



DA'WAH AND TABLIGH: THE CURRENT CRISIS AND OUR RESPONSIBILITIES



Maulana Mohammad Abdul Malek
Ameenut ta'leem (Head of Educational Affairs)
Markazud Dawah Alislamia Dhaka, Bangladesh

1st Edition: January 2020

Publisher: M.H. Shamim

Contact: +8801648361766

E-mail: mukammelhaque3@gmail.com

Contents

Introductory Note	4
<u>Part One: Our Responsibilities</u>	5
A Challenging Test... A Great Trial	6
The Current Circumstance	6
We Must Know Our Duty	7
Different types of Responsibilities	8
Love...Only for the sake of Allah!	9
what is our responsibility?	10
Let Us Not Commit a Third Offence!	11
Acquire <i>Ilm</i> from the Ulama	12
<u>Part Two: The Errors of Maulana Sa'd Sahib</u>	14
Not All Mistakes Are the Same!	15
Negligence in Regards to the Prophets <i>alaihim as-salam</i>	16
The Reality of Maulana Sa'd sahib's Ruju' and His First Ruju'	16
His Second Ruju'	18
His Statements Regarding Musa (<i>alaihis salam</i>)	19
His Third Ruju'	23
His Furth Ruju'	23
The Same Statements Six Years Ago!	24

His Fifth and Sixth Ruju'	24
Maulana Sa'd Sahib's Statement regarding Yusuf (AS)	25
Misguidance is Misguidance - Wherever it May Be!	27
Even the Holy Prophet (<i>sallallahu alaihi wa sallam</i>)	28
Labelling Upright Ulama as '<i>Ulama us-Suu</i>'	31
Two More of His Principle Errors	31
Unsubstantiated Claims Regarding the Unseen	32
His Claims Regarding Nizamuddin Markaz	32
Innovations in Deen	34
Darul Uloom Deoband's Position Regarding Maulana Sa'd Sahib	35

بِسْمِ اللّٰهِ الرَّحْمٰنِ الرَّحِیْمِ

Introductory Note:

The current crisis of the effort of Da'wah and Tabligh is truly a great concern. It is an immense tragedy and, in reality, a test for everyone. Therefore, it is essential that we understand the reality of the situation so we may differentiate between right and wrong. We also need to be aware of our responsibilities in such circumstances.

Through the grace of Allah, the Ulama have been explaining the issue and clarifying our responsibilities through their written and oratory discourses. Amongst these Ulama is Maulana Mohammad Abdul Malek, supervisor of the monthly Alkawsar and Head of Educational Affairs at Markazud Dawah Alislamia Dhaka.

This writing is an English adaptation of one of his speeches regarding this matter. It was delivered on the 4th of Rabi' al- Awwal 1440 AH – 13th of November 2018 in Munshiganj, Bangladesh. The speech was then transcribed and published in the monthly Alkawsar. This English adaptation has been produced from the mentioned publication.

As this writing was originally a speech delivered in Bangla, slight changes have been made whilst translating and transferring it into a written form in order to maintain clarity. A few words or phrases have been added or taken out in order to keep the writing easy to read and understand. The order has also slightly been changed in places to avoid repetition. Nevertheless, it should be kept in mind that this is an English adaptation of an oratory speech. Insha'Allah, if this is borne in mind, it will be easier for the reader to benefit from the writing. As for the various Urdu quotations in this writing, it has been endeavored to stay as close to the original Urdu during translation to avoid any misrepresentation. All headings in this article have been added by the translator.

May Almighty Allah enable us to benefit from this discourse by understanding our responsibilities and adhering to the advice of the Ulama – ameen.

-mohius sunnah & safuan ahmad

Part One:
Our Responsibilities

الحمد لله نحمده ونستعينه ونستغفره، و نؤمن به ونتوكل عليه، ونعوذ بالله من شرور أنفسنا ومن سيئات أعمالنا، من يهده الله فلا مضل له، ومن يضلل فلا هادي له، وأشهد أن لا إله إلا الله وحده لا شريك له، وأشهد أن محمدا عبده ورسوله. يَا أَيُّهَا الَّذِينَ آمَنُوا اتَّقُوا اللَّهَ وَقُولُوا قَوْلًا سَدِيدًا ﴿٧٠﴾ يُصْلِحْ لَكُمْ أَعْمَالَكُمْ وَيَغْفِرْ لَكُمْ ذُنُوبَكُمْ وَمَنْ يُطِيعِ اللَّهَ وَرَسُولَهُ فَقَدْ فَازَ فَوْزًا عَظِيمًا ﴿٧١﴾

A Challenging Test... A Great Trial

The task of Da'wah and Tabligh is a very essential branch of Deen. This effort is one of the many efforts of Deen that Allah has bestowed us. The ways and methods of undertaking this great and noble task are many. From these is the methodology of Maulana Ilyas (rahmatullahi alaih). He adopted this methodology after consulting his elders and teachers and making istikharah many times. However, he never classified any other methodology as wrong because he understood that his methodology was only one of many ways of accomplishing this great duty. Nonetheless, the methodology of Maulana Ilyas (rahmatullahi alaih) has proven to be greatly beneficial and abundantly fruitful for the Ummah at large, and Insha'Allah it will continue to be so. The present situation of Da'wah and Tabligh is a great concern for us all. In reality, it is a great tragedy. It is our great misfortune that a great trial has presently befallen this blessed effort.

Trials and tests continue to transpire in a person's life; in a person's personal life, family life and social life. A person undergoes different trials at different times. The duty of a believer in such circumstances is to identify his obligations. Also, one should ponder about the possible cause of the trial and what lessons should be taken from it. Tests come from Allah so a person may come out of their heedlessness and negligence. If an individual's negligence increases despite such trials, then this becomes a means of the displeasure and anger of Allah. Therefore, we must take heed and find out our responsibilities from the scholars. Many of us however are negligent. We fail to realize our duties and obligations and we fail to take the necessary lessons.

The Current Circumstance

Until now, we have been accustomed to hearing words of *hidayah* and guidance from the *mimbar* (pulpit) of Nizamuddin; we have been accustomed to hearing words of *hidayah* from the responsible persons of this effort. However, presently from this very *mimbar*, from one particular person we now hear words of misguidance and *dhalalah* instead of those of guidance and *hidayah*. When this person sits on the *mimbar*, we hear unbridled statements that contradict the *ijma'* and consensus of the *Ahlu-Sunnah wal-Jama'ah*; we hear statements that contradict the proofs of the *Shari'ah*.

The duty of the responsible persons of this effort is to refrain from making statements that contradict the proofs of the *Shari'ah* or lack evidence; to abstain from making statements based on assumptions or estimations. This was one of their distinctive characteristics until now. However, now we hear unsubstantiated claims made based on mere approximation and speculation from one of those who was responsible for this effort.

This is not just something that has been happening recently. Rather, it has been happening for a number of years! Efforts were made for the *islah* and rectification of these issues internally without the matter being publicized. His elders and associates tried their utmost for these issues to be rectified and for a mutual understanding to be achieved in private. On various occasions, letters were sent to him drawing his attention to these issues. However, it was of no avail and there was no change! Especially for the past six or seven years. These efforts for reform and rectification have been taking place with particular emphasis. However, when all such endeavors were unsuccessful then – and only then –the matter was publicized

We Must Know Our Duty

So, what is the ruling in such a situation and what does the *Shari'ah* instruct us to do? It is incumbent upon us to know and find out. There is no scope for carelessness. There is no room to let it simply be.

You can forego a personal right, for example, a property or land you own. If someone adamantly claims that it belongs to them, you can say “Let it be”. You may give up your right; you may choose not to take the matter to court. You may even tell your children to relinquish their claim. However, there is no scope to adopt such a stance regarding a matter of Deen. You cannot dismiss the issue if clearly wrong statements are being made and if words of misguidance are being propounded. You cannot dismiss it when someone insists upon their incorrect stance despite being informed. You cannot dismiss it when they continue in their attempts to establish their incorrect position.

The matter becomes of even greater importance if the individual in question is someone in-charge of a Deeni effort; someone whose words people accept as words of *hidayah*; someone whose statements people accept as religious instruction. Such a person can never be eligible of a position of religious leadership and such an individual can never be worthy of being followed.

Different Types of Responsibilities

One thing is a general or procedural responsibility. Another is a Deeni responsibility. Both are very different from one another. For example, building or constructional work in the masjid is a general and procedural duty. Therefore, there may be some workers do not pay due attention to their Salah. Builders and workers should also be particular about Salah but nonetheless, you may employ them to do their job even if they are not. You should advise them to pray but you will not need to get rid of them if they do not. This is because their responsibility is brick-and-cement work. They are not responsible for making speeches, delivering the Jumu'ah sermon or leading the prayer.

Their responsibility is not a Deeni responsibility relating to a Deeni affair. They should be given da'wah and advised, but nevertheless, they can be kept even if they do not pray. On the other hand, however, if this worker was to take the *mimbar* and start delivering a speech, or if he stands in the imam's place to lead the prayer, then this is not acceptable.

Let it be very clear that I am not trying to draw any parallels. I only wish to explain that there are two different types of responsibilities and that they are very different from one another. One is a general or procedural responsibility; another is a Deeni responsibility.

Responsibilities such as that of the *tashkeel* room, the foreigner's section or making routes for jamaats are all general and procedural responsibilities. They can be assigned to anyone who is capable of following the guidelines provided by the elders and doing the job. Other responsibilities are those directly related to Deeni matters. For example, responsibilities such that of delivering speeches, or the *ta'leem* of *Hayatus-Sahaba*, or *hidayaat* talk etc. In order for a person to be eligible for such responsibilities, their statements must be correct; their words must be the words of *hidayah* and not words of *dhalalah*! There cannot be any statements of misguidance and *dhalalah* along with those of *hidayah*. If a person makes such statements then it is the duty of the Ulama to clarify the matter it cannot be expected from them that they remain silent.

A person who is entrusted with a Deeni responsibility – the responsibility of an effort of Deen and delivering instruction regarding a matter of Deen – must follow the way of the *Ahlus-Sunnah wal-Jama'ah*. Their *aqaid* and beliefs, their words and speech and their thoughts and ideology must all conform with that of the *Ahlus-Sunnah wal-Jama'ah*. It is extremely dangerous if such a responsibility is entrusted to a person who has any aspect of *bid'ah* in them. A person who is affiliated with *bid'ah* can be of two types: Firstly, a person who commits acts of *bid'ah* by following someone else; secondly, a person who himself innovates new *bid'at*. How perilous is it if a person formulates new innovations while apparently conveying words of *hidayah*?! This is the case with Maulana Sa'd sahib (may Allah protect him)!

I have described the present circumstances as a great trial and test for us all. The reason for it being a great trial is because it is coming from an individual who everyone deemed reliable; a person who we had love and affection for; a person who we received religious instruction from and through whose speeches countless individuals came towards Deen. This makes the matter very difficult to believe and accept. Doubts and questions may arise in the people's minds - and rightly so. If a handful of people or one or two scholars were to claim that Maulana Sa'd sahib is wrong then there would be room to be skeptical about the matter. However, when countless responsible scholars from various countries have unanimously agreed on the matter then there is no room for doubt. In such a scenario, it becomes compulsory upon us that we deeply ponder upon the matter.

Love...Only for the sake of Allah!

Our love for Maulana Sa'd sahib is for the sake of Allah. We love the *haq* and we also love Maulana Sa'd sahib. However, our love for Maulana Sa'd sahib is only for the sake of Allah. We do not love him because his name is Sa'd nor do we love him because he is from the village of Khandhla. We do not love him because he is the imam of Nizamuddin masjid nor because he is the grandson of Maulana Yusuf (*rahmatullahi alaih*). Our love for him is only for the sake of Allah; because his words were the words of *hidayah* and because he used to call people towards the Deen of Allah.

However, the Ulama (All notable scholars)¹ have unanimously made it clear that many of his statements are statements of misguidance and *dhalalah*. He has made such statements in front of hundreds of thousands of people and he is not willing to change his stance despite been notified about the issues. It seems his very ideology and manner of thinking have changed. His temperament and inclinations are different. His statements and explanations are according to his own preferences and way of thinking without giving due importance to the methodology of the predecessors and the *salaf*!

Based on these circumstances, we will hold back our love for him until *islah* takes place; because our love for him was for the sake of Allah. If we accept his erroneous statements or follow him before he reforms himself Almighty Allah will be displeased. so, Our love will remain only in our hearts and we will only express it by making *du'a* for him.

¹ As for those who have adopted isolated opinions (shuzuz), or are devoid of firmness in knowledge, or because of bigotry have become an exemplification of love makes you blind and deaf", or have remained silent for some other reason, their opinion is not evidence and can not substantiate the matter in the least.

We will make *du'a* that Allah grants Maulana Sa'd sahib *hidayah* and the ability to correct his ways. That Allah grants him the ability to return to the correct path. That Allah grants him firmness and depth in *ilm*; the company of those close to Allah and the ability to gain the *ilm* of Deen in the correct way. O Allah! Grant us all steadfastness upon Deen and accept us all. Remove the crisis that has afflicted the effort of Da'wah and Tabligh. Grant correct understanding to the brothers who have chosen to follow Maulana Sa'd sahib and also grant *hidayah* and steadfastness to those making effort under the supervision of the Ulama. Forgive their shortcomings and rectify their errors. Grant them the ability to call towards *haq* in the correct manner. Save us from all kinds of bias and immoderation. Save us from disrespecting any of the elders – *ameen, ya Rabb al-alameen*.

what is our responsibility?

We need to continue doing the effort of Da'wah and Tabligh in the way taught to us by the senior elders. Let us take the example of Bangladesh: Maulana Zubair sahib, Maulana Rabi'ul Haq sahib and other Ulama of Kakrail Markaz started making this effort long before Maulana Sa'd sahib. They are senior to him. They started with the basics: with *chilla* and *saal*. They did not start by delivering speeches and *bayaans* nor did they start with a position of responsibility and authority. They did not learn this effort from someone contemporary. Rather, they were taught this effort by the elders of Maulana Sa'd sahib's father.

The *mashwarah* given by the Ulama of Bangladesh was to keep sight of the objective. They said that the objective is the effort; not a particular name or personality. Thus, it is not appropriate to invite Maulana Sa'd sahib to the Tongi *Ijtima'* because he has not corrected his severely objectionable statements and grave errors until now. The Ulama said: Let him reform his errors and then he may come just as before. They said that Maulana Sa'd sahib needs to call back the elders who left Nizamuddin Markaz because he refused to reform his ways; let him rectify the issues they have identified and assure them that the effort will take place according to *mashwarah*. Once they come to mutual understanding, Maulana Sa'd sahib may once again be amongst our elders. However, until then the effort should take place under the supervision of the other elders of Tabligh who learnt the effort from the predecessors, since the actual objective is the effort.

This was the very worthy and reasonable *mashwara* given by the Ulama. However, some people disregarded it. Neither did they accept it, nor did they remain silent. Rather, they went on to create disunity and dissent. They went as far as to call themselves the "*Itaa'ati Jamaat*" (Obedience Jamaat) in Bangladesh. *Inna lillahi wa inna ilaihi raji'oon*. They caused a rift in this great and important effort of Deen instead of staying united upon *haq*.

The Ulama made continuous efforts in explaining and clarifying the matter in order for unity to be achieved once again. They could have re-united and they should have re-united! There is no scope for disunity in the matter of *haq* and *baatil* (truth and falsehood). In such circumstances, it is necessary to stay steadfast upon the *haq*! There can be no disunity when it comes to the *haq*! This is not an issue of position and power or name and fame for such disunity to occur!

Creating disunity and dissent was the first grave offense committed. Thereafter, it was our duty to reunite, however we did not do so, thus committing a second grave offence. Let us not commit a third offence! Let us repent and rectify our ways – let us reunite for the sake of Allah!

We claim to have been “learning *Imaan*” for so many years but fail to accept the *haq*. One of the most important branches of *Imaan* is to build within oneself the capacity to accept the *haq* even if goes against my father, my *amir*, or even the person who taught me Tabligh. We should be grateful and make *du’a* for them, but we cannot obey them in that which is incorrect. It is of no benefit to them if we move away from the correct path. Rather, this will be a means of their sins increasing. We should endeavor to convince them to return to the *haq*.

Let Us Not Commit a Third Offence!

We need to reunite for the sake of Allah. Let us join hands again and reunite upon the *haq*. Let us not commit a third offence! Both groups associate themselves with this noble effort of Da’wah and Tabligh. One of the fundamental principles of Da’wah and Tabligh is *ikramul muslimmeen*. Let us at least adhere to this principle and not commit a third wrong by violating it.

There are many manifestations of this third offence. Amongst these is becoming embroiled in arguments, quarreling, backbiting and lying. We are picking out each other’s shortcomings and deficiencies, and throwing false allegations at one another. Instead of abstaining from *ghibah* ourselves, we accuse the Ulama are doing *ghibah* because they are informing us of Maulana Sa’d sahib’s errors! Ulama explaining the mistakes of Maulana Sa’d sahib is not *ghibah*; it is a Deeni responsibility and *nasiha*. *Nasiha* means well-wishing and *ghibah* means backbiting and faultfinding. As a human being Maulana Sa’d sahib can certainly have err. To discuss such errors would be classified as *ghibah*. On the other hand, identifying someone’s *Deeni* mistakes in a *Deeni* matter is not *ghibah* – it is called *nasiha* and well-wishing. It is well-wishing for the one committing the error and for those who may be following it. *Ghibah* and faultfinding is haram whereas *nasiha* is a religious obligation!

Let us refrain from *ghibah* and lying. It is not permissible to lie about someone because of a disagreement nor is it permissible to lie in order to propagate the

truth. Moreover, it is certainly not permissible to lie for the propagation of falsehood!

Lies and deceptions! *Ghibah* and false allegations! Name-calling and indecent language! Vile acts such as these have flooded social media. There is no end to the propaganda that is being spread. The matter has gone as far as sticks, stones and causing physical harm. All these things are undoubtedly haram and have no association with the values of Da'wah and Tabligh. They are haram, regardless of whether it is done for the propagation of falsehood or it is done for propagating the truth. Those making effort under the supervision of Ulama must abstain from these major sins and as well as those who follow Maulana Sa'd sahib. The latter have already wronged themselves so let them go no further by also committing these offences also.

Acquire *Ilm* from the Ulama

One of the distinctive Principles of Tabligh is that we learn *ilm* of *fa'dhaail* from the circles of *ta'leem* and *ilm* of *masaa'il* from the Ulama. On the 2nd of December 2017 Maulana Sa'd sahib stated in Nizamuddin Markaz, in the *ta'leem* after Isha:

محترم بزرگو عزیزو! علم، عمل کی کسوٹی ہے۔ علم و عمل کو علمائے کرام پر پیش کرو۔ علماء قائد ہیں، علماء مقتدی ہیں اور امت مقتدی ہے۔ علماء اس لیے مقتدی ہیں کہ اصل علم امام ہے، ہم قدم قدم پر اقوال و افعال و اعمال میں علماء کے تابع ہیں۔ علماء کی رہبری اور ان کی طرف سے ملنے والی ہدایت یہ بنیادی بات ہے، اس لیے کہ علم سے ہٹ کر جہل اور ضلالت ہے، اس لیے ہمیں چاہیے کہ ہر بیان اور ہر قول و عمل میں یہ دیکھیں کہ علمائے حق کیا فرماتے صحابہ اور خلفائے راشدین اس بارے میں سب سے زیادہ ڈرنے والے تھے، میرا قول و عمل علم کے مطابق ہے یا خلاف؟

Translation:

Respected elders and friends, the gauge for *amal* is *ilm* (i.e. the correctness of *a'maal* will be decided according to *ilm*). Present your *ilm* and *amal* before the Ulama. The Ulama are leaders. The Ulama are to be followed and the ummah are followers. The reason for the Ulama to be followed is that *ilm* is actually the imam. Every step of the way, in our words, deeds and actions we are subservient to the Ulama. The guidance and instructions we receive from the Ulama is essential, because moving away from *ilm* is ignorance and misguidance. Therefore, in every *bayaan* and in every word and deed we should see what the rightful Ulama have to say. The companions and rightly-guided *Khulafa* were the most fearful in this regard; are my words and deeds in conforming to *ilm* or contrary to it?!

Those of us claiming to follow Maulana Sa'd sahib and Nizamuddin should obey him in this statement also!

In January 2018 Maulana Sa'd gave a speech in Kakrail masjid. He stated:

علمائے کرام کو اپنی اصلاح کا ذریعہ اور ان کے ٹوکنے کو ان کا اپنے اوپر احسان یقین کریں؛ اس لیے کہ علماء جو بات فرمائیں گے اس میں عمل کی قبولیت اور اس میں ہی عمل کا صحیح ہونا ہے۔ اس طرح ہم علمائے کرام سے علمی استفادہ بھی کریں اور اگر علماء کسی بات پر اعتراض کریں یا کسی بات کو ٹوکیں تو اس کو قبول بھی کریں۔

Translation:

Be certain that the objections of the respected Ulama are a means of your rectification and their corrections are a kindness upon you, because the acceptance and correctness of actions lie only in what the Ulama say. Likewise, let us acquire *ilm* from the Ulama. If the Ulama object to anything or correct it then receive it with acceptance.

In other words, if the Ulama object that a particular statement or act is incorrect, then accept it as a means of rectification. If they stop you from doing a certain action or rectify you, then accept it as their favor and kindness. Our deeds will only be correct and accepted by Almighty Allah if we adhere to the Deeni guidelines given by the Ulama. We need to acquire *ilm* from the Ulama and accept anything they may object to as an *ihsan* (a favor and kindness).

This statement of Maulana Sa'd sahib is applicable to all of us, and even more for those who claim to follow and obey him! Claiming to obey Maulana Sa'd sahib and disregarding the correct things he says is another aspect of the third offence.

What I have said until now was not an introduction to my discussion! These are very fundamental points that I wished to convey. I mentioned them first to emphasize their importance. May Allah grant us all the ability to understand and act upon what has been said – *ameen*. Now I wish to discuss some of the errors of Maulana Sa'd sahib *hafizahullah* (may Allah protect him).

Part Two:
The Errors of Maulana Sa'd Sahib

Many brothers want to understand the current crisis of the effort of Da'wah and Tabligh. They sincerely wish to understand Maulana Sa'd sahib's mistakes and why the Ulama say he cannot be followed until he reforms his ways; why the effort should take place under the guidance of the other senior elders until then.

Not All Mistakes Are the Same!

"Who doesn't make mistakes? Everyone makes mistakes!". These are the arguments some brothers present in favor of Maulana Sa'd sahib. However, it must be understood that not all mistakes are the same. Let me elaborate with an example: A person's fast will not break if he mistakenly eats or drinks. He will not be sinful nor will he need to repeat his fast by doing *qadha*. However, if a person clearly remembers he is fasting but water mistakenly slips down his throat during *wudhu* then he will need to repeat his fast although he will not be sinful. A third scenario is if a youngster who is *baaligh* (reached the age of puberty) fasts in the month Ramadhan. His mother however convinces him to break his fast because he has exams. If he breaks his fast, then this is also a mistake. However, in this situation he will be sinful for it and he needs to repent. Moreover, he will need to repeat the fast and keep another sixty as *kaffarah* (expiation)!

It is true that everyone makes mistakes. However, mistakes are of different degrees and categories. Different mistakes have different rulings. Mistakes in *aqaid* (beliefs) and mistakes in *a'maal* (deeds) are not the same. A personal mistake and mistakes involving the rulings of the *Shari'ah* are not the same. An incorrect statement behind closed doors in the presence of one or two people and an error made in front of huge gatherings is not the same. A mistake made by a person who is considered to be an authority in Deen and a mistake made by a normal person is not the same. We may remain silent regarding the latter but we cannot do so regarding the former. Maulana Sa'd sahib is a person responsible for the effort of Da'wah and Tabligh. Hundreds of thousands of people listen to his speeches. They take his word to be words of *hidayah*; words based on the Qur'an and *Sunnah*. Thus, they accept and follow what he says. His mistake and a mistake made by another person is not the same.

The Ulama also understand that everyone makes mistakes! However, the errors of Maulana Sa'd sahib are such that he cannot be followed until *islah* (rectification) takes place.

Yesterday, I was listening to a discourse of Maulana Sa'd sahib. He was reading an Arabic extract from *Hayatus-Sahabah*. Instead of reading the name 'miqsam' (مقسم) with a *kasra* he read 'muqsam' (مقسم) with a *dammah*. This is also a mistake but we can remain silent here. Maybe it happened because of unawareness or it could be that he didn't know that it should be read as 'miqsam' (مقسم). However, when he makes statements that distort the rulings

of the *Shari'ah* and deviate from the principles of the *Ahlu-Sunnah wal-Jama'ah* the Ulama cannot remain silent!

Negligence in Regards to the Prophets

One of his major issues is the manner in which he discusses various aspects relating to the Prophets (*alaihim as-salam*). Almighty Allah sent the Prophets (*alaihim as-salam*) for the guidance of humanity. He made their lives an example for everyone to follow. We discuss and study their incidents to attain guidance. It is not permissible to discuss their lives in a critical manner as though we are seeking faults in them. *Na'udhubillah*.

However, Maulana Sa'd sahib discusses the lives of the Prophets (*alaihim as-salam*) in a manner that sometimes appears as though he is being critical of them; as if he is picking out their errors. He becomes unmindful of his wording and presentation. It seems as though he wants to portray that the Prophets (*alaihim as-salam*) were wrong and they cannot be followed in certain matters. It is as though he is warning us that we should not fall into the same mistakes as they had! *Na'udhubillah*.

He has presented the lives of the prophets in such a manner on numerous occasions. He did this regarding Musa (*alaihis salam*), Yusuf (*alaihis salam*) and even our beloved prophet Muhammad (*sallallahu alaihi wa sallam*). How can someone who makes such a great error be entrusted with the responsibility of delivering religious guidance?! Can we continue to rely upon him if he fails to correct his ways?

The Reality of Maulana Sa'd sahib's Ruju' and His First Ruju'

Ruju' is an Arabic word, which literally means to return or come back. Thus, in this context it means: admitting one's mistake and returning to the correct position. It means: explaining what mistake has been made and thereafter clarifying what the correct position should be.

Maulana Sa'd sahib has made numerous unacceptable statements on various occasions in various places. He also has made ruju' and retracted his statements a number of times. For this reason, I would like to discuss the reality of his ruju's before elaborating on his incorrect statements. As for the matter of Musa (*alaihis salam*) specifically, Maulana Sa'd sahib did eventually succeed in making a satisfactory ruju' with regards to it. I will soon discuss this also.

When the initial fatwa was prepared by Darul Uloom Deoband regarding the errors of Maulana Sa'd sahib he sent a messenger to Darul Uloom stating he is prepared to make ruju' from all of his errors. Darul Uloom Deoband provided Maulana Sa'd sahib with a short list of his objectionable statements; statements that are contrary to the consensus of the *Ahlu-Sunnah wal-Jama'ah*

and those that result in disrespecting the status of the Prophets *alaihim as-salam*. In reply to this list Maulana Sa'd sahib sent a letter to Darul Uloom Deoband which was his first ruju'. In this letter he admitted his errors.

In the beginning of his first ruju' he wrote:

----- اس سلسلے میں جن سابقہ قدیم بیانات کا حوالہ تحریر گرامی میں دیا گیا ہے، احقر اس کو اپنا ایک دینی فرائض سمجھتے ہوئے اپنی
جانب سے واضح الفاظ میں رجوع کرتا ہے، اور اللہ تعالیٰ سے عفو و مغفرت کا طالب ہے۔-----

Translation:

In this regard, this lowly one, considering it his Deeni responsibility, makes ruju' on his part in clear words from those previous *bayaans* that have been referred to, and seeks Almighty Allah's forgiveness.

However, at the end of the ruju' letter Maulana Sa'd sahib seems to accuse Darul Uloom Deoband of having ill-thoughts regarding him; that the mistakes identified were only on the basis of ill-thoughts about him. Moreover, he tries to argue that he has references and proofs for his statements. He wrote:

----- آپ جیسے عالمی علمی دینی مرکز کے اہم ذمے دار حضرات کو احقر اس کے ساتھیوں کے افکار و خیالات، موقف
و مسلک میں کسی قسم کی جو بدگمانی ہوئی ہے احقر اس کو نہایت افسوس ناک اور دعوت و تبلیغ والے مبارک عمل اور اس کے مرکز کے
ساتھ عدم تعاون سمجھتا ہے۔۔۔۔۔ نیز احقر کے بیانات پر جو اعتراض ہیں ان کے متعلق احقر کی کم علمی کے باوجود جو معلومات
اور ان کے علمی مراجع وغیرہ ہیں آئندہ ار سال کرنے کی کوشش کی جائے گی۔

Translation:

This lowly one considers very disappointing whatever ill thoughts important individuals such as yourselves - who are responsible for an international and academic center - have had regarding the ideologies and thoughts, position and way of this lowly one and his associates. He feels that it is being uncooperative with the blessed effort of Da'wah and Tabligh and it's Markaz... Moreover, despite this lowly ones lack of *ilm*, an attempt will be made to send whatever information and references are available relating to the objections raised regarding the speeches of this lowly one'.

This was what Maulana Sa'd sahib wrote at the end of his first ruju'. He argued that he has references and proofs for his statements. In other words, he was trying to establish his incorrect and misguided position. Even if references are provided for statements of *dhalalah* and misguidance then the references must also be wrong. How can there be any valid proofs or references for statements of misguidance?! Either the books being referred to

are not reliable, or this particular discussion is not reliable, or the author has made a mistake.

Is there a need for ruju' if someone assumes they are correct and has evidence to support their statements?! Can this be considered as valid ruju' or will it be considered that they are trying to unjustly prove they are correct?! Obviously such an act defeats the very objective of the ruju'. Darul Uloom Deoband therefore was unable to retract their fatwa. They sent a reply stating that despite Maulana Sa'd sahib apparently making ruju' in the beginning of his letter, the ending denotes something different. Therefore, we will be sending the fatwa to those whom it concerns and to those who can take the necessary action in this regard i.e. the Ulama and selected personnel of Da'wah and Tabligh. This was the initial fatwa of Darul Uloom Deoband.

His Second Ruju'

Maulana Sa'd sahib sent a second ruju' a few days after this initial fatwa was issued by Darul Uloom Deoband. The second ruju' was identical to the first one except for the mission of the final statements. There was no longer any mention of providing references for his unfitting statements. This second ruju' was signed by Maulana Sa'd sahib on the 10th of Rabi' al-Awwal 1438 AH and sent on the 11th of Rabi' al-Awwal 1438 AH.

As this second ruju' was clear and had nothing objectionable Darul Uloom Deoband accepted it. A note was sent to Maulana Sa'd sahib informing him that his ruju' had been received and approved of. It also stated that a detailed letter elaborating on the new position of Darul Uloom Deoband in this regard would be sent soon.

Two days later, on the 13th of Rabi' al-Awwal, a detailed letter was sent with a messenger to Nizamuddin. The letter stated that Maulana Sa'd sahib's ruju' had been accepted. It also praised Maulana Sa'd sahib for his upright conduct in admitting his error.

However, before the messenger reached Nizamuddin, information reached Darul Uloom Deoband that Maulana Sa'd sahib had repeated his objectionable statement regarding Musa (*alaihis salam*) that very day in his speech after Fajar. Moreover, he had also made an objectionable statement about Yusuf (*alaihis salam*) along with it. When Darul Uloom Deoband received this information, the messenger sent with the letter detailing Darul Uloom Deoband's new position was called back.

Thus, within the span of two days Maulana Sa'd sahib did ruju' only to repeat the very same statements. He sent his second ruju' on the 11th of Rabi' al-Awwal 1438 AH and then repeated his statements on the 13th of Rabi' al-Awwal 1438 AH. As if ruju' is just a matter of play and games! There were

apparently two ruju's but, in reality, there was no ruju' at all. A single ruju' is sufficient if it is done in the way it should be done!

His Statements Regarding Musa (*alaihis salam*)

The statement he made in Nizamuddin regarding Musa (*alaihis salam*) on the 13th of Rabi' al-Awwal 1438 AH (the 13th of December 2016) are as follows:

دعوت کا چھوٹ جانا یہ امت کی گمراہی کا یقینی سبب ہے، دعوت کا چھوٹ جانا یہ امت کی گمراہی کا یقینی سبب ہے، دعوت کا چھوٹ جانا یہ امت کی گمراہی کا یقینی سبب ہے، دعوت کا چھوٹ جانا یہ امت کی گمراہی کا یقینی سبب ہے؛ بلکہ یہاں تک لکھا ہے مفسرین نے کہ موسیٰ علیہ السلام نے اپنی قوم کو پیچھے چھوڑ کر اللہ کی رضا اور اس کو خوش کرنے کے لیے تنہا عبادت میں مشغول ہو گئے اور قوم پیچھے رہ گئے، اللہ نے پوچھا کہ ﴿وما أعجلک عن قومک یا موسیٰ﴾ (طہ: 83) اے موسیٰ علیہ السلام تمہیں جلدی میں کس نے ڈال دیا؟ موسیٰ علیہ السلام نے عرض کیا کہ وہ لوگ پیچھے رہ گئے۔ میں آپ کو راضی کرنے کے لیے آگے بڑھ گیا۔ دھیان سے سننا بات کو، اللہ نے فرمایا کہ اے موسیٰ علیہ السلام! ہم نے تمہارے پیچھے تمہاری قوم کو فتنہ اور آزمائش میں ڈال دیا، علمائے لکھا ہے کہ وجہ یہ ہوئی کہ موسیٰ علیہ السلام بجائے قوم کو ساتھ لے کر آنے کے قوم کو چھوڑ کر آگے، چالیس رات موسیٰ علیہ السلام نے عبادت میں گزار دی، اللہ کی شان کہ چھ لاکھ بنی اسرائیل جو سب کے سب ہدایت پر تھے، ان میں سے 5 لاکھ 88 ہزار، چالیس رات کی چھوٹی سی مدت میں گمراہ ہو گئے۔ صرف چالیس رات موسیٰ علیہ السلام نے دعوت کا کام نہیں کیا، میں یہ سمجھ کر کہہ رہا ہوں کہ صرف چالیس رات موسیٰ علیہ السلام نے دعوت کا عمل نہیں کیا، چالیس رات موسیٰ علیہ السلام عبادت میں مشغول رہے، اور اس چالیس رات کے عرصے میں 5 لاکھ 88 ہزار بنی اسرائیل سب کے سب بچھڑے کی عبادت پر جمع ہو گئے۔

Translation:

Da'wah being left out is certainly a cause of the Ummah's deviation. Da'wah being left out is certainly a cause of the Ummah's deviation. Da'wah being left out is certainly a cause of the Ummah's deviation. The Ulama have written that leaving out calling others towards Allah is a cause of misguidance. The exegetes have even written that Musa (*alaihis salam*) left his people behind and went alone to gain the pleasure of Allah and make him happy being engaged in ebadat. Allah asked him: ﴿وما أعجلک عن قومک یا موسیٰ﴾ "What made you hasten, O Musa!" (Sura Ta-Ha: 83). Musa (*alaihis salam*) replied "They were left behind, and I hastened ahead to please you."

Listen very carefully! Allah said to Musa (*alaihis salam*): "O Musa (*alaihis salam*)! We have afflicted your people with a tribulation and trial behind you." The Ulama have written that the reason for this was that Musa (*alaihis salam*) left his people behind instead of bringing them with him. Musa (*alaihis salam*) spent forty nights in *ibadah*. It is Allah's greatness that from

600,000 people of the *Bani Israeel*, all of who were upon *hidayah*, 588,000 went astray within the small duration of forty nights. Musa (*alaihis salam*) had only left the work of da'wah for forty nights. I say with understanding that Musa (*alaihis salam*) didn't do the work of da'wah for only forty nights, he remained engrossed in *ibadah* for forty nights, and in this period 588,000 people of the *Bani Israeel* all started worshipping the calf".

You can understand what a dangerous statement this is and how a great prophet such as Musa (*alaihis salam*) has been criticized. From his explanation, it appears that Musa (*alaihis salam*) left the effort of da'wah out of his own accord; to fulfill his own passion of worshipping The Lord in seclusion. He blamed Musa (*alaihis salam*) for *Bani Israeel* becoming embroiled in *shirk*.

Now let us have a look at the account given by the Holy Qur'an. The reality of the matter is that Allah *ta'ala* commanded Musa (*alaihis salam*) to go to mount Tur and instructed him to bring some people of his *ummah*, *Bani Israeel*, with him. He was commanded to spend forty nights on Mount Tur. Musa (*alaihis salam*) set out with some individuals to fulfill the command of Allah and he instructed Harun (*alaihis salam*) when leaving saying:

﴿اخلفني في قومي وأصلح ولا تتبع سبيل المفسدين﴾ (سورة الأعراف 7: 142) i.e. You are to be my deputy and substitute during my absence. Keep all affairs in order and do not follow those who create disruption. (*Sura al-A'raf* 7:142)

Upon drawing near to Mount Tur Musa (*alaihis salam*) hastened ahead because of his great eagerness and love for Allah, thus reaching the appointed destination before the rest. Allah *ta'ala* asked him:

﴿وما أعجلك عن قومك يا موسى، قال هم أولاء على أثري وعجلت إليك رب لترضى﴾ (سورة طه 20: 83-84) i.e. what made you hasten ahead of your people O Musa? He replied: They are coming right behind me, and I hastened to you, O my Lord, so that you may become pleased. (*Sura Ta-Ha* 20: 83-84)

Hadhrat Abdullah bin Abbas (*radiyallhu anhu*) says in the commentary of this verse:

كان الله عالما ولكن قال: وما أعجلك عن قومك، رحمة لموسى، وإكراما له بهذا القول، وتسكيننا لقلبه، ورقة عليه، فقال مجيبا لربه: هم أولاء على أثري. (تفسير القرطبي: 233/11، التفسير البسيط، الامام الواحدى، 487/14)

In other words, Allah knew why Musa (*alaihis salam*) had hurried ahead. Nonetheless, he still asked him regarding it as a way of honoring him and expressing his love for him. Musa (*alaihis salam*) replied that the people are right behind him and he had hastened ahead to please Allah. (*Tafsir al-Qurtubi* 11:233, *Tafsir al-Baseet*, Imam Waahidi 14:487)

Allah *ta'ala* then informed Musa (*alaihis salam*) regarding the people of *Bani Israeel* who had been left under the supervision of Harun (*alaihis salam*). Allah informed him that he had tested them and they had failed in the test. They did not adhere to the advice of Harun (*alaihis salam*) and went astray by falling prey to the scheming of the individual named Saamiriy.

This incident has been mentioned in the Qur'an in *Sura al-Baqarah*, *Sura al-A'raf* and *Sura Ta-Ha*. It is clear from verse 51 of *Sura al-Baqarah*, verses 80 and 86 of *Sura Ta-Ha* and verse 142 of *Sura al-A'raf* that Musa (*alaihis salam*) had gone to Mount Tur because of the command of Allah. From 148-154 of *Sura al-A'raf* it is also apparent that it was on this very journey that Musa (*alaihis salam*) was bestowed with the *Tawraat* (Torah). Moreover, it has been mentioned in verse 142 of *Sura al-A'raf* that Musa (*alaihis salam*) had made Harun (*alaihis salam*) his deputy during his absence; he didn't just leave his people to do as they pleased. He instructed Harun (*alaihis salam*) to keep everything in order and not follow those who cause mischief. It is clear from verses 91-94 of *Sura Ta-Ha* that Harun (*alaihis salam*) acted upon the instructions given by Musa (*alaihis salam*). However, due to their own ignorance, the *Bani Israeel* failed in the test. They started to worship the calf and fell prey to the deception of Saamiriy.

This is the context and account of the incident given in the Qur'an. However, the explanation given by Maulana Sa'd sahib (may Allah protect him) is that Musa (*alaihis salam*) left his people behind instead of bringing them with him. Thereafter, he left the work of da'wah for the duration of forty nights by indulging in *ibadah*. As a result, 588,000 people of *Bani Israeel* became engrossed in *shirk* and started worshipping the calf. *Na'udhubillah. Inna lillahi wa inna ilaihi raji'oon.*

Let us think for a moment! Is the statement made by Maulana Sa'd sahib an objection upon Musa (*alaihis salam*) alone, or is it also an objection upon the command that was given to Musa (*alaihis salam*) by Allah? It is also an objection upon the commandment of Allah. This cannot be considered an ordinary error. Rather, it is a grave and severe error. This statement disrespects the status of a Prophet and dishonors his rank. Whether this statement was made due to mere unmindfulness or not, the result is the same. It is an objection upon the commandment of Allah. He stated that the only reason for 588,000 people of the *Bani Israeel* going astray was because Musa (*alaihis salam*) left the work of da'wah! *Na'udhubillah*, may Allah protect us.

Allah *ta'ala* had commanded Musa (*alaihis salam*) to go to Mount Tur for forty nights. He went in obedience to the command of Allah. However, Maulana Sa'd sahib says that he left the effort of da'wah by doing so. Let me give an example so we can understand the matter more clearly. Does a person give da'wah when it is time for *fardh* salah? Is it permissible for a person to leave *fardh* salah and make the effort of da'wah? No, because the command of Allah at that particular moment is to pray salah. So how can it be said that Musa

(*alaihis salam*) left the effort of da'wah by going to Mount Tur upon the command of Allah? Da'wah and da'wah-related activities take place outside the times of *fardh* salah. *Jawlah* is done after Asr and *bayaan* takes place after Maghrib. In this same manner, Musa (*alaihis salam*) went to Mount Tur because of the obligatory command of Allah. However, it seems that Maulana Sa'd sahib feels that the effort of da'wah must be carried out even if it means leaving an obligatory command. It is just like saying that a person should give da'wah even if it means leaving Zuhr prayer. It will take 10-12 minutes for you to pray, whereas if you give da'wah then in that time it is possible that a person learns the importance of Salah!

Maulana Sa'd sahib is insinuating that Musa (*alaihis salam*) left the work of da'wah and *Bani Israeel* went astray as a result. He is blaming a Prophet of Allah. On the other hand, Allah is saying in the Qur'an that it was a test from him and the apparent cause of their misguidance was the individual named Saamiriy. The Qur'an says: ﴿وَأَضَلَّهُمُ السَّامِرِيُّ﴾, meaning Saamiriy lead them astray. However, Maulana Sa'd sahib states they went astray due to Musa (*alaihis salam*) leaving the work of da'wah. *Na'udhubillah*.

The Qur'an mentions that Allah *ta'ala* asked Musa (*alaihis salam*): ﴿وَمَا أَعْجَلَكَ عَنْ قَوْمِكَ يَا مُوسَى﴾, "What caused you to hasten ahead of your people (*qawm*), O Musa!" Then in the following verse, Allah tells Musa (*alaihis salam*): ﴿قَدْ فَتَنَّا قَوْمَكَ مِنْ بَعْدِكَ وَأَضَلَّهُمُ السَّامِرِيُّ﴾, "We have afflicted your people (*qawm*) with a tribulation after you, and Saamiriy has lead them astray."

These verses come after one another in the same *Sura* of the Qur'an and both verses mention the word '*qawm*' or people. However, the word '*qawm*' in both verses refers to two separate groups of people. In the first verse, it is referring to those individuals of *Bani Israeel* who Musa (*alaihis salam*) had brought with him to Mount Tur. In the second verse it is referring to those who were left under the supervision of Harun (*alaihis salam*). The '*qawm*' that went astray were those left with Harun (*alaihis salam*). They failed to follow his instructions and went astray by following Saamiriy. As for those who had accompanied Musa (*alaihis salam*), none of them went astray. Musa (*alaihis salam*) hastened ahead of them to gain the pleasure of Allah but none of them went astray as a result. Rather, they were following right behind him. No *sahih* hadith mentions that any of them deviated from the straight path.

This is the correct explanation of both verses; the word '*qawm*' in each of the verses is referring to a different group of people. However, it appears from Maulana Sa'd sahib's explanation that he has taken the word '*qawm*' in both verses to be referring to the same group of people!

Just in a single statement Maulana Sa'd sahib has made multiple mistakes. Firstly, he raised the objection that Musa (*alaihis salam*) left the work of da'wah. Secondly, he alleged that the people of *Bani Israeel* went astray due to

Musa (*alaihis salam*) whereas in reality it was due to Saamiriy. Thirdly, it seems from Maulana Sa'd sahib's words that Musa (*alaihis salam*) went to Mount Tur to worship Allah in seclusion on his own accord, whereas the reality is that Allah had commanded him to do so. Moreover, Maulana Sa'd sahib says when making this statement: میں یہ سمجھ کر کہہ رہا ہوں, meaning that he is saying whatever he is saying knowingly and with understanding. So can these errors be taken lightly and considered minor mistakes?!

These were the statements Maulana Sa'd sahib made after doing ruju' for the second time!

His Third Ruju'

A month after Maulana Sa'd sahib had invalidated his second ruju' by repeating his statements, he sent another ruju' - a third ruju'. This ruju' was unconditional in respect to some of his errors. However, in regards to the matter of Musa (*alaihis salam*) he argued that whatever he said could be understood from such-and-such place and from the statements of so-and-so!

The most serious objection against him was regarding the issue of Musa (*alaihis salam*). However, he audaciously tries to prove that he is correct in this very aspect. He claimed to have references. He claimed his statements were only *marjuh* (relatively weak) and not *batil* (completely incorrect). and made ruju' saying: even if my words are not batil, I make ruju'. *Na'udhubillah*.

This was his third ruju'. You may decide for yourselves if it is valid or not! He made unconditional ruju' from some matters and insisted on presenting arguments in favor of others. Can this be considered a valid ruju'?!

Darul Uloom Deoband replied to this ruju' by sending a letter refuting the arguments that had been presented. They showed that Maulana Sa'd sahib's statements cannot be established from the references provided. Secondly, they made it clear that the statements were not merely *marjuh* or relatively weak. Rather, they were *batil* and completely unacceptable.

Darul Uloom Deoband asked that Maulana Sa'd sahib unconditionally does ruju' from his statements regarding Musa (*alaihis salam*) also. Furthermore, since the statements had been made publicly in front of hundreds of thousands of people, the ruju' should also be made likewise.

His Fourth Ruju'

After this, Maulana Sa'd sahib made a fourth ruju'. In it, he made ruju' unconditionally from his statement regarding Musa (*alaihis salam*) also. Nonetheless, the principal of Darul Uloom Deoband rightfully did not approve this ruju' arguing that a ruju' made on paper to Darul Uloom Deoband was of little benefit now. Ruju' is a serious matter and not

something to be taken lightly. Three inadequate ruju' had already been made on paper! Since the statements were made in front of hundreds of thousands of people the ruju' should be likewise.

The Same Statements Six Years Ago!

It should also be kept in mind that Maulana Sa'd sahib made similar comments regarding Musa (*alaihis salam*) using much harsher language in 1434 AH in Haturabanda *ijtima'*. At that time, Maulana Zaid Al-Mazahiri An-Nadwi wrote a detailed letter to him highlighting the issue and warning him of its dangers. Unfortunately, he didn't accept the advice.

His Fifth and Sixth Ruju'

Maulana Sa'd sahib also made a verbal ruju' regarding some issues in Nizamuddin and Kakrail. On the 2nd of December 2017 in Nizamuddin, during the *ta'leem* of *Hayatus-Sahabah*; and in January 2018 in Kakrail Masjid Maulana Sa'd sahib expressed his ruju' specifically from his statements regarding Musa (*alaihis salam*). However, even after these ruju's he has continued to make many other dangerously misguided statements. You can refer to the book of Mufti Khizir Mahmood Qasimi for a brief list of such statements with reference to their date and place. One example is the Aurangabad *ijtima'* in February 2018. In this *ijtima'* he mentioned a matter relating to the Holy Prophet (*sallallahu alaihi wa sallam*) in an unsuitable manner! I will discuss this later in detail *Insha Allah*.

Nonetheless, this was an account of the multiple ruju's made by Maulana Sa'd sahib. I hope that everyone is now clear regarding the reality of his ruju's.

How can a person continue making such errors after even doing ruju' so many times!? The fact of the matter is that Maulana Sa'd sahib's approach and way of looking at things has changed and become distorted. Thus, he needed to make multiple ruju's, all of which were inadequate. He has a particular way of thinking. His attitude towards the *seerah* of the Prophets (*alaihim as-salam*) is that he comments on them according to his own understanding. This is a very careless attitude that needs to be rectified! For this reason, the Ulama maintain that Maulana Sa'd sahib's outlook and ideology needs correcting and a mere ruju' is no longer sufficient.

Our job is to attain *hidayah* and seek guidance from the lives of the prophets; not to criticize and try to find faults in them! If I do not understand something then I must refer to those Ulama who do understand.

Maulana Sa'd Sahib's Statement Regarding Yusuf (*alaihis salam*)

On the 13th of Rabi' al-Awwal, along with his statement regarding Musa (*alaihis salam*), Maulana Sa'd sahib also made the following comments regarding Yusuf (*alaihis salam*):

یوسف علیہ السلام بڑے سخت حالات میں تھے، تہمت لگی عزیزِ مصر کے گھر سے، اور بہت سخت حالات تھے؛ لیکن دو چیزیں اللہ دیکھنا چاہتے ہیں داعی سے۔ ایک تو یہ دیکھنا چاہتے ہیں کہ حالات سے متاثر ہو کر دعوت الی اللہ چھوڑ تو نہیں دیتا۔ ایک یہ دیکھتے ہیں اللہ انبیاء علیہم السلام کو کہ یہ حالات سے پریشان ہو کر ہمارے غیر سے مدد تو نہیں چاہتے؟ دوسرے یہ دیکھنا چاہتے ہیں کہ حالات سے متاثر ہو کر دعوت الی اللہ کا عمل چھوڑ تو نہیں دیتے۔

دوسری بات یہ ہے کہ پھر یوسف علیہ السلام نے ان کو ان کے خواب کی تعبیر بھی بتلا دی اور یہ خیال ہوا کہ ان میں سے ایک آدمی جیل سے رہا ہو کر اور باعزت بری ہو کر بادشاہ کے پاس جائے گا، لہذا بادشاہ کے پاس پیغام پہنچا دو۔ سنو دھیان سے کہ یوسف علیہ السلام نے اتنے عرصے سے جیل میں ہے کچھ اس کے مقدمہ پر غور کر لیا جائے اور اس کو جیل سے رہا کر دیا جائے، کی شان یوسف علیہ السلام کو شیطان نے اللہ کی یاد بھلا دی، یوسف علیہ السلام کو شیطان نے اللہ کی یاد بھلا دی، یوسف علیہ السلام کو شیطان نے اللہ کی یاد بھلا دی کہ یوسف علیہ السلام نے جیل سے نکلنے کے لیے ہم سے کیوں نہیں کہا؟

داعی کے لیے یہ دو چیزیں انتہائی ضروری ہیں، انتہائی ضروری کہ جب اس کے راستے میں کوئی حال آئے تو وہ اپنے حال کو اس سے کہے جس کی طرف سے پیغام لے کر بھیجا ہوا ہے۔ دنیا میں آپ کسی ادنیٰ سے ادنیٰ ملازم کو کسی ادنیٰ سے ادنیٰ کام کے لیے بھیجیں اگر اس کے کام میں کوئی رکاوٹ پیش آئے گی یا اسے کوئی دقت پیش آئے گی تو وہ رجوع کرے گا اور رابطہ کرے گا بھیجنے والے سے، جس نے کام کے لیے بھیجا ہے اس سے ہی رابطہ کرے گا کہ آپ بتائیے کہ میں کیا کروں؟ میرے کام میں رکاوٹ پیش آگئی میں کیا کروں؟ یوسف علیہ السلام نے رہا ہونے والے سے فرمایا: ﴿أذكرني عند ربك﴾ کہ میرا تذکرہ کر دینا بادشاہ کے سامنے ﴿فأنساه الشيطان ذكر ربه﴾ شیطان نے یوسف علیہ السلام کو یوسف علیہ السلام کے رب کی یاد بھلا دی۔ اس کے بعد یوسف علیہ السلام عرصہ جیل میں رہے۔

Translation:

Yusuf (*alaihis salam*) was in a very difficult situation. An accusation had been made against him from the household of the governor of Egypt and circumstances were very severe. However, Allah wants to see two things from a *daai'*. Firstly, does he abandon calling towards Allah because of being affected by difficult circumstances? Firstly, Allah sees if the Prophets (*alaihim as-salam*) become worried because of the difficulties and do they seek help from anyone besides Allah? Secondly, he wants to see if they are affected by conditions and leave the work of calling towards Allah as a result.

Yusuf (*alaihis salam*) had interpreted their dreams for them. He thought that one of them would be set free from prison and go to the king as an honorable and innocent person. Therefore, let me convey a message to the king.

Listen attentively. Yusuf (*alaihis salam*) had been in prison for such a long time. So let some thought be given to his case so he may be freed from prison.

The greatness of Allah! Shaytaan made Yusuf (*alaihis salam*) forget the remembrance of Allah! Shaytaan made Yusuf (*alaihis salam*) forget the remembrance of Allah! Shaytaan made Yusuf (*alaihis salam*) forget of the remembrance of Allah! Why did Yusuf (*alaihis salam*) not call upon to us for freedom from prison?

Both of these things are of utmost importance for a *daai'*. It is of utmost importance that he presents his problems to the one whose message he bears when he is faced with any situation. In this world if you send a minor employee for a small errand and he faces any obstacle or difficulty, then he will refer to the one who assigned him the task and contact him. He will specifically contact the one who sent him and ask him what to do. I am facing a problem in my task so what should I do?

Yusuf (*alaihis salam*) said to the one who was freed from prison: ﴿أذكرني عندريك﴾ Make mention of me to the king.

﴿فأنساه الشيطان ذكر ربه﴾, Shaytaan made Yusuf (*alaihis salam*) forget the remembrance of his lord. Thereafter, Yusuf (*alaihis salam*) remained in Prison for a period of time.

As you can see, Maulana Sa'd sahib is saying that instead of turning to Allah for help, Yusuf (*alaihis salam*) sought help from one besides Allah. *Na'udhubillah*. Not only that, he also said that Shaytaan made Yusuf (*alaihis salam*) forget the remembrance of Allah.

It is well known that Yusuf (*alaihis salam*) was imprisoned unjustly for a number of years. The Qur'an mentions that while he was in prison two individuals came to him for the interpretation of their dreams. He informed them that one of them would gain freedom from prison while the other would not. By the command of Allah, the events unfolded just as Yusuf (*alaihis salam*) had said. Yusuf (*alaihis salam*) said to the one who would be set free to "mention him to the king". However, what did Yusuf (*alaihis salam*) want him to "mention" about him? The Qur'an has not elaborated the matter. It could be that he wanted him to tell the King about *tawheed* (the oneness of Allah). Yusuf (*alaihis salam*) had been inviting towards *tawheed* while he was imprisoned, thus this is one possibility. Another possibility may be that he wanted the inmate to inform the king about his unjust imprisonment so that he may look into the matter. Whatever the case may be, the Qur'an is silent in this regard. All that has been stated in the Qur'an is "make mention of me to your King". Thereafter the Qur'an says: ﴿فأنساه الشيطان ذكر ربه﴾; meaning: the

inmate forgot to mention Yusuf (*alaihis salam*)'s matter to the King and Yusuf (*alaihis salam*) remained in prison for another seven years or so.

The wording of the Qur'an is ﴿فَأَنسَاهُ الشَّيْطَانُ ذِكْرَ رَبِّهِ﴾. Looking at the context of this verse and keeping the great rank of the prophets in mind, the meaning of this verse is clear. It means that Shaytaan made the one who was freed from prison forget to mention Yusuf (*alaihis salam*) to the king. This is the correct interpretation of the verse. However, Maulana Sa'd sahib's explanation is that Shaytaan made Yusuf (*alaihis salam*) forget the remembrance of Allah. Moreover, because Yusuf (*alaihis salam*) asked help from other than Allah he had to remain in prison for a further few years! How can a messenger of Allah forget to remember Allah?! Yusuf (*alaihis salam*) even invited the inmates towards *tawheed* and abstaining from *shirk* before interpreting their dreams. Is giving da'wah towards Allah not included in the remembrance of Allah?! So how can it be said that Yusuf (*alaihis salam*) forgot to remember Allah?!

How can we even think that a Prophet sought assistance from anyone besides Allah!? Such a thought goes against the great position and honor Allah has bestowed the prophets. Moreover, there is nothing wrong with adopting permissible means when faced with difficulties. Therefore, even if Yusuf (*alaihis salam*) requested the inmate to mention his imprisonment it would not be deemed as seeking help from other than Allah. Rather, this is a lawful adoption of a permissible means. A person imprisoned unjustly can ask for his case to be re-examined whether he be a *daai'*, an *alim*, or even a prophet. We understand this lesson from the very story of Yusuf (*alaihis salam*).

Deen is learnt from the lives of the Prophets. Their actions dictate to us what is permissible and what is not. Maulana Sa'd sahib however seems to think otherwise. Rather than learning the *Shari'ah* from the Prophets, he raises objections against their actions. According to him, a Prophet of Allah sought help from someone other than Allah, and consequently had to remain in prison for a longer period!

Maulana Sa'd sahib may have made ruju' from the matter of Musa (*alaihis salam*). However, according to my knowledge he is yet to make ruju' from his statements regarding Yusuf (*alaihis salam*).

Misguidance is Misguidance - Wherever it May Be!

Now, what if the supporters of Maulana Sa'd sahib claim to have references for his invalid statements? Can such references be correct? Clearly not! Misguidance is misguidance wherever it may be! Misguided statements are either found in unfounded and incorrect narrations or they are the genuine mistakes of past scholars. Other than that, if a person attempts to justify their errors, they will intentionally or unintentionally have to resort to distortion

(*tahreef*). They will take words out of their context and misrepresent the meaning as a result.

However, why the excessiveness and immoderation? Why exceed the limits? Is there no other way to highlight the importance and virtues of Da'wah and Tabligh? What is the need of distorting the *seerah* of the prophets? The fact of the matter is that anyone who oversteps the limits can never have proper evidence to support their claims. They will be forced to resort to invalid proofs and misinterpretations.

Even the Holy Prophet (*sallallahu alaihi wa sallam*)

In the Aurangabad *ijtima'*, February 2018 – after his sixth *ruju'*! –Maulana Sa'd sahib was discussing the topic of marriage and *walima*. During his discourse, he mentioned an incident from the *seerah* of the Prophet (*sallallahu alaihi wa sallam*). However, the manner in which he presented it was very objectionable and inappropriate. His overall discourse was good – he was discussing the need to avoid extravagance in weddings. Nevertheless, there was excessiveness and immoderation in his discourse, resulting in unacceptable statements being made. There is no place in Islam for excessiveness or immoderation.

Maulana Sa'd sahib claimed that the general custom (*ma'mool*) of the Holy Prophet (*sallallahu alaihi wa sallam*) was to do *walima* with things such as cheese or dates. According to him, the Holy Prophet (*sallallahu alaihi wa sallam*) did *walima* with bread and meat on only one occasion, thus contradicting his general practice. He said:

شادیوں میں اسراف سے بچو، جتنا اسراف زیادہ ہوگا اتنی اذیت ہوگی۔ حضور اکرم ﷺ نے تمام شادیوں میں کہیں پنیر کھلایا، کہیں کھجوریں تقسیم کر دیں، کہیں چھوڑے بکھیر دیئے۔ فرمایا کھاؤ تمہاری ماں کا ولیمہ ہے۔ آج اگر کوئی چھوڑے کھلا دے ولیمہ میں تو کوئی ولیمہ نہ مانے گا، کوئی اس کو ولیمہ نہیں مانے گا؛ حالاں کہ یہ عین سنت ہے۔ آپ کی ایک شادی نہیں ساری شادیاں ایسی ہی ہوئی ہیں۔ سوائے حضرت زینبؓ کے کہ اس میں آپ نے گوشت روٹی کا انتظام کیا، حضرت زینب اس پر فخر کرتی تھی کہ میرے نکاح میں گوشت روٹی کا انتظام ہوا ہے۔ اللہ کی شان کہ آپ کی جو شادی آپ کے معمول سے ہٹی اسی شادی میں آپ کو اذیت ہوئی۔ عجیب بات ہے جو شادی آپ کے معمول سے ہٹی اسی میں آپ کو اذیت ہوئی۔ اس سے اندازہ کر لو کہ ہم آپ کی گوشت روٹی کی سنت سے کتنے آگے بڑھ گئے ہیں۔ اب اذیتوں کی قرضوں کی پریشانیوں کی سود کی اور قرضوں میں دب جانے کی کتنی قسم کی اذیتیں آئیں گی۔ اگر محمد ﷺ کو گوشت روٹی کی وجہ سے اذیت ہو سکتی ہے، تو ہم آپ کے اس طریقہ سنت سے کتنے دور گئے۔

Translation:

Beware of extravagance in weddings. The greater the extravagance the more the hardship. In all of his weddings, the Holy Prophet (*sallallahu alaihi wa sallam*) sometimes gave cheese. He sometimes distributed dry dates and sometimes he spread fresh dates. He said: Partake! This is the *walima* of your mother.

Nowadays if someone gives dry dates for *walima* then no one will be willing to accept it as a *walima*. Nobody will accept it as a *walima* although this is precisely the *Sunnah*. It was not only one of his marriages; all of them were conducted in this manner. Except for Zaynab (*radiyallahu anha*) in which he arranged bread and meat. Zaynab (*radiyallahu anha*) would take pride that bread and meat was arranged for my *nikah*.

The greatness of Allah! In the very wedding that moved away from his custom (*ma'mool*) he suffered hardship. The astonishing thing is that he had to go through hardship in that very wedding that moved away from his custom. Now, compare this to how much we have gone beyond his *Sunnah* of bread and meat. Now there are so many types of difficulties: distress, debts, worries, interest and overburdening arrears. If Muhammad (*sallallahu alaihi wa sallam*) could suffer hardship due to bread and meat, then how far have we moved away from this *Sunnah* way of his.

According to Maulana Sa'd sahib, the Holy Prophet (*sallallahu alaihi wa sallam*) only arranged bread and meat for the *walima* of Zaynab (*radiyallahu anha*) and moved away from his *ma'mool* by doing so. *Ma'mool* means something that is a general practice or custom – the manner in which something is done. All the practices and customs (*ma'mool*) of the Holy Prophet (*sallallahu alaihi wa sallam*) are included in his *Sunnah*. Therefore, the implication of Maulana sa'd sahib's statement is that the Holy Prophet (*sallallahu alaihi wa sallam*) left his *ma'mool* by doing *walima* with bread and meat. Moreover, he had to suffer hardship because of it. *Na'udhubillah*. He said:

اللہ کی شان کہ آپ کی جو شادی آپ کے معمول سے ہٹی اسی شادی میں آپ کو اذیت ہوئی۔ عجیب بات ہے جو شادی آپ کی
معمول سے ہٹی اسی میں آپ کو اذیت ہوئی

Translation:

The greatness of Allah! He had to suffer hardship in the very wedding of his that moved away from his custom (*ma'mool*). The astonishing thing is that he had to go through hardship that very wedding that moved away from his custom

In other words, he had to undergo suffering due to moving away from his own *ma'mool*!

In the above statement, there is more than one error. Firstly, the Holy Prophet (*sallallahu alaihi wa sallam*) arranged bread and meat in another wedding also. (*Umdatul Qari*, volume 20, page 155, *Fathul Bari*, volume 9, page 146 under the commentary of hadith number 5171). Secondly, where is the proof that the Prophet (*sallallahu alaihi wa sallam*) did *walima* with only cheese? Thirdly, it has been mentioned in a hadith: ﴿أولم ولو بشاة﴾, i.e. do *walima*, even if you can only arrange a goat.

Maulana Sa'd sahib's message was to avoid extravagance in weddings. This is certainly correct. However, his manner of presentation was not correct. His manner was not befitting the honor and rank of the Holy Prophet (*sallallahu alaihi wa sallam*). It seems as though he is criticizing the very practice of Rasulallah (*sallallahu alaihi wa sallam*); as if he is claiming Rasulallah (*sallallahu alaihi wa sallam*) contradicted his own *Sunnah* by arranging bread and meat!

To give dates or to arrange bread and meat are both practices from *Sunnah*. They are both practices of Rasulallah (*sallallahu alaihi wa sallam*). His custom in all of his weddings is *Sunnah*. Therefore, there is no question of him opposing or contradicting his *Sunnah*! If bread and meat is also his *Sunnah* then how is it possible for hardship to befall him as a result of it?! Why would something that is *Sunnah* be a means of suffering?! Maulana Sa'd sahib himself continues to say that bread and meat is *Sunnah* and that we have gone far away from it. If this is the case, then why say that the Prophet (*sallallahu alaihi wa sallam*) moved away from his *ma'mool* (practice) and suffered because of it? We have been commanded to follow the practices of the Prophet (*sallallahu alaihi wa sallam*); not to criticize it!

Hardships and difficulties come by the command of Allah. As for their apparent cause, there could be many reasons but only Allah knows the true cause. So, which follower of Rasulallah (*sallallahu alaihi wa sallam*) says that Rasulallah (*sallallahu alaihi wa sallam*) fell into hardship because of his own shortcoming?! How can a follower of Nabi ﷺ explain the cause of the Messenger's difficulty by stating something that insinuates Nabi ﷺ making a mistake or committing an action that conflicts with what is best (*khilaf al-awla*)? Does Maulana Sa'd sahib have any proof to claim that the arrangement of bread and meat was the cause of his suffering?!

It is a greater shame that this criticism of Maulana Sa'd contradicts the Qur'an's explanation as well. The Noble Qur'an explains that the cause of the Messenger's difficulty was that certain guests were not able to uphold the etiquette of not to delay leaving after finishing meals when invited. This was the actual cause of the Messenger's difficulty. The Qur'an pointed out this etiquette. Please refer to Surah Ahzab 53. However, Maulana Sa'd is claiming

that Nabi ﷺ was the cause of his own pain due to him going against his normal practice.

On what basis is Maulana Sa'd saying that Nabi ﷺ was afflicted with difficulty because he served meat and bread at his walimah? Rasulullah (sallallahu alaihi wa sallam) instructed one of his companions to conduct his walima even by simply arranging a goat. Why would Rasulullah (sallallahu alaihi wa sallam) give such an instruction that would become the cause of difficulty and suffering?! In the wedding of Safiyyah (radiyallahu anha) Rasulullah (sallallahu alaihi wa sallam) didn't arrange bread and meat, but there was more hardship. So what will Maulana Sa'd sahib claim the cause was on that occasion?

It also ought to be kept in mind that the Aurangabad *ijtima'* took place after Maulana Sa'd sahib's sixth ruju'. One ruju' is sufficient if done in the correct manner. There would have been no need for multiple ruju's. For this reason, the Ulama maintain that Maulana Sa'd sahib's outlook and ideology need rectification and a mere ruju' is no longer sufficient.

Labelling Upright Ulama as '*Ulama us-Suu'*

Maulana Sa'd sahib has labelled righteous Ulama as '*Ulama us-Suu'*', i.e. unrighteous Ulama. He stated that those who refute his statements are '*Ulama us-Suu'*'. Maulana Sa'd sahib himself is in the wrong and it is his statements that are incorrect. However, he boldly categorizes those who correct him as '*Ulama us-Suu'*'! According to him, they are '*Ulama us-Suu'*' for saying that which is correct!

It is not a minor error to categorize the true and righteous Ulama of Deen as '*Ulama us-Suu'*'. Rather, it is a major error. Especially if you are the one in the wrong. Maulana Sa'd sahib himself has stated that we need to consider the Ulama our well-wishers and that they are our leaders. However, when they explain what is correct they become '*Ulama us-Suu'*' in his view.

It is not only Maulana Sa'd sahib's statements concerning the Ulama that are out of line. Rather, the same can be said regarding the Sahabah also. Even when discussing the *seerah* of the prophets (alaihim as-salam) his manner of speech is inappropriate. It is not in accordance with the way of *Ahlus-Sunnah wal-Jama'ah*. We have already given examples of this and discussed it in somewhat detail. Such errors and mistakes are all amongst his fundamental errors.

Two More of His Principal Errors

Until now, I have discussed only one category of the errors of Maulana Sa'd sahib. I have discussed his carelessness in language and presentation when discussing various matters of Deen. I have only given three examples from

this first category, all of which were regarding the prophets. I have not discussed his statements regarding the Sahabah nor have I gone into detail about his statements regarding Ulama.

Some of his other fundamental and Principle errors are as follows: Firstly, making unsubstantiated claims regarding imperceptible matter. In other words, making claims regarding the unseen without any valid evidence; claims based on mere approximation and speculation.

His second Principle error is the formulation of *bid'aat* (innovation in deen).

Unsubstantiated Claims Regarding the Unseen

When someone speaks about Deen it must be supported with evidence. It is not permissible to make statements based on approximations or presumptions. The only way of knowing something imperceptible or unseen is divine revelation. Allah informed his messengers of many unseen matters that were beyond the senses. However, since revelation has ended, imperceptible claims can now only be based on estimations and presumptions. Making claims regarding the imperceptible is one of Maulana Sa'd sahib's major issues. We can discuss the knowledge of the unseen found in Qur'an and Hadith as it came through divine revelation. Maulana Sa'd sahib has however exceeded these matters and started to make claims on his own part, claims which can only be based on assumptions and estimations. This is undoubtedly a major issue of Maulana Sa'd sahib and it is also a major sin.

His Claims Regarding Nizamuddin Markaz

An example of such a claim is his statement regarding Nizamuddin Markaz: He said:

یہ دو چیزیں الگ الگ نہیں ہیں کہ عالمی مشورہ الگ ہے اور مرکز نظام الدین الگ ہے، یہ ممکن نہیں ہے، یہ ممکن نہیں ہے، قیامت تک ممکن نہیں، ایک عالمی مشورہ ہو اور ایک عالمی مرکز ہو یہ نہیں ہوگا؛ کیوں کہ یہ مرکز ہے اور تا قیامت مرکز ہے۔

Translation:

These two things are not separate from one another – that *a'lami* (international) *mashwarah* is something separate and Markaz Nizamuddin is something separate. This is not possible, this is not possible. Even till the Day of Judgment, it is not possible, that there be an *a'lami* (international) *mashwarah* and a separate *a'lami* (international) Markaz! This will never be. The reason

being that this is the Markaz and it is the Markaz until the Day of Judgment!

Thereafter he said:

شیطان نے ان لوگوں کو بڑی شکوک میں ڈالا ہوا ہے بڑی شکوک میں ڈالا ہوا ہے۔ سارے عالم کا یہ مرکز ہے اور سارے عالم کو یہاں سے رجوع کرنا ہے یہ اللہ کی طرف سے طے شدہ بات ہے۔

Translation:

Shaytaan has caused those people to have great doubt. He has caused them to have great doubt. This is the Markaz of the whole world and the whole world must refer to it. This has been decreed by Allah!

This is an unsubstantiated claim regarding the imperceptible. A person may make *du'a* that Allah keeps Nizamuddin as the markaz until the Day of Judgment. That Allah make works of guidance spread from it's mimbar and safeguard it from all kinds of deviations. However, you cannot make a declaration that it will forever be a markaz of *hidayah* until the Day of Judgment. This is a matter of the unseen that we cannot perceive. No one can give such a guarantee. However, Maulana Sa'd sahib goes even further claiming that this is something which has already been decreed by Allah. *Innalillahi wa inna ilahi rajioon!* How can a person make such unsubstantiated claims regarding the unseen?!

Maulana Sa'd sahib wants everyone to stay with Nizamuddin Markaz and accept him. However, instead of reforming his thoughts and ideologies to achieve this, he makes unsubstantiated and imperceptible claims regarding Nizamuddin Markaz.

Special virtue has only been attributed to three masjids in hadith; Masjid al-Haram, The Prophet's Masjid (masjid nabawi) and Masjid al-Aqsa. Another hadith also mentions the virtue of Masjid al-Quba. So, how can any special virtue be attributed to any other masjid besides these? How can it be claimed that Nizamuddin has particular virtue? Furthermore, how can it be declared that Nizamuddin must be followed and whatever initiates from its mimbar must be obeyed?! It is not permissible to make such a claim! There is no guarantee that who will come upon this mimbar. There is no guarantee that their words and deeds will be in accordance with *Shari'ah*. Undoubtedly, Nizamuddin is a masjid from which the words of guidance spread for many years. Many righteous servants of Allah prostrated therein. The *noor* of the effort of Deen can be perceived wherever effort takes place. This is all true; however, it does not give you the right to make any unsubstantiated and unperceivable claims!

Another such claim of Maulana Sa'd sahib is that he said:

ساری دنیا کا حال یہ ہے کہ مکہ مدینہ کے بعد اگر کوئی جگہ قابل احترام اور قابل اقتداء اور قابل اطاعت اور قابل عظمت ہیں تو وہ مسجد نظام الدین ہے اور یہ آپ سب حضرات کے لیے نئے پرانے،۔۔۔۔۔۔۔، ہمیشہ کے لیے، ساری دنیا کے لیے، سارے امور کا مرجع اور سارے امور کا مرکز وہ نظام الدین ہے۔

Translation:

The condition of the whole world is that if there is a place after Makkah and Madina that is worthy of reverence, worthy of being followed, worthy of being obeyed and worthy of honor, then it is Masjid Nizamuddin. For all of you, old workers and new workers... forever and for the whole world, Nizamuddin is the reference point and markaz for all affairs.

Na'udhubillah, we seek the protection of Allah. Does anyone have the authority to make such new and unprecedented claim? Has the virtue of Nizamuddin even exceeded that of Bait al-Maqdis?! These are not mere unsubstantiated and unperceivable claims; rather they are Principles of innovation and *bid'ah*. These are such Principles that may pave the way for a new misguided and innovative sect to come into existence.

Innovations in Deen

Another one of Maulana Sa'd sahib's major problems is making statements that have no precedence and coming up with new *masaa'il*; – statements and *masaa'il* that are contrary to all proofs and cannot be found from any of the Sahabah, Tabi'een or the Mujtahid Imams – matters that are solely his own origination. Such matters are classified in *Shari'ah* as *bid'ah* (innovation).

To unknowingly follow a *bid'ah* innovated by someone else is a sin. However, to originate and formulate a *bid'ah* is a greater sin. Maulana Sa'd sahib has come up with new principles and ideologies which are not only unsubstantiated, rather they contradict all proofs of *Shari'ah*. Anything of this nature is a *bid'ah*.

A statement regarding Deen must be supported by shar'i evidence. However, Maulana Sa'd sahib has become accustomed to making statement which have no evidence. Furthermore, he makes claims, which contradict the proofs of *Shari'ah*, and presents them as if they are rulings of Deen. If someone tries to prove that something is part of Deen whereas in reality it is not then they will have to resort to some form of *tahreef* (distortion or misinterpretation). They will either present a baseless hadith, or misinterpret an established hadith, or take one hadith and leave out another. They will misconstrue the matter because of not taking all the necessary *ahadith* into consideration.

Those who are in favor of Maulana Sa'd sahib claim that he is trying to bring the effort in accordance with *seerah*. The reality of this claim however is that

new principles are being innovated based on incomplete and imperfect study of the *seerah*. Thereafter, these innovated principles are being labeled as *seerah*.

Unfortunately, due to lack of time we do not have the opportunity to elaborate further on the topic.

Until now, I have only mentioned three categories of the mistakes of Maulana Sa'd sahib. I gave three examples in the first category, two in the second and simply mentioned the third. There are other categories that I was not able to discuss due to lack of time. Nonetheless, I hope the matter is somewhat clear now. We make *du'a* that Allah grant Maulana Sa'd sahib guidance - *ameen*. Allah grant him the ability to reform himself and remain an elder just as the previous elders were - *ameen*.

Darul Uloom Deoband's Position Regarding Maulana Sa'd Sahib

Finally, I would like to discuss the position of Darul Uloom Deoband regarding Maulana Sa'd sahib as it highlights some of his core issues. A statement detailing Darul Uloom's position was published on their website titled: "ضروری وضاحت" (An Important Clarification).

Darul Uloom Deoband issued this statement after Maulana Sa'd sahib's verbal *ruju'* regarding the matter of Musa (*alaihis salam*) in Nizamuddin and in Kakrail - in other words, after his fifth and sixth *ruju'*. On the 2nd of December 2017 in Nizamuddin and also in Kakrail Masjid in January 2018 Maulana Sa'd sahib expressed his *ruju'* specifically regarding the matter of Musa (*alaihis salam*). - The wording of his *ruju'* in both places was not befitting his status; Firstly, there was no mention of what his error was. Secondly, there was no statement clearly asserting he was wrong. Thirdly, he made his incorrect statements in various *ijtima's* and in various places in front of large gatherings. However, his *ruju'* was only in relatively small gatherings. Nonetheless, he had articulated the word "*ruju'*" denoting he had retracted his statements. It was nevertheless better than a private written *ruju'*. Since it had been made in the markaz of both India and Bangladesh, it was somewhat satisfactory. As a result Darul Uloom Deoband accepted the *ruju'* in respect to Musa (*alaihis salam*).

However, the problems of Maulana Sa'd sahib are not limited to the issue of Musa (*alaihis salam*). There is a whole list of dangerous and major mistakes. What about his statements regarding Yusuf (*alaihis salam*)? as far as we know There was no verbal or written *ruju'* in this regard. Even after his *ruju'* in Nizamuddin on the 2nd December 2017 - his fifth *ruju'* - he repeated many of the erroneous statements he had made previously. There were completely new errors also. You may refer to the booklet "رجوع کے بعد مولانا محمد سعد صاحب کے چند بیانات کا علمی جائزہ" for further details.

Therefore, Darul Uloom Deoband wrote:



دارالعلوم دیوبند

Darul-Uloom, Deoband. U.P. India

حوالہ..... 2/3

التاریخ..... 31/01/2018

مولانا محمد سعد صاحب کے رجوع کے سلسلے میں

ضروری وضاحت

باسمہ تعالیٰ

گذشتہ دنوں جناب مولانا محمد سعد صاحب کے حضرت موسیٰ علیہ السلام کے واقعہ سے رجوع کے اعلان کے بعد ملک و بیرون ملک سے لوگ دارالعلوم دیوبند کے موقف سے متعلق مسلسل استفسار کر رہے ہیں۔

اس موقع سے یہ وضاحت ضروری ہے کہ مولانا کے رجوع کو اس ایک واقعے کی حد تک تو قابل اطمینان قرار دیا جاسکتا ہے؛ لیکن دارالعلوم کے موقف میں اصلاً مولانا کی جس فکری بے راہ روی پر تشویش کا اظہار کیا گیا تھا، اُس سے صرف نظر نہیں کیا جاسکتا؛ اس لیے کہ کئی بار رجوع کے بعد بھی وقتاً فوقتاً مولانا کے ایسے نئے بیانات موصول ہو رہے ہیں، جن میں وہی مجتہدانہ انداز، غلط استدلال اور دعوت سے متعلق اپنی ایک مخصوص فکر پر نصوص شرعیہ کا غلط انطباق نمایاں ہے، جس کی وجہ سے خدام دارالعلوم ہی نہیں؛ بلکہ دیگر علمائے حق کو بھی مولانا کی مجموعی فکر سے سخت قسم کی بے اطمینانی ہے۔

ہمارا یہ ماننا ہے کہ اکابر جہم اللہ کی فکر سے معمولی انحراف بھی شدید نقصان دہ ہے، مولانا کو اپنے بیانات میں محتاط انداز اختیار کرنا چاہیے اور اسلاف کے طریق پر گامزن رہتے ہوئے نصوص شرعیہ سے ذاتی اجتہادات کا سلسلہ بند کرنا چاہیے؛ کیونکہ مولانا موصوف کے ان دوراز کار اجتہادات سے ایسا لگتا ہے کہ خدا نخواستہ وہ کسی ایسی جدید جماعت کی تشکیل کے درپے ہیں جو اہل السنۃ والجماعۃ اور خاص طور پر اپنے اکابر کے مسلک سے مختلف ہوگی، اللہ تعالیٰ ہم سب کو اکابر و اسلاف کے طریق پر ثابت قدم رکھے، آمین۔

جو لوگ دارالعلوم دیوبند سے مسلسل رجوع کر رہے ہیں، اُن سے دوبارہ گزارش کی جاتی ہے کہ جماعت تبلیغ کے داخلی اختلاف سے دارالعلوم کا کوئی تعلق نہیں ہے، پہلے دن سے اس کا اعلان کیا جا چکا ہے؛ البتہ غلط افکار و خیالات سے متعلق جب بھی دارالعلوم سے رجوع کیا گیا ہے، دارالعلوم نے ہمیشہ است کی راہنمائی کی کوشش کی ہے، دارالعلوم اس کو اپنا دینی و شرعی فریضہ سمجھتا ہے۔



محمد سعد

محمد سعد

روسیام مائذنی
۱۳ جادو ۱۴۳۹ھ
۱۳

Translation:

Clarification of Darul Uloom Deoband about Ruju' of Maulana Muhammad Sa'd Sahib

There are repeated requests from within India and outside that Darul Uloom Deoband should express its view regarding the Ruju' (revocation) of Maulana Muhammad Sa'd from his comments about Musa (*alaihis salam*).

It is hereby clarified that as far the Ruju' of Maulana Muhammad Sa'd from this particular issue is concerned it is somewhat satisfactory, but the ideological divergence of Maulana Muhammad Sa'd to which Darul Uloom Deoband has pointed out in its Stand cannot be ignored at all; this is because even after so-called Ruju' he continues to make several other statements wherein he adopts the same innovative style, baseless conclusions and unwarranted application of Islamic text (Nusus) to his peculiar ideology of Da'wah. This is the reason that not only we (the servants of Darul Uloom Deoband), rather the other Ulama-e-Haq are also very much concerned due to the overall ideological approach of Maulana Muhammad Sa'd.

It is our assertion that the least diversion from the path of Akabir (pious predecessors) is immensely harmful. Therefore, following the footsteps of the predecessors, Maulana Muhammad Sa'd should be cautious enough in his statements and should stop the personal deductions (*ijtihadat*) from the Quran and Hadith; since his innovative deductions and interpretations denote as if he is bent to formulate a new group, which will be different from the way of *Ahlu-Sunnah wal-Jama'ah* and Akabir. May Allah keep us firm and steadfast on the track of our pious predecessors, *Ameen!*

Those who turn to us in this regard are once again reminded that Darul Uloom Deoband has distanced itself from the internal dispute of Tablighi Jamat and it has declared its impartiality clearly from the beginning. However, whenever people approach Darul Uloom for its views about wrong ideologies and thoughts, Darul Uloom always strives to guide the Ummah considering it its religious duty.

Signatures:

Mufti Abul Qasim No'mani

Mufti Sayeed Ahmad Palanpuri

Maulana Syed Arshad Madani

Date 13-05-1439 AH / 31-01-2018

Ref: 213

In the above statements, Darul Uloom Deoband has clarified that Maulana Sa'd sahib's ruju' regarding the matter of Musa (*alaihis salam*), can be somewhat satisfactory (قابل اطمینان قرار دیا جاسکتا ہے). (i.e. not complete satisfactory). Since he has repeatedly stated that he has made ruju' from this matter, it was accepted from him. However, the issue of Musa (*alaihis salam*) is only one of his many issues! The matter is not that he made one or two mistakes, thus by making ruju' from them the matter is solved. Rather, the fundamental problem is his ideological divergence, and this is a problem that has not yet been rectified!

Hence, the final stance of Darul Uloom Deoband has expressed that, despite his ruju's three issues can still be observed in his speeches:

1. Expressing opinions that only befit a mujtahid despite lacking the eligibility to be one
2. Incorrect deduction and application of verses of Quran and Hadith.
3. Unwarranted application of Islamic text (Nusus, i.e. Quran, Hadith and Seerah) to fit his particular methodology regarding da'wah.

These three types of problems are seen repeatedly in his new statements. Which means his ideological divergence is still exists. Due to this, Darul Uloom Deoband and other Ulama are not satisfied about him.

Darul Uloom Deoband has further warned that due to such Ijtihad of Maulana Sa'd, (may Allah protect), he is going to create a new sect which will be different from the way of *Ahlus-Sunnah wal-Jama'ah*.

Hope you have understood that Darul Uloom Deoband did not just assert that his ruju' in regards to Musa (*alaihis salam*) can be satisfactory; rather, Deoband has warned about two more issues also:

1. Ideological divergence
2. The fear of formulating a new sect, which differs from the methodology of *Ahlus-Sunnah wal-Jama'ah* and Aakabir.

The phrase "ideological divergence" in the above statement is very significant. It denotes that the errors of Maulana Sa'd sahib are not limited to a simple few mistakes from which he can make ruju' and everything will be okay. Rather the issue here is his way of thinking and his temperament. His outlook has changed and is divergent. Therefore, there is no benefit in making ruju' regarding a particular issue unless a change of ideology occurs. His thoughts and ideologies, temperament and inclinations need to be brought in accordance to that of the pious predecessors. If he reforms his outlook then a single ruju' is enough for him to be accepted again. On the other hand however, if he continues making mistakes and doing ruju' from it, then it indicates that his mentality is still the same.

The above-mentioned statement of Darul Uloom Deoband was issued on 31 January 2018. Maulana Sa'd sahib had delivered various speeches in India and abroad after this statement was issued. He has made such grave errors in these speeches which the observant Ulama were left speechless. May Allah grant him the correct outlook, attitude, and balance in his thoughts and words. May Allah give him the ability to stay on the methodology of the pious elders and the righteous predecessors who were before them - *ameen*.

End