


THE ‘BIG BANG’ BABOON THEORY OF THE ATHEISTS AND MUFTI TAQI’S GRIEVOUS BLUNDER

MUJLISUL ULAMA OF S.A.
Email: mujlisul.ulama@gmail.com
themajlis.co.za

INTRODUCTION

THE BIG BABOON BANG – TAQI'S ULTIMATE BLUNDER

"Look! How they fabricate falsehood on Allah. That suffices for flagrant sin." (An-Nisaa', Aayat 50)

Taqi Usmaani has committed the ultimate sinful blunder by flagrantly bestowing a degree of credibility to the Big Baboon Bang theory of the atheists. In the attempt to accommodate this abhorrent baboon fiction of the atheists, Taqi has crossed the redline which conspicuously separates Imaan from Kufr. By entertaining this evil theory he has cloaked it with some validity even if he now argues to the contrary.

There is not a shred of reality and truth in the Big Bang theory which spawned the notoriously noxious concept of *evolution* from which the atheists allege *Insaan (Man)* had developed via his primordial ancestor, the 'great ape'.

It is this ape theory which stems from the concept of evolution which in turn is the product of the Big

Baboon Bang, which is the vilest and most abhorrent aspect of the massive Big Baboon Bang theory. It is this aspect from which *Insaan* developed according to those who deny the existence of The Creator. All Muslims know with the greatest of conviction that the first *Insaan* was Hadhrat Aadam (Alayhis salaam) who was created in perfect and excellent form by the spontaneous command of Allah Azza Wa Jal.

But the first *Insaan* in the theory accorded credibility by Taqi was a 'great ape' – a notorious baboon. This is the logical and necessary implication stemming from any acceptance of whatsoever degree of the Big Baboon Theory. Regardless of any mental gymnastics and nafsaani juggling by Taqi to vindicate his position, the only way for exoneration and coming clear from the filth of the kufr he has shoved into the tafseer of the Qur'aanic Aayat is to issue an honourable retraction and to resort to Taubah.

The satanic *'sanad'* (biological chain) in the baboon theory, in brief is:

THE BIG BANG

↓

PRIMATES (monkeys, etc.)

↓

GREAT APES

↓

MAN

The full *'sanad'* appears in the ensuing pages.

TAQI HAS LABOURED TO PROFFER A 'CLOSENESS' OF THE BIG BABOON THEORY WITH AN ISLAMIC INTERPRETATION. HIS IDEA OF KUFR IS THOROUGHLY DEBUNKED IN THIS TREATISE. THE BIG BABOON BANG THEORY WHICH TAQI HAS PROMOTED DOES NOT FEATURE IN THE ISLAMIC CONCEPT IN ANY WAY WHATSOEVER. IN FACT IT IS THE VERY ANTITHESIS OF IMAAN. HIS ATTEMPT TO INTRODUCE THIS KUFR THEORY OF THE ATHEISTS INTO THE TAFSEER OF THE QUR'AANIC AAYAT IS BLATANTLY AND SCANDALOUSLY BAATIL.

THE BIG BANG SHAITAANIYAT

QUESTION

Currently there is intense argument between Madrasah Ta'leemuddeen (Isipingo) and the supporters of Mufti Taqi Usmani over the matter of the Big Bang theory to which Mufti Taqi has made reference in his commentary of a Qur'aanic aayat. Ta'leemuddeen has criticized Mufti Taqi for having introduced this theory in his commentary.

The supporters of Mufti Taqi have countered with their arguments in defence of Mufti Taqi. We are forwarding the arguments of both sides for your perusal. What is Haqq and what is Baatil in this controversy? Please comment in detail to dispel doubts which many Muslims are entertaining as a result of Mufti Taqi's apparent acceptance of the Big Bang theory as being the origin of the universe/world.

ANSWER

Exactly two years ago we had published in *The Majlis* a brief refutation of the kufr view of Mufti Taqi regarding the baboon 'big bang' theory of the

atheists. Before expanding on our earlier refutation, we reproduce it here.

THE BABOON BIG BANG THEORY OF THE ATHEIST APES

Question: What is the tafseer of Aayat 30, Surah 2? Is it proper to deduct from this Aayat to prove the big bang theory of the scientist? It appears that Mufti Taqi Usmani has given scope for such an interpretation to validate the big bang theory. Please comment on Mufti Taqi's following comment:

"The author has explained the interpretation of this verse as adopted by many authorities. But the miraculous style of the Holy Qur'an is that the words used by it may have different possibilities for interpretation. The words ratq and fatq used here have another meaning which is being compact' and 'being separated". If these words are taken in this sense, the verse may also be translated as, "The heavens and the earth were compact, then We separated them." In this case the verse will refer to an event of the early creation, meaning thereby that the heavens and the earth were originally a single body. Thereafter Allah separated the earth from the heavens. The contemporary research about the Big Bang is close to this description. But it should always be kept in mind that the Qur'anic descriptions are independent of any scientific theory and the Qur'an should not be made subject to ever-changing theories." (End of Taqi's

comment)

Answer. Firstly, any moron professing to be a Muslim, who believes in the rubbish baboon big bang theory of the ape atheist scientists should renew his Imaan and his Nikah if he desires to remain a Muslim.

The big bang comment of Mufti Taqi is absolute baboonic bunkum which is the effect of his bootlicking the modernists and even the atheist scientists. When a molvi has become entangled with the kuffaar riba bankers and produces fatwas of permissibility for their riba products, then it is clear evidence for mental derangement caused by the satanic disease described in the Qur'aan as *Takabbutush Shaitaan*. This disease mutilates the *Aql*, hence the disgorgement of views and opinions designed for bootlicking the votaries of modernism, liberalism and satanism. Taqi Sahib is a liberal who has deviated from the Straight Path of the Deen, hence he surreptitiously injects the kufr, fisq and fujoor of atheists, zanaadaqah, fussaaq and fujjaar into the framework of Islam.

The tafseer of the Aayat has been given with clarity by Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) and the Sahaabah. There is absolutely no scope for the kufr big bang theory of the atheists in the Qur'aan and the clear expositions of the Sahaabah. The skies and the earth having been "closed" simply means that prior to the advent of mankind on earth, there was neither rain nor vegetation. Then for man's transitory sojourn on earth, Allah Ta'ala *opened* the skies with rain and the earth with vegetation. This is the simple and pure tafseer of

Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) and the Sahaabah.

The Qur'aan may not be subjected to corrupt interpretation to give credence to the vile, kufr theories of the atheists and zanaadaqah. There is absolutely no accommodation in Islam for the baboon big bang theory and for most of the kufr theories of the atheists.

The 'contemporary research' mentioned by Mr. Taqi, is shaitaani research. Shaitaan has urinated the rubbish of the big bang into their brains. Those who even slightly incline towards the kufr of the atheists should renew their Imaan as well as their Nikah.

(End of our earlier article)

BLATANT KUFR

Taqi Sahib's statement: ***"The contemporary research about the Big Bang is close to this description."***, is undoubtedly KUFR. He has elevated the absolutely baatil, kufr status of the 'big bang' doctrine of the atheists to the level of credibility and acceptability in terms of the Shariah. This infusion of outright conspicuous kufr into Qur'aan Tafseer is shaitaan's subtle way of injecting kufr into the Aqeedah of Muslims with defective Imaan.

The idea which Taqi Sahib has extrapolated in his interpretation of the Qur'aanic Aayat is a kufr

attempt to extravasate from the Aayat credibility for the kufr massive big bang fiction of the atheists.

The defence of Taqi Sahib's supporters is a red herring. Their argument is a disingenuous attempt to exonerate him from the exceptionally grave blunder of kufr he has disgorged. Their arguments are all a lot of skulduggery designed to divert the focus from the actual kufr statement of Taqi Sahib, namely:
"The contemporary research about the Big Bang is close to this description."

Introducing the Mufassireen, Imaam Raazi, Aalusi, Baidaawi, etc. into this argument is mullock for pulling wool over the eyes of unsuspecting juhala. The Mufassireen, leave alone discussing the kufr of the Baboon Theory, did not have the haziest idea of this rubbish shaitaani fiction. Whatever the supporters have struggled to extravasate from the commentaries of the Mufassireen does not have the slightest relevance to the big bang shaitaaniyat of the atheists.

His supporter argues: *"He (Taqi) never said the Big Bang is the tafseer of the verse."* This averment is typical skulduggery. Ask any person, molvi or moron who has read the comment of Taqi

for their understanding. Invariably, everyone will say that *according to Mufti Taqi the Big Bang theory is valid.* This is the understanding every reader of the commentary will gain even if it be assumed that Taqi Sahib does not believe in the big bang shaitaani fiction. At the very minimum, he has elevated the big bang shaitaani fiction to the level of Qur'aan tafseer.

If Taqi Sahib had made a proper research regarding the satanic fiction of the atheists, he would have understood the kufr and evil of the baboon big bang theory. What does Taqi Sahib say regarding the advent of *Insaan*? In view of his acceptance and subtle promotion of the satanic fiction, it will not at all be surprising if he excretes some interpretation to bring the creation of Hadhrat Aadam (Alayhis salaam) within the scope of some stupid, fictitious hypothesis of the atheist scientists.

If he had made a proper research, he would have understood that the primordial ancestor of man's appearance is the big bang shaitaani fiction. Minus this fiction neither would there have been man, animals and the myriad of other creations and creatures which currently inhabit the universe.

But to attribute Hadhrat Aadam's creation to the satanic 'scientific' fiction will be a violent and vigorous denial of everything the Qur'aan and Hadith say and confirm about his creation.

According to the stupid kuffaar fiction the universe came into existence with some stupid 'big bang' about 14 billion years ago. The shaitaani '*sanad'* of man on earth according to the atheist Devils is:
Big Bang → first atoms → stars → heavier elements → galaxies and planets → Earth → life → evolution → humans

The link preceding *humans* in this Devil's chain is *evolution.* In this category *apes* and *monkeys* precede *humans.* Via the ape and baboon grandfathers and great-grandfathers, *humans* link up with their primordial ancestor, viz., the Big Bang shaitaan which Taqi Sahib is promoting under Qur'aanic guise.

The sub-chain in the big bang fictitious satanic theory beginning from the evolutionary link is as follows:
Humans → primates → mammals → vertebrates → earlier animals

From this evolutionary chain it is explicitly postulated that man's immediate ancestor was an ape/baboon.

Every Muslim, molvi or moron, understands that this *'sanad' (narrational chain)* is satanically *'maudhoo' and baatil*, that is: fabricated, false, stupid, vile and chicanery of the worst kind.

Does Taqi Sahib ascribe to the idea that the primordial ancestor of Hadhrat Aadam (Alayhis salaam) was this stupid baboon fictitious big bang theory? And, does he understand that by accommodating this miserably stupid theory of the atheists he has acceded to their baboon hypothesis, namely, man evolved from primates? How was it ever possible for Taqi Sahib to have blundered so deeply into the cauldron of kufr by providing scope of acceptance for a theory which claims that man evolved from an ape?

Allah Ta'ala created Hadhrat Aadam as a perfect *Insaan* with all the attributes of excellence. Life entered the moulded form of Hadhrat Aadam (alayhis salaam) spontaneous with the *'Breathing' (Command)* of Allah Azza Wa Jal. There was no baboonic evolutionary process stemming from the primordial big bang fiction.

It is appallingly preposterous for any molvi, especially for one who is supposedly in possession of great erudition in the sphere of textual knowledge *(Kitaabi Ilm)* to have committed this terrible blunder of shoving the big bang fiction into the tafseer of a Qur'aanic Aayat.

Citing the Mufassireen is a stunt to pull wool over the eyes to obfuscate the issue and to detract from the corrupt interpretation proffered by Taqi Sahib. Every opinion/theory advanced by the Mufassireen is directly attributed to Allah Azza Wa Jal whereas the shaitaani big bang fiction is in denial of the existence of Allah, the Khaaliq of entire creation. The inceptional point of all interpretations proffered by the Mufassireen is the existence of Allah Azza Wa Jal. On the contrary, the very basis of the baboon big bang theory of the atheists is the denial of the existence of The Khaaliq.

Thus, the averment regarding the big bang, namely, ***"The contemporary research about the Big Bang is close to this description."***, is unadulterated – pure – kufr. Every description proffered by the Mufassireen confirms the Existence of Allah, The Khaaliq whereas the big bang baboonery has

absolutely no scope for the existence of The Creator.

Since the theories advanced by the Mufassireen confirm the existence of Allah Ta'ala, by what stretch of Imaani logic did Taqi Sahib conjecture that the big bang hypothesis of the atheists who all unanimously deny the existence of The Creator *"is close to this description"*? Surely, he cannot argue in his defence such stark ignorance which precludes recognition of the fact that the big bang stupid fiction has absolutely no scope for the existence of The Creator, Allah Azza Wa Jal. Every moron is aware of the fundamental basis of atheism on which the big bang shataaniyat is structured. So on what basis did he conclude:
***"The contemporary research about the Big Bang is close to this description."*?**

The opinions and even conjectures of the Mufassireen are the very antithesis of the big bang claim. Whereas the ideas of the Mufassireen confirm the existence of the Creator, the satanic ideology of the atheists with their big bang hypothesis denies the existence of The Creator. This reality should have been more than ample for Taqi Sahib for understanding that he should not embark on an interpretation which leads to

obfuscation regarding the spontaneous creation of Hadhrat Aadam (Alayhis salaam) who does not fit anywhere in the stupid 14 billion year big bang stupidity.

In terms of the baboon big bang theory, the atoms in our bodies have their origins in the universe and stars which according to the baboon fiction are the effects of the big bang which is an event that has no creator in the postulation of the atheists. This idea is confirmed kufr. The description of Hadhrat Aadam's creation is explained in detail in the Hadith. He was not the product of the big bang kufr stupidity. He was created directly by Allah Azza Wa Jal. To proffer any hypothesis which attributes the creation of man, Hadhrat Aadam (Alayhis salaam) to big bang atoms which gave rise to apes and baboons, is pure kufr.

The defenders of Taqi Sahib have provided nothing Islamically valid to vindicate him. There is no Shar'i validity in their arguments. It does not require intelligence to understand that any theory which rises from the doctrine of atheism – the doctrine of the denial of the existence of The Creator, may not be accommodated in any way whatsoever. Taqi Sahib has abortively attempted to strike a balance between two violently opposite

concepts. The attempt to extravasate accommodation for the kufr big bang fiction by subtly introducing it into the tafseer of an Aayat of the Qur'aan Majeed is deplorable extravagation which most certainly demands renewal of Imaan.

While the jaahil supporter of Taqi Sahib accuses Madrasah Ta'leemuddeen with "the height of academic dishonesty", it is palpably clear that both Taqi Sahib and his defender are guilty of academic dishonesty and chicanery. There is no gainsaying that Taqi has accommodated a theory which is based on the denial of The Creator. He has accorded acceptability and validity to a satanic hypothesis which asserts that Man evolved from a baboon which in turn is the creation of the big bang fiction - the postulate which denies the existence of Allah Azza Wa Jal.

TRYING TO BEFUDDLE

The supporter of Taqi avers: *"He (i.e. Taqi) never said the Big Bang is the tafseer of the verse. He only said that one explanation "seems to be close to this concept."*

If this chap is stupid, others are not. He appears to be both stupid and cunning. The big bang idea

peddled by Taqi Sahib was said in the context of Qur'aan Tafseer. It was shoved into the tafseer of the Aayat. It was not an isolated comment. It was related directly to the Aayat. Everyone who reads it will understand that this doctrine of the atheists has Islamic validity, hence the 'mufti' sahib has entertained it.

By what stretch of Imaani reasoning can a purely kufr theory/concept be close to any teaching of Islam? Everything of Islam is based on the belief of The Creator whereas the big bang shaitaaniyat is based on the satanic idea of the non-existence of The Creator. What really has constrained Taqi to introduce into Qur'aan Tafseer the repulsive big bang kufr theory, and then too even accord it validity? It is his dalliance with the capitalist riba banks which has desensitized his Imaan to provide accommodation for the ideologies and ways of the Yahood and Nasaara. Thus he sees nothing abhorrent in shoving the kufr big bang fiction into the tafseer of a Qur'aanic aayat.

The 'closeness' which Taqi proffers is a figment of his hallucination. There is no resemblance of any kind between the concept tendered by the Mufassireen and the satanic fiction of the big bang. There is no scope in the big bang baboon fiction for

the heavens and the earth splitting. The big bang has no relationship to the idea of the splitting asunder of the heavens and earth which at one time were compact or one whole. In the big bang fiction, the heavens and earth did not exist. When this stupid fictitious bang occurred some 14 billion years ago according to the atheists, there were no heavens and earth joined together which required to be split asunder.

"Say: 'Do you in reality reject the One who has created the earth in ***two days****…Then He placed mountains on the earth; blessed it (the earth), and decreed in it its provisions in* ***four days****…. Then He focused to the sky which was* ***smoke****, and He said to it and to the earth:* ***'Come to Us willingly or unwillingly'. They said: 'We come willingly.'***
Then He made it into seven heavens (skies) within ***two days****, and He revealed (commanded) for every sky its affair. And, We beautified the sky of the world with lanterns and a means of protection. This is the decree of (Allah) The Mighty, The Wise."*
(*Haameem As-Sajdah, 9, 10, 11 & 12)*

The Qur'aanic concept pertains to already existing solid material structures which were *split apart* in terms of one interpretation with which Taqi illegitimately and abortively sought to fabricate a

'closeness' to enable him to slip the big baboon kufr theory into the tafseer of the relevant Aayat to cloak the baboonery with Qur'aanic validity.

Thus the effects of the Qur'aanic concept and of the big bang concept have absolutely not even a vestige of similarity, leave alone the hallucinated 'closeness' of Taqi.

In order to make the big baboon kufr theory plausible and palatable for the Muslim palate, the 'days' mentioned in the Aayat are said to be lengthy periods. The Big Baboon Bang is hallucinated to have transpired some 14 billion years ago. There are no grounds for believing this fiction while there are Qur'aanic grounds for rejecting the kufr mullock.

What is the need for a Muslim to incline towards a blatantly kufr theory of the impure baboon atheists? A Muslim should gravitate towards the Qur'aan for interpretation. The Qur'aan states *two days* and *four days.* What is the meaning of *days* in the Qur'aanic context? There is no need to traverse beyond the Qur'aan for ascertaining this meaning. Searching for explanations in the fictitious sources of the atheists is a sinister attempt to accommodate

the 'billions of years' postulated by the proponents of the Big Baboon Bang rubbish. Regarding the meaning of 'days', Allah Ta'ala says:

"Verily a day by your Rabb is the equivalent of a thousand years according to your calculation."

In terms of this explicit explanation in the Qur'aan Majeed, the world was created in 6000 years.

Taqi and his ilk are at pains to show that the creation of the world coincided with the kufr big baboon bang theory. However, the atheist theorists themselves debunk this utterly baseless conception. According to them there were heavens and no earth on the occasion of the big bang occurrence. The earth developed billions of years after the big baboon bang. And to this day they do not believe in the existence of the skies/heavens. The 'closeness' theory of Taqi is therefore weird hallucination.

Thus, there is absolutely NO similarity between the Islamic concept and the Devil's big baboon bang fiction. In terms of this fiction there were no heavens and earth to be cleft asunder. A *false* imaginary explosion occurred which initiated a hallucinatory evolutionary process of physical, material, plant and animal existents among which the closest ancestor of man is the baboon

postulated by the atheists whose fictitious theory of absolute kufr Taqi Sahib has abortively attempted to promote. He is clearly ignorant of the concept of the big bang.

Taqi Sahib by averring 'closeness' of the baboon theory , i.e. closeness to Islamic theories of the Mufassireen implied that the ancestor of Hadhrat Aadam (Alayhis salaam) is as depicted in the evolutionary process of the atheists, was a baboon – ***Nauthubillah!*** The progression of man by evolution which is the effect of the big bang fiction is a fundamental consequence of this satanic theory which Taqi has accepted and accorded Islamic validity.

The atheist experts of the 'Big Bang' satanic mullock state unequivocally:

"There is also an important distinction between ***monkeys and apes.*** *Humans belong to the* ***ape*** *group – specifically the great apes -- not to the monkey group. Our closest relatives are chimpanzees and bonobos."*

Taqi has linealogically related himself, mankind and especially Hadhrat Aadam's creation and origination to **"great ape group"** by elevating the

big baboon bang fiction to the realm of validity, acceptability and respectability. In so doing, he has displayed
seismic derangement of his intellectual faculty. The asseveration underlying his belief pertaining to the hallucinatory 'closeness' of the Baboon kufr fiction to Islam, reveals a terrible cognitive dissonance which causes the mind to explode, perhaps in the imaginary 'big bang' style.

In fact the very epithet 'big bang' is deceptive. Even the atheist experts say: *"Big Bang explosion is actually a misleading description of what modern cosmology proposes. Scientists use 'Big Bang' as a name for the early hot, dense state of the universe and its subsequent expansion – not for an ordinary explosion of a material object into pre-existing empty space."*

The Big Bang chain which is postulated to have ultimately produced man is as follows:

Big Bang → formation of stars → formation of the Sun and Earth → first life → simple single-celled organisms → complex cells → multicellular organisms → animals → vertebrates → fish → four-limbed vertebrates → mammals → primates → early apes →


hominins → genus *Homo* → modern humans (*Homo sapiens*)

The chronology of this satanic fiction is:

Approximate time ago	Major development
13.8 billion years	Big Bang / early universe
4.6 billion years	Sun and Solar System form
4.54 billion years	Earth forms
3.5–3.8+ billion years	Evidence of early life
~2.0 billion years	Complex eukaryotic cells become established
~600 million years	Diversification of complex multicellular life
~540 million years	Cambrian diversification of animals
~470 million years	Early land plants
~370 million years	Early four-limbed vertebrates
~225 million	First mammals

Approximate time ago	Major development
years	
~60–55 million years	Early primates
~20–15 million years	Major diversification of apes
~7–6 million years	Very early hominins close to the human/chimpanzee evolutionary split
~2.8 million years	Earliest known members of *Homo* / very early *Homo*-like fossils
~300,000 years	*Homo sapiens* appears
~50,000–40,000 years	Major expansion of modern human populations and associated archaeological evidence of increasingly complex culture

Man's ancestral lineage according to Iblees and his legions:



```
toward humans lineages
|
early hominins
|
Australopithecus
|
early Homo
|
Homo erectus etc.
|
Homo sapiens
|
MAN
```

The great and illustrious modern day expert, namely **Professor AI** states:

"……Modern Homo sapiens (i.e. modern man), our species is only about 300,000 years old. So there are really two different periods:

Common Human/Chimpanzee ancestor

↓

Homo sapies (modern man)

This evolutionary phase urinated into the brains of the atheists by Iblees, occurred 6 to 7 million years ago. The second phase is the actual appearance of today's modern man 300,000 years ago. Taqi Sahib has included by implication, perhaps in a display of staggering ignorance, all of this baboonery rubbish

in his commentary on an Aayat of the Glorious Qur'aan Majeed. He must hang his head in shame if he is still in possession of sufficient Imaani intellectual ability to comprehend the utter ghastliness of what he has excreted in the form of Qur'aan comment.

The supporter of Taqi averred:

"One of the main claims is that Mufti Taqi Saheb is trying to make the Quran fit modern science. .....He never said the Big Bang is the tafseer of the verse. He only said that one explanation "seems to be close to this concept".

The chap has displayed disingenuous stupidity by attempting to separate Taqi's rubbish comment from Qur'aanic commentary. The comment of Taqi was made in the context of Qur'aan Tafseer. The ugly rubbish baboonery statement was not made in isolation of the Qur'aan Majeed. It was shoved right into the authentic Tafseer of Aayat 30 of Surah Al-Ambiyaa. Just what need did he discern for this horrible gaffe? Does he accept that the Big Bang theory is kufr? Is there any scope for accommodating this kufr concept in Islam?

This miscreant supporter cannot succeed in shielding Taqi Sahib with incongruous blurting devoid of valid Shar'i substance. The statement *"seems to be close to this concept"* is an unequivocal affirmation of validity for the kufr Big Bang baboon fiction which implies a baboon (great ape) lineage for Hadhrat Aadam (Alayhis salaam) – *Nauthubillah!*

These chaps need to provide real facts and proofs for their uncalled stupid decantation of their hadhrat guru sahib. They should delineate with precision the alleged 'closeness' of the baboon theory to any of the concepts proffered by the Mufassireen. The slightest acceptance accorded to the big bang fiction leads to the conclusion that – Nauthubillah! – Hadhrat Aadam (Alayhis salaam) – the Perfect Man created by Allah Ta'ala – had descended from an ape.

The Kufr ramifications of this vile baboon theory are inseparable from the big bang fiction. It is palpably clear that Taqi Sahib had not applied his mind constructively when he predicated 'closeness' for this absolutely horrible, stupid theory.

His supporters should now explain exactly to which Islamically acceptable concept of the Mufassireen

does this baboon theory have a 'closeness'. Is there any semblance of the denial of the existence of Allah Ta'ala in any of the theories proffered by the Mufassireen? Does any valid Islamic theory have any implications of the dastardly kufr effects of the big bang fiction? Just in what aspect did Taqi Sahib conjecture his idea of 'closeness'? The 'closeness' claim is a massive lie disgorged by Taqi Saheb which may fool modernist morons. In fact, Taqi was performing the baboon kufr act to appease the modernists decorated with university donkey degrees.

The supporter of Taqi further says:
"In another place he clearly says that the Quran should not be made subject to changing scientific theories."

In fact Taqi has not made this averment "in another place" as the supporter misleadingly alleges. Taqi's grossly inaccurate statement pregnant with kufr reads:
"The contemporary research about the Big Bang is close to this description. But it should always be kept in mind that the Qur'anic descriptions are independent of any scientific theory and the Qur'an should not be made subject to ever-changing theories."

He made this statement immediately after elevating the big bang mullock. His averment is a red herring to divert focus from the gravity and villainy of his 'closeness' interpretation. It is Taqi himself who has provided a licence for the modernist deviates to subject the Qur'aan to the stupid ever-changing theories of the atheists. He had absolutely no business and no entitlement to accord acceptability to the kufr big bang theory. By introducing it in the context of the Aayat's interpretation Taqi has bestowed credibility to possibly the worst and most notorious concept of kufr.

Then the jaahil supporter says: *"The earlier response also showed that simply saying one idea is "close" to another does not mean you are accepting that whole idea. Imam Razi himself says regarding one view: 'And this view is close to the view of the Mutazilah'".*

The claim is not that Taqi Saheb has accepted the whole rotten fiction of big bang baboon ancestor who has been given some degree, in fact a great degree of credibility by Taqi's entertainment in the context of Qur'aanic tafseer of the origin of bonoboskind, baboonkind and mankind. This was not claimed by anyone. The claim is that his

'closeness' interpretation is absolutely ***baatil***. No one, molvi or moron, who employs his brain cells correctly will accept that the big bang stupid fiction has any closeness or resemblance with the one interpretation of *Ratq and Fatq,* namely that at one stage the heavens and the earth were compact/joined together and later cleaved asunder.

By citing Imaam Raazi's statement, the jaahil supporter has committed a stupid gaffe. Imaam Raazi was actually refuting the view, not supporting it. The *'view is close to the view of the Mu'tazilah'* was mentioned by Imaam Raazi as a rebuttal of the view of Imaam Abu Mansur Maaturidi. The controversy at that time pertaining to the *Kalaam* of Allah Ta'ala. Imaam Raazi was in fact deriding the view of Imaam Abu Mansur. He stated in belittlement or refutation of Imaam Mansur's view that this *'view is close to the view of the Mu'tazilah'* – a view which he rejected. He did not accept this view which he labelled 'close to the view of the Mu'tazilah'. He implied: *This view is close to baatil.*

Taqi's supporter did not understand the context in which Imaam Raazi had made the statement. On the basis of his failure to understand the context

and the intent of Imaam Raazi, the supporter asks the following baseless question which is not applicable at all to our discussion:
"Nobody understood from this that Imam Razi was accepting Mutazili beliefs. He was only pointing out a similarity."

By pointing out this 'similarity', Imaam Raazi was rebutting the Maaturidi Math-hab's interpretation. Imaam Raazi was an Ash'ari. He was not averring that the 'closeness' was close to the *Haq*. For him it was closeness to error because the Mu'tazilah were in error. He rejected the view which in his opinion had a 'similarity' with the Mu'tazili view. Thus, Taqi's supporter has joined Taqi Sahib in gaffe upon gaffe.

On this very basis of stupid 'similarity' has Taqi Sahib and his supporters accorded credibility to the view expressed by the Big Baboon Bang fiction. So, even if Taqi does not accept every claim of the Baboon Theory, he nevertheless implies condonation of the ape theory which posits the origin of man. The ape is inseparable from the Big Bang fiction which Taqi has woven into the tafseer of the Qur'aanic Aayat. The 'closeness' idea opens scope for satanic speculation regarding the origin of Hadhrat Aadam (Alayhis salaam). The

immediate need is for Taubah.

The big bang fiction does not in any way whatsoever even allude in the remotest degree to such a cleavage having taken place. In terms of big bang baboon there were no heavens and no earth 14 billion years ago when the baboon event supposedly occurred. To this day the fathers of baboonery (the scientists) who are over-awing the brains of
modernists, vehemently reject the existence of the seven heavens and the seven earths which the Qur'aan Majeed affirms. For them this is fiction while for us their Baboonery which denies the existence of Allah Azza Wa Jal is staggering stupidity, fiction, satanism and ***kufr.*** Thus, there is not the slightest vestige of resemblance or *similarity* between the Qur'aanic *Ratq/Fataq* and the Big Baboon Bang of the atheists.

The 'similarity' which Taqi and his clique of jaahil labourers are abortively attempting to shove into the tafseer of the Qur'aanic Aayat is a false sweepingly arbitrary claim utterly bereft of any Shar'i substance which could be proffered in vindication. Furthermore, by this terrible gaffe, Taqi has portrayed that in his understanding of the Big Bang mullock he is a socialist. The smattering

of information he has gleaned regarding this Baboon Theory is the basis for his baboonery gaffe.

The attempt by his supporters to drag into the picture Imaam Raazi, Aalusi, Aadil and other Mufassireen is nothing but the excrescence of juhala. If there was a real similarity, then too, it would also have been unwise and dangerous to entertain it in the context of Qur'aanic tafseer, any substance associated with such a rotten, horrible idea of the Baboon Fiction. But the reality is that there is ***no*** similarity such as that hallucinated by the supporters of Taqi Sahib.

In his elaboration, Imaam Raazi said: *"This view is close to the view of the Mu'tazilah."* It is chicanery to quote this simple statement of Imaam Raazi. The supporter should present the entire discussion to enable juxtaposing this concise statement of Imaam Raazi. He must provide the full context which shall, Insha-Allah, be the subject for further rebuttal.

Whatever, the topic of discussion is, Imaam Raazi was merely providing factual information. The Mu'tazilah as well as almost all deviant sects ascribe to the view of the Five Fardh Salaat. Thus, stating that this is also the view of the Mu'tazilah

or of any other deviate sect in no way whatever constitutes a gaffe such as the socialistic gaffe of Taqi Sahib. It will not compromise any teaching, tenet or view of Islam. It will not detract from the ideas of Islam embedded in the minds of Muslims. But to elevate the Big Baboon Kufr Fiction to the wrung of credibility, and that too, in the context of the Qur'aanic Aayat of *Rataq/Fataq* is a kufr gaffe which is forgivable only in the wake of a retraction by the socialist proponent of the kufr.

The jaahil supporter says: *"So the question still stands: If simply pointing out a similarity between a Quranic explanation and an outside theory is wrong and misleading, then what about these Mufassiroon who did the same thing."*

This stupid question constrains the ingemination of what has already been said several times in the aforementioned pages. There is no *similarity* between any explanation/view of any of the Mufassireen and the Baboon Fiction. The 'similarity' is a stupid red herring designed to dupe and mislead morons. It is necessary for these chaps to elaborate on this fictitious 'similarity' which they are flaunting to divert the focus from the ghastly gaffe of Taqi Sahib.

Although the theory of the heavens and earth having been conjoined and cleft asunder by the command of Allah Ta'ala, is a minority view, it is not kufr whereas the Baboon theory which Taqi has upheld and promoted is kufr of the vilest kind. So, what business did Taqi have to shove into the tafseer the kufr big baboon idea? The view of the Jamhoor Mufassireen has sufficed since the inception of Islam.

Should someone claim that with regard to Salaat, that the view of the Mu'tazilah sect is not only similar, but identical with the view of the Ahlus Sunnah, then such a claim will be valid. There can be no objection to reality and truth. But the 'similarity' between Baboon Fiction and the view based on *Ratq/Fatq of the Qur'aan* is a kufr canard which deracinates Imaan.

The supporter then dwelling in some labyrinth, meanders in confusion with some obscure rare view in an abortive bid to extravasate the idea of the non-existence of the heavens and the earth at the time when Allah Ta'ala commanded these bodies to *Ratq and Fatq*. Allah Alone is aware of the true meaning. Nevertheless, according to the Jamhoor and according to the clear text of the Qur'aan, the obvious meaning is that the heavens

and earth had existed at the time of the Command.

This argument of the jaahil, instead of vindicating the Haqq, actually seeks to defend the Big Baboon Fiction. Regarding the rare and obscure view, viz. the supposed non-existence of the heavens and earth at the time of the Command, note the following:

(1) The Jamhoor Ulama and Auliya say: *"He who seeks daleel from the rarities/obscurities of the Ulama has made his exit from Islam."* Only corrupt brains resort to clinging to obscure/rare views which are severely damaged and untenable in terms of the Shariah as understood by the Jamhoor Ummah.

(2) On the assumption that the heavens and earth did not exist at that time, the Baboon Bang theory is not and cannot be vindicated. Arguing in favour of the Big Bang Satanism is kufr. While the supporter ostensibly seeks to vindicate Taqi Sahib, the jaahil is actually defending the Big Baboon kufr theory of the origin of the world from some fictitious 'big bang', and the origin of man from the ape.

Thus he attempts to extrapolate Taqi's view by

means of extravastion based on an obscure/rare view which has absolutely no reference to the idea traded on the basis of the Big Bang Baboon Fiction. Even the rare view has no relationship with the rubbish of the Big Baboon Bang. The cunning – kufr cunning – of this supporter seeks to strike a common cord between the explicit non-existence of the heavens and earth in the Baboon theory, and the supposed non-existence of the heavens and earth on the basis of the obscure view.

The moron is too stupid or perhaps too cunningly stupid, to understand that even if this common factor had existed, the Command of Allah Ta'ala brought the *Samaawaat and Ardh* into spontaneous existence by the Divine Command of ***"Kun!"("Be!").*** The Command to cleave asunder was given to existing bodies of creation, not to non-existent phantoms. But when the Baboon Bang happened there were no heavens and no earth. In fact to this day the believers in the Big Baboon theory do not believe in the existence of the heavens.

The very idea of the heavens and earth having been conjoined at the point of the occurrence or hallucinated occurrence of the Big Baboon, is preposterously ludicrous to the scientists, more

ludicrous than fairy tales. Thus, there is absolutely no similarity such as that hallucinated by Taqi and his gang of moron defenders.

(3) The rare view of the Mufassir is an independent opinion totally unrelated to any theory of kufr and baboonery. It is a rare, weak figment of an opinion unacceptable to the Jamhoor Ummah. It is a view devoid of any *similarity* with any other view while Taqi's view is an affirmation for the imaginary real occurrence of the hallucinated Big Baboon Bang. There is not a semblance of kufr in the rare view which only propounds a rare idea of possible non-existence of the *Samaawaat and Ardh* at the time when the Divine Command emanated for the splitting of the Single Entity into two separate bodies, namely, *Samaawaat and Ardh.*

The Qur'aan itself explains the Command of Allah Ta'ala at the time of the 'splitting'. In reality there was no splitting. The earth and the sky had already been created. Stating this fact, the Qur'aan says:

"Say: 'Do you in reality reject the One who has created the earth in ***two days****…Then He placed mountains on the earth; blessed it (the earth), and decreed in it its provisions in* ***four days****…. Then He focused to the sky which was* ***smoke****, and He said to*

it and to the earth: ***'Come to Us willingly or unwillingly'. They said: 'We come willingly.'***
Then He made it into seven heavens (skies) within ***two days****, and He revealed (commanded) for every sky its affair. And, We beautified the sky of the world with lanterns and a means of protection. This is the decree of (Allah) The Mighty, The Wise."*
(*Haameem As-Sajdah, 9, 10, 11 & 12)*

The sky was smoke which was then fashioned by the Command of Allah Ta'ala into seven heavens. Smoke was the substance from which the Heavens were created just as man was created from sand, and jinn from fire, and the Malaaikah from Noor. Allah Ta'ala spoke to the earth and the smoke and commanded their obedience which they offered in submission. But all of this is fiction for Baboonists.

It is therefore ludicrously irrational to proffer the rare view in substantiation of the *similarity* claimed by Taqi who posited the ridiculous postulate of 'closeness'. He hallucinated a 'closeness' between the Command of Allah Azza Wajal to the *Samaawaat and Ardh* to cleave asunder, and the Big Baboon Bang. It is explicit kufr to seek to establish a relationship of 'closeness' between the Command of Allah Azza Wa Jal and the effects of the hallucinated Baboon Bang.

(4) It is not permissible to steer away from the *Zaahir* meanings of the Qur'aan Majeed on which is based the view of the Jamhoor, and to adopt an obscure apodalic view. Such extravagation is evidence for an impuissant mind which has collapsed in the state of intellectual explosion. Certainly, there is a marked *similarity* between a big bang intellectual explosion and the kind of 'explosion' claimed for the big baboon bang.

(5) There is absolutely no support for the kufr propounded by Taqi in the decrepit view which states the non-existence of the heavens and earth at the time Allah Ta'ala commanded them to split.

DEEPER INTO THE CAULDRON OF KUFR

In defence of Taqi, the jaahil supporter descends deeper into the cauldron of kufr with his implication of the non-existence of the physical *Samaawaat* (heavens/skies). Thus, blurting out his copro kufr, he alleges:

"The same applies to the argument about the physical sky. The latest booklet (i.e. of Ta'leemuddeen Madrasah) says science does not believe in a physical sky, while Islam teaches seven

heavens. But the earlier article already quoted Alusi discussing the possibility that the blue colour we see is not the actual heaven itself. In other words, he allows the possibility that the blue colour is simply an appearance in the layers of air."

In defence of the *faux pas* of Taqi Sahib, his supporter has degenerated deeper into the cauldron of kufr with his stupid defence. In his garbled defence he has proffered a view which has no relevance to the discussion of the subject being criticized.

There is no gainsaying that in terms of the Big Baboon Bang kufr, the seven Heavens do not exist. Such denial is KUFR. Alusi's view does not negate the physical bodies of the seven heavens. The 'blue colour' is not stated in negation or denial of the seven physical heavenly structures or of the first Samaa' to which the Qur'aan and Hadith repeatedly refer and confirm. It is indurate kufr to present a theory which denies the *physical* existence of the seven *Samaawaat* and also the seven *Ardh*, then to scrounge like a sewer rat for straws and crumbs to fabricate a defence from some unrelated concept of a Mufassir.

The contention is not and never was that the *blue*

colour is the final word regarding the First Samaa'. The blue colour has not been postulated as being the only absolute Truth and that no other view posited for the First Samaa' is tenable. Alusi's postulation does not deny the existence of the seven Heavens. His discussion and interpretation pertain to the colour, which in no way whatever is nugatory of the existence of the seven Heavens.

Now whether the blue colour is that of the actual First Samaa' (Sky) or some natural phenomenon as Alusi has postulated, is irrelevant to our current discussion which centres on the Baboon. The concern is to impale the Baboon which Taqi and his ilk have elevated to the degree of Islamic credence. Regarding this impaling of the baatil Baboon Big Bang and its excoriation, the Qur'aan Majeed says: *"In fact, We strike baatil with the Haqq, then it (the Haqq) smashes out its (baatil's) brains."*

Introducing the blue colour argument is simply a red herring designed for deflecting the focus of the critics from the irreverent Baboon venerated by Taqi's elevation. No amount of attempted deflection from the pivotal elevated Baboon by means of introducing irrelevant concepts of the Mufassireen will detract from the abhorrent gaffe

of Taqi. He has attempted to paint the Big Bang fiction with Qur'aanic veracity.

The Qur'aan Majeed in numerous Aayaat affirms the existence of the seven physical Heavens. The Hadith of Mi'raaj adequately describes the Seven Heavens. Alusi proffered an opinion pertaining to the *blue colour* we are seeing. What is that colour? We are in this discourse not concerned with the answer nor with the conjecturing views and opinions which attempt to answer this question. The answer to this question regarding the *blue colour* does not feature in our topical discussion nor does it in any way whatsoever exonerate Taqi Sahib of his kufr *faux pas.*

No one had contended that the *blue colour* visible to us is absolutely the actual physical heaven. This is another discussion which has been subjected to considerable speculation and conjecturing which have no relationship with our refutation of the ultimate blunder committed by Taqi Sahib.

Every argument proffered by Taqi's supporters is stupid and spurious. Their attempt is only to deflect the focus from the kufr gaffe of Taqi. By hallucinating a 'closeness' between the Big Bang Baboon and the interpretations of the Mufassireen

pertaining to *Ratq/Fatq,* Taqi has provided credibility for the Kufr Baboon theory. With his 'closeness' idea he is promoting the Big Baboon Bang fiction of the atheists. He has not done any favour for the Deen or for Muslims by elevating the Baboon Fiction to the level of credibility.

There is not a vestige of similarity and closeness between Islam and anything excreted by the Baboon Fiction. What need did Taqi discern for introducing this horrid abhorrent kufr theory in the commentary of the Qur'aanic Aayat? Why did he attempt to forge a 'closeness' between Islam and the most abominable theory of kufr? Understand well that by claiming that the Big Baboon Bag theory is close to an Islamic concept, Taqi is subtly promoting the Big Bang theory which posits the Ape as the ancestral progenitor of Hadhrat Aadam (Alayhis salaam) – Nauthubillah!

The concepts of the Mufassireen are not extrapolated from kufr theories. They never resorted to interpreting a kufr idea to conform with the Qur'aan. Their concepts are independent views and conjecturing which do not conflict with any tenet, principle and belief of Islam. On the contrary, the Big Baboon Fiction is pregnant with compounded kufr. It consists of nothing but kufr,

plus kufr, plus kufr.

In opposition to the methodology of the Mufassireen, Taqi based his 'closeness' idea as a relationship between the Qur'aan and the Baboon Fiction thus conferring credence to the Baboon kufr.

EXISTENCE OF THE EARTH

Presenting another stupid defence, the supporter says:

"The next objection is that the earth was already there before the 'Fath', so the verse cannot have any similarity to the Big Bang. But the earlier response already showed that Imam Razi mentions five explanations of the verse, not only the few that are being mentioned in the Taleemuddeen booklet. One of the explanations is that the heavens and the earth were not in existence and Allah brought them into existence."

Firstly, it was never contended that the earth has no temporal origin. Most certainly at one stage there was no earth. Then Allah Ta'ala created it. Allah Ta'ala created the earth, not the Big Baboon of the fiction of the atheists which Taqi has entertained as a valid possibility for the creation of the earth. The 'closeness' hallucinated by Taqi is therefore

explicit kufr.

Furthermore, the issue of contention is not the time when the earth came into existence. The issue being contended and for which Taqi is being excoriated is the 'closeness' which Taqi has imagined and on the basis of which he has bestowed credibility to the Big Bang *khuraafat (mullock, rubbish).* There exists perfect unanimity on the fact that the earth had at one time not existed.

The Big Baboon Bang according to the atheist proponents occurred about 14 billion years ago. The miscreant supporter clutching at a straw is at pains to convey the idea that the *Ratq/Fatq* also occurred 14 billion years ago to coincide with the Big Bang corrupt idea of the atheists. To concede this preposterous idea is tantamount to accept the validity of the kufr doctrine of the atheists pertaining to the Big Bang theory and all the rubbish it gave birth to.

Regardless of the variety of concepts and theories the Mufassireen have conjectured, there is no basis in all these ideas for the 'closeness' mullock hallucinated by Taqi. The Mufassireen with their concepts operated within the confines of the

Shariah. They ventured explanations for issues which the Shariah (Qur'aan ad Hadith) left ambiguous or unexplained. The Mufassireen did not seek to corroborate an outside concept with their explanations as Taqi has criminally done. Taqi has sought to sustain the Big Baboon Bang on the basis of some totally unrelated concept of the Mufassireen. Thus, he was not concerned with the defence of Islam. His objective was to confer credibility to the Big Baboon by hook or crook.

Although there is no need for sustaining our refutation to explore the details presented by Imaam Raazi pertaining to the five concepts of *Ratq and Fatq, nevertheless,* merely for demonstrating the ignorance of Taqi's defender we shall proffer a cursory synopsis of Imaam Raazi's exposition.

First Concept

This is the concept of Hasan (Al-Basri), Qataadah, Saeed Bin Jubair and a narration of Ikramah from Ibn Abbaas (Radhiyallahu ahum). The meaning (i.e. of *Ratq and Fatq*) is that both (Heavens and earth) were one conjoined body. Then Allah split them and raised the *Samaa'* to where it is, and left the earth in its substratum.

This concept necessitates that the creation of the earth preceded the creation of the *Samaa'* because when Allah Ta'ala separated the two, He left the earth wherever it was, and He raised the heavenly parts.

Ka'b said: "Allah created the Heavens and the earth conjoined. Then He created the wind between them, and He split them by means of the wind.

Second Concept

This is the view of Abu Saalih and Mujaahid. The *Samaawaat* were joined. Then they were split into seven Heavens. The same applies to the *Ardhoon* (Seven Earths).

Third Concept

This is the concept of Ibn Abbaas, Al-Hasan and of the majority of the Mufassireen. The *Samaawaat* and the *Ardh* were joined uniformly and solidly. Then Allah opened the heaven with rain and the earth with vegetation and trees. They (the Mufassiroon) gave preference to this view over all other views on the basis of Allah's statement mentioned after this (after the *Ratq/Fatq* aayat),

namely: *"We created from water every living thing."...*

Fourth Concept

This is the view of Abu Muslim Al-Isfahaani. It is valid to say that the meaning of *fatq* is *Ijaad (to bring into existence)* and *Izhaar (to make manifest)....*

(Note: Rejecting this far-fetched interpretation, Imaam Raazi comments: *'I say: In reality, verily, adam (i.e. non-existence) is pure nothing. There are no different factors and distinct essences in it. On the contrary it is a single undifferentiated state. It is only when existence takes place that entities (that is in the state of existence) become separate and different".)*

Fifth Concept

The night precedes the day… The *Samaawaat* and the *Ardh* were initially dark. Then Allah illuminated them by bringing forth daylight.

(Imaam Raazi then comments): If it is asked: 'Which of these interpretations is more befitting the obvious meaning (of the Qur'aan)? We say: The obvious meaning is that the Samaa' is in the state it is, and the earth in the state it is while both were *ratq* (jointly existing). It is not possible for both to be so without being in existence. *Ratq* is the

opposite of *Fatq*. Thus, since *fatq* means to separate, *ratq* necessarily means being joined. On this basis the fourth and fifth concepts are *marjooh (not preferable). Thus the first concept is preferable, followed by the second view…."*

(End of Imaam Raazi's elaboration)

In these five opinions in which there is considerable conjecture, none has the slightest relevance or reference to the Big Baboon Fiction which Taqi and his clique are laboriously and painfully slogging and struggling to create a similarity and a closeness. There is absolutely no support for the Baboon Fiction even if it is baselessly assumed that the Divine Command was issued prior to the existence of the Heavens and earth. The 'closeness' hallucinated by Taqi is pure mullock - satanic rubbish just as is the Big Baboon Fiction satanic rubbish.

In the assumed non-existence of the Heavens and earth at the juncture of the command of *Ratq* and *Fatq* there is no condonation for the Baboon Big Fiction. The contention of Taqi defies credulity. He has stupidly attempted to convey the abominable idea of the Big Baboon Bang being equated to the *Fatq/Ratq* command of Allah Azza Wa Jal while the proponents of this Fiction absolutely reject any

such notion which postulates seven heavens and seven earths having come into existence as an effect of their Big Baboon Bang hallucination.

If Taqi had devoted some time to a proper research of the Big Bang theory, he would have understood the absolute stupidity and kufr of his idea of similarity and closeness.

The scientists dwelling in satanic confusion proffer a variety of theories for even the origin of their Big Baboon Fiction. They even believe that this Big Bang thing will repeat itself endlessly. It is a cycle of collapse and explosion which may repeat itself endlessly. What did Taqi see and understand in this rubbish kufr theory to constrain him to join the gang of morons who have excreted this satanic Baboon theory?

It is essential that he and all of like-thinking should understand that acceptance of the Big Baboon Fiction necessitates belief in the primordial ancestor of Hadhrat Aadam (Alayhis salaam) having been an ape – *Nauthubillah*, whereas the Qur'aan Majeed unequivocally states that Hadhrat Aadam (Alayhis salaam) had no ancestor and that he was created a perfect *Insaan* in Jannat for whom even the Malaaikah had to prostrate.

What has caused Taqi Sahib to slip so badly and to land deep into the pit of kufr by aligning himself to the Big Baboon Fiction which postulates that the progenital ancestor of *Insaan* was a 'great ape'? May Allah Ta'ala save our Imaan. *"Imaan is suspended between fear and hope."*

THE VEILED DEFENCE

The supporter of Taqi says: *"So major Mufassiroon clearly allowed six days to mean six periods or stages. Nobody is saying this proves billions of years. The point is simply that saying this understanding has "no basis in Islam" is not correct when these mufassiroon themselves mentioned it."*

This averment is a veiled condonation of the Big Baboon Fiction, intentionally or unintentionally. The meanings of the Mufassiroon are all independent, totally unrelated to the Baboon Fiction whereas the idea of 'closeness' proffered by Taqi and defended by his clique, is specifically designed in defence of the Big Baboon Fiction. Thus, it is incorrect to vindicate Taqi's idea on the basis of the meanings tendered by the Mufassireen.

Taqi's idea is associated with the Big Baboon

Fiction, and this is where he departs from the Straight Path of the Mufassireen. Although much of what the Mufassiroon have explained on this issue is opinion and conjecture, they did not present their concepts to afford any credibility to the Baboon Fiction with which Taqi has hallucinated a 'closeness'. It is therefore entirely correct to say that there is no basis in Islam for the 'closeness' Taqi has imagined.

Furthermore there is a sinister dimension underlying Taqi's imagination. The very idea of the Big Bang is abhorrent to Muslims and to Allah Azza Wa Jal. Imaan violently repels the Big Bang kufr. So why did Taqi mellow to it and sought to strike an acceptable cord for it? Warning of such inclinations towards kuffaar and their ideologies, the Qur'aan Majeed says:

"And, do not incline towards those who commit zulm (that is kufr), for then the Fire shall reach you, and you will then have no friends besides Allah, then you will not be helped."
(Hood, Aayat 113)

Inclining in any way whatsoever towards the kuffaar zaalimeen, the atheists being the worse, invites the Fire of Jahannam. It is on account of

Taqi's association with the kuffaar riba banks and with the fussaaq and fujjaar in general that he inclines heavily towards them. Thus, his apologetic attitude constrains him to make some of their blatantly kufr and haraam theories and practices pliant with Islam.

Whether the six days mentioned in the Qur'aan regarding the creation of the earth refers to six normal 24 hour days or to lengthy periods of time has no relevance to the charge against Taqi Sahib. There is no substance of support for anything of the kufr Big Baboon Bang in the six days or six stages which were the effects of the Command *'Kun! (Be!)* of Allah Azza Wa Jal whereas every facet of the Big Bang Fiction is satanic kufr. A theory which is rotten with kufr - its every detail being putrefied kufr – can never be described as being close to any Islamic concept. This is the dangerous terrain into which Taqi has allowed himself to become soiled and trapped.

And, even if the six days had to be billions of years, (but for which there is not the slightest vestige of Shar'i evidence), then too would it have been egregiously erroneous to attribute closeness of the Baboon theory to the Islamic concept for the simple reason that the Big Baboon Fiction is in

total denial of the existence of Allah Azza Wa Jal, and any inclination towards it is likewise kufr.

THE KUFR OF TAQI'S DEFENDER

Exposing his own kufr, the miserable defender of Taqi says:

"The most serious issue is still the claim that the Big Bang theory itself is kufr and shirk because it ***supposedly*** *means the universe came into existence without a Creator……The scientific theory is about a physical process and the development of the universe from a hot dense state. The belief that Allah did not create it is a separate atheistic belief. A Muslim can believe that any physical process took place by the creation and power of Allah. An atheist can look at the same process and deny Allah. Those are two different issues."* (The underlining/bold emphasis is ours)

This averment is pregnant with kufr. The kufr of the chap is conspicuously percolating from this statement. His skulduggery defence of Taqi, in addition to being devoid of substance, is in reality a defence of the Big Baboon Fiction which these wayward molvis are at pains to paint with Islamic colours.

There is no ***supposition*** regarding the Big Bang

theory. Why did the fellow say '*supposedly'*? The use of this term signifying a *supposition*, not an established fact, is for diluting the kufr of the Baboon theory. He has attempted to dilute the abomination of the indurate kufr of this shataani theory.

The theory does not *suppose* the universe's existence without a Creator. It categorically denies the existence of the Creator. All the scientists and the primordial fabricator of this baboonery fraud unanimously deny the existence of the Creator, of the Heavens and the *seven* earths. Thus, the universe minus the Creator is a confirmed belief of the proponents of the Big Baboon theory.

The 'scientific process' mentioned by the fellow is a satanic baboonery process in which the Creator does not at all feature according to the atheist scientists. So why does this miscreant fellow laboriously struggle to accord credibility to a theory of explicit kufr by averring that "a Muslim can believe" in what the atheists have propounded about the Baboon Fiction? Everything is in the power of Allah Ta'ala. But the irrefutable fact is that the Big Baboon Bang is a kufr fiction which Taqi and his miserable clique are painfully labouring to hoist in the Ummah. Just what is the

sinister objective for reading credibility into the worst theory of kufr which is an absolute denial of the existence of Allah Azza Wa Jal?

Instead of deriding and rejecting this concept of the vilest form of kufr, they resort to spurious arguments to dilute with unrelated explanations of the Mufassireen the notoriety of the theory and to make it acceptable to Muslims. All their baseless arguments are designed to deceive ignoramuses by bestowing credibility and 'islamic' acceptability to this Baboon Fiction.

The fellow has employed considerable skulduggery with his claim of 'two separate issues'. There are no two separate issues germane to the Big Baboon Fiction. The scientific theory in this regard is pure kufr. This may not be swept under the carpet by means of skulduggery, claiming that Allah Ta'ala has the power to have created the universe in the manner the Baboon theory postulates. Allah Ta'ala undoubtedly has the *Qudrat* to create anything, but to support kufr on the basis of the creative power of Allah Ta'ala is never permissible. The dunderhead has excreted pure nonsense.

The reincarnation belief of the mushrikeen is kufr. Allah Ta'ala most certainly has the power to decree

such a process. But it is not permissible to argue in favour of this kufr doctrine because it is abhorrent kufr. Allah Ta'ala has the power to create speech in the idols the Hindus worship. He is able to create in the stone idols the ability to execute many actions. But it is not permissible to believe in idols having power if some mushrikeen claim that some millions of years ago these idols had divine powers, hence they are worshipping them today. It will be kufr to say that such a belief of the mushrikeen is because Allah Ta'ala has the power to create life in idols.

Allah Ta'ala has the power to eliminate Jannat and Jahannam. He has the power to assign all the Ambiya and Muttaaqeen to Jahannam and send all the shayaateen and kuffaar to Jannat. But it is not permissible to believe so on the basis of Allah's power. It is kufr to entertain such a belief. Exactly in the same way it is kufr to believe in the Big Baboon Fiction simply because Allah Ta'ala has the power to create what the atheists have imagined, namely, their big baboon progenitor of the universe.

Sight must not be lost of the vilest kufr effect of this Baboon Fiction, and that is that *Insaan* developed from a 'great ape' whose primordial progenitor was the fictitious Big Bang. Solely on

this basis of attributing the origin of Hadhrat Aadam (Alayhis salaam) to an ape – Nauthubillah! – is it kufr for any Muslim to accord credibility to the Big Baboon Fiction.

We repeat here the satanic *sanad* linking man to the Big Baboon Bang progenitor:
Big Bang → first atoms → stars → heavier elements → galaxies and planets → Earth → life → evolution → humans

Minus the Big Baboon ancestor, there would have been no human beings. This is the kufr which Taqi and his clique are laboriously and abortively vindicating. There are no two separate issues in this discussion. The fact is that it is not permissible to offer credibility to this vile, abhorrent kufr theory.

ZIGZAGGING DOES NOT EXONERATE

The supporter of Taqi says: *"Mufti Taqi never said the Quran teaches Big Bang theory. He only pointed out a similarity between the classical explanation and a modern theory……"*

In fact, he implied what the moron is denying. Taqi said:
"The contemporary research about the Big Bang is close to this description."

After dropping this kufr stink bomb, Taqi made no further comment to deride or refute the kufr theory. What does any reader understand from this terse comment? Any person reading the comment will gain the understanding that the Big Bang is a credible theory along with its Baboonery. It was precisely this impression which constrained Ta'leemuddeen Madrasah to refute the mullock arising from this veiled 'tafseer' proffered by Taqi. Taqi has claimed a 'closeness' with Islam for it, hence ignoramuses will gain the idea that the Big Baboon Fiction is credible and acceptable in Islam.

In fact, Taqi has attempted to paint the Baboon Fiction with Qur'aanic hues, hence he shoved his comment into the tafseer of the Aayat. Now he laments that he was not making tafseer of the Qur'aan with the Baboon fiction. His comment was not an isolated statement during some secular discussion. His gaffe must be viewed in the context of Qur'aan Tafseer. He had made the comment in the light of Aayat 30 of Surah Al-Ambiyaa. Now shedding tears of complaint are of no avail. Of avail and of imperative need is to retract the gaffe. By retracting he will not be diminishing whatever status he may still be having.

Furthermore, his ludicrous claim of 'closeness' has no basis in the methodology of the Mufassiroon who proffer commentary based on opinion and even on far-fetched conjecturing. While some the views of the Mufassireen were opinions *(raai)* unbacked by *Nusoos,* they were not kufr. They did not formulate opinions and ideas in support of any kufr theory. On the contrary, Taqi's 'closeness' mullock and the entire defence of his *chelas* are calculated for bestowing credibility to the kufr Big Baboon *ghutha.* Thus, there is no entitlement for these deviates to cite the Mufassiroon in their bid to bolster the kufr claim of Taqi.

There is absolutely no similarity between the Big Baboon Fiction and the "classical" explanation. This is a deceptive canard. Nothing in the classical explanation resembles the Baboon Fiction in any aspect whatsoever. The similarity is the hallucination of Taqi Sahib. The very motive underlying the attempt to pass off the Baboon kufr with the baseless 'similarity' idea is sinister. It is motivated to accommodate the pernicious schemes of the Yahood and Nasaara atheists, hence Taqi has discerned the need to mellow the concepts and Ahkaam of the Shariah to make them palatable to those who are paying the dollars for his riba products affixed with halaal labels.

The claim by Taqi's supporter that the criticism against Taqi is *'far too strong'*, is bereft of substance. Kufr is vile, but the kufr of the Baboon Fiction is the vilest. A theory which postulates that the primordial ancestor of Hadhrat Aadam (Alayhis salaam) was a 'great ape' – Nauthubillah! – is kufr of the worst kind. He who attempts to bestow credibility to this vilest of all kufr theories deserves stronger criticism than the mild analysis presented by Ta'leemuddeen. He needs to be impaled and excoriated.

On the basis of some hallucinated assumption, even if there are any aspects in the Big Baboon Fiction which could be interpreted as being acceptable – but in reality there are none – then too it will not be permissible to entertain the theory because of its abhorrent kufr denial of the Creator and the claim that the progenitor of *Insaan* was a Big Baboon.

All the zigzaggery employed by the supporters of Taqi to exonerate him from the kufr gravity of his *faux pas* are of no avail. The only way of exoneration is Retraction.

THE IMAGINATION OF THE SUPPORTER

The jaahil supporter of Taqi alleges: *"Once*

quotations have been brought from Razi, Baydawi, Naysaburi, Abu Saud, Alusi, Khafaji and Mufti Shafi Saheb, those quotations need to be answered properly."

Firstly, not a single of the 'quotations' proffered by the jaahil has any relevance to the Big Baboon Fiction. There is no basis whatsoever in the 'quotations' for vindicating Taqi's gaffe. The views stated in the 'quotations' pertain to other issues. Never did the Mufassireen relate their opinions to the Big Baboon Fiction kufr theory.

Secondly, in the aforegoing pages, we have adequately rebutted whatever rubbish the juhala had structured on the basis of the views of the Mufassireen. The quotations have been grossly misappropriated and misused for the simple reason that the opinions and methodology of the Mufassireen may not be extended to the Big Baboon Fiction Kufr. There is no kufr in the views of the Mufassireen nor vindication for any kufr theory. Thus, it is deception coupled with stupidity to strike a chord of similarity between the 'classical' Mufassireen and the Big Baboon Fiction.

MUFTI SHAFI'S OPINION

In another futile attempt, the jaahil says: *"Mufti Shafi Saheb also explains that As-Samaa' does not always have to mean one of the actual seven heavens. Sometimes it can simply mean the region or space above us…….So was Mufti Shafi also misunderstanding the Quran? Was Alusi also wrong for discussing this possibility?"*

Yes, the possibility of misunderstanding is not remote. Any opinion unsubstantiated by *Nusoos* comes with the attribute of error and misunderstanding. However, the current contention is the issue of KUFR – the kufr of the Big Baboon Fiction. The discussion does not revolve around the variety of opinions pertaining to the seven Heavens which none of the Mufassireen deny. The view of Mufti Shafi and of Alusi has no relationship with the Big Baboon Fiction. Their views pertain to an entirely different subject which is beyond the ambit of the discussion regarding the Big Baboon Fiction.

Whether *As-Samaa' (the first heaven)* refers to the actual first of the seven Heavens or to space or to whatever else is not our discussion, concern and contention. Furthermore, there is no *Wahi* to corroborate the view expressed by Mufti Shafi Sahib and Alusi. Their views are fundamentally the

products of their minds – pure raai. In fact, the conspicuously clear Qur'aanic verses override the opinion of Mufti Shafi Sahib and of Alusi. In terms of the Qur'aan, the very sky we observe is the First Samaa'. Thus, Allah Ta'ala states:

"Verily, We have beautified the sky of the world with the adornment of the stars and as a guard against every rebellious shaitaan."
(As-Saaffaat, Aayats 6 & 7)

"Verily, We have adorned As-Samaa Ad-Dunya (the sky of the world) with lanterns and We have made them (the lanterns, i.e. the stars) a means of striking the shayaateen and We have prepared for them the Punishment of the Blazing Fire."
(Al-Mulk, Aayat 5)

These Aayaat explicitly override the opinions of Mufti Shafi' Sahib and of Alusi. Allah Ta'ala states explicitly and with emphasis that the First Samaa' (Heaven), the sky of this world – the sky we see, has been decorated with stars, etc. Now any opinion conflicting with this *Sareeh Nass* is set aside and dismissed as erroneous. Great Ulama also err.

Whether the sky we see is the First Heaven or not is irrelevant. Germane to the Big Baboon Fiction

being refuted in this treatise, the issue of the skies/heavens is a red herring introduced by the deviates to deflect the focus from the actual subject of discussion, and that is the Big Baboon Fiction.

TWO SPURIOUS QUESTIONS

Another moron defender of Taqi Sahib, has posed two questions in his attempt to vindicate the gaffe of Taqi. The two questions were directed at Madrasah Ta'leemuddeen who had refuted Taqi's support for the Big Baboon Bang.

First Question

"We have not been able to find where Mufti Saheb has said such things, and we are looking in the wrong Kitaab. If this is the case, we humbly request that you guide us to the right Kitaab."

Answer

Either this interlocutor is genuinely stupid or he feigns stupidity in a bid to proffer a semblance of defence for the indefensible. In the tafseer of Aayat 30 of Surah Al-Ambiya, Taqi states with clarity and conviction:

"The words ratq and fatq used here have another

meaning which is being compact' and 'being separated". If these words are taken in this sense, the verse may also be translated as, "The heavens and the earth were compact, then We separated them." In this case the verse will refer to an event of the early creation, meaning thereby that the heavens and the earth were originally a single body. Thereafter Allah separated the earth from the heavens. The contemporary research about the Big Bang is close to this description."

Taqi has presented an interpretation which he himself describes as a tafseer of the Aayat. Thus he said: *"**In this case the verse will refer to an event of the early creation,…"*** The attempt to wriggle out of the Baboon Mess by saying that he did not give tafseer of the Aayat with his Big Bang comment, is a blatant lie. His comment is a clear indication signifying validity and Islamic credibility for the Big Baboon Bang kufr fiction.

Furthermore, the jaahil should ask Taqi to elaborate on the conundrum of 'contemporary research'. What is this nonsense? He states unequivocally that the *Big Bang is close to the tafseer which the Mufassireen had given.* This is blatantly false. It is a laborious, but abortive attempt, to portray that the Big Bang Kufr has Islamic credibility and

acceptability.

Purely on the basis of the heavens having been 'compact', i.e. being joined together, according to one interpretation, Taqi Sahib hastened to proffer his baatil interpretation of 'closeness'. But there is not a semblance of 'closeness' between what the Mufassireen have interpreted and what the Big Baboon Fiction postulates.

In the belief of the Big Baboon Bang there were no Heavens and earth existing when this big bang fiction was supposed to have happened whereas the interpretation of the Mufassireen applies to the existing heaven and earth which were cleaved asunder into seven heavens and seven earths. There is absolutely no closeness such as that hallucinated by Taqi. He fabricated the 'closeness' theory to cloak the kufr Big Baboon Bang with Islamic credibility.

The 'contemporary' stupid research still to this day denies the existence of the Creator and of the seven heavens and seven earths. What 'closeness' did Taqi see and imagine in the two mutually repelling concepts?

The stupid supporter's question is dismissed with

contempt. It is bereft of any substance. It is a question arising from dishonesty.

The Second Question

"Taleemuddeen Isipingo have erred and attributed a false claim to the honourable Mufti Saheb. If this is the case, then we urge you to retract your statement and rectify what you have said. This was the way of the Akaabir of the Ulama of Deoband. More importantly, you should also seek forgiveness from Mufti Saheb."

Answer

Undoubtedly, there has been an error. In fact it is a momentous gaffe, and that gaffe is the grotesque error of kufr of Taqi Sahib. Ta'leemuddeen did not commit any error. The charge against Taqi is 100% valid and correct.

While a retraction is imperative, it has to emanate from Taqi who is guilty of having shoved a kufr theory into the Qur'aan for conferring Islamic credibility to the Big Baboon Bang kufr fiction. He has to retract and apologize, not Ta'leemuddeen.

In addition to his retraction he should offer a public Taubah for his kufr gaffe.

TAQI'S DISHONEST RIDER

The rider, viz. *"But it should always be kept in mind that the Qur'anic descriptions are independent of any scientific theory and the Qur'an should not be made subject to ever-changing theories.",* which Taqi added to his 'closeness' mullock was a window he left open to enable himself to jump from the criticism which he perceived would follow in the wake of his acceptance of the Big Baboon Bang Fiction.

His statement is self-contradictory. He is in conflict with himself. By submitting the 'Qur'aanic description' to the Baboon theory or vice versa, he is guilty of doing exactly what he cautions against. His cautioning is dishonest. All those who read his comment immediately gain the idea of the credibility and acceptability of the Big Bang rubbish kufr theory.

Many people have written to query about Taqi's comment. We reproduce one such letter from a UK brother:

Assalaamu Alaykum Warahmatullahi Wabarakatuh

Recently, the topic of Mufti Taqi and The Big Bang Theory

came up. Many Muslims grow up under the Western Education System and get influenced by Modern Science.

After seeing the writing of Mufti Taqi, one can imagine the influence it could have on people, since there is the influence of secular education already. The child is sent to Nursey at 4 and leaves College around 18. They spend many years in that System…..

Then to see the writing of Mufti Taqi, given the Title of Shaykhul Islaam, it is not difficult to imagine the strong effect it could have on people, especially when you have narratives like Scientific Miracles of the Quraan Shareef. Upon reading it, the person could see it possibly as a confirmation of their ''Science Education''. Please comment on Mufti Taqi's Big Bang commentary. *(End of the letter)*

Taqi's comment has created much confusion in the minds of Muslims who firmly believe in the Kufr of the Big Bang theory which has as an imperative corollary the theory of evolution which postulates that *Insaan* developed from a 'great ape'. According to Islam, the first *Insaan* was Hadhrat Aadam (Alayhis salaam). Thus by cloaking the Big Baboon Bang kufr fiction with credibility, Taqi has implied that the primordial ancestor of Hadhrat Aadam (Alayhis salaam) was –Nauthubillah! - the 'great ape' postulated by the Kufr theory in which Taqi sees a 'closeness' with the interpretations of the Mufassireen. May Allah Ta'ala save our Imaan.

The Mashaaikh say:

"Imaan is suspended between fear and hope."

No one has any guarantee that he will leave this dunya with his Imaan intact. Sometimes and for some erudition in Knowledge constitutes a great calamity. In the current era even cheap-skate molvis with their smattering of defective textual knowledge gain the idea of them being 'mujtahids'.

Then there are those who despite beg qualified in textual knowledge and excelling in erudition, lack fear for Allah Ta'ala. Their brains are disfigured with *hub-e-jaah ad hub-e-maal*. They become great dangers for the Imaan and Akhlaaq of the masses. About them, Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) said:

"I fear most for my Ummah the Aimmah Mudhilleen (i.e. molvis, muftis and fake buzrugs Who deceive and mislead the masses)."

They abound in this era. Only Allah Ta'ala can protect our Imaan and save us from plunging into the snare of the agents of Iblees. While the Shariah constrains us to criticize and condemn, we are fearful of the end. We do not know in which category Allah Ta'ala will assign us. We request that readers supplicate to Allah Ta'ala for the

safety of our Imaan. The dividing line between Ikhlaas and Riya is extremely fine. At this point even accomplished Auliya sometimes falter.

CONCLUSION

The summary of our rebuttal of the red herring deceptive defence of the juhala supporters of Taqi Sahib is concise:

(1) The Big Baboon Bang Fiction is pure kufr of the vilest kind.

(2) Taqi Sahib, despite his struggle to wriggle out from the mess of his baatil interpretation, has given credibility to the Baboon theory. He has introduced his 'closeness' idea into the tafseer of Aayat 30 of Surah Al-Ambiyaa.

(3) He has attempted to show that the Big Baboon Fiction can be accommodated in Islam.

(4) His defenders have employed skulduggery by seeking to divert the focus from Taqi's gaffe. They did so by bringing into the picture views and interpretations of the Mufassireen which have absolutely no relationship to the Big Baboon Bang Fiction of the atheists.

(5) Acceptance of the Big Baboon Bang Fiction is tantamount to accepting that the primordial

progenitor of *Insaan* was a 'great ape'. The first Insaan was Hadhrat Aadam (Alayhis salaam).

(6) Believing that the Big Bang theory is credible or possible is kufr – kufr which expels from the fold of Islam.

"In fact, We strike baatil with the Haqq which smashes out its (baatil's) brains."
(Qur'aan)

INGEMINATION

In this brief discussion we have resorted copiously to ingemination. This is by design in emulation of the style of the Qur'aan Majeed. This style is necessary for retaining the focus on the pivot of the discussion for a proper understanding.

Ingeminate means to repeat over and over.