

**The Evil Bid'ah Of  
Mawlid  
Milaad  
Moulood**

**(A REFUTATION OF THE FALLACIOUS  
ARGUMENTS OF A BID'ATI MOLVI)**

**Published by:  
The Mujlisul Ulama of Sout Africa  
P.O.Box 3393, Port Elizabeth, 6056  
South Africa**

## TRASH DEFENCE

In a trash defence of the evil Bid'ah practice of moulood, a Bid'ati molvi, Zahid Hussain, framed ten questions for which he provides stupid arguments bereft of Shar'i substance. Before embarking on a detailed refutation of his flotsam and jetsam arguments in support of the Bid'ah practice of moulood / mawlid, a few principles for better understanding of the nonsensical claims of the Bid'ati molvi shall be explained.

### **(1) Ibaadat is established by explicit *Nusoos* of the Qur'aan and Sunnah**

All Muslims are aware that Islam was perfected and completed during the very age of Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam), and it is no longer in need of improvement, hence the termination of Nubuwwat. If there was scope for improvement in the Deen, Nubuwwat would not have ended, but would have continued as was the divine system prior to Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam). Announcing the perfection and completion of Islam, Allah Ta'ala says in the Qur'aan Majeed:

*“This Day have I perfected for you (O Mu'mineen!) your Deen, and I have completed for you My Favour, and I have chosen Islam as Deen for you.”*

*Ibaadat* (Worship) is only what Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam), his Sahaabah and the Salafus Saaliheen of *Khairul Quroon* (the first three noble Ages of Islam) practised. After *Khairul Quroon*, all practices in the form of worship, are evil accretions called Bid'ah about which Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) said:

*“The vilest things are innovations (bid’aat). Every Bid’ah is dhalaalah (deviation).”*

*“Whoever innovates in this our Affair (i.e. the Deen) that which is not of it, verily, he is rejected.”*

There are numerous Ahaadith condemning innovation. Despite being aware of these Ahaadith, the Bid’atis deliberately ignore them or assign to them utterly baseless interpretations. The fact is that Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) condemned bid’ah (innovation). Bid’ah in the context does not refer to mundane/worldly issues. It refers to innovation in Deeni matters (*Amrina haatha*). The worst of such acts of innovation are acts given the form of worship – ‘worship’ which never existed during *Khairul Quroon*.

It should not be difficult for an unbiased person in the quest of the Truth to understand that Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) did condemn and prohibit bid’ah, and that such bid’ah refers to acts innovated into the Deen. It never refers to mundane things such as vehicles, weapons, clocks and the thousands of other necessary amenities of life which we now possess, but which had not existed during *Khairul Quroon*.

The attempt to justify new acts of ‘worship’ such as mawlid / moulood on the basis of Madrasahs, Kitaabs and the like is absolutely fallacious. Such beneficial innovations are not innovations into the Deen. Such amenities are not acts of Ibaadat. Such new introductions do not tamper with any act of the Deen. On the contrary, they promote and enhance the very Sunnah taught by Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam).

Evil and reprehensible bid’ah does not pertain to methodology which is introduced to promote the very teachings of the

Qur'aan and Sunnah as were taught by Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) and the Sahaabah. As long as the method is not in violation of any teaching, principle or spirit of the Deen, it will be accepted and laudable. But a new act promoted as Ibaadat is evil Bid'ah, even if flagrant acts of sin are not associated with it. Thus, if instead of two rak'ats for Fajr, four are performed intentionally, then such a musalli is destined for Hell-Fire because he has introduced a bid'ah into the Deen, and that bid'ah is evil.

## **(2) Ibaadat cannot be formulated on the literal meanings of Qur'aanic and Hadith words**

As mentioned above, Ibaadat is only what was handed to us by Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) and the Sahaabah. Any form with an outer veneer of 'ibaadat' introduced after the era of *Khairul Quroon is mardood bid'ah*.

The word Qur'aan, Salaat, literally has several meanings, and so has the words Zakaat and Saum. For understanding the Ibaadat of Salaat, Saum and Zakaat, the teachings of Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) are imperative. It is not permissible to submit the word 'salaat' to whimsical personal interpretation to formulate an act of 'worship' appealing to our fancy.

Ibaadat is not an institution formulated by interpretation. Ibaadat is an act handed to us with elaborate detail. Its form has been revealed from Allah Ta'ala. It is not an institution which the minds of men fabricated. Shar'i acts of Ibaadat cannot be fabricated from one's personal understanding of Qur'aanic words or Hadith narrations of general import – narrations which do not define specific acts of Ibaadat.

### **(3) The personal acts of Auliya are not Masnoon acts of Ibaadat**

Nafil and Mubah (permissible) acts of the Auliya may not be elevated to the status of Sunnat and Wujooob. Such elevation of a Wali's personal acts of devotion will be precisely *bid'ah in the Deen*.

### **(4) Bid'ah in the Deen has been severely condemned**

Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) has, in many Ahaadith, stated and severely condemned acts of Bid'ah and those who innovate acts of worship into the Deen. Thus, the attempt to argue away bid'ah by classifying innovations into good and bad bid'ah is itself evil. Rasulullah's explicit condemnation of bid'ah may not be negated by means of interpretation and classification.

### **(5) The validity of an act of ibaadat is determined by its origin**

Regardless of the external or superficial 'beauty' of an act promoted as ibaadat, the determinant of its validity will be its origin. Who originated it and when was it originated. If it came into existence after *Khairul Quroon*, it will not be a Masnoon or Waajib act of ibaadat.

### **(6) The errors of Ulama and Auliya are not Daleel in the Shariah**

The great and illustrious Ulama also err. Their personal opinions and fancies are not the effects of Wahi. Citing the personal opinions and idiosyncratical preferences of Ulama and Auliya who flourished centuries after the *Khairul Quroon* epoch is not valid. Islam is not an evolutionary process in the manner of other religions which have undergone change and mutilation.

## A BASELESS CLAIM

In his booklet, *Mawlid Sunnah or Bid'ah*, the Qabar Pujaari author makes the sweeping allegation:

*“Celebrating the birth of Allah’s most beloved is without doubt permissible and encouraged according to the unanimous consensus of our predecessors. Its origin shines clearly from the divine book of Allah and the traditions of our great Prophet Muhammad as the midday sun.”*

This sweeping false claim is indicative of the mental and spiritual corruption of the grave-worshipping Bid’ati. If mawlid enjoyed the support which the Qabar Pujaari predicates for it in the aforementioned statement, then why the conspicuous absence of the stupid mawlid practice during the ages of the Sahaabah, the Taabieen, Tab-e-Taabieen and even thereafter?

If the alien practice of mawlid had any Islamic credibility, then why is there absolutely no mention of it in the Qur’aan and Hadith? If it was an act of the Shariah of the degree of significance and prominence as the Qabar Pujaari wants Muslims to believe, then what had delayed its entry into Islam for centuries after the demise of Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) and after completion and perfection of the Deen as announced in the Qur’aan Majeed?

If there was no doubt in the permissibility of this weird evil innovation dubbed ‘mawlid’, then why did innumerable Fuqaha and Ulama of former times condemn and outlaw it?

The Qabar Pujaari makes the sweeping claim of ‘consensus’ on the permissibility of the foreign un-Islamic practice of bid’ah. But he hopelessly fails to substantiate his fallacy with the evidence necessary for such an arbitrary claim which is glaringly false. As shall be shown further on, Insha-Alah, many very senior Ulama of former times have unequivocally condemned and castigated this practice originated by the Shiah enemies of Islam and incorporated into the Muslim Ummah by fussaag and fujjaar.

The Grave Worshipper mentions “*consensus of our predecessors*”. Who are these predecessors? The only Predecessors (Salfus Saaliheen) who are authorities of the Shariah are the Sahaabah, Taabi-een and Tab-e-Taabieen. After them came opulence and falsehood. Thus, said Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam):

*“Honour my Sahaabah, for verily, they are the noblest of you. Then those after them (the Taabieen) then those after them (Tab-e-Taabieen). Thereafter falsehood will become predominant.”*

In another Hadith, Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) said:

*“Then (i.e. after these three ages) will come people who will love obesity.”*

That is, they will love opulence and become obese and diseased, physically and spiritually, with their gluttonous consumption of carrion, haraam and mushtabah. Their hallmark will be obesity and gluttony. Therefore, wasteful feasting and merrymaking are incumbent features of the bid’ah mawlid functions all over the world.

In an attempt to pull wool over the eyes of an ignorant public, the Qabar Pujaari says:

*“Those who are kept behind a veil tend to have this illusion that the Mawlid is a party in which impermissible acts take place, like music and dancing.....I assure you that this is nothing but assumptions and accusations.”*

Firstly, the Qabar Pujaari is guilty of an abortive attempt to hoodwink the unwary and ignorant ones although he cannot succeed in bamboozling them for the simple reason that these very ignoramuses who participate in haraam mawlid functions are fully aware of the haraam practices of music, intermingling of sexes, gluttonous feasting and the like which accompany these haraam functions.

Secondly, it is acknowledged that some Buzrugs lacking in foresight and baseerat, had enacted their own private mawlid practices which were without the haraam practices. But they failed to realize that their very enactment of mawlid was bid'ah, hence haraam. Even a mawlid function devoid of other flagrantly haraam acts is also prohibited since it is an act introduced *into* the Deen and given the form of ibaadat. It is similar to adding two raka'ts Salaat performed with utmost *khushu'* and *khudhoo'*, to the Fajr Salaat or to make it an incumbent practice on its own for imposition on the Ummah.

On the other hand, if any person performs 100 raka'ts Nafl daily and punctually and retains it as his own private practice of ibaadat, it shall be an act of great merit.

Thirdly, the two different kinds of mawlid – (1) functions accompanied by flagrant haraam acts, and (2) functions minus



the flagrant acts of fisq and fujoor – while differing in degree of notoriety, are both Bid’ah. The illustrious Ulama in all centuries of Islam’s history since the time of the inception of the bid’ah mawlid, have unequivocally condemned both kinds as shall, Insha-Allah, be illustrated further on in this treatise.

Thus, the condemnation of mawlid by the Ulama-e-Haqq of all ages was not based on assumptions and false accusations as hallucinated or slandered by the Qabar Pujaari. All unbiased Muslims who have participated or even observed from the outside the mawlid practices of the masses can testify in Allah’s Name, to the evils committed with these weird mawlid practices. The claim of the Qabar Pujaari is in reality slander which he intentionally proffers in his abortive bid to bolster the bid’ah mawlid practice which is glaringly in conflict with the Shariah.

Stating another fallacy, the Qabar Pujaari alleges:

*“The truth is, celebrating the Mawlid simply means to thank Allah for sending his most beloved to this world.”*

This allegation is a blatant lie, intentionally fabricated with total disregard for the truth. Thanking Allah Ta’ala for having sent Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) should be executed in the way the Sahaabah and the Taabieen had done. Did they thank Allah Ta’ala by organizing mawlid functions even of the kind which are not aggravated with devilish acts? Were the Salafus Saaliheen ignorant of the correct way of thanking Allah Ta’ala for having sent Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) as *Rahmatul lil aalameen*? Or did these illustrious Souls refrain from thanking Allah Ta’ala for the greatest of bounties He had conferred to mankind in the form of Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam)?

The implication of the Qabar Pujaari's LIE is that the Salafus Saaliheen among whom are the Sahaabah as well had not thanked Allah or were deficient in thanking Allah Ta'ala, hence the need some centuries later for Shiahs and fussaag to fabricate mawlid customs to compensate for the deficiency. *Wala houla wala quwwata illaa billaahil azeem!*

It is a massive falsehood to say that mawlid is merely an expression of thanks to Allah Ta'ala. Every stupid person can easily understand that mawlid is a conglomeration of merrymaking, feasting, mingling of fussaag and fujjaar, singing songs, music and other evils, all of which are integral to the popular kind of mawlid functions. Regarding the second type of bid'ah mawlid which some Ush-shaaq (lovers/devotees of Allah) had erroneously observed, and which were not accompanied by flagrant acts of fisq and fujoor, the method of their expression of love and thanks is alien to Islam, hence also bid'ah.

To thank Allah Ta'ala for the wonderful Bounty of *Khaatamun Nabiyyeen*, there is absolutely no need for organized functions, be it of the second kind of the Ush-shaaq. The Qur'aan Majeed instructing us of the methodology of expressing love and shukr, commands:

*"Say (O Muhammad, to the people): 'If you love Allah, then follow me (i.e. Muhammad). Allah will then love you.....'"*

Love for Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) is the effect of love for Allah Ta'ala, and such love is attainable only by following the Sunnah of Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) meticulously, without adding bid'ah practices. Thus, the Qur'aanic command is: ***"Follow me (Muhammad)"***.

In the Path of Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) which has to be incumbently followed, there is not the slightest vestige of permissibility for mawlid activities.

What kind of ‘thanks’ is it to organize functions in conflict with the Sunnah? What type of ‘thanks’ is it for fussaag and fujjaar to gather and listen to qawwals hypocritically singing songs in praise of Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) when their practical lifestyle is pure shaitaani?

And what is the *daleel* for postponing the ‘thanks’ to Rabiul Awwal? From whence did the idea of ‘thanks’ on birthdays originate? In which era did this fabricated bid’ah originate? The Qabar Pujaari is hopelessly ignorant of the Islamic concept of shukr. ‘Shukr’ in the form of bid’ah is satanism.

To “*remember the coming of our great Prophet Muhammad into this world*”, there is no need and no permission from the Shariah to organize functions – functions which have corrupted millions of ignorant Muslims. The fisq and fujoor of mawlid functions are undeniable. If the Qabar Pujaari who has written his drivel booklet is not involved in the immoral type of mawlid, it does not in any way detract from the reality of the other type of immoral mawlid functions in vogue to this very day.

Remembering Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) is by way of the practical implementation of every Masnoon act regardless of its Fiqhi classification. Singing and feasting are not Masnoon and Islamic ways of remembering Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam). These are the ways of mushrikeen and kuffaar who have celebrations and

merrymaking functions for every event, even stupid and evil events.

The Ulama-e-Haqq had never even hinted that Muslims should abstain from remembering Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam), for such an idea is kufr. There are two ways of remembering Rasulullah, and expressing Shukr to Allah Ta'ala for the wonderful Bounty of Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam): Practical and Verbal.

The Practical method is to apply the Sunnah – i.e. the entire Shariah – the whole of it – to the best of one's ability in every day life, at every step of life. It was primarily for this remembrance that Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) instructed the Ummah with an abundance of Masnoon Duas to recite for all occasions and every step from the morning the eyes open until the time the eyes close at night.

The Verbal method which includes the Masnoon Duas mentioned above, is the abundance of Durood recitation.

The method imparted to the Ummah by Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) and implemented and taught by the Sahaabah and the Salafus Saaliheen precluded the bid'ah of the weird, wasteful, sinful practices and functions of mawlid which have no origin and no sanction in the Sunnah.

There is no objection to teaching and narrating the life episodes and the Uswah Hasanah of Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam). No one has ever forbidden this. What is forbidden and branded a haraam bid'ah is the form and method of the mawlid gathering which has been incorporated into the Deen as if it is a Waajib ibaadat which is integral to the

Sunnah. Precisely for this convoluted conception do the Bid'atis and Qabar Pujaaris brand as *kaafir* those who do not participate in their merrymaking mawlid parties which they labour to justify with meritorious practices. But the merit of such practices remains only if executed in isolation of the conglomerate of the whole mass and mess which constitute the mawlid function.

Stupidly justifying the bid'ah of mawlid, the Qabar Pujaari avers:

*“Poetry in praise of Allah and His beloved are recited without the slightest sound of prohibited music.”*

While such poetry is recited by the Ush-shaaq in their bid'ah mawlid sessions, it is also an ingredient in the flagrantly haraam mawlid functions where flagrant fisq and fujoor are the order of the day. The Qabar Pujaari has isolated the act of poetry from the whole haraam compound in a deceptive attempt to justify the haraam compound in the same way as one would cite the permissibility of grapes and water in a donkey attempt to justify his view of the ‘permissibility’ of *khamr* (liquor).

When he is upbraided for consuming liquor, he retorts that the Qur'aan Majeed mentions the bounties of grapes and water. Then he proceeds to castigate and label as *kaafir* those who say that liquor is haraam. His justification is that the Qur'aan speaks glowingly of the bounties of grapes and water. In exactly the same way does the Qabar Pujaari justify his mawlid bid'ah by citing permissible acts in isolation, i.e. extracting them from the haraam compound, and presenting Hadith evidence to substantiate the permissibility of good poetry. This

he does in his satanic attempt to justify the whole haraam mawlid/liquor compound.

No one has ever proscribed good poetry shorn of haraam frills and fancies with which it (the poetry) is clothed and despoiled in the haraam bid'ah mawlid compound. It is the compound which is haraam, not the poetry in isolation of the compound. The Fuqaha have categorically ruled the impermissibility of poetry and singing good songs (nazams/nasheeds) even without musical instruments for an audience. Poetry sung for an audience and made a profession is not permissible in the unanimous ruling of the Fuqaha of all Math-habs. This has been elaborated in detail in our publication, *Sautush Shaitaan (The Voice of the Devil)*. Poetry never was a *mashgalah* (a profession) for any of the Sahaabah or of the Salafus Saaliheen and the Men of Taqwa (the Auliya) of all ages of Islam. It is the haraam profession of the fussaag qawwaals who are engaged and paid money to sing at the mawlid functions. The occasional recitation of poetry mentioned in the Ahaadith is most certainly never a basis for the singing profession of the fussaag qawwaals. In fact, the qawwaali sessions of the fussaag in isolation of the bid'ah mawlid function is a lesser sin than their singing at mawlid merrymaking sessions. When a qawwaal is hired just for his haraam singing, it is a major sin of fisq and fujoor which every mu'min understands is not an act of ibaadat. But when the qawwaal sings at a bid'ah mawlid function, his fisq and fujoor are elevated to the status of 'ibaadat'. And, this is the effective ploy of Iblees in which he has entrapped the mawlid gang.

The votaries of bid'ah are spiritually and intellectually blind to simple realities and truths of Shar'i dalaa-il because shaitaan has corroded their hearts and corrupted their brains. Due to

such blindness from which escape is an almost impossibility, Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) said: *“Verily, Allah deprives every man of bid’ah from Taubah.”* Why would the man of bid’ah resort to Taubah when he believes that his bid’ah is ‘ibaadat’?

## THE QABAR PUJAARI’S QUESTION NO.1

The Qabar Pujaari poses the question: *“Did the Beloved Messenger practise it?”* Answering his own question, the Grave Worshipper presenting his Qur’aanic ‘evidence’ for the mawlid bid’ah, says:

*“Allah mentions the coming of the beloved into this world in the following words: ‘There has come unto you a messenger (one) of yourselves’ (Surah at-Tawbah, 128)*

*“Now has come unto you light from Allah and clear scripture” (Surah al-Maaidah, 15)*

Then the Qabar Pujaari cites the following Hadith in his weird, stupid attempt to extract ‘evidence’ for his customary bid’ah mawlid function:

*“Amongst the companions, he said: ‘Now I shall inform you of my birth (first matter), I am the prayer of Ibrahim, glad tiding of Isa’ and I am the very sight of my mother which she saw when she gave birth to me, a light exited her which enlightened for her the palaces of Syria”*

*The abovementioned verses and the Hadith are sufficient to establish the permissibility of celebrating the Mawlid for a*

*person in search of the truth. Allah clearly mentions the coming of the Prophet into this world from the world of souls.”*

This stupid ‘daleel’ is an insult to even the *jahl* of a moron. The “*person in search of the truth*” asks: I do accept everything stated in the above Hadith and other Ahaadith about the coming of our Nabi (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam). I accept that he is the *Noor* as mentioned in the Hadith, and that he was the answer to the supplication of Hadhrat Ibraaheem (Alayhis salaam), etc. But neither the Qur’aanic verses you have presented nor the Hadith mention the mawlid function – the mawlid gathering of crowds to indulge in merrymaking, singing, poetry, mingling of fussaaq, fujjaar, qawwaals, and even women, and gluttony. The Qur’aanic Verses only state historical facts pertaining to the birth and coming of Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) without commanding the enactment of birthday celebrations and parties in the manner conducted by the Bid’atis and Qabar Pujaaris. If there was any veracity in the claim of the Bid’ati, surely, the very first ones who would have understood from these Verses and Hadith that the command is for merrymaking mawlid functions, would have been the Sahaabah. But none of the Sahaabah understood what the Qabar Pujaari of this belated age has understood. Why was this understanding delayed for six centuries after the demise of Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam)? Why was this mawlid not a part of the Deen prior to its completion and perfection as announced in the Qur’aan Majeed?

The Qur’aan in numerous verses commands performance of Salaat. But the form and method of Salaat are not assigned to ambiguity and to the interpretation of men who appeared on the scene centuries after the finalization and perfection of the Message of Islam. The form of Salaat about which the Qur’aan



is silent, was explained in detail by Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam). This form is for an act of ibaadat commanded in the Qur'aan. The *hai'ah* (form) was described elaborately by Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) to preclude misinterpretation and personal opinion.

But in the verses cited by the Qabar Pujaari, there is no command to observe any act of ibaadat or a celebration. The Verses and the Hadith only present historical facts which Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) did not clothe and adorn with a form for practical observation as he did with all other Qur'aanic commands which required specific formats. Nor did the Sahaabah understand mawlid concoctions from these Verses and Hadith narrations, hence we find not a single Sahaabi and not a single one among the Salafus Saaliheen of the *Khairul Quroon* era observing the bid'ah mawlid practice as propagated and upheld by the Grave Worshippers and other elements of Bid'ah. Not a single one of the authoritative Mufasssireen and Fuqaha of the Salafus Saaliheen had ever presented mawlid celebrations in the tafseer of these Verses and Ahaadith which the Bid'atis stupidly present for the consumption of their moron flocks.

In a laughable attempt to give his stupid argument an 'academic' flavour, the Qabar Pujaari, says: "*The personal pronoun in the verse 'Now hath come unto you', is plural and for the second person which means Allah is addressing a gathering. The same personal pronoun is used in the Hadith, 'Now I shall inform you'. Only a lack of sense would now stop one from understanding the permissibility of the Mawlid gathering.*"

The brains on which Iblees has urinated are indeed lamentable. The ludicrousness of this moronic ‘argument’ speaks volumes for the *jahaalat* of the Qabar Pujaari moron. A plural pronoun directed to the Muslimeen is a feature throughout the Qur’aan used to inform Muslims of commands, prohibitions and facts pertaining to many issues. It never implies organizing of gatherings.

Directing a command to the Muslimeen, Allah Ta’ala says: “*O People of Imaan! Seek aid (from Allah) with Salaat and Sabr.*” The personal pronoun directed to the Ummah, does not permit Muslims to manufacture a whimsical form of a gathering of Salaat and Sabr for the purpose of fulfilling this Divine Command. The format of Salaat has been explained in detail by Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam), and so too Sabr. Gatherings of Sabr may not be fabricated in response to the Qur’aanic command. The format of Salaat and the conception of Sabr are not left to ambiguity and the opinion of men who arrived on the stage of Islamic history a couple of centuries after Nabi-e-Kareem (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam).

In another Aayat, Allah Ta’ala commands us directly: “*O People of Imaan! Eat from the wholesome food (Tayyibaat) which We have provided for you...*” The plural personal pronoun is used for this direct command. On this basis, it is stupidity gone haywire to organize merrymaking gatherings to devour Tayyibaat, and to justify such gatherings with the stupid lopsided argument of fulfilling shukr for the bounties provided by Allah Ta’ala. The command is simply to eat halaal and tayyib food, not to concoct merrymaking gatherings.

The Qur’aan commands: “*O People of Imaan! Spend (in the Path of Allah) from that (wealth) which We have provided for*

*you...*” The pronouns are plural and directed to the second persons, i.e. Allah Ta’ala is directly addressing the Ummah. The inference of organizing gatherings to fulfil this command is palpably moronic.

Allah Ta’ala says: *“O People of Imaan! Remember the bounties of Allah on you...”*

The command is directed to Muslims. The same plural pronouns are employed for this command. But for remembering Allah’s bounties, merrymaking gatherings may not be concocted and slipped into the fabric of the Shariah as acts of ibaadat stemming from this and similar other Qur’aanic Aayaat. The command is a directive for every Muslim of the Ummah to personally remember and be grateful for Allah’s bounties, and not to acquit himself ungratefully. It has no relationship with the concoction of merrymaking parties.

Another direct command using plural pronouns: *“O People of Imaan! Answer Allah and the Rasool when He calls you...”*

Now should merrymaking gatherings with poets and gluttony be concocted to answer Allah and His Rasool? They have to be answered with obedience to the teachings handed to us by Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam), not in ways fabricated by the nafs.

Allah Ta’ala commands: *“O People of Imaan.” When (you) are called to Salaat on the Day of Jumuah, then hasten to the Thikr (Remembrance) of Allah...”* The Mu’mineen are directly addressed and commanded to hasten towards the *‘Thikr of Allah’*. There is no ambiguity in this *Call* and this *Thikr*. The Call is Athaan, and the Thikr is the Jumuah Salaat and Khutbah. Only a Qabar Pujaari whose brains have become convoluted by satanic manipulation will venture to interpret on

the basis of this Aayat that the reference is to the bid'ah *halqah thikr* gatherings which Bid'atis have organized. The format of the Call and of the Thikrullah in this Aayat has been explained in detail to preclude any ambiguity which Bid'atis could utilize as a basis for their bid'ah thikr gatherings.

The Qur'aan Majeed and Ahaadith are replete with such commands and exhortations which concern acts of Ibaadat or Shar'i concepts which have not been left to ambiguity and for interpretation by men appearing centuries later to 'complete and perfect' the Deen or supplement Allah's stated Completion and Perfection during the very age of Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam). Thus, there is absolutely no Shar'i substance in the Bid'ati's stupid 'pronoun' argument which extracts mirth from people of intelligence.

Taking another shot in the dark, the Grave Worshipper says: *"The companions celebrated the Mawlid by mentioning the birth of the Prophet and sometimes by singing poetry about the beautiful birth."*

The claim that any of the Sahaabah had 'celebrated' mawlid is a despicable LIE. Mentioning the birth of Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) is NOT mawlid. Mawlid is a concocted format of a gathering consisting of a number of activities which all and sundry are aware of. Mawlid is not the mere mention of Rasulullah's birth by one individual to another individual, or by an Ustaadh to his students, or by a Shaikh to his mureeds, or by a Waaiz delivering his usual bayaans on any day without any merrymaking format such as mawlid functions.

There is a great difference between mere mention of Rasulullah's blessed Birth, and mawlid celebrations. Whilst the former has never been criticized, the latter has been condemned by the Ulama in every age of Islam. The Qabar Pujaari is stupidly and abortively labouring to bamboozle ignoramuses and to trick them into understanding that mawlid is the mere mention of Rasulullah's Birth. But even morons cannot be duped with this stupid reasoning.

The poetry argument mentioned by the Qabar Pujaari has already been addressed earlier. It suffices here to say that poetry among the Sahaabah was exceptionally rare, and never was it for an audience at an organized mawlid merry-making function.

Further portraying his *jahaalat*, the Qabar Pujaari avers: *"It is narrated regarding Ibn Abbaas and Jaabir that they mentioned the birth in the following words, 'He was born on 12<sup>th</sup> Al Rabi' Al-Awwal.'*" Commenting on this statement, the Qabar Pujaari says: *"Surely, if mentioning the birth of the Prophet was a bid'ah, the Sahabah would not have mentioned anything about it...."*

O Thou Moron Grave Worshipper! You shamelessly advertise your stupidity. Who has ever said that mentioning the date Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) was born or mentioning the other historical facts pertaining to the birth of Nabi-e-Kareem (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) was bid'ah? You have dug up this falsehood from perhaps the graves you worship, or Iblees has inspired you with such *ghutha'* (*rubbish*) arguments which are bereft of any semblance of intelligence, and which extract only mirth from people of understanding.

Mentioning 12<sup>th</sup> Rabiul Awwal as the day Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) was born is not bid'ah. The haraam mawlid functions and customs which are enacted on 12<sup>th</sup> Rabiul Awwal and on other occasions are bid'ah. Divest your brains from the cobwebs of *jahaalat* then you will be able to understand the stupidity of your ludicrous 'daleels'. Hadhrat Ibn Abbaas (Radhiyallahu anhu) and Hadhrat Jaabir (Radhiyallahu anhu) did not organize a merrymaking mawlid party where feasting and singing were the order of the day to announce the date of Rasulullah's birth. They did not sing poetry for an audience when they informed of the date of 12th Rabiul Awwal. They did not go out planning any elaborate function for announcing the date of birth. They did not decorate Musjidun Nabawi with buntings, flags and coloured lights to make their 'mention' of the date. They did not solicit funds for preparing degs (huge pots) of rice and dhaal, etc. for gluttonous devouring when they mentioned the date. In short, they did not commit even a single of the numerous acts of haraam, fisq and fujoor which are perpetrated at mawlid functions.

While our condemnation and the condemnation of the Ulama of all ages are directed primarily at the blatantly haraam mawlid gatherings where flagrant fisq and fujoor prevail, the other type of mawlid of the Ush-shaaq is not exculpated from the bid'ah charge. Insha-Allah, the bid'ah mawlid of the Ush-shaaq shall also be explained later on in this treatise.

The Jaahil Qabar Pujaari says: *"Why did the companions record the date of the beloved's birth?"* By this averment he implies that the objective of having mentioned the date, was for posterity, six centuries later, to organize merrymaking

mawlid parties. The silliness of this utterly baseless argument is glaringly palpable. If mentioning the date by the Sahaabi had any mawlid celebration implication, then why did the Sahaabah not organize mawlid celebrations? We are not speaking of impromptu ‘mentioning’ of aspects of Rasulullah’s birth and Uswah Hasanah. We are speaking of the type of the merrymaking mawlid functions which these moron grave-worshippers such as the Barelwi sect, and other clowns such as the Ninowi gang, and coons such as the Cape Town sheikhs are organizing. Yes, why did Hadhrat Ibn Abbaas (Radhiyallahu anhu) and Hadhrat Jaabir (Radhiyallahu anhu) NOT devise a format for mentioning the date of Rasulullah’s birth?

Then the Qabar Pujaari writes: *“Hassan Ibn Saabit was known as the Prophet’s poet. He sang praises for the Prophet..... Abbas, the uncle of the Prophet also wrote poetry regarding the Mawlid of the Prophet....”*

We reiterate that the poetry argument has already been dealt with. To elaborate further, it is essential to understand that the poetry of Hadhrat Thaabit (Radhiyallahu anhu) and of Hadhrat Abbaas (Radhiyallahu anhu) were not constituents of a mawlid celebration. They did not organize parties. They did not invite people to come in droves to listen to their poetry. Nor was their feasting and all the other haraam paraphernalia associated with the mawlid parties in vogue. Furthermore, Hadhrat Abbaas (Radhiyallahu anhu) did not compose poetry about ‘mawlid’ – the mawlid which is the subject of our discussion and refutation. The moron Qabar Pujaari attempts to confuse ignoramuses with the word ‘mawlid’. There is a world of difference between the literal meaning of mawlid and the conception of the mawlid celebration innovated by Shiahs and

imported into Islam by juhala and deviates seeking name, fame and monetary gains.

In another stupid argument presented by the Qabar Pujaari to justify the customary bid'ah mawlid functions, the moron says:

*“A fundamental belief of Muslims is that the Prophet is the greatest gift Allah has bestowed mankind with.”*

No one has ever refuted the Bounty of Rasulullah's Risaalat. No one has denied that Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) is the greatest of the Ambiya, hence the greatest gift for us and entire mankind. This issue has absolutely no relationship with the bid'ah mawlid functions innovated by those who have deviated from Siraatul Mustaqeem. The effect of acknowledging Allah's Gift is never mawlid which has no basis in Islam.

Then the Bid'ati quotes the following Aayat for his fallacious supposition of it being evidence for the customary bid'ah mawlid functions:

*“Allah verily has shown grace to the believers by sending unto them a messenger of their own who recites unto them His revelations, purifies them and teaches them the scripture and wisdom although before they were in clear misguidance.”*

*(Surah Aal Imraan, 164)*

This Aayat too does not have the remotest relationship with mawlid practices. The Sahaabah did not understand this or any other Qur'aanic Aayat as an instruction for fabricating the flotsam mawlid custom of the Grave Worshipers and other deviates. There is not the slightest evidence to even suggest that the Sahaabah had observed any kind of mawlid practice.



Regurgitating what he has already said earlier and which has already been refuted, the Qabar Pujaari proffers his own comment on the Aayat to bolster customary bid'ah mawlid. Thus he says: *"....do we not have a duty to thank Allah? Should we not express our gratitude to Allah? If yes, and surely yes then in what way and how? Let us see how Allah demands us to show our thanks and express our gratitude for the gifts He has bestowed us with. Allah says in the Qur'an:*

*'Say: In receiving the grace and mercy of Allah, they must rejoice, it is better than what they hoard.'" (Surah Yunus, 58)*

Continuing his flotsam argument, the Grave Worshipper says: *"From the above verse, we learn that we should rejoice which means we should be happy and we should celebrate....."*

Indeed, the stupidity of the Qabar Pujaari is mind boggling. What connection does a clear-thinking mind see between the aforementioned Qur'aanic Verse and customary bid'ah mawlid functions which consist of a number of haraam acts? Allah Ta'ala in the above Aayat instructs us to be happy for His Bounties. This refers to the happiness of the heart, not to any bid'ah celebration innovated six centuries after Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) – a celebration acquired by the Shiahs who had fabricated it almost two centuries prior to its introduction into the Sunni world.

The Grave Worshipper's kufr is the attribution of a monstrous LIE to Allah Azza Wa Jal. The Aayat does not have the remotest reference to customary mawlid celebrations, nor does the Aayat order the fabrication of any function for happiness. The happiness mentioned in the Aayat is simply the happiness

in the heart of the Mu'min for Allah's Bounties. Such happiness spurs him onward in Ibaadat and Taa-at. Happiness for Allah's Bounties does not culminate in bid'ah and the customary rubbish mawlid merrymaking parties of fisq and fujoor.

The moron Qabar Pujaari must quote from the Qur'aan and the Hadith verses and narrations which explicitly orders observance of the customary mawlid of which the Muslims of the first 5 or 6 centuries were totally unaware. Customs and practices accorded the status of ibaadat may not be fabricated from Qur'aanic words submitted to whimsical and fanciful opinion. Ibaadat and Sunnah practices are only what were known to the Sahaabah, Taabieen and Tabe Taabieen. All other acts given the form of ibaadat and elevated to the pedestal of ibaadat are evil bid'ah inspired by Iblees. All of these mawlid parties are the inspirations of shaitaan who has urinated into the ears of the Grave Worshipers, hence their brains are convoluted. Their hearts are disfigured, and they are hovering on the brink of Jahannam with their bid'ah. s

The moron Qabar Pujaari, extracts a word from a Qur'aanic Aayat – the word: *“They should be happy”* – then he submits it to his biased whimsical opinion to fabricate what his convoluted brains dictate. He interprets or misinterprets this word by giving it the meaning of “mawlid”, i.e. the current bid'ah mawlid celebration functions. In essence, by this stupid and satanic interpretation he implies that Allah Ta'ala says: *Be happy by organizing mawlid functions*. This is a blasphemous interpretation and a LIE attributed to Allah Azza Wa Jal.

The Qabar Pujaari does not make reference to a single Tafseer for understanding the meaning of the simple word, *‘be happy’*

which has no other meaning in the context of the Aayat other than its literal application. Allah Ta'ala says to the Mu'mineen to "be happy" for His Bounties of the Qur'aan and the Nabi (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam). Not a single one of the illustrious Mufasssireen of the Qur'aan or of the Fuqaha understood the aayat to mean what the grave-worshipper implies. For understanding the Qur'aan, it is imperative to refer to the authorities among the Salafus Saaliheen. It is tantamount to kufr to subject the Qur'aan to personal opinion, whim and fancy to manufacture corrupt 'evidence' for practices which were unknown to Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam), the Sahaabah, the Taabieen, the Taba Taabieen, and to the Ummah for the first six centuries of Islam's history.

The Aayat merely says that the Bounties of Allah are superior and better than the dunya which people accumulate. They should be happy with Allah's Bounties, not with the perishable dunya which shall be snatched away at the time of Maut. The happiness in the heart of the Mu'min is expressed by gratitude, and this gratitude is practically implemented in the manner in which the Sahaabah and the Salafus Saaliheen expressed their gratitude, and this entails greater Taa-at (Obedience) and Ibaadat, NOT the fabrication of practices such as mawlid functions which are bedevilled with haraam, fisq and fujoor, and even kufr such as the belief of the omnipresence of Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) held by the Barelwi mawlid gang of grave worshippers.

Just as Allah Ta'ala commands us to be happy for His Bounties, so too does He command abundance of Thikr, Sadqah and other acts of Ibaadat. It does not behove us to produce compound practices consisting of merrymaking functions to fulfil the command of Thikr, etc. The

methodology of Thikr, Sadqah and all Ibaadat practices and rituals have not been assigned to the realm of ambiguity for finding form and expression on the basis of personal interpretation stemming from man's fluctuating vagaries of *nafsaaniyat*. All such interpretation which produces institutions, customs and practices draped with an outer veneer of Ibaadat, but which were either unknown to the Sahaabah and Salafus Saaliheen, or which are in conflict with any tenet or principle of the Shariah are *mardood*, *mal-oon*, and the effects of satanism. This mawlid bid'ah is satanism.

The virtues of an act extolled in the Qur'aan or of Ibaadat are for the purpose of increased Ibaadat and Taa-at, not for fabrication of bid'ah functions and activities which never existed during the era of *Khairul Quroon*.

In his introductory steps for formulating his Qur'aanic 'evidence' for his bid'ah flotsam mawlid, the Qabar Pujaari asks: "... we should spend our wealth to show our gratitude to Allah. Where must we spend our wealth to rejoice?" O Thou Moron Grave Worshipper! Spend your wealth in the Path of Allah in the manner advised and shown by Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam). Spend with your right hand in a way that your left hand knows not. Spend on the Fuqara, Masaakeen, the orphans, widows and those who cannot make ends meet. Don't squander the Ni'mat of wealth in gluttonous festival feasting and excreting it all out. Don't waste wealth satanically paying large sums of money to qawwaal singers, to clowns and coons. Don't waste Allah's bounty of wealth putting up tents for singing praises and dancing to the gallery of men and women. Don't squander wealth on buntings, flags and christmas-lighting on the Musaajid on mawlid occasions. Spend wealth in Allah's Path silently seeing to the needs of the

Fuqara and Masaakeen. Don't soothe your vermiculated brains with the deception of having discharged the obligation of Sadqah by calling a handful of seemingly poor persons to a function for a plate of food. This is not spending wealth in Allah's Path. The avenues for genuine Sadqah to express shukr for the Bounties of Allah Ta'ala are numerous.

Portraying his mind-boggling jahaalat, the Qabar Pujaari says:

*“Allah says in another verse of the Qur'an: ‘And publicise well the bounty of your Lord.’ The Prophet Muhammad's birth is surely the most gracious bounty of Allah for us believers. Allah commands us to publicise it. How must we publicise the coming of the Prophet? According to the masses around the globe, one of the ways of publicising and showing acknowledgment is marching in the streets. Is there anywhere in the Qur'an where Allah has prohibited the marching in the streets to publicise His best of gifts. If not and surely not, then why not?”*

The Grave Worshipper has descended into the lowest gutter of ignorance in his presentation of this extremely stupid and ludicrous argument to justify the haraam bid'ah mawlid which deviates and followers of Iblees have innovated. Firstly, where in this Aayat or any other Aayat, or in any Hadith is it mentioned that 'proclamation' of Allah's Bounties should be in emulation of the kuffaar by way of birthday celebrations? On the contrary, the Shariah severely prohibits emulation of the kuffaar.

The marching in the streets of masses of fussaag, fujjaar and juhala constitutes a Shar'i 'daleel' for the miserable Qabar Pujaari. Utterly bereft of even a semblance of Shar'i evidence

for bolstering the mawlid bid'ah, this most unfortunate character looks askance at the monkey marches of stupid crowds. This shockingly stupid argument is the seal on this man's stupidity –this moron who has undertaken the task of 'proving' the merit and validity of the mawlid bid'ah on the basis of the Qur'aan and Sunnah. Just imagine his baboonic thinking! Drawing daleel from the monkey antics of masses of juhala, fussaag and fujaar who prance in the streets, shouting slogans and informing the world that the kuffaar are their leaders and guides in their cult of birthday celebration festivals.

Where in the Qur'aan has Allah prohibited marriage of the same sexes? Where in the Qur'aan is cremation prohibited? Where in the Qur'aan is gorilla meat prohibited? Where in the Qur'aan is human meat prohibited? Where in the Qur'aan are the other thousand haraam acts prohibited? To understand the simple fact that the stupidities of the masses do not constitute daleel in the Shariah, one requires only some brains. Knowledge is not a requisite for understanding this self-evident fact.

Since when is *absence of a prohibition* from the Qur'aan not a prohibition? Perhaps this is a principle of the Qabar Puja 'fiqh' which is the product of grave-worship. The Grave Worshipper has descended into a ludicrous morass of stupidity with his hallucinations.

Just imagine! Masses of fussaag, fujaar and juhhaal marching in the streets kuffaar style, shouting slogans, holding placards like kuffaar and prancing like baboons, and regarding this haraam compound of kuffaar antics to be a valid celebration of the Bounty of Allah Azza Wa Jal. Did the Sahaabah not

understand the Bounty of the Rasool (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam)? Why did they not dance and toi-toi in the streets in kuffaar style to celebrate the Bounty? Why has this form of clownery and coonery been delayed for fourteen centuries? Marching in the streets to celebrate Rasulullah's birth - this is indeed the pinnacle of jahaalat.

The moron Grave Worshipper presents this marching of apes as his Qur'aanic daleel for mawlid. We doubt if members of the Barelwi sect who can still utilize their brains will accept this laughable stupidity of the moron.

Sinking further in the quagmire of jahaalat, the moron grave worshipper quotes the following Qur'aanic aayat:

*“O those who believe! Forbid not the good things which Allah has made lawful for you, and transgress not. Lo! Allah does not love the transgressors.” (Surah al-Maa'idah, 87)*

Then the moron says: *“The Prophet explains this verse in the following Hadith narrated by Salman Al-Faarsi, “Lawful is that which Allah has made lawful in the book. Unlawful is that which Allah has made unlawful in the book. And that which Allah has not mentioned is forgiven (permissible).”*

Allah Ta'ala has not mentioned thousands of things, acts and issues in the Book. It does not follow from this Hadith that everything of which mention is not made in the Book is permissible. Only stupid grave-worshippers peddling their bid'ah agenda are capable of proffering such stupid arguments. The Book does not mention the meat of elephants, lions, baboons and a million other animals. The Book does not mention cremation of the dead. The Book does not mention

surrogacy, blood transfusion, organ transplanting, marrying jinn, drinking urine, insurance and a million other issues.

The rulings of prohibition on these million issues are based on principles derived from the Book and the Ahaadith. Thus, all such Rulings come within the purview of the Book. Similarly, the stupid kuffaar-style public marches are haraam based on principles of the Shariah. The factors of hurmat of clownery and coonery are prancing like apes in the streets, emulating the kuffaar, photography, gathering of fussaag and fujjaar, flags and banners kuffaar-style. Marching in the streets is never 'respectable' as the moron claims. Rowdyism, hooliganism, pride, show, etc. are inherent acts of street marches. The Sahaabah did not perform like apes marching in the streets to celebrate the birth of Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam). In fact, they did not celebrate the Holy Birth with even a bayaan in the Musjid. They made absolutely no attempt to celebrate. It is only fourteen centuries later that grave worshippers innovated this stupid haraam manner of celebrating.

No intelligent Muslim will accept that street marches are a valid way of thanking Allah Ta'ala for the Bounty of sending Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) to guide mankind. We know of *Sajdah Shukr* and *Salaat of Shukr*. We know of unostentatious Sadqah to the poor as a mark of gratitude to Allah Ta'ala. These are valid forms of expressing gratitude for Allah's Bounties, not stupid, kuffaar style street marching and stupid displaying of flags and wasting money decorating the Musajaad and the streets with kuffaar style Christmas colourful lighting.



The Shariah has not ordained ceremonies, gatherings and celebrations for expressing *Shukr* to Allah Ta'ala. The Sahaabah, Taabi-een, Tab-e-Taabi'een, the Aimmah Mujtahideen and the Muhadditheen had never indulged in any public displays of 'shukr' or in any celebration activities. But, deviates centuries later innovated these haraam activities into the Deen. What was not Deen during the era of the Salafus Saaliheen will never be part of the Deen until the Day of Qiyaamah.

The Grave Worshipper concedes that street marches and celebrations accompanied by music and other haraam acts, are not permissible. But, such marches and celebrations without the haraam factors are permissible. His fossilized brains are unable to understand that the very stupidity of celebrations and marches and their very absence from the lives of the Salafus Saaliheen are the primary factors for the prohibition. The other haraam activities generally prevalent at these bid'ah mawlid celebrations are additional factors of *hurmat* which aggravate the prohibition.

Some years ago in Durban, a satanic feature of mawlid celebrations were the Bugles of Iblees. The Boys Brigade would perform their shaitaani coonery, piping their bugles of Iblees and the stupid crowds would believe that all of this haraam is *shukr* to Allah Ta'ala for the Bounty of Rasulullah's birth.

The moron grave-worshipper says that "chanting praises and speeches are also a way of publicising." Public chanting in the streets and in halls and public speeches, etc. are not valid Islamic acts of *shukr* and publicizing the favours of Allah Ta'ala. These are ostentatious acts acquired from the kuffaar,

hence such stupid methods never ever were part of the lives of the Salafus Saaliheen. (21)

Publicizing the Ni'maat of Allah Ta'ala means to utilize the favours correctly to gain the Pleasure of Allah Ta'ala. For example, if Allah Ta'ala has bestowed the Ni'mat of wealth, the person should not act miserly, concealing the wealth and refraining from spending freely in the Path of Allah Ta'ala and even on himself and his family as is the practice of misers. There are people who desist from wearing good garments, not because of simplicity, but due to their niggardliness. They hoard their wealth and their hearts cannot tolerate spending validly on even themselves. Publicizing does not mean to become a devil or a brother of shaitaan by squandering the Ni'mat of wealth on futile and silly decorations, flags, lighting, paying huge sums for hiring halls, etc., and gathering in a carnival atmosphere to waste the time in singing, speeching, gluttonous eating and merrymaking.

Even non-Muslims are invited to the new haraam 'mass mawlid' festivals. The whole affair is just one big carnival of show, waste and bid'ah.

Presenting another silly and baseless argument for the mawlid bid'ah, the moron grave-worshipper cites the following Qur'aanic aayat:

*"Isa the son of Maryam said: O Allah, our Lord! Send down for us a cloth spread with food from heaven, that it may be an Eid for us, for the first of us and for the last of us and a sign from You, give us sustenance for You are the best of sustainers."*

Surah al-Maa'idah, 114.

This is the moron's atrocious translation, not ours. Then commenting on this aayat, the Bid'ati says:

*“From the aforementioned verse we learn that the Prophet Isa asked the Lord for food from heaven as a gift for his people. The Prophet Isa also said that the receiving of the gift will be an Eid for them, and for those who will come later in generation. The day will be remembered and celebrated as an Eid. It is an Islamic principle that everything from the previous Prophets mentioned in the Qur'an or Hadith without being refuted remains established.....If the people of the Prophet Isa made the day an Eid when they received the food from heaven, then why can Muslims not remember the day their greatest gift came from Allah as a day of Eid? Verily the day of our Prophet's birth is a day of Eid.”*

The moron is too stupid and too deep in the rot of bid'ah and grave-worship to understand that the birthday of Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) is NOT a day of Eid for Muslims because Allah Ta'ala did not make it such a day. The Sahaabah never upheld it as a day of Eid nor did the entire Ummah for six centuries from the era of Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) deem the birthday of Nabi (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) as a day of Eid. Islam has ordained for us only TWO days of Eid. Whilst the day of Jumuah is of great spiritual significance, it too has not been made a day of Eid for this Ummah. The fabrication of a third 'eid' is thus an evil bid'ah (*bid'ah sayyiah*).

And even for the Nasaara, Allah Ta'ala did not make the birthday of Nabi Isaa (Alayhis salaam) a day of Eid for them. But the Bid'ati 'dogs of the fire' of this Ummah are following

in the footsteps of the kuffaar Christians who have made the 25<sup>th</sup> December, the supposed day of birth of Nabi Isaa (Alayhis salaam), a day of celebration, calling it Christmas day. Emulating the Christians, the Qabar Pujaari bid'atis have made Rasulullah's birth day a 'christmas'.

While the original Nasaara, the true followers of Nabi Isaa (Alayhis salaam) had regarded the day of the descent of the Maa'idah, a 'day of Eid', it was on the authority of their Nabi (Alayhis salaam). But, they never fabricated 'christmas' day as a day of 'eid' as the Qabar Pujaaris have done with the day of Rasulullah's birth. In making the day of Rasulullah's birth a day of 'christmas', the Bid'atis are emulating the Christian kuffaar. The argument of the Maa'idah is putrid and absolutely fallacious.

If every Gift from Allah Ta'ala occasioned the fabrication of a day of eid, we would today have been encumbered with numerous days of 'eid'. Of greater – far greater importance and of greater mercy than the gift of the 'food' to the Nsaara, is the Gift of the Qur'aan to this Ummah. Yet, even these stupid grave-worshippers have not made the day the Qur'aan was revealed to be a day of eid. Why do they not innovate a fourth day of 'eid' to celebrate the Great Gift of the Qur'aan?

And why do these morons not innovate a fifth eid for the Great Day that Allah Ta'ala Himself announced:

*“This DAY have I perfected for you your Deen, and completed for you My Bounty, and chosen for you Islam as your Deen.”*

This was indeed a great Day and a Great Gift. So what has happened to this ‘eid’? There are numerous Gifts of Allah Ta’ala – Great Gifts – but days of ‘eid’ are not celebrated. The simple answer is that since Allah Ta’ala has not ordained the day of Rasulullah’s birth as a day of eid, and since the Sahaabah and the entire Ummah thereafter did not observe this false and fabricated ‘christmas’ day, it is a haraam innovation.

The “Islamic principle” to which the moron has alluded applies to a defined practice which existed in a previous Shariah of a Nabi. It does not refer to fabrications, falsehood and innovations which had no existence in the previous Shariats. There was no celebration of any Nabi’s birthday in any Shariat of bygone times. Thus, arguing the ‘christmas’ day innovation on the basis of this principle is moronic.

A valid application of this principle is in the example of fasting on 10<sup>th</sup> Muharram. This fast existed in the Shariah of Nabi Musaa (Alayhis salaam) for valid reasons, hence Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) introduced it into our Shariah. It was an existing defined practice. The fast of Aashura is not a practice formulated on the basis of personal opinion by interpreting some ambiguous term and stupidly and invalidly applying the principle as the moron grave-worshipper has done thereby exhibiting his gross jahaalat.

There is no ‘Maa’idah’ practice of the Nasaara which Muslims could adopt on the basis of the ‘Islamic principle’ stupidly blurted out by the moron grave-worshipper. If a Maa’idah had descended from the heaven for us, then we could have referred to rules related in the previous Shariah for adopting such rules. Furthermore, the followers of Nabi Isaa (Alayhis salaam), i.e. the true followers – his Hawwaariyeen and others

– did not fabricate a carnival day of merrymaking such as these rubbish mass ‘mawlid’ festivals. It was a sombre occasion of ibaadat and shukr for them. They did not stage mass marches and howl slogans in the streets to celebrate the gift if the Maa’idah.

The word ‘eid’ cannot be used to justify the haraam bid’ah and acts of merrymaking which the Bid’atis are associating with their meelaad/mawlid functions. Also, the word eid in the context of the Maa’idah cannot be used to fabricate a third ‘eid’ when Allah Ta’ala has ordained for us only two Eids, and when the Sahaabah and the Ummah had always observed only two Eids. If a third ‘eid’ can be fabricated and frauded into Islam, then a fourth and a fifth, etc. ‘eids’ could also be introduced, for the great Gifts of Allah Ta’ala are innumerable.

Birthday celebrations are customs of the Christians. They celebrate birthdays as occasions of merrymaking and to gratify the nafs, not as thanks to Allah Ta’ala for a gift. This is precisely the attitude of the millions of stupid, fussaaq bid’atis who indulge in mawlid functions. They congregate only to listen to songs, merrymaking, eating and excreting the food prepared from charity funds. The talks of Rasulullah’s seerat at these bid’ah function are laced with hypocrisy. Such talks are merely to give the festival a religious flavour. But the lifestyle of the masses who attend and of the moron molvis and shaikhs who preside, is the way of the kuffaar. The participants in these carnival functions are primarily fussaaq, fujjaar and juhala.

The grave-worshipper says: *“I believe it is correct to say, it is a known fact that the Mawlid is an Eid.”* Then why did the Sahaabah not know that it was an eid? Why did the Taabieem

not know that it was an eid? Why did the Tab-e-Taabieen not know that it was an eid? And, why was there absolutely no awareness of this bid'ah 'eid' during the first six centuries of Islam? And why did so many Fuqaha and Ulama criticize this kuffaar style celebration since it was innovated in the 6<sup>th</sup> century?

If the birthday is really an 'eid', then why do the Bid'atis refrain from an eid salaah, extra takbeers and the other etiquettes associated with Eid Days?

## **THE SECOND TRASH QUESTION**

*“Are sunnis adding to religion?”*

The moron grave-worshipper states in his Trash defense of the Bid'ah of mawlid:

*“Question: Surah Maidah: “we have perfected your religion” ..... so why do you sunnis add to religion; don't you believe this Quranic verse?*

*Answer: The Ahl Al-Sunnah Wa Al-Jamaa'ah are the Muslims which have remained on the path shown by the Qur'an, Hadith and the predecessors. It is infidelity to reject a verse and to add something to the religion which is contradicting its sources.*

*From the above, it is clear that the Mawlid is not a new addition to the Islamic Law but actually an act encouraged in the Islamic Law. The verse in Surah Al-Maa'idah mentioned in the question is actually a verse in support of the Mawlid celebration,*

*Allah, the Almighty Lord says:*

*“This day I have perfected your religion for you and completed my favour unto you, and have chosen for you as religion Al-Islam.” (Surah al-Maa'idah, 3)*

*When this verse was revealed, a Jew said to Umar: “If this verse was revealed upon us, we would have made that day an Eid.” Umar replied: that we know very well the day and the place of that revelation and Umar indicated that day is an Eid.*

*If the day when the aforementioned verse was revealed, can be known and remembered as a day of Eid then surely the day of our Prophet's birth should be known and remembered as a day of Eid.”*

The above is the full text of the moron Bid'ati's second chapter of his trash booklet. Every person, even every layman, can understand from the aforementioned answer the degree of stupidity of the grave-worshipper. He has totally failed to present even a vestige of response to the question which he himself had posed in his trash attempt to bolster the bid'ah mawlid.

In answering his own question, he ludicrously proffers two premises:

- (1) It is infidelity to add something to the religion which is contradicting to its sources.
- (2) Hadhrat Umar (Radhiyallahu anhu) “indicated that day is an Eid.”



The moron does concede that it is ‘infidelity to add something contradictory to the sources of the Deen.’ Yet, he blatantly denies that mawlid is precisely such an addition. Why is it not an addition in conflict with the Deen and the sources of the Deen when it –the bid’ah mawlid – was unknown to the Sahaabah and unknown to the Ummah for the first six centuries of Islam’s history?

It should be well understood that the *raison d’etre* for the mawlid function is not a later development in Islam. It is not something which was unknown to the Sahaabah. The reason / cause which the grave-worshippers proffer for their haraam mawlid festival according to them is the birth of Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam). Since this occasion is Allah’s Gift, it has to be celebrated. Then for the celebration the ignoramuses fabricated a day of christmas for merrymaking, joviality, street marching, slogan chanting, decorative flags, buntings and colourful lighting in perfect Christian and Hindu styles.

Now this *raison d’etre*, viz. Rasulullah’s Birth, was well-known to the Sahaabah and to all Muslims during the first six centuries of Islam’s history. Every Muslim from the Sahaabah right down the ladder of history, understood the greatness of the Gift of Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) as the Guide and Mercy sent by Allah Ta’ala to mankind and jinnkind. Yet, none of them ever celebrated the birthday of Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam). It never ever occurred to a single Sahaabi to celebrate the birth day of our Nabi (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam). But after six hundred years, the ignoramuses, the fujjaar and fussaaq inherited this custom from the Shiahs, imported it into Islam and established it as a christmas day. In so doing, they introduced an alien practice

into this Deen, bringing them fully within the glare of the Hadith which brands every innovation *mardood* (*rejected*) and accursed. Every innovation into the Deen is *bid'ah sayyiah* (evil bid'ah) according to the Ahaadith.

No man of intelligence can deny the irrefutable fact of mawlid being an innovation into the Deen of a practice which never existed in Islam since the time of Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam). It is in flagrant contradiction of the sources of the Deen. It has no basis in the Qur'aan and Sunnah. Hence in terms of the premises proffered by the grave-worshipper, mawlid is an act of 'infidelity'.

Even an established act of Ibaadat based on the Sunnah becomes bid'ah when it is elevated to a status higher than the status accorded to it by the Shariah. Hadhrat Ali (Radhiyallahu anhu) prohibited people from performing the Dhuha Salaat in the Musjid despite the great reward and significance of this Salaat. When this is the attitude of the Shariah towards even valid Masnoon acts of ibaadat, it should be quite simple to understand the abhorrence of the Shariah for completely new acts innovated centuries after the Sahaabah – acts which consist of a compound of haraam factors. The Shariah's abhorrence for the mawlid bid'ah is manifest for all men of intelligence.

There is no valid reason for the Sahaabah to have abstained from mawlid celebrations if this confounded festival had any permission in Islam. No one's love for Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) can ever surpass the love and devotion which the Sahaabah had for Nabi-e-Kareem (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam). Yet, mawlid celebration remained completely unknown to them. Their way of expressing shukr for Allah's

Gift was by means of *Taa-at (Obedience)* and *Ibaadat (Worship)*. There was absolutely no other way. Showing gratitude in the manner of kuffaar-type celebrations is the inspiration of Iblees in whose snare these Bid'atis are gripped.

Aayat 3 of Surah Maa'idah cited by the grave-worshipper in a stupid attempt to justify the bid'ah mawlid is in fact a strong daleel in refutation of mawlid. The Jew's comment is an acknowledgement of the great significance of the Day when Allah Ta'ala announced the perfection of Islam and the completion of His Gift. In effect the Jew implied that the greatness of this Day is of such a lofty level that it would be appropriate to appoint it (this Day) as a day of Eid. But no one in Islam, not even the corrupt Bid'atis who practise mawlid, had made this great Day a day of eid. When the moron grave-worshipper concedes that this Day is worthy of celebrating it as an Eid, so why has it not been made a day of eid? Why not incorporate it into Islam as the fourth 'eid'?

No where in the Hadith is permission for regarding this Day as a day of eid even remotely alluded to as the stupid grave-worshipper baselessly contends. The claim that Hadhrat Umar (Radhiyallahu anhu) "indicated that day as an Eid", is utterly false. If he had indicated that this Day should be celebrated as an eid, then why did he not give practical implementation to it? Why did the Sahaabah not regard that Day as a day of eid? If in Hadhrat Umar's opinion it was a Day befitting to be elevated to an eid, then why did he not do so? When Hadhrat Umar (Radhiyallahu anhu) deemed it appropriate to establish the 20 Raka't Taraaweesh in Jamaa't, he went ahead and introduced the Taraaweesh in the manner we are performing it today. It is blatantly ignorant to say that Hadhrat Umar

(Radhiyallahu anhu) had indicated that the Day the Deen was perfected could be made a day of celebration.

This stupid ‘daleel’ of the moron actually refutes the contention of the mawlid gang, for it proves that the Day which could be regarded as an eid in the view of the Jew, was never made an eid by the Sahaabah. Thus, if the significance of the day of Rasulullah’s birth had warranted that this day should be appointed an eid and an occasion of celebration, and transformed into a christmas, the Sahaabah would have been the very first to have given it practical implementation.

Furthermore, there is no indication whatsoever in the Hadith for the Day of Islam’s Perfection to be made a day of eid. This is a piece of falsehood which the moron grave-worshipper has interpolated. If indeed there is any such indication, then what has hitherto prevented the Grave-Worshippers from celebrating the Day as a day of eid?

### **THE THIRD TRASH ARGUMENT**

The grave-worshipper, presenting his third stupid ‘daleel’, utters only spurious arguments devoid of Shar’i validity. In his argument he avers:

*“Question: There’s a hadith in Tirmizi Shareef which says any Bid’ah in religion leads one astray, so why do you sunnis add this Bid’ah of celebrating?”*

*Answer: Celebrating mawlid is not a bid’ah. However, one may say that the way mawlid is celebrated nowadays is not like it was in the time of the Prophet and therefore bid’ah.”*

Indeed, this moron grave-worshipper is a great liar – *Kath-thaab*. Bid’atis feast on lies. With lies they dupe and deceive

their ignorant followers. Never ever was mawlid celebrated in any way whatsoever during the time of Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam), the time of the Sahaabah and during the first six centuries of Islam. Yet, this vile grave-worshipper shamelessly proffers the LIE of mawlid having been celebrated during the time of Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam). Despite having made this preposterous claim, he miserably failed to explain the alleged method of mawlid during the age of Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam). In making this haraam claim, he has taken his bid'ati lies to new levels of falsehood.

In a vain and stupid attempt to neutralize the Hadith in Tirmizi as well as in other Kutub, the grave-worshipper avers:

*“However, there are many other narrations of Hadith which apparently seem to contradict this one.”*

This is another brazen lie. There is no Hadith which contradicts this Hadith which bans bid'ah. There is consensus of the Authorities on the authenticity of this Hadith. There is no need to reconcile it with any other narration in view of the fact that it is not in contradiction of any other Hadith. The alleged contradiction lies in the brains of the Bid'ati convoluted by his acts of grave-worship. The Ahaadith on Bid'ah are supplementary. The one further explains the other. The claimed contradiction is the hallucination of the moron grave-worshipper.

The hallucinated contradictory narration cited by the grave-worshipper is:

*“He who innovates in this religion of ours something which is not from it, is rejected.” (Bukhari and Muslim)*

Commenting on this Hadith, the moron says: “*In the above Hadith, the Prophet has conditioned the act of innovation in religion with “that which is not from it”. This condition tells us that an innovation can have its roots within the religion and therefore not always be unlawful and misguidance.*”

This argument is a preposterous stupidity. A bid’ah cannot have its roots in the Deen. A bid’ah – evil bid’ah of which mawlid is a prime example – does not have its roots in the Deen. Bid’ah is from outside the Deen. The condition of introducing ‘*fiddeen*’ (*in the Deen*) something which is not of the Deen, applies to all acts which never were ibaadat during the era of *Khairul Quroon*. Since all acts of bid’ah are external to the Deen, incorporating them into the Deen is the mardood bid’ah of deviation (*Dhalaalah*) mentioned in the Hadith.

Any act which is already in the Deen cannot be described as bid’ah since it is an integral constituent of the Deen which was not innovated into the Deen at a later stage by morons of the Qabar Pujaari type. Mawlid was never a part of the Deen. Many centuries after Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) miscreants introduced this alien *baatil* practice into the Deen. They elevated it to such a lofty status that it has become to be considered as a fundamental practice of Islam. Hence those who do not subscribe to mawlid are labelled ‘kaafir’.

The preposterous claim that mawlid existed during the age of Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) is an exhibition of blatant falsehood – of lies compounded with lies. It is an alien custom incorporated from outside into the Deen. It has been elevated to the loftiest status of ibaadat. This is a glaring example of *mardood* bid’ah so vehemently condemned by Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam).

The proof for the *hurmat* (unlawfulness) of mawlid consists of several factors”

- Innovated as ‘ibaadat’, when in reality it is not ibaadat.
- Elevating it to the status of WujooB, when it is not even mubah (permissible).
- Imported from the ShiahS who had innovated it during the fourth century.
- Tashabbuh bil kuffaar (emulating the kuffaar), especially the Christians, hence mawlid is like christmas day is for Christians.
- The numerous acts of haraam *khuraafaat* such as flags, buntings, coloured lights, singing songs for the public, intermingling of the sexes, kuffaar-style street marches, slogans, decorating the MusaaJid in the way Hindus decorate their temples, squandering huge sums of money hiring halls, etc.
- Criticizing and even making *takfeer* of those who do not subscribe to the vile bid’ah.

Even a valid Shar’i act of ibaadat becomes bid’ah and haraam if a factor of *hurmat* is added to it. For example, performing Salaat at the time of Zawwaal, sunrise and sunset; fasting on the Day of Eid.

Making another stupid averment, the grave-worshipper says: The moron Qabar Pujaari then cites the following Hadith in his flaccid attempt to bolster his fallacious argument:

*“He who innovates in this religion of ours something which is not from it, is rejected”* [Bukhari and Muslim]

*“He who innovates in Islam a good innovation, then it is acted upon after him; for him will be written his reward and the reward of all who acted upon it without any decrease in their*

*reward. And he who innovates in Islam a bad innovation, then it is acted upon after, against him will be written his punishment and the punishment of all who acted upon it without any decrease in their punishment” [Muslim]*

Then commenting on this Hadith, the moron says:

*“In the above Hadith, the Prophet has conditioned the act of innovation in religion with, “that which is not from it”. This condition tells us that an innovation can have its roots within the religion and therefore not always be unlawful and misguidance.”*

There is absolutely no need for reconciliation because there is no contradiction. This Hadith is totally unrelated to the Ahaadith which condemn bid’ah. It refers to any evil deed regardless of it being a bid’ah or not. Qaabil murdered his brother Haabil, hence the sin of all murders committed on earth until the Day of Qiyaamah will collectively be loaded onto Qaabil because he was the one who had first perpetrated this crime.

In the same way, whoever introduces a good act, will receive the collective reward of all persons who practise the act. The one who constructs a water-well or builds a Musjid will receive the collective reward of all persons utilizing these noble facilities. This meaning brings evil acts of bid’ah such as mawlid, within its purview. Thus, the jaahil who had first innovated this haraam practice will received the calamity of the combined sins of all the moron grave-worshippers who uphold mawlid until the Day of Qiyaamah.

In another flaccid attempt to justify the evil bid’ah of mawlid, the moron grave-worshipper endeavours to strike a likeness



between mawlid and certain acts of the Sahaabah such as compiling the Qur’aan Majeed in book form. There is a vast difference between these two acts. The compilation of the Qur’aan Majeed was not a new act of ibaadat introduced by the Sahaabah. It was an act introduced to protect the very existing Islam as it was revealed to Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam). The Qur’aan was compiled to guard its authenticity – to prevent the scattered Aayaat being lost. This act did not introduce even a new iota of ibaadat in the Deen. It was a noble act for *the sake* of the Deen. It did not add to the already Perfected Deen.

Furthermore, it was an act introduced by the Sahaabah who had this right. All acts of the Sahaabah are directly linked to the Sunnah. Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) commanded the Ummah to obey and follow his Sunnah and the Sunnah of his Sahaabah, particularly the Sunnah of his righteous Khulafa. Thus, the Sunnah of the Sahaabah has been equated by Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) to his Sunnah.

From this will it be understood that the act of performing 20 Raka’ts Taraaweeh in Jamaa’t every night of Ramadhaan – established by Hadhrat Umar (Radhiyallahu anhu) – was on par with the Sunnah of Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam). Hadhrat Umar (Radhiyallahu anhu) had this right. He was entitled to do as he had done. Those after the age of the Sahaabah had no such right.

Hadhrat Umar’s act may not be cited as a basis of the haraam, evil mawlid innovated by morons, grave-worshippers and fussaaq. There is no licence for transferring the right of the Sahaabah to non-Sahaabah. The term, ‘*bid’ah hasanah*’ with which Hadhrat Umar (Radhiyallahu anhu) described the

practice which he had established, does not have the technical meaning of bid'ah which the Fuqaha apply to innovated acts. Hadhrat Umar (Radhiyallahu anhu) and all the Sahaabah had not coined the technical terms of Fiqh nor had they formulated classification for the ahkaam which was a much later development by the Aimmah Mujtahideen.

Hadhrat Umar (Radhiyallahu anhu) had used the term in its literal sense to mean just what the literal meaning is, namely: a beautiful innovation. Even if it has to be assumed that the act was an addition to the Deen, the Sahaabah had this entitlement from Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam). Hadhrat Uthmaan (Radhiyallahu anhu) had introduced in the Fajr Athaan, the terms: *As-Salaatu Khairum Minan Naum*. And, he had also introduced an additional Athaan for Jumuah. He had the right to do so. They were empowered by Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) who had likened the Sunnah of his Sahaabah to his own Sunnah. Can anyone now introduce any act in the form of ibaadat and justify it on the basis of the innovations of the illustrious Sahaabah? Yes, grave-worshippers and morons do so, hence the evil mawlid malady. They have elevated themselves to the status of the Sahaabah. If the Sahaabah could innovate acts into the Deen, then these morons believe that they too have such a right.

Hadhrat Abdullah Ibn Mas'ood's act of expelling a group of people indulging in a so-called bid'ah hasanah act of Thikrullah, is further confirmation for the contention that it is haraam to innovate acts of worship into the Deen. On expelling them from the Musjid, this very senior Sahaabi branded them 'Bid'atis', yet ostensibly they were *only* reciting and remembering Allah Ta'ala.

There are other similar examples of the Sahaabah not tolerating the slightest diversion from the Sunnah and the forms of Ibaadat, and prohibiting any act of bid'ah. Adding a 'beautiful' term of dua such as 'Salaam' to the Masnoon Dua at the time of sneezing was also branded a bid'ah.

The moron grave-worshipper mentions as 'good bid'ah' building of domes and minarets, the mihrab, building schools, new languages, and subjects of knowledge, all of which did not exist during the time of Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam). Mentioning these items further demonstrates the stark ignorance of the moron grave-worshipper. These new developments are unrelated to the Deen *per se*. These issues are not innovations *into* the Deen. They do not alter any teaching, tenet or practice of the Sunnah. A Musjid without a dome and minaret remains a Musjid, and no one becomes a faasiq or a kaafir if he does not erect a dome or a minaret on the Musjid he is constructing. No one becomes a faasiq or a kaafir if he abstains from learning the new subjects of knowledge. No one becomes a faasiq or a kaafir if he abstains from building schools, and if he imparts knowledge of the Deen from a Musjid or from his home. These introductions are not adding acts of ibaadat to the Deen as is the innovation of mawlid. But abstaining from mawlid renders one an enemy of Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) in terms of the religion of the Qabar and Karaamat Pujaaris. *(In the Western Cape, the darghas – graves of Auliya – are termed karamats. The Malay bid'atis of the Cape are like the Indian bid'atis of Bareilwi. They both are Qabar Pujaaris – Grave-Worshippers, and all of them excel in the mawlid bid'ah).*

No one has ever argued that all the new material developments and amenities of comfort are evil bid'ah. These issues have no

relevance to the bid'ah classification under discussion. The evil bid'ah refers to acts given the form of ibaadat and acts which displace Sunnah acts, and acts which add to or delete from the Sunnah. And, the Sunnah is the Practice of Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) and the Practice of his Sahaabah (Radhiyallahu anhu,), and after them come lies and falsehood. Mentioning this, Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) said:

*“Honour my Sahaabah, for verily, they are your noblest, then those after them, then those after them. Thereafter, kizb (falsehood) will become prevalent.”*

Any act of ‘worship’ such as the haraam mawlid, which has been innovated into the Deen after the era of *Khairul Quroon*, according to this and other narrations, is part of the *Kithb (lies and falsehood)* of evil innovators.

The literal meaning of the term *bid'ah* is not the issue of contention. Any new development or anything invented is bid'ah. But such bid'ah is not our concern. Relative to bygone times, all current modes of transport and almost all things. Describing such issues as *bid'ah hasanah* and basing mawlid on the acceptability of such bid'ah hasanah things is gross ignorance. There is not a single innovated so-called act of ‘ibaadat’ which may be given the designation of ‘*bid'ah hasanah*’ because all such acts innovated *into* the Deen are *bid'ah sayyiah (evil innovation)*.

The Grave-Worshipper says: “.... the Muslim scholars unanimously agree that anyone who regards something as unlawful must provide evidence, otherwise it is deemed lawful.”

No one contests this rule of the Shariah. The claim is that bid'ah is haraam. It is the worst haraam akin to kufr because it tampers with the Deen of Allah Azza Wa Jal. Mawlid is a confirmed bid'ah. It is a fabrication which the people of Bid'ah have frauded into the Deen. This is the evidence for conclusively labelling this baseless practice bid'ah. Bid'ah has been severely condemned by Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam). The Bid'ah status of mawlid is substantiated on the basis of Shar'i dalaa-il, and this is the evidence for its *hurmat*. The Bid'atis have provided no cogent grounds and arguments for the permissibility of their mawlid which they have frauded into the Deen after acquiring it from the Shiahs.

The grave-worshipper's argument of basing mawlid on the compilation of the Qur'aan Majeed by Hadhrat Abu Bakr (Radhiyallahu anhu) on the insistence of Hadhrat Umar (Radhiyallahu anhu), is absolutely fallacious. Firstly, any introduction by the Khulafa-e-Rashideen are linked to the Sunnah by virtue of the blanket command to follow their Sunnah which Nabi (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) equated to his own Sunnah.

Secondly, the compilation of the Qur'aan Majeed does not constitute an innovation or Bid'ah Sayyiah. Such compilation neither added to the Qur'aan Majeed nor subtracted or deleted from it anything. It was executed to preserve the very same Qur'aan which was revealed to Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam). It was a measure to protect the original Deen, not to add a new practice as is the bid'ah of mawlid which is a practice unknown to the Sahaabah, the Salafus Saaliheen of Khairul Quroon, and the Ummah during the first approximately six centuries of Islam.

Mawlid simply has no basis in the Sunnah. It is alien to Islam. The arguments of the Qabar Pujaari deviate is thus palpably fallacious. Every bid'ah frauded into the Deen as an act of ibaadat after the era of Khairul Quroon is bid'ah sayyiah (evil bid'ah). If the Shariah had given a licence for fabricating seemingly holy acts having the appearance of ibaadat, then today the original Sunnah and even the original ritual acts of Ibaadat would have been mangled beyond recognition as are the acts of worship of the Christians and the Yahood, etc.

In the entire duration of Fajr time it is haraam to perform any Nafl Salaat. Besides the two raka'ts Sunnatul Muakkadah, it is not permissible to perform any other Salaat during this time. Only the two Sunnats and the two Fardh are permissible. In terms of the grave-worshipper's convoluted understanding of 'bid'ah hasanah', Nafl Salaat during Fajr time should likewise be bid'ah hasanah, hence acceptable. But, the one who seeks to initiate an act of ibaadat into the Deen, has booked his ticket for Jahannam. An act cannot be included in Islam merely on its appearance as ibaadat. It requires the authority of the Shariah for an act to be an ibaadat. But for mawlid there is not a shred of Shar'i evidence for its permissibility.

The miserable grave-worshipper states in his trash defence of the mawlid bid'ah:

*“They say it is lawful to innovate **for** the religion but not **in** the religion. This objection itself is bid'ah, it was never made before by any of our predecessors. It is a baseless claim. The Hadith from Muslim I mentioned above clearly states the words, ‘He who innovates **in** Islam a good innovation.’”*

Firstly, understand well that Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) said: *“Every bid’ah is dhalaalah (haraam deviation), and every dhalaalah will be in the Fire.”* Besides this Hadith, there are many Hadith narrations in condemnation of bid’ah. What then is the meaning of a ‘good innovation’, when Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) had condemned and damned every **innovation**? The acts of ibaadat introduced by the Sahaabah may not be placed in the category of bid’ah. Such introductions are all Sunnah. The innovations which were fabricated and frauded into the Deen are all within the ambit of the Ahaadith which relegate **all acts of bid’ah** to the Fire.

In response to the moron grave-worshipper’s negation of the truth of the Hadith which condemns innovations **‘in’** the Deen, Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) said: *“He who innovates in this our Deen anything which is not of it, is mardood (rejected and accursed).”* Such a person is an accursed devil, far, very far from the mercy of Allah Ta’ala. In denying this irrefutable fact of the prohibition of innovating any act into the Deen, the very least act of kufr of which the moron is liable is denial of a Saheeh Hadith. On the basis of his denial, he structures his permissibility of innovating into the Deen any act which appears ‘beautiful’ to him and his gangs of grave-worshippers and bid’atis. Our very first Predecessor who had explicitly stated the principle of the prohibition of innovating acts **into** our Deen moron that according was Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam).

If there had existed a Shar’i licence for innovating into the Deen acts with an external facade of ‘ibaadat’, then every Tom, Dick and Harry would have felt snug in innovating whatever ‘ibaadat’ they deemed beautiful and appropriate. Thus, innovating a sixth Salaat, performing Witr in Jamaat the

whole year, introducing more terms of Thikr in the Athaan, reciting Athaan and Iqaamah for Janaazah Salaat, adding a congregational dua with hands raised after the Salaam of Janaazah Salaat, fasting 15 days of the month of Muharram, and innumerable other acts having a facade of ibaadat would all have been permissible on the basis of the stupid understanding of ‘bid’ah hasanah’, and the stupid interpretation given to the Hadith pertaining to new practices being praiseworthy and rewardable. In short, the original Deen – the Sunnah as known to the Sahaabah – would have long ago been buried.

The contention of the moron that according to the Hadith innovating ‘good’ innovation *in* Islam is good and permissible, is pure flapdoodle. The Hadith which the moron has cited does not relate to new acts of ‘ibaadat’ – acts which appear to be ibaadat. The Hadith refers to good practices – practices of any sort which protect and promote the true unadulterated Deen and which are of a benefit for the Ummah.

Such new practices introduced by Muslims are Madaaris, Khaanqahs, publications, constructing wells / boreholes, Musajjid, establishing organizations to combat enemy propagation, e.g. Christian missionary activity, etc., etc.

All of these introductions are not ‘innovations’ in the sense of the popular meaning and understanding of the term bid’ah. These introductions are not innovations into the Deen. All such institutions are designed to defend and protect the originality of Islam. On the contrary, mawlid is an addition to the Deen. It is frauded into the Deen as if it is an act of Sunnah ibaadat of the highest merit, and in fact of the Waajib status. It is precisely for this reason that those who abstain from mawlid



and the shirki act of qiyaam are branded kaafir by the Barelwi grave-worshippers who wallow in Qabar Puja.

Their qiyaam practice is an incumbent ingredient of their bid'ah and baatil mawlid. The reason for standing up while they are singing their songs is their belief of shirk that Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) makes an appearance at the gathering when the naa'ts are sung in his praise. The devil has urinated this idea of shirk into the brains of the Qabar Pujaaris.

These bid'atis with their qiyaam practice and the khatm-e-khwaajaanis who believe themselves to be 'deobandis', but who are in actual fact, another type of Bid'atis, with their spread out white sheet for their 'special' thikr session are in emulation of the mushrik Tijaani sect of West Africa. The Barelwi Bid'atis share the common belief of Rasulullah's appearance with the Tijaanis, and the so-called 'deobandi' Bid'atis share with the Tijaanis their practice of the white sheet spread for their special form of thikr. All of them are guilty of practising *dhalaalah* which will be in the Fire.

There is a vast difference between acts innovated *into* the Deen and acts established for the sake of the Deen, for guarding and protecting the practices of the Sunnah. Mawlid does not protect any teaching of the Sunnah. On the contrary, it is a haraam innovation *in* the Deen, inspired by Iblees to undermine the purity of the Deen and to entrap Muslims in a host of evil and *nafsaaniyat*.

An example of initiating a practice to safeguard the original Sunnah, is stated in the following Hadith:

*“Whoever holds on to my Sunnah at the time of the corruption of my Ummah, will receive the reward of a hundred shuhada (martyrs).”*

Introducing an act or an institution to revive the exact Sunnah of Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) comes within the ambit of the Hadith which exhorts the initiation of good practices. The Hadith in question does not refer to bid’ah – to new acts in the form of ibaadat. Consider a Sunnah act such as Salaatud Dhuhaa which is a Salaat of considerable merit and reward, yet Hadhrat Abdullah Ibn Umar (Radhiyallahu anhu) and Hadhrat Abdullah Ibn Mas’ood (Radhiyallahu anhu) described its performance in the Musjid **‘Bid’ah’**, not bid’ah hasanah, but bid’ah sayyiah. They disapproved of it. Hadhrat Ibn Mas’ood (Radhiyallahu anhu) explicitly stated that they should perform it at home. But, these moron grave-worshippers fabricate and fraud into the Deen a completely new practice with its accompaniment of haraam factors, then pollute the sanctity of the Musaaajid with their coon and clown performances, singing and swaying to gratify the lusts of their nafs.

## **THE FOURTH TRASH ARGUMENT OF THE GRAVE-WORSHIPPER**

In his stupid treatise of flapdoodle and trash arguments, the moron grave-worshipper avers that mawlid was not an innovation that was never practiced before the time of their “Ala Hazrat Ahmed Raza Khan Bareilwi”. He accuses the Ahl-e-Haq of attributing this innovation to their ‘Ala Hazrat’. In his drivel vindication of mawlid, the grave-worshipper mentions that:

- (1) Imaam Tirmizi has a “whole chapter on Mawlid”.
- (2) Imaam Jalaluddin Suyooti has written a book on the permissibility of mawlid.
- (3) Imaam Shahabuddin Ahmad Qastalaani stated: *“The Muslims have always held gatherings to rejoice the birth of the Prophet (sallallahu alayhi wasallam).”*

After mentioning these three sources, the moron adds: *“This indicates scholarly consensus on the permissibility of celebrating the Mawlid. The great Muhadditheen, Imam Sakhawi, Allama Ibn Jazri, Muhaddith Ibn Jawzi, Imam Mulla Ali Al-Qari, Imam Halabi, Sheikh Abd Al-Haq Muhaddith Al-Dehelvi, Shah Wali-Allah Al Dehelvi and many others have clearly agreed with its permissibility. ....The truth is every one of our predecessors (Salaf) believed it to be a rewarding act.”*

Compounding his drivel, the moron says: *“That is the very reason why, nobody has been able to provide any reference from any of our predecessors who said it is an unacceptable bid’ah and therefore not lawful to celebrate Mawlid.”*

Firstly, when we say Salaf (i.e. our predecessors), the reference is to those whom Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) had praised and whose actions he had equated to his Sunnah. The Salaf in our context thus refers to the Sahaabah, Taabieen and Tab-e-Taabieen. The Salaf are not those who appeared on the scene a thousand years after Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam). The claim of the moron grave-worshipper that “every one of the Salaf believed in mawlid being a rewarding act”, is a blatant lie – a falsehood of which only those addicted to qabar puja are capable of. How is it possible for the Salaf to have even commented on this bid’ah of mawlid when it never

existed during their respective ages? The drivel of mawlid was frauded into the Deen only about six centuries after the Sahaabah. The Shiahns had innovated it a couple centuries before the so-called Sunnis had acquired it from them. It was a practice completely unknown to the Salafus Saaliheen. The lies and falsehood of the moron bid'ati are thus conspicuously manifest.

There is no Hadith in Tirmizi nor in any other Hadith kitaab extolling the stupid bid'ah of mawlid. Leave alone extolling, there is not a single Hadith remotely making reference to the haraam custom of mawlid for the simple reason that it never ever existed during the age of Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam). So how is it possible for there to be Ahaadith on this practice when it was introduced into Islam only centuries after Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam)?

Ahaadith mentioning the episode and the circumstances surrounding the birth of Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) have absolutely no relationship with the customary haraam mawlid kuffaar type celebration. Milaad simply means birth. In the context of the Ahaadith it never means a birthday celebration or a custom consisting of considerable flotsam and jetsam.

When the term mawlid or milaad is mentioned nowadays, immediately the mawlid custom of birthday celebration with all its haraam paraphernalia comes to mind. The term is not today associated with its literal meaning as in the context of the Hadith.

The claim of there being consensus of the Salaf on the permissibility and rewardability of the bid'ah custom of

mawlid is a fallacy hallucinated by the moron grave-worshipper. In every age subsequent to the innovation of mawlid, the Ulama-e-Haqq had condemned it unequivocally. In his kitaab, *Al-Qoulul Mu'tamad*, Imaam Ahmad Bin Muhammad Bin Bisri (Rahmatullah alayh) states:

“Allaamah Muizzuddin Hasan Khwaarzimi (rahmatullah alayh) states in his Kitaab:

‘The Ruler of Irbal, King Muzaffar Abu Saeed Kaukari, was an irreligious king. He ordered the Ulama of his time to act according to their opinions and discard the practice of following any of the Math-habs. A group among the learned men inclined towards him. He (this king) organized moulood sessions during the month of Rabiul Awwal. He was the first of the kings to have innovated this practice.’”

Imaam Abul Hassen Ali Bin Fadhl Muqeddisi (rahmatullah alayh) states in his Kitaab, *Jaamiul Masaa-il*:

‘The practice of Moulood was not of the practices of the great, pious predecessors (*Salafus Saaliheen*). It was introduced after the *Quroon-e-Thalaathah* (the three ages following our Nabi [Sallallahu alayhi wasallam], which he [Sallallahu alayhi wasallam] described as the “best of times”). Mawlid was innovated during the age of evil (i.e. of evil people). We do not follow a practice introduced by later people, if the pious predecessors (*Salafus Saaliheen*) did not practice it. It suffices for us to follow the *Salafus Saaliheen*. And, we have no need to innovate new customs.’”

(*Al-Qoulul Mu'tamad*)

Imaam Shamsul A-immah Taajud-din Faakahaani (d 734 Hijri), says in his Risalah:

“I know of no basis for this practice of Moulood in the Qur’aan and the Sunnah. It has not been reported from any of the great Ulama and Imaams who were the Leaders of the Deen and who held on firmly to the ways of the great predecessors. In reality, this practice of Moulood is a Bid’ah innovated by evil people who were followers of lust.”

Commenting on the satanism of the faasiq king of Irbal, Allaamah Zahbi (Rahmatullah alayh) – died 748 Hijri – said:

*“Every year this ruler spent three hundred thousand (from the Baitul Maal) on moulood celebrations.”*

In the year 604 Hijri, mawlid was frauded into the Ummah by fussaag and fujjaar. The evil king, Muzaffaruddin Koukari innovated this custom with the connivance of the Ulama-e-Soo’ (evil molvis and sheikhs). It was acquired from the Shiahs who had innovated it centuries earlier. One notorious faasiq, Molvi Amr Bin Dahya Abul Khattaab (died 633 Hijri) was a staunch supporter of the faasiq king. Haafiz Ibn Hajar Asqalaani (Rahmatullah alayh) said about this evil Molvi:

*“He was a man who insulted the Fuqaha of Islam and the pious Salafus Saaliheen. He had a filthy tongue, was ignorant, excessively proud, possessed no insight in Deeni matters, and he was extremely negligent in Deeni issues.”*

*Allaamah Ibn Najjaar (Rahmatullah alayh) said: ‘I have observed consensus of the people on the fact that this molvi was a liar and unreliable.’*

*(Lisaanul Mizaan)*

Debunking the lie of *mawlid* enjoying the consensus of the Ulama, Imaam Ahmad Bin Muhammad Bin Bisri (Rahmatullah alayh) states:

*“And, the Ulama of the Four Math-habs are unanimous in condemning the practice of mawlid.” (Al-Qoulul Mu’tamad)*

Refuting the attribution of this evil bid’ah to the Salaf, Imaam Bin Bisri (Rahmatullah alayh) states:

“Imaam Abul Hassen Ali Bin Fadhl Muqeddisi (rahmatullah alayh) states in his Kitaab, *Jaamiul Masaa-il*: ‘The practice of Moulood was not of the practices of the great, pious predecessors (*Salafus Saaliheen*). It was introduced after the *Quroon-e-Thalaathah* (the three periods following our Nabi (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) which he described as the “best of times”). It (Moulood) was innovated during the age of evil (i.e. of evil people). We do not follow a practice introduced by later people, if the pious predecessors did not practise it. It suffices for us to follow the *Salafus Saaliheen*. And, we have no need to innovate new customs.”

*(Al-Qoulul Mu’tamad)*

Imaam Ibnul Haaj (Rahmatullah alayh) says:

*“Among the bid’ah which these people have innovated is the practice of moulood during the month of Rabiul Awwal. They believe that this act of moulood is among the great acts of ibaadat of Islam whilst in reality it is a practice consisting of innovations and haraam acts..... Even if it (i.e. mawlid) is without these evils (with which this function is observed) and if only food is served with the intention of mawlid, and brothers are invited to participate while the function is free from all the haraam acts mentioned earlier, then too it is bid’ah solely on the basis of the intention (of the function being mawlid), because it is an accretion in the Deen. It is not of the acts of the Salaf of the past. It has not been narrated that any of them*

*had intended mawlid. We follow the Salaf, hence for us is permissible whatever was permissible for them.” (Mudkhal)*

Regardless if the mawlid practice of some Ulama is free from haraam acts, the very function by itself is bid’ah. The error of those who observe this type of mawlid which is free of haraam acts, should be manifest. It is an innovation in the Deen, which is presented as an incumbent ibaadat. Salaat is free from haraam factors. But if Nafl Salaat is performed during Fajr time, it will be haraam because doing so will be bid’ah.

Maulana Naseeruddeen Al-Adwi Ash-Shaafi’, in response to a question said: *“It should not be practised because it has not been narrated from the Salaf-e-Saalih. It was innovated after the era of Quroon-e-Thalaathah in a wicked age. We do not follow the Khalaf (those of the later eras) in matters which the Salaf had abstained from. Following them is adequate. What then is the need for innovation?”*



“Shaikhul Hanaabilah Sharfuddeen (rahmatullah alayh) said:  
“*The function of mawlid (celebrating the birthday) of Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam), which some of the wealthy practise every year, along with its evil acts, it by itself is a bid’ah which was innovated by one who follows his lust, and who does not know what Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) has commanded.*” (Al-Qaulul Mu’tamad)

“Qaadhi Shihaabuddeen Daulatabaadi (rahmatullah alayh) says in his *Fataawa Tuhfatul Qudhaat* when asked about mawlid:  
“*It should not be held because it is an innovation, and every innovation is dhalaalah, and every dhalaalah will be in the Fire. That what the juhhaal (ignoramus) do in the beginning of every Rabiul Awwal is baseless. They stand when the birth of Nabi (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) is mentioned, and they think that his Rooh (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) is present. Their thinking is baatil. In fact, this belief is shirking. The Aimmah have prohibited such acts.*”

Soon after the evil of the Shiah mawlid bid’ah was introduced in the sixth century by the faasiq king of Irbal, the Ulama-e-Haqq vehemently criticized it. The illustrious Allaamah Taajuddin Faakahaani (Rahmatullah) – 654 – 731 Hijri, states in his *Risaalah*:

“*I know of no basis for this practice of mawlid from the Qur’aan and Sunnah. It has not been reported from any of the great Ulama and Imaams (Salafus Saaliheen) who were the Leaders of the Deen and who held firmly on to the ways of the illustrious Salafus Saaliheen. Truly, this practice of mawlid is a bid’ah innovated by evil people who are the followers of lust.*”

Allaamah Abdur Rahmaan Mughzi (Rahmatullah alayh) states in his Fataawa:

*“Verily, the practice of mawlid is bid’ah. Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) did not practise it, nor did his Khulafa nor the Fuqaha of Islam.”*

*(Sharatul Ilaahiyyah)*

The following question was posed to Mujaddid Alf-e-Thaani (Rahmatullah alayh):

*“Regarding the issue of reciting mawlid: What is wrong in reciting the Qur’aan and reciting qaseedas (na’ats) and praises with a beautiful voice? Why is the prohibition in this case?”*

Hadhrat Mujaddid responded:

“It has generated in the heart of this Faqeer that as long as this avenue (of mawlood) is not closed totally, the maniacs (of the nafs) will not desist from it. If we grant a little leeway, it will lead to considerable (indulgence).”

“Thus, the fortunate one is he who enlivens a Sunnah from the abandoned Sunan, and he kills a bid’ah from the prevalent bid’ah. This is the era heralding a thousand years since the era of the Noblest of Mankind, Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam). Signs and Indications of Qiyaamah and the Impending Hour have become manifest. The Sunnah has become hidden due to the recession of the era of Nubuwwah, and bid’ah has become prominent as a consequence of the widespread prevalence of falsehood.

The dissemination of bid’ah culminates in the destruction of the Deen. Honouring bid’ah leads to the demolition of Islam. Perhaps you have heard the Hadith: *“Whoever honours a man of bid’ah, verily he has aided in the demolition of Islam.”* Therefore, it is only appropriate to apply the focus fully and to make the utmost effort to disseminate a Sunnat from the

Sunan, and to eliminate a bid'ah from the bid'aat. It is imperative to establish the commands of Islam at all times, especially during these times of the weakness of Islam. This is reliant on the dissemination of the Sunnah and the elimination of bid'ah

It appears that some of the predecessors (such as the Shaafi' Ulama of the later eras) had discerned 'beauty', hence they approved of some such acts. But this Faqeer does not agree with them in this issue. I do not see any beauty in even a single act of bid'ah. I discern in it nothing but darkness and contamination.

**“May Allah Ta’ala grant the Ulama of this age the taufeeq to totally refrain from describing bid’ah as hasanah, and may Allah Ta’ala grant them the taufeeq to abstain from issuing fatwas condoning it even if the act of bid’ah (acts such as mouloud) appears to them glittering like the morning light, for verily the deceptions of shaitaan are massive in acts besides the Sunnah.**

“In former times due to the power of Islam, the darkness of bid'ah was overshadowed. Perhaps some of that darkness which was overshadowed (by the radiance of Islam) appeared to be *nooraani* in the rays of Islam's *Noor*. Thus, this imagination led to the opinion of *husn* despite there being absolutely no *husn* (in the acts of bid'ah) in reality. However, in the current age Islam has become weak. It may not now be imagined that the darkness of bid'ah could be tolerated, hence it is not proper now to apply the fatwa of the Mutaqaddimeen and the Muta-akh-khireen. Verily, for every era there are different *ahkaam*.” (*Al-Fathur Rahmaani*)

Hadhrat Qutb Rabbaani Sayyid Ahmad Sarhindi Mujaddid Alf-e-Thaani (rahmatullah alayh) was the Mujaddid who appeared at the commencement of Islam's second millennium. Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) said that this Deen will

be purified by a Mujaddid whom Allah Ta'ala will dispatch at the beginning of every century. The few extracts (above) reveal the gross error of those who have passed off moulood as 'bid'ah hasanah'. They all are the victims of *Talbeesul Iblees* (satanic deception).

Qutb Rabbaani Sayyid Ahmad Sarhindi Mujaddid Alf-e-Thaani states in his Maktubaat:

*“If the Sufis of the age act justly and view the weakness of Islam and the prevalence of falsehood, it will be incumbent on them not to follow their shuyookh in acts besides the Sunnah, and that they should not regard fabricated acts as their Deen with the excuse that it was the amal of their shuyookh, for verily, following the Sunnah is the only Way and the repository of goodness and barakaat. In following anything other than the Sunnah is danger upon danger. And, it is on the Messenger to only deliver the Message.”*

We do not follow the errors of some Ulama who had appeared on the scene almost a thousand years after Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam). Allaamah Suyuti (Rahmatullah alayh) and some other Ulama who appeared eight and nine centuries after Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) and who had condoned mawlid may not be followed. They have erred grievously. They have not based their preference for this bid'ah on any valid Shar'i grounds. The Qur'aan, castigating Bani Israael for having made 'gods' of their Ulama and Shaikhs, says: *“They took their Ahbaar and their Ruhbaan as gods besides Allah...”* Our Taqleed of the Aimmah-e-Mujtahideen who transmitted the pure Sunnah to us, proscribes submission to the errors of some of the later Ulama.

Our Deen with its Shariah is not the product of 9<sup>th</sup> and 10<sup>th</sup> century Ulama. It was acquired from the Sahaabah. All our arguments in condemnation of the haraam mawlid bid'ah are based on the proofs of the Shariah from the Sahaabah and the Aimmah-e-Mujtahideen, not on the personal opinions of Ulama who came on to the scene many centuries after *Quroon-e-Thalaathah*.

The blatantly false claim of 'unanimity' or 'consensus' of permissibility for the bid'ah of mawlid made by the moron grave-worshipper more than adequately exhibits his *jahaalat* and immorality of character. In every age, right from the inception of this bid'ah, the Ulama-e-Haqq had condemned mawlid.

The grave-worshipper went to the depths of falsehood by claiming that even Ibn Taimiyyah had condoned mawlid. This is false. Ibn Taimiyyah condemned mawlid in his Fataawa.

Among the illustrious Ulama who had condemned the bid'ah of mawlid are:

1. Imaam Naseerud Deen Shaafi' d.667 H
2. Mujaddid Alf-e-Thaani Hanafi d.1034H
3. Ibnul Haaj Maaliki d.737H
4. Abdur Rahmaan Al-Maghribi
5. Shaykh Taajud Deen Al-Faakihaani Maaliki d.734H
6. Haafiz Ibn Fadhl Maqdisi d.611H
7. Shaykhul Hanaabilah Ibn Qaadhi Jabaal d.771H
8. Shaykh Nurud Deen Shubraamilisi d.1087H
9. Allaamah Hasan Bin Ali
10. Allaamah Ibn Hasan
11. Ahmad Bin Muhammad Al-Misri Maaliki
12. Allaamah Abul Qasim Abdur Rahmaan Bin Abdul Majeed Maaliki

13. Muhammad Bin Abu Bakr Makhzumi Maaliki d.827
14. Allaamah Alaud Deen bin Isma'eel Shaafi'
15. Haafiz Abu Bakr Bin Abdul Ghani d.629H
16. Shah Abdul Azeez Sahib d.1239H
17. The author of Zakheeratus Saalikeen
18. Saahib-e-Nurul Yaqeen
19. Saahib-e-Shu'atul Ilaahiyyah
20. Allaamah Shaami d.1252H.
21. Maulana Abdul Hayy Lukhnowi d.1304H
22. Ibn Rajab 795H
23. Afendi Shaarih Bariqah
24. Allaamah Fakhrud Deen Khuraasaani
25. Allaamah Sha'raani d.973H

This list is not exhaustive. There are numerous other great Ulama who have at all times condemned the mawlid bid'ah. Perhaps the hallucination of consensus is the effect of some substance abuse by the moron grave-worshipper.

Jalaluddin Suyuti of the 10<sup>th</sup> Hijri century who condoned mawlid, i.e. the mawlid minus the haraam factors, was constrained to concede: *"There is no Nass for mawlid. But there is qiyaas (reasoning)."* This in fact is an admission of the total lack of Shar'i daleel for mawlid. Imaam Suyuti (Rahmatullah alayh) erred grievously with his opinion of permissibility for mawlid on the basis of qiyaas. An ibaadat is an *Amr Ta-abbudi*. It is an act ordained by Allah Ta'ala. It is substantiated by *Sareeh (Explicit) Nass*. Acts resembling ibaadat which have no basis in the Qur'aan and Sunnah and which were unknown to the Salafus Saaliheen of *Quroon-e-Thalaathah*, are precisely the evil bid'ah so vehemently abhorred by Allah Ta'ala. Such bid'ah mutilate the Deen and transform it into a hotch potch of satanic rituals with an outer

veneer of worship. Precisely for this reason, said Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam):

*“Verily, Allah deprives every man of bid’ah from Taubah.”*

He is in fact a Zindeeq without even realizing the gravity of his vile innovation and completely oblivious of his status as a “Dog of the Fire”. Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) described the mutilators of the Deen as *“Kilaabun Naar”* (*Dogs of the Fire*).

It is bid’ah which has despatched the Shariats of Nabi Musaa (Alayhis salaam) and Nabi Isaa (Alayhis salaam) into the realm of annihilation. Today, there remains nothing of the former Shariats revealed by Allah Ta’ala. Their respective followers, being the victims of Shaitaan’s snare, had totally mutilated the Shariats of the former Ambiya (Alayhimus salaam). Bid’ah was the primary tool and trap for emaciating and finally eliminating the previous shariats. Whilst shaitaan is perpetually engaging in his plot to undermine Islam with bid’ah, he with his myriad of grave-worshippers, stupid and shallow-minded molvis and sheikhs will not succeed in this pernicious objective. Allah Ta’ala, Himself has undertaken the responsibility of safeguarding the purity of Islam.

Despite Imaam Suyuti (Rahmatullah alayh) being a Mountain of Hadith, he displayed deficiency in Fiqhi Qiyaas, hence he blundered in this field to the extent of condoning even some acts of bid’ah.

Presenting the errors of the Ulama as *daleel*, and this is a favourite ‘daleel’ of the moron grave-worshippers and of modernist, liberal molvis, is at the peril of destroying one’s Imaan. Allaamah Abdul Wahhaab Sha’raani (Rahmatullah alayh) said: *“He who takes hold of the obscurities of the Ulama (presenting it as daleel), verily, he has made an exit from Islam.”*

In Fataawa Hadithiyyah, Ibn Hajar Haitami (Rahmatullah alayh) says: *“Many people stand up when Rasulullah’s name is mentioned (i.e. when it is sung) during the mawlid function. This is bid’ah. There is no Hadith, etc. to substantiate this act (of qiyaam which is an incumbent ingredient of mawlid).”*

The first among the great and illustrious Ulama to have written a refutation of the bid’ah of meelaad was Allaamah Shaikh Taajuddeen Faakihaani (rahmatullah alayh). In refutation of this bid’ah sayyiah, he writes in his *Al-Mawrid fil Kalaam ma-a Amalil Mawlid*:

*“I know not of any basis for this mawlid, neither from the Kitaab (Qur’aan) nor from the Sunnah. Nor is it narrated from those Ulama (Salfus Saaliheen) who were the Authorities of the Deen, and who had supported with diligence the narrations of the Salfus Saaliheen.*

*This mawlid is bid’ah. The Ahl-e-Baatil had originated it, and carnal lusts of the worshippers of the stomach have nourished it. ....Neither did the Sahaabah nor the Pious Taabi-een practise this (bid’ah of mawlid). And, if I am questioned about it in the Divine Presence (on the Day of Qiyaamah), I shall give this same response.*

*It is not mustahab nor even mubah (permissible) because an innovation in the Deen cannot be permissible. This is the Ijma’ of the Muslimeen. Thus mawlid is either Makrooh (Tahrimi) or Haraam.*

Allaamah Hasan Ibn Ali (rahmatullah alayh) states in *Tareeqah Radd-e-Ahl-e-Bid’ah*: *“The meelaad function which jaahil sufis had innovated, there is no basis for it in the Shariah. On the contrary, it is bid’ah sayyiah consisting of numerous evils.”*



Shaikh Muhammad Abu Bakr Makhzumi Maaliki (rahmatullah alayh) states in *Manhal Sharh Raafi*: “Among the evil acts of abomination and evil prohibitions in this age is the function of mawlid. Ummats of the previous Ambiya were destroyed for innovating new acts in the Deen.”

Allaamah Alaauddeen Ibn Ismaaeel Ash-Shaafi (rahmatullah alayh) says in his *Sharhul Ba'th Wan Nushoor*: “Mawlid is bid'ah. Its perpetrator is deserving of criticism.”

In *Shariah Ilaahiyyah* it is said: “Undoubtedly, an evil bid'ah which is prevalent in countries and cities is the mawlid function. It has no basis in the Dalaa-il of the Shariah, not in the Qur'aan and not in the Hadith.”

Even Ulama of Ibn Hajar's and Suyuti's status have fallen by the wayside and had failed to understand that the employment of *Qiyaas* to confirm permissibility for an entirely new innovation in the form of 'ibaadat' which did not exist during the *Khairul Quroon* era while the *raison d'etre* (*Illat*) cited by them did exist, is *Faasid Qiyaas*. The *Illat* of love for Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) was never more conspicuous and more profound than its presence in the age of the Sahaabah and the subsequent eras, yet these great and illustrious Devotees of Nabi-e-Kareem (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) did not innovate any birthday celebration practices in Rasulullah's honour. Any *qiyaas* which fabricates an act which is glaringly bid'ah is undoubtedly, *faasid* (corrupt) and baseless, regardless of its author. The claim of it being *Mustahab*, i.e. the type of mawlid devoid of the rubbish haraam *khuraafaat* associated with the carnival functions of this day, is erroneous and surprising for men of Ilm to make. The Ulama who have made this spurious claim had failed to apply their minds, for even a *Mandoob/Mustahab* act, there is

the need for Shar'i Daleel. It is said in *Raddul Muhtaar*:  
“*Nudb is a Shar'i Hukm. Daleel for it is imperative.*”

We are most fortunate that Allah Ta'ala has demarcated for us the limits of obedience which is owed to the Ulama. In this regard, the Qur'aan declares:

“*They (Bani Israaeel) took their ahbaar (molvis and shaikhs) and their ruhbaan (sufis) as gods besides Allah....*”

The errors and slips of the Ulama portend the gravest danger for the Ummah. Precisely for this reason did Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) say: “*Verily, I fear for my Ummah the Aimmah Mudhilleen (Ulama who misguide).*” In another Hadith, Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) said: “*I fear for my Ummah three acts: The slip of an Aalim, the disputing of a munaafiq with the Qur'aan and the denial of Qadr (Taqdeer).*” Hadhrat Umar Ibn Khattaab (radhiyallahu anhu) said: “*Do you know what will demolish Islam? The slip of the Aalim, the disputing of the munaafiq using the Qur'aan and the hukm (fatwa) of the Aimmah Mudhilleen demolish Islam.*”

Of the category of dangerous slips by the Ulama is the slip of Allaamah Sakhaawi (rahmatullah alayh) who is reported to have said: “*If in this (mawlid) there was only abasement of shaitaan and the happiness of the people of the Muslimeen, then it would suffice (for permissibility).*” Sakhaawi either did not apply his mind or he was in some state of devotional ecstasy or he was overwhelmed by the widespread prevalence of this bid'ah, hence his intellectual discernment became clouded or this statement has been wrongly attributed to him. Far from bid'ah being an abasement for shaitaan, it is an act which is exceedingly delightful to him. Bid'ah brings to him such happiness which knows no bounds. All acts of bid'ah innovated into the Deen are the inspirations and adornments of

Iblees. Obviously he will be the happiest when the Muslim Ummah indulges in bid'ah. Hadhrat Sufyaan Thauri (rahmatullah alayh) said:

*“Iblees loves bid'ah more than what he loves sin.”* Muslims repent for the sins they commit, but not for bid'ah. There are two reasons why they do not repent for bid'ah:

(1) They believe that their bid'ah is ibaadat, so why should they repent?

(2) Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) said that Allah Ta'ala deprives every bid'ati from making Taubah.

As far as the “happiness of Muslims” is concerned, only the juhala and the slaves of lust derive happiness from bid'ah, fun-festivals, merrymaking parties and birthday celebrations emulated from the Nasaara.

A graver and incredible slip of Allaamah Sakhaawi (rahmatullah alayh) is his observation: *“The People of the Cross (the Christians) have made the birthday of their Nabi (in fact their 'god') their great day of eid (i.e. Christmas day). The People of Islam are more deserving of honouring (their Nabi by means of birthday celebration).”*

This is indeed a shocking and lamentable slip committed by an Aalim of the Deen. His observation confirms that mawlid is in emulation of the Christian's festival of Christmas. Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) said: *“Whoever emulates a people is of them.”* He also said that Muslims will imitate the Yahood and Nasaara in the minutest detail right into the *“lizard's hole”*. Mullah Ali Qaari, refuting the blunder of Sakhaawi, says in his *Al-Mouridur Rawifil Moulidin Nabawi*: *“I say that*

*we have been commanded (by Rasulullah –sallallahu alayhi wasallam) to oppose the Ahl-e-Kitaab.”*

After the Conquest of Makkah when Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) set off on the Jihad Campaign of Hunain, they passed by a tree known to the Mushrikeen by the name, *Zaat Anwaat*. They used to hang their weapons on this tree, gather around it and pass the time. It was not a tree of worship. They used to halt here for a short while. This tree became a landmark for the Mushrikeen.

Among those who were with Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) were some new Muslims who were as yet ignorant of the tenets and principles of the Shariah. They said: “*O Rasulullah! Establish for us a Zaat Anwaat just as they (the Mushrikeen) have a Zaat Anwaat.*” Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) said in surprise: “*Subhaanallaah! This is just as the nation of Musaa (alayhis salaam) said: ‘Make for us a god (idol of worship) just as they (the idolaters) have gods (idols of worship).* – Surah A’raaf, Aayat 138. *I take oath by Him in Whose Power is my life! You (Muslimeen) will most certainly follow the ways of those before you (i.e. the Yahood and Nasaara).*” (Tirmizi)

Sakhaawi’s slip is of this dimension and gravity. But, we do not take our Ulama as “gods besides Allah”. Thus, in addition to mawlid being bid’ah is *Tashabbuh bil Kuffaar*. Its *hurmat* is therefore compounded. *Zaat Anwaat* was not an idol. The kuffaar used it merely as a halting place, and they hung their weapons on this tree while they relaxed. However, since it had become a famous landmark for them, Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) rejected the request on the basis of *Tashabbuh bil Kuffaar*. In fact, he likened the request to the

request of Bani Israaeel who had asked Nabi Musaa (alayhis salaam) to make for them an idol when they had seen some idolaters worshipping idols. Although the element of worship was not in *Zaat Anwaat*, Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) abhorred the request of the new Muslims because of the element of *Tashabbuh*.

From Rasulullah's abhorrence for *Tashabbuh Bil Kuffaar* the ludicrousness and abhorrence of Sakhaawi's justification of mawlid (i.e. the mawlid minus all the haraam paraphernalia which are associated with today's haraam meelaad carnival festivals) can be better understood. Regardless of whose name is cited, be he the greatest Allaamah of the age, his view, if unsubstantiated by the *Dalaa-il of the Shariah* will never enjoy Shar'i acceptance and credibility, and if in conflict with the Shariah, will be *mardood*. All those Ulama who have accorded credibility to mouloud functions have gravely slipped and erred despite their permissibility being related to only such functions which are devoid of any *munkaraat*. The very festival of mawlid devoid of *munkaraat* is bid'ah sayyiah. It is a vile act given the form of ibaadat. But Ibaadat was only that which was taught by Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) and the Sahaabah, and this has reached us via the Aimmah-e-Mujtahideen and the genuine Fuqaha.

Whilst Ibn Hajar (rahmatullah alayh) and the others are accepted and authentic Ulama, they are nowhere near the status of the Sahaabah and the Fuqaha of the Khairul Quroon. They had missed that golden era of Islam by many centuries, and were influenced by the widespread prevalence of the bid'ah of mawlid.

Again it should be emphasized that the permissibility attributed to the likes of Ibn Hajar (rahmatullah alayh) and Suyuti (rahmatullah alayh), narrated by the Ahl-e-Bid'ah, Ahl-e-Hawa and lately by the moron pseudo-deobandi cardboard molvis is absolutely no *daleel* for the votaries of mawlid because the function for which Ibn Hajar (rahmatullah alayh) and others have predicated permissibility is something widely different from the carnival for which the miscreants of today are claiming permissibility. The two acts while having the same designation, viz., mouloud/mawlid/meelaad, are different in entirety. The difference is as divergent as east and west or heaven and hell. Even those Ulama are unanimous in condemning the type of Satanism of the age which is termed 'mawlid'. There is not a single name which the morons can present in support of the satanic mawlid festivals and haraam parties of these times.

The arguments of all the other Shaafi' Ulama who arrived on the Islamic scene many centuries after Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam), and who are presented as '*daleel*' by the Ahl-e-Bid'ah and pseudo-deobandi cardboard molvi rabble are similarly spurious and utterly bereft of Shar'i evidence. Since this treatise is only a brief response to the flotsam disgorged by the miscreants, we shall bypass the drivel of this train which has been derailed from the Straight Course of the Shariah.

With regard to the moron grave-worshipper's claim of Imaam Suyuti having written a "whole book" in praise of mawlid, let it be well understood that this treatise to which he refers consists of nothing other than compound personal opinion bereft of any Shar'i *daleel*. Even Imaam Suyuti, in his treatise of personal opinion, was constrained to concede that there is no *Nass* for mawlid, and that only *qiyaas* has been resorted to.

However, it has already been explained that such qiyaas is *faasid* (baseless and corrupt). Ibaadat is not the consequence of qiyaas. It is the product of *Sareeh Nass*, and the Sunnah of Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) and the Sunnah of His Sahaabah.

Then, the moron tenders the 10<sup>th</sup> century Ibn Hajar (Rahmatullah alayh) as his ‘daleel’ for permissibility and praiseworthiness of the bid’ah of mawlid. The argument is putrid and devoid of Shar’i merit. It is surprising how even great Ulama blunder into an abyss of incongruities which evokes the surprise of those who understand the status of the erring Aalim. Anyhow, all human beings regardless of status, err and even commit lamentably grave blunders which are perpetuated by their followers. Only the Ambiya are saved from errors of judgment by Allah Ta’ala Himself. The error of a Nabi is immediately corrected by Allah Ta’ala.

Regarding the opinions of the Ulama, our criterion is always the Shariah, hence irrespective of the status of the Aalim, if his opinion conflicts with the Shariah, it shall be set aside. It is kufr to override the Shariah with the opinion of an Aalim.

Ibn Hajar’s argument is enfeebled and rendered void by his self-contradiction which neutralizes his claim. Ibn Hajar (rahmatullah alayh) who condones the kind of meelad minus haraam acts, says: *“There are two kinds of functions where the birth (of Rasulullah –sallallahu alayhi wasallam) is mentioned: (1) Such functions where impermissible activities take place. Such a function is absolutely not permissible..... Most meelaad functions are of this kind.. (2) Such functions which are devoid of evil and impermissible acts .....Many people stand when mention of the birth is made. This is bid’ah. There is no Hadith, etc. to substantiate this practice....”*

Two facts are noteworthy in the aforementioned statements of IbnHajar:

(1) All current forms of meelaad are bid'ah sayyiah and haraam. He belies the moron who peddles the idea that he (IbnHajar) and the other Ulama are in support of the type of moulood practices currently in vogue.

(2) Ibn Hajar's self-contradiction which neutralizes his claim of permissibility of the first kind of moulood. In the aforementioned statement, Ibn Hajar condemns and bans *qiyaam* (standing up) when the performers sing their 'Ya Nabi' songs or when the birth of Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) is mentioned during the meelaad performance. He labels *qiyaam* as bid'ah, and his *daleel* for it being bid'ah is that there is no Hadith substantiation for this practice. Yet he forgot that there is no Hadith substantiation for even the whole meelaad function. Thus, his condemnation of *qiyaam* because of no Hadith basis while condoning meelaad which also has no basis, not only no basis in the Hadith, but no basis in Islam for more than six centuries, is illogic. For the same reason that Ibn Hajar (rahmatullah alayh) regards *qiyaam* to be bid'ah, should he likewise have believed that meelaad too is bid'ah. The common denominator for both acts being bid'ah and not permissible is the total lack of Hadith and Khairul Quroon support.

Furthermore, the lopsided, illogic arguments which Ibn Hajar (rahmatullah alayh) and others of the same school offer for permissibility of their kind of meelaad, could have been extended to *qiyaam* as well. Just as they have mangled Ahaadith of general import to extravagant permissibility for the bid'ah of their specific kind of meelaad, so too could they have mutilated by means of baseless extrapolation the Hadith: "*Stand for your sayyid (chief).*", to eke out substantiation for the bid'ah of *qiyaam*. After all, Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi



wasallam) is the greatest Sayyid. If *qiyaam* was ordered for small-timer worldly chieftains, then this Hadith could have acted as a “great daleel” for substantiating the bid’ah of meelaad *qiyaam*. However, this logic had not occurred to Ibn Hajar (rahmatullah alayh) and others. After all, the whole ‘logic’ underlying the permissibility of even the first kind of meelaad is illogic and baseless. There can never be permissibility for bid’ah.

From the foregoing explanation it should be abundantly clear that the claim of *Ijma’* on the permissibility of mawlid is palpably bunkum. On the contrary, all the Ulama-e-Haqq of every Math-hab from the very inception of this bid’ah had slated it.

Offering some salubrious advice to the Qabar Pujaaris and deviates, Hadhrat Sayyid Ahmad Kabeer Rifaa’i (Rahmatullah alayh) who is acknowledged by all the grave-worshippers as one of the greatest Auliya and Sufis, said:

*“Respected People! What is it that you are doing? You say Haarith said so; Baayazid said so; Mansur Hallaj said so. Instead of saying so, say that Imaam Shaafi’ said so; Imaam Ahmad (Bin Hambal) said so; Imaam Maalik said so; Imaam Abu Hanifah said so. The statements of Baayazid can neither lower nor elevate you. On the contrary, Imaam Maalik and Imaam Shaaf’i indicate the path of Najaat (Salvation) and the Shariah.”*

So, we are not interested in opinions and practices of Ulama and Sufis who appeared on the scene many centuries after the Sahaabah. Any of their practices which are alien to the Shariah as it existed during the era of *Khairul Quroon* have no Shar’i validity.

## THE FIFTH TRASH ARGUMENT OF THE GRAVE WORSHIPPER

The fifth trash argument of the Qabar Pujaari is an absolute insult to intelligence. Only an obnoxious brain, convoluted by grave-worship is capable of disgorging such rubbish as this jaahil has poured out in his fallacy. He utters the colossal LIE of claiming that Imaam Abu Hanifah (Rahmatullah alayh) and Imaam Bukhaari (Rahmatullah alayh) had also observed the bid'ah mawlid practice.

His stupid 'daleel' compounded with *jahaalat* is: *"Something that has not been mentioned or recorded does not mean it did not exist."* This grave-worshipper is shockingly ignorant. An act proclaimed as ibaadat has to be incumbently recorded and clearly mentioned in the authoritative Kutub of the Deen. When this haraam practice had not existed in the Ummah for the first six centuries, how is it ever possible that these two Imaams had practised it? An act of 'ibaadat' not recorded in the Kutub of the Salafus Saaliheen is the strongest *daleel* for its bid'ah status. All acts of ibaadat are recorded in the Kutub of the Salafus Saaliheen. Not a single act of ibaadat has been omitted from the Records of the Salafus Saaliheen.

The Deen was perfected and finalized during the very time of Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam). The Qur'aan Majeed testifies with clarity and emphasis this fact. The moron grave worshipper's stupid 'daleel' implies that since a 'sixth' Salaat and another extra month of fasting are not recorded in the Books of the Salafus Saaliheen, their validity cannot be denied if some morons and grave-worshippers establish these as integral acts of ibaadat of the Deen. The fact is that the complete silence of the Salafus Saaliheen on the issue of the

bid'ah mawlid, is the strongest proof for it being bid'ah. As soon as the bid'ah of mawlid was innovated, the Ulama vigorously refuted it.

Presenting another absolutely rotten 'daleel' for his stupid view, the moron says:

*"If the books written in the past do not mention that Ibn Taymiyyah used to perform his five times daily Salah, give zakah once a year and fast in the month of Ramadan it does not mean that he did not."*

Even a moron layman understands and mocks this stupidity disgorged by the grave-worshipper. The acts mentioned by him in relation to Ibn Taimiyyah, are established and known acts of Ibaadat. There is absolutely no need for anyone to conjecture that Ibn Taimiyyah had performed or did not perform these established acts of Ibaadat.

The issue pertains to bid'ah – acts innovated as 'ibaadat' when in reality these acts never existed in Islam. If they had existed as acts of ibaadat, then there is 100% certitude that they would have been recorded in the Kutub of Islam of the Salafus Saaliheen. The Muhadditheen and the Fuqaha have not omitted a single act of Ibaadat ordained by Allah Azza Wa Jal. Every teaching the Sahaabah had acquired from Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) was delivered to the Ummah on the command of Nabi-e-Kareem (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam). An omission of an act of Ibaadat leads to the inevitable conclusion of the imperfection of the Deen which is in diametric conflict with the explicit *Nass* of the Qur'aan Majeed.

It is conspicuously obvious that acts which are not ibaadat will not be found in any of the Records of the Salafus Saaliheen. It is extremely ludicrous to expect that innovations which form

no part of Islam, and which were frauded and fabricated into the Ummah centuries after Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) would find accommodation in the Kutub of the Salafus Saaliheen. If some moron adds two raka'ts to the Fajr Fardh believing it to be an act of merit, then justifies it by claiming that nowhere in the records of the Salafus Saaliheen is this prohibited, then every person will understand that this moron is under the spell of shaitaan who has inspired this act of bid'ah in the form of 'ibaadat'.

In terms of the absurd logic of the grave-worshipper any act which is given an external facade of 'ibaadat' will be a 'Sunnah' act even if it was innovated a million years after the inception of Islam, merely on the basis of there being no explicit prohibition in the Records of the Salafus Saaliheen. And, furthermore, in terms of this corrupt logic, remarkable for its absurdity, Imaam Bukhaari, Imaam Abu Hanifah, Imaam Maalik, Imaam Shaafi, Imaam Hambal and the Sahaabah, all had indulged in it, and the satanic 'daleel' for this weird assumption is that there is *no mention of their indulgence in it*. The grave-worshipping moron's supreme jahaalat is vividly displayed further in his following statement which will surely extract mirth and ridicule:

*"If we rely on text to establish the occurrence of acts, it will be impossible to prove many of the companions and those who came after them performed their obligatory acts."*

Every act of Islam is totally reliant on textual evidence or *Tawaaruth* from the time of the Salafus Saaliheen of *Khairul Quroon*. All the obligatory acts (Salaat, Saum, Zakaat, Hajj, etc.) are substantiated on the basis of textual evidence, not on the stupid convoluted satanic 'principle' of absence of mention hallucinated by the Qabar Pujaari moron. There is no need to establish whether the Sahaabah executed their obligatory acts or not. The one who dares to audaciously claim that they did

not do so, will have to provide his evidence. The Shariah does not require us to establish whether a man performs his obligatory acts or not. It requires evidence for an act claimed to be Ibaadat. For all the obligatory, Masnoon and Mustahab actsthere is evidence – textual evidence. For the haraam bid’ah sayyiah there is not a vestige of evidence. On the contrary, there is a volume of Dalaa-il based on the immutable principles of the Shariah which brand the mawlid practices evil innovations.

Then in another abortive attempt cadging for ‘evidence’, the moron says:

*“Imam Bukhari has recorded narrations regarding the beautiful incidents that occurred at the time of the birth of the Prophet.”*

Recording in the Hadith Kitaab the ‘beautiful incidents’ which had occurred at the time of the birth of Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) is not the bid’ah mawlid Christian-style mawlid which is the subject we are discussing. No one has ever faulted the beautiful incidents which had occurred at the birth of Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam), and no one has ever ventured to say or even dream that it is not permissible to narrate these issues and the episodes of Rasulullah’s life. The target of criticism is the haraam bid’ah mawlid-christmas merrymaking carnival birthday practices in vogue.

Presenting another absurd argument, the moron says:

*“According to Imam Abu Hanifah and Imam Al-Shafa’i there is an established rule, “The essence of all (everything) is permissibility unless prohibited.”*

On the basis of this principle, the grave-worshipper claims permissibility for the mawlid bid’ah. This is another laughable stupidity. Firstly, the principle mentioned above is the subject of intense difference of opinion. Secondly, it is not an

immutable principle. Thirdly, it applies to tangible things, e.g. meat of certain animals not mentioned in the Hadith, and similar issues. Fourthly, bid'ah has been unequivocally condemned by Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam). This principle cannot override the express ruling of Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam). Bid'ah is an act which did not exist during the age of Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) nor during the era of the Salafus Saaliheen. When it was fabricated and innovated later, the explicit ruling of Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) pertaining to bid'ah applied.

The condemnation and banning of bid'ah by Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) does have valid meaning. Only a moron with vermiculated brains – brains corrupted by grave-worship – is able to venture that the principle of *Ibaahah* mentioned above cancels whatever meaning the Hadith condemning bid'ah has and conveys. The innumerable great Ulama and Fuqaha who have vehemently condemned mawlid understood the principles of the Shariah and their condemnation of mawlid as bid'ah is not based on a host of stupidities such as the absurdities advanced by the moron grave-worshipper in vindication of the mawlid bid'ah.

The moron adds that mawlid is permissible because it has not been prohibited in the Qur'aan and Sunnah. His jahaalat is further confirmed by this stupidity. Innumerable haraam acts are not mentioned in the Qur'aan and Sunnah. They are evidenced by Shar'i dalaa-il. Celebrating Christmas, valentine's day, ghost's day, using faeces for medicine, cremating the dead, hyena and baboon meat, eating mucous, eating rats, adding two raka'ts to the Fajr Salaat, adding 10 days to Ramadhaan, reciting Attahiyaat in Qiyaam, and a million other issues are not prohibited in the Qur'aan and Sunnah. These issues are prohibited on the basis of Shar'i Dalaa-il of which the moron is deplorably ignorant.

## THE SIXTH TRASH ARGUMENT OF THE GRAVE-WORSHIPPER

In this trash argument, the Qabar Pujaari avers that there is “*no harm in fixing a specific day for the Mawlid gathering*”. This stupid averment is like saying: *There is no harm in fixing a specific day for gambling or for zina or for any other haraam activity*. When the very activity for which the specific day is fixed is a haraam bid’ah, the question of ‘fixing a specific day’ does not arise. Whether a sin or a bid’ah is perpetrated on a specific day every year or on any unspecified day, it remains haraam. This argument of the moron is a stupid superfluity.

Furthermore, fixing specific days for acts of Ibaadat for which Allah Ta’ala has not ordained fixed days, is bid’ah, hence not permissible. The fixation of specific days for certain acts of Ibaadat by the Shariah, may not be extended at whim and fancy to every fabrication of the nafs. The Shariah has fixed the 10<sup>th</sup> Muharram as the Day of Aashura. The Days of Hajj are fixed. The Day of Arafaat is fixed. The Days of Eid are fixed. The Month of Ramadhaan is fixed. Lailatul Baraat is fixed. Besides Shar’i fixations, it is haraam to fabricate ibaadat for specific days. Even valid Ibaadat may not be assigned to specific days, e.g. performing Nafil Salaat, making Dua for the amwaat, etc. But these Bid’atis have inherited from the Hindus the fixed days of the 3<sup>rd</sup>, 7<sup>th</sup> and 40<sup>th</sup> day for isaal-e-thawaab for the deceased. Whilst these are valid and meritorious acts, the fixed days render the practices bid’ah. This evil is magnified with the practice of fixing a specific day for something which is a haraam bid’ah in the very first instance.

The grave-worshipper further abortively attempts to justify his stupidity by the Sunnah act of fasting on Mondays. Thus, he says:

*“The Messenger of Allah was asked why he fasted every Monday. He said on that day I was born and on that day I received the divine revelation from Allah.”*

Fasting on a Monday is Sunnah. This is a teaching of the Shariah. But not a single Sahaabi nor any of the Fuqaha had ever propagated the idea of mawlid on the basis of this Hadith. If this Hadith had any relevance to birthday celebrations, the Sahaabah would have been the very first to have given it practical expression. But the Sahaabah did not understand mawlid from this or any other hadith as the moron qabar pujaari stupidly and abortively struggles to convey.

Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) and the Sahaabah fasted on Mondays. They did not celebrate birthdays on Mondays. They did not sing songs, dance in the streets, decorate the Musjid with kuffaar flags and buntings, nor did they cook degs of dhal and rice which is specific for the mawlid gangs, nor did they indulge in the many other nonsensical stupidities and haraam activities which adorn the mawlid bid’ah. How many of these grave-worshippers who vociferously proclaim the slogan of ‘*Hubb-e-Rasool (Love for the Rasool)*’, fast on Mondays and Thursdays as was the practice of Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) and the Sahaabah? They only know how to sing songs, dance, make merry, eat and excrete, and this is the sum total of their bid’ah mawlid.

The attempt to fix days for practices for which the Shariah has not ordained specific days is bid’ah. The Qabar Pujaari is not the Shariah. He has no right to fix specific days for even halaal practices on the basis of days fixed by Allah Ta’ala for certain acts of Ibaadat. Such specifications are exclusive with the Shariah. The fixed times for the five Salaat, the fixed day for Jumuah Salaat and the like which the moron cites in his stupid attempt to justify fixing a specific day for the mawlid bid’ah



are acts ordained by Allah Ta'ala. Such fixation of time and days cannot be extended to other acts for which the Shariah has not fixed any time or day. But in so far as the mawlid bid'ah is concerned, this argument simply does not develop in view of the practice *per se* being impermissible.

After laboriously and stupidly struggling to 'prove' that a specific day may be fixed for the mawlid bid'ah, the moron is constrained to contradict himself and to confess:

*"To condition an act of worship with a specific time, day or place is not within the authority of anyone except Allah and His beloved Messenger. None of our scholars and neither our general Muslims condition the celebration of mawlid with a specific time, day, or place. This is just another accusation."*

If this averment is true, then why did the Qabar Pujaari undertake the labour of trying to prove that fixing a specific day is permissible? If it was a baseless accusation against the grave-worshippers (the Barelwis), then the moron should not have wasted time and pen with a stupid meaningless exercise in which he has been constrained to contradict himself. He should have from the very outset have simply refuted the 'accusation'. Instead of refuting it, he struggled to present argument to justify fixing a specific day for the mawlid bid'ah. After presenting justification, he contradicts himself by acknowledging that only Allah Ta'ala and Nabi (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) have the right to fix days and times for Ibaadat. This portrays the incongruity of his brains.

The fact is that the Barelwi Bid'atis do fix a specific day for their bid'ah mawlid function. The 'accusation' is valid. Although they incongruously celebrate the birthday on other occasions as well, the primary mawlid bid'ah is held on 12<sup>th</sup> Rabiul Awwal. Thus, it will be seen that the Musjids and streets are adorned with coon and carnival style in Rabiul Awwal.

The other celebrations on other days are mere handmaids of the primary Rabiul Awwal celebration.

It will be appropriate to add at this juncture that of recent, the ‘deobandi’ bid’atis, in emulation of the Barelwi Qabar Pujaaris have jumped onto the mawlid bandwagon. The only difference is that the ‘deobandi’ miscreants dub their bid’ah mawlid, ‘seerat jalsah’. The introduction of the ‘seerah jalsah’ mawlid bid’ah is an exhibition of the spiritual and *Ilmi* bankruptcy of the ‘deobandi’ bid’atis who do not have the faintest idea of the meaning of the Deobandi Maslak of our Akaabireen.

## **THE SEVENTH TRASH ARGUMENT OF THE QABAR PUJAARI MORON**

In this flapdoodle argument, the moron grave-worshipper abortively attempts to show that celebrating the birthday of Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) is not in emulation of the Christians who celebrate the birth of Jesus on Christmas day.

His first averment is: *“Resemblance of another religion that Allah and His beloved Messenger have prohibited is unlawful. Otherwise it remains lawful.”*

In addition to this averment being stupid and baseless, it is self-contradictory in that it accepts emulation to be haraam, but at the same time it is also permissible. Anyhow, the moron does concede that *‘resemblance with another religion is unlawful’*. No unbiased, intelligent Muslim can deny that birthday celebration of a holy personage is *per se* in emulation of the kuffaar, especially the Christian kuffaar who celebrate the birthday of Jesus on Christmas day.

The adornment of the Musaaajid, the streets, etc. with coloured lights, flags, buntings and ribbons, etc. are in stark emulation of Christians and Hindus. Such rubbish acts were unknown to the Sahaabah and the Salafus Saaliheen of Khairul Quroon. Only bigoted Qabar Pujaaris deny this reality.

Where in the Islamic World and when in the history of Islam did the abomination of celebrating birthdays develop? Were the devoted Sahaabah unaware of Rasulullah's day of birth? Why did they not celebrate this day in any way whatsoever? Why six centuries had to lapse before the fabrication of this accursed kuffaar practice of birthday celebration with its accompaniment of kuffaar style paraphernalia?

While the grave-worshipper concedes that a resemblance with Easter and Diwali, and kuffaar artefacts such as Christmas trees, etc., is unlawful imitation, he denies the conspicuous reality of such imitation in the mawlid bid'ah celebration. The Hadith,

*"Whoever imitates a people is of them"*, brings within its scope every act, practice and custom of the kuffaar which is unnecessarily adopted by Muslims regardless of such practices being of the mundane, not religious type. Precisely for this reason did Hadhrat Umar (Radhiyallahu anhu) during his Khilaafat forbid non-Muslims from adopting Muslim styles of dress and vice versa. He even forbade the Muslims from mounting their horses in the manner of the Ajam.

It is essential to understand that the prohibition of imitating the kuffaar is not restricted to religious practices. It covers all aspects of kuffaar life. Firstly, the celebration of a holy personage's birthday is in fact emulation of a religious practice

of the Christians in particular. Thus, it is aggravated emulation. It is the worst kind of imitation. All the adornment, decorations and trappings accompanying the celebration of mawlid are in fact imitation of the religious practices of the kuffaar.

Earlier in this treatise, the episode of *Zaat Anwaat* was mentioned. Despite the imitation in this aspect being of a mundane act of the mushrikeen, Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) prohibited it. We repeat the episode for greater edification of the lost souls.

After the Conquest of Makkah when Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) set off on the Jihad Campaign of Hunain, they passed by a tree known to the Mushrikeen by the name, *Zaat Anwaat*. They used to hang their weapons on this tree, gather around it and pass the time. It was not a tree of worship. They used to halt here for a short while. This tree became a landmark for the Mushrikeen.

Among those who were with Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) were some new Muslims who were as yet ignorant of the tenets and principles of the Shariah. They said: “*O Rasulullah! Establish for us a Zaat Anwaat just as they (the Mushrikeen) have a Zaat Anwaat.*” Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) said in surprise: “*Subhaanallaah! This is just as the nation of Musaa (alayhis salaam) said: ‘Make for us a god (idol of worship) just as they (the idolaters) have gods (idols of worship. – Surah A’raaf, Aayat 138). I take oath by Him in Whose Power is my life! You (Muslimeen) will most certainly follow the ways of those before you (i.e. the Yahood and Nasaara).*” (Tirmizi)

It is most significant that Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) likened the non-religious mundane act of *Zaat Anwaat* to idolatry, hence he (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) compared the request to the request of Bani Israaeel for an idol to worship. This episode alone illustrates the fallacy of the claim of the Qabar Pujaari mawlid votary.

This mawlid has been fabricated and innovated in emulation of the Christmas celebration of the Nasaara is amply borne out by the colossal error of Hadhrat Sakhaawi (Rahmatullah alayh) who proffered Christmas day celebration as the justification for mawlid celebration. We repeat here Sakhaawi's convoluted logic mentioned earlier.

The grave and incredible slip of Allaamah Sakhaawi (rahmatullah alayh) is his observation: *"The People of the Cross (the Christians) have made the birthday of their Nabi (in fact their 'god') their great day of eid (i.e. Christmas day). The People of Islam are more deserving of honouring (their Nabi by means of birthday celebration)."*

This is indeed a shocking and lamentable slip committed by an Aalim of the Deen. His observation confirms that mawlid is in emulation of the Christian's festival of Christmas. Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) said: *"Whoever emulates a people is of them."* He also said that Muslims will imitate the Yahood and Nasaara in the minutest detail right into the *"lizard's hole"*. Mullah Ali Qaari, refuting the blunder of Sakhaawi, says in his *Al-Mouridur Rawifil Moulidin Nabawi*: *"I say that we have been commanded (by Rasulullah –sallallahu alayhi wasallam) to oppose the Ahl-e-Kitaab."*

The command of Islam is to oppose the Yahood, Nasaara and the kuffaar in general in all aspects to the utmost of our ability. It is extremely repugnant to create a resemblance with them. Even in the matter of using weapons of war, Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) was averse to the weapons of the kuffaar. Thus, when he (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) saw a Sahaabi in one Jihad campaign using a Persian bow, he (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) ordered him to ditch it and to take an Arabian bow notwithstanding the superiority of the Persian bow. He (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) added that Allah suffices for us. Only if items of dire need and use are not available from Muslim sources will it be permissible to make use of the implements manufactured by the kuffaar. But the principle is always that *Tashabbuh bil Kuffaar* is haraam in all domains and in all facets of life. Wherever avoidable, it becomes Waajib to abstain.

Flaunting his jahaalat, the moron grave-worshipper says: *“Celebrating the Mawlid by fasting, reciting praises of Allah and His beloved or decorating the house with lights is not resembling another religion.”*

Fasting specifically on the day of Rasulullah’s birth is bid’ah. If there was any merit whatsoever in fasting specifically on 12<sup>th</sup> Rabiul Awwal, Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) would have instructed the Sahaabah to fast just as he had instructed fasting on all other occasions such as Mondays, Thursdays, the 10<sup>th</sup> Muharaam, 15<sup>th</sup> Sha’baan, the Day of Arafaat, the 13<sup>th</sup>, 14<sup>th</sup> and 15<sup>th</sup> of every Islamic month. But these Bid’atis whilst placing emphasis on their own fabricated day of fasting, generally ignore the Masnoon fasts ordered by Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam). They make a great

show of the 12<sup>th</sup> Rabiul Awwal while they and their ignorant followers remain ignorant of the Sunnat acts.

Reciting the praises of Allah Ta'ala is incumbent on every Muslim every day and every moment of his life. There is nothing special to be recited on the 12<sup>th</sup> Rabiul Awwal. Nothing specific has been ordered by Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam), and nothing specific has been observed on this day by the Sahaabah and the Salafus Saaliheen of Khairul Quroon. Thikrullah has to be the permanent and perpetual practice of the Muslim. It is crass and gross stupidity to make an issue of reciting Allah's praises on 12<sup>th</sup> Rabiul Awwal when it is supposed to be a daily practice.

Decorating the houses and Musjids, as explained earlier, is the practice of the Hindus and Christians. It is haraam to imitate the kuffaar in these silly, futile and wasteful activities. There is no need for elaboration to understand the futility, stupidity and prohibition of these activities of the kuffaar.

Disgorging more trash by way of 'daleel' for the bid'ah of mawlid, the Qabar Pujaari avers that fasting on 10<sup>th</sup> Muharram was acquired from the Jews who fasted on this day to commemorate their delivery from Fir'oan. Thus, according to the moron, fasting on 12<sup>th</sup> Rabiul Awwal is a valid practice.

In presenting this example, the grave-worshipper implies that resemblance/imitation with the Yahood and Nasaara in their religious practices is permissible, yet he has already conceded that it is unlawful to emulate them in their religious practices. If we have to fast in emulation of any religious practice of the kuffaar, the prohibition of *Tashabbuh* will be meaningless. In that case, it will be a redundant principle and meaningless.

Fasting on 10<sup>th</sup> Muharram is by order of Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam). Furthermore, the element of *Tashabbuh* does not exist since fasting on this day was a valid practice in the Shariah of Nabi Musa (Alayhis salaam) who had ordered Bani Israaeel to offer this Fast of Shukr.

Every order issued by Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) is the effect of Wahi. A practice of a former Shariah which has not been abrogated by our Shariah is valid for us. Thus, although the mushrikeen whilst worshipping their idols used to perform Hajj, Tawaaf, Sae'e, and other rites of the Hajj were performed by them prior to Islam. It does not follow that the Hajj ordered by Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) is in emulation of the mushrikeen. Hajj was the Ibaadat initiated by Hadhrat Ibraaeem (Alayhis salaam). The Arabs even after having become idolaters continued with the Hajj. This was a valid practice of an early Shariah which Islam upheld.

But, to fabricate and innovate worship practices after Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) and the era of the Sahaabah, is haraam bid'ah which tampers with and transforms the Deen into a religion of falsehood in the way the Yahood and Nasaara have mutilated their respective Shariats. The Sahaabah were well aware of the occasion of the 10<sup>th</sup> Muharram being ordered as a Day of Fasting, but they did not cite it as a basis for frauding into Islam another day of fasting such as the bid'ah of 12<sup>th</sup> Muharram.

The episode of *Zaat Anwaat* clinches the argument against the grave-worshippers and bid'atis. This episode likened to the request for idolatry by Bani Israaeel is the ultimate nail in the coffin of all and whatever arguments the mawlid bid'atis can hallucinate.



Degenerating and descending further into the quagmire of stupidities, the Qabar Pujaari says: *“It is the custom of the Muslims all around the world to use lights whilst rejoicing their days of celebration. They are commonly used for weddings by the very people who claim it is a way of the Christians.”*

This absolutely ridiculous argument is indeed laughable for its utter stupidity. What the Muslims perpetrate all around the world is not the Shariah. All around the world Muslims indulge in riba, fornication, shaving their beards and a host of other major sins. Fisq and fujoor have become the salient features of Muslims all around the world. A practice promoted as ibaadat incumbently has to be substantiated on the basis of Shar’i dalaa-il, not the fisq and fujoor in which Muslims all over the world indulge.

Those who do not indulge in these practices of bid’ah such as lights and flags, etc., do not commit such haraam acts for their marriages as claimed by the grave-worshipper. People of bid’ah, fisq and fujoor are the villains who indulge in these kuffaar drivel practices.

Insulting his own vermiculated brains, the grave-worshipper says:

*“If the Christians cover themselves with clothes, does it mean Muslims must wander around naked?”*

It appears that the Qabar Pujaari had indulged in some substance abuse when he wrote this statement. Perhaps he was drunk, for only an intoxicated person is capable of disgorging such absolute trash as a basis for innovating an act dubbed

‘ibaadat’. Muslims don garments not because Christians wear clothes. They don clothes because Allah Ta’ala adorned Aadam (Alayhis salaam) and Hawwa (Alayhas salaam) with garments. Nudity is the way of animals. So while we wear clothes by the command of Allah Ta’ala, it is haraam for us to adopt the style and fashions of the Christians or of the kuffaar in general. *Tashabbuh bil kuffaar* in dress is haraam. Islamic dress style has not been adopted in emulation of the Christians and the kuffaar in general.

It is truly demeaning to intelligence to respond to the utter rubbish and stupidity of this grave-worshipper. Nevertheless we are constrained to suffer this calamity for the guidance of ignorant and unwary Muslims who may fall in the trap of the Qabar Pujaari moron.

## **THE EIGHTH TRASH ARGUMENT OF THE QABAR PUJAARI**

Presenting another insipid trash argument which has no relevance to the mawlid bid’ah issue, the Qabar Pujaari alleges that one of the arguments of the anti-mawlid group is: “*You shouldn’t celebrate Milaad on 12 Rabi ul Awwal as that’s the date the Prophet passed away.*”

Answering this averment, the Bid’ati says that the 12<sup>th</sup> Rabiul Awwal is “not an established date for the demise” of Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam). Secondly he avers that even if Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) had passed away on 12 Rabiul Awwal, it does not follow that rejoicing on that day is prohibited. He then proceeded to present a lengthy,

futile discourse which has no relevance to the bid'ah mawlid and the dalaa-il of the Ahl-e-Haqq in refutation of this bid'ah.

It will be a pure exercise in futility to be detracted from the main issue by branching into an avenue which drifts away from the haraam mawlid issue. There is no benefit answering much of the nonsense which the grave-worshipper has lumped together in his eighth drivel argument.

It suffices to say that we say that mawlid is haraam on the basis of the Shar'i arguments already presented and which the Ulama have stated in numerous of their kutub. This argument of the 12 Rabiul Awwal being or not being the day of demise, has no relevance. We do not raise this issue as grounds for the prohibition of the mawlid bid'ah. It is something extraneous which the moron has introduced to deflect from the actual factors of prohibition.

## **THE NINTH TRASH ARGUMENT OF THE QABAR PUJAARI**

This argument pertains to music and intermingling of sexes which the opponents of the bid'ah mawlid present as aggravating factors. The Qabar Pujaari concedes that gatherings even of mawlid, if accompanied by these haraam acts will not be permissible. However, according to him, mawlid gatherings without these haraam factors are permissible.

This issue has already been explained earlier. We have explained that even such mawlid functions devoid of the

flagrant acts of haraam are also not permissible since mawlid *per se* is bid'ah.

In a baseless attempt to justify mawlid, the grave-worshipper presents the following analogy:

*“To attend any gathering in which Haram acts take place is forbidden whether it is a gathering of the Mawlid or a gathering for learning the Deen. If people gather to learn the Qur'an and Sunnah and at the same time they are intermingling with the opposite sex and using musical instruments, then surely such gathering is condemned by the Shari'ah Law. If such gatherings for teaching the Qur'an and Sunnah become common amongst the people it does not mean gathering for the teachings of the Qur'an and Sunnah should become Haram. The Haram acts will remain Haram and the permissible acts will remain permissible. The Haram acts will always be condemned and teaching the Qur'an and Sunnah will always be encouraged.*

Mawlid may not be justified on the basis of this fallacious analogy. Mawlid is not like teaching the Qur'aan and Sunnah. Firstly, haraam acts perpetrated at a gathering of Deeni propagation will render the gathering haraam. The gathering will not be permissible simply because the Qur'aan and the Sunnah are being imparted. The haraam activities polluting the gathering will render the function haraam. Secondly, teaching the Qur'aan and Sunnah is Waajib. Such classes where haraam acts are not committed will be permissible and even necessary. On the contrary, mawlid functions are *per se* bid'ah. The very function minus music and intermingling is bid'ah. Thus, the analogy is palpably false and stupid.

Furthermore, the factors of music, intermingling of sexes and other haraam acts are mentioned as aggravating factors for the prohibition. These are not the only *Asbaab-e-Hurmat (Factors of Prohibition)* for mawlid. In the absence of one or more of such factors, the function remains haraam on the basis of the existence of other factors of prohibition, and the primary factor of prohibition for mawlid is that it is *per se* bid'ah. It is a satanic accretion fabricated into the Deen.

The moron grave-worshipper addicted to LIES, most shamelessly avers:

*“In fact I have never even heard of such a gathering.”*

Here he refers to mawlid gatherings where flagrant haraam and sinful acts such as qawwaali, intermingling of sexes, etc. take place. He is in brazen denial of such mawlid functions pretending that they simply do not exist. This writer, that is, the refuter of the moron Bid'ati, has personally witnessed many many years ago during his days of jahaalat, even the boys brigade in Durban participating in mawlid functions with their bugles of Iblees and their kuffaar marching antics. The Bid'ati masses are fully aware of these haraam activities taking place at most of the public mawlid functions, especially where the Barelwi grave-worshippers of Indian origin and also Bid'atis of Malay origin predominate.

Then, the Qabar Pujaari abortively attempts to vindicate the *juhala* who pray to the inmates of the graves – the Auliya who have passed away. Such prayers and supplications which include bowing and even Sajdah to the graves are acts of shirk. The grave-worshipping moron attempts to defend the shirk of the mawlid masses who perpetrate the vilest forms of shirk at the mausolea of the Auliya. Whilst the moron is in flagrant and

stupid denial of this reality which is observed in its worst form in Ajmer and other darghas notorious for qabar puja, he still attempts to defend the perpetrators by presenting futile and baseless arguments in an abortive bid to prove that supplicating to the inmates of the graves is not shirk.

Since this treatise is a refutation of the mawlid bid'ah, we shall not digress to entertain the issue of shirk and the concept of waseelah. Insha-Allah, this shall be tackled in a separate article in which the baseless stupidities of the moron shall be demolished. Here we are concerned with the mawlid bid'ah. The summary of our response to the moron's ninth argument is:

\* Music, intermingling of sexes, etc. are not the primary grounds for the prohibition of mawlid. These are merely aggravating factors which transform the mawlid bid'ah into a function of fisq and fujoor.

\* Mawlid by itself, minus any flagrant acts of sin, is bid'ah. It is itself a grave sin. It is a ploy of shaitaan to derail Muslims from Siraatul Mustaqeem in the name of the Deen.

## **THE TENTH TRASH ARGUMENT OF THE QABAR PUJAARI**

In his tenth argument, the moron bid'ati attempts to justify the waste of lights which is a practice of the Nasaara and Hindus. Just reflect on the following stupid defence:

*“The very people who will not hesitate to holding gatherings in the name of Easter or Christmas will shout with the top of*

*their voices that it is Haram, bid'ah and Shirk to hold gatherings in the name of the mawlid.*

Is this a 'daleel' which any unbiased person of intelligence can accept for justifying the bid'ah of mawlid – a function which is haraam based on Shar'i basis? This averment is an audacious lie. Who are the Ulama-e-Haqq who condemn mawlid, yet celebrate Easter and Christmas? Did any of our Akaabir such as Hadhrat Maulana Rashid Ahmad Gangohi, Hadhrat Maulana Ashraf Ali Thanvi and the countless other Ulama-e-Haqq of all ages who had proclaimed mawlid bid'ah ever celebrate Easter and Christmas? It appears that the moron whilst formulating this stupidity (his 10<sup>th</sup> argument) was indulging in some substance of mental abuse, hence the drivel. All the Ulama who proclaim mawlid bid'ah also teach that Easter and Christmas celebrations are haraam.

This agent of Iblees says in his baseless tenth argument about the Ulama who have branded mawlid bid'ah:

*“.... these people express hatred. For such people I shall mention the following narration. ‘Iblees (the devil) cried on four occasions; when he was damned, when he was fallen (from heaven), when the Messenger of Allah was born and when Surah Al-Fatihah was revealed.’”*

The brains of bid'atis are fossilized – stultified into absurdity by shaitaani infusion of rubbish into their brains. If someone prohibits performing four raka'ts Fardh for Fajr, only an incorrigible moron will argue that the person expresses hatred for Salaat. If someone prohibits fasting on the Day of Eid, only the worst jaahil will contend that this person expresses hatred for Fasting.

Prohibiting mawlid is in fact the effect of love for Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) and his Sahaabah. This prohibition is in submission to Rasulullah's command to oppose bid'ah. It is to guard the purity of the Sunnah and to save the Imaan of people from satanic corruption.

The attempt to justify the bid'ah of mawlid with the episode of Abu Lahab is another illustration of the moron's stupidity. The slight lightening of Jahannam's punishment for Abu Lahab because when he had heard of the birth of Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam), he had in happiness freed a slave woman. This episode is cited as a basis for the mawlid bid'ah by the Qabar Pujaaris.

A person who wishes to extract any meaning of goodness from this episode, will understand that the maxima is that virtuous deeds on occasions of happiness are beneficial. This episode is not a licence for the enactment of wasteful functions and innovations which have absolutely no origin in Islam. The Deen exhorts us to practise A'maal-e-Saalihah, and such deeds have to be executed within the confines of the Shariah.

Expression of love for Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) has to be the perpetual *amal* of Muslims, and this expression is achieved by implementation of every facet of the Sunnah in our daily life. It is not an occasional expression confined to stupid and merrymaking mawlid functions executed in the styles of the Nasaara and Hindus with coloured lights, buntings, flags, singing, feasting and wasting. Such activities have absolutely no scope of acceptance in the Shariah. They all are alien to the Sunnah, in fact anti-Islam.



The citation of the non-believer, Abu Lahab's episode to justify mawlid is scraping the very bottom of the barrel of corrupt absurdity. Daleel is acquired from the Proofs of the Shariah, viz. Kitaabullah, Sunnah of the Rasool, Ijma' and Qiyaas-e-Shar'i.

These bid'atis who vociferously blare the slogan of *Hubb-e-Rasool* (love for the Rasool) are extremely deficient in the Sunnah, both in practice and spirit –*Zaahiran and Baatinan*. Their appearance, life style and moral character are generally in total conflict with the Sunnah. A rejoicement which does not cultivate the Sunnah in one's life is a satanic form of rejoicing.

Did any Sahaabi cite Abu Lahab's episode to fabricate any type of merrymaking function to commemorate the birthday of Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam)? Were the Sahaabah and the Salafus Saaliheen of the Khairul Quroon epoch not aware of this anecdote? How did they all display their love for Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi) wasallam? Hadhrat Huzaifah (Radhiyallahu anhu) with a group of the Muslims, Sahaabah included, was invited by the king of Irbal. Whilst having meals in Islamic style sitting on the floor and eating with their hands, a morsel of food fell from the hand of Hadhrat Huzaifah (Radhiyallahu anhu). As he picked up the morsel from the floor to put it into his mouth, a Muslim alongside whispered that he should refrain from doing so because the non-Muslim king and his noblemen would gain a bad impression of the Muslimeen. Hadhrat Huzaifah (Radhiyallahu anhu) sharply and audibly retorted: "*Should I abandon the Sunnah of my Beloved for these humaqaa' (ignoramuses)?*"

This was the expression of love of the Sahaabah. There are innumerable such illustrations in which the Sahaabah and the

Salafus Saaliheen expressed their love for Rasulullah, but never in stupid, wasteful, bid'ah functions such as the mawlid custom acquired from fussaag and fujjaar.

## CONCLUSION

The entire Argument of Trash and Flotsam of the moron grave-worshipper is completely bereft of a single valid argument to bolster the bid'ah of mawlid. In fact, it is a sciomancy or a divination with the inspiration of the devil who is the chief architect of bid'ah which he conceals with a thin veneer of a 'deeni' guise. If it was not for the gullibility and ignorance of Muslims in general, it would have been sinful to squander time and money responding to drivel.

The following Hadith adequately brings the moron's argument within its purview. Hadhrat Abdullah Ibn Mas'ood (Radhiyallahu anhu) addressing the Muslims said:

*“How will you be when you will be enveloped by a fitnah wherein the old will become senile and the young will become old. The people will regard this fitnah to be Sunnah. If any part of it is shunned, they will say that a Sunnah has been shunned.” The people asked: ‘And, when will that be?’ He responded: “When your Ulama (i.e. the Ulama-e-Haqq) have departed (and are in their graves), when your qaaris will be abundant, your Fuqaha will be few, your rulers will be numerous, your trustworthy ones will be few, the world will be pursued with deeds of the Akhirah, and knowledge will be acquired for reasons other than the Deen.”*

This Hadith perfectly fits these Bid'atis. They have not only equated their acts of bid'ah to the Sunnah, they have in fact, elevated their bid'ah to a status higher than the Sunnah. Now

whoever shuns or criticizes this haraam mawlid bid'ah, he is condemned and accused of shunning the Sunnah and having disrespect for Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam). While they display no care when genuine Sunnah acts are abandoned, they are swift in branding as kaafir those who criticize bid'ah. Love for Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) is in obeying him. The Qur'aan Majeed states:

*“Say (O Muhammad!): ‘If you love Allah, then obey me (i.e. Rasulullah –Sallallahu alayhi wasallam), then Allah will love you and forgive for you your sins”*

Love for Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) is on account of love for Allah Ta'ala, and this is the Primary Love. To gain Allah's love, obedience to the Sunnah is imperative. Thus, expression of Love is by following meticulously the Sunnah of Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam). A 'love' which is expressed in kuffaar – Nasara and Hindu – style with flags, coloured lights, singing, feasting, wasting and merrymaking is a false satanic 'love'. It is a deception poisonously coated with a fraudulent artificial 'deeni' cover. In the mawlid bid'ah and in all acts of bid'ah there is conflict with the Sunnah. There is neither obedience to the Sunnah nor genuine love for Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) in bid'ah. Bid'ah is deviation, and all deviation will be in the Fire, and according to the Hadith, Bid'atis are *Kilaabun Naar – the Dogs of the Fire*.