

Hakikat Kitabevi Publications No: 19

ISLAM'S REFORMERS

Hüseyin Hilmi Işık

Seventeenth 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

MARCH-2014

Publisher's Note:

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

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

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

TYPESET AND PRINTED IN TURKEY BY:

İhlâs Gazetecilik A.Ş.

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

Bismi'llâhi 'r-rahmâni 'r-rahîm

PREFACE

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Milâdî
2001

Hijrî Shamsî
1380

Hijrî Qamarî
1422

ISLAM'S REFORMERS

(THE BIGOTS OF SCIENCE AND OF RELIGION)

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

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

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

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

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

to these fundamental books of Islam.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

These mendacities of the Russian Baykiyev have been quoted

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The reformer says:

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

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

2 - The reformer says:

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

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

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

3 - The reformer says:

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

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

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

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

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

Question: “Isn’t Islam to make people attain happiness and to keep peace? Does it cause bloodshed to obey Islam?”

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

