



The Muhannad Deceit

Mawlana Asrar Ahmad Nuri

Translated by Abu Hanzala

(Released by www.aqdas.co.uk)

All praise to Allah who made His beloved ﷺ the most honoured in the whole of creation and made his respect and reverence a part of Iman. He says:

Surely We have sent you as a witness and as a bearer of good news and as a warner, that you may believe in Allah and His Messenger and may honour him and revere him; and that you may declare His glory, morning and evening.¹

Why was this Messenger sent? Allah Himself Says so that we believe in Allah and His Messenger and honour and revere the Messenger. Hence, we learn that Islam and iman are to respect the Prophet ﷺ and those who do so are Muslims and those who turn away from this are not. This verse also describes the Prophet ﷺ as a bearer of good news and a warner, meaning those who respect him, they should be given good news of grace and those who fail in this and present themselves disrespectfully, they should be warned of a tormenting punishment.

Praise is to that Lord who declared that person as deserved of eternal punishment who raises his voice and shouts in the presence of the Prophet ﷺ. He says:

O you who believe! Do not raise your voices above the voice of the Prophet, and do not speak loud to him as you speak loud to one another, lest your deeds become null while you do not perceive.²

He declared obedience towards the Prophet ﷺ to be His own:

Whoever obeys the Messenger, he indeed obeys Allah.³

He declared pledging allegiance to the Prophet ﷺ to be pledging allegiance to Him:

Surely those who swear allegiance to you do but swear allegiance to Allah.⁴

¹ 48:8-9

² 49:2

³ 4:80

⁴ 48:10

In numerous aspects, He joins the name of the Prophet ﷺ with His own:

And they did not find fault except because Allah and His Messenger enriched them out of His grace.⁵

And He says:

And if they were content with what Allah and His Messenger gave them, and had said: Allah is sufficient for us; Allah will soon give us (more) out of His grace and His Messenger too.⁶

And He says:

O you who believe! Be not forward in the presence of Allah and His Messenger.⁷

And He says:

It is not fitting for a believer, man or woman, when a matter has been decided by Allah and His Messenger to have any option about their decision: if any one disobeys Allah and His Messenger, he is indeed on a clearly wrong path.⁸

And He says:

You shall not find a people who believe in Allah and the latter day befriending those who act in opposition to Allah and His Messenger, even though they were their (own) fathers, or their sons, or their brothers, or their kinsfolk.⁹

And He says:

But it is more fitting that they should please Allah and His Messenger, if they are believers. Do they not know that whoever acts in opposition to Allah and His Messenger, he shall surely have the fire of hell to abide in? That is the grievous abasement.¹⁰

And He says:

So long as they are sincere to Allah and His Messenger.¹¹

And He says:

Surely those who annoy Allah and His Messenger, Allah has cursed them in this world and the hereafter, and He has prepared for them a chastisement bringing disgrace.¹²

⁵ 9:74

⁶ 9:59

⁷ 49:1

⁸ 33:35

⁹ 58:22

¹⁰ 9:62-63

¹¹ 9:91

¹² 33:57

This is specifically for the Prophet ﷺ because no one can annoy Allah. However, whatever is done to the Prophet ﷺ; Allah ascribes it to Himself.

This elevated reverence and unique rank was given by Allah to His beloved. Whichever blind person ignores this and disrespects the Prophet ﷺ, Allah Himself announces such a person's kufr. He says:

They swear by Allah that they did not speak, and certainly they did speak, the word of unbelief, and disbelieved after their Islam.¹³

ibn Jarir, Tabrani, Abu Shaykh and ibn Mardawiyah narrate from AbdAllah ibn Abbas radiAllahu 'anhuma: The Prophet was sitting in the shade of a tree and said: Soon, a man will come and look at you with the eyes of shaytan. When he comes, do not speak to him. Not long after, a man with peculiar eyes passed by and the Prophet ﷺ called him and asked: Regarding what do you and your companions say disrespectful words about me? He went and called his companions who all swore that they had not uttered any words of disrespect against the Prophet. It was at this incident that Allah revealed the above verse.

This makes it clear that speaking words of disrespect about the Prophet is kufr and whoever utters them – even if he claims Islam a thousand times and recites the Kalima a million times – becomes a kafir.

Allah says:

And if you should question them, they would certainly say: We were only idly discoursing and sporting. Say: Was it at Allah and His communications and His Messenger that you mocked? Do not make excuses; you have denied indeed after you had believed.¹⁴

ibn Abi Shaybah, ibn Jarir, ibn al-Mundhar, ibn Abi Hatim and Abu al-Shaykh narrate from Mujahid, student of AbdAllah ibn Abbas radiAllahu 'anhum: A man was searching for a camel that he had lost. The Prophet ﷺ told him the camel is at a certain place in a particular jungle. Hearing this, a hypocrite said: Muhammad ﷺ says the camel is at such a place. What does Muhammad know of the unseen?

Regarding this incident, Allah revealed the above verse. By saying these words, you have become kafir after being Muslims.¹⁵

By uttering disrespect towards the Prophet ﷺ to the extent that by saying – What does Muhammad know of the unseen – reciting the Kalima will not help and Allah clearly said: Do not make excuses; you have denied indeed after you had believed.

Meaning, whoever insults the Prophet ﷺ is a kafir even if he continues to recite the Kalima and professes iman. His recitation of Kalima can never save him from kufr.

¹³ 9:74

¹⁴ 9:65-66

¹⁵ Tafsir ibn Jarir Tabari, 2:105; Tafsir Durr al-Manthur, 3:254

Peace and blessings upon that beloved and his companions and family whose love is the foundation of Iman. Allah says:

Say: If your fathers and your sons and your brethren and your mates and your kinsfolk and property which you have acquired, and the slackness of trade which you fear and dwellings which you like, are dearer to you than Allah and His Messenger and striving in His way, then wait till Allah brings about His command: and Allah does not guide the transgressing people.¹⁶

Meaning, whoever loves someone or something more than Allah and His Prophet, he is rejected in the court of Allah. Allah will not guide such a person towards Himself and he should wait for the punishment of Allah. The Prophet ﷺ himself said:

None you of is a Muslim until I am more beloved to him than his parents, children and the whole of mankind.¹⁷

This hadith is in Sahih Bukhari whose narrator is Anas ibn Malik Ansari radiAllahu 'anhu. This proves that whoever holds someone to be dearer than the Prophet ﷺ, he is not an accomplished Muslim.

This is the respect that is due to the Prophet ﷺ and whose love is the cause of people's salvation in the hereafter. It is the same Prophet ﷺ about whom certain people uttered words of insolence and disrespect. Amongst their outright kufr and accursed insolence are these words:

Denying the finality of prophethood

*“The common folk, the general populace, thinks that the meaning of the saying ‘RasulAllah ﷺ is the Seal’ means that his time is after the time of the earlier prophets and that he is the last of all the prophets. However, people of discerning know that there is no specialty in being earlier or later.”*¹⁸

*“Suppose if there is a prophet born in his time somewhere, his being the Seal remains intact.”*¹⁹

*“Suppose if there is a prophet born even after the time of RasulAllah ﷺ, there shall be no difference in his being the Seal.”*²⁰

This was written even though the sahabah, imams and the whole ummah understood 'Seal of the Prophets' to mean the Prophet ﷺ is the last and final Prophet. There are numerous hadiths

¹⁶ 9:24

¹⁷ Bukhari, 1:13

¹⁸ Tahdhir al-Nas, p.3, Qasim Nanotwi, founder of Darul 'Ulum Deoband

¹⁹ Ibid, p.14

²⁰ Ibid, p.25

in which the Prophet ﷺ himself gave this meaning. The author deemed this meaning to be of the general populace and undiscerning people, meaning, all the sahabah and imams and even the Prophet ﷺ himself were counted as undiscerning people. How clear a disrespect and accursed kufr this is.

It is from the necessities of faith to believe the Prophet ﷺ to be the last Prophet and to deny a necessity of faith is kufr according to the consensus. It is in *Ashbah wa al-Nadhayir*:

If someone does not believe Muhammad ﷺ as the last Prophet, then such a person is not a Muslim because the Prophet ﷺ being the last Prophet and after all other Prophets is from the necessities of faith.

The author has openly denied this necessary belief in his book *Tahdhir al-Nas* thus committing clear kufr.

The second insolence and disrespect that was committed is this:

Satan more knowledgeable than RasulAllah

“The end result: One should ponder that by looking at the state of shaytan and the angel of death, and proving [similar] knowledge that encompasses the earth to the Pride of the world ﷺ without any documentary evidence and merely by wrong analogy – if this is not polytheism, then which part of belief is this?

Because such extensive [knowledge] for the angel of death and shaytan is proved from absolute evidence [nusus-e-qati'yah]. Where is any such absolute evidence to prove the extensiveness of the knowledge of the Pride of the world ﷺ which refutes all absolute documents in order to prove one polytheistic belief? ”²¹

This was written even though Allah Himself has explained the extensiveness of the knowledge of His beloved. He says:

And He has taught you what you did not know, and Allah's grace on you is very great.²²

He says:

And We have revealed the Book to you explaining clearly everything.²³

Imam Tirmidhi and other many other hadith scholars have narrated the hadith through various chains that the Prophet ﷺ explained the vastness of the knowledge that Allah bestowed upon him by saying.

²¹ Barahin-e-Qati'ah, p.51, Khalil Ahmad Anbethwi, attested by Rashid Ahmad Gangohi

²² 4:113

²³ 16:89

I saw my Lord and He placed His Hand on my back and I felt its coolness on my chest. At this time, everything became visible to me and I recognised it.

Imam Tirmidhi said: this hadith is Hasan. I asked Imam Bukhari about it and he said it is sahih.

AbdAllah ibn Abbas radiAllahu 'anhuma narrates regarding the Miyraj that the Prophet ﷺ said:

Everything that is in the heavens and the Earth became known to me.²⁴

And in another narration:

I got to know everything that is in the East and the West.²⁵

But look at the state of these people that they believe in the knowledge of shaytan but deny the knowledge of the Prophet ﷺ. They say the knowledge of shaytan is more than that of the Prophet ﷺ. This is great disrespect and an accursed insolence. It is in *Nasim al-Riyad*:

Whoever said that there is someone who is more knowledgeable than the Prophet ﷺ; then the speaker has tried to find a flaw and defect in the Prophet ﷺ. Hence, he is someone who has sworn at the Prophet ﷺ meaning he is the same as the person who swears at the Prophet ﷺ and there is no difference in the ruling that applies to them both.²⁶

The third disrespect can be seen in the accursed words which say:

Comparing the knowledge of RasulAllah ﷺ with lowly beings

“And then, if it is correct to attribute the knowledge of the unseen to be possessed by the Prophet ﷺ, as Zayd says, then it remains to be asked, which one he refers to. Is it only a ‘part’ of it (ba’ad) or ‘complete’; if he refers to ‘part’, then what is extraordinary about the Prophet in possessing it? Such knowledge of the unseen is also possessed by all and sundry; even infants, lunatics and all the animals and quadrupeds. And if he refers to complete knowledge of the unseen such that nothing is left out, then this is rejected by transmitted and textual evidence.”²⁷

In this passage, knowledge of the unseen was divided into only two categories: complete knowledge of the unseen and partial knowledge of the unseen. Complete knowledge of the unseen was denied for the Prophet ﷺ due to transmitted and textual evidence. As for partial knowledge of the unseen, this was not denied for the Prophet ﷺ, rather it was referred to

²⁴ Inba' al-Mustafa bi Hal Sirr wa Akhfa, p.14

²⁵ al-Dawlah al-Makkiyah bi al-Maddat al-Ghaybiyah, p.261

²⁶ Nasim al-Riyad, 4:377

²⁷ Hifz al-Iman, p.8, Ashraf Ali Thanwi

thusly: Partial knowledge of the unseen is not specific to the Prophet ﷺ. Such knowledge of the unseen is also possessed by Zayd and Amr – meaning all people – rather, it is also possessed by every infant and every lunatic; rather, it is also possessed by all animals and quadrupeds.

What a disgraceful swear and open disrespect this is towards the Prophet ﷺ which emanates from the mouths and pens of these people. Look how confidently the author equates the knowledge of the Prophet ﷺ with that of laymen, infants, lunatics and animals and how disgusting a comparison they make.

He does not even understand the simple matter that even if laymen and the other creation which they mention know something of the unseen, it is only speculative. Whereas, knowledge of the unseen that it definitive is specific to the Prophets alayhim assalam and the only definite knowledge of the unseen that is known by non-Prophets is that which is told to them by Prophets themselves. Allah says:

The Knower of the unseen! So He does not reveal His secrets to any, except to him whom He chooses as a messenger.²⁸

And He says:

Nor is Allah going to make you acquainted with the unseen, but Allah chooses of His messengers whom He pleases.²⁹

These verses have been denied in the book *Hifz al-Iman*. The author did not differentiate between the minute knowledge of infants and lunatics and the vast knowledge of the Prophet ﷺ and clearly said: In partial knowledge of the unseen, there is nothing extraordinary about the Prophet ﷺ. Such knowledge of the unseen is also possessed by laymen, all infants, lunatics and animals.

Are these words about which a Muslim can have any shred of doubt that they are clearly disrespectful? By Allah, recite the Kalima with sincerity of heart; close your eyes and cover your ears; lower your head and concentrate on your heart and consider these words:

1. That the knowledge of shaytan is more than that of the Prophet ﷺ.
2. The Prophet ﷺ is not the last Prophet; there is no harm in there being a Prophet after him.
3. Knowledge of the unseen like the Prophet ﷺ is also possessed by every lunatic and quadruped.

Can a Muslim write or utter these words? Can someone who speaks these words be a Muslim? Can someone who considers such a person a Muslim remain a Muslim himself? No, no, a million times, no. The heart of a Muslim will declare all these words to be kufr as soon as he hears them and will definitely consider those who acquiesce as kafirs.

Iman is joined with loving the Prophet ﷺ and salvation in the hereafter depends on this. Whoever does not love him, by Allah, he cannot believe. The Prophet ﷺ himself said:

²⁸ 72:26-27

²⁹ 3:179

None you of can believe until I am more beloved to him than his parents, children and the whole of mankind.

A Muslim is he about whom the Qur'an says:

You shall not find a people who believe in Allah and the latter day befriending those who act in opposition to Allah and His Messenger, even though they were their (own) fathers, or their sons, or their brothers, or their kinsfolk; these are they into whose hearts He has impressed faith, and whom He has strengthened with an inspiration from Him.³⁰

The love of the Prophet ﷺ must be stamped into your hearts such that if someone insults or disrespects him – even if he is your own father – separate yourself from him. Even if he is a part of you, make him your enemy. Have hatred for even his shadow and send damnation upon his name and love for him. May Allah grant all Muslims such a firm belief.

It was these clear insults and disrespect due to which the Imam of Ahlu's Sunnah, Imam Ahmad Rida Baraylawi, declared the following ruling upon the authors of these passages in his *al-Mu'tamad al-Mustanad*:

These people are all kafir and murtad and according to the consensus are outside the fold of Islam. Indeed *Bazzaziyah*, *Durar*, *Ghurar*, *Fatawa Khayriyah*, *Majma' al-Anhur* and *Durr al-Mukhtar* and other relied upon texts say about such people: 'Whoever doubts their kufr and punishment is also a kafir.'³¹

He wrote in his *Tamhid-e-Iman*:

The love we have for Muslims is dependent only on their the love of Allah and His Prophet. Until these insulters did not insult or until we did not see any insult of Allah and His Prophet from them, we remained cautious as is demanded about a Muslim. It was only when we saw with our own eyes insults towards Allah and His Prophet that there was no other way but to issue takfir because we heard the ruling of our Imams: Whoever doubts the punishment and kufr of such a person is himself a kafir. It was imperative to save our own Iman and that of our brothers; that is why a ruling of kufr was issued and published.³²

In *al-Mu'tamad al-Mustanad*, the part which mentioned the takfir against these people – the Deobandis – was presented before the scholars of Makkah with their actual books and a photocopy of Rashid Ahmad Gangohi's fatwa, on Thursday 21st Dhu'l Hijjah, 1323 AH³³ and the same was presented before the scholars of Madinah on 5th Rabi' al-Akhir, 1324 AH and a fatwa was beseeched from them all in these words:

Are these people deniers of the necessities of faith? If so, and they are kafir and murtad, is it necessary for Muslims to call them kafir as is the case with all other deniers of the necessities of faith as mentioned by relied upon scholars thusly:

³⁰ 58:22

³¹ Husam al-Haramayn, p.90

³² Tamhid-e-Iman, p.45

³³ Husam al-Haramayn, p.92; Sham'a Munawwar Najat, p.135

Whoever doubts their kufr and punishment is himself a kafir – which is detailed in *Shifa' al-Siqam, Bazzaziyah, Majma' al-Anhur, Durr al-Mukhtar* and other books.

The scholars of Makkah and Madinah wrote attestations in support of *al-Mu'tamad al-Mustanad* and issued edicts declaring the Deobandis to be kafir and murtad definitely and by consensus. All these edicts can be seen in *Husam al-Haramayn 'ala Munhar al-kufr wa al-Mayn*.

Furthermore, 268 scholars of India and Pakistan made takfir of the Deobandis which can be seen in *al-Sawarim al-Hindiyyah*.

To cover up and hide the verdicts issued in these two books, the Deobandis wrote books such as *al-Muhannad, al-Shihab al-Thaqib* and *Bara'at al-Abrar* – all of which are riddled with deception, slander and lies.

Sham'a Munawwar Rah-e-Najat is a collection of transcribed speeches of Mawlana Mufti Hashmat Ali Khan which he delivered in Bhadarsa, District Faizabad. When the Deobandis lodged a court order in Faizabad Court against him, Mawlana Hashmat Ali wrote this book and presented it to the court in his defence.

In the same book, he writes:

Abdul Ra'uf Khan, an Urdu teacher from Faizabad and a strong proponent of Deobandism, wrote a 548 page book entitled *Bara'at al-Abrar 'an Maka'id al-Ashrar*. It contains attestations from 616 Deobandis and was published by Madinah Barqi Press in Bijnur with monetary aid from the Deobandis of Rangoon. I have shown you the edict of Molwi Abu'l Wafa Shahjahanpuri from pages 300-310 of this book. On page 57 of his book, Abdul Ra'uf Khan writes:

It is proven from nass qat'i [absolute evidence] that the angel of death and the accursed shaytan are Hadir wa Nadir [present and witnessing] at every place and it is not proven from nass qat'i that the Prophet ﷺ arrives in gatherings of Mawlid.

What open enmity these people have for the Prophet ﷺ that they accept the angel of death and shaytan to be present and witnessing everywhere and that too from nass qat'i but explicitly deny that nass qat'i exists to prove the Prophet ﷺ arrives in gatherings of Mawlid. The tragedy is they say the above is the meaning of what is written on page 51 of *Barahin-e-Qati'ah*.

In my debate with Molwi Nur Muhammad Tandwi in the Jami' Masjid of Bahraich, I presented this passage which left Tandwi speechless. He thought for a while and then answered that this is not the full passage from page 57 of *Barahin-e-Qati'ah*. The full passage is on page 57 where the actual meaning can be seen. I immediately opened *Barahin-e-Qati'ah* to page 57 and asked him to present the real meaning. Molwi Tandwi was stunned and remained silent. Eventually, due to not being able to answer, false reports were given to the police that the situation may become violent; hence, the debate was forcefully stopped. Thus, the Deobandis saved themselves from answering such compelling criticisms.

What I want to direct attention to is the fact that 616 Deobandis whose fatawa have been published in the book *Bara'at al-Abrar* agree with its contents. The creed of all these individuals is proven by the passage that they believe the angel of death and shaytan to be present and witnessing at all places according to nass qat'i. However, if someone believes that the Prophet ﷺ arrives in gatherings in Mawlid, these Deobandis consider such a person to be out of the folds of Islam.

However, they still cannot exonerate themselves. I have just shown the fatwa from their book *Taqwiyat al-Iman*:

Whoever believes any Prophet, saint, spiritual leader, martyr, imam, ghost, fairy, jinn or shaytan to be present and witnessing at all places, such a person is a polytheist [mushrik] and infidel [kafir] in all cases; whether he believes this attribute is intrinsic [dhati] or bestowed ['ata'i], in both cases, polytheism and infidelity are proven.

Hence, these 616 Deobandi scholars who deemed innocent Sunnis to be polytheists and infidels are themselves proven to be the same according to their own *Taqwiyat al-Iman*. Therefore, the whole of *Bara'at al-Abrar* is unreliable because it is written by polytheists. The truth is that one who digs a hole himself falls into it. The evil planning of a planner returns upon himself.³⁴

Mawlana Hashmat Ali writes:

During the debate in Dodhara, District Basti, Molwi Abu'l Wafa Shahjahanpuri asked the Deobandi debater, Molwi Abdul Latif Maowi, to hand me this book, *Bara'at al-Abrar*. With the help of Allah and His beloved, I refuted the book by only saying that it is written on page 57 of this book that the angel of death and shaytan are present and witnessing everywhere according to nass qat'i whereas according to the fatwa of the Deobandi book *Taqwiyat al-Iman*, *Bara'at al-Abrar* is written by polytheists and infidels and hence unreliable and rejected.

When I presented this short refutation, neither Molwi Abu'l Wafa nor Molwi Abdul Latif could answer me. In this debate, 85 Deobandi scholars had come together, yet not one of them was able to answer this refutation.³⁵

In *Husam al-Haramayn*, the scholars of Haramayn were presented with the actual disrespectful passages written by the Deobandis alongside their accurate Arabic translation according to proper Arabic idiom. The actual books were also presented and a fatwa was sought from the scholars of Haramayn as below:

Oh, our leaders! Help the religion of your Lord. The people mentioned by the author – some of whose books are presented such as Qadyani's *I'yyaz Ahmadi* and *Izalat al-Awham*; the photocopy of Rashid Ahmad Gangohi's fatwa and *Barahin-e-Qati'ah*, which, in reality, is also by Gangohi but attributed to his student, Khalid Ahmad Anbethwi; and *Hifz al-Iman* of Ashraf Ali Thanwi – the passages have been underlined to highlight them – are these people deniers of the necessities of faith due

³⁴ Sham'a Munawwar Rah-e-Najat, p.116-118

³⁵ Ibid, p.140

to their writings? If they are and are murtad and kafir, is it obligatory upon a Muslim to call them kafir as is the ruling for all deniers of the necessities of faith and about whom relied upon scholars have said: Whoever doubts their kufr and punishment, he himself is a kafir.³⁶

In this istifta' [query], what is notable is that it has been asked whether these people are deniers of the necessities of faith. A denier of the necessities of faith is he who actually commits the offence of denying a necessary article of faith and this denial is clear and unambiguous due to which takfir is made against him. The words of the istifta' are clear in this regard:

As is the ruling for all deniers of the necessities of faith and about whom relied upon scholars have said: Whoever doubts their kufr and punishment, he himself is a kafir.

In reply, the scholars of Haramayn wrote attestations to *al-Mu'tamad al-Mustanad*. The rulings which Imam Ahmad Rida issued against the Deobandis in *al-Mu'tamad al-Mustanad*, the scholars of Haramayn also attested them. That is, according to the scholars of Haramayn, the writings of the Deobandis are clear in their meanings of kufr and no explanation can validate them and the Deobandis are guilty of clearly denying the necessities of faith. The kufr of the Deobandis is clear and due to it, takfir against them is definite and whoever knows of the passages of the Deobandis and still doubts their kufr is himself a kafir. So much so that some scholars of Haramayn clarified further in their own words:

In reality, as the esteemed author has written, the sayings of these people are making kufr wajib [necessary] upon them.³⁷

The terrible writings of these people of innovation that have been shown are clear kufr.³⁸

I became aware of the sayings of these people who lead astray who have risen in India. I saw that their writings are making it wajib for them becoming murtad.³⁹

Whoever accepts the sayings that have been mentioned in this book, he is without doubt a kafir according to the consensus.⁴⁰

However, *al-Muhannad* is the total opposite of *Husam al-Haramayn*. In it, there is neither any sign of the passages from *Hifz al-Iman*, *Barahin-e-Qati'ah* or *Tahdhir al-Nas* nor their translations. Moreover, by attempting to cover up the insolence of the Deobandis, *al-Muhannad* has in fact attested to the kufr of these people.

How so? Mawlana Hashmat Ali writes:

Molwi Khalil Ahmad Anbethwi committed the injustice that in *al-Muhannad*, the Arabic translation of the passage on page 8 of *Hifz al-Iman* by Thanwi was not presented, nor did he include the Arabic translation of the passage on page 51 of

³⁶ Husam al-Haramayn, p.73-74

³⁷ Ibid, p.124, Attestation of Mawlana Ali bin Husayn Maliki

³⁸ Ibid, p.165, Attestation of Mawlana Sayyid Ahmad Jaza'iri

³⁹ Ibid, p.133, Attestation of Mawlana Muhammad Jamal bin Muhammad

⁴⁰ Ibid, p.86-97, Attestation of Mawlana Abu'l Khayr Mirdad

Barahin-e-Qati'ah by Gangohi, nor did he include the Arabic translations of the passages on pages 3, 14 and 28 of *Tahdhir al-Nas* by Nanotwi. Rather, he wrote new passages that are not present in any copy *Hifz al-Iman*, *Barahin-e-Qati'ah* or *Tahdhir al-Nas* in the whole world; and the climax of all dishonesty was that one passage was declared to be *the summary of the meaning of our Barahin-e-Qati'ah*. Another passage was said to be *the summary of the subject of Tahdhir al-Nas* and at the end of another passage, he wrote that *here end the words of Thanwi*.

If, according to Molwi Anbethwi, there was no kufr in the passages on page 8 of *Hifz al-Iman*, page 51 of *Barahin-e-Qati'ah* and pages 3, 14 and 28 of *Tahdhir al-Nas*; then what was he afraid of? It was binding upon him to present the actual passages to the scholars of Haramayn and their correct translations and the meaning which he understood from them. He should then have asked the scholars of Haramayn whether these are the meanings of these passages or not and are they free from kufr or not?

And since Molwi Anbethwi did not do this, then it is proven that he too was absolutely certain that the passages on page 8 of *Hifz al-Iman*, page 51 of *Barahin-e-Qati'ah* and pages 3, 14 and 28 of *Tahdhir al-Nas* are filled with kufr. If the same passages are once again presented before the scholars of Haramayn and their Arabic translations, then the same fatawa of kufr, irtidad [apostacy] and wahabism will be issued that have already been decreed in *Husam al-Haramayn*.

It was for this reason and only this reason that Molwi Anbethwi was forced to hide the actual passages and to also not present their Arabic translations before the scholars of Haramayn. He concocted brand new passages and presented them as being the summary of the subject matters of *Hifz al-Iman*, *Barahin-e-Qati'ah* and *Tahdhir al-Nas*.

Moreover, this act of Molwi Anbethwi was attested and signed by Molwi Ashraf Ali Thanwi too. Hence, this famous book of the Deobandis, *al-Muhannad*, itself proves that according to Thanwi and Anbethwi, the passages on page 8 of *Hifz al-Iman*, page 51 of *Barahin-e-Qati'ah* and pages 3, 14 and 28 of *Tahdhir al-Nas* most certainly contain kufr, irtidad and Wahabism and the fatawa against their authors being kafir and murtad which are present in *Husam al-Haramayn* are unquestionably true and correct.⁴¹

This vigorous refutation was presented by Mawlana Hashmat Ali firstly in his *Radd al-Muhannad*, page 127, and then in his debate with Molwi Muhammad Husain in Randair, Surat, which took place in the latter's own Madrasa Muhammadiyah. Mawlana Hashmat Ali added:

Otherwise, the decision lies in this that the fatawa of kufr, irtidad and Wahabism decreed by the scholars and Muftis in *Husam al-Haramayn* against the passages of *Hifz al-Iman* of Thanwi; *Barahin-e-Qati'ah* of Gangohi and *Tahdhir al-Nas* of Nanotwi – show me from the actual Arabic of *al-Muhannad* the Arabic translations of these passages and from the Urdu translation of *al-Muhannad*, show me the actual passages too.⁴²

⁴¹ Sham'a Munawwar Rah-e-Najat, p.142-144

⁴² Sham'e Munawwar Rah-e-Najat, p.144

Mawlana Hashmat Ali presented this same refutation to Molwi Abu'l Wafa Shahjahanpuri during their debate in Faizabad Court. What was the state of the Deobandis of Randair when they heard this refutation? He writes:

Molwi Randairi was neither able to present the actual Arabic translations of the passages of *Hifz al-Iman*, *Barahin-e-Qati'ah* or *Tahdhir al-Nas* from the original Arabic *al-Muhannad* nor was he able to show any actual passage from the Urdu translation of *al-Muhannad* nor will any Deobandi scholar till the day of judgement be able to do so. Madrasa Muhammadiyah was full of Deobandis scholars at this time, the famous ones of whom were: Molwi Uzair Gul Kabuli, Molwi Mahdi Husain Shahjahanpuri, Molwi Ibrahim Randairi, Molwi Ahmad Ashraf Randairi, Molwi Isma'il Bismillah, Molwi Isma'il Sadiq and Molwi Abdul Rahim Randairi. They were all left dumbstruck. All praise is to Allah.⁴³

The seals of approval in al-Muhannad

In *al-Muhannad*, three passages have been copied from Imam Barzanji's monograph *Tathkif al-Kalam* – one each from the beginning, middle and end of the book. The rest of the monograph has been left out and it has been claimed that this is an attestation to *al-Muhannad*. Is this an obvious fraud or not?

There were a total of 23 attestations to Barzanji's monograph and they were all copied into *al-Muhannad*. Is this not another fraud of Anbethwi? Can every author not just copy seals from all the books in the world into his own book?

On pages 66 and 67 of *al-Muhannad*, the attestations of Mufti Malikiya and his brother have been published and it has been written:

After Mufti Malikiyyah and his brother had written this attestation, due to the efforts of the opponents, they took their words back. Coincidentally, they have been copied into this book and are presented to readers.

Can every author not learn from Anbethwi and gather the attestations of all scholars – whether they are for him or against – and then say that afterwards, due to efforts by the opponent – these people took their words back and coincidentally, they have been published and presented to our readers?

It is most notable that after Mufti Malikiyyah and his brother learned of the fraud of Anbethwi and took back their attestations, they no longer remain signatories to *al-Muhannad*. What a great lie it is to publish their attestations. If they hid their true beliefs to appease their opponents, then Mufti Malikiyyah and his brother are both liars and even then, what great dishonesty it is to publish their attestation.⁴⁴

⁴³ Sham'a Munawwar Rah-e-Najat, p.144

⁴⁴ Munazara Adri, p.115-116

This refutation can be seen on page 118 of *Radd al-Muhannad* under point's number 36 and 37.

The appalling reality of al-Muhannad

The seal and signature of Mufti Hanafiyyah of Makkah is not in *al-Muhannad* which shows that the fraud of Anbethwi had become known to him and he did not attest to *al-Muhannad* even though his attestation is present in *Husam al-Haramayn*.

A whole attestation of Shaykh al-Dala'il Mawlana Shah Abdul Haq Ilahabadi Muhajir Makki is present in *Husam al-Haramayn* whereas not even a signature of his exists in *al-Muhannad*. The reason for this is that Shaykh al-Dala'il knew both Arabic and Urdu and was well aware of the beliefs of kufr of the Deobandis. If Anbethwi had presented himself to the shaykh, all of his deceit would have been opened by the shaykh. This is why not even a signature was beseeched from him which again is proof of falsehood.

Many of the teachers of Madrasah Sawlatiyyah in Makkah were aware of the beliefs of the Deobandis. Some of them wrote attestations to *Husam al-Haramayn* but not a single one of them has even a signature to *al-Muhannad* – this too is proof of lying.⁴⁵

The deceptive attempt of al-Muhannad

When Anbethwi saw that even after all his lies and deceit, there were not many seals of approval obtained from Haramayn; he was forced to acquire attestations from his own Deobandis and then translate and publish them. He tried to emulate *Husam al-Haramayn* but the reality is that *al-Muhannad* is just full of lies.

The names of the Deobandi attesters to *al-Muhannad* are:

1. Muhammad Hasan Deobandi
2. Ahmad Hasan Amrohi
3. Aziz al-Rahman Deobandi
4. Ashraf Ali Thanwi
5. Mahmud Hasan Deobandi
6. Quadratullah Muradabadi
7. Habib al-Rahman Deobandi
8. Qasim Nanotwi, the son of Muhammad Ahmad Nanotwi
9. Ghulam Rasul, teacher at Deoband
10. Muhammad Sahul, teacher at Deoband
11. Abdul Samad Bijnuri, teacher at Deoband

⁴⁵ Radd al-Muhannad, p.117-118

12. Muhammad Ishaq Nahtori
13. Riyazuddin Meeruti
14. Kifayatullah Shahjahanpuri
15. Zia-ul-Haq, teacher at Aminiyyah, Delhi
16. Muhammad Qasim, teacher at Aminiyyah, Delhi
17. Ashiq Ilahi Meeruti
18. Siraj Ahmad, teacher at Sardhana, Meerut
19. Muhammad Ishaq Meeruti
20. Hakim Mustafa Bijnuri
21. Mas'ud Ahmad Gangohi
22. Muhammad Yahya Sahsarami, teacher at Mazahir al-'Ulum, Saharanpur
23. Kifayatullah Gangohi
24. Abdul Rahim Raipuri

As can be seen, attestations were attained from some Deobandis which were translated and published so that readers who browse the book begin to think that *al-Muhannad* too has attestations from plenty of scholars.⁴⁶

There is not a single reliable seal in al-Muhannad from the Haramayn

In total, there are 31 seals of approval in *al-Muhannad* from Makkah and Madinah. Two of these are of Mufti Malikiyyah and his brother – which have been proven to be false – and one seal from Mufti Barzanji which was copied from his book. 23 other seals are from his book too and not from *al-Muhannad*.⁴⁷ One seal is from Muhammad Siddiq Afghani and one from a Muhibbuddin Muhajir. Hence, only 3 seals remain from the Haramayn in *al-Muhannad*.⁴⁸

Mawlana Hashmat Ali then wrote a marginalia:

The state of even these 3 seals is that Mawlana Shanqizi only wrote a refutation of *al-Muhannad*. The *Nawab* and *Khan* in the name Ahmad Rashid Khan Nawab indicate that he too is someone from the Subcontinent and it was Anbethwi's deceit that he included Nawab after the name. As for the attestation of Mawlana Muhammad Sa'id Babusayl, it was not published in full. Only its summary was presented with parts taken out and this has been accepted on page 20 of *al-Muhannad*. Hence, there remains not a single reliable seal in *al-Muhannad*.⁴⁹

He further wrote:

This is the same *al-Muhannad* that the Deobandis of Randair advertised with such pride that they claimed it has 50 seals of approval from Haramayn. When the reality was shown to them, they were left dumbstruck. It is also proven that alongside *al-*

⁴⁶ Radd al-Muhannad, p.116

⁴⁷ Details of this can be seen on page 13 of this article

⁴⁸ Radd al-Muhannad, p.119

⁴⁹ Ibid, p.119

Muhannad, Anbethwi also wrote a book in refutation of Wahabis which he took with him. Those who were tricked by *al-Muhannad* attested to it and those upon whom the lies of *al-Muhannad* had become clear, they were presented with the book in refutation of Wahabis and wrote attestations to it. When Anbethwi returned to India, he published these attestations too in *al-Muhannad*. Hence, Shaykh Mustafa bin Ahmad Hanbali of Damascus wrote in his attestation:

The author, who is from the chosen people of Allah, has written this monograph that consists of legal issues, scholarly discussions and refutation of the Wahabi sect.

Similarly, Shaykh Mahmud Rashid Attar writes in his attestation:

I became aware of this brilliant book and found it to be comprehensive in which there is refutation of innovators and Wahabis.

Both these passages prove that both individuals signed a monograph which was in refutation of Wahabis and it is evident that *al-Muhannad* is not in refutation of the Wahabis but rather to remove the allegation that Deobandis are Wahabis. Therefore, it is manifest that these two individuals did not stamp their seals on *al-Muhannad*, rather, Anbethwi attained their seals to his monograph against Wahabis and then copied them onto his *al-Muhannad*.

When it is proven that Anbethwi attained some seals for his monograph against Wahabis and then copied them onto *al-Muhannad*, then however many seals there are which do not mention the subject matter and only say that we have seen the monograph and found its contents to be correct become unreliable because it cannot be known whether these too were written for the monograph against Wahabis and copied onto *al-Muhannad*.

The lies and deceit of al-Muhannad

Mawlana Hashmat Ali continues:

Ashraf Ali Thanwi, Khalid Ahmad Anbethwi, Murtaza Hasan Darbhangi, Abdul Shakur Kakorwi, Muhammad Husain Randairi, Ghulam Nabi Tarapuri, Ahmad Buzurg Dabheli and all other Deobandis, look how many deceptions are contained in your *al-Muhannad*:

1. Not presenting the actual passages of your elders.
2. To show your belief to be opposite to what is present in your books.
3. To deny the contents that have been published in your books.
4. To concoct new passages whose meanings do not exist in your books in the guise of summarising.
5. To concoct a passage and claim it is from your books.
6. To pass a verdict of kufr on beliefs that are present in your books.

7. To label that person a mulhid, zindiq, mal'un and kafir who believes what is published in these books.
8. The thing which has been labeled shirk, bid'ah sayyi'ah and haram in these books has been said to be an act of worship, a means of attaining paradise, rewarding, close to wajib, most liked and strongly recommended.
9. To change the words '*ilm-e-ghayb ke hukm* to '*aalim-ul-ghayb ka itlaq*.
10. Denying a specialty has been made an acceptance of specialty.
11. To remove the word *Aysa*.
12. Lying to deceive the scholars of Haramayn.
13. To swear at Imam Ahmad Rida Baraylawi.
14. Taking the seals of scholars and changing the passages of *al-Muhannad*.
15. To publish the attestations of Deobandis.
16. To publish seals and then say we do not have their originals.
17. To copy seals from another monograph onto *al-Muhannad*
18. To copy seals from the monograph in refutation of Wahabis onto *al-Muhannad*.

Is this what you call truthful? Is this the *al-Muhannad* that you so proudly paraded? Is this the *al-Muhannad* that you presented against *Husam al-Haramayn*? Have some shame and repent from Deobandism.

Even if Anbethwi did attain edicts in his favour after telling so many lies and committing so much deceit, can it remove the kufr from the Deobandis? Never. Moreover, these foul feats were not committed by an ignorant Deobandi but by the author of an accursed book, Khalil Ahmad Anbethwi, and it was signed by a leading Deobandi, Ashraf Ali Thanwi and also contains attestations from various major Deobandis. Hence, we learn that the same lies and deceit upon which every Sunni child sends damnation, they are the jewels in the crown of Deobandis.

Dear brothers! See for yourself that in *Husam al-Haramayn*, the original passages of the Deobandis have been written upon which the scholars of Haramayn passed edicts of kufr and irtidad. However, in *al-Muhannad*, there is no sign of any of these passages, so, you decide for yourselves whether *Husam al-Haramayn* is correct and if *al-Muhannad* is fraudulent or not.⁵⁰

A simple conclusion

In the attestations that have been published in *al-Muhannad*, it is neither written that:

Thanwi, Gangohi, Anbethwi and Nanotwi are Muslims even after writing and believing in the passages in *Hifz al-Iman*, *Barahin-e-Qati'ah*, *Tahdhir al-Nas* and the photocopy of the Gangohi fatwa.

⁵⁰ Radd al-Muhannad, p.123

Nor is it written that:

The kufr mentioned in *Hifz al-Iman*, *Barahin-e-Qati'ah*, *Tahdhir al-Nas* and the photocopy of the Gangohi fatwa is not definitive.

Nor is it written that:

The fatawa mentioned in *Husam al-Haramayn* against Thanwi, Gangohi, Anbethwi and Nanotwi due to their passages in *Hifz al-Iman*, *Barahin-e-Qati'ah*, *Tahdhir al-Nas* and the Gangohi fatwa are wrong and not binding.

Nor is it written that:

Our fatawa that are present in *Husam al-Haramayn* were acquired from us through deceit and we wrote them due to not knowing.

Nor is it written that:

We have sought back the fatawa of *Husam al-Haramayn* and whoever presents them now is a liar.

Nor is it written that:

Khalil Anbethwi has now presented the exact passages from *Hifz al-Iman*, *Barahin-e-Qati'ah*, *Tahdhir al-Nas* and the Gangohi fatwa to us verbatim. We pondered over these passages and understood that they are not kufr. The person who acquiesces with these passages and whoever wrote them is neither a kafir nor a murtad or misguided.

When *al-Muhannad* does not contain these details and surely it does not⁵¹, then never mind being an answer to *Husam al-Haramayn*, it does not even bring a blemish upon the glowing shine of *Husam al-Haramayn*.

If the Deobandis were upon the truth, then the only way to absolve themselves from the fatwa was to present all of their original passages - that the scholars of Ahlu's Sunnah deem to be kufr and upon which there is a fatwa of kufr in *Husam al-Haramayn* - in their entirety and verbatim, without any alteration, to the scholars of Haramayn. Thereafter, they could have presented explanations as they wished and the scholars could have pondered over the passages and the explanations given and then issues a ruling: If they were kufr, they would have issue a fatwa of kufr and if not, they would have clearly written that these passages do not contain kufr and their authors are not kafir but rather Muslims. If the Deobandis had bought a fatwa to this effect then, indeed, it would have been reliable but Anbethwi did not present a single passage of his Deobandi elders but rather kept them concealed and instead presented fabricated passages.

⁵¹ As proven by Mawlana Mahbub Ali Khan on pages 8,9 of *La Jawab Tahqiq-e-Waqi'iyat al-Muhannad*

Mawlana Hashmat Ali writes:

Anbethwi and all the Deobandis knew that these accursed passages certainly and most definitely contain insults towards Allah and His Prophet and a denial of the necessities of faith. If the same original passages were presented, then the same fatwa of kufr and irtidad would be issued that was already passed in *Husam al-Haramayn*. They would have made a thousand excuses and millions of explanations but none of them would be heard and this is why they could not conjure up the courage to present the original passages. Instead, they submitted concocted passages. Hence, it is proven from *al-Muhannad* that even according to the Deobandis, these passages contained kufr and their authors are kafir and murtad.

Oh, Deobandis! This is what is called victory for the truth that your own *al-Muhannad* has struck your own necks with your own hands and finished Deobandism. What is this *al-Muhannad*? It is only an affirmation of *Husam al Haramayn*.⁵²

It is fascinating that when Imam Ahmad Rida Baraylawi was in Haramayn and the scholars were writing attestations against the Deobandis, both Khalil Ahmad Anbethwi and Husain Ahmad Madani were in the blessed Hijaz.⁵³

Neither of them could come face to face with Imam Ahmad Rida. Otherwise, why did they not challenge him and have dialogue? Why did they not stop the scholars of Haramayn from attesting to the fatwa of kufr against them? Why did they not come out and say that a deceit was being committed? Instead, they remained silent.

During his stay in Makkah, Khalil Ahmad Anbethwi met with Mawlana Shaykh Salih Kamal and asked, "Are you angry with me?" Mawlana asked if he was Khalil Ahmad and said that he had written that he is a *Zindiq*. Anbethwi claimed that what had been attributed to him was not in his book. Mawlana said that *Barahin-e-Qati'ah* has been published and upon hearing this, Anbethwi was forced into asking, "Is repentance from kufr not accepted?" Mawlana replied that it is.⁵⁴

Anbethwi promised to repent from his passage of kufr and fled to Jeddah. Three years later, with the help of his Deobandi elders and their attestations, he wrote *al-Muhannad* in refutation of *Husam al-Haramayn*. As we have seen, from beginning to end, his book is a collection of lies and deceit.

al-Muhannad could have been called a refutation of *Husam al-Haramayn* if the same scholars who attested to the latter also attested to *al-Muhannad* and *al-Shihab al-Thaqib* and also agreed that they had been deceived and Imam Ahmad Rida Baraylawi had attained false attestations from them and that the passages of *Tahdhir al-Nas*, *Barahin-e-Qati'ah* and *Hifz*

⁵² Radd al-Muhannad, p.127

⁵³ Manzur Ahmad Nu'mani; al-Malfuz, Part 1

⁵⁴ Shaykh Salih Kamal documented this meeting in his letter to Sayyid Isma'il Afandi dated 23rd Dhu'l Hijjah, 1323 AH.

al-Iman are correct and totally Islamic. However, the authors of these books could not manage this. How then can *al-Muhannad* and *al-Shihab al-Thaqib* be termed refutations of *Husam al-Haramayn*?

Deobandi alterations of passages and books

The actual passages that contain disrespect have been tampered with. Scores of editions of *Taqwiyat al-Iman* contain the words, *I too shall one day die and rot away*⁵⁵ but recent editions have been altered to read, *One day, I too shall pass away and lie in the grave*⁵⁶.

After the publication of *Husam al-Haramayn*, the Deobandis began to tamper with *Tahdhir al-Nas*. For example, on page 11 of *al-Muhannad*, the three passages have not been quoted verbatim. Instead, lies were told by presenting the meaning of the passages.

Similarly, from pages 72-79 of *al-Shihab al-Thaqib*, Husain Ahmad Madani presented bogus explanations of the passages of *Tahdhir al-Nas* yet failed to quote them word for word. Rashid Company Deoband published the book and changed the words *ba'ad zamana e nabawi sal'am bhi koyi nabi paida ho to farz kiya jaye*⁵⁷.

Likewise, both *al-Shihab al-Thaqib* and *al-Muhannad* aimed to prove the passage of *Barahin-e-Qati'ah* to be Islamic but failed to provide a reasonable explanation and neglected to include the actual passage verbatim.

If one compares the original contentious passages of *Tahdhir al-Nas*, *Barahin-e-Qati'ah*, *Hifz al-Iman* and the Gangohi fatwa of *Wuqu' al-Kadhib* firstly with *Husam al-Haramayn* and then with *al-Muhannad* and *al-Shihab al-Thaqib*; one will see that the Deobandis have themselves changed them whereas they are present verbatim in *Husam al-Haramayn*.

As for *Hifz al-Iman*, it was originally a 10 page booklet which contained a passage of disrespect. However, the *Hifz al-Iman* published by Anjuman Irshad al-Muslimin in Lahore is 119 pages. Ashraf Ali Thanwi himself changed the passage in *Taghyir al-Unwan* before which he attempted to explain the passage in *Bast al-Banan*. The *Hifz al-Iman* published in Lahore and Deoband now contains the altered text.

It is a shame that Thanwi changed the passage but did not have the ability to make repentance for the original disrespectful one. Nevertheless, the changing of the text proves the veracity of *Husam al-Haramayn*.

Amongst the fallacies that the Deobandis contrive is that:

In *Husam al-Haramayn*, the passage from page 14 of *Tahdhir al-Nas* appears first, then the passage from page 28 and then the one from page 3. In this way, by arranging

⁵⁵ Mir Muhammad Kutub Khana, Karachi, p.57

⁵⁶ Jeddah edition, p.164

⁵⁷ Page 22

passages one before the other and producing a new passage, a meaning of kufr has been created.

Mawlana Hashmat Ali writes:

During the debates in Adri, Azamgarh, and later in Gaya; Molwi Manzur Sanbhali raised the same objection. I replied that it is a necessary belief as derived from the attribute of the Prophet, *Khatam al-Nabiyyin*, that the Prophet ﷺ announced his prophethood after all the other Prophets and in terms of announcement of prophethood, he is the last Prophet. In the passage on page 3 of *Tahdhir al-Nas*, this meaning has been labelled incorrect and rejected which is a denial of a necessary article of faith and kufr in itself.

In the passage on page 14 of *Tahdhir al-Nas*, it has been denied that it is impossible for another Prophet to be born in the time of the Prophet ﷺ and it is clearly written:

Suppose if there is a prophet born in his time somewhere, his being the Seal remains intact.

To deem that it is permissible and possible for a new Prophet to appear in the time of the Prophet ﷺ and to claim that this is not against *Khatm al-Nubuwwah*; this is the second denial of a necessary article of faith and the second kufr in itself.

In the passage on page 28 of *Tahdhir al-Nas*, it has been denied that it is impossible for another Prophet to be born even after time of the Prophet ﷺ and it is clearly written:

Suppose if there is a prophet born even after the time of the Prophet ﷺ, there shall be no difference in his being the Seal.

To deem that it is permissible and possible for a new Prophet to appear even after the time of the Prophet ﷺ and to claim that this is not against *Khatm al-Nubuwwah*; this is the third denial of a necessary article of faith and the third kufr in itself.

Hence, each of the three passages contains one kufr each. Therefore, if the passages on page 3, then page 14 and then page 28 were written, there would still be kufr three times. If the passage on page 28, then page 14 and then page 3 were copied, it would still be kufr three times. If the passage on page 3 was written first, then the passages on page 28 and then page 14; it would still be three counts of kufr. If the passages on page 28, then the one on page 3 and then page 14 were written, it would still result in kufr three times. If the passage on page 14 was written first, then the passages on page 3 and then page 28; it would still be kufr three times. Hence, as in *Husam al-Haramayn*, if the passage on page 14 has been presented first and then the passages on page 28 and then page 3; they still account to kufr three times. Each one of the three passages - on its own - gives a meaning of kufr.

The meanings of kufr were not created by changing the order, rather, each passage is so clear in its meaning of kufr, that from the three passages, there is not any possibility whatsoever of an Islamic meaning being derived. Hence, is your objection nonsensical, insignificant and useless or not?

This irrefutable reply left Molwi Manzur Sanbhali speechless during the debate in Adri. The 150 Deobandi scholars who had gathered together to assist him from the districts of Azamgarh, Gorakhpur, Balya and Jaunpur were all unable to answer this undeniable rebuttal either.

The limits of shamelessness were reached when this same old allegation that I had obliterated years earlier was presented to me during the debate in Gaya. I again expounded my unanswerable reply with some additions which left Molwi Manzur Sanbhali speechless once again. In this debate, 65 Deobandi scholars including Molwi Abdul Quddus, Molwi Wilayat Husain and Molwi Nazir Imam had gathered to assist Molwi Manzur Sanbhali but they were all left dumbstruck at this overwhelming response. All praise is to Allah.⁵⁸

Another myth that the Deobandis repeat is that:

In *Husam al-Haramayn*, Imam Ahmad Rida Baraylawi has presented the literal translation of the passage of *Hifz al-Iman* and due to this, the scholars of Haramayn issued a verdict of kufr. The intention of Anbethwi was to present the full meaning of the passage of *Hifz al-Iman* before the scholars of Haramayn so that they fully understand it and then pass their verdict. This is why he presented the summary and meaning of the passage in his own words and sought a verdict regarding it. The translation of your Imam [Ahmad Rida Baraylawi] is indeed correct and according to the original but because it is literal, it becomes disrespectful and the translation presented in *al-Muhannad* is idiomatic, hence, it is not disrespectful.

This criticism was made by Molwi Manzur Sanbhali during the debate in Adri in reply to which, Mawlana Hashmat Ali Khan said:

Due to being unable to answer my irrefutable criticisms of *al-Muhannad*, Molwi Sanbhali has accepted that the translation of Thanwi's passage present in *Husam al-Haramayn* is correct and according to the original. If he had stopped at this, then we would have reached an agreement, but it is unfortunate that personality worship overtook him and to cover up the kufr of Thanwi, he adds that this translation is not idiomatic but literal and due to this, the difficulty has landed on Thanwi that a fatwa of kufr has ensued from the Haramayn.

I now challenge you to prove that the translation is against Arabic idiom. What part of it points towards something that is not adduced from Thanwi's passage but present in the translation? The sentence that you have stated:

كانت فاطمته بنت رسول الله صل الله تعالى عليه ثم عليها و بارك
وسلم تحت على بن ابى طالب كرم الله تعالى وجهه

This is *qiyas ma'a al-fariq* [discrepant analogy]. In Arabic, to use the singular tense for someone is not disrespectful but in Urdu, if one does not intend to show love and honour for someone, then to use the singular tense is disrespectful. The Arabic sentence كانت فلانة تحت فلان means that *a certain woman was the wife of a certain*

⁵⁸ Sham'a Munawwar Rah-e-Najat, p.138-140

man. In Urdu, this relationship is not described as *a certain woman was under a certain man*, but rather, *a certain woman was the wife of a certain man*. Hence, the literal translation of this sentence is disrespectful. In the passage of Thanwi, it is written:

اس میں حضور کی کیا تخصیص ہے
What is extraordinary about the Prophet.

This can only be translated as:

ای خصوصیتہ فیہ لحضرة الرسالة

The passage of Thanwi says ایسا علم غیب [such knowledge of the unseen]. There can be no other translation of this in Arabic apart from مثل هذا العلم بالغیب. Hence, how can you claim that the translation is not idiomatic? Firstly, you should have told us that according to Arabic idiom, the translation should have been like this and should have presented proof from the speech of Arabs to substantiate. Only then should you have claimed that the translation is not idiomatic.

As for your assertion that the translation of *al-Muhannad* is idiomatic, this is a blatant lie of yours that not even Anbethwi had the courage to tell, otherwise, he would have included the original passage of *Hifz al-Iman* alongside his concocted passage. What could someone have done to him? Only this that they would have sent damnation upon his lies and deceit.

You have boldly claimed that there is no difference between the meanings of the passages of *al-Muhannad* and *Hifz al-Iman*. Listen, it is in *Hifz al-Iman*:

آپ کی ذات مقدسہ پر علم غیب کا حکم کیا جانا

And it is in *al-Muhannad*:

علم غیب کا اطلاق

Tell us; is there not a world of difference between the two? Is there a massive difference between *Hukm* and *Ilaq* or not?

It is in *Hifz al-Iman*:

ایسا علم غیب تو حیوانات و بہائم کے لئے بھی حاصل ہے

And *al-Muhannad* has it:

بعض غیب کا علم اگرچہ تھوڑا سا ہو زید و عمر و بلکہ ہر بچہ اور دیوانہ بلکہ جملہ حیوانات اور چوپاؤں کو بھی حاصل ہے

In *Hifz al-Iman*, the word ایسا was for *tashbih* [comparison]. Where in the passage of *al-Muhannad* is the word that indicates *tashbih*? This word was the actual basis of

kufr and it is the one that has been omitted. Tell us, is there a difference in *Hifz al-Iman* and *al-Muhannad* or not?⁵⁹

Then the Deobandis produced another individual who surpassed his elders in his shamelessness. Earlier Deobandis had admitted that the translations of *Hifz al-Iman*, *Barahin-e-Qati'ah* and *Tahdhir al-Nas* present in *Husam al-Haramayn* are correct and according to the original but this dutiful son of Deoband wrote:

The scholars of Haramayn did not know what was written in *Tahdhir al-Nas*, *Hifz al-Iman* and *Barahin-e-Qati'ah*. They issued a verdict of kufr against the subject matters that were presented to them. If the words that were presented to them were presented before any Muslim – even if they are not learned – the same verdict will be decreed. No one can doubt it being kufr but the issue is that these words are not in accordance to what is written in these books.⁶⁰

This blind man was devoid of knowledge of Arabic and its syntax, etymology and morphology because he could not see the original passages of *Hifz al-Iman*, *Barahin-e-Qati'ah* and *Tahdhir al-Nas* in *Husam al-Haramayn* – a fact accepted by his own Deobandi elders.

Also, in the *Istifta'* to the scholars of Haramayn regarding the kufr of the Deobandis, *al-Mu'tamad al-Mustanad* was not presented alone, rather, their actual books – *Hifz al-Iman*, *Barahin-e-Qati'ah* and *Tahdhir al-Nas* – and the photocopy of the Gangohi fatwa were also presented. It is in *Tamhid-e-Iman*:

I took with me a photocopy of the Gangohi fatwa to show the scholars of Haramayn and the other books of insolence.⁶¹

It is in the *Istifta'* of *Husam al-Haramayn* itself:

These are some of their books such as Qadyani's *I'jaz Ahmadi* and *Izalat al-Awham*; the photocopy of Rashid Ahmad Gangohi's fatwa and *Barahin-e-Qati'ah*, which, in reality, is also by Gangohi but attributed to his student, Khalid Ahmad Anbethwi; and *Hifz al-Iman* of Ashraf Ali Thanwi – the passages have been underlined to highlight them.⁶²

Moreover, amongst the scholars of Haramayn is Mawlana Abdul Haq Muhajir Ilahabadi, who is aware of the Urdu language. A person with minimal understanding can see and understand that in the *Istifta'* of Imam Ahmad Rida, the belief of the Deobandis has not been presented in his own words and then a fatwa sought regarding it; rather, the actual sayings of the Deobandis have been presented and a fatwa has been sought regarding them:

We ask, are these people deniers of the necessities of faith due to their words.⁶³

⁵⁹ Rudad Mubahatha Ahle Sunnat wa Wahabiya, p.112-114

⁶⁰ Inkishaf-e-Haq, p.208

⁶¹ Tamhid-e-Iman, p.44

⁶² Husam al-Haramayn, p.73-74

⁶³ Husam al-Haramayn, p.74

Also, not only were their words or beliefs asked about but the names of these people were mentioned too and a ruling was beseeched regarding these individuals.

Now, what will this blind man say? Will he say that the scholars of Haramayn did not substantiate the passages that were presented with the actual books that they were in or that they did not deeply ponder over whether there was anything Islamic in these passages before declaring that the sayings of the Deobandis are clear kufr and pronouncing them to be kafir and murtad and that whoever doubts the Deobandis being kafir is himself a kafir? Allah forbid that these illustrious scholars would issue such verdicts by naming names without firstly closely inspecting them and being fully convinced.

It is in *Husam al-Haramayn* itself that Mawlana Ali bin Husayn Maliki, teacher at Masjid Haram, says:

Hadrat Mawla Ahmad Rida Khan drew my attention to some pages that contained the words of the misguided that have raised their heads in India. They are Ghulam Ahmad Qadyani, Rashid Ahmad and Ashraf Ali and Khalil and others who are people of misguidance and open kufr. There are some of them who talk about the Lord Himself and some who attribute defects to Prophets. The author has refuted their words in an esteemed monograph whose proofs are luminous. **He asked me to ponder over the words of these people and see** what censure they are deserved of. I obeyed the author and when I **looked at the words** of these people, I saw that they are as the author described them. Their **words** are making **kufr wajib** upon them and making them worthy of punishment and in an even worse state than misguided kafirs.⁶⁴

May Allah reward him abundantly for clearly stating:

النظر في كلام هؤلاء القوم
He asked me to ponder over the words of these people.

And how he tore deceit from its roots:

نظرت في كلامهم يوجب ارتدادهم
I pondered over their words which were making kufr wajib upon them.

Mawlana Sayyid Ahmad Jaza'iri, the Shaykh of Malikis in Madinah, wrote:

In the Istifta' that Shaykh Ahmad Rida Khan presented, I pondered over its contents in great detail. May Allah prolong his life and benefit Muslims from him and grant him paradise forever. I saw that those horrifying statements and sayings were outright kufr which he had narrated from those misguided people.

This is the careful deliberation and consideration and then the pronouncement of the ruling that was beseeched from the scholars of Haramayn in the Istifta'. However, the blind man did not see any of this, and why would he, when his only aim was to veil the kufr of his elders from laymen Muslims and to entrap them in his net.

⁶⁴ Husam al-Haramayn, p.124

The one who parroted these sentiments has left this world but those of his followers who remain should ponder over this article without any bias and come out of the trance of deceit and kufr.

As for the Deobandis denying the fact that their passages contain kufr, then let it be known that there can be no explanation [ta'wil] in explicit words, otherwise nothing would be kufr. For example, if someone says there are two Gods and then offers the explanation that there are two decrees – Mubram and Mu'allaq and another person says: I am RasulAllah and fabricates an explanation that the lexical meaning is intended and it is Allah who has sent the soul into his body. Such explanations are not listened to. It is in *al-Shifa'*:

A claim to explain clear words is not heard.

It is in *Sharh Shifa'* of Imam Ali Qari:

Such a claim is rejected in the Shari'ah.

It is in *Nasim al-Riyad*:

Such an explanation will not be heard and will be considered irrational.

It is in *Fatawa Khulasah, Fusul Imadiyyah, Jami' al-Fusulayn* and *Fatawa Hindiyyah* and others:

If someone calls himself the Messenger of Allah or in Persian, Paighambar; and then gives the meaning that I take the message or am a postman – then he will become a kafir and this explanation will not be heard.⁶⁵

Ta'wil is of three types: Qarib, Ba'id and Muta'azzir. In reality, Muta'azzir is not Ta'wil; it is Tahwil [changing] and Tahrif [alteration]. Where it is said ادعاءه التاويل في لفظ صراح لا يقبل - explanations are not heard for clear words with established meanings. Here, Ta'wil refers to Ta'wil Muta'azzir because if an explanation is given for words whose meanings are already established, it can only be Ta'wil Muta'azzir. If it is not Ta'wil Muta'azzir but Ta'wil Qarib or Ba'id, then words whose meanings are already established no longer remain so. That is, if an explanation is given for words with understood meanings, it can only be Ta'wil Muta'azzir [Tahwil and Tahrif] because if it is Ta'wil Qarib or Ba'id, then it means that the words did not have established meanings in the first place.

Whatever explanations, rather alterations, the Deobandis made to their statements, even these have been answered in books such as *Tamhid-e-Iman, Waq'at al-Sinan, Adkhal al-Sinan, al-Istimdad, al-Mawt al-Ahmar* and others. The Deobandis were unable to answer these books, thereby accepting that their statements are kufr and disrespectful.

It is certain that the Deobandis believe their statements to be true because when writing them, they were neither asleep nor mad or intoxicated.

Ashraf Ali Thanwi himself says in *Bast al-Banan*:

⁶⁵ Tamhid-e-Iman, p.37-38

Whoever holds such a belief or without belief says these words directly or indirectly, I consider him to be out of the folds of Islam.⁶⁶

Here, Thanwi made takfir against himself.

As for the claim that the scholars of Haramayn issued verdicts of kufr on the condition that no doubt should remain over what was said, who said it and that it was definitely said. Then we ask the Deobandis – when there is doubt over the Kalam, Takallum and Mutakallim; what is the responsibility of a sincere and pious Mufti? Is it to use the word *if* and make takfir against named individuals with their signatures and stamps of approval and to then hand them to the adversary of the said individuals?

How can the Deobandis make such allegations of carelessness against the scholars of Haramayn? How can they say that verdicts of kufr were issued without sufficient proof at hand?

One must look at the Istifta' in *Husam al-Haramayn* and see what was said about the Deobandis. In it are the passages from *Hifz al-Iman*, *Barahin-e-Qati'ah*, *Tahdhir al-Nas* and the fatwa of Gangohi and their translations in Arabic. None of the Deobandis were able to show any grammatical, syntactical, etymological or morphological mistakes in these translations. They all admitted that the translations were correct and according to the originals. The Deobandis were also unable to show any idiomatic error in the translations; hence, they accepted that they were idiomatic. These passages contain nothing but clear kufr that is unexplainable and none of the Deobandis denied the passages or retracted from them. Hence, how can there be any doubt in Kalam, Takallum and Mutakallim.

As for the deceitful explanations the Deobandis concocted regarding their passages, these have all been quashed in numerous books. No Deobandi, not even Thanwi, was able to answer these refutations. Hence, the fact that there is not an Islamic meaning to any of these passages was accepted by all the Deobandis and Thanwi himself.

Here, we shall not reproduce these refutations. Books such as *Waq'at al-Sinan*, *Adkhal al-Sinan*, *al-Istimdad*, *al-Mawt al-Ahmar* and *Qahr Wajid Dayyan* are enough in this regard.

Regarding the *tashbih* [comparison] made in *Hifz al-Iman*, it was said:

In the passage of Molwi Ashraf Ali, there is neither a comparison nor equality.⁶⁷

We shall now prove that there is both a comparison and equality shown in his passage, but, before that, we shall show that a liar has a bad memory. On the same page in *Inkishaf*, at two places he has written *Ma'adh Allah* and *Na'udhu biAllah minhu* regarding Thanwi's comparison and equality, that is, he has accepted that making a comparison and showing equality is kufr. Then, four pages later on page 143, he writes:

Even if *tashbih* is accepted, there is still no insolence or disrespect.

If that was the case, then why did he write a few pages earlier:

⁶⁶ Bast al-Banan, p.21

⁶⁷ Inkishaf, p.139

That is, Ma'adh Allah, the knowledge of the Prophet ﷺ has been compared or equated to the aforementioned things [children, lunatics, animals].⁶⁸

Yes, it is true that he only wrote this to appease the Muslims, otherwise, his true belief was that tashbih is not disrespectful, insolence or kufr.

He writes:

لفظ " ایسا " ہر جگہ تشبیہ کے لئے ہی نہیں بولا جاتا
*The word Aysa is not always used for tashbih.*⁶⁹

And then gives the example:

زید نے ایسا گھوڑا خریدا جو اسے پسند آیا
Zayd bought such a horse which he liked.

He then asks:

Here, what has the word *Aysa* been used to compare?⁷⁰

This man does not know the rules of the Urdu language whilst he claims to have knowledge that reaches the sky.

Where both the *Mushabbah* [the thing compared] and *Mushabbah Bihi* [the thing compared therewith] are mentioned clearly or have been referred to, in such a case, the word *Aysa* is only used for tashbih. The example of this is not what was mentioned by Bijnuri, rather, an example would be if someone said:

The support that Bijnuri has given to Thanwi, what is the specialty of Bijnuri in this? Such support was also given by Darbhangi and Tandwi.

Now will the Deobandis have some shame and come out of their ignorance and admit that in the passage of Thanwi, the knowledge of the unseen of the Prophet ﷺ and the knowledge of the unseen of children, lunatics and animals are the *Mushabbah* and *Mushabbah Bihi* and the word *Aysa* is only for tashbih.

This was the tashbih in Thanwi's passage; now let us see the equality. After making the tashbih, Thanwi said:

Hence, they should all be called '*Alim al-Ghayb*'.⁷¹

If it becomes permissible to call the Prophet ﷺ '*Alim al-Ghayb*' due to the extensive knowledge of the unseen that Allah bestowed upon him, then why did this necessitate the Deobandis to deem the same permissible for children and lunatics due to them knowing a few

⁶⁸ Inkishaf, p.129

⁶⁹ Inkishaf, p.139

⁷⁰ Ibid.

⁷¹ Hifz al-Iman, p.8

matters of the unseen? This can only mean that the knowledge of the Prophet ﷺ and that of animals and madmen is the same and if there is a difference, it is only minute. Hence, for the same reason why the word '*Alim al-Ghayb*' can be used for the Prophet ﷺ, it can also be used for animals and lunatics. Therefore, it is clear that the insolent consider the knowledge of the Prophet ﷺ to be like that of children and madmen.

Surely, now you will not claim:

Using which principle is there an indication of equality?⁷²

All of these matters and much more were shown to Thanwi during his lifetime regarding his passage of kufr. Scores of questions were asked of him that left him speechless and he had to bring irrelevant excuses in his books *Bast al-Banan* and *Taghyir al-'Unwan* in which he committed further kufr after the one already present in his *Hifz al-Iman*.

The mutual takfir of the Deobandis

Murtaza Hasan Chandpuri vs. Husain Ahmad Madani

In trying to explain the passage of *Hifz al-Iman*, the Deobandis have presented many clarifications that are actually contradictory.

Murtaza Hasan Darbhangi Chandpuri writes: "The word *aysa* is not only used to mean *same*. It can also mean *itna* [اتنا] and *is qadr* [اس قدر - this much] and that is the meaning in *Hifz al-Iman*.⁷³ He also writes: In the contentious passage, the word *aysa* means *this much*. Then where is the *tashbih* [comparison]?⁷⁴

Hence, Chandpuri is saying that if the word '*aysa*' was for *tashbih*, then it would have been controversial and kufr. But, it is not controversial because it means *this much*.

Molwi Husain Ahmad Madani writes: "Mawlana [Thanwi] is saying *aysa* [such]; he is not saying *itna* [this much]. If the word *itna* was used then there was a fear that, *Ma'adh Allah* [we seek the refuge of Allah], the Prophet ﷺ has been made equal in knowledge to these things. Even then, the word *aysa* is used for *tashbih*.⁷⁵

This passage of Molwi Husain Ahmad Madani proves that the word *aysa* in *Hifz al-Iman* is for *tashbih* and if it was used to mean *this much*, it would have been ugly and could have been deemed to be disrespectful to the Prophet ﷺ and therefore kufr.

⁷² Inkishaf, p.139

⁷³ Tawdih al-Bayan fi Hifz al-Iman, p.8

⁷⁴ Ibid.

⁷⁵ al-Shihab al-Thaqib, p.102

The explanations of Chandpuri and Madani can be summarised thusly: Chandpuri is writing that if *aysa* is for *tashbih*, then it is kufr. Hence, by accepting that *aysa* is for *tashbih*, Molwi Husain Ahmad Madani becomes a kafir.

According to Husain Ahmad Madani, if *aysa* was used in the meaning of *itna* and *is qadr*, then it is kufr. This clarification makes Chandpuri a kafir due to him accepting this meaning.

Manzur Ahmad Nu'mani vs. Husain Ahmad Madani

We have seen that Molwi Husain Ahmad believes *aysa* has been used for *tashbih*. However, Molwi Manzur Ahmad Nu'mani, editor of *al-Furqan* in Lucknow, writes: "In *Hifz al-Iman*, the word *aysa* is not for *tashbih* but instead used to mean *itna* [this much]."⁷⁶ He also writes: "In *Hifz al-Iman*, *aysa* is not for *tashbih*."⁷⁷ He also writes: "If the meaning of this passage is what Molwi Sardar Ahmad is implying, then it is kufr according to us too."⁷⁸

Note: This booklet, *Fath-e-Bareilly Ka Dilkash Nazara*, is the Deobandi transcript of the debate that took place between Muhaddith-e-A'zam Mawlana Sardar Ahmad Qadri and Molwi Manzur Ahmad Nu'mani regarding the passage of *Hifz al-Iman*. Mawlana Sardar Ahmad claimed that the word *aysa* is for *tashbih* and Nu'mani claimed that it is used to mean *this much* and that if it was for *tashbih*, then we too consider it to be kufr. We have seen that Molwi Husain Ahmad has written that it is for *tashbih*.⁷⁹

Hence, it is proven that according to Molwi Manzur Nu'mani, Molwi Husain Ahmad Madani is a kafir and vice versa.

Amongst the other excuses that Bijnuri has forged is that a scholar of a certain town or a certain teacher at a school did not make takfir of the Deobandis. Bijnuri claimed to be a great scholar of high learning then why the continuous excuses of *so-and-so*? If Ijma' [consensus] was required, then this has happened:

Whoever insults the Prophet ﷺ or finds a flaw in him, he is a kafir and murtad by Ijma'.⁸⁰

What is left to see? Only that are the passages of *Hifz al-Iman*, *Barahin-e-Qati'ah*, *Tahdhir al-Nas* and the fatwa of Gangohi kufr and disrespectful or not? If they are, then is it established or is it worthy of any Ta'wil, however far-fetched it may be? Hence, there is neither a need to have Ijma' nor a Mujtahid.

The level of knowledge and expertise that Bijnuri claimed for himself, why did he not utilise it? He did not present any valid explanation regarding the passages of his elders and whatever he did write was from earlier Deobandi concoctions. He presented *Bast al-Banan* of Thanwi which has been soundly refuted in *Waq'at al-Sinan*, *Adkhal al-Sinan* and *Qahr Wajid Dayyan*. As for the Deobandi fallacies regarding *Tahdhir al-Nas*, *Barahin-e-Qati'ah* and *Hifz al-Iman*, they have all been answered in *al-Mawt al-Ahmar* and the Deobandi propaganda

⁷⁶ Fath-e-Bareilly Ka Dilkash Nazara, p.32

⁷⁷ Ibid, p.34

⁷⁸ Ibid, p.35

⁷⁹ al-Shihab al-Thaqib, p.102

⁸⁰ al-Mu'taqad, p.148

regarding the denial of the Gangohi fatwa has been dealt with in *Tamhid-e-Iman Ba Ayat-e-Qur'an* and the finest of these refutations against all of these Deobandi works is *al-Istimdad 'ala Ajyal al-irtidad* which was published during the lifetime of Imam Ahmad Rida Baraylawi.

As regards the Gangohi fatwa and the Deobandi denial that it belongs to Gangohi, when a fatwa is attributed to a Mufti and this attribution is well known and the said Mufti does not deny that the fatwa is his, then the likelihood that the fatwa was written by someone else and attributed to the Mufti decreases. When there is no denial, the fatwa will be considered to be from the Mufti. That is why it is in *Tamhid-e-Iman*:

During the lifetime of Zayd, a fatwa is published with his seal of approval and that fatwa most definitely contains kufr and is published year after year. Its refutation also gets published by various people who deem Zayd to be a kafir due to it. Zayd lives for 15 years after its publication and sees and hears all of this but does not publish a denial of the attribution of the fatwa towards him but rather remains silent until his death. After all this, will any sound minded individual opine that Zayd denied the attribution of the fatwa towards himself or that the fatwa had a different meaning?⁸¹

This is the case with the fatwa of Gangohi. It is in *Tamhid-e-Iman*:

The fatwa in which it has been clearly stated that Allah is a liar, its original copy alongside a seal of approval is preserved. Photos have been taken of it one of which I took with me along with the other books of insolence to show the scholars of Haramayn. This fatwa of calling Allah a liar was published 18 years ago in Rabi' al-Akhir, 1308 AH, in the periodical *Sayanat al-Nas* along with its refutation. Then, in 1318 AH, a more detailed refutation was published in *Matba' Gulzar Hasani*, Bombay. Then, in 1320 AH, an even stronger refutation was published in *Matba' Tuhfa Hanafiyyha*, Patna, Azimabad. The author of the fatwa died in 1323 AH and remained silent till his death. He neither said that the fatwa is not his – even though denying it in books published by himself was easy – nor did he say that its meaning is not what that the scholars of Ahlu's Sunnah are understanding but rather this is what I meant nor was it easy to withstand his name being connected to clear kufr but he still did not reply.⁸²

The books mentioned above that have shattered Deobandi concoctions should have been read in detail by Bijnuri. Each and every point in them should have been answered and even if one point that proves the kufr of the Deobandis was left unanswered, even then the Deobandis would have been considered kafir and murtad. In fact, if all of the points mentioned in these books were answered, even then the Deobandis would not have been considered Muslims. Why?

It is because during their own lifetimes, those who wrote these passages were refuted and takfir was made against them. No Islamic meaning was given by them regarding their passages. Hence, even if the passages were not established in their meaning, they became established due to the Deobandis not being able to provide a correct meaning. Now, what benefit will any Ta'wil bring to the authors? They remain kafirs.

⁸¹ *Tamhid-e-Iman*, p.39

⁸² *Ibid*, p.38-39

We urge all readers to deliberate on this article without any bias at all.

Peace and blessings be upon the Prophet ﷺ, his family and companions.