

BASELESS CRITICISM OF TASAWWUF



By:
Mujlisul Ulama of South Africa
PO Box 3393
Port Elizabeth
6056

Contents

BASELESS CRITICISM OF SUFI'ISM	- 5 -
WHAT IS TASAWWUF.....	- 6 -
THE ATTITUDE OF THE SUFIS TOWARDS THE SHARIAH	- 12 -
VENERATION.....	- 15 -
VENERATION OF THE PIOUS	- 15 -
AMR BIL MA'ROOF	- 19 -
THE SPIRIT OF JIHAD.....	- 22 -
THE CONCEPT OF WAHDATUL WUJOOD	- 23 -
THE APPEARANCE OF SUFI'ISM	- 48 -
AMR BIL MA'ROOF NAHYI ANIL MUNKAR	- 32 -
ZUHD.....	- 61 -
"BALANCED BEHAVIOUR"	- 71 -

BASELESS CRITICISM OF SUFI'ISM

The Reality of Sufism in Light of the Quran and the Sunnah, a booklet against Tasawwuf written by a Salafi, one Ibn Hadee al-Madkhalee, is a portrayal of the ignorance of the author in particular, and in general the ignorance of the Salafis of this era. Since they have confused Tasawwuf (Sufi'ism) with the cults of Bid'ah, they denounce Tasawwuf and proclaim it to be bid'ah, shirk and in conflict with *Tauheed*.

At the outset it is emphasized that any brand of 'tasawwuf' or 'sufi'ism' which is in conflict with the Shariah or with Tauheed is not Islamic Tasawwuf. On the contrary it is Satanism. Tauheed is the fundamental basis and the pivot of Islam. Minus Tauheed there is no Islam. This is not a contentitious issue.

In the U.S.A. there is a sect called the Nation of Islam who believes in a man-god – that Allah Ta'ala had settled inside a human being who was the founder of this sect of shirk and kufr. Despite their noxious doctrines of shirk and kufr, they proudly advertise themselves as Muslims and they call their religion Islam. In Pakistan is the Qadiani religion. They believe that Mirza Gulam of Qadian was a Nabi. In addition they entertain other doctrines of kufr. Yet they call themselves Muslims and proclaim their religion to be Islam. Similarly, there are other deviates/kuffaar who regard themselves to be Muslims and who label their religion with the tag of Islam.

On account of these sects with their kufr and shirk doctrines, is it intelligent to castigate Islam and proclaim it to be a cult of shirk, kufr and bid'ah? Islam cannot be branded with evil epithets and denounced as a cult of shirk simply because there are people subscribing to shirk and kufr and who have named their religion 'Islam'.

Similarly, it is downright stupid to denounce Tasawwuf (Sufi'ism) on the basis of the shirk, kufr and bid'ah of some communities who have appropriated the designation, 'Sufi'ism' for themselves. The author in his ignorance has denounced Tasawwuf without understanding what exactly Tasawwuf is. Just as the western kuffaar attribute all the jahaalat of criminal Muslims to Islam, so too does the author do with Tasawwuf. Although the practices and doctrines of the deviant sects with their cults of shirk have no relationship with Tasawwuf, the author of the booklet has failed to understand this fact.

Due to his ignorance, the author states in his booklet: *"It (i.e. Sufi'ism) has greatly affected the beliefs of the Muslims and has diverted it from its true course which was laid down in the Noble Quran and pure Sunnah."*

Deviates of a variety of hues and persuasions have undoubtedly diverted Muslims from *Siraatul Mustaqeem*, and they did the diversion in the name of Islam. One such deviate sect which has perpetrated this diversion is the Salafi sect of this era. But neither Islam nor any of its branches such as Fiqh and Tasawwuf may be blamed for the deviation of people. In every age there has been deviant sects and groups who have diverted Muslims from the true path of Islam, and they perpetrate their villainy in the name of Islam. But Islam can not be blamed nor castigated for such deviation. If the author had taken the time and applied some effort and brains to studying the Tasawwuf of the Sahaabah and the Fuqaha, then he

would not have been so audacious in his condemnation of Sufi'ism which is tantamount to castigating and denouncing Islam itself.

The proper course of action is to explain what is Islamic Tasawwuf and propagate against the bid'ah and shirk which have become attached to the deviant so-called sufi sects which flourish in North Africa, West Africa, Syria, India, Pakistan, etc.

The type of Fiqh which orientalist impart in the 'Islamic' Studies faculties attached to kuffaar universities, is not Islamic Fiqh. On the contrary, it is a 'fiqh' designed to undermine Islam. Shall we now condemn Fiqh and outlaw it? Shall we say that Fiqh is haraam, and Fiqh is not part of Islam? What shall be said is that the 'fiqh' which the enemies of Islam teach is not Islamic Fiqh. It is deviation from which Muslims must abstain. True Fiqh is what is being imparted in the proper Islamic institutions of learning – in the Madaaris.

WHAT IS TASAWWUF

In the same way, Tasawwuf which is the name for *Tazkiyah-e-Nafs* (moral purification), and the pursuit of which is *Waajib* is acquired from authentic Mashaikh who meticulously follow the Sunnah and the Shariah. The criterion of *Haqq* is the Shariah. Any diversion from the Shariah is unacceptable to the true Sufis. Explaining the nature (*Haqeeqat*) of Tasawwuf, Hadhrat Maseehullah Khaan (rahmatullah alayh) who was an authority on Sufi'ism in recent times, stated: "*The department of the Shariah which deals with A'maal-e-Baatini (conditions and states of the heart) is called Tasawwuf and Suluk, and that department of the Shariah relating to A'maal-e-Zaahiri (the external dimension such as Tahaarat, Salaat, etc., etc.) is termed Fiqh.*"

The subject matter with which Tasawwuf deals is Tahzeeb-e-Akhlaaq (adornment of moral character). The method of acquiring the Pleasure of Allah Ta'ala which is the objective of Tasawwuf, is complete obedience to the commands of the Shariah.

Tasawwuf is the Rooh and state of perfection of the Deen. Its function is to purify the Baatin (the heart and soul) of man from the carnal and bestial attributes of the tongue, anger, malice, jealousy, love of the world, love for fame, niggardliness, greed, ostentation, vanity, deception, etc..

At the same time Tasawwuf concerns itself with the adornment of the Baatin with the lofty attributes of moral excellence, viz., Tauheed, repentance, perseverance, toleration, gratitude, fear of Allah, hope, abstemiousness, trust, love, sincerity, truth, meditation, reckoning, contemplation, etc.

By this means (of Tasawwuf) the attention becomes focused on Allah Ta'ala. Man's bond with Allah Ta'ala is solidified, and this is in fact the objective of life on earth. Thus, it is incumbent for every Muslim to become a Sufi. Minus Tasawwuf, a Muslim can not be described as being a perfect Muslim."

Man is neither only of material substance nor of only spiritual substance. He is a combination of both. In addition, Allah Ta'ala has created an evil *nafs* in him. Adding to man's woes, is shaitaan whose presence on earth in pursuit of man's Imaan and Akhlaaq, was dictated by Divine Wisdom. Casting man into the raging moral and immoral storms of

this mundane abode of earth, Allah Ta'ala irders him in the Qur'aan Majeed to arrest the vagaries of his wildly fluctuating bestial *nafs*: "*Shun zaahir sin and its baatin.*" (Aayat 120, Surah Al-An'aam). There is complete unanimity of the Ummah on the shunning and abstaining from all kinds of sin, from apparent/open sins, as well as from secret/concealed sins. Among the sins of the *Baatin* are the bestial attributes of the *nafs*. Purification of the *nafs*, known as *Tazkiya-e-Nafs* is a Waajib objective of Islam. There is no need to present evidence for this self-evident fact. This is the subject matter of Tasawwuf. Besides moral purification and spiritual elevation, there is no other function for Tasawwuf, and no other objective for the Sufi.

Rectification of *Aqaaid (Beliefs)* is of fundamental importance for the Sufi. The entire success of the Sufi is reliant on correct *Aqeedah*. Expounding this fundamental requisite, Hadhrat Maulana Ashraf Ali Thaanvi (rahmatullah alayh), who was a Mujdaddid in the sphere of Tasawwuf, said:

"After rectification of Aqaaid and A'maal-e-Zaahiri, it is fardh upon every Muslim to purify (reform) his A'maal-e-Baatin. Numerous Qur'aanic aayaat and Hadith narrations explicitly confirm the fardhiyat of moral reformation."

In *Tareequl Qalandar* is mentioned:

"All 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. This notion is entertained by miscreant 'sufis' and the Ulama-e-Khushq (dry, barren Ulama – Ulama who are devoid of *roohaaniyat* – spirituality). However, both groups have misunderstood Tasawwuf. According to the spiritually arid Ulama, Tasawwuf is baseless since in their understanding the Qur'aan and Ahaadith are devoid of it. On the other hand, the miscreant 'sufis' (*ghaali sufis*) maintain that in the Qur'aan and Ahaadith are found only the *zaahiri ahkaam* with which Fiqh deals. Tasawwuf, they say, is the knowledge of the Baatin. Thus, according to their misconception, there is no need for the Qur'aan and Hadith – Nauthubillaah! In short, both groups believe that the Qur'aan and Hadith are without Tasawwuf. Conforming to their opinions, one group (the barren Ulama whom the present day Salafis emulate) has shunned Tasawwuf, while the other group (*the ghaali Sufis*) have shunned the Qur'aan and Hadith."

The author without having understood the meaning of Tasawwuf, its objective and its basis as propounded by the illustrious authorities of this department of the Shariah, has blindly denounced it simply on the basis of the baatil cults of bid'ah and shirk which have been named 'tasawwuf' by their proponents. But it is unintelligent to denounce Qur'aanic and Sunnah Tasawwuf simply because miscreants and deviates call their cult-practices tasawwuf and the followers of their cults 'sufis'.

The Imaam of Tasawwuf, the illustrious Sufi, Hadhrat Baayazid Bustaami (rahmatullah alayh) refuting the false claimants of Tasawwuf said:

"Do not be deceived if you see a performer of supernatural feats flying in the air. Measure him on the standard of the Shariah. See if he adheres to the prescribed limits of the Commands of the Shariah."

Sayyidut Taaifah, Imaam of Tasawwuf, the great Sufi, Hadhrat Junuaid Baghdaadi (rahmatullah alayh), said:

“All avenues besides meticulous emulation of Rasulallah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) are closed to mankind.”

The famous Sufi, Hadhrat Nuri (rahmatullah alayh) said: *“Do not venture near to one who lays claim to a (supposedly spiritual) state which brings in its wake transgression of the limits of the Shariah.”*

Hadhrat Khwaajah Naseeruddin Chiraagh Dehlawi (rahmatullah alayh) said:

“Obedience to Rasulallah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) is imperative. This obedience is essential in word, deed and intention because Love for Allah Ta’ala is not possible without obedience to Hadhrat Muhammad (sallallahu alayhi wasallam).”

Hadhrat Khwaajah Mueenuddin Chishti (rahmatullah alayh) said:

“He who adheres to the Shariah, executing its commands and refraining from transgression, progresses in spiritual rank, i.e. all progress (in the spiritual path) is dependent on adherence to the Shariah.”

Hadhrat Maulana Ashraf Ali Thanvi (rahmatullah alayh) said:

“Whoever has acquired the wealth of Wusool (the lofty state of close proximity to Allah Ta’ala), has achieved it by virtue of following the Sunnah.”

Similar statements have been made by all authentic Sufis whose very first step in the Path of acquiring Divine Proximity is strict obedience to the Shariah and perfect adoption of the Sunnah. The author of the baseless criticism against Tasawwuf, instead of referring to the authorities of Tasawwuf to gain the proper understanding of its meaning, looked at *juhhaal* who lay claim of Tasawwuf. These frauds and imposters who claim to be Sufis, are totally bereft of Tasawwuf. They are devoid of even a slight fragrance of Tasawwuf. Their ‘tasawwuf’ is a cult of bid’ah and shirk. The shallow-minded author has taken such miscreants to be the authoritative proponents of Tasawwuf.

The fact that the author is shockingly unaware of the Tasawwuf Tareeqah of the illustrious Sufis such as Ibraahim Adham, Junaid Baghdaadi, Baayazid Nustaami and countless others, speaks volumes for his own *jahaalat*. It is gross *jahaalat* to seek an understanding of Islam from the mushriks of the Nation of Islam or from Gulam Ahmad Qadiani or from these misguided modernist zindeeqs who have acquired their smattering of scrap knowledge from the so-called ‘Islamic’ Studies faculties of kuffaar universities. If anyone wants to know what Islam is, he has to refer to the Ulama-e-Raasikheen. Similarly, knowledge of genuine Tasawwuf can be acquired from only the true Auliya and Sufiya who meticulously follow the Sunnah and submit wholly to the Shariah.

Hadhrat Maulana Muhammad Maseehullah Khaan (rahmatullah alayh), in his treatise, *Shariat & Tasawwuf*, states:

“The whole combination of teachings imposed by Islam is known as the Shariah. Both sets of acts (A’maal-e-Zaahiri and A’maal-e-Baatini) are included in the Shariah. In the

terminology of the Mutaqaddimeen (the Salaf-e-Saaliheen of the Khairul Quroon era), the term Fiqh was synonymous with the word Shariah. Thus, Imaam Abu Hanifah (rahmatullah alayh) defining Fiqh, said: “*The recognition of that which is beneficial and harmful for the nafs.*” Later, in the terminology of the Muta-akh-khireen, the word *Fiqh* referred to that branch of Islam which related to *A’maal-e-Zaahirah*, while the the branch which dealt with *A’maal-e-Baatinah* became known as *Tasawwuf* and its anglicised designation is Suf’ism. The ways and methods of pursuing A’maal-e-Baatinah are called *Tareeqat*.

The notion that the Shariat and Tareeqat are different entities – a notion which has gained prominence among the masses in consequence of the fraud perpetrated by imposters and cranks – is palpably false and baseless. Now that the *haqeeqat* of Tasawwuf has been clarified, it will be understood that:

- *Kashf* and *Karaamaat* are not necessary constituents of Tasawwuf.
- Tasawwuf does not guarantee success in worldly affairs.
- It does not convey the idea that achievements will be made by means of Ta’weez and *Amaliyyaat* nor does Tasawwuf claim that one will be successful in worldly affairs such as court cases, etc.
- Tasawwuf does not promise increase in earnings nor cure from physical ailments.
- It does not fortell future events
- It does not teach that the mureed’s *islah* (moral reformation) will be achieved by the *Tawajjuh* (spiritual focus) of the Shaikh. Supernatural operations are not requisites of Tasawwuf.
- Tasawwuf does not contend that the mureed will not be affected by even the thought of sin nor does it claim that he will automatically, without effort, engage in ibaadat.
- It does not promise self-annihilation (*Fana and Fana-ul-Fana*).
- Tasawwuf does not promise the experiences of ecstasy and spiritual effulgence in Thikr and Shaghl, nor does it claim that the mureed will experience beautiful dreams and wonderful visions.

All these issues are unconnected with Tasawwuf. The objective of Tasawwuf is only to gain Divine Pleasure via the agency of Wara’ and Taqwa.”

Only a moron will find fault with this exposition of Tasawwuf. One who follows this unadulterated Tasawwuf of the Qur’aan and Sunnah, is a genuine **Sufi**. Just as a Qadiani and a Bilalian (a member of the American kufr cult, Nation of Islam), is not a genuine Muslim, so too, one who follows one of the many baatil cults of fabricated ‘sufi’ism’ is not a genuine Sufi. If a satan claims to be a sufi, the Suf’ism of Islam will not be condemned on the basis of the satanic claim. The unwarranted attack on Sufi’ism made by al-Madkhalee is of this moronic kind of refutation. He simply denounced Islam without understanding the meaning of Islam which the genuine Sufis practised. And, among the genuine Sufis were illustrious Fuqaha such as Imaam Abu Hanifah, Imaam Maalik, Imaan Shaafi’, Imaam Ahmad Bin Hambal (rahmatullah alayhim), and innumerable Ulama, Fuqaha and Auliya down the long corridor of Islam’s 14 century history, right from the era of Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam). In fact, Nabi-e-Kareem (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) was the first Sufi of this Ummah. Among his primary *ashghaal* prior to Nubuwwat were *Khalwat* (Seclusion) and *Muraaqabah* (meditation) which have perpetually been significant methods of the Sufiyya for the attainment of moral purification and spiritual advancement, and this practice of *Khalwat* in which the Mu’min communes with Allah Ta’ala, was perpetuated by

Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) even ayyer Nubuwwat in terms of the Qur'aanic command:

“And after you have completed (your daytime duties of Da'wat) then stand resolutely (at night in Khalwat), and focus enthusiastically towards your Rabb. (Surah Inshiraah)

Without *temporary Khalwat* (seclusion, physical renunciation of contact with all and sundry), the attainment of the lofty stages of *Roohaaniyat* is not possible. We thus see that a great Aalim of Imaam Ghazaali's calibre wandering in the wilderness and secluding himself in total isolation for a long period of nine years. After he had acquired the necessary qualifications in the realm of *Roohaaniyat*, Allah Ta'ala created the circumstances for him to re-enter society and then everyone is aware how he lay to waste the conglomerates of Shaitaan with his refutations and proclamation of the Haqq.

Imaam Ghazaali (rahmatullah alayh) - this intellectual Giant of Uloom and *Roohaaniyat* – was an Aalim with whom Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) vied. In a dream a Wali saw Nabi-e-Kareem (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) presenting Imaam Ghazaali (rahmatullah alayh) to Nabi Musa (alayhis salaam) and Nabi (alayhis salaam), and with delight asking them: “Have you such an Aalim in your Ummats?” Both Nabi responded in the negative. Lest the spiritually arid Salafi attempts to scorn the dream, we remind him that *Ru'ya Saalihah (the dreams of the Pious Men of Allah)* constitute one fortieth of Nubuwwat.

Whilst the form of *Rahbaaniyat* in vogue during the era of Hadhrat Nabi Isa (alayhis salaam) is not a constituent of Islamic practice, *temporary Rahbaaniyat* (seclusion and isolation) is valid in Islam. Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) spent every night of his blessed life in *Rahbaaniyat*. He did not refute the total *Rahbaaniyat* of the illustrious Taabee, Hadhrat Uwais Qarni (rahmatullah alayh) who spent his life in the wilderness and desert fleeing at the sight of people.

The Auliya practised various periods of *temporary Rahbaaniyat*, and the *Rahbaaniyat* which Allah Ta'ala has devised for the masses is the Masnoon ten-day I'tikaaf during Ramadhaan. All the Fuqaha and Aimmah-e-Mujtahideen during the *Khairul Quroon* era upheld the style of renunciation and abstinence of the Sufiya of those ages. None of them condemned the Sufiya. Only in the later centuries, spiritually barren Ulama considered it appropriate to criticize the Sufis. Due to their spiritual aridity, these Ulama confused the imposters and fakes with the genuine Sufis, and committed the grave injustice of condemning the entire body of Sufiya-e-Kiraam.

Imaam A'zam Abu Hanifah (rahmatullah alayh) considered it a great honour to include the Sufi, Fudhail Bin Iyaadh (rahmatullah alayh) in his Council of Ulama. Imaam Abu Hanifah would make it an incumbent point to consult with this Hermit whenever there developed masaa-il of special significance. Hadhrat Fudhail lived in isolation in a hut far away from people. Even the Khalifah Haroun Rashid would beg for admission into his hut just to make ziyaarat and acquire benediction.

Imaam Shaafi (rahmatullah alayh) and Imaam Hambal (rahmatullah) would consider it their good fortune to associate with the Sufiya. Once when Imaam Ahmad Bin Hambal and Imaam Shaafi (rahmatullahi alayhima) were together, Hadhrat Shaibaan Raa'ee (rahmatullahi alayh) - who was a Sufi - appeared on the scene. Imaam Ahmad said to

Imaam Shaafi: *"I wish to draw his attention to the paucity of his knowledge so that he becomes involved in the acquisition of knowledge."*

Imaam Shaafi forbade him. But Imaam Ahmad did not heed his advice.

Imaam Ahmad said to Hadhrat Shaibaan: *"If someone forgets to perform one of the five Salaat, but does not remember which one, what should he do?"*

Hadhrat Shaibaan: *"Ahmed, such a heart is forgetful of Allah Ta'ala. It is necessary for this person to punish his heart so that he does not become forgetful of His Friend (Allah). He should repeat all his Salaat (i.e. the five Salaat)."*

When Imaam Ahmad heard this, he lapsed into unconsciousness. After he was revived, Imaam Shaafi said: *"Did I not warn you to desist from pestering him?"* (Story No.26, page 16, Orchards of Love)

One morning while Imaamul Haramain, Abul Ma'aali was conducting his lesson in the Musjid, a Sufi Shaikh with a group of his Mureeds passed nearby. They were on their way to a feast to which they were invited. Sheikh Abul Ma'aali observing them, said to himself: *"Besides eating, drinking, dancing and jumping these people have no other occupation. Night and day, this is their engrossment."*

On their way back from the feast, the Sufi Sheikh approached Abul Ma'aali, and said: *"I have a question. A man performs Fajr Salaat in the state of Janaabah, then sits teaching in the Musjid and making gheebat of people. What type of man is he?"*

Hearing this, Imaamul Haramain Abul Ma'aali was overcome with regret and embarrassment. He said: *"Truly, I was in need of a Ghusl at that time."* He thus realised his error and henceforth appreciated the Sufiyaa.

[NB. The Sheikh's acts of leading the Salaat and remaining in the Musjid in the state of Janaabah were not intentional. Sometimes a man sleeps away after the need for Ghusl develops. When he wakes up he forgets about his Janaabah. This condition of Abul Ma'aali was revealed to the Sufi Sheikh by the inspirational process called Kashf.] **(No.28, page 17, Orchards of Love)**

Sheikh Abul Ghaith was completely illiterate, but the Fuqahaa (Jurists of Islam — top-ranking Ulama) of the age would frequent him and discuss the most intricate masaa'il. He would present convincing explanations.

Imaam Abul Qasim Qushairi (rahmatullahi alayh) says that Allah Ta'ala has ennobled the group of Sufiyaa. After the Ambiyaa, Allah Ta'ala has given superiority to the Sufiyaa over all people. He has made their hearts the mines of spiritual mysteries. (No.31, page 20, Orchards of Love)

Once the students of Faqeeh Abu Imraan, a renowned Faqeeh, wanted to put Hadhrat Abu Bakr Shibli (rahmatullah alayh) to test. They knew that he did not pursue higher knowledge. So one day the students asked Hadhrat Shibli about a mas'alah related to haidh. They were under the impression that he would not be able to answer, hence he would be embarrassed. However, Hadhrat Shibli elaborated the mas'alah with all the relevant views and differences of the Fuqaha. Faqeeh Abu Imraan was astonished. He went up to Hadhrat Shibli, kissed his head and said: "O Abu Bakr! Ten views regarding this mas'alah had reached you while I heard only three." The knowledge of the Auliya is *Wahbi* – divinely bestowed. **(THE SUFI'S KNOWLEDGE, page 78, The Pathway of His Love)**

THE ATTITUDE OF THE SUFIS TOWARDS THE SHARIAH

Hadhrat Fareeduddeen Attaar (rahmatullah alayh) said: "The Math-hab we follow, is the Math-hab of Imaam A'zam Abu Hanifah (rahmatullah alayh). This is the Math-hab of Rectitude which precludes error. What a wonderful servant of Allah was he! Besides obedience to Allah and following the Sunnat of Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam), he had no other concern."

It is recorded in *Futoohaat*: "Every conception which is in conflict with the Shariah is *baatil zandaqah* (baseless heresy). For us (Sufis) there is no Path towards Allah, but the Path of the Shariah. There is no road for us, except what Allah has shown us in the Shariah. Any person who claims that there is any other way unto Allah in conflict with the Shariah, is false. Such a shaikh who lacks adab should not be followed."

"He who lacks knowledge of the Law of Allah, has no status by Him. Allah has not made any jaahil a wali.

Hadhrat Fareeduddeen Attaar (rahmatullah alayh) also said: "Those people who have moved away from the *ahkaam* of the Shariah and fell into deception, tomorrow they will be in Jahannum with the kuffaar. Be firm on the Shariah. For the purification of the Baatin and for salvation there is no medium other than the Shariah."

Hadhrat Khwaajah Naseeruddin Mahmood (rahmatullah alayh) said: "Do whatever Allah and His Rasool have commanded, and refrain from whatever they have forbidden. People have abandoned the Qur'aan and the Hadith, hence they have become corrupt and distressed."

In *Khairul Majaalis* it is mentioned: "He who adopts a way other than the path of the Nabi (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) will never attain the goal. Besides following in the footsteps of the Nabi (sallallahu alayhi wasallam), he will not find the correct path."

In short, all these genuine Sufis were meticulous followers of the Sunnah and adhered resolutely to the Shariah. There was not a single true Sufi who did not follow the Sunnah. The Pathway of all Sufiya was only one – the Shariah. Someone said to the great Sufi, Hadhrat Junaid Baghdaadi (rahmatullah alayh) that there are some persons who claim: "We have attained the goal, hence we have no need for Salaat and Siyaam." Hadhrat Junaid

commented: *“They have spoken the truth regarding wusool (having reached the goal). However, they have reached Saqar (Jahannum).”*

Once Hadhrat Sultaan Nizaamuddin Auliya (rahmatullah alayh) during a state of ecstasy uttered: *“How lofty is by status!”. Afterwards he repented and said: “I had not uttered correctly. At that time I was a Yهودi. I now renounce that religion and embrace Islam afresh. Thus I declare: Ash-hadunal laailaha il lallaahu wahdahu laa shareeka lahu wa-ash-hadunna Muhammadan abduhu wa easuluhu”.*

Hadhrat Sultaanji did not justify the statement he had uttered whilst in a trance or in ecstasy. Observing the Shariah and to safeguard the Imaan of the masses, he renewed his Imaan. Commenting further, Hadhrat Maulana Ashraf Ali Thaanvi (rahmatullah alayh) wrote in his *Shariat & Tareeqat*:

“Hadhrat Zunnoon Misri, Sirri Saqati, Abu Sulaiman, Ahmad Bin Abil Hawaari, Abu Hafsa Haddaad, Abu Uthmaan, Nuri, Abu Saeed Kharraaz, Khwaajah Mueenuddeen Chishti, Hadhrat Abdul Quddoos Gangohi, Abu Taalib Makki (rahmatullah alayhim) and others have greatly emphasized obedience to the Shariah. It is abundantly clear from their statements that in the Path of Faqr, the very first requisite is knowledge of the Shariah, then practical implementation of the Shariah. Without these requisites there will be no progress. The Road of Divine Proximity will not open up. No one has ever attained the status of a Wali by opposing Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) and adopting bid’ah. When bid’ah severs and blocks the path, what should be said about kufr and shirk?”

All the names mentioned above are prominent and famous Sufis. Hadhrat Nuri (rahmatullah alayh) said: “If you see any claimant of proximity with Allah in a condition which is in conflict with the Shariah, do not approach near to him.”

Another great Sufi, Hadhrat Abul Abbaas Deenwari (rahmatullah alayh) said:

“People have violated the fundamentals of Tasawwuf, and have ruined its pathways. They have changed its meanings with new fabricated names. Thus they call *tama’* (avarice) *ziyaadat*, and for disrespect, *ikhlaas*. They designate abandonment of the Haqq as *shatah*; subservience to lust as *mateebah*; obedience to base desires as *ibtillaa’*; return to the dunya as *wasal*; evil character as *soolah*; niggardliness as *jalaadah*; begging as *amal*; vulgarity of the tongue as *malaamat*. But this was not the Tareeq of the Nation (of Sufis).”

Hadhrat Bandaar (rahmatullah alayh) said: *“The companionship of the people of Bid’ah leads to diversion from Allah Ta’ala.”*

Hadhrat Qiwaamuddeen (rahmatullah alayh) said:

“O Durwaish! The basis of this effort (Tasawwuf) is the criterion of Kitaabullah, the Sunnah of Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) and the history of the Salaf who were the leaders of the Deen..If anything of the Shaikh is in conflict with the Criterion (of the Shariah), then it is faasid (corrupt). If any statement or action of the Shaikh is in conflict with Kitaabullah, the Sunnah and Ijma’, it will be *mardood* (rejected). Such a Shaikh is unfit to be a leader. Whoever follows such a shaikh will not attain the goal.”

There are thousands of statements of the Sufi Mashaa-ikh which emphasize the strictest obedience to the Shariah and adoption of the Sunnah. It is thus a contemptible slander to

baselessly accuse the Sufiya of diverting Muslims from the course of Islam. Just as Islam will not be condemned if miscreants perpetrate haraam, bid'ah, fisq, fujoor, kufr and shirk in its name, so too is it downright stupid and slanderous to denounce Sufi'ism and the Sufiya because of the bid'ah kufr and shirk of the miscreants who lay claim to sufi'ism.

Offering *naseehat* to his son, Hadhrat Sayyid Abdul Qaadir Jilaani (rahmatullah alayh) who is among the most famous Sufiya, said:

“O my son! I admonish you! Fear Allah Ta’ala. Understand the rights of your parents and of all the Mashaa’ikh, for this endears the servant to Allah Ta’ala. In public and in privacy, in all states, defend the Haq. Do not abandon tilaawat of the Qur’aan Majeed, neither with your tongue nor with your heart; in privacy and in public, and recite with concentration and reflection, and with grief and tears. In all the ahkaam (of the Shariah) refer to the Muhkam aayaat of the Qur’aan, for the Qur’aan is Allah’s Proof on the people.

Do not step aside from the knowledge of the Shariah. Learn Ilmul Fiqh. Do not be among the masses and the jaahil sufis. Flee from these mercenaries, for they rob Muslims of their Deen. They are highway robbers.

Make incumbent on you the Aqaaid of the People of Tauheed and the Sunnah. Abstain from innovations. Every innovation is bid’ah and deviation. Do not associate with lads, females, bid’atis, the wealthy and the masses. By means of such association, your Deen will depart.....Do not abstain from Jamaat Salaat.....Do not hanker after governmental position. He who seeks governmental position will not succeed....Don’t associate with kings and rulers.”

Hadhrat Fudhail Ibn Iyaadh (rahmatullah alayh) was among the Akaabir Sufiya. Imaam Abu Hanifah (rahmatullah alayh) held him in the highest esteem, and would consult with him in difficult Fiqhi masaa-il. Hadhrat Fudhail said: “Allah Ta’ala destroys the deeds of a person who loves a man of bid’ah, and He snatches away the Noor of Imaan. I have firm conviction that Allah Ta’ala will forgive a person who has animosity for a man of bid’ah despite the paucity of his virtuous deeds. If you see a bid’ati walking along a road, then walk on another road. Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) cursing the Ahl-e-Bid’ah said: *“Allah, His Angels and creation curse a man who introduces a bid’ah or harbours a bid’ati. Neither is his Fardh accepted nor his Nafil.”*

Refuting the slander (which has always been made by those who bear malice for the Sufis), Hadhrat Khawaajah Muhammad Ma’soom (rahmatullah alayh), who was the son of Hadhrat Mujaddid Alf-e-Thaani (rahmatullah alayh), both being very senior Sufis, said:

“If the way of the noble Sufiya was abstention from Amr Bil Ma’roof, then why would a great Sufi say: *“A day in which there is no Amr Bil Ma’roof Nahy Anil Munkar among the Sufiya, is indeed an evil day.”* Just reflect on those people who do not oppose (evil) nor practise Amr Bil Maroof. Do they in fact believe in the thawaab and athaab of the Aakhirah and the severe warnings in the Qur’aan and Hadith for evil deeds.....

If Allah Ta’ala had loved that people should not be opposed (by means of Amr Bil Ma’roof), then why did He send Ambiya (alayhimus salaam), and why did He command the Call to the Deen of Islam and the negation of all other religions?

Allah Ta'ala has established primarily the Ambiya (alayhimus salaam), and secondarily, the Auliya (the Sufiya) to invite to the Deen, and by their medium, He (Allah Ta'ala) forewarned people of Punishment and Reward. Thus, the true followers of Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) are the the associates of Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) in Da'wat and Amr Bil Ma'roof. A person who abandons Amr Bil Ma'roof is not a follower of Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam).

Hadhrat Khwaajah Ahraar (rahmatullah alayh) said: : *"I have been appointed to disseminate and establish the Deen. Initiating mureeds is not my only function."*

This has always been the stance and way of the Sufiya.

VENERATION

Uttering a despicable slander against the Sufiya, the anti-Tasawwuf author of the baseless article, states: *"This is the most dangerous aspect of Sufism since Sufi thinking has become combined with veneration of the pious people and shaykhs and exaggeration in veneration of the dead, just as it has become combined with the saying that everything in existence is in reality Allaah (wahdatul wujood), not to mention the other aspects of Islam which Sufism has corrupted, in that its followers are charecterised by dependence upon others whilst falsely claiming to depend upon Allaah..."*

"The most dangerous aspect" is his reference to the fabrication that the Sufiya have diverted Muslims from the true course of Islam. The foregoing discussion in which the true nature and reality of Tasawwuf have been explained, has debunked this baseless averment.

As for his contention of 'veneration of the pious', it should be noted that he has categorized 'veneration' into two types: (1) Veneration of the pious, and (2) Exaggeration in veneration of the dead.

VENERATION OF THE PIOUS

Veneration of the Pious is among the *maqaasid* (objectives) of the Deen. The Qur'aan and Sunnah emphasize such veneration. Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) commanded the Sahaabah: *"Stand (in respect) for your sayyid (chief/leader)."* He also said: *"He who shows no mercy to the our little ones, and no veneration for our seniors, is not among us."* Commanding the fixation of the eyes and one's focus on the Mashaaikh, the Qur'aan Majeed says: *"Maintain your nafs resolutely with those who call (make thikr) on their Rabb morning and evening, and do not divert your focus from them..."*

Veneration of seniors is an integral constituent of Islamic Akhlaaq (Moral Character). Veneration of those whom Rasulullah (sdallallahu alayhi wasallam) described as the *Warathatul Ambiya* (The Heirs of the Ambiya) has greater emphasis in the Deen. What type of Salafi culture is it that decries veneration for seniors, especially seniors of the Deen? This statement of the author testifies to the spiritual and moral aridity of Salafis. They lack in the Qur'aanic and Sunnah attributes of moral excellence, hence to justify their vulgarity they label veneration of seniors as *shirk*.

We learn from the Ahaadith that if a child casts a glance of affection and respect at the face of his parents, he/she gains the thawaab of a Hajj. A Sahaabi enquired: 'What if one looks numerous times?' Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) responded that he/she will receive the thawaab of a number of Hajj which equals the number of glances cast at the parents. Is this not veneration of seniors? The illustrious Sufi, Hadhrat Fareeduddeen Attaar (rahmatullah alayh), addressing the Sufis, said: "*O Durwaish! It comes in the Hadith Shareef that an Aalim Faqeeh is superior to a thousand such Aabideen (pious worshippers) who spend the nights in ibaadat and fast by day. A day's ibaadat of an Aalim is equal to 40 days of ibaadat of an non-Aalim Aabid.*" The lofty degree of veneration for the Aalim should be quite apparent from this Hadith and statements of the Sufis.

Veneration of seniors is a self-evident moral requirement of Islamic moral character. We fail to understand the mentality which despises veneration of the Mashaa-ikh.

The second kind of veneration in which the limits of the Shariah are transgresses, is termed *ghulu'*. Shirk is the consequence of *ghulu'* which is committed by jaahil and miscreant 'sufis'. But their *ghulu'* may not be ascribed to the genuine Sufiya who all followed the Shariah meticulously. Instead of condemning Tasawwuf, an intelligent person will rather explain what is Sufi'ism and what is not. He will not attribute the crimes of Muslim criminals to Islam. If someone proffers *baatil* in the name of Islam, the former will be condemned and refuted, not Islam. The author would have acquitted himself intelligently if he had explained the bid'ah and shirk which the juhala had and still do portray as Sufi'ism.

That there exists bid'ah and shirk in the cults of the *ghaali 'sufis'*, as well as in the present-day western attired, beardless baboons in Syria, Turkey, U.S.A., etc., who are fraudulently hoisting their immoral cults in the name of 'sufi'ism', is conceded and unequivocally condemned. But the existence of these evils perpetrated in the name of sufi'ism is not a valid cause and reason for condemning Islam itself, for when Suf'ism is condemned and denounced, one half of the Deen is targeted for extermination by the errant and misguided Salafis of our time, one of them being the character, al-Madkhali who has baselessly directed his criticism at the Sufiya and Tasawwuf.

There are many bid'aat which have become attached to many valid and compulsory Fiqhi teachings of Islam. For instance, Janaazah Salaat and Dafan (burial) are accompanied by a host of bid'aat. Intelligence does not dictate banning Janaazah Salaat nor Dafan. The man of *Aql* will target the practices of bid'ah and endeavour to weed them out so that the Zaahiri Ibaadat is restored to its state of pristine purity. In exactly the same way will an *Aaqil* conduct himself with regard to the A'maal-e-Baatin. He will not condemn and ban the ways and methods of securing Tazkiya-e-Nafs (moral purification). Rather, he will focus on the errors, acts of bid'ah, shirk and baatil which have attached themselves to Tasawwuf with the march of time and the increase of *jahaalat* and *shaitaaniiyat*.

All the genuine Sufiya, without exception, have vehemently condemned the acts of bid'ah and shirk practised by the jaahil 'sufis'. They have warned against cultivation of *suhbat* (companionship) with bid'ati and jaahil 'sufis', and they emphasize the Wujoob of severing ties with such a 'shaikh' if one had by error established a link with him. Hadhrat Qiwaamuddeen (rahmatullah alayh) said:

“O Durwaish! The basis of this effort (Tasawwuf) is the criterion of Kitaabullah, the Sunnah of Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) and the history of the Salaf who were the leaders of the Deen..If anything of the Shaikh is in conflict with the Criterion (of the Shariah), then it is faasid (corrupt). If any statement or action of the Shaikh is in conflict with Kitaabullah, the Sunnah and Ijma’, it will be *mardood* (rejected). Such a Shaikh is unfit to be a leader. Whoever follows such a shaikh will not attain the goal.”

The foregoing explanation clarifies that whilst excessive veneration (*ghulu’*) accorded to saints and to the dead is haraam and condemned, valid veneration is a command of the Shariah, and an act of high merit. In fact it is the Sunnah of the Sahaabah who would rush to scoop in their hands the water which would roll off from the blessed limbs of Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) and rub it on their faces. Is this not veneration? Is it excessive veneration? And, the Sahaabah would use the blessed perspiration of Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) as *atar* (perfume). Is this not veneration, and is it excessive veneration? In fact, there are acts of greater veneration displayed by the Sahaabah for Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam). But the Salafis, including the author, suffers from the malady of spiritual barrenness. They are bereft of *roohaaniyat*, hence devoid of *Akhlaaq-e-Hameedah*. To them *Tazkiyah-e-Nafs* is to execute the A’maal-e-Zaahiri in any slipshod manner. Just observe them performing Salaat, and you will wonder at even their Ulama being in entirety bereft of *khushu’* and *khudhu’* when discharging their acts of ibaadat.

Veneration for the Shaikh has prescribed limits. These limits do not permit the mureed to follow an act of transgression which may ensue from the Shaikh. The Shaikh is not sinless, just as the Sahaabah were not sinless. Besides the Ambiyaa who were *Ma’soom*, no other human being is sinless. Commenting on this fact and the limits of veneration, Hadhrat Maulana Maseehullah Khaan (rahmatullah alayh), said:

“The mureed should not entertain the idea that the Shaikh is *ma’soom*. However, he should hold the Shaikh in high esteem. If occasionally the mureed observes any transgression by the Shaikh, he (the mureed) should not sever his relationship with the Shaikh. But, if the Shaikh commits transgression in abundance, the mureed should politely terminate his relationship with the Shaikh. Also, the Shaikh should not instruct the mureed to practise such acts which are transgression in terms of the Shariah.”

If one’s father commits transgression and sin, and also instructs his son to perpetrate sin, the latter is under Shar’i obligation to politely and with respect and grief in his heart refuse obedience. But the father’s sins do not justify the son’s abstention from veneration. At all times, the son is required to honour, love and venerate his father.

The same standard applies with regard to the Mashaaikh and the Ulama who are the *Warathah* of the Ambiya, and from whom we acquire the Deen, both the Zaahiri and Baatini dimensions on which our everlasting *Najaat* in the Akhirah pivots. Now what is the name of that cult which advocates coarseness of attitude, disrespect for seniors and displays aversion for Akhlaaq-e-Hameedah in general? Salafi’ism! Whilst modern-day Salafi’ism is the one extreme, we find at the opposite extreme baatil *sufi’ism* which in reality is Satanism.

Stupidly arguing against valid, lawful and Waajib veneration of seniors, al-Madkhali says in his article: “Then it is a fact that all sects of the Sufis have gone beyond bounds in veneration of their shaykhs and in complete submission of the follower (mureed) to his

teacher (shaykh); to the point that the follower gives full and unrestricted obedience to his shaykh, not showing the slightest resistance, so that he becomes like a dead body beneath the hand of a person washing it.”

Allah Ta'ala states in the Qur'aan Majeed: *“Verily, By your Rabb! (O Muhammad!) They will not have Imaan until they appoint you to be the judge in their mutual disputes, then they find no dissatisfaction in their hearts regarding your decision, and they fully submit (to your decision).” (An-Nisaa', aayat 65)*

This command of complete submission to Shar'i authority extends to even the Warathatul Ambiya in all matters of the Deen. The bond which the mureed has with his Shaikh is of Deeni import. As long as the Shaikh instructs his mureed to obey the Shariat, he (the mureed) may not waver in his obedience to the Shaikh. The relationship struck up with the Shaikh is not for sin. It is for gaining moral purification and to cultivate all the attributes of moral excellence commanded by the Qur'aan and Sunnah. The Shaikh being an expert in this field has to be obeyed. Before offering allegiance to a Shaikh, the prospective mureed is under obligation to examine him (the Shaikh) in order to ascertain if the Shaikh is a meticulous follower of the Sunnah, and whether he is a man of Taqwa. If he establishes these credentials of the Shaikh, then it will be tantamount to rebellion and nafsaniyat inspired by shaitaan to disobey the Shaikh. One who has doubts in the ability of the Shaikh should not adopt him for his guide, and if after having entered into the circle of the Shaikh he discovers a lack of compatibility or he develops doubts in him regarding the ability or credentials of the shaikh, he is free to politely terminate his association.

One takes hold of a spiritual guide fully understanding and believing that he is a qualified expert in the field and will lead one via the Shariah unto Allah Ta'ala. This is the purpose for joining the *suhbat* of the Shaikh. It is a *suhbat* commanded by Allah Ta'ala: *“Be with the Saadiqeen (the Auliya).” – Qur'aan.* Obedience to the Shaikh does not demand disobedience to the Shariah. The *ta'leem* of all the genuine Sufiya is what Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) said: *“There is no obedience for the makhloof in (any obedience which involves) sinning against Allah.”* The emphasis on obedience is obedience to the Shaikh in his valid and lawful instructions. In fact, all the instructions of the Shaikh are valid and lawful, that is, if he is a true Shaikh of Tasawwuf. How is it possible for one who meticulously follows every aspect of the Sunnah to instruct mureeds in haraam, kufr and shirk? Our Mashaikh of Tasawwuf have made it abundantly clear that where the mureed observes the Shaikh persisting in sin, then even if he does not order the mureed to sin, he (the mureed) should sever his relationship with such a Shaikh.

As for the mureed becoming like a 'dead body' in the hands of the one who gives ghusl to the mayyit, al-Makhadali's brains are too shallow for comprehending this simple issue. It is a metaphoric expression for total obedience to the valid *ta'leem* of the Shaikh. And, this is the command of the Shariah. Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) instructed: *“Die before you die.”* The mureed becomes 'dead' in the hands of his shaikh in exactly the same way as a patient suffering from a physical disease becomes 'dead' in the hands of the doctor who will diagnose and prescribe as he deems appropriate. Furthermore, the physician in the mundane realm will commit the ostensibly 'haraam' act of severing/amputating limbs and organs from the body of his patient when he deems this necessary. But, then no one, including these spiritually arid, hard-hearted Salafis, will adversely comment when the doctor commits the haraam deed of cutting off a limb.

Since there is a need to amputate the limb to prevent the disease spreading, and since this benefit is apparent to the physical eyes, everyone gladly submits and accepts the commission of this haraam. If there is no halaal remedy available, everyone gladly accepts and submits to the intake of haraam medicine. There are no adverse comments from the Madkhali type Salafis on this score. But, when the *Roohaani* physician (the Shaikh) deems it imperative to apply a spiritual remedy which in the opinion of morons and men devoid of *roohaaniyat* is in conflict with the Shariah, a hue and cry is raised, yet the health and preservation of the spiritual body (the Rooh) have priority over the health of the physical body. The health of the *Rooh* is imperative for the everlasting salvation and success in the Aakhirah.

Besides this fact, cases of seemingly unlawful spiritual remedies prescribed by a Shaikh are extremely rare. Furthermore, if the mureed is convinced that the Shaikh errs in his prescription, he is at liberty to revoke his allegiance and terminate his relationship with the Shaikh.

Everyone happily practices the prescription of being a 'dead body' in the hands of the physical doctor, but there is aversion for acting the same role under the guidance and affectionate care of the spiritual guide, and this is the consequence of disdain for the Deen, and defective understanding of the *Maqsood* of life on earth. Since the Deen has become a hobby to most people, they are averse to act in conflict with their nafsaani desires. In the mudane field they tolerate a host of conflicts with the Shariah, but in the spiritual dimension if anything which superficially appears to be a conflict whilst in reality not being in conflict with the Shariah, or if the spiritual remedy demands the treatment, it is rebelliously rejected. Madkhali should divert some of his energies to castigate medical practioners for all the haraam and najaasat they indulge in.

Being like a 'dead' body in the hands of the Shaikh signifies nothing other than being like a 'dead' body in the hands of the medical doctor who diagnoses, prescribes and amputates limbs. Just as the doctor is not allowed to amputate a healthy limb for no valid medical reason, so too, the Shaikh will not prescribe anything when there is no imperative Shar'i need for it.

This explanation adequately answers the charges which Madkhalee brings against the Sufiya's demand for obedience. Minus obedience, the mureed will not benefit in the same way as the patient will not benefit if he finds fault with the diagnosis and prescription of the doctor.

AMR BIL MA'ROOF

Disgorging another slander, Madkhalee says: *"This is one of the reasons for the extreme deviation of the Sufis, they have abolished forbidding evil so that evil actions have become good to them."*

Nothing is further from the truth than this slanderous averment. The Sufiya are paragons of virtue and beacons of guidance. Amr Bil Ma'roof Nahyi Anil Munkar is a lifelong obligation in which they are involved. Where, when and how did the genuine Sufis abolish Amr Bil Ma'roof? It is a blatantly false claim unsubstantiated by evidence. There is not the slightest

evidence to substantiate this blatant lie uttered by al-Madkhalee. All the Auliya – the genuine Sufiya – were always active in the duty of Amr Bil Ma'roof. Their writings and statements are permeated with the theme of Amr Bil Ma'roof. The Sufiya were persecuted, imprisoned and tortured for their Amr Bil Ma'roof by kings and rulers to whom the Sufiya directed their Naseehat. What is this miscreant's basis for contending that the Sufiya have abolished Amr Bil Ma'roof Nahy Anil Munkar?

Continuing with his affirmation of Amr Bil Ma'roof Nahy Anil Munkar, the noble Sufi, Hadhrat Khwaajah Ma'soom (rahmatullah alayh) says in his Maktubaat: "Understand well that if abstention from opposing (the people of baatil) had been praiseworthy, then Amr Bil Ma'roof, Nahy Anil Munkar would not have been among the Waajibaat of the Deen, and Allah Ta'ala would not have awarded the title, *Khair-e-Ummah (the Best Ummah)* to those who practise Amr and Nahy. Praising them, the Qur'aan states:

"...They command righteousness, prohibit evil and observe the limits of Allah...."

Elsewhere in the Qur'aan, Allah Ta'ala says: *"The Believing men and the Believing women are mutual friends. They command righteousness and prohibit evil."* The Ambiya (alayhimus salaam), the Sahaabah, Taabieen, Tab-e-Taabieen and all the Salaf-e-Saaliheen expended great effort in the execution of Amr Bil Ma'roof Nahy Anil Munkar, and they suffered horrendous torture and persecution to uphold this obligation.

Whatever the Auliya (Sufiya) had acquired in the spheres of Wilaayat, Ma'rifat Muhabbat, and Qurb-e-Ilaahi was via the Ambiya. The Path of Wusool is confined to obedience to the Ambiya. All paths besides this path are deviation and the roads of the shayaateen. Therefore, whoever attempts to plod the path of Haq without obedience to the Ambiya, will never attain success. He will gain nothing besides deviation. Even if such a person acquires something (by way of supernatural feats), it will be *istidraaj* (satanic manipulation and influence), the consequence of which is loss and deprivation. *'Whoever searches for a deen other than Islam, never shall it be accepted of him, and in the Aakhirah he will be from among the losers.'* (Qur'aan)

Hadhrat Junaid Baghdaadi (rahmatullah alayh), who is among the leaders of the Sufiya, said: *"Whoever has not made hifz of the Qur'aan nor studied Hadith, he cannot become a leader in our (Sufi) Maslak (Path) because our Path is totally fettered to the Qur'aan and Sunnah."*

Hadhrat Khwaajah Ahraar (rahmatullah alayh) – a prominent Sufi – said: *"If all ahwaal and mawaajid are bestowed to us, but if our nature is not adorned with the Aqaaid of the Ahlus Sunnah Wal Jama'ah, then we shall view these bestowals as nothing but corruption. On the contrary, if all corruption accumulates in us, but our nature is bestowed with the Aqaaid of the Ahlus Sunnah Wal Jama'ah, then we have no fear."*

Be just (by refraining from your baseless criticism which you level at the Sufiya)! Nubuwwat has terminated. The era of Wahi has ended. The Deen has been perfected. Divine Ni'mat has been completed. Now on the basis of which daleel and authority is it possible to set aside the ahkaam of this powerful Deen?Employ intelligence. Do not become entrapped in the deception of imagination and dreams. Stay far from the path of shaitaan. Do not let slip from your hand the beautiful Sunnah of Siraatul Mustaqeem. Undoubtedly, the way of Najaat (salvation) is to follow the Ambiya (alayhimus salaam).

Besides this, everything else is dangerous. It is therefore imperative to beware and abstain from such danger. Abandoning the Path of Salvation and adopting the path of danger is to become ensnared in the net of shaitaan, the accursed one, and to plunge yourself in everlasting perdition.

When you will have to deal with Allah Ta'ala, when the stages of the grave and Qiyaamah will have to be traversed, then nothing besides obedience to the Ambiya will be of benefit to aid you. Yes, if ahwaal, mawaajid, kushoof and ilhaamaat are in accord with the teachings of the Ambiya, then it will be light upon light." *(The above are all extracts from the discourse of the Sufi, Khwaajah Muhammad Ma'soom, the son of Hadhrat Mujaddid Alf-e-Thaani.)*

Continuing his discourse, Sufi Khwaajah Muhammad Ma'soom (rahmatullah alayh) says:

"What is the conflict between Shariat and Tareeqat? (In other words, there is no conflict whatsoever). The Shariah has been established on the basis of such Absolute Revelation in which there is not the slightest scope for doubt and uncertainty. There is no abrogation and changing in the ahkaam of the Shariah which will endure until Qiyaamah. It is imperative for the masses and the elite to practise in accordance with the commands of the Shariat. Tareeqat has no authority to efface any of the ahkaam of the Shariat and to emancipate the people of Tareeqat from the impositions of the Shariah.

Among the Aqaaid of Absolute Certitude of the Ahlus Sunnah Wal Jama'ah is that a person can never attain a stage which frees him from the impositions of the Shariah. Whoever subscribes to such a belief, is beyond the pale of Islam.....Yes, undoubtedly, sometimes some actions in apparent conflict with the Kitaab and Sunnah emanate from some Saalikeen... On such occasions the Saalik should hold on firmly to the Shariah with his jaws, and act in conflict with his kashf and wijdaan and in obedience to the Ahlus Sunnah Wal Jama'ah. At such times, the Saalik should, like Ibraaheem Khaleelullah (alayhis salaam) say: *"I do not love that which disappears."*, and proclaim: *"Verily, I have turned my face to Allaah..."* *(The Saalik, sometimes in a state of ecstasy undergo certain spiritual experiences which are seemingly in conflict with the Shariah. But when the state of ecstasy disappears, he repents and affirms his Aqeedah of the Ahlus Sunnah Wal Jama'ah. Never does he propagate his experience for public consumption. In fact, for their own benefit and the safety of the masses, they publicly renew their Imaan. This they do instead of resorting to explanation, interpretation and justification of the statements which they had made in a state of intellectual abnormality.)*

Hadhrat Khwaajah Muhammad Ma'soom (rahmatullah alayh) further says in regard to Amr Bil Ma'roof Nahy Anil Munkar: "Hadhrat Shaikh Abdul Qadir Jilaani (rahmatullah alayh) has written an entire chapter in one of his treatises on the subject of Amr Bil Ma'roof Nahy Anil Munkar. In it he has elaborated its subtleties. In this treatise he states: *"Is Amr Bil Ma'roof Nahy Anil Munkar permissible or not at a time when there is almost certainty of being killed? According to us (Sufis), at such a time too, it is permissible, in fact preferable on condition that the the one who embarks on Nahyi Anil Munkar has the ability of toleration (to bear the torture). This Nahyi Anil Munkar resembles Jihaad fi sabeelillaah against the kuffaar."* Now be just! These illustrious Souls were the leaders and guides of the People of

Wilaayat. They were the Sufiya-e-Kiraam. If their maslak was flattery (or to be lax in this field), then why did they emphasize so much on the obligation of Amr Bil Ma'roof Nahyi Munkar?" The slander of al-Makhadili is rejected with contempt.

THE SPIRIT OF JIHAD

Proffering another one of his slanders, the writer of the baatil criticism against the Sufiya, states: *"Likewise they have removed the spirit of jihad, which is to fight in the way of Allaah, with what they claim to be the greater jihaad, i.e. striving against one's own soul (jihaadun nafs)."*

From the earliest time to this very day, the Sufiya have always participated in active Jihaad – in the battlefield against the Kuffaar. They were outstanding Mujaahideen in the Path of Allah Ta'ala. The description, "the greater jihad", i.e. the struggle against the nafs, was never presented in opposition to Jihaad fi Sabeelillaah. The writer is a rotten liar to claim that the Sufiya had abolished Jihad of the Battlefield with the excuse of jihad against the nafs. Who is the Sufi who had ventured this abolition? Who is the Sufi who had propagated against Jihad in the battlefield? Dagga-smoking *mujaawars* who cling to the graves of the saints are not among the Sufiya. Khwaajah Muhammad Ma'soom (rahmatullah alayh) says:

"If Allah Ta'ala had not desired us to oppose people, then why did He send the Ambiya (alayhimus salaam)...? Why did he make Jihad fardh? Why is the significance of the Mujaahideen and Shuhada fi Sabeelillaah established with Nusoos-e-Qat'iyyah?

"He who resolves to embark on this great obligation (of Jihad) has acted wonderfully. In this path he has made a firm resolution. He embraces with enthusiasm and eagerness in the Path the hardships of the journey which in reality are the fruits of barakaat and the medium for the attainment of lofty spiritual states. Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) had said that in Jannat there are a 100 levels. The highest level will be the abode of the Mujaahideen fi Sabeelillaah. The distance between two levels is like the distance between heaven and earth. (Narrated by Bukhaari)"

To spend one hour in the Path of Allah (i.e. in Jihad) is better than spending the entire Lailatul Qadr in Makkah near to Hajrul Aswad in ibaadat. (Baihqi and Ibn Hibbaan).....If the Fuqara (Sufiya) remain for years in seclusion in acts of worship, they cannot attain the status of the action in which you are involved. (This was the Sufi's naseehat to the Moghul king, Alamghiri). Obedience and worship which are expended in the Path of the Deen are vastly superior to worship in seclusion. The Tasbeeh made in this Path (of Jihad) is superior and so is the Salaat."

In the present era who are engaging in Jihad fi Sabeelillah? Who has taken on the superpowers of the world? Who has humiliated the combined armed forces of the U.S.A., Britain, France and the coalition of 50 countries? These Mujaahideen as everyone knows, are the Talibaan in Afghanistan. All of them are followers of the Sufis. They staunchly follow Hadhrat Mujaddid Alf-e-Thaani (rahmatullah alayh). Shaikh Abdaali (rahmatullah alayh), has a special place in their hearts. Their top leaders are Sufis, and their rank and file subscribe to Sufi ideology, and follow the Sufis, albeit defectively. These followers of the Sufiya are the best Mujaahideen Fi Sabeelillah in the current age. How then can the writer of the rubbish

criticism justify his slander? All the great Sufiya throughout Islamic history had participated in Jihad and had always advocated the *fadhaa-il* of Jihad.

The struggle against the nafs has been described as the 'greater jihad' not to derogate from the Jihad in the Battlefield, but to state a fact of reality. The fight against the nafs is harder than the fight in the battlefield. Even in the battlefield, the jihad against the nafs is a continuous struggle. On the battlefield and off the battlefield, the struggle against the nafs is perpetual. It is an ongoing struggle. From this perspective it has been described as the greater jihad. This description has not been coined to minimize the importance of Jihad Fi Sabeelillaah. The actions and statements of the Sufiya debunk the slander of the writer.

Most Mujaahideen enthusiastically offer their lives and happily court Death, but they miserably fail, for example, to keep control of their eyes and their tongues. Malice, animosity, envy and pride overwhelm their hearts, yet they fight in the battlefield with sincerity in the Path of Allah Ta'ala. It is for this reason that the success of today's Mujahideen is minimal. The nafs is polluted with an abundance of *akhlaaq-e-razeelah* which deceptively appears to be 'too difficult' to eliminate. It is from this angle that the struggle against the nafs has been depicted to be the greater jihad. Never ever did the Sufiya cite this fact to abolish or to detract from Jihad Fi Sabeelillaah. This slander is also rejected with the contempt it deserves.

THE CONCEPT OF WAHDATUL WUJOOD

Mr. al-Madhkali avers: "...it has become combined with the saying that everything in existence is in reality Allaah (*wahdatul wujood*)...."

The writer has made Ibn Arabi's writings the fulcrum for his criticism of Tasawwuf. Having understood Ibn Arabi's view in the concept of *Wahdatul Wujood* to be kufr, he (the writer) has brazenly and baselessly attributed it (Ibn Arabi's concept) to all the Sufiya. At this juncture we are not elaborating on this concept in terms of the understanding stemming from Ibn Arabi's writings. However, attention is drawn to the gross injustice which this al-Madkhalee character has rendered to all the Sufiya from the era of the Salaf-e-Saaliheen to recent times.

Ibn Arabi flourished in the fifth century Hijri. He died in 543 Hijri. Tasawwuf or Sufi'ism was in existence more than five centuries prior to the advent of Ibn Arabi. By what stretch of logic or hallucination is it intelligent to align all the Akaabir Sufiya who had adorned Islam's firmament of Tazkiya-e-Nafs and Taqwa with the view expounded by Ibn Arabi five hundred years later?

Furthermore, in the 9 centuries after Ibn Arabi, there were millions of Sufis. On what basis does the writer claim that all these millions of Sufiya from the pre and post Ibn Arabi age had all subscribed to Ibn Arabi's concept of *Wahdatul Wujood*? And, what is the evidence for the contention that the Sufi technical term, *Wahdatul Wujood* had the same meaning for all the Sufiya who came after Ibn Arabi?

One of the fundamental basis of the errant writer for his *baatil* refutation of Sufi'ism is Ibn Arabi's *Wahdatul Wujood* concept. Who of the Akaabir Sufiya before Ibn Arabi and after Ibn

Arabi had espoused his peculiar concept? And, if there are isolated Sufis who had adopted Ibn Arabi's version of *Wahdatul Wujood*, on what does the writer base his charge that all the Sufiya subscribe to Ibn Arabi's view? Why did the writer not view Tasawwuf in the light of the expositions and practices of the great Auliya such as Ibn Mubaarak, Sufyaan Thauri, Fudhail Bin Iyaadh, Imaam Maalik, Imaam Ahmad, Junaid Bagdhaadi, Sirri Saqati, Dawood Tai, Sayyid Abdul Qaadir Jilaani, Haji Imdaadullah, Hadhrat Maulana Rashid Gangohi, Hadhrat Thaani and thousands of other Sufiya before and after Ibn Arabi?

It is bigotry and spiritual aridity which have constrained the writer to condemn Tasawwuf *en toto*. He has illogically, irrationally and stupidly made Ibn Arabi the pivot for his rejection of Suf'ism. Ibn Arabi is an individual who by no means was the originator of Tasawwuf. The Founder of Tasawwuf is none other than the Founder of the Shariah, viz., Muhammadur Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam), for Tasawwuf is nothing other than Tazkiya-e-Nafs which is a Waajib obligation on every Mu'min.

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 Adam (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 ayat 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 ayat 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 touch, 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 metaphorical 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 of 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 Malaikah, 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 – an ir The Existence which has neither beginning nor ending, and that Existence is onloy 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.*"

However, with regards to to *mukaashafaat* of the Auliya, the Sufiya themselves emphasize abstention from even reading their writings on this subject. Just as medical books and other textbooks of technical and academic import are valid terrain for only their respective experts, so too, it is not permissible for morons and the masses at large to even read books of th Sufiya which discuss *Asraar* (spiritual mysteries) and *mukaashafaat* (spiritual revelations).

Once when some people praised Ibn Arabi in the presence of Hadhrat Shuhaabuddeen Suharwardi (rahmatullah alayh), he said: "Beware! Never go even near to him, for you will become *zindeeq*." (*Zindeeq is a kaafir*). When Ibn Arabi died and Shaikh Shahaabuddeen was informed, he said: "The Qutb of the age and Allah's Wali has died." Amazed at this comment, people said: 'Hadhrat, then why did you deprive us of his *suhbat*?' The noble Shaikh responded: "His statements are beyond your intellectual comprehension. If you had listened to his statements, you would have gone astray. It was therefore imperative (for the safety of your Imaan) to prevent you from his *suhbat*."

In fact, Ibn Arabi himself said: “Those lacking in comprehension should not study my kutub.”

There is much to comment and write about Shaikh Ibn Arabi. However, the present treatise is not a defence of Ibn Arabi. It is in defence of Tasawwuf which is an integral constituent of Islam, and with which the Qur’aan and Sunnah are replete. Tasawwuf is not the consequence of Ibn Arabi’s writing. He appeared on the Islamic scene five centuries after the inception of Islam. The *mukaashafaat* (revelations in spiritual trances and states) are unrelated to Tasawwuf. The subject matter of Sufi’ism is not *mukaashafaat* nor miracles and the like. Tasawwuf deals with Tazkiya-e-Nafs and the experts of this department of the Deen are the Auliya-e-Kiraam (the Sufiya).

To condemn Tasawwuf and the entire Jamaat of Sufiya on the basis of the writings of a few Sufiya is portrayal of *jahaalat*. Since Ibn Arabi’s writings have no relevance to Sufi’ism, there is no need in this refutation to respond to the attack on him. If necessary, and if Allah Ta’ala grants the taufeeq, the subject of Ibn Arabi’s views could be tackled in a separate treatise.

On the topic of *Wahdatul Wujood* it suffices to say that this is a technical term in the language of the Sufiya. The Qur’aan and Ahaadith are replete with its meaning. The views of a few Sufis which conflict with the Shariah may not be presented for dismissing and negating this simple concept. Allah Ta’ala Himself has affirmed *Wahdatul Wujood* by declaring that He becomes the ears, eyes, heart, limbs – the very being – of His devotee. Allah Ta’ala says with clarity in the Hadith-e-Qudsi that He acts through the organs and limbs of His devotee. Just as every Muslim is obliged to accept this affirmation of *Wahdatul Wujood* by Allah Azza Wa Jal, so too is the very same concept expressed by the Sufiya acceptable. Considerable brains are not necessary for understanding that the unity of existence in this context is in a metaphorical sense.

THE APPEARANCE OF SUFI’ISM

Al-Makhadalee says: “As regards the first appearance of Sufism, then the word ‘Sufism’ was not known in the time of the Companions, indeed it was not well-known in the first and best three centuries. Rather it became known after the end of the first three centuries.”

Even if we have to assume that Mr.Makhadalee is correct in this contention, the appearance of a nomenclature in a later epoch for an institution which existed during the age of Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) and the *Khairul Quroon*, is not grounds for contending that the institution is baseless and in conflict with the Shariah.

The word *sufi* is derived from different terms. One term is *soof* (wool). As a derivative from this word, Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) had used it. In a Hadith in Dailmi, Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) said: *Destruction for him who wears soof while his action conflicts with his statement.*” (At-Tasharruf of Hadhrat Thaanvi) This Hadith specifically criticizes a sufi of *riya*.

Imaam Muhammad (rahmatullah alayh), the Student of Imaam Abu hanifah (rahmatullah alayh) was asked: “Why did you not write a *kitaab* on Tasawwuf?” Imaam Muhammad

replied: *"I did write a kitaab on it."* The person said: *"What is it?"* Imaam Muhammad responded: *"Kitaabul Bay' (i.e. the Kitaab dealing with trade transactions) He who is unaware of the correctness and corruption of trade dealings, eats haraam. And, he who consumes haraam, his (moral) state will never be proper."* (Baihaqi in *Shu'bil Umaan*)

Hadhrat Maulana Ashraf Ali Thaanvi (rahmatullah alayh) said: *"In the terminology of the Mutaqaddimeen, Sufi refers to an Aalim ba Amal (a practising Aalim)."* This meaning of a Sufi is stated in the following Qur'aanic aayat: *"Verily, of the servants of Allah, only the Ulama fear Allah."*

Imaam Maalik (rahmatullah alayh) said: *"He who acquires fiqh without Tasawwuf, he remains (morally and spiritually) barren. He who acquires Tasawwuf without Fiqh, verily he becomes a zindeeq. He who acquires both, verily, he has become a Muhaqqiq."*

Once when Hadhrat Ma'roof Karkhi (rahmatullah alayh) and Hadhrat Shaqeeq Balkhi (rahmatullah alayh) met, the former asked Hadhrat Ma'roof: *"What is Tasawwuf by you people (i.e. by the Sufiya of your land)?"* Hadhrat Ma'roof replied: *"When bounties are bestowed to us, we express shukr (gratitude); when misfortune befalls us, we make sabr (we adopt patience)."* Hadhrat Shaqeeq responded: *"That is like the (practice) of our dogs in Balkh."* Surprised, Hadhrat Ma'roof asked: *"What is Tasawwuf by you people?"* Hadhrat Shaqeeq said: *"When bounties are withheld from us, we express shukr, and when bounties are bestowed to us, we sacrifice (the bounties for others)."*

Hadhrat Ma'roof Karkhi (rahmatullah alayh) had died in the year 200 Hijri. This confirms the usage of the term, Tasawwuf long before the ending of the second century.

These few references debunk the contention that the term Tasawwuf *"became known after the end of the first three centuries."* Rasulullah's mentioning the term, *Suf*, and Imaam Maalik's mention of Tasawwuf are a conspicuous refutation of the baseless contention of Makhadali. There are numerous other Auliya during the *Khairul Quroon* who used this term and who were known as Sufis.

Besides this stupid nomenclature legless 'daleel', the issue we are debating, for its validity, is unrelated to terminology. Regardless of the century in which the words Tasawwuf (or Sufi'ism) and Sufi appeared, its date of introduction is unrelated to its reality. A concept can not be condemned on the basis of the term not having existed during the *Khairul Quroon*. The Qur'aan can not be branded unauthentic if a community refers to it with only the words 'Holy Book' or any other term in some other language. Regardless of terminology, the concept will be valid if it conforms to the Shariah.

Tasawwuf is nothing other than Tazkiya-e-Nafs. Innumerable statements, descriptions and definitions of the Sufiya-e-Kiraam emphasize the reality and meaning of Tasawwuf. It is that department of Islam which concerns itself with the purification and spiritual development of the Baatin. It therefore matters not when the term 'Sufi' and 'Tasawwuf' were coined.

The writer states: *"Shaikhul Islam Ibn Taimiyyah rahimahullaah, mentions that the first appearance of Sufism was in Basrah in Iraaq, where some people went to extremes in worship and in avoiding the worldly life....."*

Well, 'Shaikhul Islam' is clearly in error. He blurted out drivel by mentioning what is not factual. Furthermore, if the worship of 'some people' was 'extreme' for Ibn Taimiyyah, it does not follow that it was extreme in terms of the Qur'aan and Sunnah. Let it be known, that for every so-called 'extreme' and austere practice of the Sufiya, there is a *ma'khaz* (a basis of procurement) in the Ahaadith. Only an Aalim whose research is panaoptical is aware of the various Ahaadith which confirm the validity of the 'extreme' practices of the Sufiya. Without going into detail, we mention by way of sample, the *Ashaabus Suffah*.

Once Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) saw Hadhrat Aishah (radhiyallahu anha) eating twice in one day. He commented: "O Aisha! Were you created to only eat?" Yet everyone is aware of the extreme austerity of Hadhrat Aishah (radhiyallahu anha). Rasulullah's lifestyle and the lifestyle of the Akaabir Sahaabah testify to the validity of the so-called 'extreme' *ibaadat* and *riyaadhat* practices of the Sufiya. Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) also said: "Eating more than once a day is waste."

Once Hadhrat Ibn Umar (radhiyallahu anhu) invited his father, Ameerul Mu'mineen, Umar Farooq (radhiyallahu anhu) for meals. He had saved up for months to prepare a 'special' meal for his father. When Hadhrat Umar (radhiyallahu anhu) arrived and sat down to eat, he observed that *ghee (melted butter)* was in the food. He stood up and commented on the 'extravagance'. He left in annoyance without partaking of the food.

Hadhrat Abu Hurairah (radhiyallahu anhu) who was one of the Ashaabus Suffah says that he used to frequently collapse and become unconscious due to hunger. But they (the Ashaabus Suffah) were not allowed to ask anyone for food nor go out to earn their food. They had to adopt 100% Tawakkul. There are innumerable similar episodes of 'extreme' austerity exercised by Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) and the Sahaabah in both worldly activities and in Ibaadat. Everyone is aware of Rasulullah's swollen feet due to excessive standing in Salaat the entire night.

Hadhrat Salmaan Faarsi (radhiyallahu anhu) who was a Sahaabi of Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) had married a very wealthy lady from the Tribe of Kindah. After the Nikah he went to her house. Standing at the door, he called his wife by her name. There was no response from the house. He exclaimed: 'Are you dumb or deaf?' She responded: 'O Sahaabi of Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam): 'I am neither dumb nor deaf. However, brides are modest, hence they do not quickly speak.'

When Hadhrat Salmaan Faarsi (radhiyallahu anhu) entered, he was taken aback by the opulence. The house was embellished with expensive carpets, silken veils and other luxury household goods. Hadhrat Salmaan commented: "What! Has a fever overcome your house to warrant all this covering or has the Ka'bah Shareef come to Kindah?" She said: "O Sahaabi of Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam)? Nothing of the sort. The homes of brides are usually adorned.'

At a call of the bride, servants hastily laid out sumptuous food. Hadhrat Salmaan (radhiyallahu anhu) said: "I heard Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) saying: *'Whoever sleeps on soft and luxury bedding, dresses with garments of pride, rides on beautiful mounts of ostentation and consumes delicious foods, will not even smell of the fragrance of Jannat.'*"

The bride said: "O Sahaabi of Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam)! You are my witness! I contribute the entire wealth of this house in the Path of Allah. All my slaves are

free in the Path of Allah. I shall live with you a life of frugality.” Hadhrat Salmaan (radhiyallahu anhu) said: ‘May Allah Ta’ala have mercy on you, and may He aid you.’ (Page 120, *The Pathway of His Love*)

Let these moron Salafi critics of the Sufiya understand that there are different standards of life and ibaadat in Islam. What may be extreme for us Toms, Dicks and Harries, will be incumbent for the Sufiya. Ibn Taimiyyah did not understand this issue, hence he blurted out the drivel which Madkhalee cites as grounds for his baseless criticism of the Sufiya.

The Fuqaha, Muhadditheen and Mufasssireen all upheld the practices of the Sufiya, and they went to great lengths to present suitable interpretations to explain even such utterances of the Sufiya which appear to be in conflict with the Shariah – statements which they made in states of ecstasy, which in Sufi terminology is called *Sukr*. Ibn Hajar Haitami (rahmatullah alayh) has written a very beneficial treatise in defence of the Sufiya. If Allah Ta’ala bestows to us the taufeeq, it shall, Insha’Allah, be translated and published.

The grave injustice which al-Madkhalee committed in his drivel attack against Tasawwuf is that he has made the statements of *Sukr* of a few *maghloobul haal* Buzrugs the fulcrum of his tirade and criticism against the entire body of Auliya and Sufiya. He has ignored the teachings of the Sufiya and clings to the statements of a few Sufiya whose statements appear in conflict with the Shariah. Such statements do not justify criticizing, slandering and rejecting all the Sufiya and their ta’leem which is nothing but the Qur’aan and Sunnah.

His argument would have seemed intelligent if he had restricted his tirade to the statements which he believe are blasphemous. For his criticism he should have confined himself to Ibn Arabi, Al-Hallaaj and some others. When Hadhrat Suharwardi (rahmatullah alayh), the Founder of the Suharwardiyyah Sufi Silsilah would say that Ibn Arabi is a ‘*zindeeq*’, then by what stretch of justice and intelligence does the moron Salafi criticize all the Sufiya and brand them as heretics, etc.?

Whilst Ibn Arabi was alive, Hadhrat Suharwardi would tell his mureedeen that Ibn Arabi “is a *zindeeq*”. However, when he received news of Ibn Arabi’s death, he said: “*A Wali of Allah has died.*” When the mureeds were puzzled and asked for an explanation, the Shaikh said that he used to label Ibn Arabi a ‘*zindeeq*’ to save their Imaan for they were incapable of understanding the statements of Ibn Arabi.

For the execution of Mansur Al-Hallaaj, Hadhrat Junaid Bagdhaadi (rahmatullah alayh) confirmed and signed the decree. This should be more than adequate evidence for the Sufiya upholding the *Zaahir Shariat*. Hadhrat Junaid was Sayyidut Taaifah – the Leader of the Sufiya.

Anyhow, the seemingly blasphemous statements of some Sufiya are a subject apart which the Salafi morons should tackle separately. Then a separate treatise could be prepared on such statements made by some Sufiya. But to condemn all the Sufiya as the moron Salafi does only displays his *jahaalat* and *ghabaawat*.

Since this treatise is not in defence of Ibn Arabi and the other Sufiya whose statements al-Madkhalee has made a target, we shall bypass his criticism of these Sufiya and concentrate on the subject of Tasawwuf or Sufi’ism to show its validity and necessity in Islam.

AMR BIL MA'ROOF NAHYI ANIL MUNKAR

Mr. Madkhalee says: *“The Sufis make it obligatory for a follower to be a slave in mind and body to his shaykh, deprived of all will like a deceased person with the one washing him. Even if he sees him committing a sin or something contrary to the Sharee’ah still is not permissible for him to ask about the reason for that, if he were to do so then he would be rejected from the mercy of his shaykh and would never prosper. This is one of the reasons for the extreme deviation of the Sufis, they have abolished forbidding evil so that evil actions have become good to them, even becoming righteous deeds....”*

This averment is drivel, extremely misleading and plain slander of the Auliya of Allah Ta’ala. Just as obedience to the Rasool (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) is obedience to Allah Ta’ala, as the Qur’aan states: *“He who obeys the Rasool, verily he has obeyed Allah.”*, so too, is obedience to the *Warathatul Ambiya (Heirs and Representatives of the Ambiya)*, obedience to the Rasool and to Allah Ta’ala.

Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) commands obedience to the Shariah of Allah Ta’ala, hence obeying him is to obey Allah Ta’ala. The Sufiya teach and command the Shariah of Allah Ta’ala, hence for the mureedeen to obey the Shaikh is tantamount to obedience to Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam), and via him, it is obedience to Allah Azza Wa Jal.

Such total obedience demand that the follower’s mind be ‘enslaved’ to Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam), and this mental ‘enslavement’ is acquired in the post-Nubuwwat eras via mental ‘enslavement’ to the Shaikh who is the Representative of Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam). This kind of wholehearted and mental ‘enslavement’ is commanded by Allah Ta’ala in the Qur’aan Majeed:

“It is not lawful for the Mu’min nor for the Mu’minah to have any choice in any matter when Allah and his Rasool have decreed an issue. He who disobeys Allah and His Rasool, verily he has lapsed into clear deviation.” (Ahzaab, aayat 36)

Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) too has commanded total obedience to superiors in charge, even if the superior is a “squint-eyed black slave” Further, emphasizing the imperative importance of mental ‘enslavement’ to superiors, Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) said: *“The pleasure of Rabb is in the pleasure of (your) father, and the wrath of Rabb is in the wrath of (your) father.”* Similar Ahaadith are recorded regarding the wife’s obedience to her husband. Total obedience is commanded to the degree of mental ‘enslavement’. *‘As-sam’a wat Taa-ah’ (We here and we obey)* is the slogan and the platitude of the Mu’mineen.

Undoubtedly, the fundamental basis for the validity of this imperative attribute of mental ‘enslavement’ is conformity with the Shariah. Every Sufi implicitly subscribes to the command: *“There is no obedience to makhluq (creation ,i.e. to people) in disobedience to Khaaliq (i.e. Allah, The Creator).”* Let the moron Salafi produce his evidence for claiming that the Sufiya require their mureedeen to obey what is haraam, and to obey any orders of the Shaikh which may be in conflict with the Shariah. This is a heinous slander against the Auliya of Allah Ta’ala, they who are the *Warathatul Ambiya* in the truest and highest form after the Sahaabah.

The entire *ta'leem* of the Sufiya is pure *Amr Bil Ma'roof Nahy Anil Munkar* in both the *Zaahiri (exoteric) and Baatini (esoteric)* dimensions of the Deen. They are meticulous in observing the *Zaahiri Shariah* as well as the *Baatini Shariah*. No one observes even the *Mustahabbaat* and the *Aadaab* of the *Zaahiri A'maal* so meticulously and so steadfastly as the Sufiya. Every *Zaahiri act* of *Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam)* is accorded the highest care. There are innumerable episodes of this nature of the Sufiya. Volumes can be filled with their methodology of strict obedience to the *Sunnah*.

The Sufiya when initiating a mureed into the *Silsilah*, stipulate as a precondition, *rectification of the Zaahiri acts of the Shariah*. Thus, *Hadhrat Maulana Ashraf Ali Thanvi (rahmatullah alayh)*, who was among the leading Sufiya of this era, states in his *Haqeeqatut Tareeqat: "After rectification of Aqaaid (Beliefs) and A'maal-e-Zaahirah (External/physical acts), it is fardh upon every Muslim to reform his A'maal-e-Baatiniyah (the states of the nafs)."*

Upholding the command of *Amr Bil Ma'roof* by the Sufiya is quite apparent from their teachings. *Hadhrat Junaid Baghdaadi (rahmatullah alayh)* said: *"All avenues besides the strict following of Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) are closed to mankind."*

Hadhrat Bayazeed Bustaami (rahmatullah alayh) said: *"Do not be deceived if you see a performer of supernatural feats flying in the air. Measure him on the Standard of the Shariah – how he adheres to the limits of the commands of the Shariah."*

Hadhrat Nuri (rahmatullah alayh) said: *"Do not venture near to one who lays claim to a state which brings about transgression of the limits of the Shariah."*

Hadhrat Khwaajah Naseeruddin Chiraghi Dehlawi (rahmatullah alayh) said: *"Obedience to Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) is imperative. Such obedience is essential in word, deed and intention. Love for Allah Ta'ala is not possible without obedience to Hadhrat Muhammad Mustafa (sallallahu alayhi wasallam)."*

Hadhrat Khwaajah Mueenuddeen Chishti (rahmatullah alayh) said: *"He who adheres to the Shariah, executing its commands and abstaining from transgression, progresses in spiritual rank, i.e. all progress is dependent on adherence to the Shariah."*

Hakeemul Ummat Maulana Ashraf Ali Thanvi (rahmatullah alayh) said: *"Whoever acquires the wealth of Wusul (i.e. attaining Divine Proximity), has acquired it by virtue of obedience to the Sunnah."*

Hadhrat Ibn Ataa' (rahmatullah alayh) said: *"He who adorns himself with the aadaab of the Sunnah, his heart brightens up with the noor of Ma;rifat."*

"There is no stage higher than the stage of obedience to the commands of Allah and the Rasool (sallallahu alayhi wasallam).

Hadhrat Hasan Basri (rahmatullah alayh), the Chief, Father and Progenitor of all the Sufiya, was once giving a discourse when the notorious tyrant *Hajjaaj* entered the *Musjid* with his soldiers and with a drawn sword in his hand. A *Buzrug* who was present, said to himself: 'Today is *Hasan's* day of trial. Will he continue with his *Amr Bil Ma'roof* or will he begin to flatter *Hajjaaj*?' *Hajjaaj* sat down in the gathering. *Hadhrat Hasan (rahmatullah alayh)* continued with his *Naseehat* and *Amr Bil Ma'roof* without the slightest change in his

attitude or tone. He was totally unperturbed by the presence of Hajjaaj. He did not even look in the direction of Hajjaaj. The Buzrug said to himself: "Truly, Hasan is Hasan." (*Hasan means beautiful*).

At the end of the bayaan (lecture), Hajjaaj went up to Hadhrat Hasan and kissed his hands. Then he (Hajjaaj) commented: 'If anyone wants to see a man, let him look at Hasan!'

The fearless attitude which Hadhrat Hasan (rahmatullah alayh) displayed in his delivery of *Amr Bil Ma'roof Nahy Anil Munkar* was the attitude of almost all the Sufiya. Many of them were imprisoned, tortured and executed precisely for upholding the command of *Amr Bil Ma'roof*. It is among the vilest slanders of the moron Salafis to accuse the Sufiya of having abolished *Amr Bil Ma'roof*.

When Hadhrat Ali (radhiyallahu anhu) entered Basra, he attended a discourse which Hadhrat Hasan, the great Sufi, was giving in a Musjid. After listening to his bayaan, Hadhrat Ali (radhiyallahu anhu) asked him: "Are you an Aalim or a Taalibul Ilm (a student)?" Hadhrat Hasan said: "I am nothing. However, I narrate the words of Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) which have reached me." Hadhrat Ali (radhiyallahu anhu) commented: "This young man is qualified to give discourses."

This was the first meeting between Hadhrat Ali (radhiyallahu anhu) and Hadhrat Hasan Basri (rahmatullah alayh) who was not aware that the person who was interrogating him was Ameerul Mu'mineen Hadhrat Ali (radhiyallahu anhu). After Hadhrat Ali (radhiyallahu anhu) had departed, someone informed Hadhrat Hasan who he was. He immediately alighted from the mimbar and rushed out after Hadhrat Ali (radhiyallahu anhu). When he reached Hadhrat Ali, he said: "For Allah's sake, teach me how to make wudhu." A dish of water was brought and Hadhrat Ali (radhiyallahu anhu) physically demonstrated to Hadhrat Hasan the way in which Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) used to make wudhu. That spot became famous by the name Baabut Tasht (the Gate of the Dish).

This was the great Sufi whom Hadhrat Ali (radhiyallahu anhu) had authorized to teach the Ummah. Among his mureeds were famous Sufiya such as Hadhrat Habeeb Ajmi, Hadhrat Rabiah Basriyyah and others.

Shaikh Abdul Wahhaab Sha'raani (rahmatullah alayh) states in his kitaab, *Tambeehul Mughtarreen*: "Sayyidut Taaifah, Imaam Abul Qaasim Junaid (rahmatullah alayh) said: 'Our kitaab, the Qur'aan, is Sayyidul Kutub. It is the most comprehensive Kitaab. Our Shariah is the best and subtlest of all Shariats, and our Tareeqah (i.e. the Tareeqah of the Sufiya) is fortified by the Kitaab and the Sunnah.

Whoever has not acquired the knowledge of the Qur'aan and Hadith and who has not understood the meanings of these Two (Sources of the Shariah), following him is not valid.

If you see a man sitting cross-legged in the air, do not follow him as long as you have not seen his action on the occasions of *Amr (commands of the Shariah)* and *Nahi (prohibitions of the Shariah)*. If you find him obedient to all the commands of Allah Ta'ala and abstaining from all His prohibitions, then follow and obey him. If you find him deficient in observing the commands and not abstaining from the prohibitions, then refrain from him."

Allaamah Sha'raani (rahmatullah alayh) further says: "O my Brother! To rectify ibaadat in accordance with the Zaahir of the Kitaab and Sunnah is Waajib by *Ijma'* (*Consensus*). A man who does not distinguish between haraam and makrooh is a jaahil."

"Our Shaikh, Sayyidi Ali Khawwaas (rahmatullah alayh) said: 'The Tareeq of the Ahlut Tasawwuf has been purified according to the Kitaab and Sunnah in the same way as gold and diamonds are purified from contaminations .'"

Allaamah Sha'raani said: "I say that the one who claims that the Qur'aan and Sunnah do not expound Tasawwuf is a *kaathib* (liar) and a *muftari* (fraud). His statement in this regard is clear evidence for his *jahaalat* (ignorance) because the Sufi is one who is an Aalim who practises with *ikhlaas* in terms of his *Ilm* (knowledge)."

Rejecting the baseless criticism of the Sufiya by ignoramuses such as the Salafi morons, Allaamah Sha'raani, himself a great Sufi, states in his kitaab: "When those who followed the way of the Salf-e-Saaliheen became non-existent, the Path of the Salf was eliminated. Because of the dearth of the people of the Tareeq, some people began to believe that Tasawwuf was beyond the pale of the Shariah. I have elaborated on this subject in my kitaab, *Al-Manhajul Mubeem fi Bayaani Akhlaaqil Aarifeen*."

Commanding righteousness and prohibiting evil are the primary obligations of the Sufiya. There is no group who is as constant, firm and diligent in the execution of the obligation of Amr Bil Ma'roof as the Sufiya. Regarding this obligation, Hadhrat Uwais Qarni (rahmatullah alayh), the Sufi Recluse who would flee into the wilderness at the sight of human beings, said: "Th Mumin's firmness on the Haqq leaves for him no friend on earth. Whenever someone calls people to righteousness and prohibits them from evil, they vilify him with the worst kind of slanders (as Madkhalee is guilty of), and they seek to ruin his reputation."

It was the usual practice of Sufyaan Thauri (rahmatullah alayh) to command righteousness and prohibit evil whenever he would visit the marketplace.

If any unbiased person in search of the truth researches the lives of the Sufiya, he will be convinced that their entire lives were devoted to the command of Amr Bil Ma'roof, and in fulfilling this obligation they had to suffer much persecution at the hands of tyrannical rulers as well as the Ulama-e-Soo'. He will understand that Madkhalee's charge of abolition of Amr Bil Ma'roof Nahyi anil Munkar, requiring mureeds to submit to sin and deviation, to obey the Shaikh even if his instructions are in conflict with the Shariah and to regard evil deeds as virtuous deeds, are calumnies of the worst kind.

ZUHD

Uttering more slander against the Sufiya, the moron Salafi says: "As for *zuhd* of the Sufis then it is abandonment of lawful earning and beneficial work and to sit in seclusion in a private retreat waiting for whatever is brought to them by the people. It is to beg, ask for charity and to frequent the rulers and the traders in order to swindle them and praise and flatter them to attain crumbs from their tables. It is to falsely manifest poverty in their dress, so they wear old and worn out clothes in order to show that they withhold themselves from the life of this world and that they are pious...."

What the evil writer has said here is utter rubbish and slander. He has placed the genuine Sufiya into the category of frauds and deceits who perpetrate the acts which the moron has levelled at all the Sufiya and Auliya of Allah Ta'ala. It is imperative for this scoundrel writer to present the names of the Sufis who are guilty of the heinous misdeeds he has enumerated. Not a single one of the numerous Sufi masters in the Four Sufi Silsilahs is guilty of the calumnies of which Madhkalee accuses the Auliya.

Among the illustrious Sufi masters were Uwais Qarni, Hasan Basri, Fudhail Bin Iyaadh, Ibrahim Bin Adham, Maalik Bin Dinaar, Muhammad Waasi', Habib Ajmi, Abu Haazim Makki, Utbah Bin Ghulaam, Raabiah Adwiyyah, Bishr Haafi, Zunnun Misri, Bayazid Bustami, Abdulah Bin Mubaarak, Sufyaan Thauri, Shaqeeq Balkhi, Imaam Abu Hanifah, Imaam Ahmad Bin Hambal, Imaam Shaafi', Dawood Taai, Haarith Muhaasabi, Abu Sulaimaan Daaraani, Muhammad Sammaak, Muhammad Bin Aslam, Ahmad Harb, Haatim Asam, Sahl Tastari, Ma'roof Karkhi, Sirri Saqati, Fatah Musali, Ahmad Hawaari, Ahmad Khadrawi, Abu Turaab Bakhshi, Yahya Bin Muaaz, Shah Shuja'Kirmaani, Bu Yusuf Bin Husain, Abu Hafs Haddaad, Hamdoon Qasaar, Mansur Ammaar, Ahmad Bin Aasim, Abdulah Khabeeq, Junaid Baghdaadi, Amr Bin Uthmaan, Abu Saed Kharraaz, Abul Hasan Nuri, Abu Uthmaan Heeri, Abu Abdullah Jallaa', Abu Muhammad Ruwaim, Ibn Ataa', Ibraahim As-Raqi, Yusuf Asbaat, Abu Ya'qoob Nahrjuri, Abu Muhammad Murtaish, Abu Abdullah Muhammad Fadhl, Abul Hasan Bu Shabkhi, Muhammad Ali Hakeem Tirmizi, Abu Bakr Darraaq, Abdullah Manaazil, Sahl Isfahaani, Shaikh Nassaaq, Abu Humzah Khuraasaani, Ahmad Masrooq, Abdullah Ahmad Maghribi, Abu Ali Jurjaani, Abu Bakr Kitaabi, Abdullah Khafeef, Abu Muhammad Jareeri, Abu Bakr Waasiti, Abu Amr Haheel, Ja'far Jildi, Abul Khair Aqta', Abu Abdullah Taroghandi, Abu Ishaq Razoni, Abu Bakr Shibli, Abu Nasr Siraaj, Abul Abbaas Qassaab, Ibraahim Khawwaas, Ibraaheem Shaibaani, and innumerable other Masters of Tasawwuf.

Are all of these illustrious Souls, who were the *Warathatul Ambiya*, all frauds, deceits, crooks and robbers who consumed haraam food from rulers and traders under false pretences? On the contrary, these were such illustrious and noble Auliya who diligently implemented the Hadith of Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam):

- "Beware of the company of the wealthy."
- "The most hated Qurraa' by Allah are those who visit the rulers."
- "The noblest Jihaad is to state the Haqq in the presence of a tyrannical king."
- "Proclaim the Haqq even though it be bitter."

These noble Auliya were the first upholders of these commands. Haroon Rashid, the Khalifah (King) of the Islamic empire would beg to be admitted to the hut of Hadhrat Fudhail Bin Iyaadh (rahmatullah alayh). The Khalifah cried to just meet Hadhrat Fudhail and gain some Naseehat, but he (Fudhail) would not open the door of his hut. The Khalifah begged Dawood Taai (rahmatullah alayh) to be admitted in his presence, but he refused to open the door. Imaam Abu Yusuf (rahmatullah alayh) had to intercede on behalf of the Khalifah to gain admission to Dawood Taai (rahmatullah alayh).

It was the standard practice of *all* these Sufuya to stay far, very far from rulers and traders. They would refuse gifts of gold and silver which the rulers would offer. Ibrahim Bin Adham would work as a menial labourer one day a week and use the money to feed his mureedeem, yet he would refuse to accept gifts. And, what need did he have to visit kings and traders and hanker after their wealth, when he himself was the king of Balkh? He kicked

aside the throne of Balkh and joined the Sufi hermits in the wilderness in search of Allah Azza Wa Jal and to prepare his wealth for the Aakhirah.

Who in the above list of illustrious names had hankered after the wealth of kings and traders? Who among them had visited the kings to flatter them and to come away with gifts? Let the moron Salafi mention the names of those illustrious Sufis whom we have enumerated, and prove his slanders with evidence.

All of these Sufiya are the acknowledged Spiritual Guides of the Ummah. But the stupid Salafis of this age deem it appropriate to slander these Heirs of Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam). Bulky volumes could be written on the *Istighna'* (*Independence*) and true *Zuhd* of these great Auliya. Once a wealthy man presented 10,000 dirhams (silver coins) to Hadhrat Ibraahim Bin Adham (rahmatullah alayh). However, he refused to accept the gift and said: "Do you desire that my name be struck from the roll of the Fuqara by giving me these dirhams?"

The stupid Salafi is ludicrously ignorant of the Sunnah concept of *Zuhd* (abstinence – renunciation of the world). Salafis are crass materialists given to the fulfilment of their inordinate nafsani demands, hence their gaze at the Ahaadith on this topic is oblique, for they look with squint eyes. The austere measures of abstinence (*Zuhd*) adopted by the Sufiya are all based on the Sunnah. Among the Sahaabah were also the *Awaam* (*masses*) and the *Khawaaas* (*elite*). Among them were traders, farmers, labourers as well as Sufis of the highest calibre who abstained from worldly comforts and luxuries without pronouncing these to be haraam.

The old and tattered garments of the Sufiya which the moron Madkhalee stupidly criticizes were also the garments of Hadhrat Umar (radhiyallahu anhu), Hadhrat Abu Darda' (radhiyallahu anhu), all the Ashaab-e-Suffah (70 of them) and many other Sahaabah. They donned such garments, not because of their inability to earn and afford luxurious garments, but for the *tarbiyat* of their nafs, just as the Sufiya practise. In fact, the general practice of Hadhrat Ali (radhiyallahu anhu) when donning a new qamees (kurtah) was to disfigure it by cutting portions of it. This was to eliminate any vestige of *ujub* and *riya*.

Hadhrat Ibn Mas'ood (radhiyallahu anhu) narrated that he saw the imprint of a straw mat on the blessed body of Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) as a result of him having slept on the bare mat. Grieved by this hardship of Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam), Hadhrat Ibn Mas'ood (radhiyallahu anhu) said: "O Rasulullah! If you instruct us to spread a bed for you, we shall do so." Nabi-e-Kareem (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) said: "What relationship do I have with the world? Regarding the world, I am like like a horse rider (on a journey through the desert), who seeks the shade of a tree (to rest). Then (after resting briefly) he sets off (on his journey) and leaves the shade of the tree." (*Ahmed, Tirmizi and Ibn Maajah*).

Similarly, Hadhrat Umar (radhiyallahu) once when he came to Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam), saw the marks of the imprint of the straw mat embedded on the noble body of Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam). Aggrieved by this observation, he said: "O Rasulullah! Supplicate to Allah for prosperity for you and the Ummah, for verily, prosperity has been bestowed to the Persians and the Romans despite them not worshipping Allah." Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) responded: "O Ibn Khattaab! They are people for whom their pleasure has been given in this world (and there is nothing for them in the

Aakhirah). Are you not pleased that for them is this world, and for us is the Aakhirah?" (*Bukhari and Muslim*)

Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) had supplicated to Allah Ta'ala to grant food to him and his family one day, and to keep them hungry the next day. His poverty was not imposed, but was volitional, hence he made Dua: "O Allah! Keep me alive a Miskeen. Let me die a Miskeen and resurrect me in the assembly of the Masaakeen." (*Tirmizi, Baihqi*).

Hadhrat Aishah (radhiyallahu anha) narrated: "The family of Muhammad (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) did not fill their stomach with barley bread on two consecutive days until his demise." (*Bukhaari and Muslim*) She also narrated that the fire was not lit in their home for several days at a time. Hadhrat Aishah (radhiyallahu anha) is famed for her *Zuhd*. Once during the Khilaafat of Hadhrat Umar (radhiyallahu anhu), considerable spoils of war came to Madinah. Hadhrat Umar (radhiyallahu anhu) send a very large amount of money to her. She together with her *baandi* (female bondswoman), sat with the pile of money outside her home and distributed to all those who passed by. By the evening, there was not a dirham left. She and her *baandi* were fasting on that day. The girl commented that at least something should have been retained for iftaar. Hadhrat Aishah (radhiyallahu anha) consoling her said that today iftaar will be made with water.

Hadhrat Abu Hurairah (radhiyallahu anhu) once passed by a group of people who had roasted a goat. They invited him to join them. However, he refused to eat and commented: "The Nabi (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) left this world without filling his stomach with even barley bread." (*Bukhaari*)

Hadhrat Abu Hurairah (radhiyallahu anhu) who was a member of the Ashaab-e-Suffah, used to occasionally faint because of hunger. For days there was no food to eat, and Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) had prohibited the Ashaab-e-Suffah from earning and begging. They had to remain in the Masjid with Tawakkul on Allah Ta'ala. Abu Hurairah (radhiyallahu anhu) said that he had seen 70 of the Ashaab-e-Suffah having grossly inadequate clothing to wear. Some of them would clasp the rags around them firmly to prevent their *aurah* being exposed.

Abu Hurairah (radhiyallahu anhu) narrated that once when the Ashaab-e-Suffah were overwhelmed by hunger, Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) gave them one date each. (*Tirmizi*).

When one of the Ashaab-e-Suffah died, it was reported to Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) that a dinar was found on him. Nabi-e-Kareem (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) said that he would be branded with it, i.e. in the Fire. This was the extreme austerity which Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) had imposed on the Ashaab-e-Suffah. They had to totally renounce the dunya and live on Tawakkul. They were not allowed to earn nor to keep even a single coin with them. They had to exercise patience even if there was no food for days.

The extreme measures of *Zuhd* which were imposed on the Ashaab-e-Suffah are adequate basis for the *Zuhd* of the Sufiya.

Once Hadhrat Umar (radhiyallahu anhu) asked for some water. Water mixed with honey was brought to him. He commented: "*Verily it is 'Tayyib' (wholesome). However, I heard that*

Allah Azza Wa Jal had criticized a people for (fulfilling) their desires. You have taken your Tayyibaat in your worldly life and derived its benefit. I, therefore, fear that the (reward) of our good deeds are hastened for us (in this world).” Then he did not drink it.” (Razeen, Mishkaat)

Once Abdullah Ibn Umar (radhiyallahu anhu) invited his father Hadhrat Umar (radhiyallahu anhu) for meals. When he arrived at his son's home and saw that the meat had been fried in ghee (butter), he got up, refused to eat and departed. He felt that his son had committed extravagance by adding ghee to the meat, despite the fact that Hadhrat Abdullah Ibn Umar (radhiyallahu anhu) had saved money for several months to buy this food.

On the occasion of the conquest of Jerusalem, Hadhrat Umar (radhiyallahu anhu) refused to wear a new/clean set of garments. He preferred to meet the dignitaries of Jerusalem donning his tattered and patched qamees which had further suffered the ravages of the severe climatic conditions on the journey from Madinah to Jerusalem.

Muaath Bin Jabal (radhiyallahu anhu) said that on the occasion when Rasulallah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) despatched him to Yemen, he (Rasulallah – sallallahu alayhi wasallam) said: ‘Beware of luxury/pleasure. Verily, the Servants of Allah are not pleasure-seekers.” (Ahmed)

Rasulallah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) said: “Every Ummah has a fitnah, and the fitnah of my Ummah is wealth.” (Tirmizi)

“It was not revealed to me that I accumulate wealth and be of the traders. But it was revealed to me: “Recite the tasbeeh of your Rabb and be of those who make Sajdah, and worship your Rabb until there comes to you Yaqeen (Maut).” (Sharhus Sunnah and Abu Na-eem)

“The world is the home for one who has no home (in the Aakhirah), and it is the wealth for one who has no wealth (in the Aakhirah), and the one who has no intelligence accumulates wealth for the world.” (Ahmad, Baihq)

“Uthmaan (radhiyallahu anhu) narrated that the Nabi (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) said: ‘The son of Aadam (i.e. man) has no need for (anything) besides these: a home in which to live; a cloth to cover his aurah, and some bread and water.” (Tirmizi)

“Ibn Umar (radhiyallahu anhu) said: ‘Rasulallah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) took hold of part of my body and said: ‘Be on earth as if you are a stranger or a traveller, and enumerate yourself to be among the inmates of the graves.” (Bukhaari)

Rasulallah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) said: “If you knew what I know, you will laugh little and cry much, and you will not derive pleasure from your wives on your beds. You would go out into the wilderness crying to Allah.” Abu Zar said: ‘Would that I was a tree which would be cut.” (Ahmed, Tirmizi, Ibn Maajah).

“When you rise in the morning, do not concern yourself with the evening, and when you are in the evening, do not concern yourself with the morning.”

One night the slave of Hadhrat Abu Bakr (radhiyallahu anhu) gave him some food. Just as Hadhrat Abu Bakr (radhiyallahu anhu) ate a morsel, the slave said: "What is the matter with you? Every night you ask me (about the food). Why did you not ask me tonight?" Hadhrat Abu Bakr (radhiyallahu anhu) said: "Hunger constrained me to do so (i.e. not to ask). From where did you bring this?" The slave explained that during the days of Jaahiliyyah he used to tell the fortune of people. They had not paid him. However, when he passed by them presently, they paid him. This was the food from which Hadhrat Abu Bakr (radhiyallahu anhu) had ate the morsel. When he heard this, he inserted his hand into his throat to induce vomiting. However, after several attempts the morsel did not come out. Someone said that he should drink water, then induce vomiting. He did so and laboured much to vomit. Finally the morsel was expelled. He was considerably weakened by this struggle.

Someone said to him: 'May Allah have mercy on you. You did all this for the sake of one morsel?' Hadhrat Abu Bakr (radhiyallahu anhu) said: "If the only way for it to come out was with my soul (and I had to die), I would have extracted it. I heard Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) said saying: "Everybody which is nourished with haraam, the Fire is more deserving of it." Thus, I feared that part of my body would be nourished with this morsel"

This is the Tareeq (Way) of the Sufiya. This is the 'immoderate' and 'extreme' way which the moron Salafis criticize.

Someone asked Hadhrat Shibli (rahmatullah alayh) for the meaning of Tasawwuf. He replied: "It is to follow Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam). Allah Ta'ala said (in the Qur'aan): "Say: *This is my path. I and those who follow me call unto Allah with insight (conviction of the truth). Glory unto Allah! I am not of the mushrikeen.*" (Yusuf, aayat 108)

The foregoing few Ahaadith have been taken at random from innumerable narrations emphasizing the kind of austere *Zuhd* of the Sufiya. In his abortive attempt to falsify and refute the *Zuhd* of the Sufiya, the moron Salafi mentioned some wealthy Sahaabah who engaged in trade as if such narrations abrogate the avalanche of Ahaadith confirming and exhorting observance of the type of *Zuhd* which was the practice of many Sahaabah and the Sufiya, as well as the practice of Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) and his household.

Whilst the moron with his oblique vision is in stupid denial of the numerous Ahaadith which condone the *Zuhd* of the later Auliya and Sufiya, we do not deny the Ahaadith which mention the virtues of halaal, wealth, halaal earning, and participation in mundane activities within the confines of the Shariah. Just as the latter is permissible, so too is the former permissible. In fact, the former has greater and more virtues than the latter. The significance and virtues of *Zuhd* and *Faqr* (poverty) are numerous in the Ahaadith. Either Madkhalee has perpetrated flagrant chicanery and dishonesty by ignoring the Ahaadith pertaining to austere *Zuhd*, or he is shockingly ignorant of the existence of all these exhortations of Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam).

There are various stages of *Zuhd* of which the highest stage as confirmed by the Ahaadith, is the extreme austerity and renunciation of the world practised by the Auliya and Sufiya. Participation in mundane activities is for the masses. But those noble Souls whose focus is on Divine Love and the Akhirat adopt the Sunnah of Rasulullah's *Zuhd* which was

the *Zuhd* of many Sahaabah, Taabieen and Tab-e-Taabieen. Only morons will deny this irrefutable reality.

“BALANCED BEHAVIOUR”

Madkhalee avers: “...the religion of Islaam orders justly balanced and moderate behaviour in all affairs....If avoidance of preoccupation with this life is done within the limits of what was prescribed by the Messenger then it is something praiseworthy in Islaam....”

In this averment the Salafi contends that the *Zuhd* of the Sufiya was immoderate and in conflict with the Sunnah. He makes this conclusion on account of his *jahl-e-muraqqab* (compound ignorance). What is ‘moderation’? Whatever was practised and taught by Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) is in fact ‘moderation in Islam’. An act or an attitude may be moderate for one person and extreme for another. The standards of moderation vary.

When Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) once called for contributions for a Jihad campaign, Hadhrat Abu Bakr (radhiyallahu anhu) brought 100% of his wealth to Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam). He accepted it. Then came Hadhrat Umar (radhiyallahu anhu) with 50% of his wealth. This too, Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) accepted. When another Sahaabi brought a substantial amount of gold, Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam), took a portion of it, and returned the balance commenting that it was for the use of his family.

Whereas others would cook food daily, the fire was not even lit in the home of Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) for days. While Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) said: “*Poverty is my pride.*”, some Sahaabah engaged in the pursuit of halaal wealth which was condoned and perfectly permissible. While Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) and some Sahaabah spent the entire nights in Salaat, other Sahaabah would sleep the greater part of the night.

While some Sahaabah donned beautiful garments, Hadhrat Umar’s garment had a dozen patches, and Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) said to Hadhrat Aishah (radhiyallahu anha): “*If you intend to link up with me on the Day of Qiyaamah, then be contented with worldly provision which is sufficient for a horse rider (on a journey), and beware of the company of the wealthy, and do not regard a garment to be old as long as you can patch it.*”

While the Sahaabah in general were allowed to earn wealth, the Ashaabus Suffah were prohibited from earning and from even going out to seek their daily food. Whilst there was no condemnation of others who died and left behind considerable wealth, a member of Ashaabus Suffah who left behind just one dinar was stated to be an inmate of the Fire and that he would be branded in the Fire with the dinar.

From these few examples it should be quite clear that ‘moderation’ in Islam is a relative issue. It is not a uniform rule equally applicable to everyone. The severe austerity imposed on Ashaabus Suffah was their degree of moderation. Hadhrat Abu Bakr’s total contribution was his moderation and Hadhrat Umar’s 50% was his moderation, and so on, everyone had his standard of moderation.

What was moderation for Hadhrat Abdur Rahman bin Auf (radhiyallahu anhu) was extravagance and excessive for Hadhrat Abu Darda' (radhiyallahu anhu) who maintained that it was not permissible to retain any money whatsoever.

Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) standing in Salaat until his mubaarak feet swelled up, was his standard of moderation which was not applicable to everyone. So, whilst the Shariah does not impose on its rank and file this 'extreme' method of Salaat adopted by Nabi-e-Kareem (sallallahu alayhi wasallam), it will be the effect of Satanism to criticize a Sufi who adopts this Sunnah of Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam). Similarly, while no one will be condemned for indulging in sumptuous food and beautiful garments, no one has the right to condemn the Sufi who adopts Hadhrat Umar's standard of *Zuhd* regarding food and clothes. While Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) prohibited some Sahaabah from keeping food for the next day, others were exempted from this rule.

The Qur'aan Majeed, commanding moderation in charity, states: *"Do not keep your hand tied to your neck (i.e. do not be niggardly/stingy) nor spread it totally open (i.e. be not extravagant), for then you will sit denigrated and bankrupt."* (Israa', aayat 26)

This aayat clearly instructs the standard of moderation even in charity. However, in the *kutub of Tafaaseer* it is mentioned: *"The injunction to refrain from spending all of one's wealth in the Path of Allah Ta'ala applies to those who are weak and will not be able to bear the rigours of poverty. They will regret afterwards when saddled with bankruptcy. The standard of moderation stated in this aayat does not apply to those who enjoy a high level of Tawakkul. They may spend all their wealth in the Path of Allah Ta'ala. The episode of Hadhrat Abu Bakr (radhiyallahu anhu) is famous. He contributed all his wealth for the Battle of Tabook. When Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) asked him: 'What have you left for your family?', he responded: 'I have left Allah and His Rasool (sallallahu alayhi wasallam).'*

While the aayat instructs moderation, it has different meanings for different people. Spending one's entire estate in the Path of Allah may be extreme for most people, but for the select Mutawakkileen (Men whose trust in Allah is perfect), it is perfectly permissible and does not transgress the bounds of moderation.

What is moderation in food-intake. The stupid salafi slanders the Sufiya for their austerity in this regard because he interpretes his own gluttony as 'moderation', and the austerity of the Sufiya as extremism whilst in reality the Sufiya follow Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) and many Sahaabah in this regard. So what is the standard of moderation with regard to eating? Again there is a vast difference. Standards differ in terms of attitudes and physical strength/weakness of people. However, Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) has presented a general principle which applies to the masses. He said that one third of the stomach should be for food, one third for water and one third for air circulation. Thus, filling the stomach one third with food will be moderation for most people.

Now how will this third be measured? The volume-capacity of stomachs differ greatly. There are small, medium, large, extra-large and super large stomachs. Perhaps the moron's stomach fit in the last category, hence he takes umbrage at the little food consumed by the Sufiya who derive considerable physical and spiritual strength from *Tasbeeh* which is the nourishment of the Malaaikah.

Will every person have to engage a medical practitioner and pay an exorbitant fee for an x-ray or insertion of some scope instrument from the mouth or the hind passage to gauge the volume of the stomach? There is no need for such stupidity. Twenty one slices of bread fills Madkhalee's stomach to capacity. Twelve slices fill Zaid's stomach. 6 slices fill Bakr's stomach. For Madkhalee, moderation will be 7 slices which is one third of his super large belly. For Zaid, moderation will be 4 slices and for Bakr, moderation will be 2 slices.

However, this third-full standard is not applicable to all. There were many Sahaabah, especially the Ashaabus Suffah whose intake of food was substantially less than a third. In a Hadith mentioned earlier, Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) gave each one of them just one date despite their hunger. A near-empty stomach even after eating, was standard practice for Hadhrat Umar (radhiyallahu anhu). That was moderation for Souls of this lofty calibre. But for fellows like these moron salafis of this age, moderation has a different meaning. The consequence of their gluttony is their puddles of excreta. They excrete like camels as Allaamah Abdul Hay Lucknowi mentions in the Haashiyah on Hidaayah.

Mentioning another standard of eating, Allaamah Abdul Wahhaab Sha'raani (rahmatullah alayh) says: "When Sayyidi Ali Khawwaas (rahmatullah alayh) would eat, he would not exceed nine morsels, and he would say that Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) said: '*A few morsels which will keep erect the back of a person suffices for him.*' The term used in this Hadith is *luqaimaat* which could mean three to nine morsels." While nine morsels is not moderation for the masses with extended and bloated bellies, it fully applies to the Sufiya whose spiritual nourishment makes them independent of the gluttony and of even the standard of moderation which applies to the masses.

The same argument and logic applies to all requisites of man. Sleep, lifting weights, menial work and everything else have to be subjected to moderation. But, there is no uniform standard of moderation applicable to all people.

Fasting every alternate day is no problem for some people. Others find it difficult to fast even one day a month. Others are comfortable with the two Masnoon days of fasting per week. In every sphere it is the same. The stupid attempt to impose one fixed idea of moderation on all people is in fact immoderation and extremism which the Shariah does not condone.

The stupid salafi seeks to impose his conception of moderation on all people, even on the Auliya,. Then he abortively and stupidly attempts to substantiate his idea of moderation by selectively citing certain Ahaadith of only one category. He cites only such narrations which are applicable to the masses and which provides latitude for worldly indulgence within the confines of the Shariah. He ignores the innumerable Ahaadith which conspicuously support the life-style of the Sufiya. He is thus guilty of skulduggery or he wallows in *jahaalat*.

With this plethora of moderation standards, Madkhalee's contention that the *Zuhd* of the Sufiya was extremism is plain rubbish which portrays his *jahaalat*. For every act of the Sufiya there is a basis in the Sunnah. Only morons (*juhhaal and aghbiya*) are capable of denying this confirmed reality. His contention that the lifestyle of the Sufiya was contrary to the Sunnah is palpably baseless. Whether it be food, clothes, ibaadat, etc., the Sufiya have a valid basis in the Sunnah. What may be extreme for the masses is not extreme for the elite Auliya of Allah Ta'ala.

The moron Salafi alleges: “Some of them eat soil and sand and choose to drink murky water, avoiding pure and cool water, since they would be unable to give due thanks for it. This is in fact a puny excuse, since would they, by abandoning cool water, be giving due thanks to Allaah for the rest of His blessings upon them?”

Again the moron illustrates his compound ignorance. In the first place, how many Sufiya is he aware of who had ate sand and soil and consumed murkey water? Then, in an isolated case when the Sufi had consumed these substances, what is the evidence for contending that the reason was the Sufi’s belief of inability to ‘give due thanks’? Madkhalee has made baseless assumptions to hallucinate this reason. The one in a million Sufi who had consumed sand, did so to treat some moral condition of his nafs. Never did a Sufi believe that he was able to fulfil *Shukr* to Allah Ta’ala for a single *ni’mat*. No one understands this fact better than the Sufiya. Their humility is incomparable. Their belief of their own contemptibility is to the degree of *Ilmul Yaqeen*. They believe themselves to be more contemptible than dogs. The question that it had never crossed their minds even in the category of a stray *waswasah* that they were capable of fulfilling *Shukr* for all the limitless bounties of Allah Ta’ala except for cold water and delicious food, is the corrupt conjecturing of moron Salafis.

If in an isolated or rare case a Sufi had eaten sand, then by what stretch of intelligence and by what norm of justice is it valid to accuse all the Sufiya of having done so? And, on what basis can it be claimed that the rare Sufi had propagated his personal valid idiosyncrasy to be an act to be emulated or that it was a tenet of the Deen? When so much haraam and najis substances are nowadays used as medicine and for medical treatment, the Salafis are dumb. They are silent and have no criticism for the utilization of haraam substances for medical treatment of physical diseases, but when a Sufi had prescribed for himself a taahir substance as a treatment for a spiritual or nafsani ailment which he has diagnosed in himself, then the Salafis are quick to condemn, not only the isolated Sufi, but the entire million Sufis who had never resorted to the treatment of the solitary Sufi.

The noble Sufi who had consumed sand for a spiritual condition which he diagnosed in himself was not a jaahil. He was among the greatest Ulama of this Ummah. His name is Abu Taalib Makki, the author of the famous kitaab, *Qootul Quloob* on which great Shaafi’ Fuqaha such as Imaam Nawawi (rahmatullah alayh) were reliant. The fact that Imaam Nawawi, Imaam Raaf’i, Zarkashi as well as other Fuqaha and also Imaam Ghazaali (rahmatullah alayhim) cites from *Qootul Quloob*, is sufficient to confirm the lofty status of this noble ‘sand-eating’ Sufi. No one had ever made any disparaging comment about the noble Shaikh’s ‘sand-eating’. The illustrious Fuqaha of all Math-habs cite Shaikh Abu Taalib Makki and his kitaab occupies a lofty pedestal among the authorities of Islam. Not a single authority of the Shariah has criticized this noble Shaikh, but the moron Salafi deems it appropriate to hurl his jahaalat at this great Waarith (Heir) of Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam).

The penances which the Sufiya observed were in the category of treatment for certain moral and spiritual conditions and states. Just as no one finds fault with *tadaawi bil haraam* (medical treatment with haraam substances) when there is a real need, similarly, there can

be no valid objection against a Sufi who devised an 'extreme' measure to treat a moral or spiritual condition in him. The Sufi who drank 'murky' water did so for some specific reason. If this reason is unknown to the moron Salafi, he has no justification for condemning the Sufi, and to a greater extent is his error for implying that such penances of some Sufis were the norm of all Sufis.

In all groups are to be found imposters, fakes and cranks. It is unjust to formulate an opinion regarding the genuine members of a group on the basis of the misdeeds of the fakes. Those who have masqueraded as Sufis for worldly objectives are not the criterion for passing judgment on the Sufiya. Ibnul Jauzee's criticism in his kitaab, *Talbees-e-Iblees*, is directed at the frauds (*mustaswifteen*) who pretended to be Sufis. He never criticized the Auliya. Among the Ulama too there are numerous fakes and villains. No person of any intelligence will condone condemnation of all the Ulama simply because of the villainy perpetrated by the ulama-e-soo'. On this issue, Madkhalee says:

"The endurance of self-imposed hardship was found amongst the first Sufis, but as regards later Sufis then they were concerned only with food and drink."

And, we may add to this, even smoking dagga and indulging in adultery in the name of the Deen. But such scoundrels may not be termed Sufis. They do not belong to the noble galaxy of Sufiya who were the embodiments of virtue and morality of the highest calibre. Those whose goal on earth is materialism, food, drink, dagga and vice are not Sufis. They are the progeny of Iblees. They are not Walis (friends) of Allah. They are walis of shaitaan. By what stretch of hallucination does the moron Salafi usher such frauds and villains into the class of the Sufiya-e-Kiraam?

The Majlis

“Voice of Islam”

**Presenting the Knowledge of Islam, the Qur’aan and the Sunnah in
Pristine Purity.**

**Presenting the Deen of Islam as propounded and practised by
Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) and
his illustrious Sahaabah (radhiyallahu anhum).**

Rates R30.00 (South Africa)

US\$15 (Neighbouring States)

US\$20 (Rest of the world)

**Send your subscriptions to:
The Majlis, Subscription Dept.**

**P.O. Box 3393,
Port Elizabeth, 6056,
South Africa**

Some of our other publications

1. The Scourge of Salafi'ism PT 1 & 2
2. The Deviation of the Salafis
3. Taqleed and Ijtihad
4. Four rakaats of salaah before the Jumah khutbah
5. The Feet in Salaat the salafi error
6. The Kufr and Shirk of Ibn Taimiyyah

Hard copies of the books may be requested from:

The Publisher:
Mujlisul Ulama
Of
South Africa
P.O. Box 3393,
Port Elizabeth, 6056
South Africa

The printer:
As-Saadiqeen Islamic Centre
(Asic)
P.O. Box 818
De Deur, 1884, South Africa
Email: assaadiqeen@gmail.com
Website: www.asic-sa.co.za

**THESE PUBLICATIONS ARE
DISTRIBUTED
FREE OF CHARGE**

Your contributions may be forwarded to:

Bank: Nedbank
Acc name: As Saadiqeen Islamic Centre (A.S.I.C)
Acc no: 1039 363 458
Branch Code: 1284-05
Ref: Publications
Swift code: NEDSZAJJ

Please send confirmation of deposit to :

Fax: 086 260 3071

Email: assaadiqeen@gmail.com