly and since they do not deny nasses with clear meanings, they do not call one another ‘disbeliever.’ Yet, they hate one another. True Muslims, who are called Ahl as-sunna(t), should love and help one another, speak and write mildly to one another, and even when they have to warn one another, they should not harm one another; they should help one another and gently counsel one another in their oral and written transactions. They should help one another and entire mankind, obey the beautiful morals of Islam, and refrain strictly from causing fitna (disunion). They should not rebel against the laws of the countries they live in or attack anybody’s life, property or chastity. A Muslim has to bear these qualities. All our words, writings and actions have to be meliorative and cooperative. Sad to say, some degenerate people who are the enemies of religion and mankind and only think of their own advantages and desires are struggling to separate Muslims by disguising themselves as Muslims and even as men of religious positions. They are propagating lies concocted by British spies. Saying that they will make reforms in the religion, they want to defile Islam. On the other hand, two other great enemies, namely ignorance and laziness, act as encumbrances against being wise and following Islam, and, thus, differentiating between right and wrong, good and bad. Muhammad Âlî Pasha, for example, was a good and pious person who served as an Ottoman Governor in Egypt. Those who succeeded him were not so. Religious affairs were left in incompetent hands. A freemason named ’Abduh was brought to the board of management of Jâmi’ al-Azhar Madrasa, which had been educating Muslims for centuries. Scotch freemasons began to destroy Egyptian Muslims economically and spiritually. Through these freemasons, the British demolished the Ottoman Empire from the inside. The Grand Vizier

Âlî Pasha, a disciple of the freemason Mustafa Rashîd Pasha, handed the key of the Belgrade fortress to the Serbs in 1284 A.H. (1868). The Vizier brought his fellow-mason Jamâl ad-dîn al-Afghânî to Istanbul, and they together strove to demolish Islam from the inside. They wrote subversive books.

Rashîd Ridâ, a disciple of 'Abduh, a muftî of Cairo, wrote the book **Muhâwarât al-muslih wa 'l-muqallid**, which was published in Egypt in 1324 (1906).^[1] In this book, he writes about the conversation between a wâ'iz (Muslim preacher) who was educated in a madrasa and a modernist religion reformer, by which he gives his own ideas through their tongues. He represents the religion reformer as young, cultured, modern and powerful in discernment and logic, while introducing the preacher as a bigoted, imitative, stupid and slow-thinking man, advises the preacher through the religion reformer's mouth and puts on an air of awakening him from unawareness. He says he gives advice, but in fact he attacks the Islamic scholars, while misrepresenting heretics, zindîqs and mulhids as scholars of Islam with extensive knowledge. The book, which was written shrewdly and completely through a freemasonic mouth, bears the danger of easily hunting the credulous, pure youth. The chief of Religious Affairs, Hamdi Akseki, one of those Turks who read and were influenced by such books prepared cunningly by 'Abduh and his novices, translated the book into Turkish, adding a long preface to it and giving it the name **Mezâhibin Telfiki ve Islâmin Bir Noktaya Cem'i**, and published it in Istanbul in 1334 (1916).^[2] Professor Ismâil Hakki of Izmir, another reformer, very much praised and vastly propagandized the translation, yet, the true religious scholars during the time of Sultan 'Abd al-Hamîd Khan II saw that the book would be harmful and prevented it from spreading. And today, we feel very much worried that the youth will read this poisonous book and the like and begin to doubt about the greatness of Islamic scholars and the imâms of the four madhhabs. We have already wrote in our various books that it is right to follow (taqlîd) one of the four madhhabs and that lâ-madhhabism means to follow what is wrong.

Disbelievers, that is, non-Muslims, imitate their parents and teachers and do not follow the rules, i.e., the commands and prohibitions of Islam because of the wrong beliefs they hold. But Muslims hold fast to these rules. Likewise, the lâ-madhhabî, because

[1] Including the supplement, 143 pages; with call number 810 of the Izmirli section at the Süleymâniyye Library, Istanbul.

[2] 407 pages; with call number 810 of the Izmirli section at the Süleymâniyye Library, Istanbul.

of the wrong beliefs they have acquired by following their parents and teachers, do not adapt themselves to one of the four madhhabs, which are the explanations of these rules. But the true Muslims, who are called Ahl as-Sunna, owing to their correct î mân which they have acquired from the knowledge coming from the Sahâbat al-kirâm (radiy-Allâhu 'anhum) and the î mâms of madhhabs, adhere to one of the four madhhabs. Muslims of Ahl as-Sunna have attained the imitation (taqlîd) which is right. We thought of exposing to our pure, young brothers the lies and slanders in the book **Muhâwarât**, which was prepared very insidiously to distract Muslims from the imitation which is right and to drift them into the imitation which is wrong, by answering each of them from the books of the scholars of Ahl as-Sunna, thus performing a humble service to protect Muslims from being led to endless perdition. Thus the book **Answer to an Enemy of Islam** came about. We regard our sincere intention in preparing this book and this insignificant service to Muslim brothers as a means for the forgiveness of our sins and as our only stock for our debt of gratitude for the infinite blessings of Allâhu ta'âlâ.

We wish that our pure, young men of religious post will attentively read Rashîd Ridâ's lies and slanders and the refutations of the scholars of Ahl as-Sunna, judge fairly with their pure conscience, realize the truth, cling to it, know the wrong, and will not believe in its false decorations and advertisements.

We owe hamd (praise) and thanks to Allâhu ta'âlâ who has vouchsafed us the present edition of this book, which we prepared to do this sacred service and this exalted admonition.

A hadîth-i-sherîf reported by Dârimî reports:

“BE IT KNOWN THAT THE EVIL ONES AMONG MEN OF RELIGION ARE THE WORST AMONG THE EVIL PEOPLE. AND THE GOOD ONES AMONG MEN OF RELIGION ARE THE BEST AMONG THE GOOD PEOPLE.”

An explanation of this hadîth-i-sherîf is written in the fifty-third letter of the first volume of **Mektûbât**, by Hadrat Imâm Rabbânî.

A glossary of Arabic and other non-English terms foreign to the English reader is appended.

**Mîlâdî
2001**

**Hijrî Shamsî
1380**

**Hijrî Qamarî
1422**

ANSWER TO AN ENEMY OF ISLAM

This book answers the lies and slanders written by a lâ-madhhabî Egyptian, Rashîd Ridâ, who disguised himself as a religious man, against the 'ulamâ' (scholars of Islam) in his book titled **Muhâwarât**, in which he defends the unification (talfîq) of the four madhhabs.

1- "During the 'Asr as-Sa'âda, there was no difference of opinion either on îmân or on the rules pertaining to practices (a'mâl)."^[1]

And a few lines further below, he says,

"When there was no nass, as-Sahâba reached a decision with their own ijtihâd,"

Thus, refuting his own above-quoted words. He writes the truth in the second quotation. On matters about which there was no nass, as-Sahâbat al-kirâm (radiy-Allâhu 'anhum) made decisions with their own ijtihâd, and there were differences on such matters.

2- "In the first and second centuries [of Islam] people did not follow a certain madhhab; they did not affiliate with the madhhab of a certain imâm. When they had a new problem, they would solve it by asking any muftî they would come across, without looking for this or that madhhab. Ibn Humâm wrote so in his **Tahrîr**."

These words do not agree with what the 'ulamâ' wrote. Dâwûd ibn Sulaimân quotes Ibn Amîr Hâj as saying: "My master Ibn Humâm said it was necessary for a non-mujtahid to follow one of the four madhhabs."^[2] Ibn Nujaim al-Misrî wrote: "As explained clearly in **Tahrîr** by Ibn Humâm, it is unanimous among the 'ulamâ' that anything that does not agree with any of the four madhhabs is wrong."^[3] 'Abd al-Ghanî an-Nabulusî quotes Ibn Humâm on this subject and adds: "Hence, it is understood that it

[1] (Quotations 1-4) the preface to the Turkish version (by Hamdi Akseki) of **Muhâwarât**.

[2] Dâwûd ibn Sulaimân, **Ashadd al-jihâd**, p. 16.

[3] **Ashbâh**, "Ijti'hâd," the first chapter of the second part.

is not permissible to follow any madhhab other than the four madhhabs. Today, following Hadrat Muhammad's ('alaihi 's-salâm) religion is possible only by following one of the four madhhabs. '**Taqîd**' means to accept somebody's word without searching for his proof (dalîl). And this is done by intending with the heart. Anything done without an intention becomes wrong (bâtil). It is a mujtahid's duty to understand the proof. A muqallid has to follow one of the four madhhabs in everything he does. According to the majority of the 'ulamâ', it is permissible for him to follow different madhhabs in different affairs. So did the book **Tahrîr** write. But it has been reported unanimously that something which he began doing in accord with a madhhab has to be finished as required in the same madhhab, without uniting the other madhhabs.^[1] There have been also those scholars who have said that when a person begins following one madhhab, he should not follow another madhhab in any other thing he does unless there is a strong necessity."^[2]

The a'immat al-madhâhib's doing 'ibâda according to one another's madhhab, contrary to what the reformers think, was not with the intention of following one another's madhhab. They did so by following their own ijtihâd on that matter at that moment. It is not right to say that everybody did so by putting forward the fact that the mujtahids did so. It is not worthy of a man of a religious post to say this word without giving a true example.

3- "The political controversies which appeared later and which were claimed to be for the benefit of the religion caused the real purpose of the madhhabs to be forgotten."

This statement is a very loathsome error which can never be forgiven. He imputes to the 'ulamâ' of fiqh the guilt of those who, like himself, went out of the madhhabs and attempted to defile the madhhabs. Very old and recently printed books of the scholars belonging to the four madhhabs are obvious; none of them contains any statement or fatwâ that will change the ijtihâd of the a'immat al-madhâhib. The lâ-madhhabî people such as 'Abduh and his followers are certainly outside the circle of those scholars. They are the people who want to undermine the madhhabs. However, none of the words of these lâ-madhhabî people exists in current fiqh books. "Fiqh books" are written by fiqh scholars. Books written by the ignorant, the lâ-madhhabî or

[1] See below, article 33.

[2] **Khulâsat at-tahqîq.**

those who mix Islam with politics are not called “fiqh books.” Their corrupt writings cannot be grounds for blemishing the scholars of fiqh.

- 4- It is astonishing that he tells an unforgivable lie: “All the a’immat al-madhâhib say, ‘Do not immitate us. Make use of our documents, instead. Those who do not know the basis of our words are not allowed to follow our words.’”

Not the a’immat al-madhâhib but the lâ-madhhabî say these words. The a’immat al-madhâhib say, “The follower (muqallid) does not have to know the documents of the mujtahid. The words of the imâm al-madhhab are documents for him.”

- 5- “As humanity evolved, men’s intellects changed in the process of time.”^[1]

This statement is an expression of his belief in evolution, which is held by masons. Early people had little intellects, and today’s disbelievers are very intelligent, he means. He implies that early prophets (‘alaihimu ’s-salâm) and their companions were unintelligent. He who believes so becomes a kâfir. Adam, Shit, Idrîs, Nûh (Noah) and many other prophets (‘alaihimu ’s-salâm) were among the early people. All of them were more intelligent than all of today’s human beings. A hadîth sherîf says that each century will be worse than the one preceding it. Rashîd Ridâ contradicts this hadîth sherîf.

- 6- “Open the history books and read about the fights that took place between Ahl as-Sunna and the Shî’a [Shî’ites] and Khârijîs, and even among those who were in the Ahl as-Sunna madhhabs! Enmity between the Shâfi’is and the Hanafîs caused the Mongols to assault the Muslims.”

The lâ-madhhabî people like Rashîd Ridâ, in order to attack the four madhhabs of Ahl as-Sunna, choose a tricky way. For doing this, first they write about the assaults of the seventy-two groups [for whom the Hadîth says will go to Hell] against the Ahl as-Sunna, and about the bloody events which they caused, and then they basely lie by adding that the four madhhabs of Ahl as-Sunna fought one another. The fact, however, is that not a single fight has ever taken place between the Shâfi’is and the Hanafîs at any place at any time. How could they ever fight despite the fact that both belong to the Ahl as-Sunna! They hold the same belief. They have always loved one another and lived brotherly. Let us

[1] (Quotations 5-9) the Arabic preface to **Muhâwarât** by Rashîd Ridâ.

see if the lâ-madhhabî people, who say that those people fought, can give us an example after all! They cannot. They write, as examples, the jihâds which the four madhhabs of Ahl as-Sunna co-operatively made against the lâ-madhhabî. They try to deceive Muslims with such lies. Because the name “Shâfi’î” of the Ahl as-Sunna and the word “Shî’a” sound alike, they narrate the combats between the Hanafîs and the lâ-madhhabî as if they had taken place between the Hanafîs and the Shâfi’îs. In order to blemish the Muslims who follow the madhhabs, those who reject the four madhhabs slander them by misinterpreting some special terms. For example, referring to the dictionary **Al-munjid** written by Christian priests, they define the word ‘ta’assub’ as ‘holding a view under the influence of non-scientific, non-religious and irrational reasons’, in order to give the impression that the teachings of madhhabs as ta’assub, and say that ta’assub, has caused conflicts between madhhabs. However, according to the scholars of Islam, ‘**ta’assub**’ means ‘enmity that cannot be justified.’ Then, attaching oneself to a madhhab or defending that this madhhab is based on the Sunna and on the sunnas of al-Khulafâ’ ar-râshidîn (radiy-Allâhu ’anhum) is never ta’assub. Speaking ill of another madhhab is ta’assub, and the followers of the four madhhabs have never done such ta’assub. There has been no ta’assub amongst the madhhabs throughout Islamic history.

The lâ-madhhabî, who are the followers of one of the seventy-two heretical groups, endeavoured much to sidetrack the Umayyad and Abbasid caliphs from the Ahl as-Sunna. Those who achieved it caused bloody events. It is a base slander against the scholars of Islam to accuse them of ta’assub because they, to prevent the harm of the lâ-madhhabî, counselled these caliphs and invited them to follow one of the four madhhabs of Ahl as-Sunna. A newly developed method for attacking the four madhhabs is: first pick up a smattering of Arabic, then scan a few history books in a haphazard manner and with a narrow-minded personal sentiment, then evaluate the various past events fortuitously encountered, and finally piece them together as the evidences for the harms of ta’assub, which you somehow attribute to the Sunni Muslims. To find justification, some of those who are against the madhhabs say that they are against not the madhhabs but the ta’assub in madhhabs. However, by misinterpreting ‘ta’assub,’ they attack the fiqh scholars defending their madhhabs and claim that these scholars caused the bloody events in the Islamic history.

Thereby they try to alienate the younger generations from the madhhabs.

As it is written in **Qâmûs al-a'lâm**, Amîd al-Mulk Muhammad al-Kundurî, the vizier of Seljuqî Sultan Tughrul Beg, issued a rescript stating that the lâ-madhhabî should be cursed at minbars^[1] and, therefore, most of the 'ulamâ' in Khurasan emigrated to other places during the time of Alb Arslân. Lâ-madhhabî people like Ibn Taimiyya distorted this event as "The Hanafîs, and the Shâfi'îs fought each other, and the Ash'arîs were cursed at minbars." They spread these lies and their own false translations from as-Suyûtî's books among young people to deceive them and to destroy the four Ahl as-Sunna madhhabs and to replace it with lâ-madhhabism.

The following story is one of those related to ta'assub as it is unjustly attributed to the madhhabs and is claimed to have caused fights between brothers in Muslim history: Yâqût al-Hamawî visited Rayy in 617 A.H. and, seeing that the city was in ruins, asked the people whom he met how it happened; he was told that there had arisen ta'assub between the Hanafîs and the Shâfi'îs, that they had fought, and that the Shâfi'îs had won and the city had been ruined. This story is referred to in Yâqût's book **Mu'jam al-Buldan**. However, Yâqût was not a historian. As he was a Byzantine boy, he was captured and sold to a merchant in Baghdad. He travelled through many cities to do the business of his boss, after whose death he began selling books. **Mu'jam al-Buldan** is his geographical dictionary in which he wrote what he had seen and heard wherever he had been. He profited much from this book. Rayy is 5 km south of Tehran and is in ruins now. This city was conquered by Urwat ibn Zaid at-Tâ'î with the command of Hadrat 'Umar (radiy-Allâhu 'anh) in 20 A.H. It was improved during the time of Abû Ja'far Mansûr, and it became a home of great scholars and a centre of civilization. In 616 A.H., the non-Muslim Mongol ruler Jenghiz, too, destroyed this Muslim city and martyred its male inhabitants and captured the women and children. The ruins seen by Yâqût had been caused by the Mongol army a year before. The lâ-madhhabî asked by Yâqût imputed this destruction to the Sunnîs, and Yâqût believed them. This shows that he was not a historian but an ignorant tourist. The lâ-madhhabî, when they cannot find a rational or historical support to blemish the followers of madhhabs and the honourable

[1] Pulpits in mosques.

fiqh scholars, make their attacks with the writings and words based on Persian tales. Such tales do not harm the superiority and excellence of the scholars of Ahl as-sunna; on the contrary, they display the lâ-madhhabî men of religious post are not authorities of Islam but ignorant heretics who are enemies of Islam. It is understood that they have been endeavouring to deceive Muslims and thus to demolish the four madhhabs from the inside by pretending to be men of religious post. To demolish the four madhhabs means to demolish Ahl as-Sunna, for Ahl as-Sunna is composed of the four madhhabs with regard to practices (a'mâl, fiqh). There is no Ahl as-Sunna outside these four madhhabs. And to demolish Ahl as-Sunna means to demolish the right religion, Islam, which Hadrat Muhammad ('alaihi 's-salâm) brought from Allâhu ta'âlâ, for, the Ahl as-Sunna are those Muslims who walk on the path of as-Sahâbat al-kirâm (radiy-Allâhu 'anhum). The path of as-Sahâbat al-kirâm is the path of Hadrat Muhammad ('alaihi 's-salâm), who, in the hadîth, **“My Companions are like the stars in the sky. If you follow any one of them you will find the right way,”** orders us to follow as-Sahâbat al-kirâm.

Taqfîd (following, adapting oneself to) is done in two respects. First is the following in respect of belief ('itiqâd, îmân). Second is the following in respect of actions to be done (a'mâl). To follow as-Sahâbat al-kirâm means to follow them in respect of the facts to be believed. In other words, it is to believe as they did. Those Muslims who believe as as-Sahâbat al-kirâm did are called **Ahl as-Sunna**. In respect of practices, that is, in each of those actions that are to be done or avoided, it is not necessary to follow all as-Sahâbat al-kirâm since it is impossible. It cannot be known how as-Sahâbat al-kirâm did every action. Moreover, many matters did not exist in their time and appeared afterwards. The father of Ahl as-Sunna was Hadrat al-Imâm al-a'zam Abû Hanîfa (rahmatullâhi 'alaih). All the four madhhabs have believed what he had explained and what he had learned from as-Sahâbat al-kirâm. Al-Imâm al-a'zam was a contemporary of some Sahâbîs. He learned much from them. And he learned further through his other teachers. That al-Imâm ash-Shâfi'î and Imâm Mâlik had different comments on a few matters concerning belief does not mean that they disagreed with al-Imâm al-a'zam. It was because each of them expressed what they themselves understood from al-Imâm al-a'zam's word. The essence of their words is the same. Their ways of explaining are different. We believe and love all the

four a'immat al-madhâhib.

A snide trick which the lâ-madhhabî people often have resort to is to write about the badness of the difference in those subjects concerning belief and try to smear this badness on to the difference among the four madhhabs. It is very bad to be broken into groups concerning î mân. He who dissents from Ahl as-Sunna in î mân becomes either a kâfir (disbeliever) or a heretic (a man of **bid'a** in belief). It is stated in the hadîths of the Prophet ('alaihi 's-salâm) that both kinds of people will go to Hell. A kâfir will remain in Hell eternally while a heretic will later go to Paradise.

Some of those who have dissented from the Ahl as-Sunna have become disbelievers, but they pass themselves off as Muslims. They are of two kinds. Those of the first kind have depended upon their mind and points of view in interpreting the Qur'ân al-kerîm and the Hadîth ash-sherîf so much so that their errors have driven them to kufr (disbelief). They think of themselves as followers of the right path and believe that they are true Muslims. They cannot understand that their î mân has gone away. They are called "**mulhids.**" Those of the second kind have already disbelieved Islam and are hostile to Islam. In order to demolish Islam from within by deceiving Muslims, they pretend to be Muslims. In order to mix their lies and slanders with the religion, they give wrong, corrupt meanings to âyats, hadîths and scientific teachings. These insidious unbelievers are called "**zindîqs.**" The freemasons occupying religious posts in Egypt and the so-called Socialist Muslims, who have appeared recently, are zindîqs. They are also called "bigots of science" or "religion reformers."

The Qur'ân al-kerîm and the Hadîth ash-sherîf declare that it is bad to be broken into groups in respect of î mân and prohibit this faction strictly. They command Muslims to be united in one single î mân. The faction prohibited in the Qur'ân al-kerîm and the Hadîth ash-sherîf is the faction in respect of î mân. As a matter of fact, all prophets ('alaihimu 's-salâm) taught the same î mân. From Âdam ('alaihi 's-salâm), the first prophet, to the last man, the î mân of all Believers is the same. Zindîqs and mulhids say that those âyats and hadîths which condemn and prohibit breaking in î mân refer to the four madhhabs of Ahl as-Sunna. However, the Qur'ân al-kerîm commands the differentiation of the four madhhabs. The Hadîth ash-sherîf states that this difference is Allâhu ta'âlâ's compassion upon Muslims.

It is an utterly loathsome, very base lie and slander to twist the

Mongolian invasion of the Muslim countries and the destruction of and bloodshed in Baghdad into the “Hanafi-Shâfi’î disputes,” which never took place in the past and which will never take place in future. These two madhhabs have the same î mân and love each other. They believe that they are brothers and know the insignificant difference between them concerning a’ mâl (acts) or ’ibâdât (practices) is Allâhu ta’âlâ’s compassion. They believe that this difference is a facility. If a Muslim belonging to a madhhab encounters a difficulty in doing an act in his madhhab, he does it in accordance with one of the other three madhhabs and thus avoids the quandary. Books of the four madhhabs unanimously recommend this facility and note some occasions. Scholars of the four madhhabs explained and wrote the evidences and documents of their own madhhabs not in order to attack or –Allah forbid– to slander one another, but with a view to defending the Ahl as-Sunna against the lâ-madhabî people and preserve the confidence of their followers. They wrote so and said that one could follow another madhhab when in difficulty. The lâ-madhabî, that is, the mulhids and zindîqs, finding no other grounds for attacking the Ahl as-Sunna, have been meddling with and misinterpreting these writings which are right and correct.

As for the Tatars’ and Mongols’ invading Muslim countries, history books write its causes clearly. For example, Ahmad Jawdad Pasha wrote:

“Musta’sim, the last ’Abbâsid Caliph, was a very pious Sunnî. But his vizier, Ibn Alqamî was lâ-madhabî and disloyal to him. The administration of the State was in his hands. His sheer ideal was to overthrow the ’Abbâsid state and establish another state. He wished for Baghdad to be captured by the Mongol ruler Hulago, and he himself become his vizier. He provoked him into coming to Iraq. Writing a harsh reply to a letter from Hulago, he incited him. Nasîr ad-dîn Tusî, another lâ-madhabî heretic, was Hulago’s counsellor. He, too, incited him to capture Baghdad. The intrigues were played in the hands of these two heretics. Hulago was made to advance towards Baghdad. The Caliph’s army of about twenty thousand could not stand against the arrows of two hundred thousand Tatars. Hulago assaulted Baghdad with naphtha fires and catapult stones. After a fifty-day siege, Ibn Alqamî, under the pretext of making peace, went to Hulago and made an agreement with him. Then, coming back to the Caliph he said that if they surrendered they would be set free. The Caliph believed him and surrendered to Hulago on the twentieth of

Muharram in 656 A.H. (1258). He was executed together with those who were with him. More than four hundred thousand Muslims were put to the sword. Millions of Islamic books were thrown into the Tigris. The lovely city turned into a ruin. The **Khirkat as-Sa'âda** (the mantle of the Prophet)^[1] and the **'Asâ an-Nabawî** (the short stick the Prophet usually had with him) were burned and the ashes were thrown into the Tigris. The five-hundred-and-twenty-four-year-old 'Abbâsid State was annihilated. Ibn Alqamî was not given any position and died in abasement the same year. That year, 'Uthmân Ghâzî, founder of the Ottoman Empire, was born in the town of Söğhüt.^{»[2]} As it is seen, the Mongols' ruining the Muslim countries was caused by a lâ-madhhabî's treachery against Ahl as-Sunna. There has been no dispute between the Hanafîs and the Shâfi'îs; Muslims belonging to the four madhhabs have loved one another as brothers. This base slander, which was made against Ahl as-Sunna by Rashîd Ridâ, was repeated by the reformer named Sayyid Qutb, too, yet he is given the necessary answer with perfect documentary evidences in the book **The Religion Reformers in Islam**.

7- "In many countries, it is seen that the Hanafîs do not perform salât together with the Shâfi'îs. Saying 'âmin' loud behind the imâm and moving the finger up when reciting the Tahiyya have been causing enmity."

The books of all the madhhabs clearly write that a Muslim who belongs to a madhhab can perform salât behind one belonging to another madhhab. The idea that the small differences concerning the 'Ibâdât of the four madhhabs will cause enmity originates from the day-dreams and slanders of the enemies of the madhhabs, that is, the mulhids and zindîqs. In every part of the world Muslims of the four madhhabs have been performing salât behind one another, for, they all know and love one another as brothers. The great Walî, profound 'âlim Hadrat Mawlânâ Diyâ' addîn Khâlîd al-Baghdadî (d. 1242/1826) was a Shâfi'î. His murshid (guide, 'âlim, ustadh) Hadrat 'Abdullah ad-Dahlawî, who gave him faid (the outpouring that flows from the murshid's heart to the disciple's heart which thus attains motion, purity and exaltation) and the khilâfa [(certificate of) authority to instruct

[1] The Prophet ('alaihi 's-salâm) gave some of his mantles to some Muslims, from whom the caliphs bought them for large sums of gold. Two of them still exist in Istanbul.

[2] **Qisâs-i Anbiyâ'** (History of the Prophets), p. 890.

others], was a Hanafî. Hadrat 'Abd al-Qâdir Al-Jîlânî (d. 561/1165) was a Shâfi'î. Seeing that the Hanbalî madhhab was about to be forgotten, he became a Hanbalî in order to protect and strengthen it. Jalâl ad-dîn Muhammad Mahallî (d. 864/1459), writer of the tafsîr book **Al-Jalâlain**, was a Shâfi'î; Ahmad ibn Sâwî (d. 1241/1825), who was a Mâlikî, wrote a commentary (sharh) on this tafsîr book and facilitated its spreading far and wide. While interpreting the sixth âyat of Sûrat Fâtir in this commentary, he wrote: "The lâ-madhhabîs who live in the Hijaz, in Arabia, claim that they alone are Muslims. They say that the Muslims of Ahl as-Sunna are polytheists, though Ahl as-Sunna are the true Muslims. They are liars. We wish that Allâhu ta'âlâ will annihilate these heretical people." Hadrat Ahmad ibn Sâwî's annotation (hâshiya) on the tafsîr book **Al-Baidâwî** won a great fame, too. The famous 'âlim al-Baidâwî (d. 685/1286) was a Shâfi'î. His tafsîr is one of the most valuable tafsîr books. Most 'ulamâ' of the four madhhabs praised it and wrote commentaries on it. For example, the commentary by Shaikhzâda Muhammad Efendî, a Hanafî 'âlim, is famous and very valuable. As all Muslims know, the number of the books written by the 'ulamâ' of the four madhhabs, in which they express their praise and love for one another, exceed thousands.^[1]

8- "Of the Islamic umma, many became profound scholars. Such murshids as Hujjat al-Islâm Imâm al-Ghazâlî and Shaikh al-Islâm Ibn Taimiyya were of these."

He represents such a lâ-madhhabî person as Ibn Taimiyya, who said that Allâhu ta'âlâ was an object, who disbelieved the fact that non-Muslims would be tormented eternally in Hell, who claimed that it was not necessary to perform an omitted fard salât, and who tried to demolish Islam from within through many other similar corrupt ideas, as an Islamic scholar and murshid, and introduces him as a mujtahid like the great Islamic scholar al-Ghazâlî. Writing these two names together is a misleading invention like putting a piece of black stone by the side of a diamond. The Mâlikî scholar Ahmad ibn Sâwî wrote: "The scholars of Ahl as-Sunna reported that Ibn Taimiyya deviated from the right path himself and also caused many Muslims to deviate. It is a lie that he had had companionship with the Mâlikî scholar Imâm Ashhab."^[2]

[1] See below, the 36th article, for "moving the finger up."

[2] The tafsîr book **Al-Jalâlain**, in the interpretation of the 230th âyat of Sûrat al-Baqara.

9– Rashîd Ridâ says:

“I wrote that the taqlîd was wrong in the periodical **Al-Manâr**, which I published in 1315 [1898]. I had taken some of those writings from Imâm ‘Allâma Ibn al-Qayyim al-Jawziyya. Gathering them, I published the book **Muhâwarât**.”

By writing that the taqlîd (following, being a member of, one of the four madhhabs) is wrong, the religion reformer blemishes billions of the Ahl as-Sunna Muslims who have appeared for fourteen hundred years. He means that they will go to Hell. It must be because the lâ-madhabî, mulhids and zindîqs, that is, religion reformers, themselves know about their own defects that they cannot attack the Ahl as-Sunna openly. By using false, deceptive, evasive words, they always play behind the curtain. How could it ever be said to be wrong to follow an imâm al-madhab? Allâhu ta‘âlâ declares in the sûras an-Nahl and al-Anbiyâ’, “**Learn by asking those who know!**” and “**Adapt yourselves to Ulû ‘l-amr** (‘ulamâ’)!” It is for this reason that it has been wâjib to follow an imâm al-madhab. By saying that it is wrong to follow him, this lâ-madhabî heretic means to say, “Follow me, not him!” He tries to make Muslims give up imitating the right way so that they imitate his own wrong way. The lâ-madhabî are the imitators of error.

There are two kinds of taqlîd. The first one is the non-Muslims’ following their parents and priests and remaining in the state of disbelief. Taqlîd of this kind is certainly wrong (bâtil). The Qur’ân al-kerîm and the Hadîth ash-sherîf prohibit this kind of taqlîd. And it is not enough for a Muslim to say that he is Muslim just by imitating his parents. A person who knows, approves and believes the meanings of the six fundamentals of îmân is a Muslim. It is obvious that imitating somebody in respect of îmân is wrong. Likewise, it is a wrong imitation to believe the lâ-madhabî and to dissent from the Ahl as-Sunna. Further, it is incorrect to liken this to the taqlîd in respect of a’mâl (acts or practices). The Qur’ân al-kerîm and the Hadîth ash-sherîf command this second kind of taqlîd. The hadîth, “**My umma do not agree on deviation!**”^[1] shows

[1] This hadîth sharîf is quoted in the book **Khulâsât at-tahqîq fî bayâni hukmi ‘t-taqlîd wa ‘t-talfîq** by ‘Abd al-Ghanî an-Nabulusî (d. 973/1565), in the preface to **Al-mizân al-kubrâ** by ‘Abd al-Wahhâb ash-Sha’rânî, in various letters in **Maktûbât** by al-Imâm ar-Rabbânî Ahmad al-Fârûqî as-Sirhindî (d. 1034/1624) and at the end of **Hujjat-Allâhi ‘ala ‘l-âlamîn** by Yûsuf an-Nabhânî.

Thank You for previewing this eBook

You can read the full version of this eBook in different formats:

- HTML (Free /Available to everyone)
- PDF / TXT (Available to V.I.P. members. Free Standard members can access up to 5 PDF/TXT eBooks per month each month)
- Epub & Mobipocket (Exclusive to V.I.P. members)

To download this full book, simply select the format you desire below

