

Since there is absolutely no origin and no sanction in the Sunnah for this custom, Muslims should understand well that this practice is an evil bid'ah which errant men, gone astray, have introduced into the Ummah and have conspired to give it respectability and acceptability by coupling the noble name of Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) to it.

*(What is meelad? Page9)*

## THE SPREADING OF CONFUSION AND FALSEHOOD ABOUT THE TABLAGHI JAMAAT

(Page 2)



## WHAT IS MEELAAD?

(Page 9)

---

Published by  
**YOUNG MEN'S MUSLIM ASSOCIATION**  
P.O. BOX 18594, ACTONVILLE, BENONI  
1506, SOUTH AFRICA

## **FROM THE HADEES**

*“Do not utter such exaggerated words of the praise for me as the Christians do for the Prophet Jesus, the son of Mary. I am nothing more than a servant of Allah and his Apostle. So call me just that.”*  
(Bukhari, Muslim).

\*\*\*\*\*

Hadhrat Abu Umamma (Radhiallahu Anhu) said that the people stood up to receive Rasulullah (Sallallahu Alayhi Wasallam). Rasulullah (Sallallahu Alayhi Wasallam) forbade them to do so, saying: *“It is not the manner of the Muslims but that of the Ajamies.”*  
(Ibn-Maja).

\*\*\*\*\*

Rasulullah (Sallallahu Alayhi Wasallam) said: *“Yaa Allah! Do not let my grave be made into an idol for which worship may be offered.”*  
(Malik).

\*\*\*\*\*

=====

The Naqshbandiyah sufis repeat their devotions silently sitting perfectly calmly and quietly. Often they sit immersed and meditation (muraaqabah), quiet motionless with head bowed and eyes fixed on the ground or closed. They are very much opposed to all singing and music and hence “**simaa**” finds no place in their devotions. They are opposed to many practices such as lighting lamps at graves, spreading coverlets or sheets over graves or tombs, women gathering at the graves of saints, bowing one’s head before graves and prostrating there to show respect.”

From **“The Faith Movement of Mawlana Muhammad Ilyas”** by Professor M. Anwarul Haq.

## **THE SPREADING OF CONFUSION AND FALSEHOOD ABOUT THE**

## **TABLIGHI JAMAAT**

A book, titled: TABLEEGHI JAMAAT, is presently being circulated in South Africa. The book, the author of which is one Mr Arshadul Qaderi, has been published by one of the Bid`ati groups operating in South Africa. This book, packed with falsehood, half-truths, deceptive reasoning and the personal conclusions of its writer, is designed to bring the Tablighi Jamaat into disrepute so as to discourage Muslims for joining the Movement which aims to re-establish and revive the lost and forgotten Sunnah of Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam).

In his desperate attempt to decry and malign the Tablighi Jamaat, the author has presented numerous fanciful notions of his own. He seeks to draw a veil of secrecy around the Tablighi Jamaat and then he endeavours to build a case against the Jamaat on the basis of probabilities fabricated to conform to the opinions and pernicious motives of the Ahl-e-Bid`ah – the group which has sold its soul to grave-worship and other acts of shirk and Bid`ah. The pure and simple Sunnah of Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) militates against the plethora of dark acts of Bid`ah innovated by the sect of Bid`ah. Since the true Sunnah is the death-knell of Bid`ah and grave-worship, the Tablighi Jamaat operating among the masses with its programme of simple Sunnah is considered a dangerous foe by the votaries of Bid`ah. And, since Muslims from all walks of life have abandoned the evil part of the grave-worshippers and have turned into the direction of the Sunnah, the leaders of the deviated sect of Bid`ah are discerning the writing on the wall. The strategy of publicizing half-truths and statements cited out of context interpreted to suit the Bid`ati notions has become the favorite ploy adopted by the grave-worshippers in their desperate bid to bring a halt to the noble Deeni activities of the Tablighi Jamaat.

In his book, Mr Arshadul Qaderi refers to three incidents which he wishes the public to buy. The incidents revolve around three of his personal encounters or supposed encounters with members of the Tablighi Jamaat. In the presentation of his tales regarding his encounters with the Tablighi Jamaat he seeks to create a sinister image of the Jamaat. It is indeed very peculiar that of the millions of Muslims, the world over, who have been the light of Hidaayah by participation in Tablighi Jamaat activities, Mr Arshadul Qaderi has failed to obtain the support of a single one. If the allegation of deception against the Tablighi Jamaat be true as Mr Arshad wishes us to accept, how is it that he has been unable to find a single witness to corroborate his claims? Why is it that of the millions of Muslims who had and are joining the Tablighi Jamaat, Mr Arshadul Qaderi happens to be the only one in this wide world who has detected by personal experience the undercurrent of a sinister and a massive plot of kufr and nifaaq in the Tablighi Jamaat? Surely a movement will ultimately, by hook or crook, propagate its aims and objects among its members. A movement which fails to give practical expression to its aims and objects and instead schools its members in teachings and conceptions which are contrary to its pledged aims and goal, will cease to operate or will be transformed into another movement of a different mould by virtue of its abandonment of its aims and objects. If the Tablighi Jamaat does infact subscribe to the evil beliefs of kufr attributed to it by Arshadul Qaderi and the grave- worshippers, then surely, innumerable persons (many former followers of the Ahl-e-Bid'ah) would have acquired such beliefs. But, not a single participant among the millions will support Arshadul Qaderi in his allegations. Surely, if the writer's claims about the Tablighi Jamaat contained any grain of truth, people joining the Jamaat would have detected the corruption of beliefs being supposedly propagated at Nizamuddin and Raiwind. It is beyond reasonable imagination to accept that the Tablighi Jamaat elders have successfully concealed their 'true' beliefs from millions of laymen for several decades now.

If indeed, they had managed to accomplish this inconceivable feat of concealment, then of what purpose was their labour and effort? What was their gain when they had failed to convert the millions to their conception of Islam? Of what benefit is a recruit to a movement when the recruit—in fact each and every recruit in the case of the Jamaat—upon having qualified subscribes to doctrines and beliefs which are in conflict with the beliefs of his tutors and negatory of the aims and objects of the movement which he had joined?

The masses will never obtain the pictures of the Jamaat, which Arshadul Qaderi has attempted to create in the book of confusion and falsehood. People who have joined the Jamaat and people who are joining the Jamaat are and will be practical and live witnesses to the truth of the Tablighi Jamaat. Those who join the Tablighi Jamaat and live with it for a while will bear testimony to the falsehood published by the sect of grave-worshippers about the Jamaat.

An example of the false meanings and fanciful notions attributed to the Tablighi Jamaat activities by Mr Qaderi is his idea of the Jamaat's programme of teaching the Kalimah. He very ignorantly concludes that the motive of teaching the Kalimah is the belief that all muslims are 'polytheists' and kaafirs. Hence, calling for the renewal of Imaan. This, according to Mr Qaderi is the motive for the Tablighi Jamaat's insistence on teaching the Kalimah. But, such reasoning is downright stupid and baseless. Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) said:

*“Renew Imaan with **Laa-ilaha illallah**”*

Teaching the Kalimah is not confined to teaching only verbal recital. Along with the verbal recitation of the Kalimah are the practical demands of Kalimah. The Kalimah does not cease to operate with verbal affirmation. The practical consequence of the verbal expression of the Kalimah is the Sunnah of Rasulullah (sallallahu

alayhi wasallam). Salaat, Tahaarah and the variety of Deeni acts, beliefs and practices are all branches of the Kalimah. The Kalimah is the pivot of Deen. Everything hinges on it. It thus constitutes the starting point and the basis of an Islamic Movement. There is nothing sinister in the Ta'leem of the Kalimah which is a vital activity of the Tablighi Jamaat. It is evil and wicked to introduce sinister connotations into this pure activity of the Tablighi Jamaat. Those who have been fortunate to join the Tablighi Jamaat will know the absurdity of the claim that the Kalimah- reading and teachings of the Jamaat are motivated by an ulterior motive.

The following statement appears on page 2 of the book:

“The illiterate and uninformed Muslims, eager to repent from their sins, are being promised green gardens from the Tablighi Jamaat. They are told if they adopt the Jamaat’s ways their status will be raised above the statues of the Muslim public”

What constrains the “illiterate and uninformed Muslims” to seek the umbrella of the Tablighi Jamaat for professing their repentance? Why are they not eager to offer their repentance in the camp of the Ahl-e-Bid’ah? What is it that induces former members of the Bid’ati sect to enter the Tablighi Jamaat for the purpose of repenting and to gain the rewards of “green gardens”, a consequence of their repentance?

The Qabar-pujaari sect offers a variety of worldly attractions to people in the form of foods, sweetmeats, music, singing , merry-making, festivals, ect., while on the contrary, the Tablighi Jamaat offers only Kalimah and Salaat. But, we see people who were groveling in Bid’ah, turning their backs on such evil and joining the ranks of the Tablighi Jamaat to become imbued with Kalimah and Salaat. Why is the Bid’ati group unable to hold onto its followers and keep them firmly tied to the acts of Bid’ah with all their

slogans, colour and merry-making? The answer is simple. The truth of the Sunnah is glaring and Haqq will always surface.

What are the Jamaat's ways in the foregoing statement? Ask any one of the millions, the world over, and the answer forthcoming will be: the Kalimah, Salaat and the Sunnah. No one knows anything else since nothing else other than the Sunnah is taught by the Jamaat. While Qaderi is unable to locate a single witness to corroborate his wild allegations regarding his "experience" about the Jamaat, there are millions all over the world who testify to the truth of the Tablighi Jamaat. Multitudes of Muslims can stand up and claim with emphasis that they know nothing of the vile allegations made by the bid'atis regarding the Tablighi Jamaat. They can vouch that the things Qaderi states regarding the Jamaat are nothing but pure slander.

Rasulullah (Sallallahu Alayhi Wasallam) informed the Ummah of "green gardens" of Jannat for those who recite the Kalimah and Salaat. This was the promise made by Rasulullah (Sallallahu Alayhi Wasallam) and this is the self-same 'promise' about which the Tablighi Jamaat speaks. People are told that if they uphold the institution of salaah, the Gardens of Jannah are in store for them. This is the truth. But, Muslims have no hope of aspiring for the lofty rewards of Jannat while remaining in the camp of people given to acts of grave-worship.

The claim that members of the Tablighi Jamaat regards themselves as superior to other Muslims is blatantly false. Ask anyone of the multitudes who have participated in the Jamaat if they had at any time been taught to hold others in contempt.

In view of Mr Qaderi's inability to produce facts and proof to substantiate his claims of kufr against the Tablighi Jamaat, he desperately attempts in his book to align the Tablighi Jamaat and the Ulama of Deoband with the Wahhaabi group of Najd. He is at

great pains to forge out a basis for linking the Tablighi Jamaat to the Wahhaabi sect of Arabia. But, he fails miserably in his attempt to make falsehood appear as truth. The entire claim of the Tablighi Jamaat and the Ulama of Deoband being Wahhaabi's is reared on supposition-baseless supposition. A supposed "striking similarity between the activities of Sheikh Najdi and Moulana Ilyas" forms the basis of Qaderi's case. Assuming that there does exist the supposed "similarity", such a supposition cannot be tendered as grounds for claiming that the Tablighi Jamaat and the Ulama of Deoband belongs to the school of Muhammad Ibn Abdul Wahhaab.

The main "similarity" which is bothering the Ahl-e-bid'ah is the aversion for shirk and grave-worship. If the Ulama of Deoband and the Tablighi Jamaat happen to be the foes of grave-worship and shirk, they cannot be labeled as Wahhaabis merely because the Wahhaabis also happen to loathe acts of shirk and grave-worship. Aversion for grave-worship is an attitude which is spawned by true Tauheed. However, Mr Qaderi who had laid claim to 'fair-play' is unable to indicate even a single incident in which the Ulama of Deoband had at anytime supported the extreme measures adopted by the Wahhaabis in their onslaught against the cult of grave-worship and tomb-worship.

The allegation of Wahhaabi'ism against the Tablighi Jamaat is the claim of those bereft of truth and deficient in Islamic Tauheed. A people enslaved to tomb-worship cannot have any respect for the truth. The attitude of Mr Qaderi and his ilk has always been to proclaim Muslims as 'kaafir' on the slightest pretext. People of Sunnah who point out the evil of bid'ah customs are conveniently branded as 'Wahhaabis' by the votaries of grave-worship. Perhaps this "striking similarity" between the Wahhaabis and the Qabr Pujaaris, viz., their mutual proclamations of kufr, render the latter (the Qabr Pujaaris) Wahhaabis!

This brief rebuttal of the book of Mr Qaderi will, Insha`Allah serve as a mere introduction for more thorough and detail refutations which we are certain will be prepared by the Ulama to show up the falsehood traded by Mr Qaderi in his book on Tablighi Jamaat.

***It has been said that proof of the pudding is in the eating. Therefore, the best and the surest way of discovering the truth and the worth of Mr Qaderi`s claim and allegation is to join the Tablighi Jamaat. Join the Jamaat, participate in its simple and straightforward programme of Ibaadat. Sit in its gatherings; go to Basti Nizaamuddin and Raiwind; keep your eyes and mind open to detect any sinister proceeding and activities; endeavour to discover the “kufr” and “false beliefs” allegedly propagated by the Tablighi Jamaat. Ascertain the facts in this simple and true way. Then only will you know what the Tablighi Jamaat actually stands for. Even if the intention is not sincere, just join the Jamaat with the motive of unearthing its hidden `kufr` and its `Wahhaabi` base. You will return with a clear picture of the truth. You will then know which group is travelling along the path of falsehood and evil, and which group is travelling along the path of Haqq.***

**8 FEBRUARY 1988**

**Y.M.M.A**

**P.O. BOX 5036**

**BENONI SOUTH**

**1502**

# WHAT IS MEELAAD?

An article on the question of Moulood or Meelaad appeared recently in a booklet, 'A Diary of Muslim Festivals'. The article tenders arguments in justification of the customary acts of Meelaad celebrations. However, the arguments on which the author of the article seeks to justify these celebrations are utterly baseless and devoid of Shar'i substance. The citation of Qur'aanic verses and Hadith narration of general import is not Shar'i proof of upholding a practice which was non-existent for several centuries from the time of Rasulullah (Sallallahu Alayhi Wasallam). Acts of Ibaadat, for their validity, require specific, explicit unambiguous proofs originating in the Sources of the Shariah. One cannot advance a Qur'aanic Aayat in general implication and thereon justify an act or practice introduced into Islam by those who have no Shar'i status and who are separated from the blessed ages (Khairul Quroon) by centuries. Ibaadat (acts of Shar'i worship) are such acts which find specific Daleel (Proof) in the Qur'aan and the Sunnah. Acts which have no basis in the Qur'aan and Hadith cannot be passed off as practice of Ibaadat. The votaries of Meelaad are desperately endeavouring to pass off the practice of Meelaad as an act of Ibaadat sanctioned by the Shariah. But, this is manifestly false. Let us now deal with the arguments presented by the article in favour of the customary Meelaad celebrations.

## REFUTATION OF THE ARGUMENTS IN FAVOUR OF MEELAAD

**Argument no. (1):** The first argument tendered by the author is the following Qur'aanic verse:

"Behold! Allah took the Covenant of the Prophets, Saying: I gave you a Book and Wisdom; Then comes to you an Apostle confirming what is with you: Do you believe in him and render him help. Allah said: Do you agree, and take this my Covenant as binding on you?"

They said: We agree. He said: Then bear witness, and I am with you among the witnesses.” (3:81)

Before proceeding with the tafseer of the Aayat No.81 of Surah Aal-e-Imraan, it is necessary to point out the inaccuracy of the translation. The aforementioned translation given by the author of the article on Moulood is not correct. The correct translation of the Aayat is as follows:

*“And (remember) when Allah took the Pledge (or Covenant) of the Ambiya that whatever I gave you of the Book and Wisdom; then comes to you a Rasool confirming that which is with you, then verily you will believe in him and verily, you will aid him. He (Allah) said: What! Do you acknowledge and do you accept on this (condition) My Pledge (or Covenant)? They said: We acknowledge. He (Allah) said: Then bear witness and I too along with you am among the witnesses.”*

Thus the translation given by the author of the pamphlet is incorrect in the following respects:

(a) The Aayat does not proclaim merely the Covenant. The Aayat instructs the Ahle Kitaab to remember the Covenant. But, the translator has omitted the fact.

(b) The translator says: “I give you a Book and Wisdom.” But, nowhere in the Aayat is this stated. Allah Ta`ala says: “Whatever I gave you of the Book and Wisdom.”

(c) The translator says: “Do you believe him and render him help.” This commands that according to the Covenant “you will verily (most certainly) believe in him and most certainly aid him.” The Aayat does not pose the question: “Do you believe him and render him help.” It asserts that you will most assuredly believe in him and render him assistance.

(d) The Aayat does not say: “Do you agree and take this My Covenant as binding on you?” The Aayat says: “Do you accept on this condition my Covenant?”

The number of inaccuracies in the translation of the single Aayat manifestly bears out the incompetence of the author of the article.

The article does not contain the remotest suggestion or reference to the customary meelaad practices. Arguing deceptively, the author explains the Aayat as follows:

“Readers will note that the above was a meeting of Allah and all Prophets, and the dialogue and discussion Pertains to the advent (birth or coming) of the Holy Prophet Muhammad”.

It is indeed in gross misinterpretation of the Aayat and a classical specimen of deceptive and baseless reasoning (at which the Ahl-e-Bid`ah are adepts) to assert that this Qur’aanic Aayat is a `discussion` between Allah Ta`ala and the Ambiya regarding the “birth” of Rasulullah (Sallallahu Alayhi Wasallam). That this Aayat does not contain the remotest reference to the customary meelaad celebrations of the Ahl-e-Bid`ah, the authentic Tafseer of the Sahaabah will conclusively prove. However, before presenting the meaning of this Aayat as given by the noble Sahaabah, we shall momentarily, for argument`s sake, assume that it does represent the discussion alluded to.

Assuming that the “discussion pertains to the birth” of Rasulullah (Sallallahu Alayhi Wasallam), there is no Justification nor grounds for the claim that a reference to birth is a basis for the origination of a practice of Ibaadat which neither Rasulullah (Sallallahu Alayhi Wasallam) nor his noble Sahaabah or the Aimmah-e-Mujtahideen nor the Ulama for centuries thereafter taught, practiced or even hinted at. It was never the contention of the Ulama-e-Haqq that speaking in praise of Rasulullah (Sallallahu Alayhi Wasallam), discussing his noble birth and the remembrance of Rasulullah

(Sallallahu Alayhi Wasallam) are Bid`ah and unlawful. On the contrary, it is the belief of the Ulama-e-Haqq that whoever despises criticizes or prohibits the praises (lawful praises) of Rasulullah (Sallallahu Alayhi Wasallam) is not a Muslim. Thus, the accusation which the Ahl-e-Bid`ah monotonously level against the Ulama-e-Haqq is salanderously false. A discussion about the birth of Rasulullah (Sallallahu Alayhi Wasallam) is not the present Meelaad custom with its fanfare of Bid`ah and unislamic acts. Discussing the birth of Rasulullah (Sallallahu Alayhi Wasallam) and the customary meelaad practice are things apart. Meelaad of Ahl-e-Bid`ah is a practice consisting of a number of haraam and evil factors. It is, therefore, absurd to suggest that the aforementioned Aayat of the Qur`aan Majeed refers to the meelaad of today or even constitutes a basis for such unislamic celebrations introduced from other baatil religions.

It is not lawful in the Shariah to assign a personal interpretation based on one`s opinion to any Qur`aanic Aayat or Hadith narration. The specific meanings handed down by Rasulullah (Sallallahu Alayhi Wasallam) and his Sahaabah are the only binding teachings and rulings which have to be compulsorily accepted by the Ummah. Consider the word Salaah which appears in the Qur`aan Majeed. The literal meaning of the term includes in its scope Durood, Tasbeeh, Istighfaar, etc. It will be tantamount to kufr to side-step the specific meaning which the Shariah has given to the term `Salaah` and attribute to it a literal meaning irrespective of the correctness of such meaning in grammar. Thus, the Command in the Qur`aan to perform Salaah will have no other meaning than the five Fardh daily Salaat as the Ummah knows it. Similarly, it is incorrect to say that the Aayat cited above (No. 81 of Surah Aal-e-Imraan) is a “discussion pertaining the birth of the Prophet” and in view of such “discussion” the customary meelaad practice is substantiated in the Qur`aan. Such `logic` is absurd, ridiculous and in conflict with the Shariah.

By what stretch of Islamic imagination could it be inferred that the above mentioned Qur'aanic Aayat pertains to or constitutes a basis for the present customary meelaad-a practice which was non-existent from the time of Rasulullah (Sallallahu Alayhi Wasallam) and was introduced into the Ummah only six centuries after the demise of our Nabi-e-Kareem (Sallallahu Alayhi Wasallam)? Furthermore, history informs us that an evil learned man at the behest of a worldly king was responsible for the introduction of this custom which was originated by pagans. Muslims merely 'Islamicized' the pagan custom by introducing the name of Rasulullah (Sallallahu Alayhi Wasallam).

We had thus far assumed that the Aayat refers to a supposed "discussion about the birth of the Prophet". But, in actual fact, the Authentic Tafseer which Rasulullah (Sallallahu Alayhi Wasallam) and his Sahaabah handed down, rejects this fabricated notion of the Ahl-e-Bid'ah. The Aayat does not deal with birth of Rasulullah (Sallallahu Alayhi Wasallam). It commands the Ahl-e-Kitaab to call to memory a Pledge or Covenant of Imaan. In this Pledge even the Ambiya (Alayhimus Salaam) were ordered to believe in Rasulullah (Sallallahu Alayhi Wasallam). The details of the Pledge to be obtained by reading this Aayat in conjunction with related Aayaat and Ahaadith are:

(i) That should any Nabi (on assumption) meet up with Rasulullah (Sallallahu Alayhi Wasallam), he will believe in him. In fact, when Nabi Isaa (Alayhis Salaam) appears on earth after descending from the Heavens, he will act in accordance with the Law of Islam—the Shariah of Muhammad (Sallallahu Alayhi Wasallam).

(ii) Every succeeding Nabi will have to confirm the truth of his predecessor.

(iii) Every Nabi had to instruct his Ummah to believe in any Nabi who came after him.

(iv) The Pledge or Covenant pertains to Imaan and Nusrat (aiding).

The authorities of Islam have unanimously stated that this Aayat pertains to the pledge of believing and aiding the Nabi (Sallallahu Alayhi Wasallam). On the basis of this Tafseer the Aayat is directed to the Ahl-e-Kitaab who were bound to enter the fold of Islam as Nabi Moosa and Nabi Isaa (Alayhimas Salaam) had instructed them. The View of the other authentic Tafseer is that the word 'Rasool' appearing in the Aayat is not a specific reference to Rasulullah (Sallallahu Alayhi Wasallam), but refers to all the Ambiya (Alayhimus Salaam) in general. Every Ummah had to believe any new Nabi who came to it confirming the truth of the previous Nabi.

These authentic interpretations of Islam have been given by Hadhrat Ali, Hadhrat Ibn Abbaas, Hadhrat ibn Mas'ud and Ubay Bin Ka'b (Radiallahu Anhum). The authentic and authoritative Books of Tafseer unanimously proclaim this Tafseer as we have presented. Hadhrat Taa'us and Hadhrat Hasan Basri (Rahmatullah Alayhima) state that the purpose of the covenant was that the Ambiya aid one another (Tafseer Ibn Kathir). Allaamah Subki (Rahmatullah Alayh) explains this Tafseer in detail in his treatise: 'At-Tazeem Wal Minnah Fi La tuminunnahu wala-tansurunnahu'. Not a single authority in Islam, from the very inception of Islam, has ever claimed a meaning contrary to the official Tafseer of the Aayat. Not a single authority ever contended that the Aayat concerned refers to any meelaad customs or even constitutes a basis for this fabricated and innovated celebration with its conglomeration of un-Islamic factors.

Meelaad or the customary meelaad celebration is a specific custom given the form of an Ibaadat. Anyone who claims any Islamic status for this custom must necessarily prove its origin and sanction in the Qur'aan and the Sunnah. The Ummah has to have the example and the ruling of the Sahaabah and the Aimmah-e-Mujtahideen regarding this practice. The opinions and interpretations of non-entities and 'learned' men of this belated age are of no

consequence in the formulation of Shar'i matter. Since there is absolutely no origin and no sanctions in the Sunnah for this custom, Muslims should understand well that this practice is an evil bid'ah which errant men, gone astray, have introduced into the Ummah and have conspired to give it respectability and acceptability by coupling the noble name of Rasulullah (Sallallahu Alayhi Wasallam) to it.

**Argument No.(2):** The author of the article says:

“WHAT THE AALIMS SAYS: It is desirable and lawful to stand up by way of respect in Milad Shareef gathering when offering salutation to the Holy Prophet, peace be upon him.”

“Now in usual practice to stand up on the arrival of a person, is a gesture of respect, and to sit up when his name is mentioned is still a greater mark of respect. Again to stand up when offering salutation to the holy Prophet is a great mark of respect which, only a person bereft of sense can deny.”

“Only a person bereft of sense can deny”? This is what men whose minds have been dulled by acts of grave-worship can venture to say. Love, respect and honour are not mere outward acts of show according to Islam. In the Islamic sense, love and respect lie in obedience to the Command of Allah and his Rasool (Sallallahu Alayhi Wasallam). If Rasulullah (Sallallahu Alayhi Wasallam) commands performance of Salaat, we shall do so. If he prohibits such performance, we shall abide thereby. If he commands us to stand in his presence or in his absence we shall do so. If he forbids us from standing whether in his presence or absence, we shall do so. Respecting and honouring Rasulullah (Sallallahu Alayhi Wasallam) are confined to obey him. Any act in disobedience to Rasulullah (Sallallahu Alayhi Wasallam) will never be respect and love shown to him, irrespective of it appearing respectable and

honourable in the understanding of men of the world. The following Hadith is narrated in Tirmidhi and Musnad-e-Ahmed:

“There was none whom the Sahaabah loved as much as Rasulullah (Sallallahu Alayhi Wasallam). When they would see him, they would not stand because they knew of his detestation for this (practice of standing for him)”.

Hadhrat Anas (Radhiallahu Anhu), One of the closest of Rasulullah’s Sahaabah, narrated the abovementioned Hadith.

According to the Sunnah the Sahaabah did not stand in the presence of Rasulullah (Sallallahu Alayhi Wasallam) when he came into their gathering.

The Hadith states that since the Sahaabah were fully aware of Rasulullah’s dislike for the practice of “standing in respect”, they would remain seated when Rasulullah (Sallallahu Alayhi Wasallam) appeared in the gathering of the Sahaabah. Were all these lofty Souls, men bereft of sense? Nauthubillaah! If standing was such an imperative act for showing respect as the bid’atis seek to convey, then why did the Sahaabah not stand in respect for Rasulullah (Sallallahu Alayhi Wasallam)? If standing was a mark of respect necessary in the Shariah of Allah, then why did Rasulullah (Sallallahu Alayhi Wasallam) discourage it by his active demonstration of dislike for it? Regardless of the fact of such standing being a mark of respect in any society past or present, Rasulullah’s dislike for it in so far as his own mubaarak self was concerned, and the active practice of the Sahaabah in this regard are sufficient direction for the Ulama-e-Haqq who decry the custom of meelaad and the act of standing in the ABSENCE of Rasulullah (Sallallahu Alayhi Wasallam).

The following Hadith narrated by Hadhrat Abu Umaamah (Raidhiallahu Anhu) and recorded in Abu Dawood bears further testimony for Rasulullah’s dislike for the practice of standing for himself in respect:

“Rasulullah (Sallallahu Alayhi Wasallam) emerged Leaning on his staff. (On seeing him) we stood up (in respect and love) for him. He said: Do not stand like the non-Muslims; they honour one another (in this way of standing)”.

The Ahaadith conclusively establish that Rasulullah (Sallallahu Alayhi Wasallam) dislike the practice of others standing in respect, especially for himself. Now when Rasulullah (Sallallahu Alayhi Wasallam) detested such standing for himself when he was alive, then to a greater extent will his detestation apply to customs of standing during his absence and after his death when he is not present in any gathering.

Standing in respect in the absence of a person, particular after the demise of a person, smacks strongly of worship. If not worship, it is without a doubt, the practice of the kuffaar. Even modern Kuffaar have this custom among them, hence they stand momentarily in respect and honour of a hero or some prominent person who has died. They stand in honour of a person on celebrating his death anniversary just as the Ahl-e-Bid`ah are in the habit of doing. They stand in honour of the flag of their country and they stand in honour when the national anthem of a country is sung. Such acts of standing in respect are thus not Islamic. Rasulullah (Sallallahu Alayhi Wasallam), therefore likened the practice of standing to the ways of the non-Muslim.

## **THE DEVINE ATTRIBUTE OF OMNI-PRESENCE**

In relation to the Ahl-e-Bid`ah the —Meelaad sect— standing during these celebrations has greater notoriety and is more evil than the standing of the non-Muslims at their occasions of celebrations and anniversaries. Although the author of the article has opted for discreet silence on this issue, the actual belief which the rank and the file may not know of, underlying the custom of standing when the ‘salaami’ is being recited, is the belief that Rasulullah (Sallallahu

Alayhi Wasallam) presents himself at such gatherings of meelaad. This belief, besides being utterly unfounded and false, is akin to shrik in that the attribute of omnipresence is bestowed upon Rasulullah (Sallallahu Alayhi Wasallam). Gatherings of Melaad of this nature may be taking place in several different places and regions at one and the same time. Each set of Bid'atis labours under the false notion of Rasulullah's presence at the gathering. Thus, in terms of this belief Rasulullah (Sallallahu Alayhi Wasallam) will be present here, there and everywhere at one and the same time. Such omnipresence is exclusive to Allah Ta'ala.

In view of the fact that the Shariah does not confirm the validity of this belief and because the Shariah does not teach the arrival of Rasulullah (Sallallahu Alayhi Wasallam) at such gatherings, it is evil and sinful to concoct this belief and seek to foist the custom of meelaad on the Ummah.

The author claims that the "Aalims" say that to stand up by the way of respect in meelaad gatherings is desirable and lawful. Let the author produce his proof for his claim. Which "Aalims" have issued this rulings? Let the author cite accepted authorities of the Shariah. The opinion and fancies of men whom the Ahl-e-Bid'ah regard as their leaders in deen are not acceptable since these "Aalims" themselves have strayed from the Sunnah of Rasulullah (Sallallahu Alayhi Wasallam). The statements and practices of the Sahaabah and the Fuqaha will be proof of basis for the validity of acts.

The question also arises: Why is the custom of standing restricted to the occasions of salutations during meelaad celebrations? Why did these Bid'atis not extend the way of honouring and respecting to other occasions as well when salutations are offered to the Holy Nabi (Sallallahu Alayhi Wasallam)? During the Tashahhud in Qa'dah, salutation (Salaam) is invoked on Nabi (Sallallahu Alayhi Wasallam). But no qiyaam (standing up) takes place. When a Muslim recites Durood Shareef, he invokes salutation on Rasulullah (Sallallahu

Alayhi Wasallam), but he does not stand in respect nor does the Shariah order him to stand. During the Juma'h Khutbah the Khateeb calls out:

“O people of Imaan! Recite Durood and Salaam on Rasulullah”. (This is in fact a Quraanic Aayat).

But, everybody remains seated. Besides remaining seated, it is not verbally permissible to recite Durood Shareef on this occasion. Whence, then, has this custom of meelaad and the acts of qiyaam originated?

The author of the article attempts to accord Shar'i status to the practice of qiyaam by presenting a worldly practice. He therefore says that to stand up on the arrival of a person is the usual gesture of respect. Even if it is, it is no justification for the qiyaam of meelaad. The author himself says that such standing is a mark of respect “on the arrival of a person”. But, at the meelaad celebrations, the one who is supposedly being honoured does not arrive. It is claim that Rasulullah (Sallallahu Alayhi Wasallam) arrives at such functions. It will be over stepping the limits of Shariah to aver this. Now when Rasulullah (Sallallahu Alayhi Wasallam) does not arrive at these meelaad sessions, then for what is the standing? We have already mentioned the sinister belief of shirk attached to this practice. However, if it is claimed that the standing is a mark of respect for the holy name of Rasulullah (Sallallahu Alayhi Wasallam) which is recited on these occasions, we shall refute this by saying that the name of Rasulullah (Sallallahu Alayhi Wasallam) is recited in numerous places and on numerous occasions in Salaat and at other times, but no one including the Bid'atis, stands up. They all remain seated.

Attempting to justify this standing up in the absence of Rasulullah (Sallallahu Alayhi Wasallam) without making public the actual belief of shirk underlying the practice, the author of the article says:

“Now in usual practice to stand up on the arrival of a person, in the gesture of respect, and to stand up when his name is mentioned is still a greater mark of respect.”

While to a degree it can be conceded that standing on the arrival of a person is a mark of respect, standing when the name of a person is mentioned has never been a Muslim or an Islamic way of offering respect. If it is a mark of respect to stand up when someone's name is mentioned, it can only be a practice of the kuffaar. Such exaggerated form of respect is devoid of any Islamic substance. Islam does not tolerate such form of shirki respect. Whose name can be greater than the name of Allah Ta'ala? But, does any Muslim stand when the name of Allah Ta'ala is mentioned whether in the Khutbah while performing Salaat or at any other time whatever? Since there is absolutely no Islamic basis for standing when someone's name is mentioned, be it the Glorious Name of Allah Ta'ala or the Holy Name of Rasulullah (Sallallahu Alayhi Wasallam), the errant author meekly tenders some remote practice of the kuffaar in substantiation of the qiyaam of meelaad. The Ahle Bid'ah brand as kaafir those who do not subscribe to their unfounded practices of meelaad/qiyaam, but fail miserably to adduce any proof or basis of the Qur'aan and Sunnah to bolster their views.

**Argument No.(3):** In another futile attempt to seek out permissibility for the customary Meelaad practice, the author of the article says:

“it is clear that there is no prohibition in it (ie: in Meelaad). For justification, it is enough that there is no prohibition.....”

This is a typical example of clutching at straws. Numerous acts and practices were and will be innovated and introduced after Rasulullah (Sallallahu Alayhi Wasallam). The office of Nubuwwat did not spell out in detail each and every practice and custom which people will innovate until the day of Qiyaamah. In the Qur'aan and the Sunnah are broad principles on the basis of which an act will be

examined. If a practice is in conflict with the principles of Islam, it will be rejected. Rasulullah (Sallallahu Alayhi Wasallam) did not mention any prohibition of the institution of cinemas and discos. However, only people bereft of understanding wholly subservient to lowly desire will claim that such places are permissible in view of the fact that “there is no prohibition”. Such absurdity cannot stem from the lips and pens of people of Knowledge and Deeni understanding. It will be seen if any institution or practice contains any un-Islamic or unlawful factors. Such factors were branded unlawful by the Qur’aan and Sunnah individually. These factors existing in an institution will make applicable to it the Shariah’s ruling of prohibition. It is silly to argue that since Rasulullah (Sallallahu Alayhi Wasallam) did not prohibit Muslims from burying the dead in coffins, Christian style. Muslims are permitted to bury according to the Christian way. Christians compulsorily don black garments on death occasions and wear black arm-bands for a period after the death of a relative. A Muslim cannot argue the permissibility of these ways on the basis that “there is no prohibition in it”. The prohibition is formulated on the basis of the principles of the Shariah.

The notion that there is no prohibition pertaining to a specific act, then that act is permissible, is thoroughly refuted by the following Aayat of the Qur’aan Shareef:

“O people of Imaan! Enter into Islam fully and do Not follow the footsteps of shaitaan. Verily, he is to You and open enemy”.

(Surah Baqarah, aayat 208)

Hadhrat Abdullah Bin Salaam (Radiallahu Anhu), a prominent Sahaabi, was among the Ummah of Bani Israaeel prior to his entry into Islam. In the Shariah of Hadhrat Musaa (Alayhis Salaam) the eating of camel’s meat was haraam. Abstaining from eating camel’s meat while believing in the lawfulness, was an opinion entertained by Hadhrat Abullah bin Salaam. He reasoned that since it is not

compulsory to eat camel's flesh in Islam, there is nothing wrong by abstaining from it. In fact, in abstaining from camel's flesh while regarding it halaal for Muslim consumption, he reasoned that he would be combining the stands of both Shariahs—the Shariah of Nabi Musaa (Alayhis Salaam) and the Shariah of Rasulullah (Sallallahu Alayhi Wasallam). But, in the Wisdom of Allah Ta'ala such abstention was wrong even though it is not compulsory to eat camel flesh. Refuting the notion of the non-existence of specific prohibition, the Qur'aan-e-Hakeem forcefully commands: "O People of Imaan! Enter into Islam fully..."

The mere abstention from eating camel's meat results in the forceful aayat dispelling such notions. It should be clear now that "there being no prohibition on a specific act" is not a principle which could be employed for permissibility. The principles of the shariah will be employed to obtain a ruling of permissibility or prohibition.

**Argument No. (4):** Again, the author attempts to justify the meelaad practice by saying:

"Almighty Allah says: Honour him (ie. The holy Prophet) and revere him."

This command to honour and revere Rasulullah (Sallallahu Alayhi Wasallam) is interpreted as standing in respect for Rasulullah (Sallallahu Alayhi Wasallam). They desire to furnish this Aayat as a basis for the customary meelaad celebrations. But, this is manifestly baseless. The Aayat does not remotely refer to meelaad. How is it that six centuries after the demise of Rasulullah (Sallallahu Alayhi Wasallam) was it suggested that this Aayat ordering reverence refers to meelaad? To honour and revere Rasulullah (Sallallahu Alayhi Wasallam) are compulsory acts which constitute integral parts of Imaan.

There has never been any contention on this issue. One who disrespects and dishonours Rasulullah (Sallallahu Alayhi Wasallam) can never be a Muslim. Islam demands that a Muslim have greater respect and love for Rasulullah (Sallallahu Alayhi Wasallam) than what he can have for his parents and children. But the respect and honour which the Qur'aan commands Muslims to have and show for Rasulullah (Sallallahu Alayhi Wasallam) are not the meelaad sessions of the Ahl-e-Bid'ah. The Sahaabah had the greatest love, respect and reverence for Nabi-e-Kareem (Sallallahu Alayhi Wasallam). Only Shaihs assert the contrary. Nevertheless, in spite of their profound love and respect, the Sahabah did not indulge in meelaad and qiyaam. Celebration of anniversaries and birthdays were not practices unknown to the Sahaabah. But, since such customs are of paganistic origin and among the salient features of the kufaar, Islam abhorred these celebrations. If non-participation in meelaad and qiyaam could be correctly interpreted as showing disrespect to Rasulullah (Sallallahu Alayhi Wasallam), it will follow that all the Sahaabah and the entire Ummah for six centuries after the inception of Islam had disrespected and dishonoured Nabi-e-Kareem (Sallallahu Alayhi Wasallam). We shall also be faced with the inescapable conclusion that the Sahaabah whose love for Rasulullah (Sallallahu Alayhi Wasallam) was of a far superior degree, had lacked the ability to devise a suitable custom to demonstrate their love and respect while the Ahl-e-Bid'ah, six centuries later came up with the 'wonderful' practice of meelaad.

The author says: "The definition of respect and honour is separate in every context." As far as the Ummah is concerned, the type of respect and honour which the Sahaabah showed for Rasulullah (Sallallahu Alayhi Wasallam) is the desired goal. As Muslims and followers of the sunnah we have to obtain our direction from the Sunnah of the Sahaabah, not from any other dubious source which yields practices and customs which are decidedly in conflict with the preference of Rasulullah (Sallallahu Alayhi Wasallam) and his

Sahaabah. Why do these claimants of love find it so difficult to adhere to the ways and methods of the Sahaabah? Why are the ways and styles of the Sahaabah not sufficient for the people who are vociferous in their slogan of Hubb-e-Rasool (love for Rasool)? Most assuredly, something must be amiss in their Imaan.

**Argument No. (5):** The author, putting forward another point in favour of meelaad, says:

“Also there is no rational religious interdiction against the celebration of Milad un Nabbie.”

This statement represents a great falsehood. The ignorant maybe duped by such wild assertions, but those possessing any Deeni understanding will know the deception and falsity of the claim. Let us enumerate the factors which constitute the basis of Islamic “religious” interdiction against the celebration of the customary meelaad practice.

(a) The practice of customary meelaad celebration is contrary to the ways in which the Sahaabah demonstrated their love and respect for Rasulullah (Sallallahu Alayhi Wasallam). As such, customary meelaad/qiyaam is in conflict with the Sunnah.

(b) The practice of Qiyaam (standing) during these celebrations is the consequence of a corrupt belief of shirk, viz., the belief that Rasulullah (Sallallahu Alayhi Wasallam) arrives in the gathering.

(c) The celebration of birthdays is a custom of the kuffaar. Muslims in their custom of Meelaad are emulating the example of the kuffaar instead of the example of Rasulullah (Sallallahu Alayhi Wasallam) and his Sahaabah who never celebrated birthdays.

(d) Haraam music is employed at these celebrations.

(e) Fussaaq (immoral) qawwaals (singers) sing songs of hollow praises throughout the night. The Salaah times are totally ignored.

(f) The originators of the meelaad were evil men who innovated this custom in the year 604 Hijri.

(g) In spite of the customary meelaad having no origin in the Sunnah, the votaries of this custom accord it a status higher than even the fardh Salaat. Those who do not subscribe to this practice are branded as kaafir.

This satanic extremism sufficiently proves that this practice is a bid'ah, a new introduction which has no Shar'i sanction.

(h) Rasulullah (Sallallahu Alayhi Wasallam) disliked that anyone should stand in respect for him. When this was the attitude of Nabi-e-Kareem (Sallallahu Alayhi Wasallam) regarding qiyaam during his lifetime, his detestation for such standing during his absence and after his death would be of a greater degree.

The above are some of the salient evils attached to the customary meelaad practice. The Shariah thus does not condone the customary meelaad which is an avenue for many evils.

**Argument No.(6):** In support of Meelaad, the author cites the view of Dr F.R.Ansari:

“Milad function is a contrivance originated by Islamic Spiritual Leaders several centuries after the death of the Holy Prophet Muhammad (upon Whom be peace).....”

“Milad function is not only a practice of our times but started with the dawn of creation. Consequently. It can be classified into three types; viz: Sunnatullah, Sunnatul Ambiya, and Sunnatul Sahaabah”

Dr Ansari contradicts himself in his views on the origin of meelaad. In one statement he says that it originated several centuries after the death of Rasulullah (Sallallahu Alayhi Wasallam), which is correct. However, he irrationally contradicts himself by claiming that meelaad functions “started with the dawn of creation.” As

mentioned earlier the custom of meelaad was non-existent during the time of Rasulullah (Sallallahu Alayhi Wasallam) and in the six centuries following the demise of Nabi-e-Kareem (Sallallahu Alayhi Wasallam). The historical facts in this regard are so glaring that even a votary of the customary meelaad such as Dr. Ansari was constrained to admit that “Milad function is a contrivance originated by Islamic Spiritual leaders several centuries after the death of the Holy Prophet (on whom be peace).” How can one logically claim the customary meelaad function with its conglomeration of un-islamic factors to be Sunnah of Allah, or the Sunnah of the Ambiya, or the Sunnah of the Sahaabah when it is accepted that the practice was innovated several centuries after Rasulullah (Sallallahu Alayhi Wasallam)?

In an attempt to cloak the customary meelaad celebration with respectability and holiness, it is averred that the practice was originated by “Islamic Spiritual Leaders”. This claim is devoid of truth. As we have earlier pointed out, the customary meelaad practice was originated by evil men. It will be appropriate to give a brief history of the origin of meelaad/moulood to throw more light on this customary practice.

## **THE ORGINATION OF MEELAAD CELEBRATION**

The History of Islam is fourteen centuries old. But the history of Meealaad celebration is seven centuries old. The Golden ages of Islam –the era of Rasulullah (Sallallahu Alayhi Wasallam), of the Sahaabah, of the Taabieen, and of the Tabe-Taabieen (Quroone Thalaathah) had long passed, yet the custom of Meelaad was not initiated. Six centuries after our Nabi (Sallallahu Alayhi Wasallam) an irreligious ruler initiated this custom in the city of Mosul. Imam Ahmad Bin Muhammad Bin Bisri Maliki (Rahmatullah Alayh) writes in his Kitaab, AL-QOULUL MU`TAMAD:

“Allamah 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 Mazhabs. A group among the learned men inclined towards him. He (this King) organized Mouloud session during the month of Rabiul Awwal. He was the first of the kings to have innovated this practice.”

This irreligious ruler squandered vast sums of public funds in the organization and upkeep of these celebrations which had no sanction in Islamic Law. Allamah Zahbi (Rahmatullah alayh) died 748 Hijri-says:

*“Every year this ruler spends three hundred thousand (from the Baitul Maal) on Mouloud celebrations.”* (DOULUL ISLAM)

So this practice of Mouloud was originated by irreligious people. In the year 604 Hijri this king, Muzaffaruddin Koukari introduced this custom with the aid of some learned people whose purpose was to gain the wealth and honour of this world. A notable and a prime instigator in the origination of this custom was one Molvi Amr Bin Dahya Abul Khattab who died in the year 633 Hijri. He was a great supporter of the worldly irreligious king of Irbal who introduced this custom. The evil character of this irreligious “learned” man is a fact upon which there exists unanimity among the great and pious learned men of Islam. Hafiz Ibn Hajar Askalaani (Rahmatullah alayh) says about this Molvi who was responsible to a great extent for the innovation of Mouloud customs:

*“He was a person who insulted the Jurists of Islam and the pious learned men of former times. He had a filthy tongue. He was ignorant, excessively proud, and possessed no insight of matters pertaining to the Deen and he was extremely negligent as far as the Deen was concerned.”*

*“Allamah Ibn Najjar (Rahmatullah alayh) said: ‘I have witnessed unanimity of opinion among the people as to him (this irreligious Molvi), being a lair and an unreliable person”.*

**(LISAANUL MIZAN)**

Every unbiased Muslim will realize from the foregoing discussion that the Moulood custom was introduced by evil men and given prominence by evil men. Islamic History bears testimony to this fact. Right from its inception all the great and pious Ulama and Jurists of Islam have condemned this innovation and have warned against participation in these un-Islamic functions. There exists consensus of opinion among the true learned Ulama of Islam that the customary meelaad functions are not permissible.

It will now be clear that the practice of meelaad was the contrivance of evil men who were enslaved to this world. The customary meelaad function was not the origination of Auliya (Islamic Religious Leaders) as the Ahl-e-Bid`ah contend. The Auliya had no share in this innovation. It is inconceivable that Auliya would introduce a custom with so many ills and evils as the customary meelaad. Any practice of honouring Rasulullah (Sallallahu Alayhi Wasallam), which any among the Auliya had adopted bear no resemblance to the customary meelaad functions.

The article alleges that meelaad is “Sunnatullah, because at the dawn of creation Allah called all the Prophets and took the pledge” of loyalty to Rasulullah (Sallallahu Alayhi Wasallam) from them. Only a mind darkened with bid`ah will resort to such lop sided and absurd `logic`. A pledge taken in eternity (at the dawn of creation) has absolutely no truck with the present customary innovated practice of meelaad. The pledge mentioned in Surah Aal-e-Imraan was never a meelaad celebration. It is, therefore, downright stupid to say the customary meelaad celebration is “Sunnatullah” because of a pledge which Allah Ta`ala took from the Ambiya (Alayhimus Salaam).

## **“SUNNATUL-AMBIYA” AND “SUNNATUL-SAHABA”**

The article proceeds with its absurdity by claiming that meelaad was “Sannatul Ambiya, because every prophet who came spoke about the coming of the Holy Prophet with praise and reverence”. Speaking with reverence about Rasulullah (Sallallahu Alayhi Wasallam) is not the customary meelaad celebration. The Ambiya did not set aside specific dates for such celebrations. The Ambiya never celebrated birthdays nor did they organize feasts and festivals on such occasions. The Ambiya never organized Qawwaali sessions in which fussaag and fujjaar participate. The Ambiya did not introduce the practice of standing in a gathering in praise and honour of Rasulullah (Sallallahu Alayhi Wasallam). The speech of the Ambiya in regard to Rasulullah (Sallallahu Alayhi Wasallam) consisted of their instructions to their respective Ummats to obey and aid him should they be fortunate to link up with him. Their discussion about Rasulullah (Sallallahu Alayhi Wasallam) did not pertain to singing, dancing and merry-making festivals of evil.

As further justification for the practice of customary meelaad, the article claims that “it was Sunnatul Sahaabah”, because some of the Sahaabah recited verse of praise “about the Prophet in his presence”. That some Sahaabah had recited verses of praise in Rasulullah’s presence is not denied. But, such recital is a far cry from the customary meelaad celebration. It was never the contention that reciting the praise of Rasulullah (Sallallahu Alayhi Wasallam) is unlawful. No one has ever advanced such a claim. The contention is that customary meelaad celebrations are un-islamic and bid`ah. Reciting verses of praise for Rasulullah (Sallallahu Alayhi Wasallam), whether in his presence or absence, is permissible and laudable provided that the evils mentioned earlier do not accompany such recital.

It is thus a travesty of the truth to describe the customary meelaad bid`ah as a Sunnat of the Sahaabah.

**Argument No. (7):** The article cites the following Qur`aanic Aayat in support of the customary meelaad celebration:

“And remind them of the days of Allah. Lo! Therein are revelations for each steadfast, thankful (heart).”(14:5)

Again, there is not even the remotest reference or even suggestion about the customary meelaad practices of the Ahl-e-bid`ah. It is indeed ludicrous to present this Aayat in substantiation of a practice which has specific form, which has assumed the form of a compulsory institution of Ibaadat and which was unknown during the time of Rasulullah (Sallallahu Alayhi Wasallam), the Sahaabah and the Ummah for six hundred years after Rasulullah (Sallallahu Alayhi Wasallam). Reminding people about an event cannot be interpreted to mean the forging of a custom or an act with the form of Ibaadat and then imposing such innovated practice on the Ummah in spite of its non-existence at the time of Rasulullah (Sallallahu Alayhi Wasallam) and the Khairul Quroon (the Noble Ages). Reminding others of the “Days of Allah” refer to pure Naseehat and Muraaqabah (meditation).

If “reminding of the Days of Allah” required the establishment of celebrations and festivals similar to the customary meelaad practice, how is it that neither Rasulullah nor his Sahaabah saw fit to initiate such customs of celebration? Why did the greatest authorities of the Shariah in the Khairul Quroon (the Noblest Ages) not deem it proper to introduce meelaad and such festivals? Were all these august personalities of Islam ignorant of the purport and demand of the aayat proclaiming the “Days of Allah” ? Reminding people of the Days of Allah is not the bid`ah and haraam which the Ahl-e-Bid`ah perpetrate through the avenue of their customary meelaad.

The aforementioned Qur`aanic sentence cited in support of the customary meelaad is a portion of Aayat No,5 of Surah Ibraaheem. The full Aayat is:

*“And, verily we sent Musaa with our Signs (and We commanded him), `Extricate your nation from the darkness (of disobedience and take them) to the Light (of Imaan). And (O Musaa!) remind them (your people –Bani Israeel) of the days of Allah. Verily, in it (i.e in the events which transpired in those days of the past) are surely signs (lessons –naseehat/admonition) for every patient and grateful (Mu`min).”*

It will be seen that this Aayat refers to a command which Allah Ta`ala issued to Nabi Musaa (Alayhis Salaam). It pertains to the Bani Israeel. Let us see what the authoritative books of Tafseer say regarding the “Days of Allah”.

Tafseer Kash-shaaf says:

*“And remind them (Bani Israeel) of the Days of Allah; ie Warn them of the events which transpired in regard to previous communities—the nation of Nooh, Aad, and Thamud.*

*Ibn Abbaas (Radiallahu Anhu) said: (this refers to ) Allah`s favours and the trials which He imposed on (Bani Israeel). Among His favours are His shading them (from the fierce desert heat) with clouds; his sending down (the heavenly foods of) Mann and Salwaa, and, His splitting open the sea (to enable them to escape from Fir`oun and causing Fir`oun`s destruction). Among his trials is the destruction of communities.....”*

Not a single authority of the Shariah has understood the Aayat to refer to meelaad or any similar celebration. The straightforward meaning of the verse is for people to ponder over the bounties of Allah Ta`ala and take lesson from the terrible punishments which he inflicted on the disbelievers in bygone days. The “Days of Allah” refer to bygone days in which the various events transpired. No person in his right frame of mind will ever understand this Aayat to be meelaad celebrations. Only those who are lost in bid`ah forcibly

mutilate the true meanings of the Qur'aanic Aayat seeking some basis for their innovated practices.

In conclusion it has to be observed that the votaries of the customary meelaad celebrations do not possess the slightest shred of Shar'i proof to substantiate their practices. Their origination of customs and the form of Ibaadat accorded to these practices are examples of the evil bid'ah about which Rasulullah (Sallallahu Alayhi Wasallam) said:

*"Whoever innovates into this Deen of ours something Which is not of it (The Deen), is condemned."*

*"Every act of bid'ah is deviation (from the truth of Islam) and every act of deviation will be in the fire"*

About the people of bid'ah, Kanzul Ummaal records the following Hadith:

*"Verily the companions of Bid'ah are the dogs of Fire".*

Since bid'ah displaces the Sunnah and eliminates the pure and simple teachings of Islam, the Shariah views it as a crime of the gravest nature. The Ahaadith makes it very clear that the perpetrators of bid'ah are gnawing at the structure of Islam and are digging at the foundations of Deen. Muslims should, therefore, not be misled by the hollow and insincere slogans of love and respect raised by the supporters of bid'ah. Such slogans are devoid of any Islamic spirit and substance. Love and respect for Rasulullah (Sallallahu Alayhi Wasallam) are inextricably interwoven with obedience to the Shariah. Deviation from the road of the Sahaabah can never induce love and respect for Rasulullah (Sallallahu Alayhi Wasallam).

**MUJLISUL ULAMA OF SOUTH AFRICA  
P.O.BOX 3393  
PORT ELIZABETH, 6056**