

MAWLID / MOULOOD / MEELAAD IS BID'AH SAYYIAH

***A BRIEF REFUTATION
OF THE FLOTSAM OF THE
PSEUDO-'DEOBANDI'
MORON, CARDBOARD MOLVIS***

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

ALL MOULOOD FUNCTIONS AND FESTIVALS ARE HARAAM BID'AH SAYYIAH

Maajin (Moron-Jaahil) so-called 'muftis' not worth tuppence, are abortively struggling to promote current 'mawlid' practices as permissible. It is the claim of these morons that this is an issue of valid difference of opinion of the Math-habs. This stance which the jaahil 'muftis' and 'molvis' masquerading as 'Deobandis', are peddling is baseless (baatil), and has no validity in the Shariah. They cite some big names of Shaafi' Ulama who had appeared on the scene 600, 700 and a 1000 years after Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam), and expect Muslims in general, and genuine Ulama in particular to swallow. But deglutition is a deficiency of morons, not of men of Aql.

On the assumption that the big names had claimed permissibility for current haraam mawlid bid'ah functions, it will be rejected with contempt. The views of Ulama who mounted the platform of Islam many centuries after Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam), and centuries after the codification of the Four Math-habs of Islam, have absolutely no Shar'i status if in conflict with the Shariah as was handed to the Ummah from the era of *Khairul Quroon*. It is imperative to view the fatwas of scholars, be they big names and big guns, in the light of several immutable principles of Islam which are:

(1) The Shariah was finalized and perfected during the very age of Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) and the Sahaabah.

In this regard, the Qur'aan Majeed states explicitly with emphasis:

"This Day have I perfected for you (O Muslimeen!) your Deen, and (on this Day) have I completed for you My Favour (the Shariah of Islam), and I have chosen for you Islam as Deen."

(Surah Al-Maaidah, Aayat 3)

The completion, perfection and finalization of Islam with its Shariah preclude addition, deletion and alteration. All new practices presented in the hues of ibaadat have no room in Islam. The addition of new so-called 'ibaadat' practices implies the falsity of the aforementioned Qur'aanic aayat. It implies that Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) departed at a time when the Deen had not yet been finalized, and despite imperfection of the Deen, Nubuwwat had ended. All such implications are kufr.

(2) Ibaadat is only what was taught by Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) and the Sahaabah.

In this regard, Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) said:

"He who innovates in this Amr (Deen) anything which is not of it, verily it is mardood (rejected and accursed)."

“The vilest of things are innovations (acts of bid’ah), and every bid’ah is dhalaalah (deviation leading to Jahannam).”

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

These are just a couple of Ahaadith cited randomly. There is a deluge of Ahaadith in condemnation of bid’ah.

(3) Ibaadat is only such worship / practices which existed during the Khairul Quroon.

Any practice promoted as ibaadat, which was innovated after *Khairul Quroon* is *mardood*. Regarding the authority and authenticity of the effects of *Khairul Quroon*, Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) said:

“Honour my Sahaabah, for they are your noblest, then those after them (the Taabieen), then those after them (the Tab-a-Taabi’een. Thereafter kizb (lies/falsehood) will become prevalent.”

“The best of my Ummah, is my Age, then those after them (i.e. after the Sahaabah), then those after them (the Taabi’een), then those after them (the Tab-e-Taabi’een). Thereafter will appear people who will (of their own accord) testify without being called on to testify. They will abuse trust and will not be trustworthy. They will pledge, but not fulfil (their pledges/promises). Among them obesity (haraam fatness) will become prevalent.....Then will come people who will love obesity.”

On the basis of the aforementioned inviolable three Shar’i principles, all mawlid practices regardless of their nature and deceptive ‘beauty’ and ‘correctness’ are all the products of falsehood and obesity. All these innovated practices deceptively described and named, are acts of *dhalaalah* which lead to the Fire of Jahannam. A salient feature of these merrymaking garrulous and gluttonous singing, eating and feasting festivals of bid’ah is, the factor of ‘obesity’ mentioned and deprecated by Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam). Excessive feasting produces physical obesity which causes spiritual emaciation. These haraam ‘mawlid’ birthday functions emulated from the kuffaar – specialize in feasting and fun. People devour food like gluttons at these festivals falsely presented as ibaadat.

The entire year these miserable votaries of bid’ah forget Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) and his Sunnah. But for sustaining their nafsaani practices and desire for fun and festival, they sully the name of Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) by hoisting their bid’ah sayyiah (evil bid’ah) in the very name of Nabi-e-Kareem (sallallahu alayhi wasallam). Aiding the deviates are the *maajin* ‘muftis’ who

compound *jahaalat* with *jahaalat*. They disgorge utter tripe ‘fatwas’ which none of our Akaabir Ulama of Deoband had ever ventured.

The Akaabir Ulama of Deoband were always in the forefront of the Jihad against bid’ah, including the bid’ah of mawlid/mouloud/meelaad. Hadhrat Maulana Qaasim Nanotwi, the Founder of Darul Uloom Deoband, Hadhrat Maulana Rashid Ahmed Gangohi – unanimously the greatest Aalim of Ahl-e-Deoband – Hadhrat Maulana Ashraf Ali Thanvi and many other glittering Stars of Uloom and Taqwa which had emblazoned the firmament of Shar’i Uloom, Taqwa and Wara, were all branded *kaafir* over and over again by the people of Barelwi with whom today the ulama-e-soo’ masquerading as ‘deobandis’ are beginning to strike up alliances. Our Akaabir Ulama of Deoband had remained steadfast until the very last moments of their earthly lives in their stance and condemnation of Bid’ah. They had unanimously proclaimed meelaad with all its paraphernalia bid’ah – ***bid’ah sayyiah***.

When a misunderstanding developed in the wake of a booklet attributed to Hadhrat Haaji Imdaadullah (rahmatullah alayh), the Shaikh of the three Akaabir Ulama mentioned above, Hadhrat Gangohi and Hadhrat Nanotwi (rahmatullah alayhim) said firmly that Haaji Sahib should “consult us” in these matters. “We did not become bay’t to Haaji Sahib to ascertain the status of Hadith”. In matters of the Shariah, Haji Sahib had to refer to these illustrious Akaabir of Deoband who were his Mureeds.

In this belated age we find youngster moron ‘molvis’ citing from the texts of Shaafi’ Ulama who arrived on the scene 7, 8, and 10 centuries after Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) in their despicable attempt to negate the unequivocal Fatwa of the Ulama of Deoband on the issue of meelaad, yet they dub themselves ‘deobandis’. They are plain stupid, lacking in entirety in foresight and understanding. It is haraam for such morons to speak on Deeni issues. They should restrict their efforts to teaching Nooraani Qaaidhah, for they do nothing but mislead the masses with their convoluted fatwas of stupidity which provide unfettered latitude for the perpetuation of the haraam *khuraafaat* of **all** prevalent bid’ah sayyiah mawlid/meelaad practices and functions of merrymaking designed to foster haraam obesity as prophesized by Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam).

These cranks who attempt to subtly negate the Fatwa of prohibition of the Akaabir of Deoband to appease the Ahl-e-Bid’ah should remove their masks of deception and renounce the flimsy veneer of ‘deobandi’ism’ which they flaunt to mislead and misguide others.

Mawlid/meelaad bid’ah is not a matter of valid difference of the Math-habs. Our Akaabir have condemned it on the basis of it being Bid’ah Sayyiah. There is nothing ‘hasanah’ (beautiful) about this bid’ah regardless of what the 7th, 8th and 10th century Shaafi’ Ulama may have said. The views of the centuries-later Shaafi’ Ulama on the bid’ah of mawlid are baatil. Such views are pure personal opinion devoid of Shar’i substance. They had proffered no Shar’i daleel for permissibility. No one’s

personal opinion bereft of Shar'i dalai-il is *Hujjat (proof/evidence)* against the explicit and emphatic Shar'i Fatwa of Prohibition of our Akaabir Ulama of Deoband.

Regardless of the 'charity' which the initial mawlid practice may have catered for, the fact is irrefutable that the opinion of permissibility was extremely short-sighted. It is such opinions which have culminated in the evil of current day bid'ah mawlid festivals which are riddled with haraam and vice.

The names of Ibn Hajar, Suyuti, Shaukaani, Sakhawi, Qurafi Rahmatullah alayhim), etc. – all having appeared on the scene many centuries after Khairul Quroon – do not alter the Shariah by one jot or dot. All the Sahaabah, Taabi'een and Tabe Taabi'een were fully aware of Rasulullah's day of birth and what a wondrous and blessed occasion it was for humanity. No one's love for Nabi-e-Kareem (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) superseded the love which the Sahaabah cherished in their hearts of Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam). If there was any goodness whatsoever in the kuffaar practice of celebrating birthdays of Ambiya or if such stupid functions had been valid expressions of love, the Sahaabah would have been the very first to have initiated mawlid/meelaad just as they had initiated and embedded in Islam Taraaweeth in the current form as well as some other practices of Ibaadat.

The *Sabab/Illat* or *raison d'être* cited by the Bid'atis for permissibility of mawlid existed to a greater degree during the age of the Sahaabah and the Khairul Quroon era. Despite its existence and despite the stupendously greater love the Sahaabah cherished for Nabi-e-Kareem (sallallahu alayhi wasallam), they never initiated any practice which had even a slight resemblance to bid'ah, and by this we mean such bid'ah which initially may have been without the haraam, fisq and fujoor of current evil mawlid merrymaking, nafsani functions of singing and feasting.

Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) would not have deprived the Ummah of *Thawaab (Reward)* by remaining silent of meelaad had it been an ibaadat and an *amal* of merit. Lailatul Qadr, Lailatul Baraa'ah, the Nights of the two Eids, the Day of Aashura and the Day of Arafaat are days of ibaadat and great spiritual treasures and reward. Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) actively promoted these auspicious days and nights. He instructed fasting and Nafl ibaadat for these occasions. Yet, he remained completely silent about the day of his blessed birth. If it was a day of ibaadat to be observed and to gain thawaab, then the silence of Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) would have been irreconcilable with his mission of Nubuwwat. His very silence and his abstention from hoisting his day of birth on the Ummah as a day of observance is the clearest evidence damning the bid'ah sayyiah meelaad practices which the miscreants have innovated in emulation of the Yahood and Nasaara who celebrate the birthday anniversaries of the holy personages.

Meelaad has been hoisted on the Ummah as if it is an ibaadat of the highest merit. It has been given a status far superior to even Lailatul Qadr, and those who abstain from it are branded kaafir. In fact, our Akaabir Ulama of Deoband have been labelled kaafir over and over by the Qabar Pujaari sect (the Barelwis) for proclaiming that their meelaad is bid'ah.

The argument that mawlid if practiced ‘correctly’ is permissible is moronic. Bid’ah, said Hadhrat Mujaddid Alf-e-Thaani (rahmatullah alayh) is never beautiful. Bid’ah is ugly. It is satanic. It is shaitaan’s most potent trap. There is no beauty in innovation presented in the form of ibaadat. It is simply not ibaadat. It was unknown in the era of Khairul Quroon. It is a centuries-later innovation, and the only flimsy basis the votaries of this bid’ah can disgorge is the personal opinion, unsubstantiated by *Nusoos or Shar’i Usool* – opinions of some Shaafi’ Ulama of many centuries after Khairul Quroon – after finalization and perfection of Islam. Islam can never be adorned and beautified with innovated practices. If there had been a need for enhancing the beauty of Islam with added and innovated acts disguised as ‘ibaadat’, Allah Ta’ala would not have finalized and terminated Nubuwwat. The door of Nubuwwat would have been left open as it was left open until Hadhrat Nabi Isaa (alayhis salaam). The very finalization and termination of the long Chain of Nubuwwat is the strongest evidence for the *butlaan (nullity and falsehood)* of the bid’ah ‘ibaadat’ funfare festival of mawlid/meelaad.

Our Akaabir Ulama of Deoband were among *Baqiyaatus Salf*. They were glorious remnants of the Salfus Saaliheen of the *Khairul Quroon* epoch. They did not spew out personal opinion – opinion unsubstantiated with Shar’i daleel. Every Fatwa of our Akaabireen is structured on solid Shar’i dalaa-il. The Prohibition of meelaad stated by the Akaabir Ulama of Deoband is unlike the fatwas of personal opinion of the *muta-akh-khireen* Shaafi’ Ulama. The Akaabir of Deoband were genuine Fuqaha of the kind who had flourished during the Khairul Quroon. Today moron so-called ‘deobandi’ molvis of the *haatibul lail* class flaunt their *jahaalat* with their stupid, abortive attempts to neutralize the Fatwa of Prohibition which the Ulama of Deoband had and still resolutely propagate.

One moron, *maajin* cardboard molvi with his rodomontade attitude bordering on insolence and disrespect for the Akaabir Ulama of Deoband, disgorged: “*In almuhanad al mufanad the bible or gospel of the aqidah of the scholars of deoband its clearly mentioned mawlood free of haraan n bidat is acceptable.*”

This insolent upstart claiming to be a ‘deobandi’ lacks the rudiments of Akhlaaq. The Kitaab which he mentions so insolently is NOT the ‘bible or gospel’ of the Aqeedah of the Akaabir of Deoband. While our beliefs have been outlined and briefly explained in that Kitaab in refutation of the Barelwi sect’s slander, it is not the ‘bible and gospel’ of the Ulama of Deoband. Al-Muhannad was authored by Hadhrat Maulana Khalil Ahmad Sahaaranpuri (rahmatullah alayh). The moron molvi should read Hadhrat Khalil Ahmad’s *Baraahin-e-Qaatiah* to gain insight and to better understand his explicit criticism of meelaad and all acts of bid’ah of the Qabar Pujaari sect.

The correct approach is to cite what Maulana Khalil Ahmad Sahaaranpuri says in his *Baraahin-e-Qaatiah*. The issue at hand, is the current-day Satanist functions

dubbed 'meelaad/mawlid/ moulood'. But perhaps he is too dense in his Aql to understand *Baraahin-e-Qaatiah*. During our student days in Jalalabad, one South African student suggested to Hadhrat Masihullah (rahmatullah alayh) to introduce in the syllabus for the benefit of South African students, the Kitaab *Baraahin-e-Qaatiah* to basically equip them against the Barelwi Bid'atis when they return to South Africa. Hadhrat Masihullah (rahmatullah alayh) commented: "*To understand Baraahin-e-Qaatiah there is a need for Aql.*" We leave you at this conundrum to decide the lack of Aql in these moron youngster upstart *maajin*, cardboard molvis who lack the ability to distinguish between light and darkness. They simply are bereft of Aql.

The type of 'meelaad' for which permissibility is accorded in *Haft-e-Maslah* which is attributed to Haaji Imdaadullah (rahmatullah alayh), the Shaikh of our Akaabir Ulama of Deoband, which was his private practice and totally devoid of the slightest act of haraam, is also banned by the Akaabir Ulama. In fact, when the booklet, *Haft-e-Mas'alah* was read out to Hadhrat Maulana Rashid Ahmad Gangohi (rahmatullah alayh), he commented: "*Take it into the bathroom and burn it out.*" He had discerned the kitaab attributed to his Shaikh as being a source of fitnah and misguidance, hence his reaction. (The bathroom was chosen for burning the book because the fire was always lit there for warming the water.)

When critics reported this episode to Haaji Imdaadullah (rahmatullah alayh) who was at that time living in Makkah Mukarramah, he commented:

"In the Name of Allah, the Merciful; the "Most 'Merciful. We praise Him and recite Durood upon His gracious Nabi (sallallahu alayhi wasallam).

This epistle is from Faqeer Imdaadullah Chisti to all friends generally.

"In these days some letters from Hindustan have reached this Faqeer. The purport of these letters was that certain people hold detestable views about Molvi Rashid Ahmad (Gangohi) Sahib. The writers of the letters wished to know what attitude they should hold about Molvi Sahib (Maulana Rashid Ahmad Gangohi). On behalf of this faqeer (i.e. Haaji Imdaadullah Sahib) publicize that:

Molvi Rashid Ahmad Sahib is an Aalim-e-Rabbaani (an Aalim of Allah) and a Faadhil-e-Haqqani (a true and qualified Aalim of the Deen). He is the resemblance of the Salf-e-Saaliheen (the great and pious authorities of the Deen of former times). He is an authority of the Shariat and Tareeqat (the branch of Islam dealing with spiritual purification and development). He is engaged in the Pleasure of Allah and His Rasool (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) night and day. He keeps alive the profession of imparting the knowledge of the Hadith Shareef. After Molvi Muhammad Ishaq, he (Maulana Gangohi) is the one who keeps alive this knowledge. In Hindustan, Molvi Rashid Ahmad is an unique example and an outstanding personality.

Molvi Sahib (Maulana Gangohi) provides solutions to most intricate masaa'il. Approximately fifty persons qualify annually by him in knowledge of Hadith Shareef. He is totally immersed in following the Sunnah of Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam). He is engrossed in the love of Rasool-e-Kareem (sallallahu alayhi

wasallam). He is the proclaimer of Haqq and the hadith, "They fear not the insult of the insultors.", aptly fits him.

He reposes total tawakkul (trust) in Allah Ta'ala and he abstains totally from *bid'ah*. His profession is the dissemination of the Sunnah. He transforms people of defective belief into persons of correct belief. This is his trade. His companionship (suhbat) for the people of Islam is a tremendous boon and an alchemy. Sitting in his company induces the remembrance of Allah, and such remembrance is the sign of Men of Allah.

He is a *muttaqi* (pious and full of fear for Allah). He is detached from this world. He aspires for the Aakhirat. He has excelled in *tasawwuf* and *sulook*. The rich and the poor are equal in his sight. His gaze is focussed equally on all. He is a man without worldly desire and without ego.

The praise which this Faqeer (i.e. Haaji Imdaadullah) has lauded on him (Maulana Gangohi) in the book, *Ziyaaul Quloob*, is the *Haqq*. Now my love and opinion for him have increased by a far greater degree than before. I consider him (Maulana Gangohi) as a medium for my *najaat* (salvation in the Aakhirat).

I declare most emphatically that he who condemns Molvi Rashid Ahmad, hurts my heart. I have two wings.

One is Molvi Qasim Naanotwi, (the founder of Darul Uloom Deoband) who has passed away, and the other is Molvi Rashid Ahmad. This remaining wing of mine is now also being made a target (for vilification) by people.

The *Aqeedah* (belief) of Molvi Rashid Ahmad and myself is the same. I too regard *bid'ah* to be evil. In matters of the Deen whoever is the opponent of Molvi Rashid Ahmad is likewise my opponent as well as the opponent of Allah and of His Rasool (sallallahu alayhi wasallam).

Some *juhalaa* (ignoramus) who distinguish between *Tareeqat* and *Shariat* do so because of their lack of understanding. *Tareeqat* minus *Shariat* is unacceptable in the Court of Allah Ta'ala. Cleanliness of heart is even attained by the kuffaar. The condition of the heart is like a mirror. The mirror is dirty. The dirt on the mirror can be removed with urine as well as rose water. But the difference is a question of *tahaarat* (Shari purification) and *Najasat* (impurity). The recognition, therefore, of a *Wali* of Allah is the Standard of *ittibaa-e-Sunnah* (following the Sunnah). He who follows the Sunnah is the friend of Allah. If one is *amubtadi* (*bid'ati*) one is absolutely false."

Haaji Imdaadullah, Makkah Muazzamah 25th Zil-Qadh 1310

The votaries of this mawlid festival and birthday party celebration acquired from Christians, should not cite 600 and 700 and 1000 year later Shaafi' Ulama for permissibility. They should cite the Sahaabah. They should present *Daleel* from the Khairul Quroon. They should structure their case on *Nusoos of the Shariah*, not on the personal opinions and personal practices of centuries-later Shaafi' Ulama. Even today many misguided miscreant Hanafi Ulama, due to weakness in spirit and

deficiency in Ilm, appease the Bid'atis by accepting their haraam bid'ah practices as 'valid difference of opinion'. The views of such *juhala* are totally devoid of Shar'i substance.

When discussing the Shariah, they should not argue like the Yahood and Christians who have mangled and mutilated the Shariats of Nabi Musaa (alayhis salaam) and Nabi Isaa (alayhis salaam) beyond recognition with their personal opinions of *ahwaa*. Allah Ta'ala, severely reprimanding this type of attitude of the Bani Israaeel, states in the Qur'aan Shareef:

*"They (the Bani Israaeel) take their scholars
and saints as gods (arbaab) besides Allah..."*

The Ulama who flourished six and seven centuries after Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) are not our 'gods'. We do not submit to their personal opinions. Their views can never override the Shariah. What existed during the era of Khairul Quroon is the Shariah, not that which was cultivated by innovation centuries thereafter regardless of the artificial 'beauty' with which the bid'aat are deceptively adorned.

One moron molvi, displaying his jahaalat in the miserable attempt to peddle the idea that the senior Ulama of Deoband practised some 'purified' brand of moulood, avers:

"The mawlood that is free from any haraam n innovation was practised by our seniors."

This comment is devious and dishonest. Our seniors did not practise any kind of moulood. Who were those seniors? Let the moron mention their names. Every type of moulood is bid'ah. There is no moulood free of haraam factors. Every moulood is bid'ah sayyiah. The deceptive appellation '*bid'ah hasanah*' given to moulood functions allegedly 'free of haraam' is a gross error. It is a snare of shaitaan – *Talbeesul Iblees*. Some sincere Ulama by virtue of their short-sightedness and failure to comprehend the exact nature and meaning of bid'ah fell into the snare of deception and believed that there could be a kind of moulood free of haraam. Since moulood *per se* is bid'ah regardless of other haraam elements attached or unattached, it may not be described as bid'ah hasanah.

Bid'ah Hasanah is an act/institution introduced to safeguard or to revive a Sunnah institution. Bid'ah Hasanah is not the innovation of a new practice of ibaadat which was unknown to the Salaf-e-Saaliheen of the Khairul Quroon era. Moulood has not been introduced to revive or protect any existing Sunnah, practice or teaching of Islam. It is a pure fabrication of the nafs which has deluded even many senior Ulama, especially among the Shawaafi' later-day Ulama who appeared on the scene many centuries after Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam).

Commenting on the deception of 'bid'ah hasanah' with which shaitaan has adorned bid'ah acts such as moulood, Hadhrat Mujaddid Alf-e-Thaani, the Mujjadid of Islam's second millennium, said:

“Some people say that bid’ah is of two kinds: Hasanah and Sayyiah. Hasanah is a virtuous act which came into being after the era of our Nabi (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) and the era of the Khulafa-e-Raashideen, and it is not an eliminator of any Sunnah. Sayyiah is an innovated act which eliminates Sunnah.

However, this Faqeer does not discern any beauty in any kind of bid’ah whatsoever. There is nothing discernable in it besides *zulmat* (spiritual darkness) and *kudoorat* (spiritual contamination). Whoever today sees goodness and beauty in any innovated act because of weakness of *baseerat* (spiritual insight), will most certainly know tomorrow (at the time of Maut), after the acquisition of sharpness in *baseerat* (when all veils of darkness will be removed) that the only consequence of it (bid’ah hasanah) is regret and loss.

Sayyidul Bashr, Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) said: *“Whoever innovates in this Deen of ours anything which is not of it, it (and he) is mardood.”* Now when something is *mardood*, then from whence has it acquired beauty (*husn*)? And, Rasulullah (alayhis salaam) said: *“.....Verily, every innovation is bid’ah, and every bid’ah is dhalaalah (misguidance, deviation from the Haqq)”*. Thus, when every innovation is bid’ah and every bid’ah is dhalaalah, then what is the meaning of *husn (beauty) in bid’ah*?

It is also understood from the Ahaadith that every bid’ah is the eliminator of Sunnah, and elimination is not restricted to some acts of bid’ah. Thus, every bid’ah is sayyiah (evil). Nabi (alayhis salaam) said: *“Whenever a people innovates a bid’ah there is a corresponding elimination of Sunnah.”*

“When the mind is properly applied, it will become apparent that some acts which (some) Ulama and Mashaaikh have described as bid’ah hasanah, are in reality eliminators of Sunnah.Similar are all innovated acts of bid’ah. They all are excesses on the Sunnah from some angle or the other. An excess (on the Sunnah) is abrogation (cancellation). And, abrogation is an eliminator (of Sunnah). Therefore, make incumbent on yourself submission to the Sunnah of Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam), and be contented with following his noble Ashaab (radhiyallahu anhum), for verily they are like the Stars. Whomever of them you follow, you will be guided.

“.....Verily, every Sunnah and bid’ah are opposites to each other. The presence of the one necessarily eliminates the other. Thus, the revival of one is the elimination of the other. How then is it proper to describe bid’ah as being hasanah when its necessary corollary is the elimination of Sunnah?.....At this juncture there is an objection even though this will be heavy on the majority because of the widespread prevalence of bid’ah. But, soon tomorrow (at the time of Maut) will they realize whether we are on hidaayat or they.

“It is narrated that when the Promised Al-Mahdi (Imaam Mahdi) will intend the implementation of the Deen and the revival of the Sunnah in his era, an Aalim of Madinah who is accustomed to act according to bid’ah which he believes to be hasanah and an accessory of the Deen, will say in surprise that this person (Imaam

Mahdi) intends to eliminate our Deen. Then Imaam Mahdi will order him to be executed, for he (Imaam Mahdi) will regard as evil what that Aalim believes to be hasan (beautiful)."

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

"Regarding the issue of reciting maulid: What is wrong in reciting the Qur'aan and reciting qaseedas (na'ts) 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 moulood) 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 moulood) 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 moulod as 'bid'ah hasanah'. They all are the victims of shaitaan's *Talbeesul Iblees* snares. Citing Mujaddid Alf-e-Thaani, the following appears in Fataawa Rashidiyyah of Hadhrat Maulana Rashid Ahmad Gangohi (rahmatullah alayh):

"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."

The following are more citations from Fataawa Rashidiyyah:

* "The customary act of moulod is bid'ah and haraam. Speak about Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) no one forbids this. But do so as was practised during *Quroon-e-Thalaathah (Khairul Quroon)*. Neither were there moulod functions nor qiyaam (standing) when Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) is mentioned. All of us have been commanded to follow the Salaf-e-Saaliheen. We have not been commanded to follow the *Khalf (the later era Ulama whom the deviates quote for giving credibility to bid'ah)*.

Allaamah Ibnul Haaj who was among the very senior authorities (of the Shariah) says in *Mudkhal*: *"From among the many bid'aat which have been innovated, with the belief that it is from among the great acts of ibaadat and the projection of the shi-aar of Islam, is moulod which they do in the month of Rabiul Awwal. It is a conglomeration of bid'ah and acts of haraam.....Even if it (the moulid) is without these evils and only food is served with the intention of moulid, and brothers are invited to participate, and the function is free from all the (haraam) mentioned earlier, then too it is bid'ah merely on the basis of the intention (that the function is moulid), for verily, 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 moulid. We follow the Salaf. Thus, for us is permissible only that which was permissible for them."*

* "Maulana Abdur Rahmaan Al-Maghribi Al-Hanafi, says in his Fataawa: *"Verily, moulid is bid'ah. Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam), the Khulafa-e-Raashideen and the Aimmah Mujaahideen neither advocated it nor practised it."*

* “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 moulid (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 maulid: *“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 shirk. The Aimmah have prohibited such acts.”*

(Extracts from Fataawa Rashidiyyah)

Hadhrat Maulana Rashid Ahmad Gangohi (rahmatullah alayh) says in his *Fataawa Rashidiyyah*:

* In response to a questioner who had mentioned: *“I have heard that your Shaikh, Haaji Imdaadullah would also listen to moulod.”*, Hadhrat Maulana Rashid Ahmad Gangohi (rahmatullah alayh) said:

“Refer to Baraaheen-e-Qaatiah for a detailed elaboration of moulod gatherings. Hujjat cannot be made with the statements and acts of the Mashaaikh. On the contrary, Hujjat is with the statements and acts of Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) and the statements of the Mujtahideen (rahmatullah alayhim).

Hadhrat Naseeruddeen Chiraagh Dehlwi (quddisa sirruhu) said that when someone would cite as Hujjat an act of his Shaikh, Sultaan Nizaamuddeen (quddisa sirruhu), he (Hadhrat Naseeruddeen) would say: ‘The action of the Shaikh is not Hujjat.’ Hadhrat Sultaanul Auliya approved of this response.” (*Fataawa Rashidiyyah*, page 111)

On page 132, he says: *“Since this function (of moulid) had not existed during the era of Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam), the Sahaabah (radhiyallahu anhum) nor during the ages of the Taabi’een and Tabe Taabi’een and the age of the Aimmah Mujtahideen it is bid’ah.*

THE SHARIAH - ITS PRISTINE PURITY SAFEGUARDED BY ALLAH AZZA WA JAL

Unlike the Shariats of the Ambiya who preceded Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam), which had not been bestowed with the blessing of Divine Protection, the Shariah of Khaatamul Ambiya, Muhammadur Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) has been offered Allah's Protection against all satanic intrusions from both without and within. Thus, the Qur'aan Hakeem states:

"We have revealed the Thikr, and most certainly We are its Protectors."

With the dual agencies of the Ulama-e-Haqq and the genuine Huffaaz, has Allah Azza Wa Jal protected His Deen from the kind of mutilation and metamorphosis to which all previous Shariats have been subjected by their respective followers. The Office of the Ulama-e-Haqq has been divinely established to guard the meanings and the laws of the Deen, while the institution of Huffaaz guards the text of the Qur'aan Majeed.

Every man of Ilm is aware that the *Dalaa-il* of the Shariah are ensconced in Four Edifices, namely, Kitaabullaah, Sunnatur Rasool, Ijmaa' and Qiyaas-e- Shar'i. It should therefore be understood that any person, especially if he professes to be a scholar, who attempts to accord Shar'i recognition, credibility and acceptance to an institution, tenet, practice, custom, belief, ideology, etc. has to incumbently structure his proposal on the basis of the *Dalaa-il of the Shariah*. Any self-professing 'scholar' such as these pseudo-deobandies who are on a hike to bamboozle the ignorant and unwary with the names of recognized Ulama who have erred in their views, who seeks to ascribe Shar'i status to the personal opinions and the *faasid qiyaas* of some Ulama without structuring his case on the Divine Rock of *Dalaail-e-Ar'ba'ah*, is a moron *par bunkum*. In other words, a plain *jaahil* whose ideas excreted by his brain are fit for the sewerage drain.

That the Proof of Haqq is not the name or view of a Shaikh/Aalim, is the following unequivocal statements of the Akaabir Authorities of the Shariah:

"He who takes (as daleel) the rarities (and obscure views) of the Ulama, has made his exit from Islam." (Allaamah Abdul Wahhaab Sha'raani)

"Haaji Sahib (i.e. Hadhrat Haaji Imdaadullah, the Shaikh of the Akaabir Ulama of Deoband) is not the name of any Shar'i Daleel. Therefore to mention Haaji Saahib in relation to Shar'i issues is baseless." (Fataawa Rashidiyyah)

While there are numerous similar declarations of the Authorities, these two will suffice for this brief treatise.

Thus, just as 'Haaji Saahib' is not among the *Dalaa-il of the Shariah*, so too, are the Shaafi' Ulama or the Ulama of any Math-hab of the Muta-akhireen, not among the *Dalaa-il of the Shariah*. Ulama such as Ibn Hajar Haitami, Ibn Hajar Asqalaani,

Qaadhi Iyaadh, Sakhaawi, Suyuti and others, (*rahmatullaah alayhim*), who appeared on the Islamic horizon many centuries, even a 1000 years after Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam), are not the designations for *Shar'i Dalaa-il*. Their personal opinions unbacked by Shar'i Dalaa-il, may not be hoisted as *Shar'i Ahkaam*. And, this has greater emphasis when their personal opinions are in flagrant conflict with the *Nusoos of the Shariah*.

Great Ulama too err and are known to terribly slip and commit such blunders which cannot be reconciled with the Shariah, and which leave one aghast. Such views shall be set aside without harshly criticizing the Aalim of Haqq who has erred in his understanding. Such errors are due to a variety of factors which shall not be dealt with at this juncture.

Consider Hadhrat Maulana Ashraf Ali Thanvi (rahmatullah alayh) who is an acknowledged Aalim Rabbaani, Aarif Billaah, Hujjatullaah, and among the greatest Stars of Uloom, Wara and Taqwa produced by Daarul Uloom Deoband. In the initial phase of his life he too had grievously erred by believing that meelaad minus the haraam factors is permissible. Thus, the kitaab, *Haft Mas'alah*, attributed to Hadhrat Haaji Sahib, was actually written by Hadhrat Maulana Ashraf Ali Thanvi (rahmatullah alayh). He read it to Haaji Sahib who approved of it. However, after exchanging several letters with Hadhrat Maulana Rashid Ahmad Gangohi (rahmatullah alayh) – letters in which the discussion of participating in meelaad was elaborately discussed with solid Shar'i Dalaa-il from both parties, Hadhrat Thanvi ultimately conceded his error and retracted his opinion of permissibility. In fact, in one letter, the effect of Hadhrat Gangohi's reprimand was: *It is surprising for an Aalim of your status to utter such drivels*.

Ulama who are genuine Ulama are not daunted by the names of great Ulama when others seek to cite their blunders as *hujjat*. The rulings of the Aimmah-e-Mujtahideen of the *Khairul Quroon* are *Hujjat* for us, not the personal opinions of Ulama who appeared many centuries after the perfection announced in the Qur'aan Majeed:

"This Day have I perfected for you your Deen, and completed for you My Favour, and have chosen Islam for you as Deen."

Furthermore, let the moron pseudo-deobandi cardboard molvis understand that there is *Ijma'* of all Authorities of the Shariah, including all those Ulama whom they have mentioned as condoners of meelaad, that the current forms of mawlid/meelaad are bid'ah and haraam. There is not a single one of the Shaafi' Ulama whose names the morons have cited, who has ever claimed mawlid in general is permissible.

According to them, all the vices associated with meelaad programmes and functions are haraam. The accompaniment of these evil elements renders mawlid

haraam and bid'ah even according to those Shaafi' Ulama who have claimed, albeit erroneously, permissibility for such mawlid functions which are devoid of the haraam *khurafaat* which bedevil each and every mawlid function wherever it is held on earth. Just view the advertising pamphlet of the current carnival-type mawlid function which is being organized by the Syrian deviate, one Shaikh Ninowy and his clique of singers and stage performers.

With all these haraam elements silhouetted in the background, these pseudo-deobandi molvis should hang their heads in shame if they still have any vestige of Imaani haya, for supporting mawlid with the opinions of the senior Shaafi' Ulama who never had ever condoned the Ninowy type of haraam, Satanism perpetrated in the name of Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam). By disseminating the statements of the Shaafi Ulama whose opinions of *jawaaz* apply to other types of functions in a different setting, did these morons serve the Cause of Haqq? Did they serve the Cause of Haqq which our Akaabir Ulama of Deoband had resolutely advanced? Did they serve the Cause of the Sunnah?

What will the ordinary masses understand from such statements of *jawaaz* juxtaposed at this time in the month of Rabiul Awwal with its prevalence of absolutely haraam, shaitaani functions of meelaad/mawlid? Lamenting the dearth of Aql in the Ulama of his time, Hadhrat Mujaddid Alf-e-Thaani (rahmatullah alayh), pouring out his heart, said:

"May Allah Subhaanahu Wa Ta'ala grant tawfeeq to the Ulama of the age to abstain from saying that bid'ah is hasanah, and that they should not issue fatwa of practising it....for verily, the deceptions of shaitaan are immense in things besides the Sunnah."

One only needs to be just to understand the *zulm* which these moron molvis are inflicting on the Sunnah of Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) by disgorging the flotsam of their compound *jahaalat*.

The custom of mouloud did not have even an existence in the imagination of the Salfus Saaliheen. From the inception of Islam until well after completion of the sixth century of the Hijri era was there no existence for this bid'ah practice even in the imagination of the Ummah. It was only after the sixth century that this bid'ah sayyiah was fabricated by an evil king aided by a faasiq molvi. Ibn Hajar Asqalaani (rahmatullah alayh) comments on the founder of this bid'ah:

"He was extremely vituperative towards the Aimmah and Ulama of the Salaf. He was a man with a khabeeth (filthy, evil) tongue. He was a moron, extremely arrogant and short-sighted. In Deeni matters he was very lax.Allaamah Ibn Najjaar said: 'I have seen the consensus of people on his falsehood and weakness.'"

(Lisaanul Meezaan).

Our booklet, *The Question of Customary Meelaad*, discusses this evil molvi and the evil king in greater detail.

Allaamah Ahmad Bin Muhammad Misri-Al-Maaliki said: *“The Ulama of the Four Math-habs are unanimous in their condemnation of this act (of mawlid).”* (Al-Qoulul Mu’tamad) The baseless opinions of some Ulama are of no significance since opinion minus *Dalaa-il* from the *Nusoos* of the Shariah, are the effects of men’s minds. Such opinions may not be passed off as *ahkaam* of the Shariah which is the product of *Wahi*, not the disgorgement of the minds of men. That there is not a single *Nass* of the Shariah which can be presented to substantiate the bid’ah of meelaad, is well borne out by the statement of even Jalaluddeen Suyuti (d.911 Hijri) whom the Ahl-e-Bid’ah and the pseudo-deobandi moron molvis cite as a basis for permissibility of mawlid/meelaad. Despite having spoken in praise of mawlid, Imaam Suyuti is constrained to concede: *“There is no Nass for it (for its permissibility). But there is qiyaas (reasoning).”*

This is a clear admission of the total absence of *daleel* from Kitaabullaah, Sunnah of the Rasool and Ijma’. He mentions ‘qiyaas’, but regrettably and lamentably the qiyaas he presents in support of this bid’ah is *faasid (corrupt)* and devoid of Shar’i substance. It is indeed surprising how even senior Ulama can slip and fall into blunder. Despite them being fully aware of the irrefutable fact that for six centuries after Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) there was no existence of this bid’ah, and that the originator of this evil bid’ah was a faasiq king aided and abetted by a faasiq molvi, they still fell victim to such a grievous error which due to its wide prevalence was accepted as valid by later Ulama.

Indeed, when Ulama adopt silence in the face of bid’ah and munkar, these evils become entrenched in the Ummah. With the passage of time people, including Ulama and Mashaaikh become desensitized, the notoriety and villainy of the evil then appear insignificant to them. And, this rings the bells for Divine Punishment on a universal scale. There was a time in India, when even in the homes of reliable Mashaaikh and Ulama, the Masnoon Salaam had receded into oblivion. Even in the homes of genuine Mashaaikh some customary form of salutation was in vogue, hence when Hadhrat Sayyid Sahib (rahmatullah alayh) arrived at the home of Shah Abdul Azeez and proclaimed loudly from outside: **“ASSALAAMU ALAIKUM!”**, the Shah, with pleasant surprise said: *“Who is this Reviver of the Sunnah? There was a need for a robust Aalim of Haqq of the calibre of Sayyid Sahib (rahmatullah alayh) to revive and establish the Sunnah in a society raked with bid’ah sayyiah to such an extent that even the Thiqaat among the Ulama and Mashaaikh were silenced by desensitization. The very same evil desensitization had overtaken many Ulama who had simply accepted the bid’ah of mouloud. With much naivety they soothed their conscience with a variety of utterly baseless arguments and interpretations wholly unfit of Ulama.*

Having lapped up the spurious and stupid arguments of the Barelwi bid’atis, the pseudo-deobandi moron, cardboard molvis, also present Ibn Hajar Haitami’s view in substantiation of meelaad without understanding that just like ‘Haaji Imdaadullah

Sahib' is not the name of a Shar'i Daleel, so too is Haitami not the name of a Shar'i Daleel. Besides this fact, Ibn Hajar Haitami (rahmatullah alayh) never condoned the type of flagrant and immoral mawlid festivals and coon-funfare functions prevalent nowadays everywhere where such haraam merrymaking parties are held. Denouncing the evil of haraam meelaads (haraam according to Haitami), he says in *Fataawa Hadithiyyah*:

"...There is no doubt in the fact that the first kind of (meelaad) functions (in which haraam activities take place) are prohibited and unlawful on the basis of the Shariat's well-known principle: 'Elimination of harms has priority over acquisition of benefits.'"

Therefore, if it is known that even a single Shar'i evil will be taking place in any meelaad function, then it will be disobedience to Allah Ta'ala to participate in it. He will be sinful (for participating). Assuming that the participant engaged in a good deed at the function, it will not compensate for the evil found at the function.....Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) has commanded total abstention from all kinds of evil deeds. Hence, there is no permission for indulging in evil, be it negligible."

Although Ibn Hajar Haithami (rahmatullah alayh) is in grievous error for condoning meelaad functions which are totally devoid of the current haraam practices and evils which bedevil **every** mawlid merrymaking festival prevalent nowadays, he nevertheless categorically proclaims haraam all these shaitaani mawlid carnivals for which the pseudo-deobandi juhhaal molvis are excreting stupid arguments gleaned from the Barelwi Bid'atis.

Also in *Fataawa Hadithiyyah*, Ibn Hajar Haitami (rahmatullah alayh) states very explicitly: *"Many people stand up at the time of the mention of Rasulullah's birth during the meelaad function. **This is bid'ah**. There is no Hadith, etc. confirming this act."* Qiyaam (standing) is in fact a fundamental act in the mawlid's of today. The well-known kitaab, *Ghaayatul Maraam* of the Ahl-e-Bid'ah explicitly states:

"Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) attends every meelaad function. It is therefore Fardh to stand in honour. The one who does not stand is a kaafir."

Providing even the slightest leeway for permissibility of this bid'ah as the pseudo-deobandi morons do, is to support the prevalent kinds of haraam, evil mawlid functions which are believed to have greater importance than Salaat in certain quarters.

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."*

Innumerable Ulama who were Authorities of the Deen had criticized moulood, declaring it bid'ah sayyiah. All of them stated their case on the basis of the Dalaa-il of the Shariah while those Ulama who appeared many centuries after the era of *Khairul Quroon* condoned this bid'ah purely on the basis of personal opinion without being able to present a single *daleel* from the Shariah. They simply held on to narrations of general import and submitted these to personal opinion, conjecturing what they wished to imagine. Furthermore, the permission which they had baselessly opined was restricted to such mawlid functions which were devoid of the many *munkaraat* (evil acts) which incumbently accompany all moulood carnival parties and functions organized in this day and age.

Mawlid is not simply one isolated act of bid'ah. Its villainy brings about the vilest form of mutilation of the Deen. Hadhrat Bakr Bin Abdullah Al-Muzni (radhiyallahu anhu) narrated that Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) said: *"My Intercession is confirmed for my entire Ummah except for bid'atis."* According to the Hadith, bid'atis are *Kilaabun Naar* (Dogs of the Fire).

The Ahl-e-Bid'ah and now even the pseudo-deobandi juhhaal molvis who present the names of Ulama of the 7th— 10 centuries in their abortive bid to substantiate validity for the satanic bid'ah of moullood failed to comprehend their own stupidity for having failed to cite the name of even a single Sahaabi, Taabi'een and Tab-e-Taabi'een. They miserably inflict blindness on themselves by believing that there was no six century vacuum prior to the innovation of their haraam bid'ah sayyiah mawlid/meelaad carnival function. The fossilization of their *Aql* and calcification of their *Baatin* do not allow them to understand that a function which has no trace whatsoever in the *Khairul Quroon*, and which came into vogue only more than six centuries after Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) can never be accorded the status of ibaadat. It is one of the vilest forms of Shar'i mutilation and interpolation.

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'être (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 substantiates 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 Khatthaab (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 for 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-Mouridir Rawi fil 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 (alayhi 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.

Thus, 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 moulood 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.,

moullood/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 pseudo-deobandi miscreants, we shall by pass the drivel of this train which has been derailed from the Straight Course of the Shariah.

THE SPURIOUS CONTENTIONS OF THE JAAHIL MOLVIS

(1) One of these jaahil pseudo-deobandi cardboard molvis, in a stupid cell phone message, alleged in support of the bid'ah sayyiah moullood:

*"yes some of seniors say its fine if practiced correctly
In almuhanad al mufanad the bible or gospel of the aqidah
of the scholars of deoband its clearly mentioned mawlood
free of haraam n bidat is acceptable Others say cautious
view is not to do bec it will lead to other wrongs"*

This insolent moron, firstly lacks understanding of the essential rudiments of *adab*. Although he professes to be a 'deobandi', he insolently refers to the kitaab, the name of which he is unable to even pronounce correctly, as the 'gospel and bible' of the Ulama of Deoband. The name of the Kitaab is *Al-Muhannad alal Mufannnad*. In this Kitaab, Hadhrat Khalil Ahmad Sahaaranpuri (rahmatullah alayh) answers a list of questions posed by the then Muqallid Ulama of Haramain Shareefain. It is not Deoband's text book of Aqeedah.

The moron appears not to have the haziest idea of the meaning of mawlood/mawlid/moullood/meelaad. It is not the view of the Ulama of Deoband that any type moullood function is permissible, "if practiced correctly". The moron should define a mawlood function which is practiced correctly. What type of function is that in relation to the Ulama of Deoband. What meelaad is to the Barelwi and other juhala is well-known. But what is the meaning of a moullood function as far as the Ulama of Deoband are concerned? If the moron had known, he would not have spoken drivel.

Every moullood function organized on specific dates or held as a birthday celebration in 'honour' of Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) regardless of 'correct' or incorrect observances is bid'ah according to the Ulama of Deoband. Even if such a function is without music, and without the conglomeration of other haraam

factors which are compulsorily associated with meelaad festivals, then too it remains bid'ah. What is permissible according to the Ulama of Deoband is *Thikr-e-Wilaadat bila Quyood*, i.e. speaking or lecturing about the events surrounding the birth of Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) in general, without stipulating a day in Rabiul Awwal and without organizing a function to celebrate the birthday of Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam).

The Ulama of Deoband explicitly stipulate for permissibility of bayaans on the birth of Nabi (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) *bila quyood (without the attachment of stipulations)*. It should be a normal bayaan as all other discourses without the accompaniment of any fanfare and festival. For the benefit of the moron and his ilk, *thikr-e-wilaadat bila quyood* has absolutely no resemblance with moulood festivals, even with such festivals bereft of the other haraam elements which are incumbently attached to the haraam meelaad parties.

The moron then says in his stupid cell phone message:

*"In our context bec it has become synonymous wit
haraam an erroneous views better is not to do it"*

The atrocity of the terminology displays the atrocity of the heart and brain. Despite the moron conceding that the moulood functions in vogue are haraam, he deemed it appropriate to broadcast comments to dent the stance of prohibition of the Ulama of Deoband who have steadfastly prohibited all moulood functions. There are no such functions which come minus haraam. Did the moron acquit himself with wisdom with his shaitaani attempt to weaken the stance of the Akaabir of Deoband? Does he display foresight in spuriously arguing that there is scope of permissibility?

The moron, pseudo-deobandi cardboard molvi says in his message:

*"The mawlood that is free from any haraam n
innovation was practised by our seniors
So no point in pretending it does not exist."*

This is a blatant and a foul lie and slander uttered against the Akaabir Ulama of Deoband. They did not practise any type of moulood functions. Hadhrat Thanvi (rahmatullah alayh), in the beginning of his Ilmi career, had grievously erred by attending such moulood functions where haraam was not perpetrated. After his lecture, he would leave. Hadhrat Maulana Rashid Ahmad Gangohi (rahmatullah alayh) severely objected and reprimanded him for even such cautious participation. Finally, Hadhrat Maulana Thanvi (rahmatullah alayh) conceding his error abandoned attending any type of moulood function. The claim that the Akaabir Ulama of Deoband did not participate in any moulood functions is not a 'pretence'. It is a fact of which the moron is ignorant.

Again the moron in his haraam cell phone message alleges:

*"U could brush it under the carpet but when the
opposition present it to u wit referenced citations*

u gonna be knocked off ur feet”

The brainless moron molvi does not realize what his mouth excretes. There had never ever been any attempt by any of the Ulama-e-Haqq right from the inception of this meelaad Satanism from the seventh century when it was innovated, to ‘brush the bid’ah rot under the carpet.’ The Ulama-e-Haqq in every generation, in general, and the Ulama of Deoband in particular in the last and this centuries, have confronted head-on all kinds of bid’ah including the Satanism of moulood.

Innumerable kutub have been written by the Ulama-e-Haqq from the very era of the inception of this meelaad innovation by the faasiq king of Irbal. In every age the Ulama have refuted in their kutub the Satanism of this bid’ah. The Ulama of Deoband have written numerous kutub refuting in detail every spurious argument proffered by the votaries of this bid’ah sayyiah in defence of their haraam meelaad festivals.

We fail to understand how the moron has concluded his idea of the issue having been swept under the carpet. It appears that his *jahaalat* of the history underlying moulood bid’ah has constrained him to make this stupid averment. Whatever trash he has spewed up has been gleaned from the stupid articles written by the Qabar Pujaari Barelwi sect. If the moron had made a proper research of this issue by studying the Kutub which the Ulama-e-Haqq had written, he would then not have so stupidly advertised the density of his sensorial faculty.

He further says: *“Fact of the matter is it is a matter of diff of opinion.”* This too is a blatant lie based on the moron’s stupidity. There is absolutely no difference in the ranks of the Ulama-Haqq in the prohibition of all moulood functions which are currently in vogue. Even those Ulama who believe erroneously that meelaad without the rubbish *khuraafaat* is permissible, are in unanimity with the Ulama who proclaim current moulood functions haraam. Even those who differed with the prohibition of even such mouloods minus the haraam rubbish factors, are constrained to concede that there is no *Daleel* from the Salaf for validating this function. Thus, even Sakhaawi (rahmatullah alayh) is compelled by the reality to say in his Fataawa: *“The act of moulood shareef has not been narrated from any of the Salfus Saalih of the Three Noble Ages. Verily, it was innovated thereafter.”* Mullah Ali Qaari has narrated this fatwa of Sakhaawi (rahmatullah alayh) in his *Al-Mauridir Rawi fil Moulidin Nabawi*.

Even Ibn Hajar (rahmatullah alayh) who inclined to excesses and *faasid qiyaas* in this sphere, was constrained to concede in his Fatwa, narrated by Suyuti (rahmatullah alayh) in his *Husnul Maqsid fil Amalil Moulid*: *“The basis of the Moulid amal is bid’ah which has not been narrated from anyone of the Salfus Saalih of Quroon-e-Thalaathah.”*

The moron states:

“Al-Imam as-Suyuti authored an entire treatise on the recommendation of the mawlid celebration.”

The 10th century Imaam Suyuti's treatise is simply one mass of personal opinion. It does not contain a single Shar'i *daleel*. The case for permissibility of even such functions devoid of rubbish could not be sustained by Imaam Suyuti in terms of Shar'i Dalaa-il, hence he was constrained to concede that only *qiyaas* can be used. But, as mentioned earlier, the *qiyaas* used for meelaad is *faasid*. Imaam Suyuti's treatise is not the Qur'aan nor the Hadith nor the Ijma' of the Ummah.

The moron molvi, in his abortive haraam attempt to provide stupid cover for the current day satanic meelaad functions, states:

" al-Imam an-Nawawi's shaykh, head of the famous Syrian school, Dar al-Hadith al-Ashrafiyyah, the great Shafi'i jurist and traditionist, Abdur Rahman ibn Ismail, well-known as Abu Shamah. He states in his Risalah,

"And among the best innovated actions in these times are those actions that take place every year coinciding with the birth of the Prophet (sallAllahu alayhi wasallam) such as charity, good deeds, personal beautification, joy, and so forth, as they speak of love and reverence for the beloved Prophet (sallAllahu alayhi wasallam)..."

This is not a Shar'i *daleel* for innovating 'ibaadat'. Ibaadat consists of only the practices imparted by Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam). A practice innovated by an evil king in the seventh century is not ibaadat, and may not be promoted as such. Abu Shaamah, regardless of his status has grossly erred in his personal opinion unsubstantiated by any Shar'i *daleel*.

Charity and good deeds are valid throughout the year. Stipulating specific days without Shar'i basis for charity is bid'ah. Charity does not require anniversary celebrations in emulation of the Yahood and Nasaara. The Sahaabah never deemed it appropriate to practise charity and good deeds on the occasion of Rasulullah's birthday despite their profound love and devotion for Nabi-e-Kareem (sallallahu alayhi wasallam).

The Shariah has appointed the Day of Jumuah and the Days of Eid for personal adornment, joy and so forth. The Shariah has not set aside Rasulullah's day of birth for these acts. The innovation of these acts on another plane is bid'ah since it is an unsubstantiated innovation into the Deen. Regarding such innovations, Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) said: *"Every bid'ah is dhalaalah and every dhalaalah will be in the Fire."* There are numerous haadith in severe condemnation of bid'ah.

"Speaking of love and reverence for Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam)", is not a birthday act for Muslims. This is part of the Muslim's daily life, and the best way of expressing such love, devotion and honour is by adoption of the Sunnah in every walk of life. This birthday party type of 'love and honour' is like the love and devotion which the kuffaar superficially and deceptively express on Christmas Day, Father's Day, Mother's Day and Stupid's Day. These are all moronic days inspired by shaitaan.

Abu Shaamah's argument is baseless being bereft of Shar'i substance. We do not appoint our Ulama as "gods' besides Allah Azza Wa Jal as the Yahood and Nasaara

did to their *ahbaar* and *ruhbaan* and to Nabi Isaa (alayhis salaam). We have a glittering Shariah with its radiant Dalaa-il which constitute the Bedrock of the stance of the Ulama of Deoband.

Another moron pseudo-deobandi cardboard molvi, blurted out the following blatantly false message on his phone:

“And all these great people will approve of the mawlood which u so eager to promote which is carring on today”

The falsehood of this lie is conspicuous. Not a single of the great Ulama who had permitted their specific type of mouloud had ever condoned the haraam, shaitaani meelaad function in vogue today. The moron’s claim is absolutely false. All of them have slated the evil accretions in the kind of mouloud which they had permitted.

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 actsMany 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 Ibn Hajar:

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

(2) Ibn Hajar’s self-contradiction which neutralizes his claim of permissibility of the first kind of mouloud. 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 extravagagate 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.

SUMMARY

We conclude this brief refutation of the baatil of moulood/ mawlid / melaad with this summary for quick reference:

(1) There is total *Ijma’ (Consensus)* of all Ulama of all times and ages that the type of moulood in vogue is bid’ah sayyiah (evil bid’ah) and haraam due to the many haraam elements with which these festivals are associated.

(2) Some Shaafi’ Ulama who appeared many centuries after Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) condoned such meelaad functions which were devoid of haraam elements. They believed that their specific type of meelaad which consisted of only praising Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam), feeding people and giving charity, is commendable, hence they described it as ‘bid’ah hasanah’.

(3) There is absolutely no Qur’aan and Hadith support for the bid’ah hasanah type of moulood functions. In fact, the accretion of moulood was innovated by the vile king of Irbal more than six centuries after Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam). Thus, for the first more than six centuries, the Ummah never knew what meelaad is.

(4) The difference on this issue is not a difference of the four Math-habs. It is simply a difference between Haqq and baatil. The votaries of meelaad, i.e. the first type of meelaad minus the haraam elements, were clearly in error. For them it had become an emotional issue, hence their intellect became clouded. There are valid reasons for this lamentable error of the senior Ulama. However, this is not the juncture for elaboration.

(5) All moulood functions are haraam bid’ah sayyiah. Participation in any type of meelaad festival is a major sin.

*“Then We have established you on a Shariah regarding (all your) affairs.
Therefore, follow it, and do not follow the vain desires of those who do not know.”*
(Qur’aan)

DESENSITIZATION OF THE ULAMA AND THE NEED TO REVIVE THE SUNNAH

Hadhrat Maulana Ashraf Ali Thaanvi (rahmatullah alayh) commenting on the desensitization of the even very senior Ulama and on the imperative importance of reviving the Sunnah, said:

“These customary practices are indeed evil. Great learned and intelligent men also become entangled in these customs. On account of wide scale prevalence, they lack the courage to oppose these customs. Indeed this is a great deficiency (in the Ulama). They should confront and oppose the customs with courage and power. Without resolute opposition, not only will elimination of the customs be difficult, but it will become almost impossible.

Ameer Shah said that he had met great *Thiqah Buzrugs* (very reliable and authentic Ulama who were in fact also Auliya). Hadhrat Shah Abdul Azeez (rahmatullah alayh)’s family is a renowned and very great *Ilmi* family in India. (Great Ulama and Auliya are related to this noble family). Ameer Shah said that in this noble family there were some (evil) customs. e.g. instead of saying ‘Assalamu Alaikum’, they would say ‘Aadaab’ (or some other customary form of un-Islamic greeting).

Although Hadhrat Shah Abdul Azeez (rahmatullah alayh) detested this custom, however, due to the overpowering influence of customary practice, perhaps he had little hope of reforming people, hence the opportunity for severity (in opposition) did not arise. (Hadhrat Maulana Ashraf Ali has presented his criticism very mildly due to the seniority of Hadhrat Shah Abdul Azeez –rahmatullah alayh).

When Hadhrat Sayyid Sahib (rahmatullah alayh) visited Hadhrat Shah Abdul Azeez (rahmatullah alayh), he (Sayyid Sahib) said: “Assalamu Alaikum”. Shah Abdul Azeez, pleasantly commented in surprise: “Who is this person who has come reviving the Sunnah?” According to the Hadith the reviver of a Sunnah will receive the reward of a hundred shuhada (martyrs).” (End of Hadhrat Thaanvi’s malfooth)

Even great, renowned and accomplished Ulama too are sometimes overwhelmed by the universal prevalence of haraam customs. Having been reared in a culture of bid’ah and baatil customs, and being in the company of Ulama who have already been desensitized by the entrenched bid’ah in which their communities are mired, these Ulama fall by the wayside, and notwithstanding their understanding, knowledge and abhorrence for the customs, they slink into lethargy and inertia, failing in the Waajib obligation of *Amr Bil Ma’roof Nahyi Anil Munkar*. This is most dangerous for themselves and for the Ummah. The example of Hadhrat Shah Abdul Azeez (rahmatullah alayh) who is among the greatest Ulama in our Silsilah, conspicuously illustrates the maladies of desensitization, silence and failure to proclaim the Haqq. These maladies render elimination of baatil and bid’ah almost

impossible as is confirmed by Hadhrat Maulana Ashraf Ali Thaanvi in the aforementioned *Malfooth*.

Now, it is preposterous and downright stupid to say that what the senior Ulama have done and said is correct even if their actions and views are in conflict with the Shariah. The criterion of *Haqq* is the Shariah – the Qur’aan and the Sunnah, not the personal views of the senior Ulama nor the dreams and *mukaashafaat* (inspirational revelations) of the Auliya.

The senior Ulama who came many centuries after Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) and who had condoned moulood and even participated therein, had become desensitized and so overwhelmed by the force of the prevalent custom and culture that their intellectual discernment became clouded. Thus they failed to realize that a practice which was originated by an evil king more than six centuries after the Sahaabah – a practice of flamboyance, waste and merrymaking – a practice which they unanimously agree did not exist in Islam during the first six hundred years of its history – they failed to realize that it was a detestable bid’ah.

With spurious arguments, they mutilated the Ahaadith to fabricate baseless interpretations in the despicable endeavour to justify the bid’ah of moulood. In so doing they aided in the entrenchment of the haraam moulood bid’ah which was and still is given the status of ibaadat of such importance that deniers of its validity are branded kaafir.

The argument that the views of Ulama being *Daleel* for the validity of a custom which has no origin in the Sunnah and which, on the contrary, comprises of a number of evils, is the inspiration of shaitaan. It is among the wiles of shaitaan and is called *Talbeesul Iblees* (deception of Iblees). Castigating and prohibiting such obedience to the Ulama which conflicts with the Shariah, the Qur’aan Majeed states:

“They (Bani Israaeel) took their ulama and their shaikhs as gods besides Allah.....”

THE BID’AH OF MOULOOD AND THE CONUNDRUM OF PROMINENT SCHOLARS

Q. *The Ahlul Bid’ah in an article, backed up their moulood celebrations with sayings from some prominent scholars such as Ibn Hajar, Qustulaani, Ibn Jauzi and others, and even Haji Imdaadullah, the Shaikh of Hadhrat Maulana Ashraf Ali Thanvi. What answer is there for this proof which the Barelwis cite?*

A. We are not the muqallideen of ‘prominent scholars’. We are the Muqallideen of Imaam Abu Hanifah (rahmatullah alayh), and we follow the Shariah as it existed during the era of Khairul Quroon. The Shariah is the Deen which Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) and the Sahaabah taught and practised. Innovations having a façade of ibaadat, which were introduced centuries after Rasulullah

(sallallahu alayhi wasallam), have no validity in terms of the Shariah.

Even if thousands of ‘prominent scholars’ support the bid’ah of moulood, it will remain *bid’ah sayyiah* (evil innovation). Ibaadat is what had existed during Khairul Quroon and substantiated by the Aimmah-e-Mujtahideen and imparted to posterity by the Fuqaha of our Math-hab.

We are not awed by the names of the prominent scholars which the Qabar Pujaaris (grave worshippers) cite in substantiation of *their* evil bid’ah of moulood which consists of acts of fisq, fujoor and shirk. The personal opinions of prominent scholars – opinions unsubstantiated by the *Nusoos* of the Shariah, remain the opinions of people, and regardless of the lofty stature of the prominent scholars, their opinions may not be hoisted on to the Ummah as if these acts are practices of the Sunnah or deeds commanded by the Shariah.

If a moulood practice is totally bereft of any of the rubbish actions with which the Qabar Pujaaris adorn their satanic exhibitions of merrymaking functions, such as the unadulterated personal practice of Haji Imdaadullah (rahmatullah alayh), then too, it does not constitute a Shar’i act of ibaadat which could be imposed on others. In fact, it is not permissible to invite others to personal acts of devotion even if such acts are devoid of any of the evil flotsam of the Bid’atis. Personal expressions of devotion and love for Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) are to be restricted to the privacy of the home by the individuals engaging in them. They should not be flaunted as acts of Masnoon ibaadat or presented to the Ummah as if they are deeds commanded by Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) and practised by the Sahaabah.

Moulood is a baseless practice which has no origin in the Sunnah. The many acts of fanfare, fun, singing, clowning, feasting and merrymaking, render the function haraam and participation in these bid’ah practices is haraam. The moulood practices in vogue, as practised by the Grave-Worshippers, should not be confused with the simple and private act of Haji Imdaadullah (rahmatullah alayh).

It will be salubrious for the Qabar Pujaaris to understand that we are not members of Bani Israaeel whom the Qur’aan Majeed castigates: “*They take their (prominent) scholars and their saints as gods besides Allah...*” That was the practice of Bani Israaeel. We, the followers of Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) acquire our Deen from the Sahaabah via the transmission Chain of Imaam Abu Hanifah (rahmatullah alayh). Our Islam does not begin 8 centuries after Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) with the advent of Shaikh Subki (rahmatullah alayh), for example, nor does our Islam begin with any of the prominent scholars who appeared on the scene centuries after the Sahaabah. These prominent scholars mentioned by the Qabar Pujaaris are not our *arbaab* (gods) who we are required to worship. The rulings of the Aimmah-e-Mujtahideen and the Fuqaha override such views and practices of centuries-later Ulama which lack Shar’i substantiation.

It will do the Qabar Puja mob well to reflect the following naseehat of Hadhrat Sayyid Ahmad Kabeer Rifaa'i (rahmatullah alayh) who was a 'prominent scholar' and a great Wali:

"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 Shaafi' indicate the path of Najaat (Salvation) and the Shariah."

So, we are not interested in opinions and practices of Ulama 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. Furthermore, we shall, Insha-Allah, dissect the statements of the prominent scholars in subsequent articles.

This is a brief response to the misleading article of the Qabar Pujaaris. Insha'Allah, if Allah Ta'ala bestows the taufeeq, a detailed rebuttal of the *khuraafaat* (drivel) of the Qabar Pujaaris shall be issued.

IS MEELAAD PERMISSIBLE?

Q. *What is the Shar'i ruling on Meelaad? Many early Ulama such as Allamah Suyuti, Ibn Taimiyyah, Allaamah Ibn Kathir, etc. said that it is permissible. In the UK some people march around the city singing naats (songs) when celebrating meelaad. Is this correct? A promoter of meelaad says that Thuwaibah was the slave of Abu Lahab. When she informed him that a son (Muhammad – sallallahu alayhi wasallam) was born in his brother's house, he set her free. After the death of Abu Lahab he was seen in a dream in which he said: 'I am in severe punishment, but this is lessened on Mondays.' Then he showed his forefinger and said that he would suck it. It was with this finger that he indicated that Thuwaibah was free when she informed him of the birth of Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam). Ibn Jawzi states: 'Abu Lahab is the kaafir who is mentioned specifically in the Qur'aan.' If such a person can be rewarded for celebrating meelaad of the Nabi (sallallahu alayhi wasallam), then imagine how great the reward would be for a Muslim who celebrates it."*

A. Firstly, what the early Ulama understood of meelaad is in sharp contrast to the Hindu-type of meelaad rituals of fisq and fujoor which accompany the meelaad celebrations of the Ahl-e-Bid'ah and Qabar Pujaaris (Grave Worshipers). The meelaad celebrations in vogue are evil bid'ah – haraam bid'ah which shaitaan has adorned for the Qabar Puja sect. Such Hindu-type of celebrations are never permissible even according to those early Ulama who had participated in meelaad functions which have no basis in the Sunnah. We have written two booklets on this subject, which are available. Insha-Allah, a more detailed book shall be prepared to

demolish the baseless and stupid arguments of the Qabar Pujaaris.

The episode pertaining to Abu Lahab has absolutely no relationship with the bid'ah meelaad customs in vogue. He freed a slave woman. The claim that he had celebrated meelaad will not be believed by even the baboons. To claim that Abu Lahab the kaafir was rewarded for celebrating meelaad is a black lie fabricated by the people of bid'ah. Freeing a slave has no relationship with the stupid customs in which the bid'atis indulge.

To understand whether an act is ibaadat or not, one has to refer to the great authorities of the Khairul Quroon era (the first three ages of Islam). Whatever was ibaadat in that era is Islamic ibaadat. What was innovated 700 and 800 years after Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) is not ibaadat.

Proof for the validity of ibaadat is not Ibn Taimiyyah and Subki, etc. who came 7 centuries after Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam). They should cite the Sahaabah and the Taabieen as proof. But, they jump from the age of the Sahaabah and seek evidence for their innovations from the statements of Ulama who appeared 7 and 8 centuries after the perfection and completion of Islam. Their claims are absolutely baseless. They have no grounds on which to stand. They have nothing in the Qur'aan, Ahaadith and Fiqah to support their drivel haraam meelaad merrymaking functions.

Subki, Ibn Kathir and the other Ulama who appeared on the scene 7, 8 and 10 centuries after Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) are not the Proofs of the Shariah. As far as Ibn Taimiyyah is concerned, he was a deviate who subscribed to views of shirk and kufr. The Sahaabah, Taabi-een and Tab-e-Taabieen are the Proofs of Islam. In this regard, Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) said: *"Honour my Sahaabah, for verily they are your noblest; then those after them (the Taabieen), then those after them (Tab-e-Taabieen). Thereafter will prevail falsehood."*

Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) also said in this regard: *"The best of ages is my age, then the next age, then the next age. Then after them (the Sahaabah, Taabieen and Tab-e-Taabieen) will come such people who will (hasten) to testify without being asked to testify. They will be treacherous people who cannot be trusted. They will take vows without fulfilling them. Among them will prevail obesity.....Then will come people who will love obesity."*

Those who love the fun and merrymaking, the feasting and singing of these deceptive 'religious' functions of bid'ah meelaad in which numerous evils are committed, are the people among whom prevail falsehood and obesity (ugly fatness). Their stomachs are bloated with all the haraam food they devour in the name of the Deen. Their hollow 'love' vociferously professed for Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) is a canard – a dastardly false slogan designed for their own deception and the deception of the stupid public who indulges in the singing, dancing and merrymaking.