

it seems he is highly influenced by his intellectual acumen. After him, as is the condition of Ahle Sunnat scholars: they definitely praise Ibne Taymiyyah in blind emulation without even seeing his writings.

In any case, this also, indirectly strengthens Wahabi viewpoints and Now, although Saudi regime, due to UN pressure, is to a great extent under dissimulation (*Taqayyah*) as it was regarding the Green dome of Holy Prophet (s), which according to their viewpoint, was (God forbid!) 'the great idol', and more worthy of demolition.

Apart from that they don't bar Muslims of the world and even Shia, from Hajj; on the contrary, they even extend facilities, although from the point of view of their religion, due their being polytheists, their going near the Sacred Masjid is banned.

But in spite of reduction in fanaticism, since their wealth from oil has increased, it is being spent in excess on propagation of Wahabism in Muslim countries for which the Shia can only be distressed, but their effect upon the beliefs of majority of Ahle Sunnat is imminent.¹

¹ The Wahabis believe that they are the only true Muslims, because they uphold divine unity, while other Muslims are idolaters, who deserve to lose their lives and possessions. According to them, a person must not be considered a Muslim, even if he pronounces *al-Shahadatain*, the two testimonies; that there is no God but Allah and Muhammad is his apostle if he also believes that he could be blessed by visiting the Prophet's mosque and ask for his intercession.

They maintain that any Muslim, who professes such beliefs is an idolater, whose idolatry is a worse kind than that of Pre-Islamic people, who worshipped idols and planets. In his book *Kashful al-Shubuhah*, Muhammad Ibne Abdul Wahab called all Muslims, with the exception of his followers, idolaters about 24 times. Other labels he used to describe them were: heretics, idol worshippers, apostates, anti-divine unity, enemies of divine unity, Allah's enemies and perfidious Muslims in 20 different parts of the same book. His followers copied him in this practice. ("The Wahhabia Movement: The True Image." Al-Ghadeer Center for Islamic Studies and translated by Hamid S. Atiyyah)

Introduction: Life history and account of Ibne Abdul Wahhab

The full name of Ibne Abdul Wahhab was Muhammad bin Abdul Wahhab bin Sulaiman Tamimi.

He grew up in the Uyyana city of the Najd province. He studied Hanbali jurisprudence under his father and since young age, began to utter things opposed to the general inclination of Islamic community and objected to many things customary among Muslims.

For a long period of time he did not get anyone to share his views. After that he travelled to the Holy Mecca and then to Holy Medina and became the student of Shaykh Abdullah bin Ibrahim bin Saif and there he expressed great rage on supplications at the tomb of the Prophet.

Then he went to Najd and from there travelled to Basra enroute to Shaam. In Basra, he studied under Shaykh Muhammad Mahmui and Now, began to object against the practices of Basrans. The Muslims were enraged and he had to flee from there.¹

At last, he reached the Huraymila town of Najd, where his father was staying at that time. He continued studying under him for a long time; but labeled most of the acts of people of Najd as 'polytheism'.

Even though his father restrained him from this, he did not desist. In fact, he even rebelled against him. Soon he was joined by some other individuals and the situation in Huraymila took on the colors of

¹ At this time which was the year 1139 AH, his father Abdul Wahhab had been transferred from Uyyana to Huraymala. (*Wahabism*, Ayatullah Ja'far Subhani)

violent confrontation.¹

When his father, Shaykh Abdul Wahhab passed away in 1153 A.H. he began to publicize his beliefs with more severity and when the people of Huraymila decided to eliminate him, he fled to Uyyana.²

It was ruled by Uthman bin Muhammad bin Moammar. Ibne Abdul Wahhab tempted him that if he supported him, he would become the ruler of the whole of Najd. So Moammar decided to assist Ibne Abdul Wahhab, and Now, taking the support of this material power, he began his propaganda with full fervor.

When a substantial number of the people of Uyyana joined his party, he first demolished the dome of the tomb of Zaid bin Khattab located in that area.

This was reported to Sulaiman bin Muhammad bin Aziz Hamidi, the ruler of Ahsa and Qatif, who wrote a letter of severe condemnation to Uthman, the ruler of Uyyana, to have this man executed.

Though Uthman was inclined to Ibne Abdul Wahhab, he could not oppose Uthman, the ruler of Ahsa. So he sent a secret message to Ibne Abdul Wahhab to leave the area immediately. Ibne Abdul Wahhab urged him to greater resolve, and also tried to tempt him that he would soon be the unrivalled ruler of the whole of Najd, but he was not deceived, and insisted that he leaves the area immediately.

¹ He set out rejecting the beliefs of the people of Najd. For this reason, altercation and debates ensued between him and his father. In like manner, serious and violent disputes erupted between him and the people of Najd. This matter lasted several years until his father Shaykh Abdul Wahhab passed away in the year 1153. (*Wahabism*, Ayatullah Ja'far Subhani)

² A group of the people of Huraymala followed him and his work won fame. (*Wahabism*, Ayatullah Ja'far Subhani)

He was compelled to leave in 1160 A.H. and reached Ad Diriyah.¹ This place had always been the center for satanic movements. This was the same land of Yamama, from where Musailima Kazzab arose and claimed prophethood. The ruler of that place was the ancestor of the present rulers of the Saudi Kingdom. He was Muhammad bin Saud from the Ghanira clan.

Through someone, Ibne Abdul Wahhab established contacts with his wife and showed him the dream of ruling over the whole of Najd. Muhammad bin Saud was deceived and agreed to support him physically, ideally as well as monetarily. He declared Muslims as apostates and paid allegiance to Ibne Abdul Wahhab to plunder and kill Muslims, labeling this a holy war (*Jihad*).

After agreement with Muhammad bin Saud, Muhammad Abdul Wahhab entered the city and Ibne Saud raised a huge army and sent it to destroy the tombs around the country and to shed blood of those Muslims who try to prevent it. They fulfilled this command fully and spread killing and plunder in the lands.

When they achieved complete success, they sent messages to the rulers of surrounding areas to submit. Some of them were overawed and they accepted it immediately. Those who did not, people were persuaded to fight against them.

Thus, there were furious battles and bloodshed around Najd and beyond that in Ahsa.² After that day the progeny of Saud obtained

¹ At the time when Shaykh Muhammad went to al-Dariyya and made an agreement with Muhammad Ibne Saud, the people of al-Dariyya lived in utmost destitution and need. (*Wahabism*, Ayatullah Ja'far Subhani)

² Relating from (Uthman) Ibne Bishr al-Najdi, al-Alusi notes that:

"I (Ibne Bishr) initially witnessed the poverty of the people of Dariyya. I had seen that city at the time of Saud, when its people had enjoyed enormous wealth, their weapons were decorated with gold and silver and they mounted thoroughbred horses. They wore sumptuous clothes and were well provided with all the means of prosperity, so much so that it is beyond the scope of expression.

One day in a bazaar in Dariyya, I saw men on one side and women on the other. In the bazaar, there was a huge amount of gold, silver, and weapons and a large number of camels, sheep, horses, expensive clothes, and much meat, wheat, and other edibles, so much so that they could not be recounted. The bazaar extended as far as the eye could see. And I could hear the call of the sellers and buyers, a sound which hummed like the buzz of the bee. One (of them) would say, "I sold (my goods)", and the other (one) would say, 'I bought (something)'."

Of course, Ibne Bishr had not given an account as to how and from where such an enormous wealth had been amassed. But the trend of history indicates that it had been accumulated by attacking the Muslims of other tribes and cities (on the charge of not accepting his beliefs) and by plundering and taking as booty their properties. With regard to the war booties which Shaykh Muhammad took (from the Muslims of that region), his policy was to spend it in any way he desired. At times, he granted unto only two or three people all the war booties, which amounted to a very large amount. No matter what the booties were, they were in the possession of the Shaykh, and the Emir of Najd could have a share of the booties on permission of the Shaykh.

One of the biggest flaws during the Shaykh's life was the fact that he treated Muslims, who did not follow his notorious beliefs as infidels deserving to be fought against. He maintained no esteem for their life or property.

In short, Muhammad Ibne Abdul Wahhab called (the people) to *tawhid* (monotheism) but an erroneous *tawhid* which he created himself, not the real *tawhid* promulgated by Quran. Whoever adhered to it, would have immunity as far as his life and property were concerned, else (the dissolution of) his life and property would, like that of infidels, be religiously lawful and permissible.

The wars, which the Wahabis waged in Najd and outside Najd such as in Yemen, Hijaz, the vicinity of Syria and Iraq were on this basis. Any city, which they conquered by war and domination was religiously lawful for them. If they could, they would establish it as their own possession, otherwise they would be content with the booty they had taken.

Those, who adhered to his beliefs and hearkened to his call had to pledge allegiance to him.

If anyone rose up in rebellion, he was killed and his property divided. On the basis of this policy, for instance, they killed three hundred men from a village called al-Fusul, located in the city of Al-Ahsa and pillaged their property. (*Wahabism*, Ayatullah Ja'far Subhani)

control on Najd and all its tribes.

Muhammad bin Abdul Wahhab died in 1206 A.H. but the House of Saud continued to propagate that school through armed forces generation after generation.¹

Muhammad bin Saud was succeeded by Abdul Aziz, who also sent armed expeditions in the surrounding areas. Abdul Aziz was succeeded by Saud. He was more harsh than his father. He barred

¹ After the demise of Shaykh Muhammad, his followers also pursued this policy and kept alive his innovation and misguidance. For instance, in the year 1216, the Wahabi emir, Saud mobilized an army of twenty thousand warriors and made an inroad on the city of Karbala. At this time, Karbala enjoyed utmost fame and grandeur. Iranian, Turkish, Arab, and other pilgrims turned to it. After laying siege to the city, Saud finally entered it and brutally massacred the defenders and inhabitants of the city.

The Wahabi army created such a public disgrace in the city of Karbala that it cannot be put to words. They killed over five thousand people. After emir Saud found leisure from the affairs of the war, he turned to the treasures in the shrine of Imam Husain (a). These treasures consisted of various properties and precious objects. He took away and plundered whatever he found there. After this episode, Karbala was transformed into a situation that the poets composed elegies for it.

For over twelve years, the Wahabis, every now and then, invaded and looted the city of Karbala and its suburbs, as well as the city of Najaf. The first of these invasions took place in 1216 as already mentioned. According to writings of all Shia writers, this invasion took place on Eid Ghadeer [a festival celebrating the designation by Prophet Muhammad (s) of Imam Ali's (a) as his successor] the same year.

The late Allama Sayyid Muhammad Jawwad Amili says:

"This part of the book *Miftah al-Kirama* was completed by the writer after midnight of the ninth of the holy month of Ramadan 1225 AH while in anxiety and apprehension, for the *Unayza* Arabs, who are Wahabi, had laid siege on the Najaf Ashraf and on the place where Imam Husain (a) was martyred. They blocked the roads, plundered the pilgrims to the shrine of Imam Husain (a), who were returning to their own lands after pilgrimage in the middle of Shaban, and massacred a large number of them (mostly from among Iranian pilgrims). It is said that the number of those killed (this time) probably amounted to one hundred and fifty, some say less..."

Muslims from performing Hajj and staged an uprising against the Sultan of Turkey.

But after him the activities were mostly limited to the Najd province. So much so, that during the World War, since the government of Turkey supported Germany, it became the target of anger of British and was also weakened due to the defeat of Germany.

So, first the British made the Sharif of Mecca to raise the banner of independence against Turkish rule. Then they were displeased with the Sharif of Mecca and had the Saudi ruler of that time, who was also named Abdul Aziz, attack Mecca and keep the Sharif of Mecca on the Island of Cyprus as a prisoner and Hijaz was also put under the control of the House of Saud. Although till date the capital of the Saudi rulers is in Najd, but they exercise rule over the holy Mecca and Medina also.

Chapter One: Belief of Muhammad bin Abdul Wahhab regarding God

All know that Wahabis in general emulating their leader, are claimants of absolute monotheism and other than themselves, regard all Muslim as polytheists. But when one reads the books of Ibne Abdul Wahhab himself it is seen that this man has such a belief regarding the Lord Creator following his predecessor Ibne Taymiyyah that due to it the perfection and majesty of the Creator is damaged.

Unity of the Godhead, which is the requirement of true monotheism, is trespassed. In such a way that those verses of Holy Quran, whose some words, due to their dictionary meaning, create the imagination of corporeality: like 'His hands are spread wide' according to literal meaning and 'He occupies the throne' according to one implication it is that He sat up straight on the throne.

Regarding these verses, Islamic scholars generally believe that since their implication is against divine dignity and logically impossible for Him, they should be interpreted in a way that it fulfills idiomatic Arabic and which is also not against divine majesty; like 'hand' implies 'power' and 'occupies' should imply 'authority'.

However, Ibne Taymiyyah¹ and his follower, who succeeded him, Shaykh Ibne Abdul Wahhab; interpret all these words according to their literal meaning and are opposed to interpret any of them.

¹ Abul Abbas Ahmad Ibne Abdul Halim, known as Ibne Taymiyya, was a Hanbali scholar, who died in 728 A.H. As he expressed views and beliefs contrary to the views held by all Islamic sects, he was constantly opposed by other scholars. Investigators are of the view that the beliefs of Ibne Taymiyya later formed the principles of beliefs of the Wahabis.

They imagine God to be really occupying the throne; He possesses hands, feet, sides, eyes, face, tongue and self; and all these things are real. He speaks with a voice and He ascends and descends; He comes and goes; He laughs and cries.¹

This is exactly a corporeality on which all Muslims have consensus that it is polytheism; but books of Wahabi scholars are teeming with such things. Thus, there is a book of Ibne Abdul Wahhab himself: *Al-Tauhidul Ladhi Huwa Haqqullah Alal Aheed*, in which, under the explanation of the following verse of Quran:

حَتَّىٰ إِذَا فُزِّعَ عَن قُلُوبِهِمْ قَالُوا مَاذَا قَالَ رَبُّكُمْ ۖ قَالُوا الْحَقَّ ۖ وَهُوَ الْعَلِيُّ
الْكَبِيرُ (٢٣)

“Until when fear shall be removed from their hearts, They shall say: What is it that your Lord said? They shall say: The truth. And He is the Most High, the Great.” (Surah Saba 34:23)

It is mentioned: Twentieth point: It is proof of qualities (that is to speak with the tongue, mouth and words etc.). The Ashaira sect (majority of Muslims), believes in ‘tateel’ (negation of such qualities) and is opposed to it.

The commentator has written in its footnote:

Ashari sect is attributed to Abul Hasan Ashari and this sect has denied most of qualities. Like God being great and occupying the throne away from all His creatures; loving His creatures, His mercy upon them. His pleasure from them and His anger etc. in opposition to what is narrated from the Messenger of Allah (s), his companions and scholars regarding those things.

¹ The *tawhid* to which Shaykh Muhammad and his followers invited the people, in which they made permissible the seizure of the life and property of whoever did not accept it, consisted of proving a location for Allah Almighty and regarding Him as having limbs and organs, going by the apparent meaning of some of the Quranic verses and traditions.

After that, there is a chapter at the end of the book, reasoning through those traditions from which the tendency of their sect is understood. Thus, it is written that:

This chapter is regarding those traditions, which are regarding that statement of God, that they have not understood the true glory of Allah and all the land would be in his fist on Judgment Day.

There is a traditional report of Ibne Masud that a Rabbi came to the Messenger of Allah (s) and said:

“O Muhammad, we find (in our books) that God would take up all the skies in one finger and the lands in one finger, the trees in one finger, water in one finger and the earth in one finger,¹ and the rest of the creatures in one finger; and taking all of them, He would say: I am the true king.”

The Prophet laughed at this in such a way that even his molars became visible. As a testimony to the statement of that Rabbi, he recited the following verse:

وَمَا قَدَرُوا اللَّهَ حَقَّ قَدْرِهِ وَالْأَرْضُ جَمِيعًا قَبْضَتُهُ يَوْمَ الْقِيَامَةِ

“And they have not honored Allah with the honor that is due to Him; and the whole earth shall be in His grip on the day of resurrection...” (Surah Zumar 39:67)

It is mentioned in a traditional report of *Sahih Muslim* that mountains and trees in one finger; then He would shake them and say: I am the ruler, I am Allah.

It is mentioned in a report of Bukhari that heavens on one finger; water and earth on one finger and all other creatures on one finger – both (Bukhari and Muslim) have mentioned it.

¹ The earth has come in one finger; Now, we don’t know what earth is in another finger.

There is a report of Muslim from Ibne Umar that on Judgment Day, Almighty Allah would wrap up the skies; then take them up in His left hand and then say the same thing: I am the ruler. Where are the rebellious people? Where are the arrogant?

It is narrated from Ibne Abbas that all seven skies and all seven earths would be on the palm of God, like a grain of rye in the hands of one of you.

Ibne Jarir said: Yunus bin Wuhaib said: Abu Zaid said: My father said: the Messenger of Allah (s) said: All seven heavens in the chair are as seven dirhams [silver coins] in a shield.

Abu Zaid also said: I heard the Holy Prophet (s) say: The chair is in the throne as a ring of iron is rolling in a large forest. And there is a report from Abu Zaid that there is a distance of five hundred years between the sky of the earth and the heavens.

In the same way, the distance to the heavens is of five hundred years and then there is a distance of five hundred years between seventh heaven and the chair. And between the chair and water there is a distance of five hundred years. The throne is on the water and Almighty Allah is on the throne. Even then nothing is concealed from the acts of creatures.

Ibne Mahdi has narrated this from Hammad bin Musailima from Asim from Zar from Abdullah bin Masud and a similar report is narrated by Masudi from Asim from Abu Wael from Abdullah.

Hafiz Dhahabi says: This tradition is narrated through various chains and from Abbas Ibne Abdul Muttalib that the Messenger of Allah (s) said:

“Do you know what is the distance between the heaven and the earth? People replied: Allah and the Messenger know best. He said: There is a distance of five hundred years and the distance between one sky from another is of five hundred years and the area of each sky is five hundred years; and there is a sea between the seventh heaven and Arsh. The distance between its bottom and the top layer

is same as the distance between the sky and earth; and Almighty Allah is above that. Even then nothing from the deeds of human beings remains concealed from him.”

Abu Dawood has recorded its chronology and there are some issues in that:

First is the exegesis of that verse that:

وَالْأَرْضُ جَمِيعًا قَبْضَتُهُ يَوْمَ الْقِيَامَةِ

“...and the whole earth shall be in His grip on the day of resurrection...” (Surah Zumar 39:67)

Another point is that Jews present during the period of the Holy Prophet (s) were having this and similar information; neither they regarded them wrong nor interpreted them.

Thirdly, when that Rabbi mentioned this before the Prophet, he testified to him and verse of Quran was revealed in its support.

Fourthly, the laughing of Holy Prophet (s) after describing the negative knowledge of the Rabbi.

Fifthly, clarification of both hands and that the heavens shall be present in the right hand and the earths shall be in the left hand.

Mahmud Shukri Alusi, who himself was a Wahabi in his book: *Tarikh Najd* he has written under the religion of the people of Najd and their acts and deeds that they interpret verses and traditions of those qualities [hands, mouth etc.] as per their literal sense and leave their actual meaning to God.

But if they had entrusted the meaning to God, they would not have decided to remain upon its apparent implication.

After paying attention, everyone having insight, can feel that applying these words upon apparent connotation is not in accordance with Islamic teachings, because it entails corporality of the Godhead; and all Muslims are unanimous on denial of corporality, because it is

opposed to the principles of monotheism.

Imam of the pious, Ali Ibne Abi Talib (a) says in the first sermon of *Nahjul Balagha*:

“The foremost in religion is the acknowledgement of Him, the perfection of acknowledging Him is to testify Him, the perfection of testifying Him is to believe in His Oneness, the perfection of believing in His Oneness is to regard Him Pure, and the perfection of His purity is to deny Him attributes, because every attribute is a proof that it is different from that to which it is attributed and everything to which something is attributed is different from the attribute. Thus, whoever attaches attributes to Allah, recognizes His like, and who recognizes His like, regards Him two; and who regards Him two, recognizes parts for Him; and who recognizes parts for Him, mistook Him; and who mistook Him, pointed at Him; and who pointed at Him, admitted limitations for Him; and who admitted limitations for Him, numbered Him.”

It is clear that if we accept the creator to comprise of parts; these parts would be either necessary beings or created. If they are created the being of the creator would become created; because a compound of created things is necessarily created.

If we believe Him to be necessary being; then necessary being and in being eternal in His self, others would become equals to the creator, which is polytheism. Apart from that necessary being would be needful of tools and parts; and needfulness implies createdness and contingent existence.

As for those verses and traditions through whom they argue in favor of this wrong belief; it is clear that in every language, and especially in Arabic, one word has a number of meanings. Therefore, the meaning of every word should be regarded as one, which is correct from the aspect of reason and narration: for example: one apparent connotation of ‘istawa’ is ‘sitting upright’, but from the aspect of location, its most accurate meaning is ‘being established with power and domination’, which is full in accordance to idiom and worthy of

the divine position.

In the same way, ‘face’ implies those signs of power, who are mediums of divine cognition, whose examples are numerous in Arabic language. In the same way, the meaning of ‘hand’ implies dominance and authority.

The traditional report of the Rabbi, which was mentioned, in fact, is the evidence of inaccuracy of that belief. In that report on the statement of Jew along with the laughing of His Eminence, this statement is mentioned that is a testimony of it neither being a statement nor an act of a prophet, which should be regarded as a part of tradition; on the contrary, it is the imagination of the narrator of that report, which is evidence of his unawareness.

The logical conclusion is that His Eminence laughed so much at the foolishness of that Jew and recited this verse in his refutation; that they have not understood God with His true glory. The whole universe would be under His control on Judgment Day and not that He would take each thing of the universe and show jugglery with His fingers.

In this and other imaginations, which would be mentioned later, predecessor of Ibne Abdul Wahhab, Abu Abbas Ahmad bin Taymiyyah Harrani (d. 828 A.H.), was the first to emphasize these things and he wrote independent treatises regarding them; like the belief of Hamawiya, Wasitiya etc. and then his students, Ibne Qayyim Jauzia and Ibne Abdul Haad, etc followed in his footsteps.

Islamic scholars issued verdicts of apostasy against them. Some even declared that it was lawful to execute them. So much so that he remained in prison for a long time.

At this juncture need is felt to mention the clarifications of Muslim scholars regarding Ibne Taymiyyah, who is the actual founder of Wahabi beliefs, which would show that when such is the position of the leaders, what the position of followers would be.

Allamah Ibne Hajar Makki has written in his *Jauhar Munazzam fee Ziyarat Qabre Nabi Mukarram* that:

“The error of Ibne Taymiyyah is such that it cannot be remedied and a calamity that is unending. The selfish desires of that man persuaded him to raise the standard of jurisprudence (*Ijtihad*) and oppose the consensus of past scholars and leaders of religion in a number of issues; so much so that he even made indecent objections against the Rashideen caliphs.

He even committed audacity against the court of Almighty Allah. He lowered the majesty of the dominant power of Almighty Allah from the pulpit in public; he clearly announced Him to be having body and that He is in a particular direction and declared all those who oppose this to be misguided.

So much so that all the scholars of the time united and compelled the ruler of the time to execute or imprison him. Thus, they kept him interred till the end of his life.¹ After that this fire was somewhat put out and the darkness was dispelled; but again some of its supporters continued to appear from time to time; but they did not gain any power. They were always humiliated and disgraced and remained involved in divine chastisement.”

In his another book, *Ashraful Wasail Ilaa Fahmul Shamail*, he has written that:

“Regarding hanging ends of the turban between two shoulders, Ibne Qayyim has said regarding his teacher, Ibne Taymiyyah that he issued a rare statement and it is that when His Eminence saw his Lord keeping his hand on his (prophet’s) shoulders, he accorded this precedence to them. Iraqi says that we did not find any authentic proof of this. I say that it is like other views of these two [Ibne Taymiyyah and Ibne Qayyim], which is based on their imagination. And in proving which they have employed a long discourse and have

¹ This is uncertain, because later statement of another writer would be mentioned that he was finally released and then died.

ridiculed Ahle Sunnat that they are its deniers and this is belief in corporeality of God. (much above His being than the imaginations of those unjust) and in their belief at this point there are such invalid statements and wrong beliefs that distress one, who hears them and the decision is that all these are wrong, false, deviation and allegations, may God destroy all who believe in these statements. Imam Ahmad bin Hanbal and the senior scholars of his school are immune from the blemish of this defect; and why it should not be so; when it is denial according to many?”

A Maulana from Firangi Mahli of our Lucknow writes in *Hallul Maaqid Hashiya Sharhe Aqa'id*:

“Taqiuddin Ibne Taymiyyah was Hanbali, but he exceeded the limits and he tried to prove such things, which are opposed to the greatness and majesty of Almighty Allah. He believed in direction, location and corporeality for Him. There are many other such nonsensical statements of this man. For example, he said that Hadrat Uthman was fond of wealth and said regarding Hadrat Ali that his faith was not proper as he had embraced Islam during childhood. And issued such statements regarding Ahle Bayt of Prophet, which no believer can utter. Although authentic traditions in their excellence are recorded in Sihah books; and a conference was held in the Jabal fort, where prominent scholars of that time gathered, chief of whom being the Chief Judge, Zainuddin Maliki and Ibne Taymiyyah was also brought there and after a long discussion, the Chief Judge ordered him to be imprisoned. This occurred in 705 A.H. Then it was announced in Damascus etc. that it is lawful to take away life and property of anyone, who follows the beliefs of Ibne Taymiyyah. This is mentioned in *Miratul Jinaan* of Yafai. Then he recanted and was released from prison in 707 A.H. He said: I will follow the Ashaira school. Then he broke this pledge and when he expressed his beliefs, he was again imprisoned. Again he recanted and was released from prison. Then he resided in Shaam. Many such instances occurred there as mentioned in books of history.”

Allamah Ibne Hajar Makki in *Durare Kamina*, Vol. 1 and Dhahabi in

his *Tarikh*, have mentioned his statements and circumstances. This occurred as a background matter; the actual point is that since Ibne Taymiyyah adopted the corporeality of God, he said that He occupies a place; because everybody requires a place; and since it is mentioned in the Holy Quran that:

الرَّحْمَنُ عَلَى الْعَرْشِ اسْتَوَىٰ (٥)

“The Beneficent God is firm in power.” (Surah Taha 20:5)

It is said so because only the *Arsh* is His location. Also, since Almighty Allah exists from eternity and all parts of the universe are created, he was compelled to say: The category of *Arsh* is eternal, but His unlimited personalities come into being one after another. So, occupying a place is eternal quality of God and specifications of place are created.

It is mentioned in *Miratul Jinaan* of Yafai under the explanation of heresy of Ibne Taymiyyah, that the crime attributed to him in Egypt is that he says: God is really seated on the throne and He speaks in words and statements. After that it was announced in Damascus etc. that life and property can be seized of whoever that follows the belief of Ibne Taymiyyah.

In his *Tarikh*, Abul Fida has mentioned in the circumstances of 705 A.H. that in it, Taqiuddin Ahmad Ibne Taymiyyah was summoned from Damascus to Egypt, and a conference was held, in which after discussions, it was decided that he should be cast into prison for his beliefs, because he believed in corporeality.

Apart from that we have also seen some words of that advertisement, which was issued by the ruler regarding that fellow. Their gist is that unfortunate man, Ibne Taymiyyah, during this period had written and spoken up freely about issues of religion and initiated discussion regarding issues of Quran and divine qualities and in his statement clarified many wrong things and spoke on issues about which companions and companions of companions had remained silent.

And he mentioned what was unacceptable to the righteous ancestors (senior scholars). He expressed those beliefs, which the Holy Imams (a) had deemed to be incorrect and against which there is consensus of all Muslim scholars. His verdicts are being publicized around the country due to which public is getting deviated. In this matter he has opposed all contemporary scholars and jurists of Shaam and Egypt.

When we received these reports and it was learnt that some people have even started following him, and they talked of words, voice and corporeality regarding Almighty Allah, so we were compelled to oppose him.

This publication is very long and some of its points are translated above.

All this shows that belief of corporeality is such that Muslim scholars have consensus on its being heretical. Now, from this, opinion can be established Ibne Abdul Wahhab and his followers who believe in these things.

Whatever was mentioned above were clarifications of Ahle Sunnat and explanations of Shia scholars regarding apostasy of corporeality can be seen in *Sharh Lumah*, *Riyadhul Masail*, *Masalik* and *Jawahirul Kalaam*, and in all books of Ja'fari jurisprudence. In this way, consensus of the whole Ummah upon their heresy is proved and confirmed.

“And Allah is inimical to the disbelievers.”

Chapter Two: Wahabi belief regarding the Messenger of Allah (s)

Ibne Abdul Wahhab and his followers believe that after his passing away, Messenger of Allah (s) became like ordinary human beings in his grave. That is he neither hears nor can he reply. Neither does he has the choice of going anywhere he wants to in the east and the west.

Apart from this, in their view, it is unlawful to undertake a journey to visit his holy tomb; to seek mediation from him and to supplicate at his tomb.

Even to say: 'O Messenger of Allah,' is an act of polytheism. One, who asks him for something after his death, is a polytheist and his life and property can be seized.

They try to justify this through verses of Quran and traditions, but in fact fail to do so.

Muslims have consensus that His Eminence is alive after his passing away, not even a life proved for martyrs, on the contrary, much more perfect life.

The basis of the view that to travel for Ziyarat of the tomb of His Eminence is unlawful is a tradition found among Ahle Sunnat that the Prophet (s) said:

"Except for three Masjids, it is not lawful to travel for Ziyarat of any other place."

To use it as a reasoning for ones aim is wrong, because anyone even slightly familiar with Arabic can understand that this tradition means that among all Masjids of the world, one should only undertake a special journey for only these three Masjids.

It is so, because what is excepted has to be from the whole set.

For example if someone says: I have seen that Masjid and none other than that in my whole life, everyone would understand that he did not see any other Masjid. And not that he has not seen any other building or any other thing.

In the same way, from the fact that other than three Masjids, journey should not be undertaken for any other Masjid, restriction about Masjids will be proved.

So, it is incorrect to conclude that it is not lawful to travel towards the tomb of Prophet. Otherwise, it shouldn't be lawful to travel from one city to another for business etc. also, whose invalidity is clear.

Many a times the Prophet himself travelled to Shaam on business and proof is available.

Sayyid Mustafa Nuruddin Husaini has mentioned this in his *Khulasatul Maqaal fee Shaddi Rihaal* and the fact is that traditions explain each other.

The clarification of absolute command is made through the restricted and always, all Muslims and scholars of every period undertook journeys for Ziyarat of the mausoleum of Holy Prophet (s) and no one objected.

This proves the consensus of all Muslims and those, who opposed it later, left the congregation and deviated from the path of consensus.

Proof of journey for Ziyarat is present in some traditions as well; like it is mentioned in the book of *Insanul Uyoon* of Ali bin Burhanuddin that:

“When the Holy Prophet (s) passed away, Bilal went to Shaam and said that he would never visit Medina again. He stayed there for a long time, but one night he saw the Messenger of Allah (s) in dream and he was saying:

O Bilal, you left our neighborhood and settled down in Shaam. Now, don't you even visit us? So, as soon he woke up, he prepared for the

journey. He came to Medina and visited the tomb of Prophet.”

Also, it is proved from authentic traditions that one, who saw Holy Prophet (s) in dream, has in fact seen the Prophet only, because Satan cannot appear in form of His Eminence. Through this is proved lawfulness of undertaking a journey to visit the tomb of Prophet, which no one can deny.

Ibne Abdul Wahhab acquired this view also from his predecessors: Ibne Taymiyyah and Ibne Qayyim, as these were first to raise clamor and prolonged the discourse to prove it and Muslim scholars wrote independent books in his refutation.

Like *Shifaus Siqam fee Ziyarat Khairun Anaam*, which was written by the chief judge, Shaykh Hafiz Taqiuddin Hasan Subki.

Jawahir Munazzam fee Ziyarat Qabr Nabiul Mukarram of Allamah Ibne Hajar Makki Haithami

Muntahaiul Maqaal fee Sharh Hadith Tashaddud Rihaal of Mufti Sadruddin

...and *Khulasatul Maqaal fee Shadde Rihaal* by Sayyid Mustafa Nuruddin Husaini, etc.

Here we quote from the above books and also present statements of other scholar, which are mentioned in this context in other books:

Allamah Subki has written in the preface of his book:

“Among the best means of proximity to the divine court is visiting the holy tomb of Messenger of Allah (s) and there is journey for this purpose as is the practice of all Muslims since years. Among the statements, which Satan issued from the tongue of some unfortunate fellows is to create doubts in it and this doubt can never haunt those, who are Muslims in the true sense. It is a temptation created by such an unfortunate one, who would indeed suffer its consequences and only those laws would be applicable on him, which divine law has prescribed for such persons and the false doubts would be destroyed.”

It is mentioned in another place in this book:

“Ibne Taymiyyah has no reasoning and it is known from religion principles and practice of companions and senior scholars that they continued to even regard holy relics of many deceased personalities as blessed; what to say about prophets and messengers. One, who claims that tombs of prophets and graves of common people are similar, has made a very erroneous claim, in whose invalidity we are certain. This also implies reducing the stature of Messenger of Allah (s) to the level of ordinary Muslims and it is indeed disbelief. Because, one, who reduces the level of Messenger of Allah (s) from its true standard, is a disbeliever and if he says that it is not reducing the rank, on the contrary, it is restraining from enhancing his greatness from its true level, this is also ignorance and audacity and we are certain that Holy Prophet (s) is worthy of much more honor and respect, during his lifetime as well as after his passing away, and one, who has even the least amount of faith cannot doubt this.”

Allamah Ibne Hajar writes in *Jauhar-e-Mumazzam*:

“If you say: How we can accept that there is consensus on lawfulness of Ziyarat of holy tombs and to undertake journey for the same, whereas from Hanbalis, Ibne Taymiyyah denies that it is approved in Islamic Shariah; as Subki has mentioned and said that Ibne Taymiyyah presented a very long reasoning upon it. On the contrary, he claimed that journey for this Ziyarat is unlawful according to consensus, and Prayer is cannot be shortened during it and all traditions in its excellence, are fabricated. Afterwards also some scholars followed this view; so I will ask: who is Ibne Taymiyyah, who should be paid attention to and relied upon for some issues of religion; and he is such that some people like Ghar bin Jama-a have surveyed his useless statements, allegations and errors. He is a fellow that Almighty Allah included among the misguided, degraded him and deemed him worthy of destruction. Through excessive lies and falsehoods, he created a place for himself, which is cause of his frivolity and deprivation from divine mercy. Shaykhul Islam Taqi Subki, whose greatness, jurisprudence, piety and leadership is

confirmed, wrote an independent book in his refutation and clarified the right path through strong reasonings.”

Mufti Sadruddin has written in *Muntahayyul Aamaal*:

The prominent scholar, point of reference for tradition experts, Shaykh Muhammad Barisi has written in his book of *Ittihaaf Ahle Irfaan Ba ruwiyatil Anbiya wal Malaika wal Jaan*, that:

“Ibne Taymiyyah Hanbali has committed audacity and claimed that journeying for Ziyarat of His Eminence Holy Prophet (s) is unlawful and ritual Prayer will not be shortened during this trip, as it is a journey of disobedience. He discussed this in such detail that one starts hating him for these views. The ill-boding of this view haunted him all his life; till he was impudent even against Almighty Allah. He split the veil of divine greatness and tried to prove things opposed to His majesty and perfection. He claimed corporeality for God and deemed those who don't accept it, to be deviated and sinful. He announced this from pulpits and publicized this discussion everywhere. He opposed the past jurist scholars in a number of issues and laid silly allegations against Righteous Caliphs (*Khulafa Rashideen*) as a result of which he fell in estimation of all scholars of that age and everyone accused him of heresy. Scholars reviewed his incorrect statements and refuted his arguments. They exposed his errors and blunders.”

Ahmad bin Shahabuddin Khafaji, in the book of *Naseemur Riyaz Sharh Shifa Qadi Riyaz*, has written after the tradition of Messenger of Allah (s):

“May God curse the Jews and Christians; they deemed the graves of their prophets to be places for prostration,” that:

“It should be known that due to this tradition, Ibne Taymiyyah and his successors, like Ibne Qayyim declared their degraded imagination, due to which everyone declared them heretics. Subki refuted them by writing a separate book about lawfulness of journeying for Ziyarat of tomb of Prophet. They, in their own imagination defended monotheism with such foolish presumptions

that to mention them is also inappropriate, because they cannot be uttered by any reasonable person, what to say of an educated one.”

Mulla Ali Qari has written in the second volume of *Sharh Shifa*:

“Among Hanbalis, Ibne Taymiyyah was radical and deemed traveling for Ziyarat of Prophet unlawful, as some went to the other extreme saying that Ziyarat is a part of religion and that it is from needs of religion and its denier is a disbeliever. The second view is nearer to the fact, because whatever is regarded as recommended by consensus, to label it unlawful would be denial, because it is higher than calling some lawful thing as unlawful.”

It is mentioned in *Kashfuz Zunoon* that scholars acted with great excess regarding Ibne Taymiyyah and clearly written that:

“One, who calls Ibne Taymiyyah Shaykhul Islam is also an apostate.”

It is known from all these statements that many scholars have consensus on infidelity of Ibne Taymiyyah due to the following statement:

Shaykh Ibne Hajar Makki has written in *Durar Kamina*:

“Different people have different attitude to Ibne Taymiyyah: some include him among corporealists, because of his Hamawiya and Wastiya beliefs that hands, feet, calf and face, everything is in fact proved for God, and He is Himself seated on the Arsh. He said that this makes it necessary for Him to be in a special place and His being divided into parts. So he said that we don’t accept that being in a special place and having parts of body is from the specialties of body; so it was said that in any case, this person does not believe God to be without a place. And he believes in parts and place for Him.

Some people regard him faithless, because he says that one cannot present request to Holy Prophet (s). There is reduction of status of Prophet (s) in this; and it is restraining from according respect to him.

Noor Bakri had greatest extremism in this; that when a gathering was held regarding this, some people present there said that he is liable for punishment, so he said: It does not mean anything; because if it degrades the Prophet, he should be punished with death and if there is no insult, why he should be punish at all?

Some people declare him a hypocrite for his views regarding Hazrat Ali that wherever he turned, he failed and he tried to obtain caliphate many times, but he could not achieve it; and he fought battles only for getting power, and not for religion and he was desirous of power.

Uthman loved material wealth deeply and Abu Bakr was senile! He didn’t understand was he said. Ali embraced faith during childhood and the Islam of a child is not acceptable. Whatever he has said regarding proposal for hand of the daughter of Abu Jahl, all this has ridicule against Hazrat Ali, and it is the tradition of Holy Prophet (s) addressing Hazrat Ali (a) that ‘none shall be inimical to you, except the hypocrite’.

Some people think that this person dreamt of becoming Imam of the Ummah, because he mentioned Ibne Tumrat in excess and praised him much. Due to this, he was imprisoned for a long time and there are many famous incidents regarding this. When he was compelled to confess, he said I did mean to say that, I meant something else, then gave a very farfetched explanation.”

Statement of all these scholars show that there is consensus of Muslims on the fact that it is recommended to travel for Ziyarat of Prophet; and one, who denies it, has in fact denied a fundamental of religion.

Discussion on seeking mediation (*Tawassul*)

To seek mediation to the court of God through Messenger of Allah (s) is proved from Holy Quran. There are numerous traditions also and statements of companions and companions of companions; after that is practice of later scholars and the whole Islamic ummah, as would be clear from the statements presented below:

Proof of seeking mediation (*Tawassul*) through the Holy Quran

Addressing the Prophet, Almighty Allah said:

وَلَوْ أَنَّهُمْ إِذْ ظَلَمُوا أَنفُسَهُمْ جَاءُوكَ فَاسْتَغْفَرُوا اللَّهَ وَاسْتَغْفَرَ لَهُمُ الرَّسُولُ لَوَجَدُوا اللَّهَ تَوَّابًا رَحِيمًا (٦٤)

“And had they, when they were unjust to themselves, come to you and asked forgiveness of Allah and the Apostle had (also) asked forgiveness for them, they would have found Allah Oft-returning (to mercy), Merciful.” (Surah Nisa 4:64)

Now, everyone can understand that if seeking mediation (*Tawassul*) from Prophet was not intended, only their seeking forgiveness was sufficient, it would not have been commanded that they should come to the Prophet and then repent. It would not have required the Prophet to seek forgiveness for them. It is clear that Almighty Allah Himself is most-forgiving and most-merciful; but here He qualified His being most-forgiving and most-merciful with a condition. What can be greater proof than seeking of mediation being a divine objective?¹

¹ The word of *shafa'a* is from root word شفع which means 'even' as against وتر which means 'odd'. The reason that the mediation of a person for saving a sinner is known as *shafa'a* is that the status and position of the one doing *shafa'a* and his effective powers get attached (and become even) with the factors of salvation, which is present in the person receiving the *shafa'a* (even though it may be a little). Both these, with the help of one another, become the cause of release of the sinful person. The *shafa'a* of the beloved ones of Allah for the sinners is apparently because of their proximity and position they have before Allah, (of course by the will of Allah and under special norms, which have general and not personal aspects) they can mediate for sinners and through (invocation), and pleadings ask God to forgive their sins. Of course, *shafa'a* and its acceptance depends on a series

of conditions of which some are related to sinful person and some to the circumstances of *shafa'a* of sins.

Shafa'a in other words is the help of the beloved ones of Allah (by His will) to the one, who in spite of being sinful has not disconnected his spiritual relation with Allah and the beloved ones of Allah. Moreover, this standard should always be safeguarded.

According to one meaning, *shafa'a* is: One inferior person, who has the aptitude for leaping forward and progressing seeks help from a superior person in the form of one lawful order. However, the one seeking help should not, from the viewpoint of spiritual perfections, fall to such extent that he loses power of advancing and the possibility of changing into a pious man.

Right from the time of Holy Prophet (s) till the later periods, it had been the practice of Muslims to seek *shafa'a* from true intercessors. They were always asking in their lifetime or in their death and such *shafa'a* had never been objected by any of the Islamic scholars on any ground or Islamic principles.

One of the point of differences of the Wahabis with the other Islamic sects is that although they accepted *shafa'a* as an Islamic principle (like the other Muslims) and say that on the Day of Qiyamah, the intercessors will intercede for the sinners and in this matter the Holy Prophet (s) will play a greater role, yet they say that no one has the right to seek *shafa'a* from them in this world. They say: The Holy Prophet (s), the other prophets, the angels and beloved ones of Allah have the right of doing *shafa'a* on the Day of Judgment, but one should ask for *shafa'a* from the Master of *shafa'a* and the One, who gives permission for that i.e. Allah and say:

اللهم شفّع نبينا محمد فينا يوم القيامة أو اللهم شفّع فينا عبادك الصالحين أو ملائكتك أو نحو ذلك مما يُطلب من الله لا منهم فلا يُقال يا رسول الله أو يا وليّ الله أسألك الشفاعة أو غيرها مما لا يقدر عليه إلا الله فإذا طلبت ذلك في أيام البرزخ كان في أقسام الشرك.

“O God, make the Holy Prophet (s) and your virtuous servants and the angels as our intercessors on the Day of Judgment.” However, we are not having the right to say, “O Prophet of Allah” or “O wali of Allah we ask you to seek shafa'a for us. This is because shafa'a is something, which no one is capable of doing, except Allah. Asking such a thing from Holy Prophet (s), who is living in Barzakh will be a kind of polytheism (shirk).”