

# Refutation of Composite Nationalism

Mawlana Zafar Ahmad al-‘Uthmani

Translator’s note: At the end of the Book of Campaigns (*Kitab al-Siyar*) from *I‘la al-Sunan*, Mawlana Zafar Ahmad al-‘Uthmani (1310-1394 H/1892-1974 CE) writes: “Its compilation was [done] under the supervision of the prodigy of this age, the knower of Allah, the sage of the Muhammadan nation, the reviver of the Islamic religion, my master, Shaykh Mawlana Muhammad Ashraf ‘Ali al-Thanawi (1280-1362 H/1863-1943 CE), Allah extend his stay amongst us and give us the good fortune of his sacred breaths for a long time. All praise to Allah by Whose glory and magnificence, good deeds are accomplished. Our final call is that all praise belongs to Allah Lord of the Worlds.” After this comes a section under the title, “An Addendum to the Book of Campaigns: Refutation of Composite Nationalism,” in which he addresses a particular political ideology popular at that time in India which has correlations with modernist tendencies amongst many Muslims today. I therefore, felt, it was fitting to translate this 25-page refutation. The date given at the end of the addendum for the completion of this refutation is Dhu al-Qa‘dah 1357 H (January 1939 CE).

## Contents:

Translator’s Note	1
Hadiths	2
Definition of Composite Nationalism	5
The Ruling of Composite Nationalism	5
The Idea of Composite Nationalism in India	6
Refutation of Arguments used to Justify Composite Nationalism	7
An Explanation of the Correct Stance on this Matter with Reference to the Hadiths of the Chapter	14
Regarding the Festivals of the Idolaters and what is Permitted and not Permitted	18
Regarding Islam’s Position on Gandhi’s Nonviolent Resistance	20
The Author’s Dream of the Prophet (peace and blessings be upon him)	25
Final Remark	25

## Hadiths:

1. Narrated from Abu Hurayrah in a long hadith, raised [to the Prophet (Allah bless him and grant him peace)]: “Verily, Allah has removed from you the high-mindedness of Jahiliyya [pre-Islamic ignorance] and its glorification of forefathers. It is only a pious believer or a wretched sinner. Men are all the sons of Adam, and Adam is from dust.” Al-Tirmidhi and Abu Dawud narrated it. (*Mishkat al-Masabih*, p. 418)
2. Narrated from ‘Uqbah ibn ‘Amir, he said: Allah’s Messenger (Allah bless him and grant him peace) said: “These ancestries of yours are not an insult upon one [another]. All of you are the children of Adam. The measuring container is nearly full; you will never fill it [a metaphor served to illustrate everyone’s deficiency, no matter their lineage after Adam]. No one has any superiority over another except by religion and piety; ([to the end of] the hadith).” Ahmad narrated it and al-Bayhaqi in *Shu‘ab al-Iman*. (*Mishkat al-Masabih*, p. 418)
3. Narrated from Abu Dharr, that the Prophet (Allah bless him and grant him peace) said to him: “Ponder! You are no better than a black person or a red person, unless you are superior to him in piety.” Ahmad narrated it, and its narrators are trustworthy.
4. Narrated from Abu Sa‘id, he said: Allah’s Messenger (Allah bless him and grant him peace) said: “Verily, your Lord is one, and your father [Adam] is one. Thus, there is no superiority of an Arab over a non-Arab or a red man over a black man, except by piety.” Al-Tabrani narrated it, and al-Bazzar the like of it; the narrators of al-Bazzar are the narrators of the *Sahih*.
5. Narrated from Humayd ibn ‘Abd al-Rahman ibn ‘Awf, he said: ‘Abd al-Rahman ibn ‘Awf heard a man say: “I am the closest of people to the Messenger of Allah (Allah bless him and grant him peace).” Thereupon, he said: “Others besides you are closer to him, though you have his ancestry.” Al-Tabrani narrated it.
6. Narrated from Abu Hurayrah, he said: Allah’s Messenger (Allah bless him and grant him peace) said: “When it is the Day of Resurrection, Allah will command a caller to announce: ‘Know that indeed I appointed a caste and you appointed a caste. Thus, I made the noblest of you the most pious amongst you, and you refused but to say so-and-so the son of so-and-so is better than so-and-so the son of so-and-so. Thus, today I will elevate my caste and debase your caste. Where are the pious?’” Al-Tabrani narrated it.

[Al-Haythami said]: “In the first [hadith] (no. 5) is his [i.e. Tabrani’s] teacher, al-Miqdam ibn Dawud who is weak, and in the second is Talhah ibn ‘Amr [who is] rejected.” (*Majma‘ al-Zawa‘id*, 8:84)

I [Mawlana Zafar Ahmad al-‘Uthmani] say: As for al-Miqdam (d. 283), he is differed upon. Maslamah said: “There is no harm in his narrations.” Muhammad ibn Yusuf al-Kindi said: “A jurist, jurisconsult.” Al-Mas‘udi said in *Muruj al-Dhahab*: “He was from the great jurists and the senior fellows of Malik [i.e. his school].” They only criticised his narration from Khalid ibn Nizar with a weak criticism as mentioned in *Lisan al-Mizan* (6:89).

As for Talhah ibn ‘Amr, if he is [Talhah ibn ‘Amr] al-Hadrami al-Makki, then Jarir ibn Hazim, al-Thawri, Abu Dawud al-Tayalisi and others narrated from him. Ibn ‘Adi said: “A group of

trustworthy individuals narrated from him and most of what he narrated is not followed-up.” ‘Abd al-Razzaq narrated from Ma‘mar that he, Shu‘bah, al-Thawri and Ibn Jurayj met, and then a *shaykh* approached and dictated to us four thousand hadiths by heart and he did not err except in two places while we were looking in the book. The error was not from us or from him. It was only from above [i.e. Allah]. The man was Talhah ibn ‘Amr. End [quote] from *Tahdhib al-Tahdhib*. In this is the greatest indication of his [good] memory, his ascertainment and his precision. And if he is [Talhah ibn ‘Amr] al-Qannad, then Ibn Abi Hatim mentioned him and did not mention any criticism of him, and al-Bukhari narrated from him without chain, and Ibn Hibban mentioned him in *Kitab al-Thiqat*, while Abu Dawud said: “He is not strong,” (*Tahdhib al-Tahdhib*) which is a light weakening. Hence, the two narrations are acceptable as proof, especially since they have corroborants which we mentioned previously.

7. ‘Uthman ibn Abi Shaybah narrated to us: Abu al-Nadr, meaning Hashim ibn al-Qasim narrated to us: ‘Abd al-Rahman ibn Thabit narrated to us: Hassan ibn ‘Atiyah narrated to us from Abu Munib al-Jarashi from Ibn ‘Umar (Allah be pleased with them), he said: Allah’s Messenger (Allah bless him and grant him peace) said: “Whoever resembles a people (*qawm*), he is from them.” Abu Dawud narrated it. Ibn Taymiyyah said: “This is a good chain, since Ibn Abi Shaybah and Abu al-Nadr and Hassan ibn ‘Atiyah are trustworthy, famous and eminent narrators of the two *Sahils*; Yahya ibn Ma‘in, Abu Zur‘ah and Ahmad ibn ‘Abd Allah said [about] ‘Abd al-Rahman bn Thabit ibn Thawban: ‘There is no harm in him.’ ‘Abd al-Rahman ibn Ibrahim Dahim said: ‘He is trustworthy.’ Abu Hatim said: ‘He is upstanding in hadith.’ As for Abu Munib al-Jarashi, al-‘Ijli said about him: ‘He is trustworthy, and I do not know anyone who mentioned him negatively.’ Hassan ibn ‘Atiyah heard from him. Imam Ahmad and others used this hadith as proof.” (*Iqtida’ al-Sirat al-Mustaqim*, p. 39)

It was [also] narrated in this hadith from Ibn ‘Umar from the Prophet (Allah bless him and grant him peace) that he forbade resemblance with the [non-Muslim] non-Arabs and he said: “Whoever resembles a people he is from them.” Al-Qadi Abu Ya‘la narrated it. Many of the scholars used this as proof for the detestability of things like the dress of the disbelievers. (*Iqtida’ al-Sirat al-Mustaqim*, p. 40)

8. Narrated from Jabir in the hadith of the Farewell Pilgrimage and its sermon on the Day of ‘Arafah, while mentioning the hadith he said: He (Allah bless him and grant him peace) said: “Everything from the matter of Jahiliyyah is laid under my feet [i.e. cancelled].” Muslim narrated it. (*Iqtida’ al-Sirat al-Mustaqim*, p. 53)
9. Through the route of Malik from al-Zuhri from Abu Salamah ibn ‘Abd al-Rahman, he said: Qays ibn Matatiyya arrived at a circle in which Suhayb al-Rumi, Salman al-Farisi and Bilal al-Habashi were [present], and he said: “This is Aws and Khazraj, they have undertaken to help this man [i.e. the Prophet (Allah bless him and grant him peace)], so what is the matter with these [non-Arab] people [that they are helping an Arab]?” Thereupon Mu‘adh ibn Jabal stood up and seized his collar, and took him to the Prophet (Allah bless him and grant him peace) and informed him of his statement. The Prophet (Allah bless him and grant him peace) stood up angered, dragging his cloak until he entered the mosque. Then it was announced: “The prayer is congregating.” Thereupon, he ascended the pulpit, praised Allah and glorified Him, and he said: “As for what follows: O people! Verily, the Lord is One Lord. The father is one father. The religion is one religion. Verily, Arabic is not for any one of you a mother and a father; it is only a language, so whoever speaks Arabic, he is an Arab.” Al-Silafi narrated the

hadith. Ibn Taymiyyah said: “This hadith is weak, and it appears to be invented upon Malik. However, its meaning is not farfetched, rather it is sound from some routes as we have mentioned previously.” (*Iqtida’ al-Sirat al-Mustaqim*, p. 39)

10. Narrated from ‘Amr ibn Murrah regarding His statement “They do not witness falsehood,” (Qur’an 25:72) “[meaning,] they do not support the idolaters with their idolatry and do not mix with them.” Abu al-Shaykh narrated it and Ibn Taymiyyah was silent about it in *Iqtida’ al-Sirat al-Mustaqim*, p. 81.
11. Narrated from ‘Ata ibn Yasar, he said: ‘Umar said: “Avoid the speech of the non-Arabs, and entering upon the idolaters into their temples on the day of their festival.” Abu al-Shaykh also narrated it (p. 86), and al-Bayhaqi narrated it with an authentic chain from Sufyan al-Thawri from Thawr ibn Zayd from ‘Ata ibn Dinar the like of it.
12. With the chain from al-Thawri from ‘Awf from al-Walid or Abu al-Walid from ‘Abd Allah ibn ‘Amr, he said: “Whoever builds in the lands of the foreigners and performs their Nayruz and their Mahrajan, and resembles them until he dies while he is like this, he will be gathered with them on the Day of Resurrection.” It has multiple authentic and good chains, mentioned by Ibn Taymiyyah. (*Iqtida’ al-Sirat al-Mustaqim*, p. 95)
13. ‘Isa ibn Yunus narrated to us from Thawr from ‘Umar ibn Yazid, he said: ‘Umar wrote to Abu Musa (Allah be pleased with them): “As for what follows: Gain understanding of the Sunnah and gain understanding of Arabic, and understand the Arabic of the Qur’an, for it is in Arabic.” Ibn Abi Shaybah narrated it. (*Iqtida’ al-Sirat al-Mustaqim*, p. 98)
14. Isma’il ibn ‘Aliyyah narrated to us from Dawud ibn Abi Hind that Muhammad ibn Sa’d ibn Abi Waqqas heard a people speaking in Persian, so he said: “What is the matter with this Zoroastrianism after pure monotheism?!” Ibn Abi Shaybah narrated it. (*Iqtida’ al-Sirat al-Mustaqim*, p. 97)
15. Al-Silafi narrated from the hadith of Sa’id ibn al-‘Ala’ al-Barda’i: Ishaq ibn Ibrahim al-Balkhi narrated to us: ‘Umar ibn Harun al-Balkhi narrated to us: Usamah ibn Zayd narrated to us from Nafi’ from Ibn ‘Umar (Allah be pleased with them), he said: Allah’s Messenger (Allah bless him and grant him peace) said: “Whoever is proficient at speaking in Arabic must not speak in non-Arabic, for indeed it causes hypocrisy in him.” He also narrated it with another recognised chain to Abu Suhayl Mahmud ibn ‘Amr ibn al-‘Abkari: Muhammad ibn al-Hasan ibn Muhammad al-Muqri’ narrated to us: Ahmad ibn Khalil narrated to us in Balkh: Ishaq ibn Ibrahim al-Hariri narrated to us: ‘Umar ibn Harun narrated to us from Usamah from Nafi’ from Ibn ‘Umar with it [i.e. the hadith]. Ibn Taymiyyah said: “This statement resembles the statement of ‘Umar ibn al-Khattab. As for raising it [to the Prophet (Allah bless him and grant him peace)], it is a clear forgery.”

## Explanation

### [Definition of Composite Nationalism]

I say: This phrase [“composite nationalism” – *al-qawmiyyat al-muttahidah*] has been mentioned repeatedly on the tongues of the politicians of our time, particularly in India. It has a definition according to them which they have adopted, and that is what we wish to refute. Those who are blind to the technical definition of these people and suffice with the linguistic meaning, and thus find no fault with it, have removed the noose of jurisprudence and sacred knowledge from their necks [as it is the concepts behind phraseologies that matter, not the phrases themselves].

After this we say:

The [technical] definition of composite nationalism is that:

- peoples of different religions, Islamic and non-Islamic, completely assimilate, such that none of them have a social culture (*tamaddun*) distinct from the social culture of others, nor is the social conduct (*mu'asharah*) of one people distinguished from the social conduct of other peoples;
- and they are all religiously equal, either by inventing a religion composed of different religions or by not exposing any trace of religion except internally, while externally they are as one nation; such that any single people does not have a separate title, rather collectively they are called by a unified title due to their common land or lineage or colour, for example;
- and no one people from them have a separate [political and legal] system, rather it is necessary for their system to be majoritarian based on the mixed [opinions] of these peoples; and in determining this system and its laws, the views of the majority of them are considered; thus whatever the majority agree with, it is approved, and whatever they reject, it is rejected and is never approved.

### [The Ruling of Composite Nationalism]

Once you are aware of this, there is no doubt that such “composite nationalism” is only permissible when the rule of Islam is dominant and the Muslims are the majority, such that the social culture and social conduct of the disbelievers is erased, while the social culture and social conduct of the Muslims survive, and externally the religion of all peoples is Islam, without inventing a religion composed of multiple religions, because Islam does not tolerate any disbelief permeating it since a [religion] composed of Islam and disbelief is undeniably disbelief as is not hidden; and the language of all the peoples is the language of the Muslims; and their system is the system of Islam and no other.

It is binding on the Muslims of India to exert their full effort to [achieve] the like of this, and this will never happen except by uniting the various Muslim groups under one banner, and removing the divisions between them. If they were to join on one path, and their word became one, and they became one unit like a well-structured building, dominance will only be with them, if Allah Almighty wills, even if their enemies are many. Thus, there is no need for them to seek help from others of the idolaters though they lead [people] astray and dominate and multiply.

If the matter was reversed, and the rule of disbelief was dominant, and the disbelievers the majority, and the social culture and social conduct of Muslims was made to be lost and forgotten, while the social culture and social conduct of disbelievers dominant over the peoples, and the symbols of Islam were erased and the symbols of disbelief erected, and the language of Muslims was erased and the language of disbelief kept alive and the Muslims were forced to speak in their language and leave their Islamic

language, and their [political and legal] system was premised on the opinions of the majority, that is the disbelievers, even if a religion was invented for them composed of [different] religions and no trace of Islam remained externally and in plain sight, and none of its symbols stand erect in villages and cities, no Muslim will doubt that such nationalism is invalid and forbidden according to the Shari'ah, rather no one will doubt it being disbelief and apostasy or [at least] leading to disbelief.

There is no doubt that acquiring such composite nationalism leading to a majoritarian government is not at all from jihad, because the objective of jihad is to elevate the word of Allah, not mere defence of homeland, because if defence of homeland leads to the authority of idolatry and the dominance of the idolaters over it [i.e. the land] instead of the authority of Christians, it would be like fleeing from rain and standing under a drain. So how strange, the feeble-mindedness of the opinion of one who calls this defence a jihad for freedom and is heedless of the reality of this freedom and its implication since a majoritarian government only helps in the freedom of the peoples who are the most in number, and as for the one which is least in number they have no freedom in this at all, and its share in this [majoritarian government] is merely servitude to the majority in whose hands are the reins of authority. The numbers in India are in the favour of the idolaters not the Muslims, so the benefit of composite nationalism and majoritarian government will not return but to the idolaters, and the Muslims will not achieve from it [anything] besides servitude [of the idolaters] in place of [an earlier] servitude [to the British].

It is not hidden that servitude to the indigenous people is more severe than servitude to a foreigner, especially since composite nationalism does not come about except by abolishing the name of Islam and its symbols and making all the peoples as one nation, no people from them being distinguished from another people, that is the minority of them is not distinguished from the majority, since a majoritarian [government] forcefully represses only the minority and does not harm the majority at all due to the rein of authority being in their hands, so what need is there for them to annihilate their religion and its symbols and in abolishing the signs of their people and its close relatives?

#### [The Idea of Composite Nationalism in India]

From the misfortune of the inhabitants of India is the authority of the Christians over the land of India for a hundred and fifty years, and their effort to weaken the Muslims and strengthen the idolaters therein. Then a group of Indian idolaters arose called "Congress," attempting to build a composite nationalism in India between its Muslims and its idolaters in the conceptual understanding we outlined. A group affiliated to knowledge from the Muslims stood to assist it, and a multitude of the commoners became deluded by them like cattle, so they claimed that composite nationalism is established by the text of the Qur'an and hadith. "Grave is the word that comes out of their mouths. They say nothing but lie." (Qur'an 18:5) I swear by Allah! The Christian authority over the land of India is not more harmful to its Muslim inhabitants than this composite nationalism which the Congress and those who align themselves with it on this [matter] from these scholars and fools call towards; since the majority of the people of India are idolaters, so if they are successful in what they desire, of composite nationalism, the explanation of which has preceded, the traces of Islam and its symbols will fade and idolatry will dominate and its families and its armies will gain strength, and the foundations of Islam will be destroyed and the symbols of the idols will be elevated. This is visible in the earnestness of the Indians to abolish the Islamic symbols, in particular the slaughter of cows and the Urdu language which comprises of the Arabic language. Their senior leaders announced that composite nationalism will never arise in India except by erecting a mixed social culture composed of the social culture of the Muslims and idolaters, and you have no alternative to building a new religion composed of two religions. Some of them say: "Religion is separate from politics, so the inhabitants of India must have a

new education system in which there is no interference of the Qur'an and other books of religion, and they must also have one common language for all peoples, not having a particularity with the Muslims, and [they must have] one system which is not premised on religion but on the opinion of the majority and the majority opinions." Some of them say: "The adherents to all religions ought to know that God and religions being in the highest place of heaven is better than they interfere with worldly matters and political issues." [And they say] other statements explicitly within the connotation of composite nationalism and a majoritarian system.

I implore you by Allah! Is such composite nationalism that is clearly flawed approved of by Islam, and are Allah and His Messenger, the master of creation (upon him blessing and peace), satisfied with it? Never, by Allah! Rather, it is destruction of the structure of Islam, removal of the noose of divine oneness (*tawhid*) from the necks of creation, dragging its people to apostasy and heresy and pure atheism.

#### [Refutation of Arguments used to Justify Composite Nationalism]

By this, the answer to the distortion of some foolish scholars that Britain is a greater enemy to Islam and its adherents, and its authority over the land of India is a greater reason for its power and its rule over Muslim lands like Egypt and Syria, so we must totally eliminate its authority from India by erecting a composite nationalism with the idolaters to help the world of Islam and then we will devote [ourselves] after that entirely to these idolaters, is apparent. We say: It is not permissible to acquire goodness by means of wickedness, so if we were to concede that composite nationalism will totally eliminate the authority of the Christians over the land of India, despite this, it entails the authority of idolatry and its adherents over it, and the removal of Islam and its symbols from it. So will anybody with a grasp of intellect be satisfied, while he knows that a land from the lands of Islam will benefit by the removal of Islam and its symbols from other lands? Never, by Allah, this is not something that a Muslim who believes in Allah and the Last Day will ever be pleased with.

The jurists have stated that it is not permissible to tolerate a known harm in order to acquire a possible benefit. Furthermore, the defence which the Congress have undertaken does not bring about an immediate revolution, rather it brings it about gradually in order to ruin something of the foundation of the authority of Christianity and build in its place something of the majoritarianism which is its replacement, so the authority of Christians is not eliminated from India except that the majoritarian authority is strengthened therein and its symbols rise and its foundations ascend, and that will not happen except when the traces of Islam are erased and its symbols abolished and its armies eliminated and its foundations destroyed and its structure ruined. So how will you be entirely devoted to these idolaters when your hearts have reached your throats? And who told you that the democracy which will appear in your land after the authority of the Christians will not help them [i.e. the Christians] against the Muslims and they will not seek dominance and the upper-hand over the lands of Muslims? For it is manifest that democracy will not remain a democracy, rather it will transform into a repressive autocracy, so if a number of Muslims are fighting their Muslim brothers today to assist the Christians because of hunger and poverty and suffering, then their children and their children's children will fight their Muslim brothers willingly to assist composite nationalism in which they were brought up and with the milk of which they were nourished. Hence, the establishment of composite nationalism in India in a jihad for freedom is not part of helping the world of Islam at all.

As for their [i.e. the Muslims who advocate composite nationalism] statement: "Wherever Allah Almighty mentions in His Book the nations of the Prophets, He unqualifiedly uses the term 'nation' (*qawm*) for a group including Muslims and idolaters, so the adoption of composite nationalism is established from the mixture of peoples of different religions," it is pure fallacy and baseless forgery

because the accuracy of unqualifiedly using ‘nation’ for the aforementioned group does not entail the permissibility of adopting composite nationalism which the politicians adopt in this time. Do you not see that Allah Almighty, despite unqualifiedly using the term ‘nation of Nuh’ for their Muslims and their idolaters, He separated them before that into two groups and He distinguished between the two parties, by His statement: “The similitude of the two parties is as the blind and the deaf and the seer and the hearer. Are they equal in similitude?” (11:24) And He said to Nuh when He called to His Lord, “My son is of my household! Surely Your promise is the truth and You are the Most Just of Judges” (11:45): “O Noah! Verily, he is not of your household; verily, he is of evil conduct, so do not ask Me that of which you have no knowledge. I admonish you lest you be among the ignorant.” (11:46) And He said: “Indeed, there is an excellent example for you in Ibrahim and those with him, when they said to their people, ‘We disown you and what you worship instead of Allah. We disbelieve in you. Enmity and hatred has arisen between us and you forever, unless you believe in Allah alone.’” (60:4) All this negates composite nationalism according to the [definition] which they adopt. Whoever has doubt about this, let him say to the idolaters inviting to this nationalism: “We disown you and what you worship instead of Allah. We disbelieve in you. Enmity and hatred has arisen between us and you forever, unless you believe in Allah alone” (Qur’an 60:4) and then let him see if they will be happy with making him an integral member of the members of that nationalism or dispel him from the circles and accuse him of pure fanaticism. And He Almighty said: “Now, can the one who knows that whatever has been revealed to you from your Lord is the truth, be equal to one who is blind?” (13:19) and other verses distinguishing between Muslims and idolaters and between the friends of Allah and His enemies. Is it possible for anyone to dare to say that the nations of Nuh and Ibrahim and Musa and others of the Prophets were on one religion composed of Islam and disbelief or that the Prophets adopted for their nations a composite nationalism in the sense which is intended by the politicians from the children of our time? Never, no one will dare [to say] this, except one who has not smelt the fragrance of knowledge, because the Qur’an is explicit in that “all men used to be a single community. Then, Allah sent prophets carrying good news and warning, and sent down with them the Book with Truth to judge between people in matters of their dispute. But it was no other than those to whom it was given who, led by envy against each other, disputed it after the clear signs had come to them. Then Allah, by His will, guided those who believed to the truth over which they disputed; and Allah guides whom He wills to the straight path.” (2:213) In this is an indication – according to one of two opinions – that the sending of Prophets was a distinguishing shredder of the singularity which people were upon from before, negating the composite nationalism which they would adopt in the love between them in the life of the world. Hence, the unqualified usage of the ‘nation of Nuh’ and the ‘nation of Ibrahim’ etc. for their Muslims and their disbelievers was only because of their being one nation before the sending of Prophets to them. Where in this is there that Allah Almighty made them one nation, or He adopted for them a composite nationalism? For indeed this is a new terminology invented by politicians from Europe, and those who tread their path in abolishing divine laws and taking off the noose of religion from the necks follow them in this, returning to the earlier Jahiliyya which the Qur’an alluded to by its statement: “All men used to be a single community” – i.e. on falsehood – “Then, Allah sent prophets carrying good news and warning”; and its statement relating from Ibrahim: “You have chosen only idols instead of Allah. The love between you is only in the life of the world.” (29:25) And His Almighty statement: “They wish that you should disbelieve, as they have disbelieved, and thus you become all alike. So, do not take friends from among them.” (4:89) Consider His statement “and thus you become all alike,” how it nullifies the basis of composite nationalism, for indeed it has no meaning according to its advocates except the equality of all peoples, in secret and in public, and their forming one body in social intercourse and civilisation.



So it is strange, the dimwittedness of these people, how they reverse the reality and construe composite nationalism which Allah sent the Prophets to abolish and shred as being established in the Qur'an and hadith. To Allah is the complaint of the distortion of words from their places.

As for their statement that the Messenger of Allah (Allah bless him and grant him peace) wrote, when he arrived at Madinah, a document between the believers and Muslims of Quraysh and Yathrib and those who followed them and joined with them and fought with them, that they are one community (*ummah*) besides the people, and in this [document] it is mentioned that "the Jews of Banu 'Awf are a community with the believers, for the Muslims is their religion and for the Jews is their religion," hence this is a composite nationalism which the Messenger of Allah (Allah bless him and grant him peace) enacted between the believers and the Jews who were disbelievers. [The fallacy] in this is that they became one community not merely because they shared a homeland or lineage or colour or language, but they only became so due to the pact which they made between themselves and this is not at all from composite nationalism, since a pact is only ever between two conflicting parties, nothing bringing them together besides a pact they agree to. This is something we don't denounce or dispute, rather it is something we have invited you to many times: that you make with the idolaters of the members of the Congress a pact on which the two parties, the party of Allah and the party of Satan, agree. Then they say: This is from religious fanaticism and group nationalism and not from composite nationalism at all; so look how they are deluded.

Furthermore, the Messenger of Allah (Allah bless him and grant him peace) did not make the Muslims and Jews one community whereby their system would be majoritarian, premised on the opinion of the majority and the majority opinion, rather the rein of their system was in the hand of Allah's Messenger (Allah bless him and grant him peace) alone and his rule was dominant over them. This is proven by what is in this very document in his statement: "None of them may leave [Madinah] except by the permission of Muhammad (Allah bless him and grant him peace)," and his statement: "Whatever happens between the signatories of this document, of an incident or dispute, from which corruption is feared, it must be referred to Allah and Muhammad, the Messenger of Allah (Allah bless him and grant him peace)." (*Sirah Ibn Hisham*, 1:280)

There is no dispute over the permissibility of such composite nationalism in which the rule of Islam is dominant over it – but how distant is this from what you call to of a nationalism in which the rein of its system is in the hand of the majority and they are the idolaters and the rule of disbelief is dominant over it? "Will they then not meditate on the Qur'an, or are there locks on the hearts?" (Qur'an 47:24) "Alas for the slaves (of Allah)!" (Qur'an 36:30) May these minds be destroyed, how they argue using an opposite [to prove its] opposite. "The blind and the sighted are not equal, nor are darkness and light, nor shade and the heat of the sun." (Qur'an 35:19-21)

They say that the Messenger of Allah (Allah bless him and grant him peace) made Banu Hashim and Banu al-Muttalib, the Muslims of them and the disbelievers of them, into one community aside from Quraysh, and a composite nationalism formed between the Muslims and idolaters of them, so they were altogether one body against Quraysh, helping him and protecting him from their persecution, and the rein of this authority was in the hand of Abu Talib who was an idolater and he was the leader of the people, and in whose hand was both [the power] to execute and cancel. We say: You lied and you did not produce any evidence for your claim, since the Messenger of Allah (Allah bless him and grant him peace) never requested help from Abu Talib, and Abu Talib would only help him and protect him from his own accord due to what Allah disposed him to, of loving his nephew; and likewise Banu Hashim and Banu al-Muttalib, they only helped him and protected him due to what they were disposed to, of tribalism and disdain of one of them being harmed at the hand of another tribe, and all of that was

of their own accord, not due to a request from Allah's Messenger (Allah bless him and grant him peace), nor because he formed a composite nation in the sense which the politicians of the disbelievers invented; and the Messenger of Allah (Allah bless him and grant him peace) was not a follower of them in this, rather all of them followed him. Do you not see that he would openly declare Islam to his people and proclaim it as Allah commanded him to (Qur'an 15:94), and mention their gods and criticise them, insult them, and mock their customs and accuse their fathers of error and the idolaters of Banu Hashim and Banu al-Muttalib heard all of this and were not satisfied with it from him, for Abu Talib was on the religion of Quraysh and so were the idolaters of Banu Hashim and Banu al-Muttalib and despite this, they helped Allah's Messenger (Allah bless him and grant him peace) and protected him from the persecution of Quraysh until the nobles of Quraysh said to Abu Talib: "Your nephew has cursed our gods, insulted our religion, mocked our way of life and accused our forefathers of error; either you must stop him or you must let us get at him, for you yourself are in the same position as we are in opposition to him and we will rid you of him...we cannot endure that our fathers should be reviled, our customs mocked and our gods insulted. Until you rid us of him, we will fight the pair of you until one side perishes'... Abu Talib was deeply distressed at the breach with his people and their enmity but he could not desert the Messenger of Allah (Allah bless him and grant him peace) and give him up to them...Abu Talib sent for the Messenger of Allah (Allah bless him and grant him peace) and told him what his people had said. 'Spare me and yourself,' he said. 'Do not put me on a burden greater than I can bear.' The Messenger of Allah (Allah bless him and grant him peace) thought that his uncle had the idea of abandoning and betraying him, and that he was going to lose his help and support. He answered, 'O my uncle! By Allah, if they put the sun in my right hand and the moon in me left on condition that I abandon this course, until Allah has made it victorious, or I perish therein, I would not abandon it.' Then the Messenger of Allah (Allah bless him and grant him peace) broke into tears and got up. As he turned away, his uncle called him and said, 'Come back, my nephew,' and when he came back, he said, 'Go and say what you please, for by Allah I will never give you up on any count.'" (*Sirah Ibn Hisham*, 1:140) [Translation extracted from Alfred Guillaume's *The life of Muhammad*, p. 119]

So look! Did the Messenger of Allah (Allah bless him and grant him peace) request help from his uncle or did he protect him of his own accord? And was Abu Talib a commander over the Messenger of Allah (Allah bless him and grant him peace) or was he (Allah bless him and grant him peace) the commander over himself, unconcerned with those who helped him or forsook him? And is there not [evidence] in this that the residents of Makkah invited the Messenger of Allah (Allah bless him and grant him peace) to a composite nationalism and Abu Talib agreed with them on this and invited the Prophet (Allah bless him and grant him peace) to it and he refused them and him, and persisted on publicly announcing insult of their gods and mocking their way of life and proclaiming what Allah commanded him and distinguishing between truth and falsehood, and Abu Talib helped him on this and Banu Hashim and Banu al-Muttalib agreed with him, so they were protectors of the religion and helpers of Islam despite remaining on idolatry, and that was from the mysteries of Allah's work through His Prophet since He helped him and aided him via his enemies, despite his proclamation [of Islam] by Allah's command and his hurling the falsehood which they were upon by means of the truth? Is this from the composite nationalism which the Congress calls to at all? Never, by Allah! No one will analogise it to that except [one with] a twisted heart or [one who] reverses reality.

Ibn Ishaq said: "Then the Quraysh incited people against the companions of the Messenger of Allah (Allah bless him and grant him peace) who had become Muslims. Every tribe fell upon the Muslims among them, beating them and seducing them from their religion. Allah protected His Messenger (Allah bless him and grant him peace) from them through his uncle, who, when he saw what Quraysh were doing, called upon Banu Hashim and Banu al-Muttalib to stand with him in protecting the Messenger of Allah (Allah bless him and grant him peace). This they agreed to do, with the exception of

Abu Lahab, the accursed enemy of Allah. Abu Talib was delighted at the response of his tribe and their kindness, and began to praise them and bring to men's memory their past. He mentioned the superiority of the Messenger of Allah (Allah bless him and grant him peace) among them and his position so that he might strengthen their resolve and that they might extend their kindness to him. He said: 'If one day Quraysh gathered together to boast, 'Abd Manaf would be their heart and soul...'" (*Sirah Ibn Hisham*, 1:141) [Translation extracted from Alfred Guillaume's *The life of Muhammad*, pp. 120-1]

In this is evidence that Abu Talib is the one who stood in Banu Hashim and Banu al-Muttalib and called them to help the Messenger of Allah (Allah bless him and grant him peace) and protect him from Quraysh, and that was not from his (Allah bless him and grant him peace) doing, nor by his request, rather he - my father and my mother be sacrificed for him - was not in need of their help and from requesting aid from them, and they only did what they did because of the tribalism they were disposed to, and due to what they saw in the Messenger of Allah (Allah bless him and grant him peace), of signs to which their necks fell in humility, although they did not announce their acceptance of Islam and faith and remained on the religion of their forefathers as imitators, but intelligence and balance called them to avoid persecuting this trustworthy prophet and stop those who wanted to persecute him from the idolaters.

Ibn Ishaq said: "When Abu Talib feared that the multitude would overwhelm him with his family, he composed the following ode, in which he claims protection in the sanctuary of Makkah and by his position therein. He showed his affection for the nobles of his people while, nevertheless, he told them and others in his poetry that he was not going to give up the Messenger of Allah (Allah bless him and grant him peace) or surrender him on any count whatever, but he would die in his defence:

'When I saw the people had no love for us

And had severed every tie and relationship

....

I stood firm against them with my pliant spear

And my shining sword, heirloom of princes

...

You lie, by God's house, we will not leave Makkah

And go forth until your affairs are in confusion

We will not give him up until we lie dead around him

And be mindful of our wives and children

...

By my life I am devoted to Ahmad

And his brothers as a constant lover

May he never cease to be an adornment to the people of the world

An ornament to those whom the Lord of difficulties has befriended

For who among men can hope to be like him

When judges assess rival claim to merit

Clement, rightly guided, just, serious

Friend of a god, ever mindful of him

By Allah! But that I might create a precedent

That would be brought against our elders in assemblies

We would follow him whatever fate might bring

In deadly earnest, not in idle words

They know that our son is not held a liar by us

And is not concerned with foolish falsehood

Ahmad has struck so deep a root amongst us

That the attacks of the arrogant fail to affect him

I shielded and defended him myself by every means

The Lord of mankind strengthen him by His help

And display a religion whose truth holds no falsehood.” (*Sirah Ibn Hisham*, 1:147) [Translation extracted from Alfred Guillaume’s *The life of Muhammad*, pp. 122-7]

In this is evidence that Abu Talib was never a commander over the Messenger of Allah (Allah bless him and grant him peace), rather he (Allah bless him and grant him peace) was a commander over him, adored by him. Abu Talib recognised in him integrity, truth and sound judgement but he disdained following him and announcing obedience to him for fear of insult; so where is this from the composite nationalism which the Congress desire from the Muslims of India whereby all of them will be under a majoritarian system based on the majority opinion with the majority being idolaters?

They say: “The Prophet (Allah bless him and grant him peace) sought protection with Mut’im ibn ‘Adi, and Abu Bakr with Ibn Al-Dughnah, and they stayed in Makkah under their protection.” We say: This is not at all from the composite nationalism which you are attempting to prove, and it is only from the matter of guarding (*hirasah*) and we do not deny the permissibility of accepting a non-Muslim bodyguard who will protect us against enemies. Whoever knows the meaning of granting protection and seeking protection which was from the customs of the Arabs, will never doubt that the protector from them was not a leader over the one who sought protection, rather the one who sought protection was a leader over the protector, so if the one who sought protection was persecuted under the protection of one of them, that would be an insult and humiliation for the protector. Furthermore, granting protection and seeking protection was from the contracts of exchange according to them, so whoever granted protection to another once, it would be binding on the one who sought protection to grant him protection another time in exchange for that. Do you not see that when Quraysh seized Sa’d ibn ‘Ubadah before the migration and thought that he pledged to the Prophet (Allah bless him and grant

him peace) in secret and promised him support and aid when he migrated to Madinah, so they tied his hands to his neck with the rein of his camel, and they dragged him until they brought him inside Makkah, beating him and pulling him by his hair, and Sahl ibn ‘Amr said to him: “Woe to you! Do you not have between you and a member of Quraysh [an agreement of] protection and a pact?” He said: “Yes, by Allah, I would grant protection to Jubayr ibn Mut‘im ibn ‘Adi’s merchants, and I would protect them from those who wished to harm them in my lands, and [I granted protection to] al-Harith ibn Harb ibn Umayyah ibn ‘Abd Shams.” He said: “Woe to you! Then call the name of the two men, and mention what [happened] between you and them.” So he did this and a man went to them and found them in the mosque near the Ka‘bah and he said to them that a man from Khazraj is calling your names and mentioned that there was [an agreement of] protection between you and him. They said: “Who is he?” He said: “Sa’d ibn ‘Ubadah.” They said: “He has spoken the truth; he would grant protection to our merchants and prevent their oppression in his lands.” They then went and freed him. (*Sirah Ibn Hisham*, 1:247)

All who have knowledge of the position of Banu Hashim in Makkah and its high rank in Quraysh know that there is no tribe from its tribes except Banu Hashim had a favour over it, particularly Mut‘im ibn ‘Adi, since Abu Talib helped him multiple times and saved him from many predicaments as indicated in his famous ode:

“O Mut‘im! I did not desert you when you called for help

Nor on the day of battle when mighty deeds were called for

Nor when they came against you full of enmity

Opponents whose strength matched yours

O Mut‘im! The people have given you a task to do

I too when entrusted with a task do not evade it.” (*Sirah Ibn Hisham*, 1:147) [Translation extracted from Alfred Guillaume’s *The life of Muhammad*, p. 125]

Due to this, the Prophet (Allah bless him and grant him peace) sought protection with him during his journey from Ta‘if in exchange for what was upon him, and contracts of exchange are not from composite nationalism at all. Analogise this to Abu Bakr seeking protection with Ibn al-Dughnah, although Abu Bakr did not request from him to grant him protection, and he only granted him protection from his own accord, and he insisted that Abu Bakr return to Makkah under his protection. So where in this is what these people seek, of composite nationalism and its like?

They say that the Muslims migrated to Abyssinia and stayed under the protection of the Negus while he was still a disbeliever, and had not recognised Islam or submitted to it. We say: Did they invent a composite nationalism there with the Negus and his people before his conversion to Islam? Or did they merely live in his lands? If it is the first, produce proof, and if the second, who is it that bans a Muslim journeying to the lands of war for the purposes of trade and farming and touring and relaxation etc.? These jurists of ours have formed [entire] chapters in jurisprudence for the one granted amnesty (*musta‘man*), and neither they nor any of the politicians considered it to be from composite nationalism. Do you not see that many Jews and Christians entered the abode of Islam and resided there for a period? Is this from composite nationalism at all? And here, we and you, all of us, are in the land of India, under the authority of the Christians, so is this from composite nationalism with the Christians at all? So strange are these inverted minds, how they argue with that in which there is no proof and delude the commoners by leaving the topic, like a drowning person grasping at every straw.

They say: “The Messenger of Allah (Allah bless him and grant him peace) took ‘Abd Allah ibn Urayqit as a guide when he migrated to Madinah, so why is it blameworthy for us to take the Congress as a guide for us regardless of the dominance of disbelief in it?” We say: ‘Abd Allah ibn Urayqit was his (Allah bless him and grant him peace) bodyguard under his command, and the Congress is not so, rather you are under its command. Ibn Battal said under the commentary of this hadith: “All the scholars allow taking protection from them [i.e. disbelievers] at the time of necessity and other [times], due to what is in this of disgrace for them, and the only prohibition is that a Muslim himself guards an idolater due to what is in this of disgracing a Muslim.” (*Fath al-Bari*, 4:364)

[An Explanation of the Correct Stance on this Matter with Reference to the Hadiths of the Chapter]

Once you are aware of [the definition of] composite nationalism, and that all the arguments of the opposition to establish it are baseless, and its proof is weak in the Shari‘ah and in the intellect, we will turn to explaining what the Shari‘ah has come with, with respect to this subject, so we say:

The hadiths which we mentioned in the text indicate that Allah has removed the high-mindedness of Jahiliyyah, and that there is no superiority of a red person over a black person, and that Allah has appointed a caste for his creation and that is piety, and people refused but to appoint for themselves a caste besides this which is ancestry of forefathers. In all of this is clear evidence that ancestry, which has more influence in creating nations than does anything else, has no consideration with Allah; and it is only a pious believer or a wretched sinner. “The similitude of the two parties is as the blind and the deaf and the seer and the hearer. Are they equal in similitude?” (11:24) Thus, the believers and the disbelievers will never be a single nation. Rather they are two different parties. Yes, there is no harm in their unity and agreement in worldly contracts and political affairs when the rule of Islam is dominant, and otherwise not. Since forming nations by ancestries is invalid, what is your opinion of forming nations based on colour, homeland and language? He Almighty said: “The believers are but a single brotherhood.” (49:10) Hence, He considers all the believers brothers, whether they are Arab, non-Arab, black, red or white, from whichever land they are from, and with whichever language they speak. Verily, Allah does not look at your forms; He looks only at your deeds and your intentions. Hence the consideration is on faith and deeds; while ancestry, homeland, colour and language measure up to nothing with Allah except in some rules, like leadership being particular to Quraysh and the consideration of compatibility in marriage for interests the lawgiver has indicated to and the jurists have expounded.

The hadith: “Whoever resembles a people (*qawm*), he is from them.” The least of the states of this hadith requires the impermissibility of resembling disbelievers and idolaters, although its outward requires disbelief of the one who imitates them, as in His Almighty statement: “Whoever from you takes them as protectors, then indeed he is from them.” (5:51) There is no doubt that composite nationalism in the meaning we outlined entails the removal of distinction between Muslims and idolaters, and that all of them are equal in social conduct and culture, and they are united in name, language, form and publicity, and it is not hidden what this contains of destroying the foundations of Islam, for avoidance of the conduct of the disbelievers of the scriptuaries (*ahl al-kitab*) and the idolaters, and opposing the scriptruaries and the [non-Muslim] non-Arabs is a great and comprehensive principle from the principles of the Shari‘ah with many branches. I do not think that one who delves into jurisprudence and examines the indications of the Shari‘ah and its objectives and the rationales of the jurists and their juristic discussions have any doubt about this. Rather, I do not think that whenever one in whose heart faith has settled and the reality of Islam has become clear to him, and that it is the religion of Allah besides which He will not accept from anyone, is warned of this point, except the life of his heart and the soundness of his faith will necessitate his awakening with the quickest of

attentiveness. Nevertheless, we seek protection in Allah from the rust of hearts and the desires of souls which prevent [one] from recognising the truth and following it.

Ibn Taymiyyah said in *Iqtida' al-Sirat al-Mustaqim*: “Allah has indeed sent Muhammad (Allah bless him and grant him peace) with wisdom which is his Sunnah, and it is the law and the way which He instituted for him. Part of this wisdom was that He legislated for him actions and statements by which the path of those angered upon [i.e. the Jews] and the misguided [i.e. the Christians] will be separated; so he instructed him to oppose them in external conduct [like dress and speech] for [a number of] reasons: From them is that commonality in the external conduct creates an affinity and conformity between the two resembling parties leading to a level of conformity in character traits and deeds and this is a professed phenomenon, since the one who dons the dress of the people of knowledge for example, finds in himself a kind of attachment to them, and the one who wears the uniform of the army for example, finds in himself a kind of acquisition of their character traits and his nature becomes demanding of that [character] unless an obstacle prevents this. And from them is that opposition in external conduct necessitates separation and distinction leading to a cessation of the causes of [earning Allah's] anger and the means to deviation, and sympathy with the people of guidance and pleasure, and the realisation of that which Allah has severed of the friendship between his successful army and his losing enemies.”

Till he said: “Commonality with them in external conduct necessitates outward confusion, such that the ability to distinguish between the beloved rightly-guided ones and those angered upon and misguided based on the outward is not possible. And there are other wise reasons for this. This is when that external conduct is only permissible if free from their resemblance; as for it being from the necessities of their disbelief, it becomes a branch from the branches of disbelief, so conformity with them in this is conformation in one type of their disobedience. Hence, this is a principle which should be understood properly. And Allah knows best.” (p. 8)

The hadith: “Everything from the matter of Jahiliyyah is laid under my feet [i.e. cancelled].” Ibn Taymiyyah said in *Iqtida' al-Sirat al-Mustaqim*: “That which they were upon of rituals and customs like their call ‘O family of so-and-so and O family of so-and-so’ and like their festivals and other than that from their activities are [all] included in this [hadith].” (p. 53) It is not hidden what is incorporated in composite nationalism, of participating with the idolaters in many of their festivals and the matters of their idolatry.

The hadith: “Qays ibn Matatiyya attended a circle in which Suhayb al-Rumi, Salman al-Farisi and Bilal al-Habashi were present...” I say: In this is manifest evidence of the repudiation of composite nationalism, for Qays ibn Matatiyyah only denounced Suhayb, Bilal and Salman being in the circle of Muslims because they were from the tribes of non-Arabs and were not Arabs, so Allah's Messenger (Allah bless him and grant him peace) was angered by this, and said: “Verily, Arabic is not for any one of you a mother and a father; it is only a language,” i.e. so there is no reason for making this the basis of nationalism. It should not be said: “In this [is proof] of nationalism being based on speaking in Arabic due to his statement ‘whoever speaks Arabic, he is an Arab,’” because we will say: Its meaning is: Arabic is not a measure of virtue, and it is only a language related to speech and nothing else, and there is no doubt that speech alone contains no superiority, as proven by what has passed from Abu Sa'id raised [to the Prophet (Allah bless him and grant him peace)]: “Verily, your Lord is one, and your father [Adam] is one. Thus, there is no superiority of an Arab over a non-Arab or a red man over a black man, except by piety.” And this is an authentic hadith.

The hadith: “His statement ‘They do not witness falsehood (*zurr*),’ (Qur'an 25:72) ‘[meaning,] they do not support the idolaters with their idolatry and do not mix with them.’” A group have said about His

Almighty statement “They do not witness falsehood” that its purport is a “false witness” which is “lying.” This is questionable since He said “They do not witness falsehood (*yashhadun al-zur*)” and did not say “They do not witness with falsehood (*yashhaduna bi al-zur*)” and the Arabs say “I witnessed such-and-such” as in “I attended,” as the statement of Ibn ‘Abbas: “I witnessed the ‘Id with Allah’s Messenger (Allah bless him and grant him peace),” and the statement of ‘Umar “The booty is for the one who witnessed the battle.” This is frequent in their speech. As for “I witnessed with such-and-such,” its meaning is: “I gave information regarding it.” The reasoning behind the exegesis of the Tabi‘in is that falsehood is a feigned embellishment, as in his (Allah bless him and grant him peace) statement: “The one who shows off more than he has been given is like the one who wears garments of falsehood (*zur*).” (Narrated by al-Bukhari and Muslim) And since Allah has praised not witnessing falsehood, which is merely attending by sight or audition, then what about conformity with what is more than this, of deeds which are the deeds of falsehood? And it is not hidden that composite nationalism with the earlier definition leads to supporting the idolaters and conformity with them in many of their festivals which is blameworthy in the Shari‘ah.

The hadith: ‘Umar said: “Avoid the speech of the non-Arabs, and entering upon the idolaters into their temples on the day of their festival.” In this [is evidence of] the detestability of a man habitually speaking in non-Arabic despite having ability over it, for the Arabic tongue is a symbol of Islam and its adherents, and languages are the greatest of the symbols of civilisations by which they are distinguished. Ibn Taymiyyah said: “For this [reason] we say: It is required for everyone capable of learning Arabic to learn it because it is the worthiest language of being desired, although it is not prohibited for anyone to speak in non-Arabic. Al-Shafi‘i disliked for the one who knows Arabic to be named in other than it and to speak with it mixing non-Arabic with it. And this, what he mentioned, was said by the imams and is narrated from the Sahabah and Tabi‘in. And it was transmitted from a group of them that they would speak with a word of non-Arabic after a word [in Arabic] as the Prophet (Allah bless him and grant him peace) said to Umm Khalid bint Khalid ibn Sa‘id ibn al-‘As while she was young, having been born in Abyssinia, ‘O Umm Khalid! This [dress] is *sana*’ and *sana* in the Abyssinian language meant ‘beautiful.’ It was narrated from Abu Hurayrah that he said to someone who caused him pain in his stomach: ‘Is *shakm* in *durd*?’ [i.e. ‘is my stomach in pain?’] Some narrated it raised [to the Prophet (Allah bless him and grant him peace)] which is unsound. As for the habit of speaking in [a language] besides Arabic, which is a symbol of Islam and the language of the Qur’an, until it becomes a habit of the city and its inhabitants and for the households and for a man with his companion and the people in the marketplace or the rulers or those in charge of the register or the scholars of jurisprudence, there is no doubt that it is disliked, as it is part of resembling non-Arab [non-Muslims], which is disliked as has preceded. This is why the early Muslims, when they resided in the land of Syria and Egypt and the language of its people was a Roman language, and the land of Iraq and Khurasan and the language of its people was Persian, and the land of West Africa and the language of its people was Barbarian, they accustomed the inhabitants of these lands with Arabic until it became dominant in these lands, for their Muslims and their non-Muslims. This is how Khurasan was previously, but then they became relaxed in the matter of language and gained the habit of conversing in Persian, until it became dominant over them and Arabic was forgotten for many of them, and there is no doubt that this is disliked. The desirable way is to be accustomed to speaking in Arabic so that the youngsters will pick it up in the homes and schools so the symbol of Islam and its adherents becomes dominant, and that makes it easy for Muslims to understand the meanings of the Book and Sunnah and the speech of the predecessors, as opposed to the one accustomed to a language and then wants to change to another as this is difficult. Know that being accustomed to a language influences the mind and characteristics and religion in a strong and clear way, and also influences resemblance with the earlier part of this religious community (*ummah*) of the Sahabah and Tabi‘in, and resembling them increases intellect and religion and good



characteristics; and also, Arabic language itself is part of religion and its knowledge is an obligation, since the understanding of the Book and Sunnah is an obligation and they are not understood but by [understanding] Arabic, and whenever an obligation is not fulfilled except by means of something else that becomes obligatory; and thereafter, from it [i.e. Arabic language] is what is obligatory on individuals and from it is what is obligatory communally.” (p. 98)

Once you know this, from the severest of what the Muslims are afflicted with in India is that their predecessors who conquered these lands left the habit of conversing in the Arabic language and they showed preference to the Persian language and then they founded a language composed of Arabic, Persian and Hindi called Urdu which is the dominant language in these lands, their Muslims and non-Muslims, and it is today a symbol of Muslims therein, from the remnants of the traces of their predecessors who had control over it and conquered it; and it is the language to which most of the sciences of Islam of the Qur’an, hadith, jurisprudence and the speech of the predecessors, in translation and commentary, has been transferred. Thus, the Congress stood to eliminate this language from the land of India and popularise the Hindi language therein. It is not hidden that Hindi in relation to Urdu here is equivalent to Persian in relation to Arabic in the lands of the Arabs, so it is not permissible for Muslims to prefer Hindi over Urdu just as it is not permissible for the Arabs to prefer Persian over Arabic, due to what is in this of abolishing the symbol of Islam, since Urdu is the closest language to Arabic in the land of India and the easiest of them to learn and teach and the strongest of them with a connection to Arabic and the most widespread of them in the lands of Islam in speech and conversation, for there is no land from the lands of Islam except there is in it a group who speak it or understand it. Hence, it is obligatory on the Muslims of India to preserve this language and maintain it, and refrain from the Hindi language which is the language of the idolaters and their symbol. And it is binding on the scholars to try hard to encourage the spread of the Arabic language in their schools, in speech, conversation and writing so that this Islamic symbol is not erased from the land of India as is the hope of the Congress and its devotees.

The hadith: ‘Abd Allah ibn ‘Amr said: “Whoever builds in the lands of the foreigners and performs their Nayruz and their Mahrajan, and resembles them until he dies while he is like this, he will be gathered with them on the Day of Resurrection.” In this [is proof] of the prohibition of building in the lands of the idolaters and he only mentioned that - and Allah knows best - because in the time of ‘Abd Allah ibn ‘Amr and others of the Sahabah, they [i.e. the idolaters] were banned from displaying their festival in the land of Islam and the cities of the Muslims, and none of the Muslims would resemble them in their festival; and they would only be able to do that if it was in their land. Ibn Taymiyyah said this. I say: This is just as you see in the land of India, that the houses of the Muslims and the idolaters are not mixed in the old lands, rather they are separate and distinct, so the idolaters are not able to display their symbols except in their lands and their areas, not in the lands of the Muslims. So whoever from the Muslims builds his house in an area of the idolaters to resemble them in their festivals for example, and avoids the area of the Muslims, his ruling is what ‘Abd Allah ibn ‘Amr mentioned, and its outward entails that it makes him a disbeliever by participating with them in the totality of these activities or it makes that [practice] from the enormities necessitating hellfire, although the first is the outward of its wording. Hence, the participation in some of these [activities] is a sin. It is not hidden that composite nationalism leads to complete participation which is more severe than all of this, so there is no doubt it is a great sin from the enormities of disobedience.

The hadith: “Gain understanding of the Sunnah and gain understanding of Arabic, and understand the Arabic of the Qur’an, for it is in Arabic.” Gaining understanding in Arabic is from the communal obligations on the Muslims like gaining understanding of the Sunnah because understanding Arabic is the means to understanding the Qur’an and Sunnah, and it is not hidden that that will not come about

for the people of India except through the medium of Urdu for it is the language that facilitates the teaching of Arabic and learning it, as is manifest and obvious. His statement, “understand the Arabic of the Qur’an, for it is in Arabic,” indicates the obligation of maintaining the Arabic of the Qur’an i.e. the Arabic of its words and letters, and it is not hidden that that will not come about for the people of India except by means of Urdu due to its comprising of all Arabic letters, and if they were accustomed to Hindi, they will never be able to Arabise the Qur’an due to it not having *tha, sad, ‘ayn, za, dad* and *qaf*. So understand.

The hadith: Muhammad ibn Sa’d ibn Abi Waqqas heard a people speaking in Persian, so he said: “What is the matter with this Zoroastrianism after pure monotheism?!” Speaking in Persian in Arab lands has been compared to Zoroastrianism after pure monotheism, and likewise speaking in Hindi and avoidance of Urdu in India is like becoming Hindu after being Muslim, since Urdu is the language of Muslims and Hindi is the language of the idolaters.

The hadith: “Whoever is proficient at speaking in Arabic must not speak in non-Arabic, for indeed it causes hypocrisy in him.” In this [is evidence] of the permissibility of speaking in non-Arabic for one not proficient at Arabic. As for one who is proficient at it and the addressee understands it, it is not permissible for him to speak in non-Arabic and become accustomed to speaking in it due to what is in this of preferring Arabic over non-Arabic which is a sign of hypocrisy. This ruling is specific to the Arab lands or the lands in which its inhabitants are accustomed to speaking in Arabic. Hence, it is not permissible therein for those proficient in Arabic to speak in other than it. As for lands in which its inhabitants are not accustomed to speaking in Arabic, it is permissible there for those proficient in Arabic to speak in non-Arabic as the addressee does not understand Arabic, but if there are two languages there, one having a speciality with the Muslims and another having a speciality with the idolaters, it is not permissible for one proficient at the first to speak with the second due to what is in this of preferring the symbol of idolatry over the symbol of Islam. This is something indicated by the purport and meaning of the hadith as is not hidden. It is apparent that composite nationalism which the Congress advocate will lead to Urdu being erased from India which is from the symbols of Islam therein, so it is not permissible for Muslims to support it in this and participate with it in such wrongs. Allah is asked for help.

#### **Benefit: [Regarding the Festivals of the Idolaters and what is Permitted and not Permitted]**

The statement of ‘Umar, “Avoid entering upon the idolaters into their temples on the day of their festival” has preceded. This is the ruling of entering upon them during their celebrations and their seasons which they erect to display their supremacy and their happiness with their religion. Sadly for some of the people knowledge, they go to the likes of these celebrations which the idolaters of India hold and they deliver a speech there while there is an idol in front of them which they erected to display a symbol of disbelief and idolatry. To Allah is the complaint of this act of theirs, for indeed, by Allah, they are misguided and misguide [others] and by this they insert the enormity of idolatry and its adherents into the hearts of Muslims.

Ibn Taymiyyah said in *Iqtida’ al-Sirat al-Mustaqim*: “Al-Khallal said in his *Jami’*: Chapter on the Detestability of Muslims Going to the Festivals of the Idolaters. He narrated from *al-Muhanna*: I asked Ahmad about attending these festivals which take place near us in Syria like Tur Yanur and Dayr Ayyub and its likes, the Muslims attend it and attend the markets and they bring sheep and cows and flour and wheat and barley and other than that although they only enter the markets for business and do not enter with them into the monasteries. He said: When they do not enter with them into the monasteries and only attend the market, there is no harm, since Ahmad stated the like of what has come from ‘Umar of

the prohibition of entering their temples during their festivals, and this, as we mentioned, is from the matter of drawing attention to the prohibition of doing as they do.”

I say: He only negated harm from attending their markets in their festivals and their seasons when they do not stay away from our markets in our festivals and our seasons, for when they stay away from our markets we stay away from attending their markets because the believer has pride [for his faith]. And when only hostility remains, we treat them as they treat us. It is not hidden what is in attending their markets of a certain level of esteem for their festival and respecting it and adorning it for them and increasing their numbers; it has been reported that one who increases the numbers of a people he is from them.

As for accepting gifts from them on the day of their festival, we have mentioned previously about ‘Ali ibn Abi Talib (Allah be pleased with him) that he was offered a gift on Nayruz and he accepted it. And Ibn Abi Shaybah narrated in *al-Musannaf*: Jarir narrated to us from Qabus from his father that a woman asked ‘A’ishah: “We have foster parents from the Zoroastrians and when they have a festival they offer us gifts,” so she said: “As for what is slaughtered for that day, do not eat [it], but eat from [the fruits of] their trees.” And he said: Waki’ narrated to us from al-Hakam ibn Hakim from his father from Abu Barzah that he had Zoroastrian neighbours who would offer him gifts on Nayruz and Mahrajan, so he would say to his family: “Whatever is fruit, eat it, and whatever is other than that, return it.”

All this proves that the festival has no effect in prohibiting the acceptance of gifts; rather its ruling in the festival and outside of it is the same, because there is no support of them in this for the symbols of disbelief. However, accepting the gift of disbelievers from the abode of war and the people of protection (*dhimmah*) is a separate issue in which there is disagreement and detail, and this is not its place.

As for the ruling of offering gifts to them on the day of their festival, Ibn al-Qasim was asked about riding on boats in which Christians ride on their festivals, and he disliked it for fear that punishment will descend on them due to their idolatry which they were united upon, and Ibn al-Qasim disliked for a Muslim to gift something to a Christian during their festival in exchange for his [gift] [Mawlana Zafar: So what about when it is not in exchange, but an initial gift?]: “I consider it part of glorifying his festival and helping him for the benefit of his disbelief. Do you not see that it is not permissible for Muslims to buy from the Christians something that will benefit their festival, neither meat nor curry, nor lending an animal, nor any help in any part of their festival, because that is part of glorification of their idolatry and helping them in their disbelief? The rulers should ban the Muslims from this. This is the view of Malik and others. I do not know any disagreement in this.” This was mentioned in *Iqtida’ al-Sirat al-Mustaqim*.

I say: It is not hidden what is incorporated in the composite nationalism which the Congress calls to, of elevating the word of disbelief and displaying the supremacy of the idolaters, so how is it permissible for a sane Muslim to say it is permissible to participate with them in this and support them in it? There is no power and no might except with Allah.

In sum, forming nations by hometowns, colours and languages, if it is merely for knowing one another, then it is like forming them by ancestries. He Almighty said: “We made you into nations and tribes that you may know one another.” (49:13). And if it is for racism and tribalism so the white [person] is repelled by the black [person] and the Arab by the non-Arab and the Indian by the non-Indian, it is unethical in the Shari’ah and in the intellect. It is not hidden that the composite nationalism devised by the politicians in this time is not for mere recognition of one another, rather for racism and tribalism as is visible, and this is from that which the Shari’ah has come to abolish, so whoever claims that it is

established by the Qur'an and hadith, he has caught himself in ignorance and in deprivation from the light of knowledge, so understand. Allah has charge of your guidance.

They say that the European politicians consider composite nationalism to be from the greatest of their weapons, by which they incite the people of Europe to fight other nations, so what is [the blame] on us if we use this weapon and we return thereby their plot towards them and we incite the peoples of the inhabitants of India to adopt composite nationalism amongst them to shake the foundations of the authority of Christians over their lands and eradicate them from their land? We say: Then, confess that you adopted this from Europe not from the Qur'an and Sunnah, and we will say: There is no harm in this if the rule of Islam is dominant over them. As for when the rule of idolatry is dominant, that is more severe on the Muslims than the authority of the Christians and more harmful for them in their religion as we explained. Furthermore, if we were to concede that the idolaters of India want what you want of eradicating the authority of the Christians from the land of India and expelling them from it - and to prove this will take stripping away the thorns from a cactus tree [i.e. it will be extremely difficult to prove] - then they only want a majoritarian government in the shadow of Britain, saying with their mouths what is not in their hearts, with hatred for the people of Islam appearing on their mouths and their deeds, and what their breasts conceal is greater. For betrayal is their symbol and scheming is their cover as we have experienced from them more than once, and one who tries something whose quality has been experienced [before] will become regretful. And Allah Almighty knows best.

In sum, composite nationalism is not from the Shari'ah at all. This is the book of Allah speaking to us the truth, and this is the Sunnah of our Prophet (upon him blessing and peace) inviting us to truth, so understand, and Allah has charge of your guidance.

#### **Benefit: [Regarding Islam's Position on Gandhi's Nonviolent Resistance]**

A deceiver (*dajjal*) from the idolaters arose in India who the advocates of composite nationalism from the members of the Congress take as their leader and guide, by his judgement they come and go, and his instruction in politics they carry out. The accursed claims that resistance against the oppressive rulers by tolerating the persecution is preferable to war, so whoever wishes to throw the noose of the authority of the [oppressive] rulers from his neck, he must oppose the state laws and he must endure what he suffers from the ruler and his oppressive supporters of physical torture and imprisonment; they should do so for a period of time, and by this the pillars of the government will crumble, and its terror and its awe will be removed from the hearts by lengthening the tongues [against them]. We do not deny this being a scheme from the schemes of war and a tactic from its tactics which may occur during a time when its people are too weak to resist the enemy by force, courage, striking and wounding. However, it is very strange that a group of Muslims and their scholars in India have claimed this to be a Sunnah from the examples of the Prophet (Allah bless him and grant him peace) and that he would use it when residing in Makkah before the migration to Madinah, so he commanded those with him of the Muslims to declare the oneness [of Allah] and insult the gods of the idolaters and make mockery of their way of life and criticise their religion and insult their forefathers, and when they suffered persecution from the idolaters, they should not repay them with its like, rather they should pardon and overlook, and endure what they suffer, and this [equates to] resisting the enemy by perseverance and nonviolence. We say: If that was a Sunnah from the traditions of the Prophet (Allah bless him and grant him peace) you would have been the first to call to it and the foremost of those who bowed to it, and you would not have been beaten to it by this accursed, and he would have been following you in this, and you would not be following him; for, has the Sunnah of your Prophet been hidden to you until this accursed explained it or did you not reflect on the Qur'an, neither you nor your forefathers, and that pitiful one understood it? And if tolerating persecution was always better than war as this leader of yours claims, why did the

Prophet (Allah bless him and grant him peace) migrate to Madinah and did not eliminate the strength of the people of Makkah by forgiveness and pardon and nonviolence his entire life? And why did Allah permit him to fight the enemy and commanded him to prepare whatever he could of power, of trained horses, by which the enemy of Allah and his enemy and others besides them would be terrified (Qur'an 8:60)?

If you say that was only after attaining power in Madinah and when it is so, fighting is preferable, but before attaining it, nonviolent resistance is superior, we say: This conflicts with the opinion of your accursed leader, for he claims nonviolent resistance is always better which is in conflict with what the Qur'an and the Sunnah of the Prophet (upon him blessing and peace) has come with so it is not permissible for you to support his view at all, nor adduce proof for it from the Qur'an and Sunnah foolishly and ignorantly.

From the catastrophes [of this time] is that the accursed has arranged a syllabus for children's education and included in this [syllabus] his view that nonviolence is always better than violence and conquering lands with gentleness and softness is better than shedding the blood of people, and his likeness in this is not but as the likeness of the learned men of the Christians who, when they emerge from their lands to spread Christianity, they command the arms factories to prepare weapons of war of heavy artilleries and other [weapons] every day, and when they come to the land of India and other [lands] they announce the saying of the Messiah, "Verily the land of God and His Kingdom belong to the weak and the downtrodden." Similar [to them] is this accursed who has ordered the elders of his people to build a college of war, so the children of the idolaters learn therein the sciences of war and its arts, while he says to people that nonviolence is always superior to violence. It is strange from the common Muslims and a group of their scholars that they were deluded by his speech and they find no fault in teaching these myths, and they don't know that when their children learn this and study Brahman history whose religion was nonviolence, the Brahmans will become great in their hearts, and the greatness of 'Umar the Distinguisher, and 'Ali and Khalid (Allah be pleased with them) will be removed from their hearts. The Satan beautified in their hearts the superiority of the religion of the Brahmans over the religion of Islam due to their belief that the first is premised on softness, leniency and mercy, while Islam is premised on jihad and shedding the bloods of the idolaters, while they are heedless of mercy to the mischief makers being a great injustice to all the worlds, especially the weak.

The truth is that gentleness, leniency, forgiveness, pardoning and nonviolence are wonderful and beautiful in its right place; however, when a man is a mischief maker possessing great evil and baseness, with no deterrent preventing him from his evil, he will only grow in pride and rebellion by gentleness and leniency, and [will only grow] in arrogance and violence by forgiveness and pardon. Hence, gentleness with [someone] like him is like showing compassion to snakes and scorpions, which a sane person will never approve, and a possessor of intelligence will never be satisfied with it. Hence, Islam is the religion of beauty (*jamaal*) and majesty (*jalal*), and [the religion of] those who are harsh to the disbelievers and merciful amongst themselves (Qur'an 48:29).

After this, know that the order of Allah to His Prophet (Allah bless him and grant him peace) to forgive, pardon and turn away from the idolaters before the migration was not because this was from the means of resisting the enemy, nor was it because it was something that will eliminate its power and destroy its structure, and if that were so, He would never have ordered them to fight and He would not have said: "We sent down iron in which there is strong power, and benefits for the people" (57:25). Rather, this was only because – and Allah knows best – they were weak in Makkah, having no power to fight, for fear that the people will snatch them. Then when He gave them shelter in Madinah and supported them with His help so the people of Madinah became their supporters and helpers, and He sustained

them with wholesome [provisions], He commanded them to resist the enemy by war and fighting. In sum, in Islam there is only fighting with weapons, or not fighting with it.

As for war without weapons, i.e. by patience and enduring persecution, there is no trace of this in the example of the Prophet (Allah bless him and grant him peace) and the conduct of his companions. Thus, his conduct in Makkah was to avoid fighting and warring altogether, not warring by means of patience as they claim. And his conduct in Madinah was to fight and combat with swords. This does not entail that resistance by means of patience is not permissible in the Shari'ah. It means only that it is not a Sunnah and is not established from the predecessors, so its ruling is the ruling of newly-invented modern weapons - there is no harm in their use when free from something forbidden in the Shari'ah. For if we were to know that the authorities of the time are frightened by merely shouting at them and the foundations of their kingdom will tremble by the peoples demonstrating against them by mere raids and clamouring without fighting and conflict, what need is there for us to throw ourselves into destruction and fight with weapons? For indeed he (Allah bless him and grant him peace) said: "Do not wish to meet the enemy, and ask Allah for safety. And when you meet [them], stay firm." (Narrated by al-Bukhari and Muslim) However, the permissibility does not entail superiority, nor [does it entail] fighting with weapons is always blameworthy as the accursed claims. Abu al-Zubayr narrated from Jabir that "the Prophet (Allah bless him and grant him peace) remained for ten years following people into their homes in the season [of Hajj] and [the festivals of] Majannah and 'Ukaz, [saying]: 'Who will believe me and who will shelter me and who will help me until I convey the messages of my Lord, and for him is Paradise?' And he did not find anyone to help him and shelter him, and he walked amongst their men inviting them to Allah while they pointed to him with the fingers, until Allah sent us [the Ansar] to him from Yathrib, so a man from us would come to him and believe in him and read to him the Qur'an, and then he would return to his family and they would accept Islam, until there did not remain a house from the houses of the Ansar except there was a group of Muslims therein openly declaring Islam. Allah sent us to him so we conferred and convened and we said: 'Until when will the Messenger of Allah (Allah bless him and grant him peace) be driven to the mountains of Makkah and feared for?' So we travelled until we arrived to [meet] him in the season [of Hajj] and we pledged the pledge of 'Aqabah..." (*Zad al-Ma'ad*, 1:306)

Whoever contemplates the conduct of the Prophet (Allah bless him and grant him peace) and his companions during their stay in Makkah, he will not doubt that the weak from them would endure and forgive and pardon those who oppressed them. As for the strong from them, they would defend and fight. Ibn Ishaq said: "The companions of the Messenger of Allah (Allah bless him and grant him peace) would, when they prayed, go to the mountain paths and shorten their prayer [for fear] of their people. When Sa'd ibn Abi Waqqas was amongst a group of the companions of Allah's Messenger (Allah bless him and grant him peace) in a mountain path from the mountain paths of Makkah, suddenly a group of idolaters emerged while they prayed and they abused them for what they were upon and [what they were] doing, until they fought them. So Sa'd ibn Abi Waqqas on that day struck a man with the jawbone of a camel and he wounded him. That was the first blood to be spilt for Islam." (*Sirah Ibn Hisham*, 1:148) It is authentic that 'Umar ibn al-Khattab, when he became a Muslim, he fought Quraysh and they fought him until he prayed openly near the Ka'bah and the Muslims prayed with him. Ibn Mas'ud said: "When 'Umar became Muslim, the Muslims became dignified in themselves, together with Hamza's acceptance of Islam before him. And they knew that they would protect the Messenger of Allah (Allah bless him and grant him peace) and they will take revenge by means of them from their enemy." (*Sirah Ibn Hisham*, 1:188)

So if endurance of persecution and forgiveness and pardoning was from the means of resistance, Sa'd would not have fought any of the idolaters, nor 'Umar, nor Hamzah. And those who were tortured from

the Muslims like Bilal, ‘Ammar ibn Yasir, his mother and his father and their likes from the slaves, were only tortured because they were weak and unable to protect themselves, and their endurance of persecution was not a scheme or a war tactic, and nor was it a means of resisting the enemy, rather it was because of the lack of means and strength. And when the Messenger of Allah (Allah bless him and grant him peace) saw what had afflicted his companions of suffering and [saw] the safety he was in from Allah and from his uncle Abu Talib, and that he was unable to protect them from what they suffered, he said to them: “If only you would leave for the land of Abyssinia, for there is a king there under whose [authority] none are oppressed and it is a land of integrity, until Allah makes an opening for you in [the plight] that you are in,”; thereupon, Muslims from his (Allah bless him and grant him peace) companions went to Abyssinia (*Sirah Ibn Hisham*, 1:172).

Thus, if the endurance of the Muslims, their forgiveness and pardoning of the idolaters was a scheme from the schemes of war, there would be no meaning to their migration to Abyssinia. When Abu Talib died and Quraysh began to persecute the Messenger of Allah (Allah bless him and grant him peace) more than ever before in the life of his uncle, he went to Ta’if and he exposed himself to the tribes, so Allah sent to him the people of Madinah as was previously mentioned, and Allah permitted His Messenger to fight and defend and take revenge from those who oppressed them and transgressed against them; thus, the first verse that was revealed on this is His statement: “Permission (to fight) is given to those against whom fighting is launched, because they have been wronged, and Allah is powerful to give them victory.” (22:39) Ibn Ishaq said: “When Allah Almighty permitted him to fight, and this group of the Ansar followed him to help him and [to help] those following him and those Muslims who sought refuge with them, the Messenger of Allah (Allah bless him and grant him peace) ordered his companions from the emigrants of his people and those with him in Makkah to leave for Madinah and migrate there and join their brothers of the Ansar and he said: ‘Verily Allah has made for you brothers and an abode you will be safe in,’ so they left gradually. And the Messenger of Allah (Allah bless him and grant him peace) stayed in Makkah waiting for permission from his Lord to leave from Makkah and migrate to Madinah.” (*Sirah Ibn Hisham*, 1:257)

Hence, if his endurance of persecution and forgiveness and pardon of the enemy was due to it being a form of resistance, a scheme from the schemes of war, none of this would have meaning as is not hidden. And if his endurance and the endurance of those with him of the Muslims was to seek kingdom and authority, as these fools from the Congress claim, the Messenger of Allah (Allah bless him and grant him peace) would not have rejected ‘Utbah ibn Rabiah’s offer when he said to him: “O my nephew, you are one of us as you know, of the noblest of the tribe and hold a worthy position in ancestry. You have come to your people with an important matter, dividing the community thereby and ridiculing their customs, and you have insulted their gods and their religion, and declared that their forefathers were unbelievers, so listen to me and I will make some suggestions, and perhaps you will be able to accept one of them.” The Messenger of Allah (Allah bless him and grant him peace) agreed, and he went on, “If what you want is money, we will gather for you out of our property so that you may be the richest of us; if you want honour, we will make you our chief so that no one can decide anything apart from you; if you want sovereignty, we will make you king, and if this ghost which comes to you, which you see, is such that you cannot get rid of him, we will find a physician for you, and exhaust our means in getting you cured of it,” or words to that effect. The Messenger of Allah (Allah bless him and grant him peace) listened patiently, and then said: “Now listen to me, ‘In the Name of Allah, the compassionate and merciful, *ha mim*, a revelation from the Compassionate, the Merciful, a book whose verses are expounded as an Arabic Quran for a people who understand, as an announcement and warning, though most of them turn aside not listening and say, Our hearts are veiled from that to which you invite us.’ (Qur’an 41:1-5).” Then the Messenger of Allah (Allah bless him and grant him peace) continued to recite it to him. When ‘Utbah heard it from him, he listened attentively, putting his hands

behind his back and leaning on them as he listened. Then the Messenger of Allah (Allah bless him and grant him peace) ended at the prostration and prostrated himself, and said, “You have heard what you have heard, Abu al-Walid; the rest remains with you.” (*Sirah Ibn Hisham*, 1:155) [Translation extracted from Alfred Guillaume’s *The life of Muhammad*, pp. 132-3]

Thus, can anyone with a grasp of intellect say the Messenger of Allah (Allah bless him and grant him peace) would endure the persecution of Quraysh and forgive them and pardon in order to seek leadership and to eliminate their supremacy or he would do that to resist the enemy by endurance and nonviolence, whereas they would offer to him leadership willingly with his authority over them if he were to abandon dividing their community and ridiculing their customs and insulting their gods and their religion, and they never requested from him to leave his religion for their religion, nor to leave calling people to his religion, and they only asked from him to abandon dividing the community by insulting their religion and ridiculing their customs and attributing error to their forefathers? Ibn Ishaq said: “Then when the Messenger of Allah (Allah bless him and grant him peace) openly declared Islam to his people and proclaimed it as Allah commanded him to (15:94), his people did not disown him and they did not reject him according to what has reached me, until he mentioned their gods and criticised them; and when he did this they deemed him a great [threat] and denounced him and resolved to oppose him and show hostility to him, except those that Allah protected by [making them] accept Islam, and they were few.” (*Sirah Ibn Hisham*, 1:138)

You may [even rightly] say that the people were offering him obedience and were satisfied with him being a ruler over them had they made an agreement of composite nationalism between him and them whereby no one interferes with another in the matter of his religion, he does not insult him, accuse him of error, insult his religion, and all people are equal in the freedom of consciousness and belief, so the Messenger of Allah (Allah bless him and grant him peace) rejected this and refused but to complete his light even if the disbelievers disliked it (Qur’an 61:8). In all of this is the greatest proof of the invalidity of composite nationalism which the fools of our times claim is established by the Qur’an and Sunnah, and is the clearest proof that the endurance of the Prophet (Allah bless him and grant him peace) of the persecution of his people and his forgiveness and pardoning them was not in order to seek leadership, nor to break the supremacy of the enemy thereby, rather to accomplish the proof and to spread the message and prove that he does not desire the gains of the world but only wants rectification [of people] as much as is possible (Qur’an 11:88). Such was the pattern of Allah with His Prophets that they were tried with the persecution of their peoples firstly, then they were patient, then Allah decided between them and their peoples and He is the best of deciders. Do you not see Musa (upon him blessing and peace) and his people, how Pharaoh and his people persecuted them? They afflicted them with a horrible torment, killing their sons and sparing their women (Qur’an 2:49) so they endured this for a while, and their endurance was not a resistance of the enemy, rather in obedience to the command of Allah that He may try them, and until the trial was complete and the tribulation was widespread, Allah caused Pharaoh and his people to drown, and His “sublime word was fulfilled for the Children of Israel, because they stood patient” (7:137) “and We destroyed what Pharaoh and his people used to build and what they used to raise high.” (7:137) Thus, whoever claims that the endurance of Musa and his people was a part of nonviolent resistance, he has caught himself in ignorance. If that were so, Allah would not have drowned Pharaoh and his people; rather, He would have commanded the Children of Israel to endure and always forgive until their patience destroyed the kingdom of Pharaoh and shook its foundations and destroyed its structure. Since it was not so, analogise this to the endurance of the Prophet (Allah bless him and grant him peace) and his companions; for al-Bukhari narrated from Khabbab ibn al-Arat, he said: We complained to the Prophet (Allah bless him and grant him peace) while he was reclining on a garment in the shade of the Ka’bah and we faced harshness from the idolaters, saying: “Will you not pray to Allah?” So he sat up with his face having turned red, and he said:



“There was a man from those before you, for whom a [ditch] was dug in the earth, and he would be placed therein, and a saw would be brought and placed above his head and he was split in two, and that did not deter him from his religion; and [another] was raked with iron combs that removed his flesh from his bones and sinews, and that did not deter him from his religion. By Allah! Verily, this matter [of Islam] will be fulfilled, until a rider travels from San‘a to Hadramawt not fearing [any] besides Allah, or a wolf [devouring] his sheep, but you haste.” (*Mishkat al-Masabih*, pp. 447)

Do you, then, believe that this endurance and tolerance of suffering was a desire for leadership? Never! Rather, it was so Allah exposes the patient (Qur’an 3:142), and distinguishes between the truthful and the liars (Qur’an 69:3), and then permits them to fight (Qur’an 22:39), suppressing thereby the disbelievers (Qur’an 3:141). So understand. Allah has authority over your guidance and He is the protector of the righteous.

Let this be the last sentence on the issues circulating on the tongues of the commoners in these days. To Allah is the complaint of what those affiliated with knowledge are perpetrating, of the distortion of texts and laws.

[The Author’s Dream of the Prophet (peace and blessings be upon him)]

I was blessed in [my] sleep to see the master of creation, our master Muhammad (Allah bless him and grant him peace), in these days, and he gave me glad tidings of the dominance of Islam and its people over the idolaters and the blameworthy disbelievers soon with the help of Allah, Possessor of Glory and Generosity. O Allah! Make this dream of mine true. Provide us with complete and true sincerity, and give us the ability to [do] what you love and approve, and give us and those who follow us a good end, and make our latter better than our former. Pardon us, forgive us, and have mercy on us. You are our patron, so help us against the disbelieving people.

[Final Remark]

A draft of this addendum was completed towards the end of Dhu al-Qa‘dah in the year 1357 after the migration of our Prophet, upon him blessing and peace, a perpetual, lasting and continuous blessing and peace, without end (January 1939 CE). All praise to Allah by Whose glory, greatness and good favour, righteous deeds are accomplished.