

# **THE SCOURGE OF SALAFI'ISM**

**A REFUTATION OF A  
COPROCREEP'S SLANDEROUS  
DIATRIBE AGAINST IMAAM  
MATURIDI AND THE ULAMA OF  
DEOBAND**

**PART 1**

**BY  
MUJLISUL ULAMA OF SOUTH AFRICA  
P.O. BOX 3393, PORT ELIZABETH  
SOUTH AFRICA  
6056**

**“IN REALITY, WE STRIKE  
THE HAQQ ON TO  
BAATIL, THEN IT (THE  
HAQQ) SMASHES OUT ITS  
(BAATIL'S) BRAINS. THEN  
SUDDENLY IT (BAATIL)  
VANISHES. AND FOR YOU,  
THERE IS WAIL (RUIN  
AND JAHANNUM) FOR  
THAT WHICH YOU  
FABRICATE.”  
(QUR'AAN)**

**CONTENTS**

INTRODUCTION .....- 6 -

REFUTATION OF THE COPROCREEP'S BASELESS  
'INCONSISTENCY' NO. 1 WHICH HE FALSELY  
ATTRIBUTES TO THE ULAMA OF DEOBAND.....- 13 -

    SHARH AQAAID NASAFI.....- 13-

    THE EIGHT SIFAAT.....- 18-

    "ONE OR TWO BOOKS" .....- 19-

    TAHAAWIYYAH.....- 22-

REFUTATION OF THE COPROCREEP'S BASELESS  
'INCONSISTENCY' NO. 2 WHICH HE FALSELY  
ATTRIBUTES TO THE ULAMA OF DEOBAND.....- 28 -

    ALLAH'S SIFAAT (ATTRIBUTES).....- 28-

    ALLAH'S ULUWW (HIGHNESS).....- 40-

    ALLAH IS 'NOWHERE'?.....- 42-

    ALLAH'S OMNIPRESENCE.....- 42-

    THE POINTING OF THE SLAVE GIRL.....- 45-

    ALLAH IS EVERYWHERE SAYS THE QUR'AAN.....- 50-

    THE COPROCREEP'S INSOLENC OF 'FILTHY' PLACES.....- 51-

    THE BELIEF OF THE HANAABILAH.....- 58 -

    REVERSION?.....- 59 -

REFUTATION OF THE COPROCREEP'S BASELESS  
'INCONSISTENCY' NO. 3 WHICH HE FALSELY  
ATTRIBUTES TO THE ULAMA OF DEOBAND.....- 61 -

    SALAFIS ARE NOT HANAABILAH.....- 61-

CRITICIZING IBN TAIMIYYAH.....- 62 -

REFUTATION OF THE COPROCREEP'S BASELESS  
'INCONSISTENCY' NO. 4 WHICH HE FALSELY  
ATTRIBUTES TO THE ULAMA OF DEOBAND.....- 73 -

    HAYAATUN NABI– THE LIFE OF RASULULLAH (SALLALLAHU ALAYHI  
    WASALLAM) IN BARZAKH.....- 73 -

REFUTATION OF THE COPROCREEP'S BASELESS  
'INCONSISTENCY' NO. 5 WHICH HE FALSELY  
ATTRIBUTES TO THE ULAMA OF DEOBAND.....- 95 -

    ABSTENTION FROM ISTIGHFAAR.....- 95-

    KIBR AND ITS REMEDY.....- 101

-

REFUTATION OF THE COPROCREEP'S BASELESS  
'INCONSISTENCY' NO. 6 WHICH HE FALSELY  
ATTRIBUTES TO THE ULAMA OF DEOBAND.....- 106 -

    BAY'T (OR BAY'AH).....- 106-

    CAN THE SHEIKH BE WRONG?.....- 113-

    THE DEGREE OF REVERENCE FOR THE SHAIKH.....- 115-

REFUTATION OF THE COPROCREEP'S BASELESS  
'INCONSISTENCY' NO. 7 WHICH HE FALSELY  
ATTRIBUTES TO THE ULAMA OF DEOBAND.....- 126 -

    BID'AH.....- 126-

    TASAWWUF AND THE HANAABILAH.....- 130-

    THE SIFAAT – A STUPID ARGUMENT.....- 131 -

    DUA AFTER JANAAZAH SALAAT.....- 134-

    MOULOOD.....- 136-

    PRACTICES OF TASAWWUF.....- 136-

SLANDERING THE ULAMA AND THE AULIYA.....- 138-

NABI ISAA'S QABAR.....- 139-

DEOBAND.....- 145-

BARELWI PRACTICES.....- 162-

REFUTATION OF THE COPROCREEP'S 'INCONSISTENCY NO.8' WHICH HE FALSELY ATTRIBUTES TO THE ULAMA OF DEOBAND .....- 165 -

WAHDATUL WUJOOD.....- 165-

REFUTATION OF THE COPROCREEP'S INCONSISTENCY NO.9 - THE DUMB HANBALI BUTCHER SCENARIO - WHICH HE FALSELY ATTRIBUTES TO THE ULAMA OF DEOBAND .....- 175 -

DIRECTION AND LOCATION FOR ALLAH TA'ALA.....- 175 -

ALLAH'S HIGHNESS.....- 181 -

HANAABILAH? THE FALSEHOOD OF THE COPROCREEP .....- 183 -

**INTRODUCTION**

An anonymous character, self-styled 'ex-Deobandi', residing in England, and who lauds on himself the 'accolade', 'the *Ash'ari-Maturidi crusher*' has written a lengthy diatribe of *ghutha (rubbish)* bereft of any academic worth, in condemnation of the noble Imaams of *Aqeedah (Belief)*, Imaam Abu Mansur Maturidi and Imaam Abul Hasan Ash'ari (rahmatullah alayhima), in general, and in particular in vilification of the Ulama of Deoband who are the chief exponents of the Hanafi Math-hab whose adherents are the followers of Imaam Abu Mansur Maturidi who is the Imaam of the Sunnah who elaborated the *Aqeedah* of Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) and the Sahaabah as presented by Imaam Abu Hanifah (rahmatullah alayh) in his famous kitaab, *Fiqhul Akbar*.

Whilst the writer of the stercoraceous diatribe pretends to be courageous with his lambasting, abusing, and vilifying the greatest Imaams of this Ummah, he portrays his abject cowardice with his anonymity. A person who has assumed on himself the satanic venture of vilifying and refuting the greatest authorities of the Shariah, is not supposed to conceal himself in a fortress of anonymity. One who sallies forth into the domain of academic criticism, especially when it is directed at some of the greatest *Warathah (Heirs)* and Representatives of Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam), should not squeak like a mouse. He is supposed to remove his mask of cowardice to expose his obnoxious face, and to bare his poisonous fangs to all and sundry. His cowardice which spawned his anonymity, testifies to the garbage he has unloaded and the rot he has excreted in his 63-page diatribe of *jahaalat*. Indeed the miserable traitor wallows in a cesspool of iniquity.

It is abundantly clear from the manner of his acquittal in his diatribe of *jahaalat*, that he is divinely accursed, coming within the scope of the Qur'aanic aayat:

*“And, Allah casts rijs (filth) on those who have no Aql (intelligence).”*

When Allah Ta'ala vermiculates a brain with *RIJS*, the repository of such a deranged mind, displays his stark nescience of the subject he undertakes to comment on without realizing his accursed stupidity and what a fool he makes of himself. Men of sound Knowledge are not prone to deglutition of the rubbish he has disgorged in his panegyric discourse hailing the anthropomorphist ideology which demotes Allah Ta'ala, Rabbul Izzat, down to the level of a physical idol –*Nauthubillaah!*

In view of his attributes of cowardice, anonymity and divinely inflicted *rijs*, the authors (viz., Mujlisul Ulama) have awarded him the distinguished title of *Coprocreep*. It is with this 'distinguished' title that this miserable coward who has deemed it appropriate to heap criticism and insult on the greatest Auliya and Ulama of this Ummah, is painted. He should thus take notice of the Divine Ultimatum of War. In a Hadith-e-Qudsi, Allah Azza Wa Jal warns:

*“He who causes distress to My Wali, verily I give him notice of war.”*

In the name of the Deen, the cowardly coprocreep has assumed the satanic task of vilifying the *Aqeedah* of the Ahlus Sunnah Wal Jama'ah, which comprises the Math-habs of Imaam Abu Hanifah, Imaam Malik, Imaam Shaafi', and Imaam Ahmad Bin Hambal (rahmatullah alayhim).

The coprocreep Salafi perpetrates the colossal deception of portraying himself as a follower of the Math-hab of Imaam Ahmad Bin Hambal (rahmatullah alayh). In his preposterous claim of deception he does nothing but brings disrepute to the Math-hab of Imaam Hambal (rahmatullah alayh) in the same way as did his infamous imams of anthropomorphism., namely, Ibn Taimiyyah, Zaaghuni, Daarimi, Ibn Khuzaimah and others of their anthropomorphal ilk. In his claim of palpable falsehood he follows in the footsteps of the anthropomorphists of several

centuries ago, who had also contended to be among the Hanaabilah whilst nothing of their belief coincides with the *Aqeedah* of the Hanaabilah

Ibn Taimiyyah, the Imaam of the deviant Salafis, whose *Aqeedah* spawns anthropomorphism, had also claimed to be a Hambali. Similarly, Abu Abdullah Bin Haamid, Al-Qaadhi Abu Ya'la, and Ibnuz Zaaghuni had also laid claim to be among the Hanaabilah whilst in reality they were anthropomorphists ascribing physical form and body to Allah Azza Wa Jal. Exposing the coprocreeps who masqueraded as Hanaabilah, Imaam Ibnul Jauzi – a 5<sup>th</sup> century authority of the Hambali Math-hab – said:

*“I have seen some of our Ashaab (of the Hanaabilah) expressing themselves in the Usool (in matters of Belief) with what is improper. They inclined to writing (books). Three of them are Abu Abdullah Bin Haamid, his companion Al-Qaadhi and Ibnuz Zaaghuni. Thus, they wrote books which disgraced the Math-hab (of Imaam Ahmad). I have seen them descend to the level of the (ignorant) masses. They interpreted the Sifaat (Allah's Attributes) literally... Thus, they affirmed for Allah Ta'ala a (physical) form and face in addition to His Zaat (Being). They affirmed for Him two (physical) eyes, a mouth, lips, jaws, two hands, fingers, palms, a thigh and two legs. Then they said: 'We did not hear of the mention of a head (for Allah Ta'ala).' They even said: 'It is that He (physically) touches and can be touched.....' They interpreted according to the literal meanings the Names and the Attributes.....I said to them: 'O our Ashaab! You (are supposed to be) the Companions of narration (Naql) and your great Imaam is Ahmad Bin Hambal and he was under the whip (of torture) saying: 'How can I say that which has not been narrated?' Therefore beware of innovating into his Math-hab that which is not of it.....Do not interpolate into the Math-hab of this illustrious pious man of the Salaf (i.e. Imaam Ahmad) what is not of it (of his Math-hab). You have cloaked this Math-hab (of the Hanaabilah) with something extremely ugly so much*

*so that it cannot be said to be Hambali. Rather it is Mujassami (anthropomorphism).*

*Verily, Abu Muhammad Taimeemi said regarding some of your leaders: 'Certainly, they have disgraced the Math-hab (of Imaam Ahmad) with such ugly villainy which cannot be washed until the Day of Qiyaamah.'*"

The copro-Salafis have no platform from within the ranks of the Ahlus Sunnah from which to propagate their copro-baatil. They therefore, mask themselves with Hanaabilah colours, pretending to be Hanaabilah when in actual fact their copro-beliefs spawn anthropomorphist attributes for Allah Ta'ala. Throughout his diatribe of *jahaalat* the coprocreep merely rants and raves incongruities. If it was not for the fear of the ignorant and unwary being deceived and misled by the treacherous deceit and stupidities of the coprocreep, we would not have undertaken to refute his drivel bereft of academic worth.

Salafi'ism is a scorbutic scourge which gnaws at the very foundations of the *Aqeedah* of the Ahlus Sunnah Wal Jama'ah. It is therefore imperative for Muslims to beware of this pestilence bred by Muhammad Ibn Abdul Wahhaab, the founder of the Wahhaabi-Salafi sect which had developed its copro-anthropomorphic ideology on the philosophy of Ibn Taimiyyah of the 7<sup>th</sup> Islamic century.

The discourse of *jahl* disgorged so arrogantly by the coprocreep contains all the trademark vitriol which usually Salafis in general display on account of their lack of spirituality and morality. They are totally bankrupt in *Akhlaaq-e-Hameedah* (*The Attributes of Moral Excellence*), hence they are able to revile Allah's Auliya and Ulama without the slightest twinge of conscience. On the other hand, is the teaching of our Akaabir – the Ulama of Deoband – that if someone has suffered the misfortune of fettering himself to a Bid'ati Shaikh, then whilst it is incumbent to sever ties from him, it is likewise incumbent to

effect the separation with respect and decorum. It is not permissible to revile the errant shaikh who had acted as one's spiritual guide just as it is not permissible to revile one's father who happens to be a faasiq-faajir. But this miserable coprocreep Salafi treacherously hurls vituperation on his Asaatizah (Teachers) – the Ulama of Deoband – from whom he had acquired the textual knowledge which he now utilizes so incompetently in his squirms and squeaks against the illustrious Bastion of Islam – the Ulama of Deoband.

If he believes that his silly, insipid and insulting tirade will have any measure of success for his mission of Salafi'ism, then he is sorely mistaken, for the Ulama of Deoband constitute the *Haqq*, and Allah Azza Wa Jal states in the Qur'aan:

*"In fact, We strike baatil with the Haqq which smashes out the brains of baatil, Then suddenly it (baatil) vanishes.*

*And for you (O Miserable Salafis!) is Wail (Hell and Destruction) for the (falsehood) you are fabricating."*

*(Aayat 18, Surah Al-Ambiya)*

While the cowardly moron attempts to cloak his stupid article with an academic veneer, it in reality is bereft of any academic worth. The *ghabi*, in his dissertation of *ghabaawah* presents seven so-called 'inconsistencies' in the "*Aqeedah Manhaaj*" of the Ulama of Deoband. His cowardly and stupid criticism from behind a veil of anonymity displays his obscurantist attitude. His entire attack against the Ulama of Deoband is bereft of academic and rational evidence. Instead of presenting clear-cut arguments backed with evidence, the moron who can never be called an '*Ash'ari-Maturidi crusher*', has only darkened the pages of his stercoracious presentation with a load of unsubstantiated claims.

He has made a flagitious attempt to derogate the *Aqeedah* of the Ulama of Deoband who are staunch upholders of *the Aqeedah (Islamic Belief) of the Ahlus Sunnah* as propounded by Imaam Abu Mansur Bin Muhammad Bin Mahmood Maturidi (d:333 Hijri), who had championed the *Aqeedah of the Qur'aan*

*and Sunnah* presented to the Ummah by Imaam Abu Hanifah (rahmatullah alayh). And, this concept propounded by Imaam Maturidi (rahmatullah alayh) is the Belief of the Salf-e-Saaliheen – the Pious Predecessors of *Khairul Quroon* – the eras of the Sahaabah, Taabieen and Tab-e-Taabieen.

The moron's odious flotsam is so lacking in academic evidence that his attempt to refute the sound and well-substantiated concept of *Maturidi Aqeedah* is an exercise of *obscurum per obscurius*. Leave alone 'crushing' the Ash'ari-Maturidi *Aqeedah*, the Saudi-Salafi employed copro-agent has failed to inflict the slightest dent in the armour of the *Aqeedah* of the illustrious Imaam Abul Hasan Ash'ari and Imaam Abu Mansur Maturidi (rahmatullah alayhima). A *ju'l* (a dung worm) can never hope to crush the Maturidi Giant of Uloom.

Since this anonymous Saudi agent has deemed it appropriate to attack the illustrious Akaabireen of Deoband from behind his cowardly cover of anonymity, we shall refer to him throughout this refutation with the title, *coprocreep-ju'l* which is a worm that lives in dung and nourishes on dung.

We shall also briefly explain some of the kufr beliefs of anthropomorphism promoted by the coprocreep's imaam, Ibn Taimiyyah, as well as touch on related issues for the better understanding of the masses who are unaware of the vile beliefs of the Coprocreep-Salafis who blindly follow the 7<sup>th</sup> century Ibn Taimiyyah.

In view of the false propaganda campaign initiated by the Copro-Salafis against the Ahlus Sunnah Wal Jamaa'ah, there has developed a need for a thorough exposure of this deviant Salafi sect. Insha'Allah, a series of books shall be published towards this end.

Under the false and deceptive slogan, *The Qur'aan and the Sunnah*, these Hashawi Salafis are promoting an anthropomorphist cult which portrays Allah Ta'ala as a physical being with finite dimensions. They subscribe to a defective

concept of tauheed which is at variance from the pure Aqeedah of Tauheed of the Ahlus Sunnah Wal Jama'ah.

Their concept of tauheed accommodates even *shirk*, for they believe that Allah Azza Wa Jal is not the only Eternal Being. Sinking into the dregs of kufr and shirk, their Imaam, Ibn Taimiyyah espoused the doctrine of the eternity of the universe – that the universe and every species in creation, even donkeys as a species, are co-eternal with Allah Azza Wa Jal. This vile belief will be explained further in this treatise as well as in a separate book which will be published in refutation of Ibn Taimiyyah's baatil opinions and beliefs, Insha-Allah.

### **MUJLISUL ULAMA OF S.A.**

Rabiuth Thaani 1434 – March 2013

**REFUTATION OF THE COPROCREEP'S  
BASELESS 'INCONSISTENCY' NO. 1 WHICH HE  
FALSELY ATTRIBUTES TO THE ULAMA OF  
DEOBAND**

**SHARH AQAID NASAFI**

With regard to this highly-placed, most authoritative treatise expounding the *Aqaaid* (beliefs) of the Ahlus Sunnah Wal Jama'ah, and which kitaab is to this day of fundamental importance in the sphere of *Aqeedah*, the coprocreep moron says: “*Sharh Aqaaid Nasafiyyah, the former bedrock of Deobandi-Maturidi Aqeedah has been severely compromised within the Deoband of today.*”

This unsubstantiated contention of the coprocreep is false and utterly baseless. *Sharh Aqaaid* remains the “bedrock” of the *Aqeedah* of the Ahlus Sunnah Wal Jama'ah. It is a kitaab in *Aqeedah* which occupies the highest pedestal in the sphere of the Beliefs of the Ahlus Sunnah Wal Jama'ah. The contention that this elevated kitaab of Allaamah Taftazaani (rahmatullah alayh) has been “severely compromised within the Deoband of today” is a despicable canard. The compromise exists in the hallucination of the coprocreep.

This wonderful kitaab (i.e. the *Matan*) which deals with the subject of *Aqaaid* was authored by Imaam Umar An-Nasafi Abu Hafs Umar Bin Muhammad Ahmad Bin Ismaail Bin Muhammad Bin Luqmaan Nasafi (rahmatullah alayh). He was born in the year 461 Hijri in the City of Nasaf and died in 537 Hijri in Samarqand. He is also known as Imaam Najmudeen. Mullah Ali Qaari states in *Tabaqaat* that Imaam Najmuddeen would impart knowledge to both humans and jinn, hence he is known as *Muftith Thaqalain* (the Mufti of the Two Species - man and jinn). He was a follower of the Hanafi Math-hab.

The *Sharh* (Commentary), i.e. *Sharh Aqaaid*, of this highly authoritative treatise, is devoted to the refutation of the deviate sects and the substantiation of *Aqaaid* and *Usool* of Islam according to the expositions of the *Salf-e-Saaliheen*. It is therefore only a corrupt jaahil – a coprocreep – who can afford to be so audaciously moronic as to criticize and refute this noble Work and to attack the Ulama of Deoband who have been the vanguards of the Deen in general and of the *Aqaaid* of the Ahlus Sunnah in particular.

Claiming an existence of an ‘internal conflict in *Aqeedah*’ of the Ulama Deoband, the coprocreep alleges: “...because the book is a philosophical mash-up, these particular Deobandi brothers have been forced to admit that: ‘Even if one said that *Nasafiyyah* is not our *Aqeedah*, then there is no problem in that.’” It is palpably clear that the coprocreep’s brain is a stercoracious mash-up of *jahl-e-muraqqab* (compound ignorance), hence he has been able to shamelessly gorge out such stupid hash. The *Aqeedah* of the Ulama Deoband remains unanimously the same as it was since the inception of this august Bastion of Islamic Uloom. While there exist differences among the Ulama Deoband on political, fiqhi and mundane issues, there is unanimity of *Aqeedah*. Any difference which some jaahil such as this coprocreep alleges will be the stupidity of turncoats such as the “ex-Deobandi” coprocreep, half-baked molvis who have adopted Salafi’ism for the lure which monetary gain exercises, and fledglings who have no position in the Firmament of Uloom adorned by the illustrious Akaabir Ulama of Deoband.

When we speak of the Ulama of Deoband, we refer to the Akaabireen who had established Daarul Uloom and who had nurtured and sustained it for almost 150 years. Like all great institutions of Islam, even Daarul Uloom Deoband has passed over its pinnacle and is morally, spiritually and academically on the downhill. Thus, any stupid contradictory opinion which any Deobandi molvi of this era may venture may not be attributed to the Ulama of Deoband. Maudoodis and Salafis had already

infiltrated the ranks of Deoband some decades ago. In 1968 this writer, himself had heard in a discussion between Hadhrat Maulana Masihullah (rahmatullah alayh) and a senior from Deoband, that molvis with Maudoodi leanings had managed to gain positions on the staff of Daarul Uloom Deoband.

Thus when the term “*Ulama of Deoband*” is mentioned, then we understand that the reference is to Hadhrat Shah Waliyullah Muhaddith Dehlwi, Shah Abdul Azeez, Shah Muhammad Ishaq, Shah Abdul Ghani, Hadhrat Maulana Qaasim Nanotwi, Shaikhul Hind Maulana Mahmoodul Hasan, Maulana Husain Ahmad Madani, Hadhrat Maulana Rashid Ahmad Gangohi, Hadhrat Maulana Khalil Ahmad Ambetwi, Hadhrat Maulana Ashraf Ali Thaanvi, Hadhrat Maulana Qaari Tayyab, Hadhrat Shaikh Zakariyya, Hadhrat Maulana Masihullah (rahmatullah alayhim) and countless other seniors who were all Stars of Uloom of impeccable value, honour and rank. The glorious era of the Ulama of Deoband did not commence with the establishment of the Madrasah building in the town of Deoband. The initiation of this glorious epoch was with Hadhrat Shah Waliyullah Muhaddith Dehlwi (rahmatullah alayh).

Any contradictory view ventured by any molvi who had happened to study at Darul Uloom Deoband or at any other spiritually affiliated institution of Daarul Uloom will not be construed as a difference in the ranks of the Ulama of Deoband. Therefore, any miscreant molvi who has embraced the Salafi' creed of this era is beyond the pale of that Vestibule of Islam known as the Ulama of Deoband. The stupid view of a coprocreep who has reneged from the Haqq due to his *jahaalat and nafsaaniyat* may not be interpreted to be a conflict in the *Aqeedah* of Ahl-e-Deoband merely because he happened to study at Daarul Uloom.

Lamenting the predominance of *Sharh Aqaaid* in the educational institutions of the Ulama of Deoband, the coprocreep states: “*Yet, on the other hand, Nasafiyyah is still*

*considered by many Deobandis to be the ultimate Aqeedah manual and have rejected breaking the centuries-long practice of being Maturidi in the truer sense of the word...”*

Let it be known that ‘*Nasafiyyah*’ is considered by all *Deobandis* to be the “*ultimate Aqeedah manual*”. Furthermore, we state unequivocally that in *Aqeedah* the Ulama of Deoband are Maturidis just as they are Hanafis in Fiqah, and so was Imaam Abu Mansur Maturidi (rahmatullah alayh). *Sharh Aqaaid* is a treatise which propounds the Maturidi Aqeedah Math-hab. In his kitaab, *Al-Muhannad*, Hadhrat Maulana Khalil Ahmed Ambetwi (rahmatullah alayh) states unambiguously that in *Aqeedah* the Ulama of Deoband follow Imaam Maturidi. The illustrious senior Ulama of the time had fully endorsed this claim. Thus we who are linked inextricably to the Ulama of Deoband are proud Maturidis, and so are all the Ulama-e-Ahnaaf. There has never been the slightest attempt to conceal this conspicuous and vehemently proclaimed fact.

The coprocreep implies that the Ulama of Deoband are shy to ‘admit’ that they are Maturidis when in fact the direct opposite is the truth. He gained this idea from the hallucinations of his mashed up brains contaminated by coprophilic tendencies.

Peddling the false impression he attempts to convey, the coprocreep says: “*I don’t know what the status of those Deobandi scholars is, who not only want to discard the book from teaching but make fun of its content.*” Their status is the same as your copro status. They are coprocreeps like you. They are morons who have not even understood *Sharh Aqaaid*. They have mashed up brains such as your dung-filled skull.

Let it be known that in this age there are numerous of half-baked molvis who had studied at Daarul Uloom Deoband or at some of its affiliates as this coprocreep had done. They had pursued knowledge for the sake of the dunya, hence they never acquired the *Noor of Ilm*. They are like the *khanaazeer* (swines) mentioned by Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam). They are *khanaazeer* who have been garlanded with necklaces of

diamonds, pearls and gold – the wonderful Shar'i Uloom imparted by the Ulama of Deoband. Such dung-worms have become the handmaids of the Saudi Salafis who have engaged these miserable renegades to propagate Salafi'ism. These coprocreeps masquerade as Ulama of Deoband when in reality they have no relationship and no affinity with the Ulama of Deoband. The stint they had done at Deobandi institutions is comparable to Shaitaan's stint in the heavens. When they denuded themselves by displaying their treachery, they fell into the category of Iblees when he had reneged from obedience and fell from grace. Just as Iblees may not be related to Jannat and the Malaikah on the basis of his former habitation of that sacred abode, so too may these coprocreeps who have treacherously reneged from the *Maturidi Aqeedah – the Aqeedah of Haqq – the Aqeedah of the Salf-e-Saaliheen – the Aqeedah of the Ahlus Sunnah Wal Jama'ah* – not be related to Deoband. Their stupid ideas and corrupt beliefs and their renunciation of Imaam Maturidi may not be said to be a difference in the ranks of the Ulama of Deoband regarding the staunch adherence to the *Minhaaj* of Imaam Maturidi who followed the *Minhaaj* of Imaam Abu Hanifah (rahmatullah alayh) and of the Salf-e-Saaliheen in general.

Imaam Maturidi had written a highly authoritative *Sharah (Commentary), Kitaab Sharhil Fiqhil Akbar* which is a commentary on Imaam Abu Hanifah's treatise on *Aqeedah, Al-Fiqhul Akbar*. He is Imaam Abu Hanifah's student via three intermediaries. In the Branch of *Aqeedah*, Imaam Abu Mansur Maturidi Hanafi (rahmatullah alayh) occupies one of the loftiest pedestals. Thus, it is only a man whose brains have been deranged and mashed up by divinely inflicted *Rijs (filth)* who flaunts the insolence to attack and ridicule such an illustrious Authority of Islam as Imaam Maturidi (rahmatullah alayh) and the Akaabireen of Deoband. Regarding characters such as the coprocreep, the Qur'aan Majeed states:

*“And Allah afflicts with rijs (filth) (the brains) of those who have no intelligence.” (Surah Yoonus, aayat 100)*

The coprocreep asks: *“So which one is it, Deobandi friends? IS THE BOOK part of your Aqeedah, or IS IT NOT?”* With all the emphasis at our command we state unequivocally that THE BOOK, I.E. SHARH AQAID, IS NOT ONLY 'PART' OF OUR AQEEDAH, IT IS IN FACT OUR AQEEDAH. IT IS THE AQEEDAH OF THE ULAMA OF DEOBAND. IT IS THE AQEEDAH OF THE SALF-E-SAALIHEEN. IT IS THE AQEEDAH OF THE AHLUS SUNNAH. Yes, it is our Aqeedah regardless of how much the dung-worm detests it.

### THE EIGHT SIFAAT

The coprocreep then has the raw nerve of saying: *“And please don't sit on the fence, as it has some aspects that are unavoidable, like the EIGHT SIFAAT for Allah only – you either with it or against it.”*

We have made it abundantly clear that we “are with it”. Devils such as the cocrocreep are against it. There is no question of fence-sitting. The response is loud and categorical from the Ulama of Deoband. We revere *Sharh Aqaaid* and to a greater degree do we revere, honour and laud Imaam Abu Mansur Maturidi (rahmatullah alayh) for having lucidly presented to the Ummah the *Aqeedah* of the Ahlus Sunnah as propounded by Imaam Abu Hanifah (rahmatullah alayh).

As for the “Eight Sifaat”, the coprocreep exhibits stark ignorance. He has not even understood the text of *Sharh Aqaaid*, hence he has dismally failed to comprehend the meaning of Eight Sifaat. His *jahaalat* has constrained him to flaunt plain *ghabaawah (density of brains)*. The coprocreep makes a passing reference to the “Eight Sifaat” of Allah Azza Wa Jal stated in *Sharh Aqaaid*, without expounding his stupid umbrage. He does not explain what is Islamically wrong in the averment of the ‘Eight Sifaat’. We affirm the validity of the Eight Sifaat of Allah

Azza Wa Jal. What is mentioned in *Sharh Aqaaid* regarding the Eight Sifaat is 100% correct.

His contention that Maturidis believe in *only* eight Sifaat for Allah Azza Wa Jal is the product of his *jahaalat* and his inability to comprehend even the clear text of *Sharh Aqaaid*. Nowhere in this kitaab of authority is the Sifaat of Allah Ta'ala confined to eight.

In *Al-Fiqhul Akbar* Imaam Abu Hanifah (rahmatullah alayh) encapsulates this particular dimension or concept of Allah's attributes into Seven Sifaat. At this juncture we shall not elaborate on this issue because the coprocreep besides mentioning the Eight Sifaat has not dilated on it. He should state exactly what his objection is to the Eight Sifaat concept. What conflict with the *Aqeedah* of the Salf-e-Saaliheen does he discern in this concept of Imaam Abu Hanifah (rahmatullah alayh) and further expounded by Imaam Maturidi (rahmatullah alayh), and which is imparted in *Sharh Aqaaid*?

The coprocreep's statement: "...like *EIGHT SIFAAT for Allah only*" betrays his stark ignorance and gross inability to understand the text of *Sharh Aqaaid*. When he saw the word 'eight', the moron summarily concluded that according to us Maturidis, Allah Ta'ala has *only* eight Sifaat (Attributes). It is haraam for a jaahil such as this coprocreep to speak on a topic which is beyond his intellectual and academic grasp. For a while it shall suffice to merely reject his baseless claim that Maturidis believe that Allah Ta'ala has only eight Attributes. If he presents arguments in an academic fashion, he shall, Insha'Allah, receive an academic response to demolish the misconception which he has formed merely looking at the word 'eight' in *Sharh Aqaaid*.

### “ONE OR TWO BOOKS”

Lamenting further, the coprocreep says: “*If one goes to any Darul Uloom website, one may find ONE or TWO Aqeedah books – Sharh Aqaaid and / or Tahawiyyah. So we can*

*confidently assume that wherever Sharh Aqaaid is taught, it is taught because it is their Aqeedah as Maturidi tradition goes, just look at how much Deobandis respect Nasafiyyah.”*

The coprocreep acquits himself as if Deobandis are concealing their respect, honour and reverence for Imaam Maturidi. He behaves as if the Ulama of Deoband teach *Sharh Aqaaid* while claiming not to be the followers of Imaam Maturidi. Just from whence did this miserable cum-Saudi Salafi coprocreep get this putrid idea? The Ulama of Deoband teach *Sharh Aqaaid* because, undoubtedly, it is their *Aqeedah*. There is no conflict on this issue. It is not a hidden doctrine. There is no Shiah *taqiyyah* cloaking the issue in the ranks of the Ulama of Deoband. You don't have to 'assume' that *Sharh Aqaaid* is the *Aqeedah* of Ahl-e-Deoband “as Maturidi tradition goes”. This is an irrefutable fact. We proclaim it with a loud clamour. What then is the need for assumption?

Referring to some unknown 'Deobandi molvi' who appears to be just as coprophilic in the brains as this coprocreep, he says: “*As one Deobandi Molvi who told me: 'Sharh Aqaaid is only taught so that the student becomes aware of the various sects of Islam, not because it is our Aqeedah.'*” If the coprocreep has honestly and correctly quoted the miserable 'deobandi molvi', then we say with emphasis that it is pure nonsense. The molvi dwells in the haze of his *jahaalat*, hence he made this absurd observation. He appears to be a moron just as the coprocreep. There is no need for the coprocreep to cite evidence to prove that Ahl-e-Deoband are Maturidis – there is no need to cite proof for the fact that our *Aqeedah* is encapsulated in *Sharh Aqaaid* because we categorically and loudly affirm that we, the Ahl-e-Deoband, are Maturidis. Thus, the coprocreep's attempt to prove that the Ulama of Deoband are Maturidis is an exercise in stupid redundancy.

Sinking deeper into his quagmire of redundancy and compound ignorance, the coprocreep says: “*As for Darul Ulooms that only teach Tahawiyyah, or have abandoned*

*Nasafiyyah for Tahawiyyah – THIS DOES NOT MEAN ANYTHING. As long as their interpretation of Tahawiyyah is in the darkness of Maturidi principles, then it wouldn't make a difference."*

Darul Uloom which do not teach *Sharh Aqaaid*, but have opted for *Aqeedatut Tahaawi*, are not in rejection of the *Aqeedah* as propounded in *Sharh Aqaaid* in the hallowed radiance of Maturidi principles. Darul Uloom have effected changes in the syllabus to suit their individual needs pertaining to changing circumstances such as time constraints, poorer intellectual ability of students, etc. Rejection of *Sharh Aqaaid* is tantamount to rejection of the *Aqeedah* of the Ahlus Sunnah as propounded by the Salf-e-Saaliheen on the basis of the Qur'aan and Sunnah.

Most certainly, *Tahaawiyyah* is and will be taught in the light of Maturidi principles since our Guiding Star in this sphere is the illustrious Imaam Abu Mansur Maturidi. There is no ambiguity – no fence sitting in this regard.

The stupid coprocreep then says: *"The real questions that should be put forward to Deobandis is (grammatical error is coprocreep's): How do you interpret Tahawiyyah? In the light of what the Salaf had to say, or in the darkness of what the later Maturidis and Ash'aris wrote like Taftazaani, Razi and co.?"*

In answer to this silly question of the coprocreep, we say: We interpret *Tahawiyyah* in the glorious celestial light of the principles of Imaam Abu Mansur Maturidi (rahmatullah alayh) who was among the illustrious Salf-e-Saaliheen. Via just three intermediaries he was the Student of Imaam Abu Hanifah (rahmatullah alayh). He was a great Imaam in Usool. We follow him, and all *kutub in Aqeedah* are incumbently interpreted in the celestial halo of Maturidi principles. The difference between Maturidis and Ash'aris is negligible. They differ on about a dozen masaail only. But fundamentally they are one Soul. All Hanafis, Shaafis, Maalikis and Hambalis are the followers of these two illustrious Imaams of *Aqeedah*. Only a moron of the

coprocreep's kind following his Saudi Salafi masters, will proclaim all Hanafis, Shaafis and Maalikis to be kaafirs on the basis of their submission to the *Aqeedah of Islam* as propounded by Imaam Mansur Muhammad Bin Muhammad Bin Mahmood Hanafi Maturidi (d:333 Hijri) and Imaam Abul Hasan Ash'ari (d:324 Hijri). Despite Imaam Abul Hasan Ash'ari himself being a Hanafi, the majority of his followers in *Aqeedah* are followers of the Shaaf'i Math-hab.

Contrary to what the Salafi coprocreep alleges, there is no conflict between Imaam Tahaawi Hanafi (rahmatullah alayh) and Imaam Maturidi (rahmatullah alayh). The bankruptcy of the Salafis is conspicuous from the fact that even they are constrained to rely on Imaam Tahaawi Hanafi for issues pertaining to *Aqeedah*. However, with regard to some Aqaaid mentioned in *Aqeedatut Tahaawi*, these Salafis introduce their own corrupt *Ta'weel (interpretation)*. Similarly, do they mutilate the statements of Imaam Ash'ari to suit their whimsical opinions. Imaam Tahaawi (d:321 hijri) was a contemporary of both Imaam Maturidi and Imaam Ash'ari, and like Imaam Maturidi was a Student of Imaam Abu Hanifah (rahmatullah alayh) via a few intermediaries.

## TAHAAWIYYAH

The cocrocreep says: *"The problem is that the Maturidis use Tahawiyya's text to justify their creed, when in fact Tahawi wrote it in his own style when Ilm al-Kalaam was not existent the way we see it today; the terminologies were not there."*

The problem exists in the mashed up brains of the coprocreep. The Qur'aan Majeed too has its own eloquent, inimitable style. Great Mufasssireen have written commentaries of the Qur'aan applying later day terminologies. There is absolutely nothing wrong with terminologies of the age being utilized provided there is no conflict with the Qur'aan and Sunnah. It is therefore insufficient for the coprocreep to peddle that the 'creed' of the

Maturidis is at variance with the creed of Imaam Tahaawi. It devolves on this moron to explain precisely what the conflict is. The application of different terminology is not necessarily conflict.

It is required of the coprocreep to engage in an academic dissertation in which he should elaborate on the supposed 'conflicts' between the Maturidis and Imaam Tahaawi, and the 'conflicts' between the Maturidis and the Salf-e-Saaliheen. And, when he touches on this topic the coprocreep should remember that the Salf-e-Saaliheen are not restricted to the early Hanaabilah. Imaam Abu Hanifah, Imaam Abu Yusuf, Imaam Muhammad, Imaam Zufar, Imaam Abu Bakr Ahmad Bin Ishaq Juzjaanee, Imaam Abu Sulaimaan Musa Bin Sulaimaan Juzjaanee (the latter two being the Ustaadh of Imaam Maturidi), Imaam Abul Hasan Ash'ari and Imaam Abu Mansur Maturidi himself, and numerous others were all part of the *Salf-e-Saaliheen*.

Ibn Taimiyyah and Ibn Qayyim are nowhere within proximity of the Salaf-e-Saaliheen. Their views shall therefore be discarded. Furthermore, these latter two subscribed to some weird views of kufr which shall be explained later in this treatise, Insha'Allah.

While the styles of presentation of Imaam Nasafi (author of the *Matan* of *Sharh Aqaaid*) and Imaam Tahaawi differ, such difference is not to be construed as difference in actual 'creed' or *Aqeedah*. For example, while Imaam Abu Hanifah (rahmatullah alayh) encapsulates the *Usool of Sifaat* into seven, the later Ulama of the Ahnaaf extended the number to eight. A careful examination will establish that it boils down to the same thing. Just as there exists difference of opinion among the Fuqaha of the same Math-hab, so too are there differences in the details among the Ulama of the same Math-hab in *Aqeedah*.

The claim that Ilm-e-Kalaam was non-existent during the age of Imaam Tahaawi (d: 321 hijri) is baseless. Ilm-e-Kalaam was

necessitated when Greek kufr philosophy was translated into Arabic and ruined the Imaan of numerous scholars, resulting in the Mu'tazilah sect who denied the Sifaat of Allah Ta'ala. The founder of this sect was Waasil Bin Ata (d:130 hijri). Thus Ilm-e-Kalaam came into existence long before Imaam Tahaawi (rahmatullah alayh). Besides these trivialities, the coprocreep has not furnished any academic evidence to prove that the 'creed' of the Maturidis (Hanafis and others) is in conflict with the creed of Imaam Tahaawi.

Furthermore, we need to traverse higher than Imaam Tahaawi, and avoid the pitfall of restricting discussion on *Aqeedah* to the simple style of Imaam Tahaawi's compilation. Imaam Tahaawi (rahmatullah alayh), in his treatise compiles the beliefs of the Ahlus Sunnah in simple form and style, and all these beliefs are acquired from Imaam Abu Hanifah's *Al-Fiqhul Akbar*. A study of Imaam Abu Hanifah's *Al-Fiqhul Akbar* will establish that *Sharh Aqaaid* is in fact an 'extract' of *Al-Fiqhul Akbar*. The style of presentation of *Sharh Aqaaid* is the style of Imaam Abu Hanifah (rahmatullah alayh) in *Al-Fiqhul Akbar*. And, if anyone has brains – healthy brains, not mashed-up stercoracious brains such as the brains of the coprocreep, he will understand that the style of Imaam Tahaawi (rahmatullah alayh) is a simplification of the *masaail of Aqeedah* expounded in *Al-Fiqhul Akbar*.

While the academic presentation of *Al-Fiqhul Akbar* and *Sharh Aqaaid* are meant primarily for the Ulama-e-Raasikheen, *Aqeedadut Tahaawi* is for the masses in general, hence its very simple style. But there is no conflict in the actual *masaail of Aqeedah* appearing in all three treatises. The *Aqeedah* of the followers of Imaam Maturidi is the *Aqeedah* of the Qur'aan and Sunnah as explained by Imaam Abu Hanifah (rahmatullah alayh) and enumerated in simple style by Imaam Tahawi (rahmatullah alayh).

Furthermore, Imaam Maturidi (rahmatullah alayh), himself has also presented a *Sharh (Commentary)* in the simple style of

Imaam Abu Hanifah's *Al-Fiqhul Akbar* for easy comprehension. This Sharh by Imaam Maturidi very resolutely affirms that the *Aqeedah of the Salf-e-Saaliheen* whose chief expounder is Imaam Abu Hanifah (rahmatullah alayh), is in fact his (Imaam Maturidi's) *Aqeedah* – the *Aqeedah* of the Sahaabah, Taabieen and Tabe-Taabieen – the *Aqeedah* of the Salf-e-Saaliheen – the *Aqeedah* stemming from only the Qur'aan and Sunnah.

That the *Aqeedah* of Imaam Maturidi, Imaam Tahaawi and of the Ahnaaf, Maalikiyyah and Hanaabilah is the *Aqeedah* of the Salf-e-Saaliheen, is conspicuously portrayed by the introduction appearing in the treatise, *Aqeedatut Tahaawi*:

“Said Shaikh Imaam Faqeeh Ilmul Anaam Hujjatul Islam Abu Ja'far Warraaq At-Tahaawi Al-Misri: This is a dissertation of the *Aqeedah* of the Ahlus Sunnah Wal Jama'ah in terms of the Math-hab of the Fuqahaa of the Millat, Abu Hanifah Nu'maan Bin Thaabit Al-Kufi, Abu Yusuf Ya'qub Bin Ibraheem Al-Ansaari and Abu Abdullah Muhammad Bin Hasan Shaibaani (ridhwaanullah alayhim aj-maeen), and what they believe of the Usool of the Deen and follow as Deen for Rabbul Aalameen.” This introductory statement in *Aqeedatut Tahaawi* is not the word of Imaam Tahaawi. A lofty Soul of Imaam Tahaawi's calibre, does not confer accolades and titles on himself. The titles have been lauded by one of the Talaamizah (students) of Imaam Tahaawi.

Its significance is the fact that the Foundation of *Maturidi Aqeedah* comprises of Imaam Abu Hanifah, Imaam Abu Yusuf and Imaam Muhammad (rahmatullah alayhim). Thus, *Sharh Aqaaid* is synonymous with *Al-Fiqhul Akbar* and it affirms the entire *Aqeedah* enumerated in detail in simple form in *Aqeedatut Tahaawi*. But the coprocreep is too great a moron to understand this self-evident fact.

The coprocreep labouring under a massive misapprehension regarding the fundamental importance of *Sharh Aqaaid* and the Maturidi Math-hab of *Aqeedah* whose primary exponents and

upholders in this age are the Ulama of Deoband and the institutions which gushed from Daarul Uloom Deoband, states:

“What I am saying is that, even if a Darul Uloom sacks *Nasafiyyah* from its syllabus and replaces it with *Tahawiyyah*, that would not be enough in determining that they have renounced *Aqeedah* as most likely their interpretation of *Tahawiyyah* would be in the light of Maturidi creed itself.”

The coprocreep is extremely conceited and contumaciously presumptuous in his coprophilic notion that the Ulama of Deoband are lined up to embrace the baatil Salafi *firqah*. He acquits himself in a manner to convey the impression that the Ulama of Deoband have given the pledge to ‘sack’ and expunge *Sharh Aqaaid* from their syllabus, and in the event of introducing *Aqeedatut Tahaawi* they would teach it in the light of the stupid ideas of anthropomorphism of deviated Salafi'ism which is the product of blindly following the Hashawi, Ibn Taimiyyah. We fail to understand what has led this coprocreep to infer that the Darul Ulooms of Deoband would even entertain the notion of abandoning Maturidi principles when teaching any kitaab of *Aqeedah*. What has given this miserable moron the idea that the Ulama of Deoband are set to ‘renounce’ the “Maturidi Creed”, the Creed of the Ahlus Sunnah Wal Jama'ah as expounded by Imaam Abu Hanifah (rahmatullah alayh) and his Ashaab? It appears that this *ghabi* indulges lavishly in some kind of substance abuse, hence he suffers from the disease of hallucination.

There is absolutely no conflict in the *Minhaaj* of the Ulama of Deoband. From the inception of Deoband, they have resolutely remained steadfast on the *Aqeedah of the Sunnah*. They have proudly proclaimed themselves to be followers of Imaam Maturidi. There is nothing hidden in the *Minhaaj* of the Ahl-e-Deoband.

With this we conclude our response to the coprocreep's ‘Inconsistency No. 1’ which is a hash of inconsistencies bereft of any academic worth. He has not presented a single academic

argument in his 'Inconsistency No. 1' which he has levelled against the Ulama of Deoband. His claptrap is nothing besides *da'wa bila daleel* – contention without proof.

## REFUTATION OF THE COPROCREEP'S BASELESS 'INCONSISTENCY' NO. 2 WHICH HE FALSELY ATTRIBUTES TO THE ULAMA OF DEOBAND

### ALLAH'S SIFAAT (ATTRIBUTES)

Baselessly criticizing the *Ahl-e-Haqq* (the Ulama of Deoband – the followers of Shaikh Abu Mansoor Maturidi – rahmatullah alayh), the anonymous coprocreep avers:

*“Without shadow of doubt, one of the few greatest issues pertaining to the debate between the Sunnis (Hanaabilah) and the Maturidis (Deobandis) in Aqeedah is the Attributes of Allah, and on top of this is the issue of the Highness of Allah. It is affirmed by the Hanaabilah, the Ahl al-Hadeeth, the Salaf as well as the four Imams and their students. But what is the position of the Maturidis in general and the Deobandis in particular?”*

*I'll just list the irreconcilable approaches I have witnesses in relation to the “Where is Allah” issue.” 1. Sharh Aqaaid and classical Maturidi text suggest that Allah is nowhere, which was exactly the opinion of the academic Jahmiyyah the Salaf pronounced Takfeer against.”*

Before we proceed to demolish the coprocreep's stupid and baseless charges, it is of salutary importance to briefly explain who exactly Imaam Abu Mansoor Maturidi (rahmatullah alayh) is. Imaam Abu Mansoor Maturidi died in the year 332 Hijri. He was among the very senior Mashaaiikh; a *Muhaqqiq*, *Mudaqqiq* and an Imaam of the Mutakallimeen of the Ahlus Sunnah. In addition he was a great Aabid (Saint) and a Buzrug of *karaamat*. He authored the best kutub in *Aqaaid*. Among his famous works are *Kitaabut Tauheed*, *Kitaabul Maqaalaat*, *Kitaab Auhaamu Mu'tazilah*, *Raddul Usoolil Khamsah Abi Muhammad Baahami*, *Raddul Karaamiah*, *Ma-aakhathus Sharaa'i (in Fiqh)*, *Al-Jadal*

(*Usoolul Fiqh*), and *Ta'weelaatu Ahlis Sunna (Tafseer of the Qur'an)*. This latter kitaab is unique and incomparable.

He had an orchard wherein he would work himself. It was among his *karaamaat* (miracles) to feed guests with unseasonal fruits from his orchard. When the astonished guests enquired about the fruits, Imaam Abu Mansoor Maturidi (rahmatullah alayh) would respond: “*With my right hand I never committed a sin. Therefore, whatever I desire to accomplish with my right hand, it is fulfilled.*”

Once when some people complained to him about the *zulm* (oppression and cruelty) of the king, he fashioned a bow with grass and took a blade of grass to act as an arrow. He threw it in the direction of the tyrannical king. Later it transpired that the king was killed on that very same day.

The purpose of narrating this brief account of this illustrious Imaam of Aqeedah who was an expert in all Sciences of the Deen, is not to imply that miracles and Taqwa are *Dalaa-il (Proofs)* for the validity of *Aqeedah* or any Shar'i *mas'alah*. The objective is to show that Imaam Maturidi (rahmatullah alayh) was not a small-timer or a chancer, or a quack or a crank like these modernist, deviated salafi-Taimiyyites and anonymous coprocreeps who wallow in ignorance and who wag their copro-soiled tongues to spit venom at the illustrious Salf-e-Saaliheen – and Imaam Maturidi (rahmatullah alayh) was among the Salf-e-Saaliheen. Through the medium of only two Ustaadh intermediaries he was the Student of Imaam Abu Hanifah (rahmatullah alayh).

When a man of impeccable Islamic moral character, profound Knowledge, lofty Taqwa and piety displays supernatural acts, then such miraculous deeds are termed *Karaamatul Auliya (Miracles of Allah's Friends)*. It is clear proof for his *Maqbooliyat indallaah (Acceptance by Allah Ta'ala)*. It is proof that He speaks with the *Noor of Allah*, such *Noor* which overflows from the *Baatin (Spiritual Heart)* and becomes

manifest on the tongue and all the physical limbs of the body. In short, Imaam Abu Mansoor Maturidi (rahmatullah alayh) was an embodiment of *Noor*. Instead of wagging his filthy, dog-like tongue with copro-criticism directed at this illustrious Imaam of the Shariah, it would have been infinitely superior for the moron if thorns had developed in his filthy tongue to prevent him from his ranting and raving against such a noble Friend (Wali) of Allah Azza Wa Jal. It will serve him good to reflect on the following Hadith-e-Qudsi: “*He who distresses My Wali, verily, I have given him an ultimatum of war.*”

The coprocreep has described the sect which he follows as “*the Sunnis (Hanaabilah)*”. This description is a gross deception calculated to mislead the unwary and ignorant by trading the impression that these modernist Salafis and their Hashawi anthropomorphist forbearers such as Ibn Taimiyyah, Ibn Qayyim, Zaghuni, Daarimi, etc. are followers of Imaam Ahmad Bin Hambal (rahmatullah alayh) when in reality this is furthest from the truth. They neither follow Imaam Ahmad Bin Hambal in Aqeedah nor in Fiqah. While in general the *Wahhaabis* (the followers of Muhammad Ibn Abdul Wahhaab) follow the rules of the Fiqh of Imaam Ahmad Bin Hambal, they are not the Muqallideen of this great Imaam. One prominent *mas'alah* on which they outrightly reject Imaam Ahmad Bin Hambal (rahmatullah alayh), is the issue of three Talaqs uttered in one session or in a single statement. According to Imaam Ahmad as well as the other three Math-habs, all three Talaqs take immediate effect. But, according to the copro-Salafi deviates, these three Talaqs equal only one Talaq. This is not the only difference they have with Imaam Ahmad Bin Hambal. In subservience to Ibn Taimiyyah, they are at stark variance with the Ahlus Sunnah in scores of *masaa-il*. However, this is not the occasion to digress into the details of their differences with Imaam Ahmad Bin Hambal (rahmatullah alayh).

Now from where did they obtain the *mas'alah* that three Talaqs equal one Talaq? And from whence do they draw their

concepts of Aqaaid? It is an open secret that despite their efforts to conceal their source, the fountainhead of all their deviations is Ibn Taimiyyah. They are absolutely blind followers of Ibn Taimiyyah. Their Taqleed is the blindest form of taqleed. It is the blindest because they abandon the rational and established Taqleed of the Aimmah of the Khairul Quroon epoch and adopt the taqleed of the seventh century Ibn Taimiyyah who appeared on the scene almost 7 centuries after Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) and about 550 years after Imaam Abu Hanifah (rahmatullah alayh).

While they dub themselves 'Hanaabilah' in order to hoodwink the Ahlus Sunnah Wal Jama'ah, they are in actual fact Taimiyyites who spawn anthropomorphism for Allah Azza Wa Jal with their baatil, *copro-ta'weel* of the *Mutashaabihaat* (*Allegorical*) *aayaat* of the Qur'aan-e-Kareem. We shall therefore use the appellation *Taimiyyites* to describe these blind and ignorant followers of Ibn Taimiyyah. Their slogan, '*Quraan and the Sunnah*' is false and highly misleading. They pretend to derive their rulings from the Qur'aan and Sunnah when in reality they simply mimic Ibn Taimiyyah.

Taimiyyites and Shiahs have one common feature, namely, the doctrine of *Taqiyah or Holy Hypocrisy*. While Shiahs openly profess belief in *Taqiyah*, the Taimiyyites do not make a profession of it. Nevertheless, despite being Taimiyyites, they find it agreeable to describe themselves as 'Hanaabilah' to detract from the fact that they are the blind and dumb followers of a man who appeared on the scene of Islamic history seven centuries after Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) - a man who was not among the Salf-e-Saaliheen.

Ask any one of these Taimiyyites who professes to have some knowledge of the Deen: '*If a man issues three Talaqs in a single utterance to his wife, how many Talaqs have come into effect?*' His response will be: '*One Talaq?*' Then say to him: '*But according to Imaam Ahmad Bin Hambal (rahmatullah*

*alayh*), *three Talaqs come into effect.*' The Taimiyyite will be dumbfounded and go into the defensive mode with weird *ta'weel* (baseless interpretation). This single mas'alah has been presented merely to show that these coprocreeps are not among the Hanaabilah. They are incorrigible Taimiyyites. Their Imaam of the recent century was Al-Albaani who died recently.

The coprocreep has contended a difference between the Hanaabilah and the Maturidiyyah regarding the *Sifaat* (Attributes) of Allah Ta'ala. However, he has failed to present this difference or differences. It behoves him to enumerate the differences and present an academic discussion on the views of the two sides without resorting to Ibn Taimiyyah because he is not Imaam Ahmad Bin Hambal (rahmatullah alayh) nor does he follow the *Minhaaj* of Imaam Hambal, neither in Aqeedah nor in Fiqah. The coprocreep Salafi is required to cite precisely from the works of Imaam Ahmad, if any, or from the writings of Imaam Ahmad's top Ashaab. We do not accept Ibn Taimiyyah to be a mouthpiece of Imaam Ahmad Bin Hambal (rahmatullah alayh).

Imaam Maturidi (rahmatullah alayh) did not diverge from the Aqeedah of the Salf-e-Saaliheen. He expounded the Aqeedah of Imaam Abu Hanifah, Imaam Abu Yusuf and Imaam Muhammad (rahmatullah alayhim). He wrote a voluminous exegesis on *Al-Fiqhul Akbar* of Imaam Abu Hanifah (rahmatullah alayh). Far from refuting any of the concepts of Aqeedah propounded by Imaam Abu Hanifah, he (Imaam Maturidi) confirmed every belief of the Salf-e-Saaliheen before him. The coprocreep claims that the position of the Taimiyyites is the same as that of the Four Imaams (Abu Hanifah, Maalik, Shaafi' and Ahmad Bin Hambal). In making this preposterous contention, he attempts to convey that the Aqeedah presented by Imaam Maturidi and upheld by the illustrious Akaabir Ulama of Deoband, is at variance with the Aqeedah of Imaam Abu Hanifah (rahmatullah alayh) and the other Salf-e-Saaliheen. It devolves on him as an incumbent obligation to present the alleged difference with

precision. Making a brazen, sweeping claim without providing the evidence or without presenting a discussion on the issue is an admission of ignorance and academic bankruptcy.

Since there is no difference in the Aqeedah of Imaam Maturidi and Imaam Abu Hanifah, it will be beneficial perhaps to clear a bit of the mental fog of the coprocreep to mention what the Imaam of the Taimiyyites had to say about Imaam Abu Hanifah and the other Imaams whom the Muqallideen follow. In his *Kitaabul Imaan*, Ibn Taimiyyah states: “Allah Ta’ala cast a special gaze of Rahmat on His Muslim servants. He bestowed to them Hidaayat on the truthful tongues of the Four Imaams and the other illustrious Muhadditheen and Mujtahideen. They all had refuted the erroneous beliefs of the false sects of Jahmiyyah, etc. pertaining to the Qur’aan, Imaan and the Divine Attributes. All of them were unanimous on the Aqaaid of the Salaf.”

At this juncture, Ibn Taimiyyah explicitly mentioned Imaam Abu Hanifah, Imaam Abu Yusuf and Imaam Muhammad (rahmatullah alayhim). Their beliefs were precisely that of their predecessors, the Taabieen and the Sahaabah. Their mutual differences pertain to *Furooe masaa-il* and such *Ijtihaadi masaa-il* for which there was no *Nass*. On such issues of justifiable and acceptable minor difference, the Taimiyyites of this age have adopted the unbridled policy of *Takfeer* of some of Islam’s most illustrious Savants, such as Imaam Maturidi and the Akaabir Ulama of Deoband. In the absence of *Nusoos*, difference of opinion is an automatic logical corollary.

Just consider the stupidity of the Taimiyyites on the issue of the classification of the *Sifaat* of Allah Azza Wa Jal. Without even having understood the text of *Sharh Aqaaid* and the texts of other Maturidi literature, which include *Al-Fiqhul Akbar* of Imaam Abu Hanifah (rahmatullah alayh), the foundational basis of all Maturidi Aqeedah literature, the coprocreep jaahil rushes off to claim that according to the Maturidis Allah Ta’ala has “only eight *Sifaat*”. When a man who embarks on a refutation of

the Giants of Uloom, is unable to even understand the *ibaarat (text)* in the kutub, then it is indeed an insult to discuss academically with such a jaahil. Nevertheless, in the interests of the unwary there is a need to refute the flotsam of *jahaalat* which the coprocreep has gorged out in his animosity for the Ulama of Deoband and for Imaam Maturidi (rahmatullah alayhim).

Imaam Maturidi and his followers at no stage claimed that Allah Ta’ala has only eight Attributes. What they had done was to classify the *Sifaat* into two categories in emulation of the methodology of Imaam Abu Hanifah, Imaam Abu Yusuf and Imaam Muhammad (rahmatullah alayhim). We shall not elaborate further on the issue of classification because the coprocreep has not presented any discussion on this topic. He has only made a stupid claim without elaborating the issue. Should he embark on an academic discussion to ‘prove’ that according to Imaam Maturidi, Allah Ta’ala’s *Sifaat* are restricted to eight, then we shall, Insha’Allah, respond with the *dalaa-il* and elaboration of our Aimmah in the sphere of *Aqeedah*.

The conceptual differences of opinion among the authorities of *Aqeedah* is just natural and unavoidable in view of the total absence of *Nusoos* on the subject. In the absence of *Nusoos*, every authority of the Shar’iah, without exception, who has commented on the Divine Attributes, was compelled to resort to *Ta’weel*. Regardless what meanings have been tendered by the various authorities, all are the effects of *Ta’weel* for which a need had developed, and that essential need was to refute the *kufir* of the sects of *baatil* among which are the anthropomorphists who have taken refuge under the Hanaabilah umbrella bringing eternal disgrace to the Math-hab of the noble Imaam Ahmad Bin Hambal (rahmatullah alayh). With their anthropomorphism created by their literal *ta’weel* of the allegorical Qur’aanic verses and Hadith narrations, the coprocreep Salafis – the Hashawis - have defamed and damaged the Hambali Math-hab.

It is gross jahaalat for the proponent of a view based on his personal opinion to claim *Qat'iyat (Absolute Certitude)* for his copro-concept. *Qat'iyat* is the product of only *Wahi*. While rejection with vehemence on the basis of rational and Shar'i *dalaa-il* of an adversary's view is acceptable and tolerable, proclaiming one's own view – the product of pure opinion – to be the absolute and final repository of truth is bigotry and self-conceit.

The coprocreep in his splenetic tirade against Imaam Maturidi and the Ulama of Deoband, has attempted to extravasate capital from the exposition of the *Sifaat* by Ibn Abil Izz Al-Hanafi of the 7<sup>th</sup> century. Ibn Abil Izz has written a commentary of 500 pages on Imaam Tahaawi's 8-page famous document known as *Aqeedatut Tahaawi*. Superficially it appears that Ibn Abil Izz supports the dimensional concept of *jihaat (direction)*, etc. which the coprocreep Salafis attribute to Allah Azza Wa Jal.

Firstly, whatever Ibn Abil Izz has written on this issue is by way of wholesale *Ta'weel*. Almost his every statement is the effect of *Ta'weel*. Appearing on the scene 5 centuries after Imaam Tahaawi, Ibn Abil Izz attempts to read into Imaam Tahaawi's explicit statement negating the six created directions for Allah Azza Wa Jal, employing his own *ta'weelaat*. He interprets Imaam Tahaawi's negation to be applicable to the *Mushabbihah* of his age, i.e. 5 centuries prior to Ibn Abil Izz, hence he deemed it appropriate to wander off at a wide tangent to expand on Imaam Tahaawi's negation and ascribe such meanings to Imaam Tahaawi's explicit negations which the great Imaam never intended.

Ibn Abil Izz's *ta'weelaat* of Imaam Tahaawi's *Aqeedah* is too far-fetched for acceptance. Whilst this is not the occasion to elaborate on Ibn Abil Izz's wholesale *Ta'weel*, it will be appropriate to say that the coprocreep Salafis swiftly jump on to the bandwagon of taqleed – blind following – of just any one from whose statements they believe extravasation of capital is

possible. Copro-Salafis are the arch-enemies of Taqleed, yet they have no qualms to resort to blind Taqleed of even the Khalaf such as Ibn Abil Izz and just anyone else in whose writing they discern even a semblance of support for their copro-anthropomorphic concepts.

Every argument presented by Ibn Abil Izz for the views he has expressed on the basis of *Ta'weel* can be shattered with further *Ta'weel*. We are not the Muqallideen of Ibn Abil Izz. He is not our Daleel nor the source for the Aqeedah of the Ahlus Sunnah. Ibn Jauzi Al-Hambali who flourished 2 centuries before Ibn Abil Izz had already negated the ideas which the latter stated on the basis of *Ta'weel*. The bottom line in this domain is that every single one of the authorities of all sects and Math-habs of both the Salaf and the Khalaf resorted to *Ta'weel*. Even the categorization of the *Sifaat* by Imaam Abu Hanifah (rahmatullah alayh) is the effect of *Ta'weel*, for nowhere in the *Nusoos* of the Qur'aan and Ahaadith does this categorization appear. It suffices to say that Shaikh Ibn Abil Izz's view derived by wholesale interpretation of Imaam Tahaawi's statements five centuries after this great Imaam, is not *Wahi*. It is preposterous and stupidity supreme to expect anyone to adopt blind taqleed of Shaikh Ibn Abil Izz (rahmatullah alayh) in his personal interpretations which conflict with the interpretations of other authorities centuries before him, and which are in conflict of the explicit position of Imaam Tahaawi (rahmatullah alayh) whose words he cites then reads into it what he believes was the intention of the great Imaam.

Imaam Ibn Jauzi (rahmatullah alayh) mentions in his treatise, *Daf'us Shubhit Tashbeeh* that once Imaam Ahmad Bin Hambal expressed a fatwa on a question posed to him. Someone commented: "*Ibnul Mubaarak does not have this view.*" Hadhrat Ibnul Mubaarak (rahmatullah alayh) was among Islam's greatest authorities in every field of Islamic Knowledge. He was a Muhaddith, Faqeeh, Mufassir, Zaahid and Wali of the loftiest status, hence the person was surprised to hear a contrary view. In

response to his comment, Imaam Ahmad (rahmatullah alayh) said: *“Ibnul Mubaarak did not descend from the heaven.”* In other words, Ibnul Mubaarak’s view is not *Wahi* revealed to him. There was no *Qat’iyyat* is his personal view. Similarly, we say to the coprocreep that Shaikh Ibn Abil Izz (rahmatullah alayh) and whomever he may wish to quote from the Salaf and the Khalaf, did not descend from the heaven. Any view expressed on the basis of *Ta’weel* regardless of its correctness, is not *Wahi*. And, the coprocreep Salafi has absolutely no right to cite anyone’s views and expect to have it rammed down the throat of others in terms of *our* principle of *Blind Taqleed* since these Salafis are the greatest opponents of Taqleed in every department of the Deen.

The diversion from the Hambali Math-hab in *Aqeedah* was initiated about three centuries before Ibn Taimiyyah. Allaamah Ibnul Jauzi Hambali (rahmatullah alayhi) states in his kitaab, *Daf’ush Shubhit Tashbeeh war Rad alal Mujassimah mim-may yantahilu Math-habal Imaam Ahmad*: *“I have found from three writers from our Ashaab who have diverted from the Maslak of the Mutaqaddimeen Hanaabilah: (1) Abu Abdullah Bin Haamid, (2) Qaadhi Abu Ya’la Muhammad Bin Al-Husain Hambali, and (3) Abul Hasan Ali Bin Ubaidullah Bin Nasr Zaaghooni Hambali. In their books they stigmatized the actual Hambali Math-hab. They descended to the level of the masses and ignoramuses. They interpreted the Divine Attributes in terms of the dictates of sensual perceptions. For example, in the explanation of ‘Allah created Aadam in His form’, they showed that Allah Ta’ala possessed form and a face in addition to His Sifaat. They accepted that Allah Ta’ala had eyes, hands, fingers, etc. There is explicit tashbeeh in their statements.”*

Despite such preposterous Hashawi beliefs of kufr, they claimed to be part of the Ahlus Sunnah Wal Jama’ah, and members of the Hanaabilah. Ibn Taimiyyah and Ibnul Qayyim followed these three deviates. Thus, their claim to Hambaliyyat

– being Hanaabilah - is fallacious. The ‘hanaabilah’ whom the Ahlus Sunnah (Deobandis) criticize are not the true followers of Imaam Ahmad Bin Hambal (rahmatullah alayh). They are the Hashawi deviates slinking surreptitiously among the Hanaabilah. Similarly were there Hanafis in former times who masqueraded as Ahnaaf although by *Aqeedah* they were Mu’tazili.

Another very important fact from which sight should not be lost, is erroneous attribution to Imaam Abu Hanifah (rahmatullah alayh) made by Ibn Taimiyyah and his muqallideen (the Taimiyyites). Abdullah Ansaari, the student of Ibn Taimiyyah, had written a *sharah*, *Al-Farooq*, of *Aqeedatut Tahaawi*. Ibn Taimiyyah had contended on the basis of *Al Fiqhul Akbar* that according to Imaam Abu Hanifah, Allah Ta’ala has a fixed abode in *A’la Il-liyyeen*. This contention is utterly baseless. Imaam Abu Hanifah (rahmatullah alayh) had not made this ludicrous claim. Neither is this fallacious view substantiated by the *Riwaayat* of Faqeeh Abu Laith, nor in the *Riwaayat* of any of the authoritative and reliable Narrators among the Ashaab of Imaam Abu Hanifah.

The contention of a fixed physical abode for Allah Ta’ala is the baseless interpretation and fabrication of Abdullah Ansaari Taimiyyi, the author of *Al-Farooq*. The Taimiyyites cite this false attribution to substantiate their view. Rejecting the notion of a fixed physical abode for Allah Azza Wa Jal, Imaam Abu Hanifah (rahmatullah alayh) said: *“Whoever says that Allah is in the heaven or in the earth, is a kaafir.”* This statement is tantamount to assigning Allah Azza Wa Jal into a created physical space – high and lofty is He above such fabrication. Undoubtedly, Allah Azza Wa Jal is in the heavens and the earth, for the Qur’aan itself explicitly and emphatically asserts the Divine Presence in both abodes: *“He is Allah in the heavens and in the earth.”* (*Aayat 3, Al-An’aam*) Other verses also confirm this fact. Imaam Abu Hanifa’s statement is not in refutation of this emphatic Qur’aanic assertion. Imaam Abu Hanifah’s statement was in the context of *physical space*

assigned to Allah Ta'ala by the likes of the copro-Salafis who in reality are the progeny of the Hashawis.

Some of the later Hanaabilah had departed from the Straight Path of Imaam Ahmad Bin Hambal (rahmatullah alayh). However, Allaamah Ibnul Jauzi (rahmatullah alayh - died 597 Hijri) thoroughly refuted their baatil. But, then came Ibn Taimiyyah who followed the deviant path of the later Hashawis masquerading as Hanaabilah. He differed with the Four Imaams in an abundance of masaa-il, both *Furoo' and Usool*.

The aforementioned discussion is a brief elucidation of the background of the debate between the Ahlus Sunnah Wal Jama'ah and the coprocreep Taimiyyites who profess to be the expounders of the Hambali Math-hab in the sphere of *Aqeedah*. It is essential to remember that what Ibn Taimiyyah and some others who have been swayed by him have been propagating, and what the coprocreep crank is gorging out has never been the Math-hab of Imaam Ahmad Bin Hambal. In fact, Ibn Taimiyyah subscribed to the kufr doctrine of the eternity of the universe. Insha-Allah, this kufr concept shall be refuted in a separate treatise, as will other Taimiyyi deviant beliefs.

Our advice to Darul Uloom is to devote special attention to the Taimiyyite menace. They should equip students with adequate knowledge to confront the fitnah. The Akaabireen of former times and of recent times have left a treasure of *kutub* in which every *baatil* of the Taimiyyites has been thoroughly refuted. It is waajib in our day for a group of Ulama to devote time and to concentrate on this menace. Only by thorough *mutaala-ah* of the *kutub* will the Ulama be in position to demolish the Taimiyyite baatil with confidence and with a thoroughness which will send these coprocreeps seeking refuge in their dung-heaps of baatil.

Now we commence with the understanding that those whom the coprocreep states in his article to be Hanaabilah are actually Taimiyyites. Imaam Ahmad Bin Hambal and his genuine

followers are at one with the other Math-habs in Aqeedah. Allaamah Ibnul Jauzi Hambali (rahmatullah alayh) has clarified this deception which some deviate 'Hanaabilah' had propagated by attributing their deviation to Imaam Ahmad (rahmatullah alayh).

### ALLAH'S ULUWW (HIGHNESS)

According to the coprocreep, '*on top of*' the controversy with the Ahl-e-Haqq is "*the issue of the Highness of Allah.*" The coprocreep has failed to elaborate his concept of the word '*highness*'. What precisely does he mean by the 'Highness of Allah'? Can he cite a single Maturidi or Aalim of Deoband who has denied the glory, grandeur, majesty and highness of Allah Azza Wa Jal? Everyone affirms the Highness of Allah Azza Wa Jal. It devolves on the coprocreep to explain what exactly he means by the "Highness" of Allah. He should elaborate the Taimiyyite concept of 'Highness'. His exposition of his 'highness' concept will enable us to tackle and demolish his *baatil* with greater efficiency. It is improper for us at this juncture to waste time to respond to an ambiguity which we are sure the coprocreep himself is unable to expound. Nevertheless, we shall briefly discuss the copro-deception.

The meaning of 'highness' according to the baatil Taimiyyite doctrine means *physical highness*. And, this is precisely what the Ahlus Sunnah reject, for it leads to the conclusion that Allah Azza Wa Jal is a physical entity – *Subhaanallaah!* Far above and pure is He of such blasphemy which stems from the 'highness' concept in terms of Ibn Taimiyyah's doctrine which the coprocreep is propagating.

In response to his question, the simple answer is that all Maturidis and Deobandis affirm the Highness of Allah Azza Wa Jal. If he disagrees, he should present his evidence for scrutiny.

By *Uluww (Highness)* the coprocreep actually means physical highness – *fauqiyyah* – in the physical sense. In support of this

literal interpretation, they present the aayat: “*Unto Him does a holy word rise, and the virtuous deed rises to Him.*” From this and similar other verses, the anthropomorphists have deduced that Allah Azza Wa Jal is ‘above’ in the physical sense, hence ‘highness’ to the coprocreep is to be at the highest physical level of creation as we know, namely, the Arsh. Shaikh Ibn Abil Izz (rahmatullah alayh) who appeared two centuries after Ibnul Jauzi (rahmatullah alayh) had also erroneously utilized this Qur’aanic verse to establish *Allah’s Fauqiyyah*. Refuting this *istidlaal* (deduction) and *ta’weel*, Ibn Jauzi (rahmatullah alayh) states in his *Daf’u Shubh*: “*Some have argued that Allah is on the Arsh on the basis of the aayat: ‘Unto Him rises the wholesome word...’, and on the basis of the aayat: ‘He is Qaahir (The Overpowering One) above (fauq) His servants.’ They have opined that fauqiyyah (aboveness) to be in the physical sense whilst they forgot that fauqiyyah hissiyyah (physical aboveness) relates to physical bodies and to atoms. (And they have forgotten) that sometimes fauqiyyah refers to elevated rank. Furthermore, just as He has said: ‘He is above (fauq) His servants’, so too has He said: ‘He is with you wherever you may be.’ Now the one who interprets it (i.e. being together) as being together with knowledge (Ilm) will find his adversary interpreting istiwa’ to mean qahr.*” It is tit for tat. Both resorting to Ta’weel.

Thus, both groups resort to interpretation. The one who negates *martabah* (status) for *fauq*, should then also negate *ilm* for *ma-a’* (being together). There is no sound logic in the argument which asserts a physical presence on the Arsh, but denies a physical presence elsewhere despite ‘presence’ in general is Quranically affirmed for all places. The stance of the Ahlus Sunnah is that Allah’s Presence and Highness whether on the Arsh or anywhere else as stated in the Qur’aan, are not in the physical sense as the ideology of the anthropomorphists spawns, and whom the coprocreep follows.

## ALLAH IS ‘NOWHERE’?

The coprocreep contends that “*Sharh Aqaaid and classical Maturidi text suggest that Allah is nowhere.*” Without presenting the relevant text from Sharah Aqaaid and other Maturidi literature, he states that the ‘*nowhere*’ attribute is ‘suggested’ by Imaam Maturidi. By this we understand that the coprocreep has made this inference and stupid interpretation (*ta’weel baatil*) on the basis of his lack of understanding of what he has read in Sharah Aqaaid. Why does he say ‘suggest’? Why not make an unequivocal claim that Maturidis believe that Allah Ta’ala is ‘nowhere’? He has baulked at making any such claim because ***nowhere*** in Maturidi literature is the ‘*nowhere*’ doctrine propounded. So, the coprocreep’s claim of a suggested doctrine is the product of his stupid conjecture which in turn is the consequence of his inability to understand Maturidi literature.

If he persists in his ludicrous claim, he should present the exact *ibaarat* (text) from Sharah Aqaaid and other Maturidi texts and discuss and refute the view academically. It will then devolve on us to respond with *dalaa-il* to negate his copro-ideas.

With his ‘nowhere’ suggestion the coprocreep attempts to foster the notion that Maturidis, i.e. the Ahlus Sunnah Wal Jama’ah, deny the existence of Allah Azza Wa Jal. However, if by ‘nowhere’ the moron means negation of physical space and dimension, then we state unequivocally the correctness of such a conception ascribed to ‘nowhere’. But, the coprocreep in reality will not assign such an interpretation to his ludicrous ‘nowhere’ allegation because he is a Taimiyyite, and Taimiyyites ascribe physical space, dimension and direction to Allah Azza Wa Jal. This Taimiyyite doctrine is blasphemous *baatil*.

## ALLAH’S OMNIPRESENCE

Then, the coprocreep presents what he believes to be a conflict among the Ulama of Deoband. Thus he says: “*Many Deobandi scholars who are not in touch with Maturidi Aqeedah*

*have continuously portrayed to the masses that Allah is everywhere. This is deviant Sufi belief which was also taken on board by the non-academic Jahmiyyah.”*

So far, the coprocreep has not unfurled his belief pertaining to the Divine Presence. He has contented himself to criticize without providing evidence and without stating what exactly is the Maturidi and Deobandi belief on this issue.

True Sufis are the strictest followers of the Sunnah. They are the Muqallideen of the Four Math-habs. The Sufis who follow the Hanafi Math-hab, follow Imaam Maturidi in Aqeedah, which is the Aqeedah propounded by Imaam Abu Hanifah (rahmatullah alayh) in *Al Fiqhul Akbar*, and summarized by Imaam Tahaawi (rahmatullah alayh) in his *Aqeedatut Tahaawi*. True Sufis have no deviant beliefs as the coprocreep slanders. Any brand of ‘sufi’ism’ which is in conflict with the *Minhaaj* of the Ahlus Sunnah Wal Jama’ah is not Tasawwuf. It is Satanism. Thus, it is unjust to condemn the Sufis on account of the bid’ah, shirk and excesses of some false claimants of Tasawwuf. There exists deviation in all groups and institutions. The worth and validity of a group are ascertained from its authorities, not from those who have strayed from the Straight Path. For example, to ascertain the Math-hab of Imaam Ahmad Bin Hambal, it will be a grievous error to look at Ibn Taimiyyah who came centuries after Imaam Ahmad. Furthermore, Ibn Taimiyyah diverged from the Math-hab of Imaam Ahmad in many masaa-il. He is not an authority of the Hambali Math-hab. The Math-hab of Imaam Ahmad has to be acquired from his Ashaab, not from anthropomorphists who masquerade as Hanaabilah.

As for the averment that ‘Allah is everywhere’ it is an Attribute of Allah Ta’ala mentioned in simple Qur’aanic terms without delving into philosophical, metaphysical, academic and copro arguments with all their hair-splitting paraphernalia, incongruities, absurdities, etc. - argument and exposition which are totally destructive for the masses, arguments which display

the *ghabaawah* (*density of brains*) of even so-called ‘shaikhul islams’, and which open the avenue for kufr. ‘Everywhere’ is the most logical and simplest way for negating *makaan* for Allah Azza Wa Jal. It is the best manner of refuting the Taimiyyite Hashwi concept of confining Allah Azza Wa Jal to a specific place and space of His creation. The Ahlus Sunnah Wal Jama’ah absolutely deny and negate the Taimiyyite belief of the confinement of Allah Ta’ala in space and direction – high is He above such blasphemy which the anthropomorphists and Taimiyyites ascribe to Him.

Allah Ta’ala states in the Qur’aan Majeed:

- ? The east and the west belong to Him. Wherever you turn your face, there is the Face (Presence) of Allah.
- ? He is with you wherever you are.
- ? He is with them wherever they are.
- ? He is Allah in the heaven and Allah in the earth.

Thus, Allah’s Presence as mentioned in the Qur’aan, is *Everywhere without confinement to makaan*, and to our understanding it is Divine Omnipresence *bila kayf*. The uncorrupted minds of simple people do not dwell into avenues of kufr nor embroil themselves in hair-splitting academic issues and arguments. The simple belief of ‘*everywhere bila kayf*’ is an affirmation of the belief of the Ahlus Sunnah that Allah Ta’ala is not confined to any specific space. This is the belief of Imaam Abu Hanifah and of all the Salf-e-Saaliheen – a belief inherited from the Sahaabah. But the convoluted brain of the coprocreep Salafi twists this simple Qur’aanic belief of the Ahlus Sunnah into the hideous concept of ‘Allah being no where’. This is coprocreep blasphemy.

In the exposition of the Qur’aanic verse: “*He (Allah) is with you wherever you are.*”, Imaam Baihaqi narrated that the Sahaabi, Hadhrat Ubaadah (radhiyallahu anhu) said that the best Imaan of a Mu’min is that he understands and has implicit faith that Allah is with him wherever he is. (*Al-Asmaa’*)

The apparent 'conflicts' of the Ulama of Deoband claimed by the coprocreep in his presentation of the 'nowhere' and the 'everywhere' contentions are thus non-existent – pure hallucination of a copro-brain. There is no conflict among the Ulama of Deoband on the Sifaat of Allah Azza Wa Jal.

### THE POINTING OF THE SLAVE GIRL

Regarding the slave-girl's pointing upwards, apart from the academic explanation, the simple, straightforward explanation is that it is the common understanding of all people of all religions that the Creator is The Being of Highness. For human beings, highness/loftiness is associated with 'aboveness', not with the earth. In relation to the earth, the heavens as we perceive them are 'above' us, not below us. The head is the highest and noblest part of the human body. It is high above the rest of the body. The souls of the evil ones are imprisoned in *Sijjeen* which is an abode of torment within the dregs of the earth. Man and beast trample and excrete on the ground. It is disrespectful and sinful to place the Qur'aan Shareef on the ground at feet level.

Of the two directions, above and below, in relation to humans, 'above' has highness, loftiness and nobility. This understanding relates to created human beings, not to the Uncreated, Eternal Allah Azza Wa Jal Who cannot be confined to physical dimensions, and Who is bereft of dimensional and directional attributes of deficiency. To Him, above and below are the same. Thus, when the Mu'min's head is on the ground in Sajdah, he is closest to Allah Ta'ala while the deviant Ibn Taimiyyah and the Hashawis say that a man is closest to Allah Ta'ala when he is on a high mountain or at the top of the minaret. This is their level of stupidity which is the direct effect of ascribing physical dimensions to Allah Azza Wa Jal.

The Malaaikeh are in the heavens, 'above' us. The Sidratul Muntaha is in the seventh heaven, 'above' us. The actual Ka'bah around which the Malaaikeh perform Tawaaf is in the seventh

heaven, 'above' us. In view of the association of the heavens with all things sublime, celestial and spiritual, all illiterate and rural people lacking in any academic knowledge, as well as the nature of all men, understand the skies/heavens to have a special association with Allah Ta'ala. But the relationship of physical aboveness is in our imagination, and does not constitute an attribute of Allah Azza Wa Jal as contended by coprocreep Salafis who currently expound the doctrines of the Mujassamis (Anthropomorphists) of some centuries ago, who masqueraded as Hanaabilah.

The slave-girl by pointing upwards was negating idolatry. It was a time of idolatry. Prior to her acceptance of Islam, she worshipped the idols of the Mushrikeen located in the Ka'bah. The entire nation was worshipping idols. Hence, by pointing upwards, the slave-girl affirmed that she did not believe in idols. If she was an idolater, she would have said that the 'gods' are in the Ka'bah which had housed a myriad of idols of worship.

In their armoury of flimsy and spurious arguments, this *Mudhtarab* Hadith is an extremely weak, in fact baseless, argument. It is not befitting for a man of Knowledge to present this flimsy argument for substantiating such a fundamental issue as *Aqeedah*, especially when there is a formidable array of *Dalaa-il* of the Ahlus Sunnah Wal Jama'ah in negation of the corrupt belief of the confinement of Allah Ta'ala to the space of the created Throne.

The coprocreep making another false allegation says: "...for this group of Maturidis the act of pointing to the sky or saying Allah is up above is kufr." This construction is the product of the coprocreep's hallucination. What is his proof for saying that 'pointing to the sky' in the context of the Hadith is kufr? Yes, if the pointer consciously believes or claims that Allah Ta'ala is confined in the sky, as do the Hashwi coprocreeps, then such a belief will be kufr. But this belief of kufr does not stem from the simpleton's (the slave-girl's) pointing to the sky. She was at that moment *khaaliyuz zahn*. Her mind was bereft of the stupidities

which the Taimiyyites ascribe to 'aboveness' when they relate it to Allah Azza Wa Jal. She simply indicated that she believed in the One Allah, not the idols which were the popular gods of the mushrikeen. Obviously she could not and would not point into the ground.

The girl did not verbally proclaim the confinement of Allah Azza Wa Jal in the skies. Thus, the assertion that "saying Allah is above is kufr" is both spurious and a false attribution to the Maturidis. In short, there is absolutely no *daleel* for the coprocreep and the Taimiyyites in this Hadith, nor does this Hadith possess the strength to dislodge the mass of evidence presented by the Four Imaams, their illustrious Ashaab among whom was the Shaikh Abu Mansoor Maturidi, and the Ahlus Sunnah Wal Jama'ah as a whole.

Clinging further to this Hadith, the coprocreep avers: "*As a side-issue, they also say the Prophet accepted her answer as she was not a scholar. So what does this mean? Does it mean that there is one Aqeedah for laymen and another for theologians? Or should their Aqeedah be the same? If it is the same and the true Aqeedah is as they say it is that Allah is nowhere, then why didn't the Prophet correct her?*"

With this stupid argument, the coprocreep further displays his *jahaalat*. Firstly, as pointed out earlier, the attribution of 'nowhere' is a baseless figment of the hallucination of the coprocreep. No where does Maturidi doctrine affirm the hallucinatory attribute of 'nowhere' which implies non-existence for Allah Azza Wa Jal. We reiterate that there is no *makaan* anywhere in Allah's vast creation to which Allah Azza Wa Jal could be confined into space and restricted to dimension. The Arsh is a created object. But Ibn Taimiyyah says that the Arsh is co-eternal with Allah Ta'ala. Allah Ta'ala is not confined to it nor does He occupy this physical item of creation in anthropomorphic style as the Taimiyyites imply. He is *Everywhere* in the meaning of the context of the Qur'aanic

verses affirming Omnipresence for Him – a meaning which is beyond the comprehension of the created human mind with its finite boundaries of operation.

Describing the non-existence of *makaan* in relation to Allah Azza Wa Jal, Imaam Abu Hanifah (rahmatullah alayh) stating the belief of the Ahlus Sunnah Wal Jama'ah, said:

*"He existed (since eternity) and there had not existed makaan (space/place)."*

Refuting the type of corrupt doctrine propounded by Taimiyyites and other *firqah-e-baatilah* before Ibn Taimiyyah, Imaam Tahaawi (rahmatullah alayh) said: "*Allah is not encompassed by the six directions as is all creation.*" Thus, negation of *makaan* for Allah Azza Wa Jal never means that he is 'nowhere' as the coprocreep says, and which he falsely ascribes to Imaam Maturidi and the Ahlus Sunnah Wal Jama'ah.

Difference of Aqeedah, i.e. one for laymen and one for theologians, does not stem from the Hadith. However, there will most certainly be difference in intellectual and mental comprehension of different people. There are geniuses and morons. Consider the coprocreep moron who has embarked on a refutation of the illustrious Giants of Uloom while he lacks the ability to understand the *ibaaarat* of Sharah Aqaaid. Then there are rustics and intellectuals. There are people with dense brains (*ghabis*). We therefore find that Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) said: "*Speak to people according to the level of their intellectual capacity.*" It is plain stupidity for a theologian to engage a *ghabi* and a rustic farm labourer in the polemical arguments of philosophy. It will suffice for people of *ghabaawah* to recite the Kalimah, believe in the Oneness of Allah Ta'ala and the manifestations of His *Sifaat* without dabbling in the polemics of philosophy which had ruined the Imaan of numerous men of knowledge.

Perhaps the coprocreep is unaware of the Hadith which explains Nabi Musa's extreme annoyance and anger when the simple, illiterate shepherd had expressed the desire to apply oil

to the hair of Allah Ta'ala, and to render other physical acts of service to Him. Allah Ta'ala revealed to Nabi Musa (alayhis salaam) to refrain from rebuking the shepherd, for he was expressing his love to Allah Ta'ala in terms of the level of *Aql* which Allah Ta'ala had bestowed to him. So while such anthropomorphic expressions are tolerable if made by men of *ghabaawah*, they will be blasphemous and kufr if uttered by men of intelligence and by theologians.

The Hadith of the shepherd conspicuously illustrates *one Aqeedah with different understandings* by different persons. Only a coprocreep will interpret this as different Aqeedahs for different people. Islam is beautifully simple. It was the introduction of Greek philosophy translated into Arabic during the Taabieen era which had destroyed the Imaan of numerous scholars, not the Imaan of the common folk. It was to save the Imaan of the masses that the Salaf-e-Saaliheen had adopted the policy of belief without *Ta'weel*. In that epoch this policy was a necessity. Later, there evolved a need for *Ta'weel* to refute *baatil* and to establish the *Haqq*. The Ahl-e-Haqq are not men possessing fossilized brains like the ghabi coprocreep Salafis.

We are to simply believe just as Allah Ta'ala says in the Qur'aan and Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) in the Hadith. The Qur'aan says: Allah is wherever you turn your face. We say: Yes, we believe Allah is *bila kayf* wherever we turn our face. The Qur'aan says: Allah is with you wherever you are. We say: We believe Allah is with us *bila kayf* wherever we are. The Qur'aan says: Allah made *istiwa* on the Arsh. We say: We believe Allah's *istiwa* on the Arsh *bila kayf*, whatever it may mean without us attempting to fathom the *haqeeqat* of this *istiwa*. The Qur'aan says Allah is in the heaven and in the earth. We say: We believe Allah is in the heaven and in the earth *bila kayf – bila makaan*.

The only benefit and utility of the polemical and philosophical expositions of the Akaabireen Salaf-e-Saaliheen

and of our recent Ulama on the issue of Allah's *Sifaat and Zaat* were to refute the corrupt, kufr beliefs of the many baatil sects which had mushroomed in the Ummah. All of them were the illegitimate offspring of Greek philosophy initiated by the Mu'tazilahs.

### ALLAH IS EVERYWHERE SAYS THE QUR'AAN

Presenting another spurious argument, the coprocreep says: *"I asked a Molvi about this, and he replied with the verse: 'And Allah is in the skies and the earth', implying that Allah is everywhere. But this is wrong. In Arabic, the structure of this verse is similar to one saying:*

*Abu Bakr is the Khalifah in the East and the West. So does this mean that Abu Bakr is everywhere? In the light of this, the correct translation of the verse in al-An'aam is: And He is the Allah in the skies and the earth, i.e. the one who is worthy of worship in the skies and the earth..."*

It is most significant that the coprocreep has resorted to *ta'weel* (interpretation) to explain this aayat. In terms of his crooked 'manhaaj', *ta'weel* is not valid. Just as the Taimiyyites posit a literal translation for the ayaat pertaining to *Istiwa alal Arsh*, so too does it behove them to accept the literal meaning of this aayat which he has subjected to *ta'weel* to avoid conflict with the Taimiyyite belief pertaining to *Istiwa*. In terms of logic, there is no valid reason to negate *ta'weel* for the *Istiwa'* aayat, and to affirm it for aayat 3 of Surah An'aam (the above verse). There is no Shar'i basis for this selective adoption of *ta'weel*, especially by a sect which ostensibly and deceptively negates *Ta'weel*.

While there are several versions in the tafseer of this aayat, there is consensus of the authorities of the Shariah in rejection of the Jahmiyyah belief of the existence of Allah Azza Wa Jal in every *makaan*. This consensus is likewise extended to the

Taimiyyite belief of the attribution of *makaan* for Allah Azza Wa Jal. They assign a confined *makaan*, viz. the Arsh, for Allah Ta'ala with their literal *ta'weel* of the *Istiwa'* aayat while they have no rational reason for negating the literal meaning of aayat 3 of Surah An'aam. In addition to seeking refuge in *ta'weel* of this aayat, the coprocreep deletes the term '*fi*' (*in*) from *ardh* (*the earth*). He has no right to discard the '*fi*' on the basis of *ta'weel* which the Taimiyyites deny when it comes to the *Istiwa'* aayat. He has committed downright chicanery by deleting the term '*fi*'.

The coprocreep has no basis for decrying someone who resorts to *ta'weel* for *istiwa'* in view of the Salafi *ta'weel* of *ma-akum* (*together with you*). The coprocreep who inhabits a glasshouse should beware of casting stones at others.

The Molvi merely said what Allah Ta'ala Himself says: "And, He is Allah Who is in the heavens, and in the earth." While the Ahlus Sunnah Wal Jama'ah are entitled to resort to *ta'weel* of this aayat to refute confinement of Allah Azza Wa Jal to *created makaan*, Taimiyyites have no such entitlement in view of their corrupt belief of confinement of Allah Ta'ala to *the created makaan of the created Arsh*. They are logically bound to literally translate and literally understand this aayat just as they do with the *Istiwa'* verse.

The 'everywhere' explanation is the way to convey to the masses the negation of *makaan* for Allah Azza Wa Jal. In other words, Allah Ta'ala is not contained in any specific space/place. So where and how does He exist? This He Alone knows. We believe in His Existence and Presence *bila kayf*. All the philosophical contentions regarding the manner of Allah's Existence are futile and dangerous for the layman.

### THE COPROCREEP'S INSOLENT OF 'FILTHY' PLACES

Presenting another argument to bolster the Taimiyyite belief of *makaan* for Allah Azza Wa Jal, the coprocreep says: "The same

*Molvi was asked about Allah being in filthy places after having implied that Allah is everywhere.....The Salaf have clearly used the argument of filthy places to negate that Allah is everywhere coupled with the many evidences to prove that Allah is Above everything...."*

The coprocreep is mired in confusion as an effect of his stupidity. The argument of 'filthy places' was utilized by the Salaf-e-Saaliheen to negate the Jahmiyyah/Taimiyyah belief of *makaan* for Allah Azza Wa Jal. It was not used to negate 'everywhere' in the meaning in which the masses understand it, viz. there is no *makaan* to confine Allah Azza Wa Jal. The coprocreep's difficulty stems from his kufr belief of Allah Ta'ala being physically confined to the Arsh. In the Qur'aan Majeed Allah Ta'ala states with clarity and emphasis that His *Wajh* (*Face*) is 'everywhere' – wherever you turn your face, there is the Divine Face. Since 'Face', 'Hand', etc. do not have physical meanings in the Aqeedah of the Ahlus Sunnah Wal Jama'ah as expounded by Imaam Maturidi, these being among His *Sifaat*, the question of 'filthy places' does not apply to the concept of '*everywhere bila makaan –bila kayf*'. Yes, undoubtedly, it applies to those who confine Allah Ta'ala to physical space like the Jahmis and Taimiyyis. The coprocreep should answer: Is Allah Ta'ala aware of what goes on in filthy places? Does Allah Ta'ala see into filthy places? Does Allah Ta'ala hear what takes place in filthy places? Does Allah's power extend into filthy places, etc., etc. *ad infinitum* in relation to His *Sifaat* ? Whatever the coprocreep's answer is to these questions will be our answer to the question in relation to 'Presence'.

Just as Allah's *Sifaat* of *Basr, Sam'a, Kalaam, Hayaat, Ilm, Qudrat, Takhleeq, Tarzeeq, etc.* are not the effects of physical appendages, so too is His *Sifat of Wajh (Face)*. His *Presence* is His *Sifat* which has absolutely no physical connotation, hence the stupid question of 'filthy places' does not apply. It dwells only in the filthy minds of coprocreeps who assign Allah Azza Wa Jal into a confined created space, thereby stripping Allah

Azza Wa Jal of His *Sifaat*. It is utterly baseless to direct the 'filthy places' argument to those who do not believe in *makaan* for Allah Ta'ala.

The coprocreep's contention that there are 'many evidences to prove that Allah is above everything' is *baatil*. It should be understood that when the coprocreep uses 'above' in relation to Allah Azza Wa Jal, he means physical aboveness. He assigns *makaan* to Allah Ta'ala, and he confines Allah Azza Wa Jal to the restricted space of the created Arsh. There is no 'evidence' of the Salaf-e-Saaliheen for such a corrupt and blasphemous belief. None of the Salaf believed in this copro-doctrine of kufr which is the disease of the Taimiyyites.

The belief of the Ahlus Sunnah regarding Allah's Presence is the concept of *Nufoothul Ilaahiyyah (Permeation of Divinity)*, and this is precisely what the masses understand when it is said Allah Ta'ala is 'everywhere'. The masses with their uncorrupted minds do not believe in a physical being and the confinement of Allah Azza Wa Jal to physical *makaan* as the Taimiyyites do. Thus, if the 'filthy places' argument is directed to the *Sifat of Wajh*, it should likewise be directed to all the other Divine *Sifaat*, for verily, they are all in the same category – *azli, abadi, and NOT physical*. The coprocreep's confusion is the product of his physical concept fabricated for Allah Azza Wa Jal.

Presenting another stupid argument for ascribing physical space and dimension to Allah Azza Wa Jal, the coprocreep says: "I confronted him with the text of Sharh Aqaa'id "and Allah is not set in ANY place". His reply (while smiling): 'I need to check it up.'" The Molvi's inability to understand or his lack of knowledge of the finer points of Aqeedah is not an adverse reflection on the Ulama of Deoband or on Imaam Maturidi. The text of Sharah Aqaa'id is 100% correct. Allah Ta'ala is not confined to any *makaan*. This is our Aqeedah. It is the Aqeedah of the Ahlus Sunnah Wal Jama'ah while the belief of the Taimiyyites is that Allah Ta'ala is confined to the created space

of the created Arsh. Imaam Abu Hanifah (rahmatullah alayh) stated unequivocally that the belief of confining Allah Ta'ala to *makaan* is kufr.

The coprocreep's criticism of Allaamah Kauthari is grounded in his (the coprocreep's) *jahaalat*. At no stage did Allaamah Kauthari deny the greatness, highness, glory, grandeur and majesty of Allah Azza Wa Jal. It devolves on this moron to produce the precise statement/s of Allaamah Kauthari to back up his slander. Like the rest of the Ahlus Sunnah Wal Jama'ah, Allaamah Kauthari denied the physical 'highness' – the confines of the physical space of the Arsh – the Taimiyyite belief of kufr. There is no person even among all the *baatil* sects subscribing to a multitude of kufr beliefs who ever had the kufr audacity to deny the 'highness' of Allah Ta'ala in the abstract meaning of the term. The denial relates to the rejection of the Jahmi/Taiymi belief of the physical 'highness' (presence) which the coprocreeps ascribe to Allah Azza Wa Jal.

Little does the coprocreep realize that the blasphemous belief of physical 'aboveness' spawns for Allah Azza Wa Jal the defective attributes of derogation and imperfection, since it makes Allah Ta'ala subservient to His *makhlooq* (created space – *makaan*) –Nauthubillaah!

Continuing with his spurious arguments, the coprocreep says: "A former colleague studying Saheeh Muslim in a Darul Uloom asked the Sheikh for some guidance about how to counter the Salafis on this particular Hadith. The teacher hesitated, then referred them to Nawawi's Sharh. But no answer."

The inability of the student and the Ustaadh to provide a satisfactory answer cannot by any stretch of imagination or logic be interpreted as being a conflict in the *Minhaaj* of the Ulama of Deoband. It is ridiculous to expect every student and every Ustaadh to be experts in the polemical science of *Aqeedah*. Great Ulama too are unacquainted with many issues due to lack of research in particular fields of knowledge. Sometimes there is no

need to waste time on research for which there is no need. Not everyone is inclined to a subject. Not everyone has the intellectual ability to grasp the hair-splitting arguments which are encountered in philosophy and Kalaam within the parameters of which the polemics of Aqeedah are discussed. It is therefore no blot whatsoever on the Ustaadh who was unable to answer the student on the specific question pertaining to a specific Hadith. In short, this issue of the Ustaadh and the student is an insipid stupid copro-filled, silly argument which is devoid of any substance.

Presenting another nonsensical argument, the coprocreep says: *“Another guy responded to me: And Allah is with you wherever you are (al-Hadeed). A trait of the People of Whims and Innovation is that they do not look at the whole picture; they concentrate on perverted interpretations of some theological provisions and use them to create doubts within the minds of their masses.”*

In fact, the Taimiyyites do not look at the ‘whole picture’, hence they apply their corrupt principle of *ta’weel* selectively. When it suits their whims and fancies, they adopt *ta’weel* to innovate blasphemous beliefs such as their corrupt interpretation of the *Istiwa’* aayat to innovate the blasphemy of a physical Allah confined by physical space on a physical throne, all of which are His creations. Taimiyyites look at issues with oblique vision. They fail to understand the consequences of a corrupt belief. Specifying physical dimension and direction for Allah Azza Wa Jal, spawns a physical deity – Nauthubillah.

They are the ones guilty of not looking at the whole picture. They are the ones who corrupt the minds of the ignorant masses by propagating a kufr belief which was originated by the Jahmiyyah centuries prior to the appearance of Ibn Taimiyyah. His idea of physical ‘aboveness’ or physical ‘highness’ for Allah Azza Wa Jal is his heritage from the Jahmiyyah.

As for the aayat in question, the Qur’aan Majeed states in Surah Al-Hadeed:

*“It is He Who has created the heavens and the earth in six days, then He established (His Qudrat) on the Arsh. He knows what enters into the earth and what emerges from it. He is with you wherever you are. And, Allah sees whatever you are doing.”* (Al-Hadeed, aayat 4)

The coprocreep interprets part of the aayat literally, and part of it figuratively. While ascribing a literal meaning to the *Istiwa’* part, to convey the notion that Allah Ta’ala sits on the Arsh, he ascribes an abstract meaning to the presence in the heavens and the earth. Thus, he says that Allah Ta’ala is in reality on the Arsh, but not in reality in the heavens and in/on the earth. What is his *daleel* for creating this difference? While we are not averse to the interpretation applicable to the statement: *‘in the heavens and in the earth’*, the coprocreep should explain why it is not possible for ascribing a similar or identical meaning to *fis-samaawati wa fil ardh* – the meaning ascribed to *istiwa alal arsh*? Both issues could be depicted as being *bila kayf*. The Qur’aan affirms both conditions for Allah Azza Wa Jal.

Refuting the idea of Allah Ta’ala sitting on the Arsh, Imaam Abu Hanifah (rahmatullah alayh) states in his *Kitaabul Wasiyyah*: *“If He (Allah) was dependent on sitting and resting, then before the creation of the Throne where was Allah? Thus He is free from this. High and great (is He).”*

Imaam Abu Hanifah (rahmatullah alayh) further states in his *Kitaabul Wasiyyah*: *“We acknowledge that Allah has made ‘istiwa’ on the Arsh without Him having any need for it (the Arsh) nor any need for resting thereon. He is the Protector of the Arsh and (everything) besides the Arsh.”*

It is best to refrain from presenting a translation/interpretation for the word *‘istiwa’* due to the corrupt notions which stem from translations and interpretations. The notorious idea which the Taimiyyite conception of *‘istiwa’* spawns is that Allah Ta’ala sits on the Throne like a human king. In this regard Mullah Ali

Qaari states in the annotations of *Sharah Fiqhil Akbar*: “*Imaam Abu Hanifah said that whoever says that Allah is in the heavens or on earth is a kaafir because the (logical) conclusion of this statement is that he has fixed a place for Allah Ta’ala. He who entertains this notion (of makaan) for Allah Ta’ala is a Mushabbihah (a deviant sect).*”

The dogmatic and bigoted averment that Allah Ta’ala is stationed on the Arsh is tantamount to fixing *makaan* for Allah Ta’ala since the Arsh is a created finite structure. With regard to the Arsh being Allah’s creation as was explicitly and emphatically confirmed by Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam), the later reviver of the Hashwi anthropomorphic cult, Ibn Taimiyya propounded the kufr that the Arsh in its species was not created by Allah Azza Wa Jal, but is co-eternal with Allah Ta’ala, having had no temporal origin. This kufr shall, Insha-Allah be demolished in brief in this treatise and in greater detail in a separate treatise.

In Anwaarul Baari, Hadhrat Allaamah Anwar Shah Kashmiri (rahmatullah alayh) enumerates several of Ibn Taimiyya’s beliefs. One of his beliefs, is: “Allah sits and rests on the Arsh. Eight rams are bearing aloft the Divine Arsh. ....In Fathul Baari, Vol.13, page 314, Haafiz states that the math-hab of the Jismiyyah sect who interprets *istiwa’* to mean *istiqraar* (to rest), is baatil. On page 316, Vol.13, Haafiz narrated that Imaam Muhammad said the *Sifaat* of Allah Ta’ala should be accepted without analogy and interpretation. Whoever resorts to interpretation like Jahm (the founder of the Jahmi sect), is far from the path of Nabi (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) and his Sahaabah, and beyond the fold of the Ahlus Sunnah Wal Jama’ah.”

“Inside Allah Ta’ala is such mass (weight) which is heavier than the mass of the entire world, hence there is so much pressure on the Arsh (as a consequence of this weight).....Allah is in a direction, viz., above, hence people inhabiting mountain

peaks and top floors of buildings are closer to Allah.....On the Day of Qiyaamah, Allah Ta’ala will seat Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) alongside Him on the Arsh. .... The Arsh along with Allah Ta’ala is eternal.” There are many other absolutely baatil beliefs of Ibn Taimiyyah.

These corrupt beliefs of Ibn Taimiyyah scuttle the coprocreep’s lament, viz.: “*They (i.e. the Deobandis) constantly put words in the mouth of the Sunni Hanaabilah like: ‘If Allah is on the throne, this would mean He has a body and is restricted and is subject to direction and has a literal/physical presence’ and all that nonsense.*” All of that ‘nonsense’ has in fact been propounded by Ibn Taimiyyah, and all of that ‘nonsense’ is the logical and rational conclusion of confining Allah Azza Wa Jal to a specific *makaan* (space). The Ulama of Deoband are not putting any words in the mouths of the Taimiyyites. The Taimiyyites themselves are gorging out these words of nonsense.

### THE BELIEF OF THE HANAABILAH

The coprocreep in his stupidity states: “*Hanaabilah believe in whatever is in the Quran and Sunnah and refute whatever has been refuted by the Quran and Sunnah without having to dwell in all this philosophical nonsense the Ahl al-Kalaam bring to confuse themselves and the masses.*”

While this is the belief of the true Hanaabilah and of the Maturidiyyah and Ash’ariyyah, it is never the belief of the Taimiyyites masquerading as ‘Hanaabilah’. The Ulama of Deoband and all Maturidis believe in everything in the Qur’aan and Sunnah. Thus, we say that Allah is in the east and west because the Qur’aan says so. We say Allah is with everyone because the Qur’aan says so. We say Allah is on the Arsh because the Qur’aan says so. We say Allah is on earth because the Qur’aan says so. We say Allah is closer to us than our jugular vein because the Qur’aan says so. We say Allah descends to the first heaven and ascends again because the

Hadith says so. We say and believe *bila kayf* in everything of the Sifaat of Allah Azza Wa Jal the Qur'aan and Sunnah say. Only Allah Azza Wa Jal knows His Attributes. There is not a single conception pertaining to the Divine Sifaat which enjoys *Qat'iyyat*. All concepts are the products of the human mind.

On the contrary, the Taimiyyites reject with *ta'weel* (*interpretation*) every Sifat of Allah Ta'ala mentioned in the Qur'aan, besides the Sifat of *Istiwa*. So while they say Allah is on the Arsh, they deny His Presence on earth, His Presence with us, His Presence in the East and West as the Qur'aan unequivocally proclaims. The charge against the Ahlus Sunnah made by the coprocreep is therefore utterly baseless.

### REVERSION?

With vainglorious stupidity the coprocreep avers: *"The only way we can know of whether they have fully reverted to the Aqeedah of the Salaf and the Ahl al-Hadeeth is by a fatwa coming out of a Darul Uloom explicitly stating that they are NOT on the Maturidi/Ash'ari manhaj of Aqeedah."*

The 'fatwa' the coprocreep seeks is as follows: ***"We, the Ulama of Deoband fully, and in entirety adhere firmly to the Aqeedah of the Ahlus Sunnah Wal Jama'ah – of the Salaf-e-Saaliheen – on the Minhaaj of Imaam Maturidi (rahmatullah alayh). We affirm the Haqq of whatever Imaam Maturidi had propounded, and we reject the baatil of the Taimiyyites and of the deviates among the later day Hanaabilah whom Allaamah Ibnul Jauzi Hambali (rahmatullah alayh) had refuted."***

There is no other fatwa which the coprocreep can expect to be forthcoming from the Ulama of Deoband. Far, far from the slightest vestige of dissociation from the Minhaaj of Imaam Maturidi, we affirm with conviction the Haqq which this illustrious Imaam of Aqeedah had propounded on the basis of the Qur'aan and Sunnah, and following the Salaf-e-Saaliheen.

The coprocreep further says: *"Overall, Deobandis need to seriously consider who they are following, who they are influenced by....."* Our response is: We follow Imaam Maturidi. We are influenced by Imaam Maturidi (rahmatullah alayh).

**REFUTATION OF THE COPROCREEP'S  
BASELESS 'INCONSISTENCY' NO. 3 WHICH HE  
FALSELY ATTRIBUTES TO THE ULAMA OF  
DEOBAND**

**SALAFIS ARE NOT HANAABILAH**

In his Inconsistency No.3 which he attributes to the Ulama of Deoband, the coprocreep, besides lauding praises on Ibn Taimiyyah, has criticized the Akaabir Ulama of Deoband for their views on Ibn Taimiyyah, the Imaam of the Salafis who follow him blindly. Their minhaaj (way/methodology) is one of blind taqleed of Ibn Taimiyyah. Whatever Ibn Taimiyyah said is given the status of Qur'aanic wahi. The coprocreep is also at pains in his attempt to convey the idea that the views of Ibn Taimiyyah are also the views of Imaam Ahmad Bin Hambal. Thus, he describes the Salafis as being 'Hanaabilah'.

While Ibn Taimiyyah and his Najdi followers, the Salafis, generally follow the Fiqh of Imaam Ahmad bin Hambal (rahmatullah alayh), they are not the Muqallideen of Imaam Ahmad (rahmatullah alayh). The coprocreep commits deception by describing them as 'Hanaabilah'. Allaamah Ibn Jauzi Hambali (he was a true follower of Imaam Ahmad Bin Hambal), in his famous Kitaab, *Dafa' Shubhatit Tashbeeh War-Rad alal Mujassimah mim man Yantahilu Math-haba Imaam Ahmad*, exposes the deviation of those Hambalis who had deviated from the Maslak of Imaam Hambal (rahmatullah alayh).

Allaamah Taqiyyuddin Abu Bakr Hisni Damashqi (rahmatullah alayh), in his Kitaab, *Daf'u Shubah man Shabbaha wa Tamarrada wa Nasaba thaalika ilas Sayyidil Jaleel Al-Imaam Ahmad*, explains the beliefs of Ibn Taimiyyah. Both these kitaabs reveal the true colours of Ibn Taimiyyah. Allaamah Taqiyyuddin (rahmatullah alayh) states in his *Daf'u*: "He who asserts the negation of everlasting athaab (punishment in the

*Hereafter*), and he is Ibn Taimiyyah and (also) his followers, verily he has audaciously (transgressed) the Kalaam of Al-Ghafoor (Allah, The Forgiving).....Has it reached you that he (Imaam Ahmad) had said that istiwa' is an attribute of His Holy Being (Zaat) or attribute of action (sifatul fe'l)? From whence have you alighted on these things. All of it is evil innovation attributed to one who refutes bid'ah.....Whoever narrates from him (Imaam Ahmad) that he said that istiwa' is from the Sifaatusz Zaat or Sifaatul Fe'l or its zaahir (literal meaning) is intended, verily he has fabricated on him (i.e. he has spoken a lie in the name of Imaam Ahmad)."

While the blind followers of Ibn Taimiyyah seek to mislead people with the idea that their Imaam (Ibn Taimiyyah) was a staunch follower of the Hambali Math-hab, in reality he had diverged from the *Minhaaj* of Imaam Ahmad like some other miscreant Hambalis before him. The two kitaabs mentioned above elaborately expose the deflection and diversion of Ibn Taimiyyah and those before him whom he had emulated.

**CRITICIZING IBN TAIMIYYAH**

The coprocreep criticizes the Akaabir of Deoband for their views on Ibn Taimiyyah, and he makes an abortive attempt to scuttle such well-grounded views of our Akaabireen with non-consequential differences of attitude and approach among our Ulama regarding the person of Ibn Taimiyyah. The criticism against our Akaabir – those who had castigated Ibn Taimiyyah for his baatil – has no justification. Our Akaabireen – the Senior Ulama of Deoband – were among the Auliya of Allah Ta'ala. They would go to great lengths to save a man from the fatwa of kufr and dhalaal (deviation) by presenting even far-fetched interpretations. They never displayed haste in criticizing those with whom they disagreed.

Our Akaabireen were embodiments of *Akhlaaq-e-Hasanah*. Some of them, due to their paucity of information pertaining to Ibn Taimiyyah's beliefs, had even referred to him as 'shaikhul islam'. Therefore, when any of our illustrious Senior Ulama (they have all disappeared from this dunya) criticized a man, the need is imperative to listen and study the reasons and the basis of their criticism. Their criticism is invariably well-grounded. It is based on irrefutable facts. They did not rant and rave like the coprocreep who does not know what he is saying in his litany of inconsistencies.

All those who had acquired *Ilm* of the Deen at our Madaaris in Deoband, Saharanpur, Jalalabad, etc., etc., will testify that before embarking on teaching Hadith, the Ustaadh sometimes spends days 'brainwashing' the Talaba (Students) with the lofty rank and personality of Imaam Bukhaari (rahmatullah alayh). In general all the Muhadditheen (including those who had baselessly criticized Imaam Abu Hanifah) and the Fuqaha of all Four Math-habs are revered by our Ulama, and this reverence is dinned into the ears and drilled into the brains of the Talaba.

Since the academic course demands robust dissection and neutralization of the *dalaa-il* of the other Math-habs, the Akaabireen Ulama left no stone unturned to ensure that there be no vestige of disrespect and disdain in the hearts and minds of the Students for the Muhadditheen and Fuqaha of the other Math-habs. On the contrary, Salafis being in entirety bereft of morality and spiritually barren, acquit themselves insolently in their diatribes against the Fuqaha of the Ahlus Sunnah. Thus, it will be seen that all sincere and genuine Talaba who had acquired *Ilm* at our Madaaris, cherishing profound respect and honour for all the Muhadditheen and the Fuqaha of all Math-habs despite the clash of views, and despite the robust rational exercises of neutralizing with rational and narrational arguments the views and *dalaa-il* of the adversaries in the field. We are not allowed to let respect for the illustrious

Muhadditheen and Fuqaha slip from our grasp. We regard them all, be they of whatever Math-hab, to be members of the august Fraternity known as *Warathatul Ambiya (the Heirs of the Ambiya)*.

We read in the kutub of Fuqaha and Muhadditheen of the other Math-habs severe criticism for Imaam Abu Hanifah (rahmatullah alayh). The response of our Akaabireen of Deoband has always been rational and at academic level. The rank and status of the senior Ulama, Fuqaha and Muhadditheen have always been observed by the Ulama of Deoband. The question which the coprocreep should answer is: Despite severe differences with Imaam Bukhaari and numerous other Muhadditheen and Fuqaha of the other Math-habs, why do the Ulama of Deoband not criticize them or deal with them in the same vein as they deal with Ibn Taimiyyah?

If the criticism of Ibn Taimiyyah by the Ulama of Deoband is unjustified and based on a mere difference of opinion, then why do the Akaabireen of Deoband refrain from criticizing Imaam Maalik, Imaam Shaafi', Imaam Ahmad and countless others despite the severity of the differences on *Ilmi* issues? What are the reasons for the differential treatment meted out to Ibn Taimiyyah? Ibn Taimiyyah had strayed from the *Minhaaj* of the Salaf-e-Saaliheen. Despite appearing on the scene centuries after *Quroon-e-Thalaathah* he fabricated views in conflict with what the Salaf-e-Saaliheen had propagated.

To justify Ibn Taimiyyah's *dhalaal* the coprocreep and all those of his ilk make Imaam Maturidi (rahmatullah alayh) their scapegoat. Since they baulk at disgorging their baatil attacks directly against Imaam Abu Hanifah and his senior Students, they find it appropriate to pour out their intellectual flotsam on Imaam Maturidi (rahmatullah alayh).

One of the best criteria for understanding the *Haqq or Baatil* of a scholar is to ascertain the views of the Akaabir Ulama of Deoband. If they criticize or denigrate a scholar, then understand that he is a deviate to be shunned because it never was the

*tareeqah* of our Senior Ulama to brand a scholar as a deviate merely because of difference of opinion. But when the difference is beyond the limits of permitted difference, then the scholar enters the confines of *dhalaal* (evil, haraam deviation which culminates in kufr).

Imaam Shaafi' (rahmatullah alayh) says that it is Fardh to recite Surah Faatihah in every raka't of the Salaat by even the muqtadi. Imaam Abu Hanifah (rahmatullah alayh) said that it is haraam for the muqtadi to do so. Reflect on the severity and gravity of these opposite views. There are many similar differences among the Fuqaha of the different Math-habs. Despite such sharp and irreconcilable differences, did you ever read or hear of the Akaabireen of Deoband denigrating Imaam Shaafi' or Imaam Maalik or Imaam Hambal (rahmatullah alayhim)? So why do they have a different attitude towards Ibn Taimiyyah? Why is Ibn Taimiyyah singled out for branding? The fact is that Ibn Taimiyyah was in sharp conflict with the Salaf-e-Saaliheen.

Now coprocreeps are seeking to vindicate Ibn Taimiyyah's *dhalaal* under '*Hanaabilah*' cover. But Imaam Ahmad (rahmatullah) did not propagate what Ibn Taimiyyah propounded. Senior Ulama of the Hanaabilah such as Ibnul Jauzi (rahmatullah alayh) had clarified the deviated role of those Hanaabilah who had differed with Imaam Ahmad (rahmatullah alayh). Allaamah Ibnul Jauzi (rahmatullah alayh) had elaborately refuted the *baatil* beliefs attributed to Imaam Ahmad Bin Hambal (rahmatullah alayh) by the Ahl-e-Tashbeeh, Ahl-e-Tajseem and the Mutakh-khair Hanaabilah whom Ibn Taimiyyah followed.

In *Anwaarul Baari*, Allaamah Anwar Shah Kashmiri (rahmatullah alayh) states:

“Our clarity of statement and audaciousness in proclaiming the Haqq have annoyed most of the Salafi brothers, the Ghair

Muqallideen and some honourable Salafis of Nadwa. However, we are obliged to proclaim the Haqq regardless of how bitter it may be for anyone. We shall most assuredly proclaim it. They (the Salafis) should without hesitation produce their *dalaa-il*. We are prepared for responding. Let it be understood that the under mentioned beliefs are the Aqaaid of Allaamah Ibn Taimiyyah, Allaamah Ibnul Qayyim and Nawaab Hasan Khaan and of the Salafi ghair muqallideen in general:

- (1) Allah Ta'ala is sitting on the Arsh like a sitting person. Eight goats are bearing aloft the Arsh.
- (2) The weight within Allah Ta'ala is heavier than the mass of all things on earth.
- (3) Allah Ta'ala is located above, hence those on top of mountains and on upper floors are closer to Allah Ta'ala.
- (4) No one had denied physical body and form for Allah Ta'ala.
- (5) On the Day of Qiyaamah after annihilating everything, Allah Ta'ala will descend and walk on earth.
- (6) On the Day of Qiyaamah Allah Ta'ala will sit on the Kursi.
- (7) The Arsh is eternal (i.e. it is uncreated). It is co-eternal with Allah Ta'ala.
- (8) It is haraam to undertake a journey specifically to make ziyaarat of the Grave of Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam).
- (9) It is shirk to make dua by the *Waseelah* of Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam).
- (10) The Holy place of Rasulullah's rest has no superiority over other places.
- (11) When making Salaam to Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam), the Holy Grave should not be faced.”

These are merely a few beliefs and masaa-il in which Ibn Taimiyyah is in opposition to the Jamhoor Salaf. Since Ibn Taimiyyah differs with the Ijma' of the Ummah on numerous issues, he falls beyond the pale of the Ahlus Sunnah Wal Jama'ah. Precisely for this reason has he been treated differently

by the Ulama of Deoband. Our Akaabireen have refuted Ibn Taimiyyah's corrupt views and beliefs with solid Shar'i evidence. The coprocreep should take up these differences, one by one for academic discussion, and Insha'Allah, the dalaa-il of our Akaabireen in refutation of the corrupt beliefs will be forthcoming. But he miserably lacks the ability to present rational and academic arguments. The coprocreep is able to only disgorge emotional effluence against Imaam Maturidi (rahmatullah alayh).

Contrary to the claim of the coprocreep, Ibn Taimiyyah has not been misrepresented by the Ulama of Deoband. The Akaabireen speak with solid proofs which are recorded in many kutub. It devolves on the coprocreep to illustrate the alleged misrepresentation. Neither the Ash'aris nor the Maturidis ever misrepresented Ibn Taimiyyah.

The coprocreep alleges: *“Darul Uloom have always had a culture of: ‘If you read Ibn Taimiyyah’s literature, you will be brainwashed.’”*

There is an imperative need to prevent students and others from reading the literature of deviates. Not all students possess the requisite intellectual capacity to understand *dalaa-il*. Baatil can be presented in forms which are palatable to people of little understanding. The first person to prevent from reading the literature of others, was Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) who prevented the Sahaabah from reading even the Taurah, much of which was extant in that age. Nabi-e-Kareem (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) specifically prohibited Hadhrat Umar (radhiyallahu anhu) from reading the Taurah.

That people, even Ulama, become influenced by baatil written deceptively and with appeal, is undeniable. When Greek philosophy was translated into Arabic, many Ulama fell into the trap of shaitaan. They became victims of Greek philosophy and began subscribing to explicit beliefs of kufr pertaining to the

*Zaat* and *Sifaat* of Allah Azza Wa Jal. In fact, even the Imaam of the coprocreep Salafis, namely, Ibn Taimiyyah, was enmeshed in the tentacles of the philosophers. He too was brainwashed by philosophy, hence he propounded his kufr of the universe being uncreated and co-eternal with Allah Azza Wa Jal. Even his muqallid, Al-Albaani, was constrained to dissociate from Ibn Taimiyyah on this belief of kufr. So when it is known that Ibn Taimiyyah propagated many beliefs of falsehood, deviation and even kufr, then it is the Waajib obligation of the Asaatizah to prevent students from studying the literature of the deviates.

As for the Ulama-e-Raasikheen (those grounded in the Ilm of the Deen), they study the literature of the Ahl-e-Baatil, and thoroughly refute their corruption, fitnah and baatil.

If students are prevented from reading pornographic 'literature', no one will have a valid objection. There should likewise be no objection when the Asaatizah prevent students from reading something worse, viz., spiritual pornography – corrupt beliefs and masaa-il propounded by deviates. Pornography ruins the moral character. But corrupt beliefs destroy Imaan.

Presenting another baatil postulate, the coprocreep alleges: *“The reason why they (i.e. the Ulama of Deoband) have isolated him is obviously due to the fact that he is the most open in condemning the heritage of the Maturidis, the current spiritual forefathers of the Deobandi theology.”*

Again the coprocreep acquits himself irrationally and paroxysmally, and he speaks without a shred of evidence. Every argument in favour of baatil presented by Ibn Taimiyyah has been academically refuted by the Ulama of Deoband. What the Maturidis propagated was nothing other than the Deen of the Sahaabah transmitted by the Ulama of *Quroon-e-Thalaathah*. It is for this reason that we say to the coprocreep to take up one mas'alah at a time and discuss it elaborately with Ibn Taimiyyah's arguments. Then, Insha'Allah, the dalaa-il of our

Akaabireen in refutation will be presented. Ibn Taimiyyah by virtue of his corrupt views and deviation has isolated himself from the Ahlus Sunnah Wal Jama'ah. There was no need for the Ulama of Deoband to isolate him. A man of Haqq can never be isolated, for Haqq will always surface and proclaim itself.

We must reiterate that the coprocreep is guilty of a despicable lie which he blurts out deliberately, fully aware of the truth that the Ulama of Deoband have debunked Ibn Taimiyyah's deviated beliefs and views with *dalaa-il*. It therefore devolves on him to refute and negate the *Ilmi Dalaa-il* of the Ulama of Deoband instead of disgorging stupid drivel. Nothing that he alleges in his outpouring is by way of *daleel*. There is no academic semblance in his coprophilic article.

Making another stupid contention, the coprocreep says: “*And all our Deobandi brothers tend to focus on is warning against al-Waasitiyyah. This demonstrates they do not have a CLUE about who they are unjustly condemning and undermining the authority of a true Imam in Aqeedah. They should focus on the principles Ibn Taimiyyah discussed rather than listen to their spiritual forefathers with an open eye, and see how many scholars there are, both before and after him, who agree with his ideas.*”

This coprocreep lacks even a clue of understanding. He demonstrates startling *jahaalat*. Alternatively he deliberately resorts to chicanery and slander to claim that the very senior Ulama of Deoband such as Allaamah Anwar Shah Kashmiri and others did not have a clue about Ibn Taimiyyah, yet they condemned him. This is *sareeh buhtaan* (*explicit slander*) directed to some of the greatest Ulama who adorned the firmament of Shar'i Uloom in these latter times. When our Akaabireen refute Ibn Taimiyyah or anyone else for their baatil, they do so with solid and irrefutable *dalaail*. Their arguments are academically and rationally irrefutable, hence we find the likes

of the coprocreep seeking to pull wool over the eyes of the ignorant and unwary with emotional trash.

The Akaabir Ulama of Deoband embark on a refutation *only* after making exhaustive research of the subject to be refuted. They never conducted themselves with irresponsibility, simply criticizing and branding other Ulama to be deviates without solid Shar'i grounds. They occupied the loftiest pedestal in the Fraternity of *Warathatul Ambiya* of their age. Centuries prior to the advent of the era of Ulama-e-Deoband, innumerable Arab and other Ulama had severely criticized and lambasted Ibn Taimiyyah. Their works are extant. They too had demolished Ibn Taimiyyah with solid and copious Shar'i *dalaa-il*.

It is not sufficient to reject Allaamah Kauthari without presenting academic arguments. It is incumbent for the coprocreep to spell out exactly where and how Allaamah Kauthari had erred and deviated. Without *dalaa-il* the claims are nothing but the ranting and raving of a *jaahil* stagnated in his *jahl-e-muraqqab* (compound ignorance).

The coprocreep contends that Ibn Taimiyyah has been condemned on the basis of “accusations that do not simply exist”. If this is indeed as he professes, let him present an academic treatise to debunk the allegedly false accusations against Ibn Taimiyyah. Let the coprocreep with his ‘modern-day students of knowledge within the Sunni Hanaabilah’ refute the expositions of the Ulama of Deoband with *dalaa-il*. All of his ‘modern-day Hanaabilah students of knowledge’ are *juhala* who have little relationship with the true Hambali Math-hab. They are not genuine Hanaabilah. They are ‘hanaabilah’ of the cardboard type.

The coprocreep makes mention of “*some isolated fataawaa in fiqh the rigid Muqallids did not like*”. Since the coprocreep has assumed on himself the task of defending Ibn Taimiyyah, and in the process slanders the Ulama of Deoband, he owes to the Ummah the obligation of enumerating these ‘isolated fataawaa in fiqh’ with all the necessary Fiqhi arguments to substantiate

his Imaam's point of view. The counter-arguments of the Ahlus Sunnah Wal Jama'ah represented by the Ulama of Deoband will, Insha'Allah, be forthcoming. It is insufficient to make a passing reference to the alleged 'some isolated fataawaa'. He should enumerate and discuss them with their incumbent evidences. There are sharp differences on masaa-il among the Muqallideen of the various Math-habs. But it shall not be found that the Muqallideen of one Math-hab berating and denigrating the Imaams of the other Math-habs. But for Ibn Taimiyyah, there is a special treatment. He was the propounder of baatil, dhalaal and even kufr.

The Akaabir of Deoband were most judicious in their criticism of Ibn Taimiyyah. Their criticism was not the effect of some personal vendetta nor was it baseless. They would scrutinize a view and discuss it from all angles, and if it had to be refuted, they executed the task admirably with rational and narrational *dalaa-il*. Allaamah Anwar Shah Kashmiri (rahmatullah alayh) narrated the following interesting episode regarding Ibn Taimiyyah:

"The Ulama have indicated to the intellectual confusion and narrational conflicts of Allaamah Ibn Taimiyyah. Ibn Batutah (770 Hijri) was a great historian and a globe trotter. He spent 29 years travelling around the earth. He was a contemporary of Allaamah Ibn Taimiyyah. He was extremely intelligent Aalim. Until his demise he had remained a Qaadhi in some places.

He spent considerable time in Shaam (Syria) where he benefited from the discourses of Allaamah Ibn Taimiyyah. During the Ramadhaan of 726 Hijri he wrote: "Ibn Taimiyyah is a prominent Aalim of Shaam. He gives discourses academically in the branches of knowledge. However, there is something amiss in his Aql (intelligence)." Some other Ulama have interpreted this to mean deficiency in intelligence.

Ibn Batutah also narrates an incident to which he was an eye witness. He writes that on a Jumuaah day, Ibn Taimiyyah was on

the mimbar giving a lecture on the Hadith of *Nuzool* (the Hadith in which it is mentioned that Allah Ta'ala descends to the lower heavens during the latter part of the night). Whilst lecturing, he (Ibn Taimiyyah) descended one step on the mimbar and commented: "Allah Ta'ala descends in this manner from the Arsh to the heaven of the world (the lowest heaven)." The Maaliki Faqeeh Ibnus Zuhra immediately objected. Others condemned him (Ibn Taimiyyah). Allaamah Anwar Shah Kashmiri (rahmatullah alayh) comments:

"Besides the Ambiyaa (alayhimus salaam) no one else is infallible. No one denies his excellences, vast knowledge and virtues. But, his numerous *tafarrudaat*, especially in Usool and Aqaa'id are most certainly agitating. Hence, there is no option but to elaborate on him. May Allah Ta'ala overlook our errors and faults, Aameen." ---*Anwaarul Baari, Vol.19*

The numerous defects of Ibn Taimiyyah in *Usool, Aqaa'id and Fiqh* necessitated special treatment for him in order to illustrate his errors so that others are saved from falling into the snare of deviation.

The coprocreep commits another slander by accusing the Ulama of Deoband of 'focussing on personalities rather than content.' Any fair-minded person in search of the Haqq, who studies with sincerity the criticism of Ibn Taimiyyah by the Ulama of Deoband, will not fail to discern the rational and judicious manner of their arguments which are all of an academic nature bereft of emotionalism. The personality of Ibn Taimiyyah is not the subject of their criticism. His deviated beliefs are subjected to scrutiny and refutation, and that is admirably effected rationally in terms of the *dalaa-il* of the Shariah. The emotional ranting and raving of the coprocreep is devoid of Shar'i substance.

**REFUTATION OF THE COPROCREEP'S  
BASELESS 'INCONSISTENCY' NO. 4 WHICH HE  
FALSELY ATTRIBUTES TO THE ULAMA OF  
DEOBAND**

**HAYAATUN NABI – THE LIFE OF RASULULLAH  
(SALLALLAHU ALAYHI WASALLAM) IN BARZAKH**

In the 4<sup>th</sup> alleged inconsistency which the coprocreep attributes to the Ulama of Deoband, he rants some rubbish about '*hayaatis*' and '*mamaatis*'. Propounding the rubbish figment of his imagination, the coprocreep states: "*Some Hayaatis have compromised and have invented 'levels of life' in the Barzakh – the highest being reserved for the prophets and they say this is strongest/closest to the worldly life.*"

Then in pursuance of his rubbish, he asks: "*Why do you endlessly want to equate the Barzakh life to the world life?*"

The coprocreep proceeds with cunning in presenting the subject of our belief of *Hayaatun Nabi*. It should be noted that in order to reject this Belief of the Ahlus Sunnah, the coprocreep traverses a meandering, round about route so as to steer away from stating the actual belief of Salafis on this score. He subtly endeavours to imply that Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) is not *hayaat (alive)* in his Mubaarak Qabr. Whilst it is the belief of Taimiyyites that Rasulullah's Mubaarak Body has decomposed and disintegrated into sand, he does not mention this vile belief of Ibn Taimiyyah. On the basis of *taqiyah*, he conceals this evil belief and argues laboriously to convey the belief without proclaiming it overtly.

The very first essential principle to understand regarding the Ulama of Deoband is that when we say '*Ulama of Deoband*', the reference is not to mediocre Molvis who had acquired knowledge at Deobandi Darul Uloom nor to any Ulama who have deviated from the *Minhaaj* of the Akaabir Ulama of

Deoband. When the term '*Ulama of Deoband*' is used it refers to Giants and Stars of IIm and Taqwa such as Hadhrat Maulana Qaasim Nanotwi, Hadhrat Maulana Rashid Ahmad Gangohi, Hadhrat Maulana Khalil Ahmad Saharanpuri, Hadhrat Maulana Ashraf Ali Thanvi (rahmatullah alayhim), and to the glittering galaxy of senior Ulama-e-Haqq associated with Darul Uloom Deoband. These illustrious Souls are the Seal of the Ulama of Deoband. Any view which clashes with the unanimous stance of these noble Ulama of Deoband, is never the view of our Ulama (the Ulama of Deoband).

It should be well understood that Darul Uloom Deoband has long ago been infiltrated by men of the Maudoodi sect and men with Salafi leanings and views. Thus, any conflicting view tendered by such miscreants/munaafiqs who happened to have studied at Darul Uloom linked to Deoband is never the view of the Ulama of Deoband.

There is no need to delve into the silly discussion pertaining to the '*hayaati* and '*mamaati*' concepts which the coprocreep derisively presents. In so doing, he endeavours to cast a veil of deflection and deception on the stance of the Ahlus Sunnah Wal Jama'ah (the Four Math-habs) on the issue of Rasulullah's life after his earthly death. The issue at hand is whether Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) is *hayaat (alive)* in his Qabr Shareef (in Barzakh). The details and exact nature of this noble *Hayaat* of the Ambiya (alayhimus salaam) are of no significance. The fundamental issue is: "*Are the Ambiya alive after they had died an earthly death?*"

On this issue there is no difference of opinion among the Ulama of Deoband. (*Bear in mind who the Ulama of Deoband are!*). According to the Qur'aan, Sunnah and Ijma' of the Ummah, the Ambiya (alayhimus salaam) are alive in Barzakh, and so are the Shuhada (the Martyrs). However, it is quite obvious that the *Hayaat* of the Ambiya (alayhimus salaam) is of a higher state than the *Hayaat* of the Shuhada. Furthermore, all mankind, including the kuffaar, have life in Barzakh. The

questioning in the grave, the torments and pleasures in the grave, etc. are all related to Barzakh. These states are not related to inanimate objects such as stones. It is therefore, simple logic that the *Hayaat* of the *Ambiya* (alayhimus salaam) in Barzakh will not be of the same level as the 'hayaat' of the *kuffaar* in Barzakh.

On this issue, the belief of the Ulama of Deoband is the precise belief of the Ahlus Sunnah as it has been propagated and believed since the era of the Salaf-e-Saaliheen of *Quroon-e-Thalaathah*. The Ulama of Deoband do not stand apart from the Ahlus Sunnah in this belief. In his famous kitaab, *Al-Muhannad*, Hadhrat Maulana Khaleel Ahmad Ambetwi (rahmatullah alayh) records the questions posed by the then Ulama of Haramain Shareefain, who were not Salafis, but staunch Muqallideen of the Math-habs, and his answers. On the question of Rasulullah's *Hayaat* after his earthly death, the Ulama of Haramain Shareefain asked:

*"What is your view regarding the Hayaat of Nabi (alayhis salaatu was salaam) in his blessed Qabr. Is that (life) special with him or is it similar to Barzakhi Hayaat of all the Mu'mineen?"*

Hadhrat Maulana Khalil Ahmad (rahmatullah alayh) answered as follows:

*"According to us and our Mashaaiikh, Hadhrat Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) is alive in his Qabr Shareef. His Hayaat is duniyawi (i.e. like the worldly life) without (its) obligations. And, that is special with him (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) and all the Ambiya (salawaatullah alayhim) and the Shuhada. It is not like the barzakhi life common to all Mu'mineen, in fact common to all mankind. Thus, Allaamah Suyuti explicitly states in his treatise, Abnaaul Azkiya wa Hayaatil Ambiya that Shaikh Taqiuddin As-Subki said: 'The hayaat of the Ambiya and the Shuhada in their graves is like their hayaat on earth. Testifying for this is the Salaat of Musa*

*(alayhis salaam) in his Qabr. Verily, Salaat demands a living body.....'*

*Thus this substantiates that the Hayaat of Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) is duniyawi (also) Barzakhi because it exists in the Realm of Barzakh."*

This is the belief of the Ahlus Sunnah Wal Jamaa'ah, hence it was approved and endorsed by the Ulama of the Haramain Shareefain. The Ulama of Haramain Shareefain had bestowed glowing accolades on Hadhrat Maulana Khalil Ahmad (rahmatullah alayh) for his answers which 100% represented the Belief of the Ahlus Sunnah Wal Jama'ah on the question of the *Hayaat* of the *Ambiya* (alayhimus salaam), as well as on the other 25 questions which the illustrious Allaamah Khalil Ahmad answered, and with which answers *all* the noble Ulama of Haramain Shareefain concurred. The following is the concurrence of Hadhrat Shaikh Muhammad Saeed Baabaseel Shaafi', Shaikhul Ulama in Makkah Mukarramah, and the Imaam and Khateeb of Musjidul Haraam:

*"Bismillahir Rahmaanir Raheem. I have studied these answers of the illustrious Allaamah to the questions posed in this treatise, and I have found them (the answers) completely correct. May Allah Ta'ala reward him who had responded, my honoured, unique Brother Shaikh Khalil Ahmad. May Allah Ta'ala perpetuate his goodness and glory in both worlds, and with him (Maulana Khalil Ahmad), by the honour of Sayyidul Mursaleen may Allah break the heads of the deviates and the envious ones until the Day of Qiyaamah, Aameen."*

Ulama of Makkah, Madinah, Egypt and Damascus, of all Four Math-habs, lauded accolades on Allaamah Khalil Ahmed and concurred with his answers which were unanimously confirmed to be the Aqaaid of the Ahlus Sunnah Wal Jama'ah while paying glowing tribute to him for stating the Haqq with clarity. Thus, the attempt by the coprocreep to create the false impression that the *Hayaat* belief of the Ulama of Deoband is in conflict with the

belief of the Ahlus Sunnah is most despicable and dismissed with the contempt it deserves.

The coprocreep, in subservience to the Saudi Salafis and other deviated *ghair muqallideen* are notorious for their Shiah-type *taqiya* stunts. Deceit is their salient feature. Therefore, the coprocreep speaks as if the Ulama of Deoband are alone in the belief of *Hayaat*, i.e. the concept of *the Hayaat of the Ambiya* to which the Ulama of Deoband subscribe.

The argument of Nabi Musa (alayhis salaam) performing Salaat in his grave has not been originated by the Ulama of Deoband. Shaikh Taqiuddin Subki mentions it, and Imaam Suyuti narrated it. This fact alone should be sufficient to dispel the falsehood that the concept of *Hayaat* propagated by the Ulama of Deoband is not the belief of the Ahlus Sunnah Wal Jama'ah. While there is complete consensus on the issue of Rasulullah's *Hayaat* after his earthly demise, the precise details of this concept are not explained in the Qur'aan and Ahaadith. No one has the right to claim that his personal understanding of an ambiguous concept has the status of Wahi. It suffices to say that the concept to which the Ulama of Deoband subscribe has not been originated by them. It has come to them from the Salaf-e-Saaliheen by way of authentic narration. We therefore find that the Maaliki, Shaafi', Hanafi and Hambali Ulama of the Haramain Shareefain upholding the elaboration tendered by Hadhrat Allaamah Khalil Ahmad.

If the concept of the Ulama of Deoband was an innovation, the Ulama of the Haramain Shareefain, Damascus and Egypt would not have concurred.

The 'rational' arguments which the coprocreep presented in no way whatsoever succeeds in making even a kink in the belief propounded by the Ulama of Deoband in view of the fact that their view is the view of the Four Math-habs. Logic may not be tendered as a *daleel* for refuting what has been established and upheld by the narration of the Four Math-habs. There is no

factor (*murajjih*) to confer preference to the conjecturing of the coprocreep and his Salafi cohorts. On the contrary, the established view of the Four Math-habs is as old as Islam, and it totally eliminates any conflicting concept.

Displaying considerable density of intellect (*ghabaawah*), the coprocreep avers: "*If one looks at al-Muhannad by M.Khalil Ahmed Sahaaranpuri, he says: "His life is Duniyawi, but Barzakh as well as it is (something happening) in the Barzakh life." So here we see a person living BOTH the duniyawi AND the barzakh life. It's as if a person is in the World of Souls and the World of the Dunya at the same time, or in Barzakh AND the Hereafter at the same time. What an impossibility! How can a person be inside a house AND outside it at the same time?"*

The 'impossibility' is a figment of corrupt and defective understanding. The concept of the Ahlus Sunnah presented by Allaamah Khalil Ahmed (rahmatullah alayh) in his kitaab, *Al-Muhannad*, was firstly upheld and lauded by the Ulama of the Four Math-habs of Haramain Shareefain, Damascus and Egypt.

Secondly, it was never contended that Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) was in two different physical abodes at one and the same time. The simple explanation is that the *duniyawi* dimension of *Hayaat* of the Ambiya (alayhimus salaam) exists in one realm, the Realm of Barzakh. There is neither a rational impossibility nor a Shar'i impossibility to preclude the validity of this concept.

It is the belief of the Ahlus Sunnah Wal Jama'ah that punishment in Barzakh occurs to the physical body as well. Furthermore, in the life Hereafter, it will be a physical life – a *duniyawi* life. By '*duniyawi*' is not meant existence on earth. It refers to the physical nature of life. There is no *daleel* to deny the reality of *duniyawi* (physical) existence of Insaan in Barzakh and in Qiyaamah. *Duniyawi* does not mean the world. It is an adjective describing worldly attributes. Therefore, the contention that Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) is

postulated to be in two physical abodes at one and the same time is baseless and absurd.

This stupid analogy confirms that the coprocreep is unaware of the meaning of *Mahaal-e-Aqli* (rational impossibility). It will serve him well to gain re-admission to a Madrasah to acquire the basic knowledge of *mantiq* (logic) to enable him to understand the meaning of 'impossible'. The idea that one plus one equal three is a rational impossibility. But, to imagine an animal with a 100 heads is not *mahaal-e-aqli*. It is not a rational impossibility despite it not being a normal possibility. There is no valid rational reason for contending that a human being has no physical existence – his physical body with his worldly personality – in Barzakh.

According to the Hadith, the qabr of the successful Mu'min will be increased manifold in size and a variety of comforts will be bestowed to him. On the other hand, terrible punishment in the grave awaits the kuffaar and the disobedient Muslims. This comfort and torment will be meted out to the *dunyawi* body and soul of man, in Barzakh. It is thus plain stupidity and density of brains corrupted by stercoracious substances of *dhalaal* to deny the possibility, in fact, the established belief of physical punishment/reward in Barzakh.

The coprocreep says: "*The rules of dunya do not apply to barzakh in the slightest.*" To which 'rules' is he referring? If he is alluding to the rules of the Shariah, no one has ever contended that such rules are applicable in Barzakh. In fact, Allaamah Khalil Ahmed (rahmatullah alayh) in his answer explicitly makes mention the terms '*min ghair takleef*'. Whatever the coprocreep means by 'rules of the dunya', no one has claimed that the 'rules of the dunya' apply to Barzakh. However, this non-applicability does not negate the existence of a *dunyawi* personality in Aalam-e-Barzakh. There is no daleel for substantiating such a contention, neither Shar'i nor rational.

The stupid coprocreep further avers: "*Regarding Me'raj and Israa, our Prophet talked to the past prophets while the Prophet was in his dunyawi life whereas the people he was talking to (except for Jesus) were in their Barzakh life. This is just a miracle of our Prophet – i.e. being able to talk to those of the Barzakh, NOT that all the prophets were still in the Dunya.*"

Before demolishing the coprocreep's self-contradictory statement, it is necessary to comment on his use of the name 'Jesus' for Hadhrat Nabi Isaa (alayhis salaam). Perhaps he is one of the interfaithers who subscribes to the kufr doctrines of the interfaith movement financed and espoused by the Saudi king. What constrains a Muslim when addressing other Muslims to refer to Hadhrat Nabi Isaa (alayhis salaam) with the Christian kufr name of 'Jesus'? Let him search his heart.

In the aforementioned averment the coprocreep switches clumsily from '*dunyawi*' to *dunya*. Who had claimed that the Ambiya to whom Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) spoke on the Night of Mi'raaj were in the dunya? This episode of Mi'raaj is cited by the Ulama-e-Haqq to support the rationality of the belief that the Ambiya were with their *dunyawi* personalities in Barzakh. The coprocreep, in his statement, has conceded that Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) with his physical body – his *dunyawi* personality – addressed the Ambiya in Barzakh. So how was this possible? By a miracle he was in two different houses at one and the same time? If the 'miracle' had made the 'impossibility' stated by the coprocreep possible on the Night of Mi'raaj, what precludes the re-enactment of the 'miracle' after the demise of Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam)?

In this averment, the coprocreep has trapped himself in a self-contradiction. Earlier he had claimed that this was impossible, now by the 'miracle' the impossible has become possible. The whole Mi'raaj from beginning to end was one wonderful Miracle. It was the command of Allah Azza Wa Jal. How can it be impossible for Allah Ta'ala to decree a *dunyawi* existence for

the Ambiya in Barzakh? Again, we should remind the coprocreep that by *'dunyawi'* is not meant the world. It is not being suggested that the Ambiya are in two different abodes at one and the same time. The Ambiya (alayhimus salaam) were performing Salaat in Barzakh. Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) observed them with their *dunyawi* bodies performing Salaat. They were not invisible celestial souls whom Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) saw and spoke to.

Another interesting fact is that whilst the Ambiya (alayhimus salaam) were in their Barzakhi life, they all were present in Masjidul Aqsa on the Night of Mi'raaj, where Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) led them in Salaat. Regardless of what interpretation is tendered, the fact remains that the Ambiya were present on earth during their Barzakhi life. This as well as many episodes of the Shuhada confirm that whilst they are in Barzakh they do appear on earth with Allah's permission. Their Barzakhi life is undeniable, and so is the *dunyawi* dimension. The coprocreep's confusion stems from his deficient understanding of the term *'dunyawi'*. He has stupidly concluded from this word that the belief of the Ahlus Sunnah Wal Jama'ah entails the notion of Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) being in two different abodes at one and the same time.

A being in Barzakh can, with Allah's permission, make an appearance on earth or anywhere else in Allah's universe whilst he will still be in the state of Barzakh. His appearance on earth such as the appearance of the Ambiya (alayhimus salaam) in Masjidul Aqsa on the Night of Mi'raaj, does not negate the fact that they were in Barzakh. Barzakh is not a fixed physical abode such as the earth with geographic frontiers. It is the existence of human life after Maut until Qiyaamah. While that phase of life in relation to man is described 'Barzakh', it is not Barzakh for the Angels who are present during this phase of human life. Wherever Allah Ta'ala allows the deceased person to reside or be in Barzakh, he/she will occupy that abode without Barzakh

being negated. Thus, Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) being in his Qabr Shareef with his blessed worldly (*dunyawi*) body in no way whatsoever negates Barzakh. The physical body can and does exist in Barzakh. Thus it is confirmed that whilst Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) is in Barzakh, he is also in this dunya, in his Mubaraak Qabar in Madinah.

The earth does not consume the blessed bodies of the Ambiya and the Shuhada. Wherever Allah Ta'ala allows them to reside after their demise, that place is in the Realm of Barzakh notwithstanding the endurance of their physical (*dunyawi*) bodies and personalities. The coprocreep has spoken absolute rubbish. He is ignorant of the Shariah's concept of Barzakh.

Dwelling aimlessly in his state of confusion, the coprocreep alleges: *"Also, if the prophets are alive due to the various evidences they bring, then why don't they ever apply the dunyawi principle to the martyrs as well, who too have evidence that proves their life."*

In this statement the coprocreep is in fact denying the *Hayaat* of Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam). This statement appears to be the cat which has slipped out of the bag. The true belief of the coprocreep, in fact of all Salafis, lies embedded in this statement. He asks: *'If the prophets are alive due to the various evidences they bring...'* The logical conclusion of this question is that he does not believe in the *Hayaat* of the Ambiya (alayhimus salaam). If this is indeed so, then there is no doubt in his kufr. Whilst this is the implication of his statement, the declared explicit belief of Ibn Taimiyyah and copro-Salafis is that Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) is not alive in his Qabr.

In fact, the Ahlus Sunnah does 'apply the *dunyawi* principle' to the Martyrs as well. It is our belief that the Shuhada too enjoy this kind of superior life in Barzakh, albeit of a lower level than the status of the Ambiya (alayhimus salaam). Confirming this belief, Allaamah Khalil Ahmad (rahmatullah alayh) states in his

*Al-Muhannad* in response to the question posed by the Ulama of Haramain Shareefain:

*“It (the life in the grave being dunyawī as well) is exclusive with him (sallallahu alayhi wasallam), all the Ambiya (salawatullaahi alayhim) and the Shuhada. It is not barzakhī as it is for all the Mu’mineen, in fact, for all mankind.”*

This answer annihilates the erroneous conclusion the coprocreep has made regarding his imagined inconsistency relative to the belief of life in Barzakh for the Ambiya and the Shuhada. The Shuhada do enjoy a similar kind of life although of a lower category than the life of the Ambiya (alayhimus salaam).

Inconsistently pursuing his claim of ‘inconsistency’ of the Ulama of Deoband, the coprocreep avers: *“Some Hayaati Deobandis have compromised and have invented ‘levels of life’ in the Barzakh – the highest being reserved for the prophets and they say this is strongest/closest to worldly life. Once again this is Batil.”*

The claim that ‘levels of life’ do not exist in Barzakh is stupid and *baatil*. A high degree of Aql is not a requisite for understanding that a Muslim fornicator, bandit and murderer, even if he has been forgiven will not occupy the same lofty level of life in Barzakh and Jannat as the Ambiya would. The contention of the coprocreep is astonishingly absurd. Will criminals and the Shuhada have the same level of life in Barzakh? And, for even the Ambiya (alayhimus salaam) there will be different levels. The Qur’aan Majeed is explicit in stating that some Ambiya have higher ranks than other Ambiya. This difference in rank will not be obliterated in Barzakh nor in Jannat. Islam does not propagate the communist doctrine of a classless society. Even in Jannat it will not be a classless society. There will be ranks above ranks, not only among the Ambiya

and Shuhada, but also among the ordinary Mu’mineen. This argument of the coprocreep is too stupid to pursue further.

The coprocreep accuses the Ulama of Deoband of equating the life of Barzakh to the life of the world. The density of his sensorium constrained him to arrive at this stupid conclusion. No one has equated the superior life of the Ambiya (alayhimus salaam) in Barzakh to the inferior life of this world. The attributive word, ‘*dunyawī*’ is not an equation. It does not equate the superior life of Barzakh to the worldly life. It only explains man’s physical attributes and personality which constituted him in the world. These attributes and personality will not be annihilated in Barzakh. *Insaan* will remain *Insaan* in Barzakh. There is *Hayaat* for all human beings in Barzakh. But, the *Hayaat* of the Ambiya (alayhimus salaam) is of the highest category. If life in Barzakh is negated, what then is the meaning of reward, comfort pain and punishment in the Qabr? What is the meaning of the questioning in the grave if *hayaat* is negated? The coprocreep compounds his rubbish with more and more rubbish.

*Hayaat* in the realm of Barzakh is undeniable. Denial of it is kufr. Allah Ta’ala states in the Qur’aan Majeed regarding the *Shuhada* (Martyrs):

*“Do not say about those who have been slain in the Path of Allah that they are dead. In fact, they are alive, but you are unaware.” (Baqarah, aayat 154)*

*“Do not think of those who have been slain in the path of Allah that they are dead. In fact, they are alive, by their Rabb they are being given rizq, enjoying the bounties Allah gave them from His kindness.....” (Aal-e-Imraan, aayats 269/170).....*

The Qur’aanic negation of ‘death’ for the Shuhada is the death as understood by human beings. The Qur’aan explicitly says: *“Do not say that they are dead.”*, despite the fact that they had died an earthly death – death as man understands it. The ‘life’ which the Shuhada have been granted is life which is the

opposite of earthly death, hence the emphasis: “*In fact, they are alive.*” The Qur’aan tells us that they are alive just as we are alive here on earth prior to earthly death. In addition to them being alive, they are enjoying a variety of bounties and are being given sustenance (food) to eat.

Now when the Qur’aan Majeed confirms *dunyawi* life, albeit of a superior kind, for the Martyrs, then by what stretch of Islamic logic do the juhhaal deny this type of superior *dunyawi* life for Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) in particular, and the Ambiya (alayhimus salaam) in general?

There is neither logical impossibility nor Shar’i impossibility for the existence of this type of life in Barzakh. And, if it appears ‘impossible’ to the fossilized sensorium of coprocreeps, it matters not. The density of brains of deviates constrains them to deny simple and self-evident Qur’aanic facts.

The fact that the bodies of the Ambiya (alayhimus salaam) and of the Shuhada do not decompose, is further evidence for the bestowal of *dunyawi* (i.e. physical) life of a lofty kind. Now whether their bodies are in the physical graves or transferred to some other abode, their presence in Barzakh is undeniable. Barzakh is not a physical abode with territorial boundaries such as the earth. It is therefore downright *jahaalah* to contend that a being cannot be in Barzakh and on earth at one and the same time.

The impossibility would develop only if Barzakh was a distinct physical abode with physical boundaries. But Barzakh is a phase of existence which commences from after Maut and endures until Qiyaamah.

Wherever it is, it is the physical body in the state of Barzakh. This is the meaning of *dunyawi* life which is a special bounty awarded to the Ambiya (alayhimus salaam) and the Shuhada.

In an extremely stupid and a flabby attempt to bolster the Salafi denial of *Hayaat* for the Ambiya (alayhimus salaam) and the Shuhada, the coprocreep avers: “...*the bodies being*

*preserved is not a sign of worldly life, but it is the divine order of Allah, for both the prophets as well as the martyrs. It is divine law in itself, not because the prophets are still alive in the worldly sense.*”

Everything in creation is the ‘divine law’ of Allah Ta’ala. Nothing happens without His command. The Ahlus Sunnah do not contend that mere preservation of the physical bodies is the basis of the belief of the post-Maut *Hayaat* of the Ambiya (alayhimus salaam) and the Shuhada. A dead body could be preserved for ages in a deep freezer without it decomposing. No one will say that such preservation is a sign of worldly life. Nevertheless, the body preserved intact in a deep freezer on earth is in the state of Barzakh. Physical presence on earth does not negate the existence of Barzakh. While it is quite possible for the bodies of the Ambiya (alayhimus salaam) and of the Shuhada to remain intact without life by the command of Allah Ta’ala, it is kufr to subscribe to such a corrupt belief because to do so would be in denial of the Qur’aan and other proofs stated in the Ahaadith.

The Qur’aan explicitly and emphatically declares *life* for the Shuhada, and warns against saying they are dead. Allah Ta’ala is addressing human beings and mentioning Maut and Death to them as they understand these two states. The Qur’aan tells us to refrain from saying that the Shuhada are dead - dead in the worldly sense, despite them having died a physical death. While their physical death is undeniable, it does not follow that no revival and restoration to physical life takes place in Barzakh. Aside from the fact that this is not a logical impossibility (*mahaal-e-aqli*), it is expressly confirmed in the Qur’aan that they are *alive – alive in the way we understand life to be*. The relevant aayaat stating the *Hayaat of the Shuhada* are not among the *Mutashaabihaat* (allegorical verses). They are verses with literal meanings.

Furthermore, what exactly does the coprocreep mean by ‘worldly life’? It devolves on him to expound his theory of

'worldly life' to enable us to respond with greater clarity. Does he mean that the Ambiya (alayhimus salaam) and the Shuhada are dead, i.e. bodies without souls in Barzakh? But the Qur'aan says that they are alive – alive in the worldly meaning. This does not mean that they are living a worldly life as they lived prior to their death. It only means that their physical bodies are together with their souls. In other words they are completely *Insaan* (*human*), having their senses all intact, in fact to a far greater degree.

Hadhrat Anas (radhiyallahu anhu) said: *“The Ambiya are alive in their graves and perform Salaat.”* Imaam Baihqi, in addition to narrating this Hadith from Allaamah Subki, also narrates it from Imaam Abu Ya'la. Commenting on the *sanad* of the Hadith narrated by Imaam Abu Ya'la, Allaamah Haithami said: *“The narrators of Abu Ya'la are thiqaat (reliable).”* Allaamah Azezi states in *As-Sitaahun Niyarah*: *“This Hadith is Saheeh.”* Allaamah Ibn Hajar states: *“Baihaqi has authenticated this Hadith.”* (*Fathul Baari, Vol.6, Page 352*). Mullah Ali Qaari narrates in *Mirqaat, Vol.2, page 212*: *“The narration that the Ambiya are alive in their graves is Saheeh.”* Allaamah Anwar Shah Kashmiri states in *Faidhul Baari, Vol.2, page 64*: *“Haafiz Ibn Hajar concurred with Imaam Baihqi (regarding the authenticity of this Hadith).”*

Allaamah Anwar Shah Kashmiri also says: *“Many a'maal (acts of ibaadat) occur in the graves, e.g. Athaan and Iqaamah according to Daarmi, and recitation of the Qur'aan according to Tirmizi.”* (*Faidhul Baari, Vol.1, page 183*)

Mufti Muhammad Yusuf Ludhianwi states:

“From the time of Khairul Quroon until the 14<sup>th</sup> century there was no difference in this mas'alah. All the Akaabir had elaborated on this mas'alah in their writings in their own style. Among the Akaabir of the Aslaaf some had written special treatises on this subject (the Hayaat of Rasulullah - sallallahu alayhi wasallam). They had substantiated with clarity the issue

of the Hayaat of the Ambiya. It is a clear issue and a belief on which there exists the Ijma' of the Ummah.

While the *Hayaat* of the Shuhada is proven by the clear text of the Qur'aan Kareem, the *Hayaat* of the Ambiya-e-Kiraam is proven from the Qur'aan Kareem by way of *Dalaalatun Nass*. May self-opinionated people be destroyed. They have introduced jahaalat (ignorance) in the name of research, and bid'ah in the name of Sunnah. On this fictitious basis so-called 'muhaqqiqeen' (researchers) have, in addition to interpolating in other Ijma-ee masaa-il, refuted this Aqeedah (of the Hayaat of the Ambiya).”

The coprocreep following blindly his jaahil Salafi handlers is at pains to show that the belief of *Hayaat* of the Ambiya (alayhimus salaam) has been invented by the Ulama of Deoband about one and half centuries ago. He abortively tries to conceal the irrefutable fact that many centuries before the existence of Darul Uloom Deoband, this belief was entrenched in the Ummah, and that it has come down from the Khairul Quroon. Neither Imaam Suyuti nor Allaamah Subki, who both were Shaafis, was among the Ulama of Deoband. Darul Uloom Deoband had not even existed in that era many centuries ago. So why does the miserable coprocreep single out the Ulama of Deoband for his baseless criticism?

The Saheeh riwaayat of Hadhrat Anas (radhiyallahu anhu) who is among the most senior Sahaabah, dismisses the rubbish belief of the coprocreep and his Salafi bosses.

The moron asks: *“If the Prophets were still living a worldly life then what was the need to wash our Prophet and perform Janaazah over him?”* The stupidity of this argument is self-evident. But only morons fail to discern the stupidity. That Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) died a physical death in this world has never been denied. The Qur'aan also testifies that death will overtake Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam). The issue does not revolve around denial of his physical death – death as it occurs to all human beings. The issue is his life in

Barzakh. The contention of the Ahlus Sunnah is that in Barzakh the Ambiya (alayhimus salaam) enjoy a superior form of life – a life in which their bodies and souls exist together in the form of human beings. They are not in an abstract spiritual state. When the Qur'aan Majeed explicitly confirms such physical life for the Shuhada, then to a greater degree by way of *Dalaalatun Nass*, will the Ambiya (alayhimus salaam) be enjoying a physical life in Barzakh of a higher degree than even the Shuhada.

With regard to the subsistence of Rasulullah's marriages to his wives, this is a contentious issue among the Ulama. While some Ulama maintain that the marriages of Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) subsisted even after his earthly death, others do not subscribe to this belief. However, the belief of the *Hayaat of the Ambiya (alayhimus salaam) and the Shuhada* is not based on the subsistence of Rasulullah's Nikahs nor on the fact that the Ambiya do not leave an estate for inheritance. These are subsidiary issues which are presented to bolster the original belief of *Hayaat* which is not reliant on these masaa-il.

While the coprocreep calls on us to base our case on only the Qur'aan and Sunnah, he is in total denial of the Qur'aan by refuting *Hayaat* of the Ambiya (alayhimus salaam) and the Shuhada. What constrains these deviates to interpret away the verses stating emphatically the physical life of the Shuhada? They are falsifying the Qur'aanic aayaat solely to bolster the corrupt belief of their deviant Imaam. One of the fundamental issues of sharp conflict between the Ahlus Sunnah Wal Jama'ah and the Wahhaabi Salafis is the belief of Rasulullah's *Hayaat* in his blessed Grave. While the deviates deny *Hayaat* for Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam), the Ahlus Sunnah affirm it.

They also deny the authentic Hadith of Hadhrat Anas (radhiyallahu anhu) who explicitly mentioned that the Ambiya are alive in their graves and perform Salaat. We have already

cited above the references for the authenticity of this Hadith. Thus, the coprocreep blindly follows his deviant handlers whose corrupt beliefs he laps up like a dog licking up vomit.

The belief of the *Hayaat of the Ambiya in their Graves* is based on the Qur'aanic verse in which the *Hayaat of the Shuhada* is explicitly mentioned, and on the Ahaadith such as the narration of Hadhrat Anas (radhiyallahu anhu) who states this belief with great clarity, and on other Ahaadith in which it is mentioned that Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) saw the Ambiya performing Salaat, and their performing Salaat behind him in Musjidul Aqsa. This is a belief which has come down in the Ummah from the age of the Sahaabah. Coprocreeps and the miscreant Salafis are in denial since they have strayed from Siraatul Mustaqeem.

The first to deviate from Siraatul Mustaqeem regarding this belief was Ibn Hazam who denied the return of the souls of the Ambiya to their bodies. In his concept, '*hayaat*', means the life of the soul – only a spiritual existence. This is palpably false since the Qur'aan categorically prohibits us from saying that the Shuhada are dead. The Qur'aan unequivocally say that, "*they (i.e. the Shuhada – body and soul) are alive and by Allah they are being fed.*" Allah Ta'ala addresses all the Mu'mineen and speaks to us in the terms that we understand. In order to refute the baseless notion of Ibn Hazam, the Ulama deemed it incumbent to describe the life of the Ambiya in the graves with the term '*dunyawi*'. In other words, they are alive with their physical bodies.

Their existence in the graves is not on the same level as the life of the ordinary Muslims and of entire mankind which includes the kuffaar. It is contumacious to even suggest that the *hayaat* of the Ambiya is the same as the *hayaat* of even the kuffaar who are all living in Barzakh at a level far below the lofty status and form of the Ambiya. The Qur'aan asks: "*What, do you not understand?*"

We really are not in need of these rational arguments to prove the *dunyawi Hayaat* of the *Ambiya* (alayhimus salaam). The Qur'aan, Ahadith and the Ijma' of the Salaf-e-Saaliheen are more than adequate to confirm the veracity of this belief. Ibn Taimiyyah and Ibn Hazam appeared on the scene several centuries after the Salaf-e-Saaliheen of Khairul Quroon. Allaamah Samhudi (rahmatullah alayh), died 911 Hijri, states:

*"There is no doubt in the Hayaat of Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) after his demise. The same applies to all the Ambiya (alayhimus salaam). They are alive in their graves. Their hayaat is of a higher status than the hayaat of the Shuhada about whom Allah Ta'ala has informed in His noble Kitaab."*

*"The proofs for the Hayaat of the Ambiya necessitate hayaat of the physical bodies such as was the condition in the dunya....."* (Wafaaul Wafa, Vol.4)

Stating the belief in terms of the Shaafi' Math-hab, Allaamah Taajuddin As-Subki (rahmatullah alayh), died 777 Hijri, states:

*"Hadhrat Anas narrated that Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) said: 'The Ambiya are alive in their graves and are performing Salaat.'"*

*"According to us (the Shawaafi'), Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) is alive, in his full senses.... The deeds of the Ummah are presented to him, and the Durood and Salaam (recited by the Ummah) reach him."*

*"Among our Aqaaid (Beliefs) is that the Ambiya are alive in their graves. Where then is Maut? (i.e. How can he be dead when he is alive?). Imaam Baihaqi (rahmatullah alayh) had authored a treatise on the Hayaat of the Ambiya in their graves. We have heard it."* (Tabqaat, Vol.3)

Hafiz Ibn Hajar (rahmatullah alayh), died 852 Hijri, said: *"Verily, the Hayaat of Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) in his Qabr is such that it will not be followed by Maut. On the*

*contrary he will remain alive. The Ambiya are alive in their graves."* (Fathul Baari, Vol.7)

*"When it has been substantiated by narrational proof that the Ambiya are alive, then rational proof also substantiates it since the Hayaat of the Shuhada is established by the explicit text of the Qur'aan. The Ambiya are superior to the Shuhada."* (Fathul Baari, Vol. 6)

Among the Hanaabilah, Ibn Aqeel (rahmatullah alayh) said:

*"Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) is alive in his Qabr and he performs Salaat."* (Raudhatul Bahiyyah, page 14)

Imaam Baihqi (rahmatullah alayh), died 458 Hijri, said:

*"Verily, Allah Jalle Shanuhu has returned to the Ambiya their souls, hence they are alive by Allah as are the Shuhada....."* (Hayaatul Ambiya, page 14; Sharhi Mawaahib Zurqaani, Vol.5)

Imaam Shamsuddin Muhammad Bin Abdur Rahmaan As-Sakhaawi (rahmatullah alayh), died 902 Hijri, said: *"We believe and we acknowledge that Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) is alive. He is being given Rizq in his Qabr. The earth does not consume his blessed body. There exists Ijmaa' on this."* (Al-Qaulul Badee', page 173)

Allaamah Jalaluddin Suyuti (rahmatullah alayh), died 911 Hijri, said: *"The Hayaat of Nabi (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) in his Qabr and of all the Ambiya is a fact known to us by virtue of such knowledge which is Qat'i (absolutely authentic). According to us the proofs for this are well established, and the narrations are Tawaatur indicating this fact."* (Al-Haawi lil Fataawa, Vol.2)

*"Among the Tawaatur narrations from Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) is the (narration) about the Hayaat of the Ambiya in their graves."* (Sharhul Bughawi, page 4)

Allaamah Abdul Wahhaab Sha'raani (rahmatullah alayh), died 973 Hijri, said:

*“The Ahaadith regarding Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) being alive in his Qabr performing Salaat with Athaan and Iqaamah, are undoubtedly authentic.” (Manhul Minnah, page 92)*

Mullah Ali Qaari (rahmatullah alayh), died 1014 Hijri, states:

*“Among the reliable beliefs is that Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) is alive in his grave just as all the Ambiya are alive in their graves. They are alive by their Rabb. Their souls have a relationship with the Ulwi (celestial) and Sifli (terrestrial) realms as was their duniyawi condition. With regard to the heart, they are of the Arsh, and with regard to the body, they are of the earth.” (Sharh Shifa’, Vol.2)*

Shaikh Abdul Haq Muhaddith Dehlwi (rahmatullah alayh), died 1052 Hijri, said:

*“There is consensus on the Hayaat of the Ambiya. There is no difference of opinion on this issue.” (Ash-atul Lam’aat, Vol.1)*

Even Abdullah Bin Muhammad Bin Abdul Wahhaab Najdi (rahmatullah alayh), died 1206, the Imaam of the Najdi Salafis, confirming the Hayaat of the Ambiya said:

*“It is our belief that the status of our Nabi is totally superior to the ranks of creation. He is alive in his Qabr with perpetual life, superior to the life of the Shuhada about which the revealed Qur’aan explicitly mentions. This (superior life) is because he is the noblest of them without any doubt. Verily, he (i.e. Rasulullah – sallallahu alayhi wasallam) hears those who recite Salaam on him.” (Ithaaf, page 415)*

Maulana Abul Ateeq Abdul Haadi Muhammad Siddique Najeebabaadi Al-Hanafi states:

*“Verily, they (the Muhadditheen) are unanimous on the Hayaat of Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam). There is no difference among them on this issue.”*

*(Anwaarul Mahmood-Sharh Abi Dawood, Vol.11)*

Alhamdulillah, we have shown conclusively that the coprocreep's alleged 3<sup>d</sup> and 4<sup>h</sup> inconsistencies are devoid of Shar'i and logical arguments. The Salafi belief regarding the Hayaat (Life) of Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) is baatil.

**REFUTATION OF THE COPROCREEP'S  
BASELESS 'INCONSISTENCY' NO. 5 WHICH HE  
FALSELY ATTRIBUTES TO THE ULAMA OF  
DEOBAND**

**ABSTENTION FROM ISTIGHFAAR**

Diverging from the subject of his alleged inconsistency No.4, the miserable coprocreep disgorges the following drivel:

*"You will find and witness and seen Deobandis (esp. Tableeghis) do Istighfaar or seek repentance, or tell others to do repentance, after carrying out good deeds. I believe this has Sufistic roots where some Sufis used to do Istighfaar from the acts of worship themselves, and this is based on that good deeds bring about self-arrogance."*

*(We have reproduced the coprocreep's statement verbatim, errors and all.)*

The coprocreep has further displayed his jahaalat by uttering this pure rubbish. His conclusion regarding *Istighfaar* after *ibaadat* demonstrates his total lack of understanding of the practices and attitude of the Ulama of Deoband who in their own little way always tried to follow the Sahaabah of Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam). Again it should be clarified that when it is said, 'Ulama of Deoband', the reference is to the Akaabireen, not to the medley of molvies of a variety of persuasions and defective knowledge of this era. Only one who subscribes in entirety to the *Minhaaj* of the Akaabireen will be enumerated in the roll of the Ulama of Deoband.

The first stupid slander the coprocreep alleges is : *"Some Sufis used to do Istighfaar from the acts of worship themselves"*. This allegation is utterly baseless. Here the coprocreep implies that the Ulama of Deoband equate acts of *ibaadat* to acts of sin. Just as *Istighfaar* is incumbent when sinning, so too is *Istighfaar* essential when rendering acts of *ibaadat*. This is the absurd

implication of the coprocreep's fallacious conjecture. Our Akabireen act in accordance with the following Qur'aanic verses:

*"And they (the Muttaqeen) recite Istighfaar (repent and ask forgiveness) in the times of As-haar." (Aal-e-Imraan, aayat 17)*

*"And, when it is As-haar, they seek forgiveness (recite Istighfaar." (Ath-Thariyaat, aayat 18)*

*As-haar* is the plural of *sahr* which is the last one sixth of the night, just before the ending of Tahajjud time, and commencement of Subh Saadiq.

The preceding verses state: *"Verily, the Muttaqeen will be in gardens and fountains. They accept what their Rabb bestowed to them. Verily, even before this (on earth) they were people of piety. They used to sleep very little during the night. And, late at night (just before Subh Saadiq) they would engage in Istighfaar." (Ath-Thaariyaat, Aayaat 15 – 18)*

It is very significant that despite the Muttaqeen spending the greater part of the night in *ibaadat*, they engage in *Istighfaar*. Now what is the purpose of this *Istighfaar*? Why do the people of piety engage in *Istighfaar* despite being engaged the greater part of the night in *ibaadat*. This *Istighfaar* according to the Qur'aan follows immediately after hours of *ibaadat* late at night. Do these Muttaqeen repent and seek forgiveness because they had worshipped? Do they regret having engaged in *ibaadat* during the night?

Regret is a requisite of Taubah. Minus regret, Taubah is meaningless. It is essential that the one who seeks forgiveness (makes *Istighfaar*) for sins should have remorse. Another requisite of Taubah is to pledge never again to repeat the sin. Without this pledge, the repentance is not valid.

The coprocreep in effect implies that according to the Ulama of Deoband, it is necessary *"to do Istighfaar from the acts of worship themselves"*. In other words, the acts of *ibaadat*

themselves are supposed to be sins in terms of the coprocreep's hallucinated doctrine which he attributes to the Ulama of Deoband, hence they engage in *Istighfaar* after Ibaadat. Nothing can be further from the truth. It is totally absurd to read such a corrupt meaning of kufr into the act of *Istighfaar* after Ibaadat. Here in the Qur'aan Majeed, Allah Ta'ala Himself, commands us to engage in *Istighfaar* in the last extremity of the night immediately after having engaged in hours of ibaadat during the night time. Why does Allah Ta'ala praise the Muttaqeen who engage in *Istighfaar* after practising good deeds?

Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) reported that during this last portion of the night, Allah Ta'ala descends to the Sama-e-Dunya (the first heaven). He announces: "Is there any repenter (for sins) so that I may forgive him? Is there anyone seeking forgiveness (reciting *Istighfaar*) so that I may forgive him?"

Since this is a time of *Maqbooliyat* (Acceptance), the Muttaqeen engage in *Istighfaar* which is desired by Allah Ta'ala despite the fact that they had not indulged in any sins. They were engaged in pure ibaadat for hours during the night. Then immediately after the ibaadat, they engage in *Istighfaar*. Thus, it should be clear that *Istighfaar* should not be restricted to occasions of flagrant sin.

Since the Muttaqeen understand that their ibaadat can never measure up to the glory and majesty of Allah Azza Wa Jal, and that their ibaadat will always be defective in relation to Allah's status, they seek forgiveness for their defective discharge of the ibaadat, not for the acts of ibaadat "*themselves*" as alleged by the coprocreep.

Furthermore, the late hours of the night as well as the moments succeeding ibaadat are occasions of ready acceptance (*Maqbooliyat*). It is therefore logical to take advantage of these auspicious moments to petition Allah Ta'ala for forgiveness of sins already committed. The *Istighfaar* is for sins committed and

for defective discharge of ibaadat, not for acts of ibaadat. In addition, this methodology is not the product of opinion. It is by command of Allah Ta'ala, and the teaching of Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam).

The Qur'aan Majeed praises these Ulama of Deoband who engage in *Istighfaar* after acts of ibaadat.

In a self-contradiction, the coprocreep states: "*Although Deobandis do not seek forgiveness for the acts themselves, but they do seek forgiveness from any mistakes committed in acts.*" What sin do the Ulama of Deoband commit if they seek forgiveness for short-comings and deficiencies in their acts of Ibaadat? Common sense – simple Imaani sense is sufficient to understand the necessity for seeking forgiveness for the commission of 'mistakes'. Is it then a sin in the Salafi belief to engage in *Istighfaar* for errors and mistakes? The absurdity of the Salafi *minhaaj* is self-evident from the corrupt idea peddled by the coprocreep.

When should one repent and engage in *Istighfaar*? It is quite apparent from the belief of the coprocreep that *Istighfaar* is not permissible without sin first preceding it. Only thereafter is *Istighfaar* valid in terms of copro-Salafi'ism. This corrupt supposition will preclude a person from *Istighfaar* if he believes that he has not sinned. And, this belief is possible only if this person has a comprehensive list of sins besides which there are no sins. Now if this person does not commit any of the acts enumerated in his comprehensive handbook of sins, there will be no need for him to engage in *Istighfaar*. In fact, in terms of the Salafi belief it will be sinful to repent and engage in *Istighfaar* in view of no sins having been committed.

This belief leads to *takabbur* (pride), because the Salafi regards himself to be pure and holy, hence no need for *Istighfaar*. The arrogance which Salafis generally display and the disdain and contempt they have for the Imaams of the Math-

habs and the Fuqaha, are therefore not at all surprising. They are morally and spiritually barren.

They advocate *Istighfaar* only when a person commits an act which he believes is a sin. But there are numerous acts and attitudes which are sinful without man even realizing that he has indulged in sin. The Ambiya (alayhimus salaam) are *Ma'soom* (Sinless). Rasulallah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) used to repent and engage in *Istighfaar* 70 times daily, and in one narration 100 times. What constrained the Sinless Nabi (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) to engage in *Istighfaar* in such abundance?

Committing an act which one understands to be a sin is not a prerequisite for *Istighfaar*. There are numerous actions and attitudes which are sinful, and which are committed without a person even realizing that he has sinned. Then there is the defective discharge of obligations. Then there is man's nafs which is inherently evil as mentioned by Nabi Yusuf (alayhis salaam): "*I do not exonerate my nafs from evil, for verily the nafs is a great commander of evil...*" (Surah Yusuf)

Now when the Ambiya (alayhimus salaam) engaged in abundant *Istighfaar*, who are the coprocreeps who wallow in flagrant sin, and who are we all to justify abstention from *Istighfaar*?

*Istighfaar* after ibaadat is not seeking forgiveness for having executed the act of ibaadat as the coprocreep falsely alleges. It is the plea for forgiveness for defective performance of ibaadat, for sins already committed, for sins which cannot be remembered, for sins committed without understanding, for sins committed by mistake, for sins committed in the distant past and for which *Taubah* may not have been made.

In addition to this list of sins, *Istighfaar* is extremely efficient for the cultivation of *Tawaadhu'* (Humility) which is the opposite of *Takabbur*. When a man understands his sinful nature and that he is always sinning, he is overwhelmed by remorse. His

gaze is focused on his own weaknesses, not on the faults and sins of others.

The daily practice of *Istighfaar* of Rasulallah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) and the Qur'aanic praise for the Muttaqeen who engage in *Istighfaar* at the time of Tahajjud after having spent considerable time in ibaadat are more than adequate substantiation for the validity of the practice and attitude of *Istighfaar* of the Ulama of Deoband. Hadhrat Thaubaan (radhiyallahu anhu) narrated: *When Rasulallah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) completed his Salaat, he would recite Istighfaar three times.*" – (Muslim) This is the Sunnah practice which the coprocreep condemns, but which the Ulama of Deoband observe. Thus, Rasulallah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam), himself instructed by way of his action that *Istighfaar* should follow ibaadat.

In a flabby attempt to justify the Salafi teaching of abstention from *Istighfaar*, the coprocreep says: "*What people SHOULD be doing after acts of worship is SHUKR and Duas of MORE TAWFEEQ.*"

What is the coprocreep's basis for believing that those who engage in *Istighfaar* abstain from *Shukr*? *Istighfaar* is not the antithesis of *Shukr*. In fact, *Istighfaar* cultivates a greater degree of *Shukr* in a man of humility who believes that despite his sins, Allah Ta'ala is bestowing his boundless mercy and bounties to him. The humble man's heart inclines more to gratitude than the hard heart of a Salafi who believes in his innocence and holiness on the basis of which the coprocreep justifies abstention from *Istighfaar*.

*Shukr* is an integral constituent of the process of *Tazkiyah Nafs* of the Ulama of Deoband. The objective of the *Tasawwuf* of the Ulama of Deoband is twofold: elimination of the evil nafaani attributes, and the adornment of the nafs with the attributes of moral excellence. This is the meaning of *Tazkiyah Nafs* and *Tasawwuf* according to the Ulama of Deoband. This is our *Minhaaj*.

**KIBR AND ITS REMEDY**

In another baseless allegation, the coprocreep says: "*Also, in the Deobandi circles that I have continuously experienced, 'seeking and conveying knowledge' is treated as something that would bring about kibr (arrogance) and needs something to counter it, like going out in Tabligh, giving Bay'ah to a Sheikh who – by his 'spiritual Tawajjuh' – would rid you of this arrogance, non-spirituality, etc.*"

The coprocreep is merely displaying his raw jahaalat with his stupid speculation. No one in his era, i.e. the era of the Akaabir of Deoband, has emphasized the significance, virtue and importance of the search for Ilm and of its propagation (tableegh) more than the Ulama of Deoband. It was precisely for this sacred mission that the Akaabir had established Darul Uloom Deoband, and in its wake mushroomed the other thousands of Madaaris all over the world.

*Tazkiyah Nafs* (moral reformation) is a Waajib command of the Qur'aan and Sunnah. Only stupid coprocreeps and arrogant Salafis deny the inherent evil of the nafs which is confirmed in the Qur'aan and Ahaadith. The nafs of *insaan* in collusion with shaitaan manipulates all the lofty attributes of excellence to deceive a person and to entangle him in the mesh of *akhlaaq razeelah* (evil/corrupt attributes). The bounties of Allah Ta'ala are misused at the behest of the evil nafs. Who can deny the existence of *kibr* in man? Perhaps Salafi coprocreeps do.

*Kibr* which is inherent in the nafs, asserts itself by the misappropriation of the *Ni'maat* (Bounties) of Allah Ta'ala. Knowledge, health, wealth, physical strength, beauty, children, material possessions, expertise, etc. are all the bounties of Allah Ta'ala. If these *Ni'maat* are mis-manipulated, they become the basis on which the effects of *kibr* become manifest. Denial of the existence of *kibr* in the nafs is kufr. *Kibr* does not develop as a consequence of poverty, weakness, humility, simplicity, mundane lowliness, etc. The substratum of *kibr* is the bounties

of Allah Ta'ala which *insaan* misuses. Thus, a man becomes proud and arrogant on account of his wealth and worldly status or because of his knowledge, etc. The Tasawwuf of the Ulama of Deoband teaches *insaan* how to correctly apply the bounties of Allah Ta'ala.

Our Akaabir and the Sufiya do not hold the belief that seeking knowledge and propagating knowledge are evil and *kibr* per se as the miserable coprocreep alleges. His brains appear to be welded to *jahaalat*, hence he developed this absurd conclusion.

*Tawajjuh* is not among the methods of *Tarbiyat* (moral training). The coprocreep has conspicuously advertised his ignorance by venturing this baseless claim. *Karaamaat* (miracles) of the Auliya are an established reality. But the Ulama of Deoband and the Sufiya do not contend that *Karaamat* is a method of *Tarbiyat*. Neither *Karaamat* nor *Tawajjuh* is a method of training and taming the inordinate Nafs-e-Ammaarah of *insaan*. If a Wali demonstrates a *Karaamat*, it does not follow that it is part of Tasawwuf. Similarly, if a Wali who is a Faqeeh demonstrates a *Karaamat*, it does not mean that the miracle is part of Fiqh.

*Tawajjuh* in the context mentioned by the coprocreep means to exercise the power of the mind or of the soul for a purpose. There are two sources of *Tawajjuh*. The physical power of the mind or the spiritual power of the soul is developed purely by physical exercise such as practised by the yogis. The other method for this achievement is by means of Taqwa, the effect of which is *Karaamat*. Both ways have no relationship with Tasawwuf. Tasawwuf is nothing other than *Tazkiyah Nafs* (moral reformation) – eliminating the beastly qualities and adorning the nafs with the attributes of moral excellence. But the stupidity of the coprocreep has confused the issues for himself and for his Salafi handlers.

The coprocreep also accuses the Ulama of Deoband of a "*mentality of an assumed separation between spirituality from*

*Shariah knowledge*". This lie is a slander against the Ulama of Deoband. This alleged mentality is the effect of the hallucination of the coprocreep. It is an accusation devoid of substance. Far from the alleged 'mentality of separation', the Ulama of Deoband structure Tasawwuf on the foundations of the Shariah. There is no barrier between the two. What the Ulama of Deoband call Tariqat or Tasawwuf is an integral part of the Shariah – of the Qur'aan and Sunnah. Tariqat/Tasawwuf is not a concept at variance with or apart from the Shariah. Any concept of Tasawwuf which conflicts with the Shariah is Satanism.

Tariqat teaches the Aalim to appreciate the value of the Ilm of Deen. It inculcates in him the enthusiasm and the ability to give practical expression to the Knowledge he has acquired. It teaches him not to misuse the Ni'mat of Ilm-e-Deen. It warns him against utilizing the Ilm for mundane aims, mercenary and nafsani objectives. Such misappropriation of Ilm for worldly and nafsani objectives was predicted by Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam). In this regard he said that the time will come *"when the knowledge of the Deen will be acquired for purposes other than the Deen, and when the deeds of the Akhirah will be practised for the acquisition of the dunya."* Thus, the 'separation' theory is a figment of the imagination of the coprocreep.

Since the modern-day Salafis are bereft of Islam's concept of *Tazkiyah Nafs*, we find them spiritually barren. Their morals are a superficial façade devoid of reality. Their morals are aptly described in a similitude in the Qur'aan Majeed. Allah Ta'ala states in His Kalaam:

*"His likeness is like a (smooth) rock on which there is some sand. Then a storm strikes it, leaving it (the rock) bare (as it initially was prior to the sand accumulating on it). They have no control over anything they earn (that is, over their actions)."*  
(*Al-Baqarah, aayat 264*)

Anyone who was involved in a debate with a Salafi will vouch for their raw manners. When they are driven into a corner with *dalaa-il*, it is then hilarious to watch them snap. Their dishonesty is akin to the Shiah doctrine of *Taqiyah*. In the presence of knowledgeable Hanafis, they will praise Imaam Abu Hanifah (rahmatullah alayh) and the other Aimmah. But, behind the backs of the Ahnaaf they spit venom in particular for Imaam Abu Hanifah (rahmatullah alayh). Too many Ahnaaf among the laymen have testified to this haraam taqiyah attitude and stratagem of the Salafis. Morally and spiritually they are as bare as a smooth rock on which plants cannot grow. They are bereft of *Akhlaaq and Roohaaniyat*.

It is in the light of their corrupt unofficial doctrine of *Taqiyah* that they are falsely calling themselves 'Hanaabilah' or the followers of Imaam Ahmad Bin Hambal (rahmatullah alayh). They are confounded liars in making this claim. They do not follow any of the Four Math-habs of the Ahlus Sunnah. If they were Muqallideen of Imaam Ahmad (rahmatullah alayh), they would not have been known as 'Salafis'. In reality they are Taimiyyites – the blind followers of Ibn Taimiyyah. The claim of the coprocreep that the Salafis are 'Hanaabilah' is a blatant copro-lie.

*Tazkiyah Nafs* (moral reformation) has no existence in their *minhaaj*. They are absolutely arid, barren, infertile and sterile in the spiritual and moral spheres of Islam. The Salafis can degenerate to brutal levels of injustice and oppression. It were the Salafis who had conspired with the British to abolish the Othmaani (Ottoman) Khilaafate. The British had installed the first wrung of Salafis in the Arabian Peninsula. They had butchered countless Muslims of the four Math-habs on the pretext of bid'ah and shirk.

From their so-called puritanical extreme of their early stage when Britain installed them as the rulers of Makkah Mukarramah and Madinah Munawwarah, they have today swung

to the other extreme –the extremity of immorality, debauchery and treachery. To such a degree of villainy have the Saudi Salafis – the so-called Saudi royal family – sunk, that they have become the flagship for the kufr interfaith movement, and for everything that is American. The Saudi Salafis are at the helm of the kufr-shirk interfaith movement, bolstering this evil movement with their massive financial contributions. Even Salafis of a lesser degree of corruption are in opposition to the Salafis of the Saudi family.

Their brutal repression of the followers of the Math-habs loudly testifies for the *dhalaal* and spiritual bankruptcy of the Salafis. They are bereft of *Akhlaaq-e-Hameedah*.

It is gross injustice and a dark falsehood to equate the miscreant, bid'ah, shirki 'sufi' cults of West and North Africa with the pure Qur'aanic and Sunnah Tasawwuf of the Ulama of Deoband. There is no resemblance between the Satanism which is practised in the name of sufi'ism in some places, and the pure Tariqat of the Ulama of Deoband.

All movements degenerate with the march of time. Just look at the state of moral and doctrinal (Aqeedah) corruption and degeneration which has overtaken the Saudi Salafis. They now wallow in the dens of American vice and prostitution. They have betrayed Islam and the Ummah at the behest of the U.S.A. They have become confounded mushrikeen, for they believe that the U.S.A. is their 'Maula' (friend and protector). Will it be proper to equate the initial raw puritanical movement of the first Saudi king who was installed by Britain to the corrupt and immoral Saudi regime of today? On what basis is the coprocreep Salafi equating the West and North African cults of baatil sufi'ism with the pure and holy Tariqat of the Ulama of Deoband? Salafis are devoid of brains and hearts. They are plain morons. They lack in Ilm and Akhlaaq, hence they disgorge so many inconsistencies and incongruencies.

## REFUTATION OF THE COPROCREEP'S BASELESS 'INCONSISTENCY' NO. 6 WHICH HE FALSELY ATTRIBUTES TO THE ULAMA OF DEOBAND

### BAY'T (OR BAY'AH)

The miserable Salafi coprocreep in whose constitution is ingrained *kizb* (*lies and falsehood*), in his baseless criticism of the Ulama of Deoband, slanders as follows:

*“If a mureed makes Bay'ah to a Sufi Sheikh, he cannot make Bay'ah to another Sheikh in his lifetime because it is an insult. So if one is studying something in a Deobandi Darul Uloom, then one cannot go to a Salafi institution or Arabia or the Arab lands in general, or else that would mean offence – this is what happens! “*

This jaahil coprocreep despite having spent some time in a Deobandi Darul Uloom, is clearly ignorant of the *Minhaaj* - the way, methodology and attitude of the noble Akaabireen of this illustrious Jamaat of Ulama. The claim that a mureed of a Shaikh of Tasawwuf is prohibited from making bay't to another Shaikh for the entire duration of his lifetime is a despicable LIE. There is no such rule in the Tasawwuf of the Mashaikh associated with Darul Uloom. On the contrary, a true Shaikh of Tasawwuf will encourage a mureed to seek the spiritual guidance of another Shaikh, if in his opinion there is no *Munaasabat* (compatibility/congeniality) between him and the mureed.

It is a principle of Tasawwuf to which our Akaabireen rigidly adhere, that *Munaasabat* is a condition of Bay't. Thus, in his kitaab, *Shariat & Tasawwuf*, Hadhrat Maulana Masihullah Khan (rahmatullah alayh) states:

“Experience has proven that for gaining spiritual benefit (fuyudh-e-batini), mutual munasabat (congeniality) between the

Shaikh and Mureed is a natural condition. Normally, benefit is dependent on affection which is the reality of natural congeniality (*munasabat-e-fitri*). Sometimes a Shaikh will refer a mureed to another Shaikh because of the lack of such *munasabat* between them. In doing so the Shaikh establishes either by deduction or *kashf* (inspiration from Allah Ta'ala) that the mureed has *munasabat* with a certain Shaikh. In this Path it is essential that *munasabat* exists between the Shaikh and Mureed otherwise the latter will not benefit. Such *munasabat* is the basis for the acquisition of benefit and passing on *faidh* (spiritual grace) to the mureed.

*Munasabat* envisages that there exists between the Shaikh and Mureed compatibility and harmony to such a degree that the mureed discerns no rejection in his heart for any word or act of the Shaikh although he (the mureed) may have some mental disagreement with any word or act of the Shaikh. Nevertheless such mental disagreement will not countenance rejection for the Shaikh in the heart of the mureed. In short, harmony and compatibility are conditional for *bay't*. It is therefore essential to first inculcate *munasabat*. This need is imperative. In the absence of this essential condition, *mujahadaat* (strivings), *riyadhaat* (certain forms of exercises designed to subdue the nafs), *muraqabaat* (meditations) and *mukashafaat* (intuitive revelations) are all futile. In the absence of natural *munasabat* (*tab'i munasabat*), the mureed should endeavour to inculcate intellectual (*aqli*) *munasabat*, because benefit is dependent on it.

In view of the overriding importance of *Munaasabat*, one should not enter into the *Bay't* allegiance if such *munaasabat* is lacking.”

This is an incumbent principle of *Tasawwuf* which Hadhrat Masihullah (rahmatullah alayh) and all *Muhaqqiqeen* of *Tasawwuf* explain with clarity and which is considerably emphasized. What the *Ahl-e-Bid'ah* who masquerade as Shaikhs

of *Tasawwuf* do, has no bearing on the reality and *Haqq* of the *Tasawwuf* practised by the *Akaabireen* of Deoband. The contention that the *Mashaikh* of Deoband prohibit termination of the *Bay't* relationship is manifest slander. There is no Sufi Shaikh of the *Haqq* who follows the *Shariah* and the *Sunnah*, who regards the termination of the bond to be an 'insult' as the *Salafi* coprocreep falsely contends.

If a Shaikh believes that his *Ta'leem* is not benefiting a mureed, or the mureed experiences lack of *munaasabat* with his Shaikh, the former will and should advise, in fact, instruct, the mureed to take hold of the *Mantle* of another Shaikh. He will even advise the mureed of a Shaikh whom he (the first Shaikh) believes will be of benefit to the mureed.

Similarly, the mureed may terminate the relationship on account of *Adm-e-Munaasabat* (lack of compatibility). He only has to inform his Shaikh that he is terminating the *bay't* relationship. There are many examples of such mutual termination among the *Mashaikh* of *Tasawwuf*. Hadhrat Maulana Ashraf Ali Thanvi (rahmatullah alayh), in particular, was extremely rigid in the observance of the principle of *Munaasabat*, and he would not hesitate to terminate the *bay't*, and at the same time proffer advice to the mureed regarding a new Shaikh.

The *Salafi* coprocreep's ignorance is stark, for he confuses academic study with *Tasawwuf*. Adopting a Shaikh of *Tasawwuf* and pursuing academic studies at a *Darul Uloom* are two different vocations. Thus, his claim that a student who has a *bay't* relationship with a Shaikh of *Tasawwuf* is not allowed to study at a *Darul Uloom* of his choice is blatantly false. Firstly, it is the *Minhaaj* of the senior *Mashaikh* of *Tasawwuf* of Deoband to refrain from initiating students into the *Path* (*Tareeqat/Tasawwuf*). Once, during his student days, Hadhrat Maulana Ashraf Ali Thanvi (rahmatullah alayh) requested Hadhrat Maulana Rashid Ahmad Gangohi (rahmatullah alayh) to accept him as a mureed. Hadhrat Gangohi responded that as long

as he (Maulana Ashraf Ali Thanvi) was engaged in the pursuit of academic knowledge, he should regard the idea of becoming a mureed to be a *shaitaani waswasah*.

The general attitude of our Mashaaikh was to refrain from accepting students as mureeds.

The discouragement to join a Salafi academic institution (madrasah) is the policy of our Ulama at our Darul Uloom. This policy is unrelated to the *Khaanqah*. It is the Waajib obligation of the Asaatizah to warn their students from the dangerous pitfalls and traps of Salafi institutions. It is Islamic, Waajib and entirely logical for the Asaatizah of the Darul Uloom to warn their students against Salafi snares. When it is our belief that Salafis are plodding the path of baatil; that they constitute a deviant sect; that they are coprocreeps who subscribe to the blindest form of taqleed, namely, the taqleed of a seventh century Aalim who had strayed from the *Minhaaj* of the Ahlus Sunnah of the Salafus Saaliheen, then it will be gross *khiyaanat* for us to allow our students to become ensnared in Salafi baatil which their institutions teach.

It is therefore Waajib on us to endeavour to prevent our students from studying at any Salafi institution whether in Madina or elsewhere.

The coprocreep alleges: *“A mureed cannot question his Sufi Sheikh’s tactics /approach to his tazkiyah. The same applies to Darul Uloom culture in not all but many instances. I once challenged a teacher relating to the presence of a word.....The teacher got so upset he walked out of the class.....”*

Firstly, a true Shaikh whose profession is the Tazkiyah of the Nafs of his mureeds, does not have ‘tactics’. His methodology is called *Ta’leem*. He does not operate like stupid, immoral Salafi coprocreeps who seek refuge in anonymity, and under such cover they cowardly issue ‘brave challenges’. The Shaikh of

Tasawwuf is a Roohaani (Spiritual) physician whose duty it is to diagnose the spiritual maladies of the mureed and offer prescriptions and remedies. No one questions the medical doctor. Everyone accepts his prescriptions and remedies without question. But, in the spiritual domain, the coprocreep propagates a stupid difference.

Spiritual maladies, due to their intangible (spiritual) nature are more subtle and complicated than tangible (physical) diseases. Just as a patient suffering from a physical disease has no right of questioning his doctor’s prescription and remedy, so too, does he lack this right in relation to his Spiritual physician.

Our Akaabireen advise people that prior to accepting a person to be their Spiritual Guide, they should first investigate and study him to ascertain if he is a Shaikh of the Haqq. Proffering this advice, Hadhrat Maulana Masihullah (rahmatullah alayh) says in his kitaab, *Shariat & Tasawwuf*:

“A Shaikh is one who has full knowledge and experience of spiritual ailments (amraadh-e-batinah), attributes of vice and virtue (akhlaaq-e-razeelah and akhlaaq-e-hameedah), their characteristics (khawaas) and their effects (ta’theerat). He should further be able to distinguish between their similarities and he must have perfect ability in devising plans and prescriptions for the acquisition of the attributes of virtue and the elimination of the attributes of vice. He has to be aware of the progress and retrogress of these attributes. He must be well versed in the hazards of the nafs and shaitaan, the intuitive senses and feelings pertaining to the angels and the Divine Being. He must be able to distinguish these various intuitive and extra-sensory feelings and perceptions. It is therefore imperative that the Shaikh of tareeqat be one who is qualified in this knowledge, be a mujtahid in this field and possesses natural ability and inherent propensity. If he has acquired the Tareeq by a mere self-study of books on Tasawwuf or by listening from others, he will destroy

the mureed whom he is attending, because he will not be in position to correctly diagnose the various states of the mureed.

Shaikh Ibn Arabi (rahmatullah alayh) briefly summarises the signs of a Shaikh-e-Kamil (the perfect and qualified Shaikh) to be three:

1. Deen resembling the Deen of the Ambiya.
2. Prescribing like the physicians.
3. Management and control like that of kings.

The exposition of the above summary is as follows:

1. He should possess the necessary knowledge of the Deen which he must have acquired by either academic pursuit of such knowledge or from companionship with the Ulama-e-Muhaqqiqeen.
2. He must be a deputy (Khalifah) of a Shaikh-e-Kamil attached to an authentic Silsilah.
3. He should be uprighteous and pious.
4. He had derived spiritual benefit by having being for an adequate period of time in the company of the Shaikh. Such "companionship" is either by means of correspondence or by physical presence in the association of the Shaikh.
5. The people of knowledge (i.e. the Ulama) hold him in high esteem, and also refer to him.
6. The effect of his companionship (suhbat) is increase in the desire for Akhirat and Divine love as well as detestation for the love of the world.
7. The majority of his mureeds are followers of the Shariat, their conditions conforming with the demands of the Shariat.
8. He is devoid of greed and desire (for worldly gain and benefit).
9. He engages in Thikr and devotional practices.
10. He does not leave his mureeds unfettered, but reprimands them when the need arises. He treats everyone according to their respective abilities.

The one in whom these attributes exist is worthy of being a Shaikh and he should be considered a wonderful alchemy. His companionship and service to him are in fact priceless treasures. Once these attributes of perfection are found in a Shaikh, one should not be concerned about kaaramat (miracles) and kashf (inspiration). It is not necessary that these states (karaamaat and kashf) exist in the Shaikh-e-Kamil nor is it necessary that he be one who does not himself earn his livelihood."

Again the jaahil Salafi coprocreep confuses the Madrasah with the Khaanqah. To substantiate his contention which is related to the Shaikh of Tasawwuf (the Sufi Shaikh), the coprocreep cites the episode related to the Madrasah where he was studying. The teacher who had 'walked out of the class upset', was not a Sufi Shaikh. To bolster his lies pertaining to the Sufi Sheikhs, the coprocreep failed to cite any incident from the lives of the Akaabir Mashaaiikh of Tasawwuf associated with Darul Uloom Deoband.

Secondly, the teacher (Ustaadh) who had walked out of the class must have done so on account of the insolence of the coprocreep who had not sincerely and humbly asked a question to educate himself, but had '*challenged the teacher*'. The coprocreep displayed his pride and stupid 'expertise' in Arabic grammar. His intention was to humiliate the Ustaadh, hence he 'challenged' his senior with his satanic insolence. Insolence is a salient feature of Iblees. When Allah Ta'ala questioned him about his refusal to perform Sajdah for Aadam (alayhis salaam), Shaitaan insolently and challengingly stated: "You created me from fire, and him from sand." The coprocreep was fortunate that the Ustaadh did not deliver a few lashes with a heavy whip as a balm for his insolence.

The main issue here is that the teacher's attitude cannot be presented as substantiation for the absurd claim that a 'mureed cannot question his Sufi Sheikh'. A mureed has all the right to question his Shaikh on issues pertaining to his Tazkiyah and Islaah. But, he has no right to become insolent like the

coprocreep and seek to 'challenge' his Shaikh. The Khaanqah is not a place for insolent coprocreeps with the attributes of Iblees. The type of shaitaani challenge which the coprocreep made to his Ustaadh is undoubtedly "the ultimate sin of disrespect" to which he referred.

Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) said that the one who teaches you even one word of the Qur'aan is your master. You become his 'slave'. This is the superior status of the Ustaadh over his student. Every branch of Deeni education is related to the Qur'aan Majeed. Disrespect is a very prominent trait in almost all Salafis.

### CAN THE SHEIKH BE WRONG?

The Salafi coprocreep voicing another slander against the Ulama of Deoband, says: *"A Sheikh can never be wrong in his approach to Tazkiyah of his mureed's heart – a mureed must have the firmest belief that his Sheikh is right. And guess what? Darul Uloom has the same mentality as well? All Islamic institutions, esp. so-called Wahhabi-salafi institutions are unacademic and they themselves are upholding all the Islamic sciences as the Salaf upheld them."*

From whence did the coprocreep extract this falsehood. Who among our Akaabir said, and in which kitaab of the Akaabir of Deoband is this LIE stated? When it is our belief that even our illustrious Aimmah-e-Mujtahideen such as Imaam Abu Hanifah, Imaam Abu Yusuf, Imaam Muhammad, etc. also erred, how is it possible to believe that our Akaabireen held the view that a sheikh of Tasawwuf can never err?

When it is said 'Ulama of Deoband', the reference is to the illustrious Stars and Giants of all branches of Shar'i Uloom including Tasawwuf. These noble authorities of the Deen were Stars of Ilm such as Hadhrat Maulana Qasim Nanotwi (rahmatullah alayh), Hadhrat Maulana Rashid Ahmad Gangohi (rahmatullah alayh) and Hadhrat Maulana Ashraf Ali Thanvi

(rahmatullah alayh). The first was the Founder of Darul Uloom Deoband. Regarding the second, there is consensus of the Ulama of Deoband that He (Maulana Gangohi) was the greatest in this august Jamaat of Ulama. Hadhrat Thanvi (rahmatullah alayh) was acknowledged as a Mujaddid. He was a unique expert in all fields of Shar'i Uloom. Besides these three illustrious Ulama, there were numerous great Ulama-e-Haqq of Daarul Uloom Deoband, who had emblazoned the firmament of the Shariah.

The aforementioned three Akaabir Ulama and Mashaaikh of Deoband had commented regarding their noble Shaikh, Hadhrat Haaji Imdaadullah (rahmatullah alayh) that in matters of Hadith and Masaa-il, Hajee Sahib should refer to them. They had stated unambiguously that the objective of bay't with their Shaikh was to facilitate practice (*amal*) on the Ahaadith and Masaa-il of the Shariah which they had acquired. They did not enter into the bay't relationship in order to ascertain the status of the Ahaadith, etc., because that knowledge they had acquired in the Madrasah.

When Hadhrat Haji Sahib had written the treatise, *Haft-e-Mas'alah* which ostensibly condoned meelaad and other similar practices, Hadhrat Maulana Rashid Ahmad Gangohi (rahmatullah alayh) instructed his own mureed to burn out the book, and he commented that Haaji Sahib "should refer to us" in such masaa-il. It is therefore tantamount to slander for the Salafi coprocreep to contend that according to the Ulama of Deoband the sheikh is never wrong; that he may not be questioned, etc.

The following exposition of Hadhrat Maulana Masihullah (rahmatullah alayh) debunks the falsehood which the Salafi coprocreep has attributed to the Akaabir Ulama and Mashaaikh of Deoband:

"There are various reasons which induce a Mureed to search for a Shaikh other than the one who is his Shaikh. Among these reasons are:

(1) The Mureed discovers that his first Shaikh does not adhere to the Shariah. The Shaikh indulges in bid'ah or always commits kabeerah (major) sins.

(2) The mureed has no congeniality (munaasabat) with the first Shaikh notwithstanding the first Shaikh being a strict adherent of the Shariah and a follower of the Sunnah.

(3) The demise of the first Shaikh. In this event it will suffice if the Mureed turns to another Shaikh to perfect his islaah (reformation) without him even becoming his formal mureed. The mureed may, however, also complete his islaah by another Shaikh along with entering into Bay't with him (the Shaikh).

It is vital to remember that after having accepted another Shaikh, the Mureed should never be disrespectful to his former Shaikh, neither in word or deed nor in his absence or presence. This applies even if the former Shaikh happened to stray from the Shariah. Any such disrespect will prove calamitous for the Mureed. “

Undoubtedly, the Ulama of Deoband not only discourage, but warn their students against the danger of studying at Salafi educational institutions. This is a holy obligation which devolves on the Ulama. It is imperative to warn Muslims to be on their guard against the *fitnah* of the Salafis. The Ulama would be failing in their duty if they do not alert their students regarding the dangers of Salafi institutions.

Thus, the charge that the Akaabir of Deoband maintain that a Shaikh is 'always right', and does not err, is palpably false.

### THE DEGREE OF REVERENCE FOR THE SHAIKH

The Salafi coprocreep states: “*A mureed cannot even entertain the thought of another sheikh he has not bay'ah to be better than his own Sheikh.....What matters is that the reverence and respect is taken to such a high level that the Shariah or the truth*

*no longer matters, nor does it remain the primary focus of students.”*

This is another despicable lie disgorged by the coprocreep. The Mashaikh of Deoband do not teach their mureedeem what the coprocreep has claimed here. The objective of Bay't is *Islaah (Reformation)* of the nafs. The Shaikh thus does not indulge in the destructive exercise of comparing other Mashaikh with himself. He does not engage in such futile, in fact, destructive, exercises with his mureeds. A sheikh who involves his mureeds in the type of *ghutha* (rubbish) vomited up by the coprocreep is not a Shaikh of Tasawwuf. He is not a Murshid – a Spiritual Guide.

The coprocreep has placed his own stupid interpretation to a certain *ta'leem* which the Mashaikh proffer to their mureedeem, namely, that it is essential for the mureed to have implicit faith in his Shaikh and that he should believe that for his own *Islaah* there is no one in his knowledge who can benefit him more than the Shaikh whom he is adopting as his spiritual guide. This is a perfectly reasonable, rational principle which operates in even all mundane spheres. A person of understanding enlists the services of such a medical doctor in whom he has implicit faith, believing that he is 'the best' doctor to diagnose and prescribe for his sickness. If the patient believes that there is in the vicinity another better qualified/experienced doctor, it would be irrational for him to acquire the services of a practitioner whom he believes is of inferior expertise. The same applies when a person seeks legal advice from an attorney.

It is not an issue of 'best' relative to *Taqwa* or *Qurb-e-Ilaahi* (Divine Proximity). It is 'best' in terms of diagnosis and prescription. Should the mureed believe that there is another better qualified Shaikh for his spiritual maladies, it would be irrational for him to be satisfied with a Shaikh of lesser expertise. An ambivalent attitude towards one's Shaikh is indicative of *adm-e-munaasabat* (*non-existence of compatibility*). Compatibility is an essential condition for the

obtainment of *Islaahi* benefit from the Shaikh. But the density of the brains of the coprocreep has confused him. He appears not to have even a hazy idea of the meaning and objective of Tasawwuf.

While the purpose of this specific item of *Ta'leem* is designed for the spiritual benefit of the mureed, the Salafi coprocreep interprets it as being the effect of self-conceit. This is a principle termed in Tasawwuf as *Wahdatul Matlab (Unity of Purpose)*.

The episode and comments of the three Pillars of Deoband, namely, Hadhrat Maulana Rashid Ahmad Gangohi, Maulana Qasim Nanotwi and Hadhrat Maulana Ashraf Ali Thanvi (rahmatullah alayhim) mentioned above, adequately debunk the coprocreep's accusation and slander of venerating the Shaikh over and above the Shariah to the extent that the Shariah is expunged from the life of the mureed. Only a stupid Salafi coprocreep, due to his insolence and contempt for the Truth would venture such slanderous accusations against the sterling Ulama and Mashaaikh of Deoband whose lives were devoted to and sacrificed for reviving and establishing the Sunnah and for the dissemination of the Deen.

The miserable liar further states: *"If a sheikh does something questionable, the mureed cannot question the sheikh as he might be in the state of sukr, jazb, haaal, etc."*

On the contrary, intelligent mureeds usually do question their sheikh, but with humility, sincerity and respect regarding any doubtful practice which they may observe in the Shaikh or which he may have done. In this regard, Hadhrat Maulana Masihullah (rahmatullah alayh) writes in his *Shariat & Tasawwuf*: *"If in any doubt, immediately discuss it with the Murshid."* The Mureed is entitled to question and seek an explanation. But insolence which is the effect of coprocreep vanity and pride, is never permissible. If the Shaikh is a genuine Shaikh who was genuinely in some spiritual state (*haal*), then

on emergence from that state of ecstasy if he is informed that his utterance, etc. was in conflict with the Shariah, *never* will he justify it nor proffer an interpretation despite being aware that he had made the statement in a 'different world'. He understands that no amount of logical explanation will make sense to spiritually arid people. On the contrary, he will repent in order to impress on the mureeds strict observance of the *Zaahiri Shariah*.

On the other hand, if the statement he had uttered in a *haal* appears peculiar or inexplicable, but it does not conflict with the Shariah, the Shaikh will adopt silence. He will not respond since the issue is not related to the *Islaah* of the mureeds. When the Shaikh remains silent, the mureed should understand that there is a mystery which he (the mureed) would be unable to understand, hence the Shaikh selected silence.

Furthermore, Hadhrat Maulana Ashraf Ali Thanvi (rahmatullah alayh) has clarified that if the Shaikh acts in conflict with the Shariah, the mureed should with respect terminate his bay't. But even when terminating the allegiance and thereafter, the ex-mureed should never adopt the insolence of Salafi coprocreeps who are so self-conceited that they believe themselves superior to their Asaatizah, hence they have no qualms in issuing challenges to their Teachers.

The attitude of the Mashaaikh of Deoband is succinctly stated in the following statements of the illustrious Sufi Mashaaikh: *"Do not be deceived if you see a performer of supernatural feats flying in the air. Measure him on the Standard of the Shariah. That is, his observance of the limits of the Shariah (or his non-observance)."* ---Bayazid Bustami

*"All avenues besides the strict following of Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) are closed to mankind."* – Junaid Baghdaadi

*"Do not venture near to one who lays claim to a state which brings about transgression of the limits of the Shariah."* --- Hadhrat Noori

*“Obedience to Rasulallah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) is imperative. Such obedience is obligatory in word, deed and intention because love for Rasulallah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) is not possible without this obedience.”* -- Khwaja Naseeruddin Chirage

*“Whoever acquires the wealth of Wusul (Attainment of the Love of Allah Ta’ala) acquires it by virtue of following the Sunnah.”* --- Maulana Ashraf Ali Thanvi

Stating the nature of Tasawwuf, Hadhrat Maulana Masihullah (rahmatullah alayh) writes in his *Shariat & Tasawwuf*: “Now that the nature and reality of Tasawwuf have been clarified, it will be understood that:

- ? Kashf (inspiration and revelation) and karamaat (miracles) are not necessary.
- ? It does not promise success in the worldly affairs.
- ? It does not assert that one’s work and need will be achieved by means of ta’weez and potions; nor does it claim that one will be successful in court cases by means of duaa.
- ? It does not promise increase in one’s earnings nor does it promise one cure from physical ailments.
- ? It does not foretell future events.
- ? It does not contend that the disciple’s (mureed’s) reformation will be achieved by the spiritual focusing (tawajjuh) of the Shaikh. Extra-normal operation is not necessary to Tasawwuf.
- ? It does not contend that the one who treads this Path will not be afflicted by even the thought of sin nor does it claim that the mureed will automatically (without effort) engage in Ibaadat.
- ? It does not promise total self-annihilation so that one is not aware even of one’s presence.
- ? It does not promise the experiencing of states of ecstasy and spiritual effulgence in Thikr and Shaghl (spiritual exercise) nor does it claim that one will see beautiful dreams and wonderful visions.

All these are not the aims of Tasawwuf. The purpose is the Pleasure of Allah Ta’ala. This then, should be kept in sight.”

Salafis in general, and the cowardly coprocreep who shields himself in the veil of anonymity whilst displaying the ‘courage’ of a sapling, in particular, are spiritually barren, hence their inability to understand the spiritual states of the Auliya. Even Rasulallah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) during his initial stage of *Wilaayat* prior to *Zuhoor-e-Nubuwwat* (the public manifestation of Nubuwwat), experienced such states. The Hadith testifies to this fact. However, since Salafi coprocreeps expunge Tasawwuf from Islam, they miserably fail to understand the explicit Tasawwuf of the Qur’aan and Sunnah. Their gross ignorance of the meaning of Tasawwuf constrains them to believe that Tasawwuf is some queer, mystical, baatil concept which is in conflict with the Shariah. Nothing is further from the Truth.

The Qur’aan and Sunnah apply great emphasis on *Tazkiyah-e-Nafs* (self-reformation), and this is precisely the meaning of the Tasawwuf of the Mashaaikh of Deoband. Explaining the concept of Tasawwuf, Hadhrat Maulana Masihullah (rahmatullah alayh) states in his *Shariat & Tasawwuf*:

*“Tasawwuf in fact is the Rooh and state of perfection of the Deen. Its function is to purify the baatin (the spiritual heart) from the despicable bestial attributes of lust, calamities of the tongue, anger, malice, jealousy, love of the world, love for fame, niggardliness, greed, ostentation, vanity, deception, etc.. At the same time Tasawwuf aims to achieve the adornment of the heart with the lofty attributes of moral excellence such as repentance, perseverance, gratitude, Divine fear, hope, abstinence, Tauheed, trust, love, sincerity, truth, meditation, reckoning, etc. In this way man’s focus on Allah Ta’ala is cultivated.*

*All the authentic principles of Tasawwuf are to be found in the Qur’aan and Ahaadith. The notion that tasawwuf is not in the Qur’aan is erroneous. Miscreant sufis as well as spiritually barren Ulama (Ulama-e-Khushq) entertain this corrupt notion.*

*Both groups have misunderstood the Qur'aan and Ahaadith....In conformity with their (corrupt) opinions, one group (the barren Ulama) has shunned Tasawwuf (which is an integral component of Islam), while the other group (miscreant sufis) has shunned the Qur'aan and Ahaadith."*

This, then is the Tasawwuf which our Akaabir of Deoband taught, but which the coprocreep has miserably failed to understand.

The coprocreep further denigrating Tasawwuf and the Mashaaikh of Deoband mentions a story about a Buzrug who had advised three persons who were going on a journey to refrain from eating elephant's meat. We reproduce here verbatim what the Salafi coprocreep has written in this regard:

*"A group of three excellent mureeds came to their sheikh who was resting on his bed (I don't recollect his name). They were intending to go out to travel. They came to the Sheikh for some spiritual advice. The Sheikh said: "Nothing is in my mind at the moment. You may leave". But the Mureeds insisted for just one piece of advice. The Sheikh spontaneously said: "Do not eat the meat of elephants". The mureeds started wondering what type of Naseehah is this! But the Sheikh insisted that this is the only piece of advice in his head at the time (note: he could not say: Follow the Shariah in public and private, but he did say: Don't eat elephant meat). So the three Mureeds set out.*

*In the jungle, they encountered a massive storm and they lost their way. Ultimately their provisions started to run out. They were in a dire need. They were absolutely close to the brink of death. Eventually, they saw a baby elephant lying near a tree. Two of them said: "we have to slaughter and eat it or else we will die". The third said: "Don't contradict what our Sheikh said. The consequences will be deadly." The other two just couldn't hold themselves and they hunted down the baby elephant and consumed it, whereas the third stayed there, trying to prevent them. He was so tired, he lied down waiting for death by*

*starvation, and his eyes shut slowly, until he lost sense of what was around him. The other two ate to their fill, then slept where their fellow was on the brink of dying.*

*An hour or so later, the mother-elephant came and saw what happened to her child. She was distressed severely, She looked around and saw three humans lying down in the heat of the day. She went up to them and smelt their mouths. As for the first two, she killed them. As for the third, she somehow got him to sit on her back (after she found out he did not eat her child by smelling his mouth) and took him to some trees where there were fruits growing."*

This episode is not a fabrication as alleged by the coprocreep. It also does not belong to the very distant past. The Shaikh whose name the coprocreep says he cannot recollect, is Hadhrat Haaji Imdaadullah (rahmatullah alayh) who was the Shaikh of some of the greatest Ulama in the world at the time, viz. Hadhrat Maulana Qaasim Nanotwi, Hadhrat Maulana Rashid Ahmad Gangohi and Hadhrat Maulana Ashraf Ali Thaanvi (rahmatullah alayhim). This story has been narrated by *Thiqah* (reliable, righteous) Ulama. The reliability of the Ulama and Mashaaikh who have narrated this story is beyond reproach. They never were liars of the coprocreep's ilk. This coprocreep whilst being a Salafi operates like a rat, cunningly portraying himself as a 'Hanafi' to seduce ignorant Hanafi students and to trap them into the snares of Salafi'ism by way of his *Shiah oriented doctrine of Taqiyah*. *Taqiyah* is common to Salafis and Shiahs.

The coprocreep's claim that this naseehat 'encourages a person to forsake the Shariah' is baseless and is the effect of the coprocreep's ignorance and spiritual barrenness. Far from encouraging a person from forsaking the Shariah, it commands him to observe the Shariah. The persons concerned were not on the verge of death due to starvation. The fact that the one who had refrained from consuming the meat had not died, testifies to the fact that there was no Shar'i justification for the others in the group to have killed the baby elephant to consume its meat.

Furthermore, the *naseehat* emanating from an authentic Wali whose credibility and uprightness were upheld and vouched for by great Ulama of the time – Ulama of the Zaahiri Shariah – was not to be discarded or treated lightly. There was undoubtedly wisdom underlining it despite the Shaikh himself being unaware of it at the moment when he proffered it. *Kashf and Ilhaam* are realities which only Salafi coprocreeps deny. The very nature of this particular and peculiar *naseehat* should have conveyed to the group at the time, that there was no incumbent need for them to have killed the baby elephant since they had not reached such a dire state of starvation which occasioned such a move, especially when the contemplated move was in conflict with the *naseehat* of a wise and uprighteous Wali of Allah Ta'ala.

The errant group paid the penalty with their lives for committing two exceptionally grave errors: (1) They violated the Shariah by consuming haraam meat at a juncture when eating haraam was not justified. (2) They ignored the *naseehat* of a Wali of Allah Ta'ala – such a *naseehat* which was 100% in conformity with the Shariah.

Let us expand further on this issue. Assuming the Shaikh had said: “*Eat pork!*”, then too it would be improper to condemn the Shaikh and to dismiss his *naseehat* as a stupid ranting in conflict with the Shariah. The Shaikh who is a paragon of the Shariah – the Zaahiri Shariah – and an embodiment of the *Uswah* of Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) does not talk drivel and *ghutha* (*rubbish*) as do Salafi coprocreeps. His *naseehat* to ‘eat pork’ should not be dismissed lightly or with disdain. There is some wisdom beneath the surface which currently may be inexplicable, but which will soon become manifest and comprehensible.

Of course, pork is haraam and no one will give practical expression to the *naseehat* about pork. It will be set aside and a suitable interpretation proffered without condemning the Wali

who is a meticulous follower of the Sunnah. The mystery will be shelved. After some time the group becomes entangled in such circumstances, for example they were imprisoned in Guantanamo Bay or in one of America's torture chambers elsewhere in the world, and all food and water were denied to them. In consequence, they were reduced to dire straits of hunger which threatened them with death. Now to psychologically punish them further, the American captors knowing the Muslim aversion for pigs, presented pork to them. Some of the group who were on the point of death decided to eat the pork. One brother decided to rather die than eating pork. Then the others reminded him: “*Don't you remember that the Shaikh said: 'Eat pork'?*” Now we understand the meaning of the Shaikh's *naseehat*. It was meant for this occasion. Thus, the *naseehat* which was apparently in conflict with the Shariah was in fact 100% in conformity with the Shariah.

But spiritually barren Salafi coprocreeps do not understand because there is *rijs* (filth) in their brains. About such coprocreeps who condemn the Auliya of Allah Azza Wa Jal, it appears in a Hadith Qudsi:

“*Whoever hurts My Wali, verily, I issue to him an ultimatum of war.*”

The Qur'aan Majeed furthermore says about coprocreeps: “*And Ar-Rahmaan afflicts rijs on those who lack Aql.*” A salient feature of Salafi coprocreeps is the conspicuous lack of *Aql* (Intelligence) which is the consequence of spiritual aridity.

There is absolutely no ‘disaster’ in the story of the elephant. It is in entirety in conformity with the Shariah. And, assuming that it was in conflict with the Shariah, it would be set aside or assigned a suitable interpretation without giving practical expression to the ostensible meaning of the *naseehat*. The need for interpretation in such cases is because the statement emanates from a genuine Wali of Allah Ta'ala. He is not a coprocreep. He is not an impostor. He is not a fake as all these *juhhaal* Salafis are.

In a miserable, flabby attempt to show that the *naseehat* of Hadhrat Haaji Imdaadullah (rahmatullah alayh) is in conflict with what Imaam Nasafi states in Sharh Aqaaid, which kitaab is a mainstay of *Aqeedah* instruction at our Darul Uloom, the copro- creep says: “...and this is where the Sufi mentality of Deoband contradicts Nasafiyyah as well when Nasafi says in Sharh Aqaaid: ‘And a slave cannot reach to a level where orders and prohibitions are absolved from him’.”

The density of the coprocreep’s brains is conspicuously established by his stupid averment. There is no contradiction between the *naseehat* and what is mentioned in Sharh Aqaaid. Furthermore, the statement from Sharh Aqaaid quoted by the coprocreep provides proof for the belief of the Ulama and Mashaaikh of Deoband that they adhere to the Shariah, and that they refute the baatil concepts of the bid’ati Sufis. Earlier in this Refutation we have reproduced from *Shariat & Tasawwuf* the statements of our former Mashaaikh of Tasawwuf. Their statements clarify our adherence to the Zaahiri Shariah and the Zaahiri Sunnah.

We thus are compelled to dismiss the coprocreep’s ranting as plain garbage – *ghutha* and *rijs* with which his brains are contaminated and disfigured. In refutation of Salafi criticism of Tasawwuf, we have published another book, *Baseless Criticism of Tasawwuf*. This kitaab is available. Write for a copy.

## REFUTATION OF THE COPROCREEP’S BASELESS ‘INCONSISTENCY’ NO. 7 WHICH HE FALSELY ATTRIBUTES TO THE ULAMA OF DEOBAND

### BID’AH

Accusing the Ulama of Deoband of indulgence in Bid’ah or selective bid’ah, the coprocreep refers us to the kitaab, *Al-I’tisaam*, authored by Imaam Shaatibi (rahmatullah alayh). Then he enumerates some statements of Imaam Shaatibi on the issue of bid’ah. In this regard, the following should be noted:

In general, the Ulama of Deoband are in agreement with Imaam Shaatibi’s exposition of bid’ah. With the exception of the 8<sup>th</sup> point of Imaam Shaatibi, the Ulama of Deoband are in agreement with whatever the Imaam has written, and from whose kitaab the coprocreep Salafi has quoted. In the 8<sup>th</sup> point, the coprocreep, narrating Imaam Shaatibi, says:

“And an example for *Sadd al-Dharaa’i* ruling being applicable in the scenario of the bystander falling into Bid’ah *Haqeeqiyyah* is: doing the congregational Dua after Fard Salah, even though you have the belief that it is a general Sunnah which is correct, but other people would think that it is a specific Sunnah for after Salah, and this has no evidence, so your act would take up the same ruling of Bid’ah *Idaafiyyah* even though the definition of it did not apply to you.”

In this averment, Imaam Shaatibi (rahmatullah alayh) concedes that making Dua or even congregational Dua after Fardh Salaat is a “General Sunnah”. A ‘General Sunnah’ may not be treated lightly and simply discarded on the basis of hallucination. A mere idea that a ‘bystander’ will understand another meaning from a person practising a Sunnah, is not sufficient cause for branding that ‘General Sunnah’ to be bid’ah. If this attitude has to be adopted and elevated to the level

of an *Asl (Principle of the Shariah)*, then we are afraid, all Masnoon acts of the Shariah will have to be abandoned on the basis of such hallucination.

Another example which has been mentioned by the coprocreep is *Musaafahah* (hand-shaking) after Eid Salaat. While we are in agreement with Imaam Shaatibi that *Musaafahah* after Eid Salaat is bid'ah, and we do criticize this practice, we differ on the basis of the bid'ah ruling. While according to Imaam Shaatibi the bid'ah ruling is the effect of the idea (which could be hallucinatory) that observers would think that it is Fardh, we denigrate the practice and brand it as a bid'ah on the basis of the principle of the Shariah which states that to elevate a practice to a higher level than what the Shariah has assigned to it is bid'ah. For example, regarding a Mustahab or Sunnat act to be Waajib is bid'ah.

Thus, we say that *Musaafahah after Eid Salaat* is bid'ah because of the reality of elevation of the status of this Masnoon act. People regard it to be Waajib. They take offence and castigate those who refrain from hand-shaking after Eid Salaat.

But hand-shaking is unlike Dua after Salaat. Hand-shaking is Masnoon at times when meeting a person. It does not follow that *Musaafahah* will become bid'ah if a friend meets his friend in the market place even if one hallucinates that a bystander would believe that it is Fardh to make *Musaafahah* in the market-place. However, if it becomes a popular belief that hand-shaking in the market-place is Waajib, then undoubtedly, we shall say that now this practice is bid'ah. This is not based on hallucination. Circumstances will testify to the status which the people have elevated a practice. This will be the determinant for the declaration of bid'ah, not mere hallucination.

It has been conceded that Dua after Fardh Salaat is a Sunnah although it is wrongly described as a 'General Sunnah'. What does 'General Sunnah' in relation to a specific practice mean? Washing the limbs thrice, making masah of the whole head, etc.

in Wudhu are specific Masnoon acts. They cannot be classified 'General Sunnah' acts such as *Musaafahah* which is Masnoon for all occasions of meeting but not for after Fardh Salaat as is the case with Dua. Thus, like washing the limbs thrice is a specific Sunnat practice related to Wudhu, so too, is making Dua after Fardh Salaat a specific Sunnat act for this occasion. Hence, just as washing the limbs thrice and making masah of the whole head may not be discarded on the basis of hallucination or the idea that bystanders would think that these practices are Fardh, similarly, Dua after Salaat may not be discarded on the basis of hallucination.

However, if the specific Masnoon act of the *Istihbaab* class is elevated to Waajib or Fardh, then it would be declared bid'ah until such time that the masses have corrected their belief by virtue of the *Ta'leem* of the Ulama. If the Sunnat act of Dua is believed to be Waajib/Fardh, then undoubtedly, it will enter into the domain of bid'ah. There is no argument in this. Wherever this bid'ah exists, abstention will be necessary.

The coprocreep suffering from the malady of pride (*takabbur*) and self-conceit (*ujub*) is particularly in opposition to Dua after Salaat because he feels that in his student-days he was 'humiliated' by an Ustaadh in front of the class because he did not make Dua after Asr Salaat when he had led the Salaat. Recounting the incident and betraying his *takabbur* and *ujub*, the coprocreep avers: "As you can see, the opinion was being forced upon me by way of humiliating me in front of the class." The coprocreep has let the cat out of the bag by this statement. His self-conceit is truly bloated to feel humiliated by a reprimand of his Deeni Ustaadh. He is following in the footsteps of shaitaan who felt humiliated by the command of Allah Ta'ala to make Sajdah to Aadam (alayhis salaam). A student pursuing Deeni studies who is affronted by an Ustaadh's rebuke is an embodiment of Iblees in the attribute of *takabbur*.

Further, the rebuke or attitude of the Ustaadh is not the *Minhaaj* of the Ulama of Deoband. That was the personal

reaction of an Ustaadh who felt that the coprocreep was getting too big for his boots, hence he needed his wings to be clipped.

Regarding Dua after Fardh Salaat, it is our intention to write a special treatise on this subject, Insha-Allah. The Salafi arguments will, Insha'Allah, be neutralized and the standpoint of the Ahlus Sunnah will be affirmed in our book.

The second issue is that the coprocreep cites Imaam Shaatibi and presents his view as the final word of the Shariah whereas Salafis have no entitlement to attempt imposing the taqleed of any Faqeeh on us or on anyone because they are the worst scoundrels in the 'science' of *adm taqleed*. Their deceptive and hollow slogan is '*Qur'aan and Sunnah*'. The coprocreep should now adhere to the Qur'aan and Sunnah for substantiation of his copro-claims. He should not seek refuge in the kitaab of Imaam Shaatibi. He should not seek refuge in the views expressed by the Maaliki Faqeeh.

Salafis are the enemies of the Aimmah-e-Mujtahideen. It therefore does not behove the coprocreep to dig out the views of Imaam Shaatibi (rahmatullah alayh) to substantiate his (the coprocreep's) baatil.

Furthermore, we are not the muqallideen of Imaam Shaatibi. There is therefore no common basis for a debate between the coprocreep and us. There is no imperative need for us to even entertain Imaam Shaatibi's views and expositions on any topic. The Ulama of Deoband are the Muqallideen of Imaam Abu Hanifah (rahmatullah alayh), and in Aqeedah too we follow Imaam Abu Hanifah (rahmatullah alayh) via the channel of Imaam Maturidi (rahmatullah alayh). Hence, in this discussion the kitaab of Imaam Shaatibi is a non-issue. Whatever the coprocreep has cited from Imaam Shaatibi's kitaab is old hat for the Ulama of Deoband. They are fully cognizant in the principles governing the issue of bid'ah.

The Ulama of Deoband, i.e. our Akaabireen, have always consistently and steadfastly opposed all forms of bid'ah. The

claims of the coprocreep to the contrary are *baatil* and specimens of blatant falsehood.

### TASAWWUF AND THE HANAABILAH

Presenting another stupidity, the Salafi coprocreep who to this day masquerades deceptively as a Hanafi in England, says: "*So if one comes to the issue of the Prophet's birthday, they refute the Barelwis on their position, but then they can't refute the Hanbalis on the same charges regarding certain aspects of Sufism, which in fact have the same purposes as Mawlid – love for the Prophet, love for Allah, love for the Shariah.*"

Due to the exceptionally poor grammatical construction, the meaning of this statement remains a conundrum. We suggest that the coprocreep requests someone better versed in English to check his writings before he releases his *ghutha* to the public. We venture to infer that here the coprocreep means that the 'Hanbalis' criticize the Tasawwuf of the Ulama of Deoband on the very same grounds that the latter criticizes the bid'ah practices of the Ahl-e-Barelwi. If our inference is correct, we firstly say that the Hambali Ulama do not criticize the Tasawwuf of the Ulama of Deoband.

The Salafis parading as 'Hanbalis' are the guilty culprits. They are the spiritually barren ones who criticize the Tasawwuf of the Ulama of Deoband without even understanding what exactly this Tasawwuf is. In fact, they are criticizing an imperative department of Islam, viz., Tazkiyah Nafs which is Waajib. The Qur'aan and Sunnah are replete with teachings and commands pertaining to this branch of Islamic Knowledge. Salafis are generally deceits. They are like chameleons. They oscillate between the Hanafi and Hambali Math-habs. They are keen to ensure that both sides of their bread is buttered, hence they speak so much conflicting *ghutha*.

It devolves on the coprocreep to point out exactly which acts of Deobandi Tasawwuf they liken to the acts of the Barelwis. He

should cite specific examples to illustrate the alleged inconsistency of our Akaabireen on this issue.

### THE SIFAAT – A STUPID ARGUMENT

Pursuing the aforementioned stupid argument, the coprocreep says: *“It’s like Mu’tazilites refuting the Maturidis in the eight Sifaat the Maturidis affirmed by saying: “Our Aql also instructs us to negate these eight Sifaat too, as they too would lead to Tashbeeh, because the attribute of hearing would mean Allah has ears, and ears is a body part and body parts are creation.....” and so on and so forth – Maturidis just wouldn’t be able to reply to this philosophy used by the Mu’tazilah. This is mentioned by Sheikh MS Ibn al-Uthaymeen.”*

Much *Aql* is not a requisite for responding and refuting this copro-philosophy of the stupid Mu’tazilis with their beliefs of kufr. On account of their kufr, Allah Ta’ala has afflicted their brains and the brains of these Salafi coprocreeps with *RIJS (FILTH)*, hence in their estimate this stupid ‘philosophy’ so simple for refutation, appears an insurmountable obstacle to them and in their imagination a chasm which the Maturidis cannot traverse. Thus, for these Mu’tazili and Salafi coprocreeps, the Qur’aan Majeed states: *“And He afflicts with Rijs those who have no Aql.”*

The simple refutation for this stupid copro-philosophy is: What is the proof that physical ears and a physical body are incumbent for hearing? What is the logical proof for contending that without ears hearing is a rational impossibility? The most that could be said in this regard is that physical ears and physical bodies are necessary for human beings and animals for the function of hearing. If ears are necessary for human beings for the operation of the function of hearing, what rational proof is there for a claim that there do not exist any beings in Allah’s entire creation who hear without ears? What is the absolute proof for contending that the Malaaiakah who do hear also have

ears like human beings? Also, what rational proof is there to refute the possibility of hearing without ears? There may be creatures who hear without ears. There may be inanimate objects who hear without ears and see without eyes and eat without mouths, etc., etc.

If ears are indispensable for hearing, then what causes the ear itself to hear? Does an ear have another ear causing it to listen? The absurdity is self-evident. The same logic applies to the tongue and eyes. In fact, the Qur’aan Majeed affirms hearing and speaking of physical objects without ears and tongues. Thus, the Qur’aan states: *“This Day (of Qiyaamah) shall we put seals on their mouths and their hands will speak, and their feet will testify about the deeds they had perpetrated.” (Yaaseen, Aayat 65)*

*“Until when they (the kuffaar) will arrive by it (the Fire), their ears, their eyes and their skins will testify (against them) regarding the deeds they had committed. They (the kuffaar) will say to their (own) skins: ‘Why do you testify against us?’ They (their skins, ears and eyes) will say: “Allah Who has bestowed speech to everything, has made us speak, and it is He Who has created you the first time and unto Him shall you be returned. You did not conceal (your evil deeds never thinking) that your ears, eyes and skins would testify against you.” (Haameem As-Sajdah, Aayats 20, 21,22)*

Hadhrrat Abu Hurairah (radhiyallahu anhu) narrated that on the Day of Qiyaamah a Munaafiq will say: ‘O my Rabb! I believed in You, Your Kitaab and Your Nabi. I performed Salaat, fasted and spent in Sadqah..... Allah Ta’ala will then say: ‘We shall soon know when the witnesses testify.’ The Munaafiq will be puzzled. He will wonder who the witnesses are. His lips will then be sealed. His thighs, flesh and bones will speak and testify to the deeds he had committed...’ (Muslim)

All these limbs are today seeing, hearing and remembering the deeds and misdeeds man commits. To testify presupposes hearing, seeing and speaking. Yet all these limbs of man have no ears, no eyes and no tongues. But they will perform the functions

of hearing, seeing and speaking. There are numerous Ahaadith which narrate the Mu'jizaat (Miracles) of Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) and the other Ambiya. Stones, trees, etc. spoke to Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) and heard his statements.

Did the pebbles have ears? When the Mimbar was first introduced in Musjid Nabawi and Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) stopped leaning against the tree, it (the tree) sadly cried. Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) spoke to it and comforted it. Did the tree have ears to hear our Nabi's comforting words which caused the tree trunk to cease crying? Did the Mimbar have eyes through which its tears flowed? How stupid were the Mu'tazilis! And how stupid are the Salafis! They all are cocrocreeps hence they could not see the Qur'aanic refutation of their copro-philosophy nor did the Mu'tazilis possess sufficient brains to understand the simple issue that man listens with ears and sees with eyes and speaks with a tongue because that is the way Allah Azza Wa Jal created him. Entire creation may not be analogized on the basis of man.

It is irrational to understand or believe that just because these organs are necessary for man, therefore they must also be necessary for everything existing in Allah's creation. But the calcified sensorium of Mu'tazili and Salafi coprocreeps is incapable of understanding simple realities.

The Qur'aan Majeed itself affirms these *Sifaat (Attributes)* for Allah Azza Wa Jal. This by itself is adequate proof that a physical body is not a requisite for hearing, seeing and speaking. The existence of these *Sifaat* in no way whatsoever leads to the conclusion that Allah Ta'ala requires a physical body – Nauthubillaah! The charge of *Tashbeeh* is therefore utterly misplaced and baseless. No *Tashbeeh* conclusion develops from any of the beliefs expounded by Hadhrat Maturidi (rahmatullah alayh). Coprocreep, jaahil Salafis masquerading as 'Hanbalis' hallucinated that '*Tashbeeh*' is the conclusion of the denial of

*Makaan (created physical space and place)* for Allah Azza Wa Jal. On the contrary, *Tashbeeh* is the effect of their *Istiwa alal Arsh belief*.

While the affirmation of the *Sifaat* for Allah Ta'ala does not produce any *Tashbeeh* conclusion, the Salafi belief of assigning Allah Ta'ala into a physical domain, namely, the Arsh which is a physical object, produces the conclusion of *Tashbeeh*. The logical conclusion of this Salafi belief is the affirmation of anthropomorphism for Allah Azza Wa Jal – Nauthubillaah!

### DUA AFTER JANAAZAH SALAAT

In his attempt to fabricate and fraud an inconsistency in the *Minhaaj* of the Ulama-e-Deoband, the Salafi coprocreep with extreme flabbiness presents a nonsensical argument in the form of an alleged discussion between a Deobandi and a Barelwi on the bid'ah practice of Dua after Janaazah Salaat.

We reproduce the alleged atrocious discussion which is both stupid and false.

Barelwi: Congregational Dua after Janaazah Salah is Sunnah just like Fard prayer.

Deo: No it isn't. Here is a fatwa of M. Rashid Ahmed Gangohi who says Dua after Janaazah is Bid'ah.

Barelwi: You are giving me a scholar's opinion!? I give you the Quran!: "When you finish, make effort, and turn to your Lord (i.e. do Dua)." Now what do you have to say?

Deo: I have come to debate you, not to listen to your lecture.

Barelwi: Take this too! "When My slaves ask you about me, then [tell them that] I am Close [to them, I accept the Dua of the Dua-maker when he makes Dua to me]." This verse is general and unrestricted (Aam and Mutlaq). Now what do you have to say!?

Deo: (he could have remained silent, but he started talking some jibberish)

Barelwi: Janaazah is Fard (Hanafis say it is Fard Kifaayah, but it is Fard at the end of the day), and there should be no difference between the five Fard and Janaazah - they should be the same. Deo. (he could accepted he was wrong, but he had to defend Deoband, so he continued to flap his wings but to no avail - no principle, no manhaj)

A true Aalim of Deoband will not acquit himself so stupidly as the coprocreep has portrayed in the abovementioned 'discussion'. A Deobandi Aalim will not present Hadhrat Maulana Rashid Ahmad Gangohi (rahmatullah alayh) as a *daleel* in a debate with a Barelwi Bid'ati because Barelwis brand this great Aalim and all the Ulama of Deoband as kaafir. Only a moron of the Salafi coprocreep's calibre will stupidly present as *daleel* someone whom the opposition believes to be a kaafir.

The whole silly discussion is the product fabricated by dense, fossilized salafi brains. An Aalim of Deoband will simply say that Dua after Janaazah Salaat is bid'ah because Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) and the Sahaabah, the Taabieen and the Tab-e-Taabieen and all the Fuqaha of Islam down to the present age NEVER made dua at this juncture. Janaazah Salaat was taught and performed by the Sahaabah. But they did not have dua after the Salaat as part of this act of Ibaadat. On the contrary, Dua after the daily Salaat is part of the practice of the Sahaabah.

The Dua after Salaat is not the effect of logical deduction from a *Mutlaq* Hadith. It is part of the direct *ta'leem* of the Sahaabah. Only Salafi morons such as the coprocreep confuse the two duas and flabbily attempt to negate the Dua after Salaat in the way the Ulama negate Dua after Janaazah Salaat. The consistency of the Ulama of Deoband is thus sustained.

Salafis are the ones who argue in an unprincipled manner, hence their inconsistencies in their stupid *minhaaj*. They have no straight, consistent *Minhaaj*. They jump from pillar to post

like monkeys since they lack in true Knowledge of the Deen. Their academic deficiency is aggravated by their lack of Islamic morality (Akhlaaq). The Deobandi position pertaining to Dua after the daily Salaat is established and vindicated by the Ahaadith and the practice of the Sahaabah. Insha'Allah, this question will be dealt with in a separate treatise.

## MOULOOD

The coprocreep salafi states: "*My Deobandi brothers, your refutations on Mawlid in principle are largely futile due to the apparent double-standards and bias you have in favour of the practices prevalent in your mosques like congregational Dua, Sufism through the same orders the Barelwis have and the countless other practices you possess that must equally be refuted as Mawlid and other Barelwi Aqaaid are refuted by you.*"

The 'double standards and bias' alleged here are the effects of the hallucination of the coprocreep. There is a world of difference between the Mouloud practices of the Barelwis and the Dua after Salaat which the Ahlus Sunnah of whom the Ulama of Deoband are integral constituents, practise and teach. While the former has neither origin nor sanction in the Sunnah and Shariah, being pure fabrications and innovations consisting of evil elements, the Dua after Salaat has Shar'i substantiation. This is not the juncture for presenting arguments to prove these claims. On the issue of Mouloud we have written separate booklets. On Dua, as mentioned earlier, a treatise shall be prepared, Insha-Allah. For the purpose of the current discussion what we have mentioned here suffices. The one is pure haraam fabrication while the other is pure Sunnah and upheld by the Shariah.

## PRACTICES OF TASAWWUF

Such practices of Tasawwuf which are not part of the Sunnah

are never presented by the Mashaaikh of Deoband as teachings of the Sunnah or of the Shariah. Such acts are not practised as acts of ibaadat. They are in the category of *remedies (ilaaq)* in the same way as are medical remedies and medication. Just as physical remedies and medicines which did not exist during the age of the Sahaabah are permissible, so too are spiritual remedies valid and permissible. The argument against such spiritual remedies would be valid only if these are accorded Sunnah status.

The practices, ways, mannerisms and beliefs of deviate Sufis may not be shoved into the camp of the Ulama of Deoband in the same way as the fisq and fujoor and even kufr practices of the Salafi Saudi ruling family may not be claimed to be part of the Salafi *Minhaaj* of Ibn Taimiyyah for example. The Saudi ruling elite is by aqeedah the followers of Muhammad Ibn Abdul Wahhaab. They cite the very same Ulama as their authorities whom the coprocreep Salafis present as their Mujtahid Imaams whom they blindly follow.

All movements decline, degenerate and decompose. The beliefs and practices of the *ghutha* at the end of the tether should not be cited as the *Minhaaj* or *Tareeqah* of the authorities of the Movement or Math-hab.

We do concede that in this era pseudo-Deobandis have introduced bid'ah and have veered sharply from the *Minhaaj* of the Ulama and Mashaaikh of Deoband. In view of their deviation they cease to be Deobandis. They have made their exit from the fold of Deoband via the avenue of their bid'ah and dhalaal. But when we speak of the Ulama of Deoband, the reference is restricted to the Akaabir Ulama, not to any mediocre and deviant person who happened to study at a Darul Uloom affiliate of Deoband. This very coprocreep Salafi had also studied at such a Madrasah. But his misguided sojourn at a Deoband Madrasah does not confer to him the Mantle of the Ulama of Deoband. Similarly, if any fellow who had studied at a Deobandi

Madrasah degenerates into bid'ah and dhalaalah, then it will be only a moron/coprocreep who will hold the Ulama of Deoband responsible for such bid'ah and dhalaalah.

In fact we (Mujlisul Ulama of S.A.) have also published a bulky volume titled, *THIKRULLAH IN THE MIRROR OF THE SUNNAH*, in which we refuted the bid'ah forms of thikr innovated by so-called Deobandis. Hadhrat Maulana Ashraf Ali Thaanvi (rahmatullah alayh) had also said that bid'ah is not confined to urs and moulood. There are acts of bid'ah which so-called Deobandis have innovated. But, only morons of the coprocreep's calibre will unjustly attribute such deviations to the Akaabir Ulama of Deoband.

The *Athkaar* and *Ashghaal* practices of the Mashaaikh have come down from centuries before the establishment of Darul Uloom Deoband, and as long as these practices are executed within the limits of the Shariah, and in privacy, it is baseless to brand them bid'ah. Any person has the right to recite, for example, *La ilaha il lallaah* 10,000 times, and perform 100 raka'ts Nafil Salaat every day, and recite the Qur'aan Shareef at fixed times at his convenience. Despite this programme not being Sunnah, it is perfectly valid. However, if this programme is imposed as a Sunnah act of ibaadat on the community, then undoubtedly, it will be branded bid'ah. If someone sits on a chair to recite the Qur'aan Shareef, it may not be branded bid'ah. But, if this form is elevated to the status of Sunnah, then it would be bid'ah.

### SLANDERING THE ULAMA AND THE AULIYA

The coprocreep's contention that the Ulama of Deoband join the miscreant, bid'ati, mushrik so-called 'Shaazalis' of this era in their haraam so-called 'sufi' dances, is a vile slander against the Deobandi Auliya. Warning slanderers of the coprocreep's type, Allah Ta'ala says in a Hadith-e-Qudsi: "*Whoever distresses My Wali, I give him notice of war.*" This coprocreep appears to be

shaitaan incarnate, hence he is so audacious with his slander against the noble Ulama and Auliya of Deoband. Let him name any of the Akaabireen of Deoband who had participated in the shaitaani dances of the so-called Shaazli 'sufis'. This slander is dismissed with the contempt it deserves.

If it was reasonable to attribute the bid'ah and deviation of every character who studied at a Deobandi Madrasah to the Akaabir Ulama and Mashaaikh of Deoband, then the logical conclusion would be the 'correctness' of attributing every crime and evil of every Muslim to our Nabi (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) and the Sahaabah (radhiyallahu anhum), and it would be logical to attribute the fisq and fujoor of the Saudi ruling clique to Ibn Taimiyyah and Muhammad ibn Abdul Wahhaab. The Salafi coprocreep dwells in self-deception, jahaalat and falsehood on which he structures his vilification of the Ulama and Auliya of Deoband.

### NABI ISAA'S QABAR

Accusing the Ulama of Deoband of condoning Bid'ah, the jaahil Salafi coprocreep alleges: *"Your failure in taking Bid'ah seriously has led you to believe that Jesus will be buried alongside our Prophet – ....All you have is a severely weak Israelite narration from Sunan Tirmidhi in this regard...."*

Firstly, we should again draw attention to the crude manners of the coprocreep. Since Salafis are bereft of morality (Akhlaaq-e-Hameedah) and since they are downright disrespectful and vulgar in conduct, his arrogance displays all the the vulgar audacity of Taimiyyites, hence he refers to Hadhrat Sayyiduna Nabi Isaa (alayhis salaam) with the Christian designation, 'Jesus'. He lacks in entirety in Islamic decency. Therefore, his copro-filled brains and heart deter him from saying Nabi Isaa (alayhis salaam), for perhaps so saying is also bid'ah and baatil in the devious 'minhaaj' of the Salafi math-hab. Similarly, he cannot say Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) or

Muhammad (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) or Nabi (alayhis salaam). Rather he opts for the dubious Christian title, 'prophet', without the salutation when referring to Nabi-e-Kareem (sallallahu alayhi wasallam). This vulgarity is a window into the moral aridity of Salafi hearts.

Secondly, the Hadith on this issue is valid and authentic even if it should be assumed momentarily that only Tirmizi has recorded it in his Sunan. The belief that Hadhrat Nabi Isaa (alayhis salaam) will be buried alongside Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) has not been originated by the Ulama of Deoband. It is a belief as old as Islam. There is *Tawaatur* transmission of this belief. The coprocreep should not act pontifically regarding the classification of Hadith because we are not the Muqallideen of the Muhadditheen. Furthermore, Salafis are averse to Taqleed. They should therefore not attempt to hoist the taqleed of the Muhadditheen on us. They must adhere to their corrupt slogan of 'Qur'aan and Sunnah'. Whilst they raise this slogan, they are deceptive. They act like the Shiahs, slinking deceptively behind the façade of their corrupt belief of *taqiyyah*.

We do not accept the coprocreep's citation of Hadith classification which he has no alternative other than to ascribe to the Muhadditheen. It is not for Salafi coprocreeps to crawl to the Taqleed of the Muhadditheen for support. If they begrudge our Taqleed of Shar'i Personnel who were the Students of the Sahaabah and their Students, they (coprocreeps) should not stupidly seek to impose on us the taqleed of Hadith classification which developed a couple of centuries after the age of the Sahaabah. Since Salafis vociferously proclaim the slogan of 'Qur'aan and Sunnah', the coprocreep should not traverse beyond these confines in any argument.

For example, he has no right and no justification for citing the Maaliki Faqeeh, Imaam Shaatibi (rahmatullah alayh) in substantiation of any of his (i.e. the coprocreep's) baatil ideas. Neither are Salafis the muqallids of Imaam Shaatibi (rahmatullah alayh) nor are we. Furthermore, the coprocreep may not cite to

us even Imaam Abu Hanifah (rahmatullah alayh) since Salafis are averse to him. In fact they abhor Imaam A'zam (rahmatullah alayh) while under cover of their rotten doctrine of *taqiyyah*, they pretend to 'honour' him in the presence of Hanafis. They should confine all their arguments on the basis of 'Qur'aan and Sunnah'. But of these sources they know extremely little. They have invariably to resort to Ibn Taimiyyah and Albaani.

As far as the burial of Nabi Isaa (alayhis salaam) is concerned, the following appears in Mirkaat Sharh Mishkaat of Mullah Ali Qaari:

*"Abdullah Ibn Salaam (radhiyallahu anhu) narrated that it is written in the Tauraah: 'Isa, the son of Maryam (alayhimas salaam) will be buried together with him (Muhammad – sallallahu alayhi wasallam).' Abu Maudood said: "Verily there remains in the Bait (of Aishah – radhiyallahu anha) the space of a qabr. Narrated by Tirmizi*

*Teebi said that this is recorded in the Tauraah...Isaa, the Son of Maryam, will be buried with him (Muhammad – sallallahu alayhi wasallam)."*

*Abu Maudood is one of the narrators of the Hadith. He is a Madani. Teebi has narrated this. The Author says: 'He is Abdul Azeez Bin Sulaiman Al-Madani. He saw Abu Saeed Khudri (radhiyallahu anhu) – a very senior Sahaabi, and he heard from Saaib Bin Yazeed and Uthmaan Bin Dhuhhaak. He was kaamil (perfect) and they have authenticated him.*

*In the Bait of Aishah (radhiyallahu anha) there is a place for a qabr. Verily, Shaikh Al-Jazri said: 'Similarly, many who have entered the Hujrah (the Room of Hadhrat Aishah –radhiyallahu anha) and saw the three Graves according to the description (which describes the three Graves and, one grave for Nabi Isaa-alayhis salaam)...the one Grave (for Nabi Isaa- alayhis salaam) is to the side of the Grave of Umar (radhiyallahu anhu). Verily it has been narrated that Isaa (alayhis salaam) after his sojourn on earth, will perform Hajj and return. Then he will die between*

*Makkah and Madinah. He will be carried to Madinah and buried in the Hujrah Shareef on the side of Umar (radhiyallahu anhu). Thus these two noble Companions will be between these two great Nabis (alayhimas salaatu was salaam wa radhiyallahu anhuma)." Mirkaat, Vol.11*

*"Abdullah Ibn Umar (radhiyallahu anhu) narrated that Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) said: 'Isaa Ibn Maryam (alayhis salaam) will descend to earth. He will marry, beget children and stay 45 years. Then he will die and be buried with me in my Qabr. Thus, I and Isaa Ibn Maryam will rise together from one Qabr between Abu Bakr and Umar.' Abu Dawood said that there remains the place of a Qabr in the Bait.... Narrated by Ibnul Jauzi in Kitaabul Wafa'" (Mirkaat, Vol.10)*

The following appears in Tafseer Ibn Katheer, Vol.1, page 575:

*"Al-Haafiz Abul Qaasim Ibn Asaakir narrated from some of the Salaf that Isaa Ibn Maryam (alayhimas salaam) will be buried with Nabi (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) in his Hujrah."*

In *Ad-Durrul Manthoor*, Vol.2, page 743, the following appears regarding the Qabr of Nabi Isa (alayhis salaam): *"Tirmizi has recorded – and he has classified the narration Hasan – from Muhammad Bin Yusuf Bin Abdillaah Bin Salaam from his father who narrates (in turn) from his grandfather who said: 'It is written in the Tauraah regarding Muhammad (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) that Isa will be buried with him.'*

*In his Taareekh, Imaam Bukhaari, and Tibraani from Abdullah Bin Salaam (radhiyallahu anhu) said: 'Isaa Ibn Maryam will be buried with Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) and his two Companions. Thus his (Isaa's) grave will be the fourth."*

In *Majmauz Zawaahid*, Vol.8, page 206, the following is mentioned:

“Abdullah Ibn Salaam (radhiyallahu anhu) said: ‘Isaa Ibn Maryam will be buried with Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) and his two Companions (Abu Bakr and Umar – radhiyallahu anhuma). Thus his (Isaa’s) Qabr will be the fourth one.’ Narrated by Tibraani.”

The following appears in *Umdatul Qaari*, Vol.8 page 255:

“Al-Haafiz Abu Abdullaah Bin Muhammad Bin Mahmood Bin An-Najjaar mentions in his kitaab, *Ad-Durratuth Thameenah fi Akhbaaril Madinah*, that the Qabr of Nabi (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) and the qabr of his two Companions are in the Bait of Aishah (radhiyallanu anha), and he said: ‘In the Bait (room) there is a place for a Qabr.’ Saeed Bin Al-Musayyab said: ‘In it will be buried Isaa Ibn Maryam (alayhis salaatu was-salaam).’ And, it has been narrated from Abdullah Ibn Salaam (radhiyallahu anhu) that Isaa Ibn Maryam (alayhimas salaam) will be buried with Nabi (sallallahu alayhi wasallam). Thus, his Qabr will be the fourth one.”

The following appears in *Kanzul Ummaal*, Vol.14 page 262:

“Aishah (radhiyallahu anha) narrated that she said: ‘O Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) I see myself living after you. Therefore grant for me permission to be buried at your side.’ Then he said: ‘How can there be for you a place (of burial at my side)? There is no place (there) except for my Qabr, the Qabr of Abu Bakr, Umar and Isaa Ibn Maryam.’”

In *Tareekh Madeenati Dimashq*, Vol. 47, page 523, the very same Hadith narrated by Hadhrat Aishah (radhiyallahu anha) above, is recorded. The *Sanad of the Hadith is as follows: Abul Hasan Salmi > Abu Muhammad At-Tameemi > Tamaam Bin Muhammad Al-Bajli > Aqeel Bin Ubaidillah Al-Azdi > Muhammad Bin Abdillah Bin Ja’far Ar-Raazi > Abu Umayyah Al-Ahwas Bin Al-Mufaddhal > Abil Mufaddhal Bin Ghassaan >*

*Muhammad Bin Abdillah Bin Abdil Azeez Al-Umri > Saalih Bin Shuayb Bin Talhah Bin Abdullah Bin Abdir Rahmaan Bin Abi Bakr from Aishah (radhiyallahu anha), that she said: ‘I said: Ya Rasulallah! Verily I see myself living after you. Therefore, permit that I be buried alongside you... (the same narration as above).’”*

From the aforementioned Ahaadith as well as similar narrations in other kutub, the following facts stand out clearly:

- (1) The Ulama of Deoband did not innovate the belief that Nabi Isaa (alayhis salaam) will be buried alongside Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) and that the space of a Qabr has been left for him. It is a belief that is as old as Islam.
- (2) The Hadith stating this fact is not “a severely weak Israelite narration from Sunan Tirmidhi” as the jaahil Salafi coprocreep contends. This preposterous claim portrays his stark ignorance in the field of Hadith.
- (3) Tirmizi has classified the Hadith “*Hasan*”.
- (4) The many other corroborating narrations in this regard, fortify Tirmizi’s narration even further.
- (5) The coprocreep’s attempt to discredit the Hadith and brand it a “severely weak Israelite narration” simply because one of its narrators happens to be Hadhrat Abdullah Ibn Salaam (radhiyallahu anhu) is scandalous and extremely vile. Hadhrat Abdullah Ibn Salaam was a senior Sahaabi. He was among the Ulama of Bani Israaeel and a descendant of Nabi Yusuf (alayhis salaam). Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) testified that he is a Jannati. His narration may not be dismissed merely because he was from the Bani Israaeel. He was a noble, uprighteous Aalim of Bani Israaeel, hence he embraced Islam and became a Sahaabi. He was an expert of the Tauraah, hence his unequivocal statement that according to the Tauraah, Nabi Isaa (alayhis salaam) will be buried next to Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam), has been accepted by all authorities of Islam. In

addition, the other Ahaadith on this subject are not narrations from the Tauraah nor have they been made by any Israa'ili nor are they attributed to Israa'ili Riwaayaat.

(6) None of the authorities who narrated this Hadith had refuted the fact of Nabi Isaa's burial alongside Rasulallah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam).

It should now be clear that the belief of the burial of Hadhrat Isaa (alayhis salaam) alongside Rasulallah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) was not innovated by the Ulama of Deoband. It has existed in the Ummah from the age of the Sahaabah. The coprocreep's attempt to assail this fact by seeking refuge in falsehood and ignorance only exposes his chicanery and deceit.

## DEOBAND

Talking more drivel, the moron coprocreep says: *"My Deobandi friends are now suggesting that Deoband is a wide range of ideas and opinions that are not down to one particular scholar, but it represents a whole range of scholars from different backgrounds."*

The creed of the Ulama of Deoband has been superbly and adequately defined in *Al-Muhannad* by Allaamah Khalil Ahmad Saharanpuri (rahmatullah alayh). It is the creed of the Ahlus Sunnah Wal Jama'ah - the Creed of the Sahaabah (radhiyallahu anhum). And, the Ulama of Makkah, Madinah, Damascus and Cairo, all upheld the veracity of this Creed. There is absolutely nothing new in the Creed of the Ulama of Deoband. It is the Creed to which the Four Math-habs of Islam subscribe. Any departure from the Creed defined in *Al-Muhannad* is baatil and has no relationship with the Ulama of Deoband. Deoband represents only one *Aqeedah* - the *Aqeedah* of the Ahlus Sunnah Wal Jama'ah. The *Minhaaj* of the Ulama of Deoband is not a hybrid system consisting of coprocreep methodology and beliefs. Deoband is the Bastion of the Sunnah along the Way of Imaam Abu Hanifah (rahmatullah alayh).

In an attempt to bolster the corrupt practices of the errant Salafis whom the coprocreep erroneously and falsely describe as 'Hanaabilah', he says: *"Coming back to the theme of your Tasaahul in not identifying the danger of Bid'ah - the worst sin after Kufr and Shirk - you continuously make fun out of the contemporary Hanaabilah by accusing them of going around saying: 'Bid'ah', 'Bid'ah', 'Bid'ah' when this is just a reflection of your non-hatred for Bid'ah."*

In his attempt to portray the Ulama of Deoband as the initiators of a new sect in Islam, the Salafi coprocreep states: *"Deobandism is a creed and a self-contained sect within itself....It is exactly why M.KAS wrote al-Muhannad. It is exactly why many Deobandi elders have condemned Imam Ibn Adbil Wahhab and Ibn Taymiyyah. It is exactly why the label of Deobandi is proudly adopted by millions amongst you worldwide."*

'M.KAS' refers to Hadhrat Allaamah Khalil Ahmad Saharanpuri (rahmatullah alayh) who wrote the wonderful kitaab, *Al-Muhannad alal Mufannad*, in response to the questions posed by the then Ulama of the Haramain Shareefain. The kitaab, *Al-Muhannad* was the consequence of Barelwi slanders against the Ulama of Deoband. Today, the Salafi coprocreeps are indulging in slander against the Ulama of Deoband, and *Al-Muhannad* is an adequate refutation of the calumnies of the Salafi coprocreep. After reading *Al-Muhannad*, the Ulama of Makkah Mukarramah, Madinah Munawwarah, Syria and Egypt applauded the illustrious Allaamah and heaped accolades on him. They all attested to the correctness of all the answers pertaining to the Aqaaid of the Ulama of Deoband. Were all these Ulama of the Haramain, etc. also part of the so-called 'Deobandi sect' hallucinated by the miscreant Salafi coprocreep? Did all these non-Deobandi Ulama study at Darul Uloom Deoband?

Earlier in our refutation of the coprocreep's alleged inconsistency No. 4, we have presented the comments of the

Ulama of the Haramain, etc. on the beliefs and practices of the Ulama and Mashaaikh of Deoband.

From the answers and accolades which these noble senior Ulama had conferred to the Ulama of Deoband, it is clear that the coprocreep is a moron whose mental density precludes him from the comprehension of rudimentary facts. If the Ulama of Deoband had belonged to a separate sect, what then constrained the Ulama of the Haramain, Syria and Egypt to glowingly confirm the correctness of Allaamah Khalil Ahmad's *Al-Muhannad* and to bestow to him such lavish applause as they had done in their response?

The Deobandi elders have condemned the deviations of Ibn Taimiyyah and Muhammad Bin Abdul Wahhaab. Since they strayed from the path of the Ahlus Sunnah, they deserve the valid criticism which the Ulama of Deoband present with their Shar'i facts and basis. Our Akaabireen never spoke drivel and *ghutha* such as these Salafi coprocreeps disgorge. The Ulama of Deoband spoke on the basis of solid Shar'i facts which the coprocreeps have failed to address, leave alone refute rationally. They descend only into rubbish ranting as is clear from this coprocreep's stupid anti-Deoband flotsam.

The coprocreep attempts to create the idea that it is only Deoband who has criticized Ibn Taimiyyah and the founder of the Wahhaabi sect of Saudi Arabia masquerading deceptively as 'Hanaabilah'. Centuries before Darul Uloom Deoband came into existence, Fuqaha and Ulama of the Arab World had severely criticized Ibn Taimiyyah. In fact, the rulers of the time had imprisoned him for his heretical views. Were they all Deobandis? Were all those Ulama who had written kitaabs in condemnation of Ibn Taimiyyah also Deobandis, centuries before Deoband Madrasah came into existence? The criticism against Ibn Taimiyyah cannot be argued away with corocreep emotion. The coprocreep Salafi has miserably failed to respond

academically to the dalaail on which the Ulama of Deoband base their criticism.

Displaying more of his ignorance, the Salafi coprocreep alleges: "*You have given the power of legislation of the Shariah to your Deobandi elders besides Allah. What is all this nonsense of reading Yaa Noor after Salaah seven times then rubbing your eyes? .....What would be the difference between you and the Barelwis who rub their eyes in Azaan?*"

There is a vast difference between the Barelwi practice and what an extremely small number of Deobandis do regarding the practice to which the coprocreep has referred. The Ulama of Deoband do not teach the practice (mentioned by the coprocreep) as an act of ibaadat or as an act of the Sunnah. They do not present any Hadith in substantiation of this and similar practices.

It is not a practice recorded in our kutub of Fiqh and Aqeedah. It has never been taught by the Ulama of Deoband. Therefore, one will not see the hundreds of thousands who had studied at Deobandi institutions adopting this practice. This is an isolated practice which is perfectly permissible as an *ilaaj (remedy)* for the eyes. It is a practice which some Buzrug had proffered in the same way as physicians prescribe medicine and remedies. If the words of Allah Azza Wa Jal had no curing properties, then the coprocreep should explain the Hadith: "*(Surah) Faatihah is a cure for every disease.*", as well as many similar other Ahaadith. The coprocreep should explain the numerous spiritual remedies which the Salafi Ulama have upheld and which are recorded in their Fataawa kutub. The coprocreep should refer to the kitaab, *Fataawa Ulama-il Baladil Haraam*, which is a compilation of the Fatwas of the Salafi Ulama of Saudi Arabia. *Kitaabur Ruqa* in this voluminous kitaab records numerous spiritual remedies endorsed and advocated by the likes of Shaikh Ibn Jibreen and Ibn Uthaymeen, senior Salafi Ulama.

The Qur'aan Majeed itself informs us that "*It is a cure for the hearts*". The words of the Qur'aan and Allah's Names, in

addition to being medicine for the spiritual hearts, are also balm and treatment for physical sicknesses. Ulama of the Salafi math-hab uphold this fact and condone these spiritual remedies.

A Sahaabi had recited Surah Faatihah and blew on a patient who was instantly cured, and the Sahaabi accepted payment in lieu. Rasulallah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) upheld the veracity of the Sahaabi's act as well as the permissibility of the payment. There are a number of Ahaadith pertaining to the medicinal value of Qur'aanic verses and Surahs. Only a jaahil, bereft of Aql - a moron such as this miserable coprocreep masquerading as a hybrid Hambali-Hanafi to lure and ensnare uneducated, unsuspecting young Hanafis into the web of Salafi'ism - will dispute these facts and realities. Despite the corroboration in the Hadith, no one propagates that these spiritual remedies are part of Aqeedah.

On the contrary, the Barelwis propagate the *Sunniyat* of their practice of kissing the thumbs during the Athaan. In fact, they even assign it the status of *wujoob*. Anyone abstaining from their practice is believed to be disrespectful to Rasulallah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam). They furthermore present fabricated narrations to accord this practice the status of *ibaadat* which they seek to impose on all and sundry. The chasm of difference between the two practices is thus conspicuous.

The coprocreep has also laboriously and abortively struggled to convey the baseless idea that the Ulama of Deoband do not believe that the Malaaikeh deliver Durood and Salaam to Rasulallah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam). His *ghabaawah* (calcification of the brain) is stark, hence he audaciously presents this ludicrous analogy. There is not a single Deobandi who believes what the miserable, jaahil Salafi coprocreep alleges.

Ranting and raving in his intoxication of *ghabaawah* (i.e. density of brains common to morons), the coprocreep alleges:

"*You Deobandis have never ever affirmed the concept of 'Ibaadat.....'*" The stupid fellow will have to return to Madrasah - not a Salafi one - to understand the meaning of Ibaadat in Islam. Neither do Salafis have a proper understanding of *ibaadat* nor do they possess morality (Akhlaaq) which is the bedrock of Ibaadat. The condition of their Salaat performance is appalling, especially in the Haramain Shareefain. They fiddle and dance so much in Salaat that the concentration of other musallis is ruined. Throughout the duration of their Salaat, they sway like the Yahoo. Repeatedly they adjust their scarves. Their eyes dwell from pillar to post. Neither is their ruku' correct nor their sajdah. Their Salaat is totally devoid of *khushoo'* and *khudhoo'*. They just have no concept of *ibaadat*.

There is no deviated sect in Islam which displays so much flagrant disrespect for the Qur'aan Majeed as Salafis do. Their displays of blatant disrespect for the Qur'aan Shareef can be heart-breakingly observed in the Haramain Shareefain. They lay on their backs in the Musajid holding the Qur'aan Majeed with one hand as if they are reading some lewd magazine. Then they place it either on their abdomens or near to their buttocks while they doze off. When they have to make Sajdah Tilaawat, they are too darn lazy to place the Qur'aan Majeed honourably on the bench or shelf. Holding the Qur'aan Majeed in one hand, they prostrate with the Holy Kalaam of Allah Ta'ala on the ground at the side of their heads. They are unable to distinguish between their feet and the Qur'aan Majeed. For them both are equal in status, hence it does not cause even a twinge of conscience for a Salafi to place the Qur'aan Majeed at his feet or near to his buttocks.

As far as Akhlaaq are concerned, they are morally corrupt, abrasive and bereft of compassion. Dishonesty and slandering the Fuqaha of the Mathaahib are among their salient features. In the presence of especially Hanafis, they praise Imaam Abu Hanifah (rahmatullah alayh), But behind the backs of Hanafis, they disgorge their insidious venom against Imaam A'zam

(rahmatullah alayh). If a sincere Salafi wishes to learn Ibaadat and Akhlaaq, he will have to search for a genuine Shaikh among the Ulama of Deoband. We do concede that such Mashaikh are rare, extremely rare, even in the ranks of the Ulama of Deoband of this era.

Furthermore, Salafis are notorious for consuming just any kind of haraam food and carrion meats, and they love kuffaar dress. They have an inveterate hatred for the headgear of Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam), hence to perform Salaat and to strut around with a bare head is a virtue for them.

The coprocreep simply rants and raves. He cites principles without any relevance to the topic of discussion. There is no link between the principle, '*Everything is halaal until proven haraam*', and the matter under discussion. But since the coprocreep's article is a confused rambling of stupidities, he has vermiculated himself in an unprincipled manner, hence he disgorges pure *copro-ghutha (copro-rubbish)*. He jumps from one topic to another without following a principled methodology of argument. But then he audaciously speaks of 'manhaaj'. Nothing better can be expected from a moron coprocreep whose nescience related to issues of Fiqh, Aqaaid, Ibaadat and Akhlaaq is appalling. But despite such colossal ignorance, the coprocreep, as well as Salafis in general deem it appropriate to wag their insolent tongues against the Aimmah-e-Mujtahideen. Now, in order to present a specious front of 'respect' for Imaam Abu Hanifah, the coprocreep baselessly and slanderously assails the Ulama and Mashaikh of Deoband who have acquired all of their Ilm and Taqwa from the Aimmah and Fuqaha of the Hanafi Math-hab. By way of this tactic of slandering the Ulama of Deoband and maintaining an ostensible silence regarding Imaam Abu Hanifah (rahmatullah alayh), the coprocreep desires to peddle the idea that the beliefs and practices of these Ulama are innovations which were originated about 150 years ago when Darul Uloom Deoband was established. But, everyone

who has some understanding and a smattering of knowledge will understand that the Ulama and Mashaikh of Deoband have not introduced any belief or practice which is at variance with the *Minhaaj* of the Salaf-e-Saaliheen of *Khairul Quroon*.

The coprocreep accuses the Ulama of Deoband of creating a division between what he terms 'normal Muslims' and the Sufi mureeds. His yardstick for his hallucinated division is the special forms of Athkaar which the Mashaikh prescribe for their muredeen. Only a moron will interpret that by these Athkaar the Mashaikh believe that their muredeen are apart from 'normal' Muslims. It has already been mentioned earlier that the specific forms of Athkaar are not prescribed as Masnoon acts of ibaadat. They are in the category of *ilaaj (remedy)*. A sheikh who prescribes such acts as Masnoon ibaadat is a jaahil who has no understanding of Tasawwuf.

The coprocreep also seeks to convey the impression that the Ulama of Deoband had originated these forms of Athkaar when in reality they have inherited these spiritual ways and means from the great Mashaikh centuries before the establishment of Darul Uloom Deoband. In the firmament of Tasawwuf, the Mashaikh of Deoband are late - very late arrivals. These practices have come down in the Ummah from many centuries before the inception of Darul Uloom Deoband.

Another aspect of importance in this regard is that the Madaaris do not delve into any of these practices. They have an academic syllabus which has no relationship whatsoever with the Athkaar and Ashghaal practised in the privacy of the khaanqah. Far from creating a division, the Mashaikh of Deoband say that if a person wishes to be a normal Muslim, he has to undergo Islaah of the nafs. Minus moral reformation, a person will remain a salafi animal, bereft of Sunnah morality.

Levelling another slander against the Ulama of Deoband, the moron coprocreep alleges: "*You Deobandis use the Hadith of the Ethiopians dancing in front of the Prophet ....you use this to*

*prove worship...."* The injustice committed by this *ghabi* is slander or even blasphemy. The Ulama of Deoband are always at pains to explain this specific incident which the legalizers of music cite in justification of their singing and music. Never did the Ulama of Deoband ever present this Hadith to justify any of their Thikr practices. Furthermore, the practice of *raqs* (so-called *sufi dancing*) is alien to the Mashaaikh of Deoband. It is dastardly slanderous to accuse the Mashaaikh of Deoband with indulgence in this practice. This palpably and scandalously false accusation is dismissed with contempt.

Jumping from one donkey to another, the coprocreep says: *"Also, we do not need evidence that wearing a shirt and trousers is Halal; rather evidence is required to prove them Haram."* The evidence for the prohibition of western kuffaar attire is so glaring like the sun shining in the day that it would be proper to contend that no evidence is required to prove the prohibition of emulating the kuffaar in their attire and in their stupid and morally destructive ways, styles and practices. But, since Salafis are lovers of western garb - bareheads, jeans, T-shirts, in addition to devouring carrion, etc. - the coprocreep deemed it appropriate to surreptitiously inject this issue into a discussion which has absolutely no relationship to this subject matter.

The Ulama of Deoband had never propagated the idea that the peculiar *athkaar* and *ashghaal* which the Mashaaikh prescribe for mureeds, form part of the Aqeedah of Islam. Drinking medicines which did not exist during the age of Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam), and consuming the latest styles of food and cakes which did not exist before, are all halaal. The onus of proving these items to be haraam rests on the one who propagates that they are haraam. If the coprocreep says that these issues are not acts of ibaadat and are not proclaimed to be Aqeedah, our response is the same regarding the *athkaar* and *ashghaal* of the Mashaaikh. The coprocreep should first prove

that the Ulama of Deoband believe these prescriptions to be part of Aqeedah/Ibaadat.

Not a single Deobandi Madrasah teaches any of these khaanqah practices. When the coprocreep was 'studying' at a Deobandi Madrasah did these *athkaar* and *ashghaal* form part of the curriculum? Thus, the following statement of the coprocreep is baseless and misdirected: *"So going against Tawaqquf in Tawqeef issue is Haraam until there is evidence to substantiate the claim made in relation to that Tawqeef (i.e.Aqaa'id and Ibaadat)."*

In fact, this is precisely the stance of the Ulama of Deoband, hence they have at all times been in the forefront fighting bid'ah. It is for this reason that all our Akaabir Ulama have been branded 'kaafir' by the Barelwi grave-worshippers. The Ulama of Deoband have rigidly maintained that Ibaadat is only what is taught by the Sunnah. The charge against the Ulama of Deoband is false and is thus dismissed with contempt.

In another abortive attempt to criticize the Ulama of Deoband, the coprocreep says:

*"As benefit, I should also say that a person who thinks driving a car downtown is some sort of worship or a special Deeni act in itself has committed a Bid'ah too, because he has ventured out into Tawqeef (of establishing a Deeni speciality of driving downtown) without legislation. (I know this sounded weird, but it is to prepare for what's coming up)*

However, if he was driving a car downtown to get to Salah Ma' Jamaa'ah in the mosque, that driving would have the same ruling as the ultimate aim, i.e. driving would have the same Hukm as the Hukm of Salah Ma' Jamaa'ah in the mosque, based on the known principle: whatever Wajib cannot be accomplished without act, that other act leading to it would also be Wajib (same applies to Fard, and same applies to Sunnah,. Therefore, to call driving in the car to the mosque as a 'Bid'ah Hasanah' is ABSOLUTLEY SENSELESS in theory as the scholars have already classified such non-narrated practised acts (such as driving to the mosque, as well as building schools, and the creation

of Nahw, the compilation of the Quran in one Mushaf, etc.) in light of the ruling I have mentioned in this paragraph. "

What he has mentioned is precisely the standpoint of the Ulama of Deoband. Whether some describe such new developments as 'Bid'ah Hasanah' or any other name is immaterial. It does not detract from the reality of the permissibility of the new introduction, and at times from its incumbency depending on the degree of necessity. 'Bid'ah Hasanah' in so far as Ibaadat is concerned, is restricted to the Khairul Quroon. The term has technical import in relation to Ibaadat which has its origin in these three Golden Ages of Islam. Sanctifying these three *Khairul Quroon* epochs Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) said:

*"Honour my Sahaabah, for verily they are the best of you; then those after them; then those after them. Thereafter falsehood will prevail."*

Similar other Ahaadith as well elevate this epoch and link it to the age of Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam). Hence, Hadhrat Umar (radhiyallahu anhu) who had introduced the 20 raka'ts Taraaweeh Salaat in the congregational form in which the Ummah has been performing it since the age of the Sahaabah, described it (the Taraaweeh) as 'Bid'ah Hasanah'. Thus, 'Bid'ah Hasanah' in its restricted/technical meaning relates to Ibaadat which comes within the purview of the Sunnah since Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) had commanded that the Ummah holds firmly "with their jaws" on to the Sunnah of his Khulafa-e-Raashideen.

Besides its technical import, the term is also used loosely, i.e. literally, to mean simply a good/meritorious introduction without the status of Masnoon Ibaadat despite it being a medium for thawaab (reward), e.g. carpets in the Musjid, setting aside a specific place for Salaat in a plane, a flashing red light in a Musjid to inform of the time of Zawwaal so that musallis

abstain from performing Salaat at the Makrooh time, publication of time-tables for Salaat, setting up soup kitchens for the poor, constructing wells and boreholes, etc., etc.

All of these and many other acts could be literally described as bid'ah hasanah without the attribution of the technical meaning. In other words, whilst these are all beautiful and meritorious acts, they are not Masnoon acts of Ibaadat. Thus, no one may be criticized for abstaining from participation in these acts. But, those who abstain from and abandon Bid'ah Hasanah acts which in the technical sense refers to Masnoon Ibaadat such as Taraaweeh Salaat, the second Athaan on Jum'ah, reciting *As-Salaatu Khairum minan noum* during the Fajr Athaan, pave their path of Jahannum.

Now that the meaning of this term has been explained, understand well that the Ulama of Deoband do not elevate the khaanqah practices to the status of Aqeedah nor to Masnoon Ibaadat. Thus, they do not say that these practices are Bid'ah Hasanah as the moron coprocreep slanders. The density of his brains constrained him to conclude that the Mashaaikh of Deoband believe the khaanqah practices to be integral to Aqaaid and Masnoon Ibaadat. We have no cure for the stupidity of the moron.

The spiritual malady of the coprocreep is aggravated by his malicious hatred for the Ulama and Mashaaikh of Deoband, hence his copro-article exudes all the trademark vitriol which Salafis generally and usually display for the Ahnaaf.

The coprocreep's *jahaalat* combined with arrogance has morphed into malice for the Ulama and Mashaaikh of Deoband, hence he is blind to the slanders which he levels at these noble Representatives of Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam).

The following *Malfooth* of Hadhrat Maulana Muhammad Masihullah (rahmatullah alayh), succinctly and adequately explains the attitude of the Mashaaikh of Deoband regarding the prescribed forms of non-Sunnah aaraad/athkaar and ashghaal:

" External abundance of *auraad* (specific forms of *Thikr*) is not among the etiquettes (*aadaab*) of the Mureed. On the contrary, this group (of *Saalikeen*) is ever engaged in eliminating *khatraat* (stray and evil thoughts and diversions) and negligence of the heart. Their occupation is purification of character and not abundance of practices. *Faraa-idh* and *Sunan-e-Muakkadah* are incumbent on them. They adhere to these rigidly. The heart remaining in a permanent state of *Thikr* (*Thikr Qalbi*) is superior than abundance of supererogatory acts of worship (*Nafil*)".

In another *Malfooth* Hadhrat Masihullah (rahmatullah alayh) said:

"The Mureed should not entertain the idea that the Shaikh is *ma'soom* (sinless). However, he should hold the Shaikh in high esteem and if occasionally the Mureed witnesses any transgression by the Shaikh, he (Mureed) should not sever his ties with the Shaikh on this account. However, should the Shaikh perpetrate acts of transgression in abundance, the Mureed should end his ties with the Shaikh politely, honourably and with respect. The Shaikh should also not command the Mureed to do such acts which constitute transgression (in the *Shariah*)".

Emphasizing the extreme importance of the *Shariah*, Hadhrat Masihullah (rahmatullah alayhi) said:

"The structure of this *Tareeq* (Path) revolves on the protection of the *Aadaab* of the *Shariah*, on guarding oneself against *haraam* and *mushtabah* (doubtful things), on guarding the senses against the prohibitions of the *Shariah*, preventing one's moments from negligence and connecting them (one's moments) to Allah and on not regarding as *halaal* even a grain in which there is doubt even in times of need, leave alone times of comfort and prosperity."

The attitude of the *Mashaaiikh* of Deoband regarding the *Shariah* which is encased in the *Qur'aan* and *Sunnah*, is summarized by Hadhrat Masihullah (rahmatullah alayh) in the following *Malfooth*:

"One should have a Shaikh fitting the description given by Hadhrat Junaid (rahmatullah alayh), namely, the *Qur'aan-e-Kareem*, in his right hand, the *Sunnah* of *Rasulullah* (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) in his left hand and he (the Shaikh) should walk in the light of these two lamps so that one does not fall in the pits of doubt nor in the darkness of *bid'ah*."

Stating the category of *ashghaal*, Hadhrat Maulana Ashraf Ali Thanvi (rahmatullah alayh) said: "*The purpose of all ashghaal is concentration of the heart. They are not Maqsood bith-thaat (objectives by themselves).*"

The *Akaabir* of Deoband have made it very clear that these *athkaar* and *ashghaal* are not *Masnoon Ibaadat* nor the objectives (*maqasid*). Rather they are the *tharaa'i* (means and ways) for the acquisition of perfect concentration in *Ibaadat*. Such concentration is *Maqsood bith-thaat* since it is commanded in the *Hadith*. Anyone who contends that a particular way is not permissible should present his *Shar'i* proof. Medicine of this era did not exist in the *Khairul Quroon*. The remedies for physical cure and health of this age are all innovations, yet no one contends that they are *haraam* unless a specific remedy is proven to be *haraam*. Similarly, spiritual cure and health which are imperative commands of the *Shariah* also have different ways and means which did not exist during the age of *Risaalat*. But non-existence in that age is not a *daleel* for prohibition. Only if these *tharaa'i* are elevated to the status of *Ibaadat* or *Aqaa'id* or they violate any principle or teaching of *Islam*, could they justifiably be declared *bid'ah* and *haraam*.

Ways for the acquisition of *Zaahiri Ilm* (academic knowledge of the *Shariah*) have been innovated after the age of the *Sahaabah*. The construction of *Madaaris*, introduction of syllabi, printing of *kitaabs*, etc. are all *tharaa'i* for the acquisition of the *Maqsood*. Since there is no conflict with any principle or teaching of *Islam* in these ways and means for acquisition of *Ilm*, it is justifiably averred that these ways and means are

meritorious although not Waajib if lawful alternatives exist or could be introduced. The Ulama among the Sahaabah did not acquire their Ilm in the way subsequent generations pursued Knowledge. Yet, no one brands these innovated ways to be bid'ah.

Exactly in the same way did the Auliya introduce new ways and means for achieving Tazkiyah of the Nafs. While Tazkiyah is the *Maqsood*, the new methods are the *tharaa'i* (*the ways and the meanings for achieving moral reformation*). The *suhbat* (*companionship*) of Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) had made the Sahaabah independent of formulating any way for achieving Tazkiyah. Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) was the supreme Sheikh in whose blessed *suhbat* Tazkiyah was achieved rapidly. After the departure of Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam), there developed a decline in the spiritual system. Hence we find that the athkaar and nafl acts of ibaadat of the Auliya after the age of the Sahaabah, quantitatively by far exceed that of the Sahaabah. The Auliya of later times had to strive for years to acquire the *roohaaniyat* which the Sahaabah gained within a short while in the *suhbat* of Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam). The deprivation of Rasulullah's *suhbat* constrained the Auliya to adopt measures and introduce ways and means for the attainment of the *Maqsood*.

If it is permissible to introduce new ways and means for the achievement of physical health, for the pursuit of Zaahiri (academic) Knowledge, and for just about everything in this mundane world, there can be no Shar'i impediment for the introduction of ways and means to develop *roohaaniyat*. It devolves on the opponents of these *tharaa'i* to produce solid Shar'i dalaa-il for the negation of such ways and means which are not in violation of any express teaching or principle of the Shariah. Only moron Salafi coprocreeps baselessly brand such *tharaa'i* to be bid'ah.

The entire argument presented by the coprocreep in his abortive attempt to sustain his accusation that the Ulama of Deoband have elevated the *tharaa'i* to the level of ibaadat and aqaa'id is baseless and an exercise in stupid redundancy. There would have been validity in his argument on this issue if these ways and means had been accorded the status of ibaadat and aqeedah. But this is not the case.

It should also be understood that the deviations of miscreant 'shaikhs' who had acquired a smattering of knowledge at some Deobandi Madrasah as the coprocreep had done, may under no circumstances be labelled as the views, beliefs and practices of the Ulama of Deoband. For the beliefs, practices and *Minhaaj* of the Ulama Deoband, *Al-Muhannad alal Mufannad* of Allaamah Khalil Ahmad Saharanpuri (rahmatullah alayh) is an adequate concise text book. It was upheld and highly praised by the Ulama of the Haramain Shareefain, Misr and Shaam. Any departure from the exposition in *Al-Muhannad* has no truck with the Ulama of Deoband.

As far as the public halqah thikr and nazam singing programmes which have mushroomed today in the Musaajid are concerned, we too have sharply criticized these deviations. Our book, *Thikr in the Mirror of the Sunnah*, discusses and refutes these deviations and innovations. It is gross injustice to attribute such deviant practices to the Ulama of Deoband simply because the perpetrators happened to have acquired knowledge at Deobandi Madaaris and have a relationship with some Mashaaikh who are affiliated to Deoband.

Decline and corruption set into every institution with the passage of time. To understand a movement it is imperative to examine the principles of its founders.

The misconduct, baseless beliefs, bid'ah, fisq, fujoor, zanaadaqah and kufr which pollute the Ummah today cannot be attributed to Islam on the basis of the perpetrators being adherents of Islam. Similarly, the deviations of miscreants who

had studied at Deobandi Madaaris cannot be attributed to the Ulama of Deoband.

The coprocreep should confine his attack on the Ulama of Deoband to *Al-Muhannad*, and present argument in refutation of the exposition of Allaamah Khalil Ahmad (rahmatullah alayh). The discussion could then be conducted on a better academic level. But this coprocreep has degenerated into rubbish. He stupidly attributes the beliefs and deviations of miscreants to the Ulama of Deoband. He disgorges nothing but copro-garbage.

Another important aspect is the issue of *Ikhtilaaf* (*Difference of Opinion*). *Ikhtilaaf* existed even among the senior Sahaabah during the very lifetime of Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam). After the demise of Nabi-e-Kareem (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) the concept of *Ikhtilaaf* magnified manifold. The differences increased among the Sahaabah, Taabieen and Tabe Taabieen. Thus, in academic issues there are numerous differences among the Fuqaha of the same Math-hab, yet they remain members of the same Math-hab. Imaam Abu Yusuf (rahmatullah alayh) and Imaam Muhammad (rahmatullah alayh) despite their numerous *ikhtilafaat* with their Ustaadh, Imaam Abu Hanifah (rahmatullah alayh), remained Hanafis. It is unreasonable and the effect of density of brains to expect that there should not be any differences of opinion among the Ulama of Deoband. To label such mutual differences of Ulama who subscribe to a particular School of Thought as 'inconsistencies' betray the *jahaalat* and *ghabaawat* of the coprocreep who has extravagated from the Path of the Sunnah with his renege from the Hanafi Math-hab for the sake of the *dhalaal* of Salaf'ism.

Furthermore, for the ascertainment of the authoritative view in the event of *Ikhtilaaf*, it will be necessary to refer to the authorities of the School of Thought. Relative to the Ulama of Deoband, the reference is *Al-Muhannad*. Thus, whatever the coprocreep has argued under the heading: "*Ibn al-Qayyum in I'laam referred to the negative implications of considering*

*Tawqeef issues Halal until proven Haram*", is palpably baatil - baseless and redundant since the Ulama of Deoband NEVER confirm Ibaadat and Aqaa'id for acceptance on the basis of *Aql* although the former are shown to be based on sound *Aql* - *Aql*, a dearth of which preponderates in the ranks of Salafi coprocreeps.

## BARELWI PRACTICES

In his attribution of 'inconsistency' of *minhaaj* to the Ulama of Deoband, the coprocreep cites the Deobandi criticism of the Barelwi practices such as moulood. In this criticism he strives to show that the Deobandi practice of Dua after Salaat is on par with moulood. Since we do not criticize Dua after Salaat or since we adhere to this Dua, we have, in his opinion, no valid argument against moulood, urs and the other practices of the Qabar Pujaari (Grave-worshipping) sect. This coprocreep dwells in total confusion. His analogy with the Barelwis is stercoraceous *ghutha*.

The Ulama of Deoband maintain that the Dua after Salaat is *Masnoon*. And for this contention they have solid Shar'i dalaal. On the contrary, the moulood, etc. practices of the Grave Worshipers have neither origin nor sanction in the Sunnah. Further aggravating these practices are two evils: (1) Elevation of these practices to Waajib Ibaadat, and (2) Accretion of many evils acts. These evils are explained in our two treatises on *Moulood*. These books are available. Thus, there is a vast chasm of difference between the Dua after Salaat and the Barelwi bid'ah practices.

The arguments which the coprocreep produces against moulood and raqs (so-called 'sufi' dances) should be directed to the Barelwis, and the bid'ah/shirki miscreant 'sufi' tareeqahs which abound in North and West Africa, Syria, and elsewhere. There is no relationship between the Ulama of Deoband and these acts of bid'ah which have been elevated to the status of

Wujoob. In addition, to the status accorded, these practices consists of other evils as well. The Ulama of Deoband have always consistently proclaimed the bid'ah nature of moulood functions. The coprocreep is therefore barking up the wrong tree by having introduced moulood in his argument against the Ulama of Deoband. Moulood and raqs practices have never ever been accorded ibaadat status by the Ulama of Deoband as the moron coprocreep alleges.

It is also false and slanderous for the coprocreep to claim that the Ulama of Deoband are of the view that sufi dances are the "only way to attain Tazkiyah". Such practices have no relationship with Tazkiyah-e-Nafs. Thus, the coprocreep has slandered the Ulama of Deoband with his false statement: "*Most Deobandis say that it is VERY HARD to attain Tazkiyah without these types of measures.*"

"*These types of measures*" in the context of the coprocreep's argument refer to *raqs* or the so-called sufi dances which the fellow attributes to the Ulama of Deoband. Let it be known that *raqs* does not form part of the Islaahi programme of the Mashaaikh of Deoband. His claim is therefore slanderously baatil.

Furthermore, a method introduced for a valid Shar'i objective will be valid and permissible as long as it does not violate any teaching or principle of the Shariah. Thus if in the opinion of a Shaikh reciting 10,000 *La ilaha il lalaah*, and performing 100 raka'ats Nafil Salaat, etc. will assist his mureeds in their Islaahi programme, then only morons such as Salafi coprocreeps, will claim that this program is bid'ah and baatil. The Shaikh is not telling the public nor his mureeds that this prescription is Sunnah or ordered by the Shariah. It is among the *Tharaa'i* (*ways and means of attainment*). There is absolutely no Shar'i daleel to contest this. The stupid opinion of a coprocreep is devoid of Shar'i substance.

Whatever the coprocreep says about *raqs* (dancing) is correct. There is no need for us to refute him on a baatil practice. But he is a confounded liar for attributing this practice to the Ulama of Deoband.

Uttering another despicable lie, the coprocreep alleges: "*And when we consider that the whole of the Shariah contributes to one's Islaah and Tazkiyah (in contrast to Deobandis who think they are contradictory), it should not be considered as an impossible task.*"

The many statements of the Auliya, Ulama and Mashaaikh of Deoband which we have cited earlier debunk this slander which the miserable coprocreep attributes to the Ulama of Deoband. According to all the Ulama of Deoband, strict obedience to the Zaahiri Shariah and Sunnah is an imperative requisite for the attainment of Tazkiyah-e-Nafs. Minus this condition, it is not possible to achieve moral reformation and spiritual elevation. Since the coprocreep is a squint-eyed jaahil, he looks obliquely at the practices and statements of the Mashaaikh of Deoband. He suffers from oblique mental vision because of his crash course at some Deobandi Madrasah, and that too motivated by a sinister agenda. Hence, he has failed miserably to understand the Tareeqah and Maslak of the Ulama and Mashaaikh of Deoband. He thus sucks copro substances from his thumb and hurls his filth at the Ulama of Deoband without realizing that his copro-najaasat rebounds onto his face.

The coprocreep has darkened several pages with a futile discussion of the principle, *Al-Aslu fil ashya' tahreem*, i.e. "*Things are initially haraam.*" He cites the examples pertaining to meat and sex. His discussion is an exercise in stupid redundancy because it has absolutely no relationship to the false charges he has levelled against the Ulama of Deoband. We shall therefore bypass his rubbish allegations on this score.

**REFUTATION OF THE COPROCREEP'S  
'INCONSISTENCY NO.8' WHICH HE FALSELY  
ATTRIBUTES TO THE ULAMA OF DEOBAND**

**WAHDATUL WUJOOD**

In his baseless allegation No.8, the Salafi coprocreep states: *"Deos claim to be Maturidis. This means that they should affirm the very first piece of text in Nasafiyyah, which is that "the realities of everything is true and real" (not an illusion). Deos also claim to be Sufis. This means they should believe in their Tafseer of Wahdatul Wujood, which is that only Allah really exists and everything else is just an illusion. This is the same Obstinate Sophism refuted by Nasafiyyah."*

The coprocreep, due to his stark ignorance, has portrayed two entirely different issues as being contradictory, hence he alleges that the Ulama of Deoband ascribe to a contradiction. Outlining his stupid understanding on this issue, the jaahil coprocreep says: *"So which one is it gonna be - a huge fundamental of Maturidism as set out in the very first line of Nasafiyyah - i.e. realism for everything, or arguably the most fundamental precept of Sufism - Wahdatul Wujood or realism for only Allah and anti-realism for everything else? Renouncing either is tantamount to renouncing the whole discipline to which it is connected (either Maturidism or Sufism), and not renouncing either is a severe self-contradiction...."*

The Ulama of Deoband affirm both issues, viz. all created things have real existence, and the concept of *Wahdatul Wujood* is correct. But there is a vast difference in Divine Realism and the realism of created beings. While the Existence of Allah Azza Wa Jal is independent of all things, the existence of all things is dependent on Allah Azza Wa Jal. Thus, *Wahdatul Wujood* does not portray created objects to be non-existent and devoid of reality. But, in relation to Allah's Existence, the existence of creation has no 'reality'. While Divine Existence is eternal and

self-subsisting, the existence of all created beings is of temporal origin and in entirety dependent on Allah Ta'ala. In this context, Existence is applicable to only Allah Azza Wa Jal.

The 'self-contradiction' is the hallucination of the coprocreep, which is the consequence of his mental vermiculation effected by copro-vermin. In presenting this hallucinated 'self-contradiction', the coprocreep has conspicuously advertised his *jahaalat*. He has extracted from two entirely different subjects (Aqaaid and Akhlaaq or as he terms it: 'Maturidism and Sufism'), two different concepts, and presented them stupidly as if both deal with the same issue. Thus, he imagines the 'self-contradiction' since he did not understand either of the concepts.

His confusion is like the ignorance of a person who sees a self-contradiction in the different usage of the word *bachelor*. Zaid, a married man, has acquired a B.A. (Bachelor of Arts) degree. When Zaid informed the coprocreep that he is a Bachelor of Arts, the coprocreep retorted: 'But you are married. You have a wife and children.' Regardless of Zaid's attempts to explain, the coprocreep demonstrating his *jahaalat*, obstinately maintains that Zaid is guilty of a 'self-contradiction' because he contends that he is a 'bachelor' whilst he has a wife. This is precisely the nescience which the calcified brains of the coprocreep displays in his 'self-contradiction' stupidity against the Ulama of Deoband.

The 'reality' of created things which is stated in Nasafiyyah has absolutely no relationship with the concept of *Wahdatul Wujood* which the Auliya (Sufiya) propound. While the former, i.e. the reality of things, refers to the physical existence of tangible or material or physical creations of Allah Azza Wa Jal, denied by the Sophists, *Wahdatul Wujood* is a *state* or a spiritual condition. It is among the *Ahwaal* (*spiritual conditions*). It is an abstract concept.

Explaining the reality of things, it is mentioned in Nasafiyyah: *"The haqaa'iq (realities) of things (created things) are confirmed."* This is in rejection of the *Indiyyah* sect of the

*Sufastaaiyyah* (Sophists) who believe that all things as we see and touch, are hallucinations similar to the hallucinations of the coprocreep who has imagined falsities for the Ulama of Deoband.

*Wahdatul Wujood* does not have the remotest relationship with the reality of created material objects. This concept does not deny the real existence of created things. It merely means that in relation to Allah's Existence, all things pale into 'non-existence' since the only True and Independent Existent is Allah Azza Wa Jal. The existence of entire creation depends on the Command of Allah Azza Wa Jal. If the size of an ant is compared with the size of an elephant, it will be correct to say that the ant has no existence and no size in relation to the massive body of the elephant. The ant's physical strength in relation to the elephant's physical power is 'non-existent' - it has no 'reality'. And in relation to the size of the entire universe, the ant has 'no' size. The droplet of water on the beak of a sparrow is non-existent in relation to the waters of the oceans of the world. Such statements to convey superiority and emphasis do not deny the real existence of the inferior and insignificant being.

*Wahdatul Wujood* is a technical term which has a specific meaning in the terminology of the Auliya. But because the coprocreep is stupid and lacks understanding of the specific terminologies of the Sufiya, he has interpreted this Sufi term to be in contradiction of a literal term spoken of in entirely another subject. Since *Wahdatul Wujood* does not deny the material existence of created objects - in fact it has no relationship with it - the coprocreep's objection serves only to confirm his gross ignorance of both subjects. Neither has he understood what is mentioned in *Nasafiyyah* nor does he understand the meaning of *Wahdatul Wujood*.

Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) himself has expounded the *Wahdatul Wujood* concept of the Sufiya. In a

Hadith-e-Qudsi, Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) said: "*The Son of Aadam distresses Me by abusing dahr (time, age, era) whilst I (i.e. Allah) am Time. All affairs are in My Command. I alternate night and day.*" (Bukhaari, Muslim, Maalik and Abu Daawood)

It is a simple reality and truth that Age (Time) is not Allah Azza Wa Jal. It is Allah's creation. However, despite the absence of unity between Allah and Time, the Hadith-e-Qudsi figuratively states the unification or unity of Allah and Time. This is *Wahdatul Wujood* which the very same Hadith explains by saying: "*It is I (Allah) Who alternates night and day.*" Age/Time is subservient to Allah Ta'ala. It has no existence without the Command of Allah Azza Wa Jal. Since it is totally dependent on Allah Ta'ala for its existence, Allah Ta'ala said: 'I am Time'. This is *Wahdatul Wujood* which the coprocreep has been unable to understand. It is not a denial of the existence of created things.

Let all anti-Tasawwuf morons understand that *Wahdatul Wujood* is a technical term in the terminology of the Sufiya. Elaborating on the meaning of this term, Hakimul Ummat Maulana Ashraf Ali Thaanvi (rahmatullah alayh) who was the Mujaddid of Sufi'ism in this century, says:

"Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) said:

(1) "*Allah Ta'ala said: 'The son of Aadam (i.e. man) causes distress to Me. He abuses Time whilst I am Time. Affairs are in My Hand. I alternate night and day.'*" (Bukhaari, Muslim and Abu Dawood)

Continuing his elaboration of *Wahdatul Wujood*, Hadhrat Maulana Ashraf Ali Thaanvi (rahmatullah alayh) writes: "All actions and effects are in the control of Allah Ta'ala. The Actual Operator and the Independent Existent are only Allah Ta'ala. The Hadith clearly substantiates the contention of the Sufiya. Besides Allah Ta'ala no creation has an independent existence. Entire creation depends on Him for its existence. This concept has been designated *Wahdatul Wujood*."

The meaning is not that Allah Ta'ala and creation is one. It merely means that the being of creation has no independent existence. All existences despite existing, but in relation to the Divine Existence, their existence is superficial, not original and independent. Whilst the Divine Existence is perfect, that of creation is defective. Whilst all creation exists by virtue of the existence bestowed to it by Allah Ta'ala, this (created) existence has no significance in relation to the Divine Existence. In fact, all existences in relation to the Divine Existence are non-existent. Thus, there is only One True Being Who Exists independently. This concept is called *Wahdatul Wujood* to convey emphasis on the One True Existing Being.

A narrational (*Naqli*) daleel for this concept is the Qur'aanic verse: "Everything will perish except His Face." (Obviously when everything is perishable, then there is only One real Existing Being Whose existence is independent.)

Night and day are constituents of Time which Allah Ta'ala attributes to Himself. Whatever is in time, and which man attributes to it (time) is in Allah's power Who is the One Who gives effect to all affairs. Hence, abusing affairs which happen is tantamount to abusing Allah Ta'ala. It is quite apparent that Allah Ta'ala and Zamaanah (Time) are not a single entity or a Unity. However, despite the non-existence of unity, the effect of unity has been stated in terms of an interpretation. On the basis of this *ta'weel*, the Muhaqqiqeen have stated the concept of *Wahdatul Wujood*. – End of Hadhrat *Thaanvi's* summarized explanation.

The concept of *Wahdatul Wujood* explained by Hadhrat Maulana Ashraf Ali Thaanvi (rahmatullah alayh) as well as other Akaabir Sufiya is explicitly affirmed by the tafseer of aayat 3 of Surah Hadeed presented by Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam).

"He is the *Awwal* (The First), the *Aakhir* (The Last), the *Zaahir* (The Manifest) and the *Baatin* (The Hidden)." (Aayat 3,

*Surah Hadeed*). Tafseerul Mazhari, presenting the tafseer of this aayat states:

**"He is Awwal:** He was before everything. There was nothing before Him. Verily, He is the Originator (The One Who brought into existence) all things.

**"He is Aakhir:** He will remain after everything perishes (and is annihilated). Verily the existence of Allah Ta'ala is Original (True and Independent). There is no possibility of separation of existence from him and of annihilation. The existence of things besides Him is borrowed in the decree of Allah Ta'ala.....He will remain after everything, and nothing will be after Him.

**"He is Zaahir:** He is above everything. Nothing is above Him. The objective of *zuhoor* (being manifest) is existence. There is no *zuhoor* (manifestation) for the *ma'doom* (that which is non-existent). The existence of everything is acquired from Him, and is a shadow by virtue of His existence. Thus the manifestation of everything is a branch of His Manifestation.

**"He is Baatin:** He is the Hidden by virtue of the perfection of His *Zuhoor* (Manifestation), and also because of the *Baatin* of His Essence.. There is nothing besides Him.....

Muslim, Abu Daawood, Tirmizi, Nisaa', Ibn Maajah and Ibn Abi Shaibah narrated from Abu Hurairah (radhiyallahu anha), and Abu Ya'la Musali narrated from Aaishah (radhiyallah anha) that Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) said whilst he was lying down:

"O Allah! Rabb of the heavens and the earth, and Rabb of the glorious Throne! Our Rabb and the Rabb of everything; The One Who splits the seed; The One who revealed the Taurah, Injeel and Furqaan! I seek refuge with You from the evil of everything which You grab by its forelock. O Allah! You are the First, and nothing was before You. You are the Last, and nothing will be after You. You are the Manifest, and there is nothing above You. You are the Hidden, and there is nothing besides You....."

Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) himself negated the existence of everything. This negation is in relation to Allah's Existence. This is the meaning of *Wahdatul Wujood* – *only One True Existing Being*. The Sufiya never believed that Allah Ta'ala is incarnate in human beings or in any of His creation or creation is Allah – *Nauthubillaah!*

Another basis for the concept of *Wahdatul Wujood* as explained by the Sufiya, and which concept is fully within the confines of the Qur'aan and Sunnah, is the following Hadith-e-Qudsi. Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam), reporting a Hadith Qudsi, said that Allah Ta'ala said:

*“Whoever bears animosity for My Wali, verily, I issue to him an ultimatum of war. There is nothing more beloved to Me for a servant gaining My proximity than that which I have made obligatory on him. The servant incrementally gains My proximity with Nawaafil until I love him. Then when I love him, I become his ears with which he hears; his eyes with which he sees; his hands with which he touches, and his feet with which he walks.” (Bukhaari)*

In another narration, reported by Abdul Waahid, it also appears: *“And (I become) his heart with which he thinks and his tongue with which he speaks.”*

Another Hadith also affirming the correctness of the Sufiya's concept is the following Hadith:

Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) said: *“Verily, on the Day of Qiyaamah Allah Ta'ala will say to a man: ‘O son of Aadam! I was sick, but you did not visit Me.’ The man will say: ‘O my Rabb! How could I visit you whilst you are Rabbul Aalameen?’ Allah Ta'ala will say: ‘Don't you know that My certain friend was sick and you did not visit him? Don't you know that if you had visited him, you would have found Me by him?’*

*‘O son of Aadam! I asked food from you, but you did not feed Me.’ The man will say: ‘O my Rabb! How can I feed You whilst*

*You are Rabbul Aalameen?’ Allah Ta'ala will say: ‘Did you not know that a certain friend of Mine had asked you for food, but you did not feed him? Did you not know that if you had fed him, you would have found Me by him?’*

*‘O son of Aadam! I had asked you for water to drink, but you did not give it to Me.’ The man will say: ‘O my Rabb! How can I give You water to drink when You are Rabbul Aalameen?’ Allah Ta'ala will say: ‘A certain friend of Mine asked you for water, but you did not give it to him. If you had given him water to drink, you would have found that by Me.’” (Muslim)*

Similarly, as Hadhrat Thaanvi has elucidated, in the second Hadith (above) Allah Ta'ala explicitly states that He becomes the ears, eyes, heart, hands and feet of His devotee, and that it is He who is doing all the actions emanating from His devotee. Despite this unification (*Wahdatul Wujood* – *Unity of Existence*) expressed in the Hadith, there is no real or actual unification or *hulool* of Allah Ta'ala into the person or into any of His creation. The extreme and lofty level of Divine Proximity which the devotee is bestowed with by virtue of his love and obedience for Allah Ta'ala, is in fact the meaning of *Wahdatul Wujood*. It means nothing else. It does not refer to the kufr concept of *hulool* or incarnation or of Allah's pervasion in insaan or in any aspect of His creation.

Likewise, in the third Hadith, Allah Ta'ala attributes the devotee's sickness to Himself, saying that He was sick, and He was hungry and He was thirsty. Any Muslim in possession of some brains not deranged by stupidity will understand that these are metaphorical expressions denoting the lofty state of Divine Proximity (*Qurb-e-Ilaahi*) and Divine Acceptance (*Maqbooliyat*) the devotee enjoys. It is this metaphorical 'unity' which is termed *Wahdatul Wujood* of the Sufiya-e-Kiraam, which the spiritually barren baboons of crass materialism have interpreted to mean *divine hulool/incarnation/pervasion*, but such conception of kufr did not dawn in the pure Souls of the Auliya of Allah Azza Wa Jal.

It is a technical term having a methaphorical connotation. Never did the Sufiya intend thereby *hulool* ( i.e. the pervasion/incarnation of Allah Ta'ala physically into the being of the devotee) *Nauthubillaah!* When Hadhrat Mansur Al-Hallaaj (rahmatullah alayh) during a state of spiritual *Sukr* experienced certain *mukaashafaat* which are inexplicable in human language, and in consequence exclaimed: '*Anal Haqq!*', which statement is in conflict with the Zaahir of the Shariah, he was sentenced to death and executed. Hadhrat Junaid Baghdaadi (rahmatullah alayh), his Shaikh and the Chief of the Auliya of all ages, and the noblest of the Sufiya, despite understanding the spiritual mystery (*Sirr*) of Mansur's utterance, in deference to the Shariah and for the safety of the Imaan of the masses endorsed the verdict of execution. It is therefore contemptible injustice to accuse the Sufiya of propagating any concept of kufr and shirk.

Who can deny that there is only One Independent Original Existent – Allah Azza Wa Jal? And who can deny that the entire creation of mankind, jinnkind, the world of the countless trillions and 'impossibillions' of Malaaiakah, the innumerable worlds of other species of creation –intelligent and superficially unintelligent, the billions of universes with their billions of stars, suns, moons and Allah Alone knows what else, are all dependent for their existence on the One Eternal Existing Being? Who can deny that the shadow is dependent for its existence on the body casting the shadow? And who can deny that the reflection in the mirror is dependent for its existence on the object portrayed in front of the mirror? All these 'existences' are in relation to Allah Azza Wa Jal superficial, secondary and entirely dependent on His command. This is the meaning of *Wahdatul Wujood* – *the unity of existence*.

By existence in this context is meant Independent Existence – Uncreated Existence – The Existence which has neither beginning nor ending, and that Existence is only Allah Azza Wa

Jal. If morons fail to comprehend this simple issue, it will be the effect of some curse having settled on their brains. And that curse has destroyed what is termed *Noor-e-Fahm*. If the brain is not adorned with this spiritual glitter, it cannot understand the meaning of *mukaashafaat*. About such noxious brains, the Qur'aan states: "*And Allah casts rijs (filth) in those who lack intelligence.*"

*Extract from Baseless Criticism of Tasawwuf.*

**REFUTATION OF THE COPROCREEP'S  
INCONSISTENCY NO.9 - THE DUMB HANBALI  
BUTCHER SCENARIO - WHICH HE FALSELY  
ATTRIBUTES TO THE ULAMA OF DEOBAND**

**DIRECTION AND LOCATION FOR ALLAH TA'ALA**

In his ninth ramble, the coprocreep is at pains to prove a specific direction for Allah Ta'ala by presenting a particular mas'alah in terms of the Hambali Math-hab. In this mas'alah, a person who is dumb (not to be confused with stupid) - literally dumb or unable to speak - when slaughtering an animal, should point his finger upwards to indicate that he is slaughtering in the Name of Allah Ta'ala.

Then, the coprocreep proceeds to contend that this mas'alah has cast the Ahnaaf (followers of the Hanafi Math-hab) whom he restricts to the Ulama of Deoband and their followers, in a dilemma because:

- a) If they accept the validity of this rule, which their propagation of Taqleed requires of them, then it follows that they are acknowledging that Allah is in the Heavens.
- b) If they reject the mas'alah, they will be refuting what Taqleed commands, viz., strict following of the Math-hab which the Muqallideen Ulama propagate.

This *fiqhi* mas'alah of the Hambali Math-hab poses no dilemma for the Ahnaaf. While this mas'alah deals with a physically dumb person (*akhras* - one who is unable to speak), the coprocreep is dumb and numb in his brains embedded in a stercoral sensorium, hence he is capable of excreting from his mouth this drivel which he cites as a basis for the formulation of an *Aqeedah* (Belief).

Let it be known to the dumb coprocreep that *Aqaa-id* are not the products of *juz'i fiqhi masaa-il*. The attempt to construct a

Belief on the basis of a particular *fiqhi* rule which is the effect of *Qiyaas* (*Reasoning*) speaks volumes for the *jahaalat* of the coprocreep. He is too stupid to understand that *Aqeedah* is the product of *Daleel-e-Qat'i* (a daleel based on absolute certitude such as a Qur'aanic aayat or Ahaadith-e-Mutawaatarah).

The contention that Allah Ta'ala is confined to the Arsh above the heavens is an *aqeedah*. To substantiate this belief it is downright stupid to present as proof the method which the Hambali Math-hab imposes on an *akhras* for the validity of *Thabah*.

The rationale for pointing towards the heaven when the dumb person slaughters, does not support the contention that Allah Ta'ala is confined to the heavens and that He is nowhere else. Assuming that the slave girl who had indicated towards the heaven with her finger when Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) had asked her about Allah Ta'ala, had indicated instead to the east and the west and backed it up with the Qur'aanic aayat: "*Unto Allah belongs the east and the west. Whichever way you turn, there is the Face of Allah.*", Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) would likewise have confirmed her Imaan. Thus, the statement that Allah Ta'ala is in the heavens is supported by the aayat: "*He is The Being in the heaven Who is Ilaah (the Deity), and in the earth He is the Ilaah...*" (*Aayat 84, Zukhruf*), as well as by other aayaat. There was therefore no need to dig out the *fiqhi* issue pertaining to the 'dumb' slaughterer.

Although this aayat states explicitly that Allah Ta'ala is also in the earth, to man's understanding loftiness is related to the realm which to us is 'above'. We and animals trample, excrete, mess and sin on the earth. The ground on which we tramp is not considered to be lofty. Thus, although the Qur'aan Majeed categorically affirms the Presence of Allah Azza Wa Jal also "*in the earth*", when we raise our hands in dua or we are in distress, then we raise these limbs in that direction which is above in relation to us.

Just as the aforementioned aayat states that Allah Ta'ala is in the heaven and *in the earth*, other verses mention other directions as well, such as east and west which logically includes north and south and all points between any two directions. Thus, whilst Allah Azza Wa Jal encompasses all directions just as He encompasses entire creation including the Arsh and everything above and below the Arsh, direction does not encompass nor confine Him. But the logical conclusion of the belief of the deviant salafis is that Allah Ta'ala is confined in a specific space of His creation, namely on the Arsh. But this is manifestly baatil.

The simple explanation for the pointing towards the heaven by the *akhras* when slaughtering an animal is to confirm that he slaughters in only Allah's Name, not in the names of any idols or other deities who are all located on and in the earth, not in the heavens. It is downright stupid to present the pointing of the dumb person as a *daleel* for the corrupt belief that Allah Ta'ala is confined in the heavens.

If someone says that he believes that Allah Ta'ala is confined to the Ka'bah, and presents as his *daleel* the fact that when slaughtering animals they have to be faced in the direction of the Ka'bah, and Salaat has to be performed in the Ka'bah's direction, and the body in the grave has to be faced to the Qiblah, then his 'daleel' will be similar to the coprocreep's 'daleel' of pointing towards the heaven for his belief of confining Allah Azza Wa Jal to the Arsh or in the heavens. It will be said to the ignoramus who endeavours to formulate a *belief (aqeedah)* on the basis of his logic and opinion: *An Aqeedah is the product of a narrational daleel of the Qat'iuth Thuboot category. Irrespective of how logical your opinion and deduction may appear, the fact remains that it is the product of your opinion and reasoning whereas Aqeedah is the effect of a direct Command of the Qur'aan and Hadith of the Qat'i class of Ahaadith.*

So what the coprocreep fails to understand due to the stercoreal substances in which his brains swirl, is that the *aqeedah* of Allah Ta'ala being confined to a specific spot in His creation, namely the created Arsh, cannot be substantiated on the basis of a simple *fiqhi* mas'alah of the Hambali Math-hab pertaining to the slaughtering of animals by a dumb man. Whilst the slaughterer in the question here is physically dumb, the coprocreep is dumb and numb in his brains, hence he blurts out drivel without applying his mind.

There is also no need to dig out the *fiqhi* mas'alah for substantiating the Presence of Allah Azza Wa Jal in the heaven (*fis-samaa'*). A better daleel of absolute certitude (*Qat'iyyatuth Thuboot*) exists in the Qur'aan Majeed which states: "*He (Allah) is The Being in the heaven Who is the Ilaah (Deity/God).*" The Qur'aan emphatically and explicitly affirms the Presence of Allah Azza Wa Jal in the heaven (*fis-samaa'*). Therefore, the coprocreep's attempt to prove Allah's Presence in the heaven with the aid of the dumb slaughterer is a futile and a stupid exercise.

In addition, the attempt to prove the Presence of Allah Azza Wa Jal in the heavens is redundant and irrational. An argument is presented to affirm an issue which is being denied. However, the Ahnaaf are not in abnegation of the Divine Presence in the heaven. We testify that Allah Azza Wa Jal is in the *Samaa'*. The attempt to prove to us the Divine Presence in the heavens is therefore stupid, misdirected and redundant. It is a futile exercise.

The reason why the coprocreep has refrained from citing the Qur'aanic verse which affirms the Divine Presence in the heaven, is because the very same aayat affirms the Divine Presence *in the earth* as well. The Qur'aan Majeed states: "*He (Allah) is The Being Who is the Ilaah in the heaven, and the Ilaah in the earth.*" (*Zukhruf, aayat 84*). In assigning a confined space to Allah Ta'ala, the coprocreep and his salafi masters are in denial of this Qur'aanic verse which explicitly declares the

Divine Presence *in the earth* as well. There are other verses too of the Qur'aan-e-Hakeem which confirm the Divine Omnipresence - an Immanence which is beyond the comprehension of the human mind. Thus the Qur'aan states: "*East and West belong to Allah. Whichever way you turn, there is the Face of Allah.*"

While the salafi coprocreeps believe that Allah Ta'ala is *only* in the heaven, confined to the Arsh, the Qur'aan Majeed explicitly affirms the Omnipresence of Allah Azza Wa Jal. They are unable to deny that they resort to naked *ta'weel* to bend the Qur'aanic verses to conform to their corrupt belief of Allah Azza Wa Jal being confined to the created Arsh. Refuting the literal interpretation of the terms: "*He is in the heaven...*", Shaikh Ibn Jauzi Hambali (rahmatullah alayh) says in his kitaab, *Dafu Shubh*: "*It has been emphatically established that the aayat is not to be understood literally because the word 'fi' (in) is for zarfiyyah (i.e. for containment in space) whilst Allah Subhaanahu Wa Ta'ala is not contained by space. Now when (human) understanding prevents from adopting such a meaning, then there remains only to describe The Mighty One with what is magnificent to creation.*"

It is never magnificent to ascribe such an attribute to Allah Azza Wa Jal which renders Him 'smaller' than His creation, which is the conclusion of confining Him to a particular point in creation, namely, the Throne.

Furthermore, the Hambali *fiqhi* mas'alah does not place the Ahnaaf in a quandary because while the Ahnaaf are Muqallideen, they are not the Muqallideen of the Hambali Math-hab. It is therefore spurious and silly to present a *fiqhi* detail of the Hambali Math-hab to negate the belief of the Ahnaaf. This *fiqhi* mas'alah has no relevance to the arguments of the Ahnaaf. It is not a requirement of the Hanafi Math-hab nor of the Maaliki and Shaafi' Math-habs for the validity of *Thabah* that the *akhras* points towards the heavens when slaughtering. The Ahnaaf are

under no obligation to offer Taqleed to the Hambali Math-hab on this or any other mas'alah. The following claim of the coprocreep is therefore utterly baseless and misdirected:

*"As Mathabistic Taqleed would suggest, the Deo must advise him to point to the sky before slaughter to legalise the meat according to the Hanbali school of law."* The Ahnaaf have no need to advise anyone to point to the sky when slaughtering since this act is not a requisite for the validity of *Thabah* by an *akhras* in terms of the Hanafi Math-hab nor according to the Shaafi and Maaliki Math-habs. Thus, by abstaining from imposing on the *akhras* to point to the heavens when slaughtering, the Ahnaaf are not in abnegation of the Divine Presence in the heavens. Pointing is simply not a requisite of *Thabah* according to the three Math-habs.

The following averment of the coprocreep is likewise superfluous and redundant: "*The Hanaabilah who devised this mas'alah had only one thing in mind - that by pointing, it is meant Allah being up-above in the heaven is meant.*" The Divine Presence "*up-above in the heaven*" is a belief which is not restricted to the Hanaabilah. The followers of all Math-habs affirm this belief. However, the difference between the followers of the FOUR Math-habs and the salafi coprocreeps is that while they cordon and block-off Allah Azza Wa Jal in a specific space of His creation, the followers of the FOUR Math-habs affirm the Divine Omnipresence *Bila Kaif-Bila Makaan*. His Presence is immanent in the heavens, the earth, in the space in-between the heavens and the earth, above the Arsh, below the Arsh and in whatever Allah Azza Wa Jal has created and of which we are unaware precisely as stated in the Qur'aan Shareef. And, as for the concept of Divine Omnipresence, we say that it is *bila kaif*. No one knows and no one can ever formulate a concept for any of the Divine Attributes, which could be encompassed by the finite capacity of the created mind.

Furthermore, the *fiqhi* mas'alah of the Hanaabilah pertaining to the dumb slaughterer (dumb as opposed to numb and dumb

brains) on the basis of which the coprocreep has abortively attempted to structure a *belief* relating to the *Sifaat* of Allah Azza Wa Jal, has no relevance to *Aqeedah*. Whilst it is imperative to believe in the *Aqeedah*, it is not incumbent for the *akhras* to confine his expression of Tasmiyah to the pointing act. It is thus stated in *Al-Mughni* of Ibn Qudaamah from whence the coprocreep has extracted this *mas'alah*: "*Verily, if he (the dumb slaughterer) makes any sign which indicates the Tasmiyah, and this (fact) is known (from his indication - ishaarah), then it shall suffice.*" (*Al-Mughni, Vol.11, page 61*)

After stupidly proffering this baseless and unrelated *fiqhi mas'alah*, the coprocreep who masquerades as a Hanafi in England, asks: "*Dear Deo, what is your choice? Mathabistic Taqleed? or Maturidism?*" Our response: Dear salafi coprocreep! Our choice is both - *Mathabistic Taqleed and Maturidism*.

### ALLAH'S HIGHNESS

The coprocreep alleges in his *ghutha*: "*According to the Maturidis, suggesting that Allah is up above in His Highness is Kufr.*" The coprocreep is extremely deceptive in the use of the terms "*in His Highness*". He utilizes this phrase to divert attention from the logical and literal conclusion of confining Allah Ta'ala to the created Arsh which is a physical structure. Salafis, like Shiahs resort profusely to *taqiyah* (*holy hypocrisy*) to deceive the audience. Whilst the end result of the beliefs of the coprocreep salafis pertaining to Allah's *Sifaat* is the attribution of anthropomorphism to Allah Azza Wa Jal, they deceptively endeavour to conceal the reality of their kufr belief of *tajseem* (*attribution of physical dimensions*) for Allah Azza Wa Jal, hence the coprocreep blends the belief of 'Allah being above' with the abstract phrase, "*in His Highness*".

The Maturidis (the Ahnaaf/Deobandis and Hanafis of every hue) do not deny the fact of Allah Azza Wa Jal being 'above the

Arsh', whatever this means. What the Ahnaaf and the followers of all FOUR Math-habs deny is the confinement of Allah Azza Wa Jal to the Arsh in the way a physical body is confined to a specific space in Allah's created space. Allah Ta'ala is bereft of physical dimensions and direction. High and Glorious is He above all such deficiencies as the coprocreep and his ilk attribute to Allah Azza Wa Jal with their belief of confinement. Succinctly stating the principle governing our Belief - the Belief of the Ahl-e-Haqq - the Belief of the Ahlus Sunnah - Imaam Abu Mansur Maturidi (rahmatullah alayh) states: "*Its principle is: 'We do not equate His (Allah's) action with the action of creation nor do we describe Him with the attributes of creation, for verily, He (Allah) has informed that 'Nothing is like Him' (Shuraa, aayat 11)...'*" (*Tafseerul Maturidi, Vol. 1. page 412*)

The Maturidis vigorously negate the suggestion of the slightest resemblance between Allah Azza Wa Jal and any creation. It is therefore, undoubtedly, kufr to attribute the deficiency of dimension to Allah Azza Wa Jal. And, this attribution of defect to Allah Azza Wa Jal is the logical conclusion of consigning Him to the Arsh which is a physical structure created by Allah Azza Wa Jal. So while believing in the Aayat which mentions *Istiwa alal Arsh*, the understanding of the *Istiwa* is incomprehensible to the finite mind of man.

Imaam Maturidi (rahmatullah alayh) says in his Tafseer of the Qur'aan: "*....It is not permissible to describe The Creator with actions similar to (the actions of) others besides Him. Verily, He is Hayy (Alive), Qadeer (All-Powerful), Samee' (The Hearer), Baseer (The See-er). He has negated (from Him) the attributes of creation so that he is not (thought of) like one of creation. Hence, when these (attributes of anthropomorphism) have been negated (rendered baatil), then tashaabuh (resemblance with creation) is (automatically) effaced. Thus, the meaning of the Attributes (of Allah) is whatever Allah has intended thereby. This is the necessary corollary of the negation of tashaabuh.*" (*Tafseer Maturidi, Vol.1*)

Imaam Maturidi (rahmatullah alayh) bases this simple, straightforward *Aqeedah* of the Ahlus Sunnah - the **FOUR** Math-habs - on the Qur'aanic aayat: "*And Nothing is like Him (Allah).*"

### **HANAABILAH? THE FALSEHOOD OF THE COPROCREEP**

In the effluence of *ghutha* of which his article comprises, the coprocreep has painfully laboured to deceptively convey the idea that he and the salafi coprocreeps are propounding the Math-hab of Imaam Ahmad Ibn Hambal (rahmatullah alayh). They thus attribute all their *khuraafaat* (*rubbish/drivel/flotsam/jetsam*) to Imaam Ahmad Bin Hambal (rahmatullah alayh). It should be well understood that in this contention the coprocreep is perpetrating a vile falsehood. It is a blatant LIE to claim that the baseless *Tajseemi* beliefs of the coprocreep salafis were the teachings of Imaam Ahmad (rahmatullah alayh).

What has happened is that some 'scholars' of the Hambali Math-hab had lost the pathway of the Ahlus Sunnah. They deviated into baatil and bid'ah and began propounding beliefs of anthropomorphism relating to the *Zaat* and *Sifaat* of Allah Azza Wa Jal. (*Anthropomorphism is the attribution of human qualities and personality to Allah Ta'ala*). Whilst these deviates who were from the Hanaabilah continued portraying themselves as Hanaabilah, in reality they constituted a totally different sect subscribing to the very antithesis of the *Aqeedah* of Imaam Ahmad Bin Hambal (rahmatullah alayh) and of the Ahlus Sunnah. They are like the Qadianis who were formerly Hanafis. Whilst they fabricated their own baatil beliefs, their external acts of ibaadat conformed to the teachings of the Math-hab. Whilst the Qadianis themselves developed into a distinct religion apart from Islam, the coprocreep salafis continue to shelter under the umbrella of the Hambali Math-hab whilst surreptitiously propagating their beliefs of *Tajseem*.

The illustrious Allaamah Abul Faraj Abdur Rahmaan Bin Al-Jauzi Hambali (rahmatullah alayh) thoroughly exposed the hypocrites who operated under cover of the Hambali Math-hab. In his kitaab, *Daf'u Shubhit Tashbeeh bi-Akuffit Tanzeeh*, Allaamah Al-Jauzi states:

\* "I have seen from among our (Hanaabilah) companions those who propounded in the *Usool* (of Beliefs) that which is erroneous and they resorted to writing (articles).....They authored such books whereby they disgraced the Math-hab (of Imaam Ahmad Bin Hambal). I saw them descend to the level of the masses. Thus they interpreted the *Sifaat* (*Attributes of Allah Ta'ala*) in terms of anthropomorphism. ....Verily, they adhered to the *zaahir* (literal meaning) of the *Asmaa'* (Names) and *Sifaat* (Attributes). Thus they named these with such innovated names for which they had no daleel neither by way of *Naql* (narration) nor by *Aql* (intelligence). They paid no heed to the Nusoos which diverted (meanings) from literality to such meanings which are incumbent for Allah Ta'ala, nor (did they heed) whatever confirmed the negation of the dimensions of temporality by the *zaahir* (literality). .....(Despite this) they say: 'We are the Ahlus Sunnah whilst their statements are explicit in *tashbeeh* (creating a resemblance between Allah and creation, and attributing anthropomorphism to Him).'

"I admonished them, and said to them: 'O our companions! You are (supposed to be) the Ashaab of *Naql* (people who believe in narrational evidence), and your great Imaam Ahmad Bin Hambal said whilst under lashes: 'How can I say what was not said (by the Salf-e-Saaliheen)?' Therefore, beware of fabricating in his Math-hab that which does not belong to it."

("Lashes/whips" in this context is a reference to the occasion when the ruler, Ma'moon who was a *Mu'tazili*, ordered Imaam Hambal - rahmatullah alayh - to be severely flogged for his unshakeable belief and propagation of the *Aqeedah* of the *Qur'aan* being the *Uncreated Word of Allah Azza Wa Jal*. Whilst the flogging was being meted out, this great Imaam of the Ahlus Sunnah resolutely maintained the belief of the Salf-e-Saaliheen

*and said: 'How can I say that what was not said by the Salf-e-Saaliheen?')*

\* "If you had to say: 'We recite the Ahaadith (pertaining to the Attributes of Allah) and we maintain silence (i.e. we do not probe nor comment)', then no one will criticize you. However, your literal interpretation of the (relevant) Ahaadith is vile. Therefore, do not include in the Math-hab of this Pious Man of the Salf (i.e. Imaam Ahmad) that which is not part of it. Verily, you have cloaked this Math-hab (the Hambali Math-hab) with disgraceful evil to the extent that (you cannot) be called a Hambali, but a Mujassimi (anthropomorphist)."

\* "Verily, Abu Muhammad At-Tameemi used to say with regard to some of your leaders: 'Verily, they have disgraced the Math-hab (of Imaam Hambal) with such abomination which cannot be washed until the Day of Qiyaamah.'"

\* "Verily, they (these coprocreeps) have confirmed for Allah Ta'ala (fabricated) attributes, whilst the Attributes of Allah are not confirmed except by means of *Al-Adillah Al-Qat'iyyah* (Proofs of Absolute Certitude)." (*Beliefs may not be fabricated on the basis of opinion and personal reasoning regardless of how rational and logical such fabrication may appear*).

\* "(In the fabrication of beliefs) they do not distinguish between Hadith Mash-hoor such as the Hadith pertaining to descent to the heaven of the world (Samaa Dunya), and Hadith which is not *Saheeh* such as the narration: '*I saw my Rabb in the most beautiful form*'. In fact they confirm an attribute with that as well as with this (i.e. regardless of the classification of the Hadith)."

\* "They interpret some statements on certain occasions, and they refrain from interpreting these statements on other occasions." (*This is a reference to their inconsistency which is also conspicuous in the ghutha disgorged by the coprocreep in his stupid article*).

\* "Thus, I considered it imperative to refute them so that the Imaam (i.e. Imaam Hambal) may not be related to this (fabrication). Should I remain silent, I shall be related to that belief (of the coprocreeps)..."

\* "Abu Bakr Bin Khuzaimah said regarding the aayat: 'For our Rabb there are two eyes with which He sees.' This is a fabricated bid'ah for which there is no daleel for them....."

\* "On the basis of what has been narrated (by the anthropomorphist coprocreeps) the *Zaat* of Allah is smaller than the Arsh. Therefore, their statement: "*We are not Mujassimah*", is indeed surprising."

\* "Some of them (i.e. these salafi coprocreeps) say that the direction of the Arsh is opposite to that (portion) of the *Zaat* which faces it, and it is not opposite to the entire *Zaat*. This is explicit in affirming *Tajseem and Tab'eedh* (i.e. *Allah Ta'ala is a material body consisting of parts - Nauthubillaah!*). Indeed it is most difficult upon us - How can this speaker be related to our (Hambali) Math-hab?"

\* "Ahmad (i.e. Imaam Ahmad Bin Hambal) did not affirm direction for Allah Ta'ala....."

\* "Know that verily, everyone who imagines that Allah Subhaanahu exists in space, seeks for Him direction. ....However, when direction for Him is negated, then likewise is space for Him also negated.....It is clear that space encompasses that which is in it. But nothing can encompass the Creator nor can an attribute develop for Him."

\* "When laymen do not understand statements of this kind, then do not apprise them of that which they cannot understand, and do not bother them. And, it is said: "Verily, Allah's *Istiwa on the Arsh* is as it befits Him."

**(CONTINUED IN PART 2)**