

**TARIQ
JAMEEL**
A
**DISPASSIONATE,
MILD CRITICISM**

By
EMRAAN VAWDA

Maulana Taariq Jameel's Bayaans – A Cause for Concern

بِسْمِ اللَّهِ الرَّحْمَنِ الرَّحِيمِ

This article¹ attempts to answer a basic question:
Is it safe for the layperson to listen to the bayaans of
Maulana Taariq Jameel Saheb?

By 'safe' is intended Deeni safety.

In probing this question, the following six points will be
concisely considered:

A. Al Kalimatul Haadi

In September 2010 Mufti Muhammad Eesa Khan Saheb
published a book entitled:

الكلمة الهادي الى سواء السبيل فجواب من لبس الحق بالباطيل

(The guiding word toward the straight path, in reply to the
one who conflated the truth with many falsehoods). The
book is in Urdu and about 360 pages. In this book Mufti
Eesa Saheb discussed, in detail, many errors of Maulana
Taariq Jameel Saheb of Pakistan, the famous Tablighi
orator. His problematic statements were transcribed and
then refuted.

Upon completion, the book was presented to certain
senior Ulama of Pakistan for their comments. The
following Ulama endorsed the book.

1. **Maulana Muhammad Sarfaraz Safdar Saheb رَحْمَةُ اللَّهِ** (1914-2009) was a world famous expert on deviant sects. He spent his entire life writing extensively and produced numerous works in almost every field.
-

¹ This article uses of hyperlinks. To make use of these one is required to be connected to the internet. Click / tap on the texts highlighted in blue, which will then take one to the related document or audio clip. This may take time depending on the speed of the connection.

He exposed and in detail refuted the works of the deviant sects. Upon hearing some of the objectionable statements made by Maulana Taariq Jameel Saheb, he commented:

He [Maulana Taariq Jameel Saheb] is an agent of the deviant sects.

2. **Professor Ghulaam Rasool Adeem Saheb.**

3. **Maulana Fadhl Muhammad Yusufzai Saheb, the Ustaad of Hadith at Jamiah Islamiyah, Binnori Town, Karachi.**

Many eminent South African Ulama are graduates of this world famous Darul Uloom.

Maulana confirmed that definitely some of Maulana Tariq Jameel's statements deserved to be taken to task.

4. **Maulana Husain Shah Saheb of Balochistan.**

At some stage Maulana Taariq Jameel Saheb apparently retracted some of his previous statements.

Commenting on such apparent retraction, Maulana Husain Shah Saheb writes:

I carefully studied [Maulana] Taariq Jameel's all-inclusive retraction and his incorrect defensive interpretations. I tried to weigh them against his original errors. It appears as if [Maulana] Taariq Jameel has not made any retraction at all, since he is not yet convinced that his lessons were satiated with incorrect beliefs.

5. Professor Qadi Muhammad Taahir Ali Alhaashimi of Hazara.

6. Mufti Abdul Waahid Saheb. Darul Iftaa, Jamiah Madaniyah, Lahore.

7. Maulana Muhammad Sardar Saheb. Darul Uloom Arabiyyah, Hangu. Pakistan.

8. Maulana Muhibbun Nabi Saheb. Darul Uloom Madaniyyah. Lahore.

9. Maulana Saajid Husain Muaawiyah Saheb, Abbottabad.

10. Maulana Muhammad Siddiq Saheb. Principal Jamiah Rashidiyyah. Rawalpindi.

11. Qaari Fath Muhammad Saheb. Sargodha.12. Maulana Muhammad Sulayman Saheb. Rawalpindi.

13. Maulana Sayyid Abdul Maalik Shah Saheb. Gujranwala.

14. Mufti Zafr Iqbal Saheb. Principal Madrasah Miftaahul Uloom. Bhakkar. Pakistan.

15. Maulana Muhamad Nawaz Balooch Saheb. Gujranwala.

[One of the reasons for recording these names is to dispel the possible notion that the concern around Maulana Taariq Jameel Saheb's statements is an isolated or obscure view.]

Some of the ustaads and Muftis from Jamiah Ashrafiyyah, Lahore, called for Maulana Taariq Jameel Saheb. When he appeared before them, they presented him with a list of his unacceptable statements.

Maulana Taariq Jameel Saheb verbally accepted his error and retracted from these statements. In order to verify this, Maulana Taariq Jameel Saheb was requested to sign a document confirming the same. He refused.

In August 2008 Maulana Taariq Jameel Saheb wrote:
For some time some pamphlets have been distributed concerning me. A booklet has also been printed. I have only one response to all of this. سُبْحَانَكَ هَذَا بُهْتَانٌ عَظِيمٌ
[Aayah meaning: Glory be to Allah, this is a grave false- accusation]. Alhamdulillah I am bound by the school and pattern of the Ulama e Deoband, the Ahlus Sunnah Wal Jama-ah. I am a student of this school, and I am firm on its belief system.

This was shortly after his apparent retraction at Jamiah Ashrafiyyah, Lahore. It begs the question: If he admitted that he was in error, what does he mean by saying that this is a grave false-accusation? One cannot have it both ways: admitting and denying the charge. It places in question whether there was a genuine retraction.

Mufti Muhammad Eesa Khan then presented Maulana Taariq Jameel Saheb a copy of the statements of concern in order to seek clarity. He offered Maulana Taariq Jameel Saheb the opportunity to clarify his statements. Maulana Taariq Jameel Saheb ignored the offer. Maulana Taariq Jameel Saheb followed it up with a written statement saying:

If in my lectures different impressions are to be found, it is due to my error in expressing myself, not an error in my beliefs. However one will note in respect of these contentious statements that Maulana Taariq Jameel Saheb expresses himself quite clearly.

It is not simply a matter of ambiguous expressions.

Mufti Muhammad Eesa Khan then sent Maulana Taariq Jameel Saheb a message via Hajee Muhammad Naeem, inviting him to Gujranwala in order to discuss the statements. Hajee saheb conveyed the reply that Maulana Taariq Jameel Saheb is not prepared to come to Gujranwala.

Mufti Muhammad Eesa Khan thereafter felt that he had exhausted the avenues of giving Maulana Taariq Jameel Saheb an opportunity of redeeming or explaining

himself. He thus felt the need to write a refutation of these statements and to publish the same.

The book is rather lengthy, and it is not practical to condense the book in few lines². Hence those who are able to comprehend Urdu are urged to first read the book before passing comment on this sensitive issue.

Even if one does not agree with the entire contents of the book, this much is evident that Maulana Taariq Jameel Saheb has made many contentious, problematic and Controversial statements.

Some of these are bound to put the layperson into serious doubt in respect of certain fundamental issues of Deen.

² My apologies to the reader. I only had a few hours to spare in writing this brief article. Had there been more time, much more material on the topic could have been presented. Also, few people nowadays have time to read lengthy articles. If we revert to the core question this article seeks to answer, namely: Is it safe for the layperson to listen to the bayaans of Maulana Taariq Jameel?, a careful study of the book will produce a clear answer in the negative.

B. Maulana Taariq Jameel's praise or Maududi

Abul A'la Maududi (1903 - 1979) was a religious scholar who founded the Jamaat-i-Islami in 1941. On the surface his writings were inspirational and he managed to

gain a large following. However, surreptitiously hidden within his writings were poisonous teachings which eat away at the fundamentals of Islam.

His writings display flagrant disrespect towards the Ambiya عَلَيْهِمُ السَّلَامُ and Sahabah رَضِيََ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ. The Deobandi Ulama were at the forefront of exposing the dangers of his teachings and movement. Examples of such criticism of Maududi are the following: One, Two, Three, Four and Five.

In this clip Maulana Taariq Jameel Saheb has unreserved and immense praise for Maududi. It effectively pours water on all the efforts the Deobandi Ulama have made in combatting this scourge.

The issue is not about which group one belongs to – the Deobandi School or Jamaat-i-Islami. The more pressing issue is the danger to one's Imaan that lurks below the apparent appeal of Maududi's teachings.

Maulana Taariq Jameel Saheb has expressed similar sentiments of praise regarding the Shia. Maulana Taariq Jameel's ardent followers defend his stance by saying that he is not ignorant, and fully understands that Maudidiasm and Shiasm are wrong.

He only makes such statements in order to win over the members of these sects. They hastened to point out that as a result of him expressing such sentiments he was invited to address the Jamaat-i-Islami and the Shiah.

Such an invitation was never previously extended to any Deobandi Aalim. Without interrogating the veracity of these claims, let us for a moment generously assume that they are true in conceding that he is two-faced.

Such a viewpoint is very selfish and narrow minded. It only takes aim from a certain vantage point. Maybe Maulana and his close followers are blessed to know the truth. But what about the many thousands of lost souls out there in the real world who are prepared to grab onto any “?-ism” that catches their fancy?

From the perspective of the ignorant layman who is fresh and green, if he had to hear such praises, according to his mind-set the impression created is that there is nothing objectionable about Jamaat-i-Islami or Shiasm.

Hence such a person will, without reservations, become comfortable with the teachings of Maududi and the Shia under the confidence that it has the imprimatur sanction of an internationally popular Islamic orator who draws unmatched crowds. In this manner the layperson will be putting his/her Deen in danger.

The second danger of such doublespeak is that the Shia and Jamaat-i-Islami leadership, whether sincerely or out of mischief, could announce that there cannot be anything seriously wrong with Shiasm or Jamaat-i-Islami since a famous person like Maulana Taariq Jameel Saheb has praised them.

Here is South Africa, Shia proselytists have already intimated that if Shiasm was as bad as the others make it sound, a person like Maulana Taariq Jameel Saheb would never have praised them. They thus propose that shiasm is not as evil as the “extremists” would want the public to believe, and that Shiasm should therefore be accommodated within the banner of Islam.

In such situations the Ulama, whose duty it is to defend the faith of the Muslims, have no option but to publicly declare that persons such as Maulana Taariq Jameel Saheb cannot be relied upon. In response thereto, his ardent followers then react by labelling these Ulama “extremists”. The enemies of Islam thereafter sit back and laugh at the ensuing circus.

The cause of all this confusion and tension is the initial doublespeak. Remove it and such situations do not arise. Sayyiduna Umar رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُمْ too noble to deceive (others), and too smart to be deceived.

C Maulana Taariq Jameel’s introducing the aspect of the “weakness” of Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى

Clips One and Two deal with the same topic. It appears that Maulana Taariq Jameel Saheb was combatting the Bareilvi position whereby some of their leaders say that the Imaams of the Haramain are kaafir, and hence Salaah behind them is not permissible.

We obviously do not agree with that stance. Notwithstanding certain differences we have with the Imaams of the Haramain, we maintain that they are Muslim and that Salaah behind them is permissible.

What is of concern is how Maulana Taariq Jameel Saheb goes about establishing his point.

His basic premise is contained in two rhetorical questions which he poses to his audience and which essentially go as follows: Has Allah **سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى** become so weak that he has allowed a kaafir to be the Imaam of his House? Has Nabi **صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ** become so weak that he has allowed a kaafir to be the Imaam of his place of Salaah?

Maulana Taariq Jameel Saheb could have easily addressed the issue without raising these spurious arguments. The underlying teaching implicit and concealed within these two questions is extremely dangerous. It goes contrary to certain very basic and fundamental core beliefs of Islam.

Allah **جَلَّ وَعَلَا** is totally independent of His creation. No conduct of the creation has any consequences or implications on Allah's **سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى** perfection and independence. Allah **جَلَّ جَلَالُهُ** according to His absolute Wisdom allows evil, in various degrees, to exist on earth.

Good and bad, virtue and vice, all exist by the permission and control of Allah جَلَّ جَلَالُهُ. The existence of evil does not in any way imply that Allah نَعُوذُ بِاللَّهِ (نَعُوذُ بِاللَّهِ مِنْ ذَلِكَ).

This is supported by the famous Hadithul Qudsi wherein Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى teaches us that if all of mankind and Jinn had to be as evil as the most evil of man, then too this will not decrease Allah's جَلَّ وَعَلَى Grandeur and Greatness in the least bit.

Maulana Taariq Jameel's first deductive reasoning goes like this: If a kaafir had to be the Imaam of the Kaaba, it will imply that Allah is weak (نَعُوذُ بِاللَّهِ مِنْ ذَلِكَ).

But since Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى is not weak, it implies that the Imaam of the Kaaba cannot be a kaafir. His first proposition is not only totally false, it also betrays a very basic understanding of Uloohiyyah (the concept of godhood) in Islam.

Hypothetically it is possible for a kaafir to end up to be the Imaam of the Kaaba. I certainly am not saying that it has occurred, but merely stating that it is possible. And if it had to occur, it will not imply that Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى is weak (نَعُوذُ بِاللَّهِ مِنْ ذَلِكَ). There is no such rule in Deen which says that if a person is the Imaam of the Kaaba, then this is a guarantee that such a person has Imaan. Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى in His supreme Wisdom even allows evil people to

gain control over the Kaaba. Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى best knows the reasons for such worldly phenomenon.

Let alone that, before the end of time Allah جَلَّ وَعَلَا will allow some evil persons from Habshah (Abyssinia) to Physically tear down the Kaaba, which is worse than being the Imaam.

None of these events can or will imply any weakness in Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى (نَعُوذُ بِاللَّهِ مِنْ ذَلِكَ). In 930 the Qarmatians (an extreme shiah sect) gained control over Makkah Mukarramah and Madinah Munawwarah.

In 930 the Qarmatians (an extreme Shiah Sect) gained control over Makkah Mukarramah and Madinah Munawwarah. They desecrated the Zamzam well with corpses of the Hujjaaj and took the Hajrul Asward from Makkah Mukarramah to al-Hasa.

Such ghastly events can occur, and do not mean that Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى is weak (نَعُوذُ بِاللَّهِ مِنْ ذَلِكَ).

Maulana Taariq Jameel's second deductive reasoning goes like this: If a kaafir had to be the Imaam of Madinah Munawwarah, it will imply that Rasulallah صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ is weak (نَعُوذُ بِاللَّهِ مِنْ ذَلِكَ). But since Rasulallah صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ is not weak, it implies that the Imaam of Madinah Munawwarah cannot be a kaafir.

Once again his first proposition is totally false and betrays a very basic understanding of Risaalah (prophethood) in Islam. Rasulallah's صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ strength exhibited itself during his lifetime.

Once he صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ passed on from this world, no subsequent event in this world has any reflection on his strength or “weakness”. He صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ does not control any worldly event from the after-world.

The concepts underpinning Maulana Taariq Jameel’s statements have serious implications for the listener’s Imaan.

The average person will not be able to discern how he/she is being led toward an incorrect understanding of Tawheed and Risaalah. Hence it is not safe for such persons to be exposed to these bayaans.

D. Maulana Taariq Jameel on Me’ raaj

In this audio clip, which requires careful listening, Maulana Taariq Jameel Saheb explains the incident of Me’raaj – Rasulullah’s صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ ascension to the heavens.

He firstly mixes the Aayah of Israa with the incident of Me’raaj. Secondly, the more serious issue is that he gives his audience the impression that Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى physically came down to earth to fetch Rasulullah صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ. Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى is free from time and space. It is incorrect to believe that Allah جَلَّ وَعَلَا physically moves from place to place. There are two separate questions before us in this regard.

(a) Can Maulana Taariq Jameel Saheb redeem himself in respect of this specific clip? If one wants to give him the

benefit of doubt and exonerate him, it is possible. After all he did in-between mention that Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى is free from time and space, and that this is just a mode of expression. This is not where our main concern lies.

(b) Is the Deen of the commoner being compromised by exposure to this clip?

To interrogate this question one needs to undertake an exercise. Ask a layperson who has basic understanding of Urdu what he/she understood from the clip. Notwithstanding the two exculpatory sentences that were inserted, the dominant impression, in the understanding of the layman, will still be that the clip conveys that Allah جَلَّ جَلَالُهُ physically came down to earth (نَعُوذُ بِاللَّهِ مِنْ ذَلِكَ).

The average person does not have sufficient understanding whereby he/she can compute that the two exculpatory sentences were meant to cancel out or override what was mentioned in the other sentences.

At the very least, Maulana Taariq Jameel's grossly negligent manner of expressing himself has a strong potential of leading the average listener towards the incorrect belief that Allah جَلَّ جَلَالُهُ physically came down to earth (نَعُوذُ بِاللَّهِ مِنْ ذَلِكَ).

Maulana Taariq Jameel's bayaans contain many unreliable narrations, such as this one which states that

Allah **سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى** was the first to make the Janazah of Rasulallah **صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ**. The reasonable fear that the layperson may be putting his/her Aqeedah on the line is sufficient cause for concern. Better safe than sorry!

E. Mufti Zar Wali's sounding of warnings with regards to Maulana Taariq Jameel

Mufti Zar Wali Khan is a senior Aalim of Pakistan, and the founder of Jamiah Arabia Ahsan- Ul-Uloom.

In clips One, Two and Three he sends out, in very stern terms, a clear warning against Maulana Taariq Jameel Saheb. All I wish to establish from the three clips is that:

- (a) Mufti Zar Wali Saheb had an opportunity to personally engage Maulana Taariq Jameel Saheb with respect to some of his contentious statements,
- (b) Maulana Taariq Jameel Saheb made certain admissions to Mufti Zar Wali Saheb, and
- (c) Based on such interaction, Mufti Zar Wali Saheb felt it his duty to warn the public against Maulana Taariq Jameel Saheb.

[Note: Whatever else appears on the clips are issues best dealt with directly with Mufti Zar Wali Saheb, should

anyone have a concern. He may be contacted via the madrasah website <http://ahsanululoom.org/> .

It would be grossly unfair to expect me to be his self-appointed spokesman.]

Now when a senior, well-respected and reliable Aalim, also from Pakistan, who had the opportunity of questioning Maulana Taariq Jameel Saheb sets off warning sirens, this would surely be sufficient reason for the layperson to, at the very least, adopt a cautionary position.

F Maulana Taariq Jameel's disrespectful demeanour towards Nabi Musa عَلَيْهِ الصَّلَاةُ وَالسَّلَامُ

In this audio clip Maulana Taariq Jameel Saheb discusses the incident where Allah جَلَّ جَلَالُهُ instructed Nabi Musa عَلَيْهِ الصَّلَاةُ وَالسَّلَامُ to grab the snake, which was previously his walking-stick. In the lives of the Ambiyaa عَلَيْهِمُ السَّلَامُ it is possible to find an incident or two which is intended to be humorous or light-hearted. This is definitely not one of them. The situation was a very serious one. Nabi Musa عَلَيْهِ الصَّلَاةُ وَالسَّلَامُ was overcome with the natural human fear one has of a dangerous animal. There was nothing amusing about such fear.

When recounting the incident, Maulana Taariq Jameel Saheb can clearly be heard giggling or laughing at Nabi Musa عَلَيْهِ الصَّلَاةُ وَالسَّلَامُ the tone and mannerism adopted was indeed highly disrespectful. It is indicative of jeering, mocking or making fun. The audience can be heard joining in on the giggling or laughter.

Sadly in many quarters giving bayaans have become theatrical.

The performer leads the audience, who must follow suite otherwise the bayaan loses its lustre and drive.

The average member of the congregation sheepishly follows the mob mentality. If the speaker, who is a world renowned orator, is doing it and the other members of the audience are unhesitatingly aping him, it must be acceptable in terms of how the layman thinks.

It would be extremely rare for the layperson in such a situation to apply his independent mind and immediately slam on the brakes. Herein lays the grave danger for the ordinary folk.

They don't realise that they are caught up in the ambience of the speaker and audience, hence dropping their guard and placing their Imaan in jeopardy.

The clip sends cold shivers down one's spine. One cannot avoid the following question from crossing the mind:

Have the speaker and audience lost their Imaan?

What was the need for such theatrics? What purpose does it serve?

Maulana Taariq Jameel Saheb has many thousands of ardent followers. They need to seriously ask themselves where their allegiance lies – with the Ambiyaa عَلَيْهِمُ السَّلَامُ Or with Maulana?

Without a shadow of doubt there is Imaani danger for a person to sit in such bayaans wherein grievous disrespect of a Nabi is shown.

Conclusion

The world and its entire contents are not even worth the wing of a mosquito. We all know that we will have to leave our worldly possessions behind one day. Yet, if we can afford it, we go the extra mile and acquire one further layer of security over our possessions. Our Deen, which is infinitely more valuable, deserves a higher degree of protection and concern. It will not even cost us to abstain from that which could possibly put our Deen at risk.

The above brief words are motivated by our sense of duty to protect the Deen of the masses. We advise the public, for the safety of their Deen, to abstain from listening to the Bayaans of Maulana Taariq Jameel Saheb.

In this article we have stayed clear of making any judgment against Maulana Taariq Jameel Saheb as a person. The aim is to protect the public, not to go after an individual. Amongst the parting advices which Imaam Abu Hanifa رَحِمَهُ اللهُ gave to his famous student Imaam Abu Yusuf رَحِمَهُ اللهُ, he said:

“Do not go after the faults of people, rather search out their correct deeds. If you come to know of some bad in a person, don’t mention it, but rather try to look for some good which you could then mention. (This should apply) except in the matters of Deen.

There (in matters of Deen) if you see some bad in a person you must mention it to the people so that they do not follow this person and guard themselves against him”.

May Allah **سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى** guide Maulana Taariq Jameel

Saheb and us to the straight path, give him and us the ability to admit our errors, to make sincere tawbah and to die on Imaan.

Emraan Vawda
27 June 2018

Comment by The Majlis

Whilst Emraan Vawda's article states the reality which has ruined the Imaan of TARIQ DAJJAAL, it takes into consideration the reaction of people more than the Pleasure of Allah Ta'ala.

It is not permissible to deal mildly and respectfully with brazen enemies of the Deen who utilize the public platform to misguide and lead to Jahannam the unwary and ignorant masses. Such Mudhilleen as Tariq Jameel may not be addressed with honourable titles such as 'Maulana Saheb'.

Devils of the TARIQ DAJJAAL type come within the purview of the Hadith: "*Hate for Allah's sake*".

For the likes of this human devil, the criticism has to be in Qur'aanic terminology, not in the manner indoctrinated by kuffaar universities. In this respect, the article renders an injustice to Allah Ta'ala, Islam and the lost Muslim community.