

Answering the Soofee
G. F. Haddad
and his book Against
Imaam al-Albaanee

Compiled by
Abu Hibbaan & Abu Khuzaimah Ansaari

© 2007 Maktabah Ashaabul Hadeeth, Birmingham UK
© 2007 Maktabah Imaam Badee ud deen, Birmingham UK

Contents

Part 1

The Issue of Calling Oneself Abdul-Mustafa or Abdun-Nabee

Part 2

The Issue of Haadhir-Naadhir and Ilm ul-Ghayb According to Abdul-Hayy Lucknowee Hanafee.

Part 3

The Fabrication of Kissing the Thumbs In A'dhaan (Updated)

Part 4

The Hinduism of the Soofee Bareilwee Religion

Part 5

The Fadl al-Rasul al-Badayuni Affair

Part 6

The Mulla Saahib Baghadaadee Affair.

Introduction

All praise be to Allaah Jalo Wa A'la the lord of the creation and of all that exists we praise him seek his aid and assistance, and may there salutations upon the Last and final Messenger of Allaah (Sallallahu Alayhee Was-Sallam) in abundance.

Very recently , Gibril Fouad Haddad published a book titled, 'Albani and his freinds', Haddad a rabid soofee has attempted to rebuke and refute the Scholars of Ahlus-Sunnah.

To proceed:

Without lengthening this introduction and wanting to address the issues and points, it will not be inappropriate to mention some background with regards to this epistle that is to be presented inshallaah. As is well-known ash-Shaikh al-Allaamah Ehsaan Elaahzee Zaheer rahimahullah authored a monumental book against the extreme and misguided Soofee sect, the Bareilwee's. The scholarly level and standard of this book is not hidden from anyone and it is well accepted and acknowledged to be a classical work

However in recent times a criminal, an individual upon heretical ways, Gibril Fouad Haddad has attempted to answer this book in a brief manner, but unfortunately has failed miserably and thereby discredited himself and his misguided soofee cult, their methodology aswell as these central issues, it would have been better if he had not undertaken this task thereby preventing the misguidance of others and himself. Some of his answers to some chapters were so poor and based upon ignorance that we had no choice but not to answer them. what we saw fit to answer then Inshallaah it will presented, and all help and aid is sought from Allaah alone, the creator of creation.

Therefore what follows are replies to what Gibril Haddad compiled

Part 1

The Issue of Calling Oneself Abdul-Mustafa or Abdun-Nabee

The summary of the article is, Haddad brings names of a number of people with the name Abd un-Nabee thereby trying to prove it is permissible because a large number of people kept this name. Secondly he deduces that Shaah Ismaa'eel Shaheed's book in English has an introduction by a one named Ghulaam Rasool therefore why the double standards and thirdly he brings a poem. We do not wish to paste the whole of his article, however when necessary we will paste what is needed, as for those wanting to see what he wrote then this will not be far from an internet search

So from all this it can be seen he does not mention anything to prove his claim all he has done is to present some information and as usual, as the great diversion tactician that he is, nothing gets answered in the scholarly manner that we would have liked to have seen.

It is also to be noted here the point of contention was keeping the name Abdul-Mustafa as Ahmad Raza Khaan kept for himself and not Abdun-Nabee, yet Haddad brings a list of names that were Abdun-Nabee only. However as this discussion has opened we also will see what is said concerning this.

We also need to note that Ahmad Raza Khaan did not only call himself Abdul-Mustafa but would also refer to himself with this name and more importantly Haddad failed to realise the names that he has mentioned were the original names of those people. They did not unlike Ahmad Raza Khaan change them to Abdun-Nabee or Abdul-Mustafa, as we know from Bareilwee sources that his real name was something different and he was given various other names by members of his household.

As Shaikh Allaamah Ehsaan Elaahie Zaheer mentioned in al-Bareilwiyyah, "He was named Muhammad, his mother kept the name Aman Mian, his father Ahmad Mian and his grandfather called him Ahmad Raza." (A'la Hadhrat pg.25 of Bastawee).

"But Ahmad Raza was not satisfied with any of these names and kept the name Abdul-Mustafa for himself." (Mann Huwa Ahmad Raza pg.15 of Shuja'at Qaadiree, refer to al-Bareilwiyyah)

Ahmad Raza Khaan and went one step further and said, "The believer is really the one who is Abdul-Mustafa." (Fataawa Ifreeqiyyah pp.28-29. Meaning that the believer is a believer when he worships the Messenger of Allaah (Sallallahu Alahee Was-Sallam).

Allaamah Abu Muhammad ibn Hazm said, "All the names (which contradict Tawheed) which manifest the worship of other than Allaah, then they with agreement are unlawful for example Abdul-Amr, Abdul-Ka'bah and others except Abdul-Muttalib" (See Fath ul-Majeed pg.400-401 and Qurratul-U'yyoon al-Muwahhideen pg.575).

The Messenger of Allaah (Sallallahu Alayhee Was-Sallam) also ordered man to change his name who had an addition to Abd, which was not from the name of Allaah. Once a tribe came to the Messenger of Allaah (Sallallahu Alayhee Was-Sallam) and a man was named Abdul-Hajar. So the Messenger of Allaah (Sallallahu Alayhee Was-Sallam) asked him, "Whats your name?" he replied, "Abdul-Hajr." So the Messenger of Allaah (Sallallahu Alayhee Was-Sallam) said to him, "Your name is Abdul-Allaah (now.) (Transmitted by Ibn Abee Shaybah in Musannaf)

Dear readers please note importantly that, Ahmad Raza Khan was named 'Muhammad' but he was not satisfied with this and therefore changed it to Abdul-Mustafa.

It is known that there is virtue and blessings in the name of Muhammad and there would be no reason to change this name. The name Muhammad and the names of other Prophets are also virtuous.

Hence Allaamah Minawee said, "After the (naming of) names of Allaah the names of the Prophets and Messengers (Alayhis-Salaam) should be given precedence because Prophets and Messengers were the most best and pious from the people amongst their nations, Just as their manners, actions, taqwaa and status was great and lofty then their names were also good and virtuous, hence being named with the names of the Prophets (Alayhis-Salaam) is a means of virtue." (Faidh al-Qadeer 3/246)

Imaam Bukhaari has established a specific chapter in his Saheeh, "Baab Mann Samma Baa-Asmaa al-Ambiyaa" (Chapter From Naming the names of the Prophets.) (Saheeh ul-Bukhaari with Fath ul-Baaree 10/577. Similarly Imaam Nawawee in his Explanation of Saheeh Muslim established a similar Chapter heading, "Baab at-Tasamma Baa-Asmaa al-

Ambiya Was-Saaliheen.”

Imaam Bukhaari has established another Chapter heading in his Saheeh more specific to the name of Muhammad, “Baab Qaul an-Nabee Sallallahu Alayhee Was-Sallam Samwaa Baa-Asamaa WaLaa Takoonu Bee-Kunniyatee” (Chapter the Statement of the Prophet: name yourselves on my name And do not use My Kunyah” and he then presents the hadeeth of Abu Hurairah (the same as the chapter heading). (Saheeh al-Bukhaari Ma’a Fath 10/571 and Sunan Abee Dawood Ma’a Au’n al-Ma’bood 4/446).

Imaam Nawawee said, “A group of the companions have narrated this hadeeth which include Jaabir and Abu Hurairah.” (Adhkaar pg.261 of Nawawee).

Many Scholars have established lengthy chapters in mentioning the virtues of the name Muhammad and some even authored books specific to this name, such as Haafidh Ibn Bakeer as-Sairfee authored, “Fadhal Mann Asmah Ahmad Wa Muhammad.”

So for someone now to change his name from Muhammad to Abdul-Mustafa is something indeed strange. Some may argue that Mustafa is the name of the Messenger of Allaah (Sallallahu Alayhee Was-Sallam), then this is correct and if Ahmad Raza had re-named himself Mustafa then this would have also been admirable and something virtuous, but he does not do so rather he calls himself the Abd (slave) of Mustafa.

The word Abd literally means slave in the context of worship ie the slave of Allaah similarly to Abid, the worshiper. So when Abd is used in names it solely devoted based upon the concept of worship, therefore this necessitates a name of Allaah should follow it to denote he is a slave of Allaah. Mr Haddad argues Abd is also used in the context of a servant or slave and therefore when it is said Abdul-Mustafa it refers to the servant of the Messenger of Allaah (Sallallahu Alayhee Was-Sallam), but we say in the custom of the Arabic language you do not find people calling or referring to their servants or slaves as Abd, rather they refer to them as Ghulaam, which also means slave or servant.

It is narrated by Abdullaah bin Umar who said the Messenger of Allaah (Sallallahu Alayhee Was-Sallam) said, "The most beloved names with Allaah are Abdullaah and Abdur-Rahmaan." (Saheeh Muslim 2/206, Abu

Dawood with Au'n 4/443, Tirmidhee with Tuhfa 4/28, Ibn Maajah 1/273, Daarimee 2/380, Musnad Ahmad 2/128, Baihaqee 9/306, Mustadrak al-Haakim 4/274).

Allaamah Raaghib said, "Abd and A'boodiyah (Servitude) is the expressing of humility and E'baadah is an expansion and also explanatory of Abd and it means to humble oneself and no one is worthy of it except the one who is most deserving of it and who has favoured the people the most, and that is the dhaat of Allaah ONLY." (al-Mufradaat Fee Ghareeb al-Qur'aan 1/319).

Allaamah Muhammad Murtadha Zubaidee Hanafee said smething very similar that Abd refers to the servitude of the one who is most deserving of it with humilty. (Refer to Taaj al-Uroos 2/410).

Allaamah Ibn Manzoor Afreeqee said the same in his Leesaan ul-Arab 3/271 and mentions the hadeeth of Abu Hurairah from Saheeh Muslim which is to follow next, Allaamah Ibn Manzoor goes onto say, "Because they would associate their servitude (Abdiyyah) to themselves and this is specific only to Allaah alone because is the Rabb of the E'baad (the slaves) and all the people are his E'baad (slaves).

Hence The illustrious companion one of the great Imaams of Ahlul-Hadeeth, Abu Hurairah said, "Without doubt the Messenger of Allaah (Sallallahu Alayhee Was-Sallam) said, "No one should say 'my slave or my ummatee because all of you are the slaves of Allaah and all your women are the female slaves of Allaah, rather you should say my servant or maid." Saheeh Muslim 2/238.

Mr Haddad also raises this point when mentioning the English edition of Taqwiyyatul -Eemaan, wherein the introducer of the book, is Ghulaam Rasool Mehr. So Haddad excitingly says, "The strange statement that ?to name oneself ?Abd al-Rasul/al-Nabi or Ghulam al-Rasul/al-Nabi is shirk? originates in the book of Shah Isma` il Dihlawi titled Taqwiyyat al-Iman [cf. Darussalam English edition p. 42, p. 54, p. 141]. It is ironic that the preface to the English edition of this book is signed precisely by one Ghulam Rasool Mehr, since Ghulam also means slave in Arabic."

There is a great lie here, which Mr Haddad thought he would mentioned and it would go unnoticed, and that is no.1 lies on by saying we say it is Shirk to use the names Ghulaam Rasool or Ghulaam Nabee, no.2 he

equates Abdun-Nabee And Abdur-Rasool with Ghulaam Nabee and Ghulaam Rasool and no.3 that Shaah Ismaa'eel Shaheed Dehlwee has refuted and reprimanded the usage of the name Ghulaam Nabee or Ghulaam Rasool.

If one looks at the page references cited by Mr Haddad then one will come to know that the names Shaah Ismaa'eel was referring to were Abdun-Nabee, and prefixes with Baksh and Ghulaams to Muhiuddin and Moinuddin, no where at all does he mention the names of Ghulaam Rasool or Ghulaam Nabee. The word Ghulaam as mentioned before means slave or servant and not worshipper (as Abd means worshipper), it is this distinction which Haddad and his associates fail to realise. In addition to this Ghulaam Rasool or Ghulaam Nabee literally mean the servants of the Messenger of Allaah (Sallallahu Alayhee Was-Sallam), ie they spread his authentic Sunnah, stick to it and encourage, warn from Bida'h and practices contrary to the Sunnah, they mention the virtues and lofty status of their Prophet.

Even your own Bareilwee Scholar affirms our position, he Muftee Ahmad Yaar Khan Gujraatee Bareilwee Hanafee says, "This prohibition is on the basis of it being highly disliked as it is not good to say Abdi (ie Abd) and it is better to say Ghulaam." (Jaa ul-Haqq p.363).

Shaah Waleeullaah Dehlawee said, "From the aspects of Shirk it was also that they would their offspring Abdul-Uzza and Abush-Shams and other such names. Then these names are from the central aspects of shirk and this is why the Sharee'ah has forbade such names." (Hujjatullah al-Baalighah 1/63).

It is well known that Uzza was a female, which the people used to worship (refer to Sunan Nasaa'ee) and when Makkah was conquered the Messenger of Allaah (Sallallahu Alayhee Was-Sallam) ordered Khaalid bin Waleed (Radhiallaahu Anhu) to kill her, (refer to Tafseer Ibn Katheer 4/254. So Abdul-Uzza were such names adopted by people with regards to worship and this proves our earlier point of Abd referring solely to worship.

Ibn Hajr al-Makkee said, "It is Haraam to name someone King of Kings because this name exclusively belongs to Allaah, similarly the same applies to the names Abdun-Nabee, Abdul-Ka'bah, Abdul-Daar, Abdul-Alee and Abdul-Hassan as these names contain Shirk." (Sharh Minhaaj from Majmoo'a al-Fataawa 3/253).

Shaikh Mulla Alee Qaaree Hanafee said, "The name Abdun-Nabee which is famous then this is disbelief as is apparent however if Abd is referred to something that is possessed (ie bought) or captive then it is not disbelief." (Sharh Fiqhul-Akbar pg.238).

So this does not know mean because it is not disbelief it is permissible to use the name rather it will still remain impermissible, hence Shaikh Mulla alee Qaaree said also, "It is not permissible to keep the names Abdul-Haarith or Abdun-Nabee and these names which are well-known and customary amongst the people, then there is no reliability in this." (Mirqaat Sharh Mishkaat 9/106).

Maulana Abdul Hayy Lucknowee wrote in answer to the question, "Is it permissible to keep the name Abdun-Nabee or names similar to it."

He answered, "If this name Abdun-Nabee is kept with regards to belief then it is clear shirk... " (Majmoo'a al-Fataawa 3/95)

He also said whilst asked the question, "Is it correct to keep the names Abdul-Rasool or Abdul-Hussain." He answered, "Such names which have an addition to the name Abd, which is in reference to someone other than Allaah (ie Nabee or Rasool) then it is not correct in the Sharee'ah. So any names of this nature are not free of shirk. The Qur'aan and Sunnah indicate the prohibition of keeping such names and the scholars of the Ummah of Muhammad have continuously clarified this issue." (Majmoo'a Fataawa 2/327).

It should also be noted that Haddad has used the kunyah Abdul-Mustafa for himself, after all the discussion that has preceded we have come to know this is impermissible without a doubt. To continue the discussion further we ask to what extent is keeping the name Gibril permissible, as Gibril is the name of Angel.

Haafidh Imaam Ibn Qayyim said, "It is unlawful to call humans based upon the names of Angels." (Tuhfatul-Mawlood pg.94).

Ashab said, "When Imaam Maalik was asked concerning keeping the name of the Angel Jibreel (Haddad spells it as Gibril) (for humans) he replied it is unlawful." (Qadhee A'yaadh has also mentioned this from Imaam Maalik).

Imaam Bukhaari also brings a report in his Taareekh al-Kabeer in which the Messenger of Allaah (Sallaahu Alayhee Was-Sallam) advised keeping the names of the Prophets and prohibited the names of the Angels. Although Imaam Baihaqee has reported from Imaam Bukhaari who said this chain needs to be looked into.

so we say neither is the Kunyah Abdul-Mustafa permisible and nor is the name of Gibril, so we ask you oh you Rabid soofee with what face have you claimed your legitimacy with

Part - 2

The Issue of Haadhir-Naadhir and Ilm ul-Ghayb According to Abdul-Hayy Lucknowee Hanafee.

By: The Hanafee Shaikh Abil-Hasanaat Abdul-Hayy Lucknowee

Source: Majmoo'a al-Fataawaa 1/45-46

Abul-Hasanaat Abdul-Hayy Lucknowee is well respected with the Hanafiyyah and there is no doubt concerning this. The rabid soofee Gibril Fouad Haddad has even accepted the eminence of Abdul-Hayy Lucknowee and titles him with the title of 'Imaam'. So now we will see what his Imaam has to say concerning his beliefs. So by the time we have finished with Haddad and his pack the hanafiyyah will have no choice but to abandon this and other illegitimate children of theirs.

"Imaam" Abul-Hasanaat Abdul-Hayy Lucknowee was asked

QUESTION

It is the habit of the people of this city that during a calamity they call upon the prophets and awliyaa for help and they believe they are haadhir naadhir (omnipresent and watching), and that when they call upon them, they listen and supplicate for their needs, so is this permissible or not?

ANSWER

This is unlawful rather it is clear and manifest shirk because in this someone other than Allaah is considered to have knowledge of the unseen and such a belief is clear Shirk. According to the Sharee'ah of Islaam shirk is to give and consider someone other than Allaah to have Allaah's attributes and qualities and having knowledge of the unseen is one such attribute, as the books of Aqeedah have clearly mentioned. As a summary we will just mention one quote,

Mulla Alee Qaaree writes in the Explanation of Fiqh ul-Akbar, "Knowledge of the unseen is such affair which is for Allaah alone and humans are informed by means of insights miracles or signs in order to bring evidence,

from those things in which this is possible and doing this in way that is not possible for them. This is the reason why the books of verdicts mention that if someone by looking at the clouds, claims to have knowledge of the unseen and says today it will rain, then this is disbelief and the hanafiyyah have declared the people to be disbelievers who believe the Messenger of Allaah (Sallalaahu Alayhee Was-Sallam) had knowledge of the unseen because it contradicts the saying of Allaah, "Say no one knows the unseen of the heavens and the earths, except Allaah" this is how it is mentioned in Masaa'irah (a hanafee book of aqeedah)."

So believing that the prophets and the awliyaa are haadhir naadhir and to believe they hear our calls of need all the time in every situation, even if they are far away, is clear Shirk because this attribute is specific and solely for Allaah and no one is equal to him in this.

Fataawa Bazaaziyyah mentions, "Someone married (ie did a nikah) without witnesses and said, "I make Allaah, his Messenger and his Angels my witnesses" then he becomes a disbeliever (Kaafir) because he held the belief that the Messenger of Allaah (Sallalahu Alayhee Was-Sallam) and the Angels know the unseen."

Bazzaaziyyah also mentions. "Similarly our scholars (ie the hanafee scholars) said about those people who believe the souls of the Maashaykh (ie Soofee shaikhs) are haadhir, then they are disbelievers (Kaafirs)."

And Allaah knows best, Abul-Hasanaat Muhammad Abdul-Hayy.

QUESTION

What is the ruling concerning the person who believes the souls of the Maashaykh are haadhir and know everything?

ANSWER

He is a kaafir, (disbeliever). Bazzaaziyyah mentions. "Whoever said the souls of the Maashaykh (ie Soofee shaikhs) are haadhir and they know (the unseen), then they are disbelievers (Kaafirs)."

and Allaah knows best. (refer Abul-Hasanaat Abdul-Hayy Lucknowee's al-Majmoo'a al-Fataawa 1/85)

Part 3

The Fabrication of Kissing the Thumbs In A'dhaan (Updated)

There is not a single example from the Prophet life that by passed the Muslim Ummah. The act of worship such as the Adhaan is done five times a day which was legislated 10 years after Hijraa and it was done in front of the prophet (Sallallahu Alayhee Was-Sallam) in Madeenah, and in the books of ahadeeth we have its history and the Mu-adhdhin. But it is not in a single narration that one should kiss his thumbs on hearing the Adhaan, if we do want to kiss something then we might as well as kiss the Mu-adhdhin lips who utters the A'dhaan five times a day. This action of kissing the thumbs on hearing the Adhaan was never practiced during the time of the pious predecessors.

Their Evidences

The narration is that which is attributed to Abu Bakr as-Siddeeq (Radhiallaahu Anhu) that when he heard the Mu-adhdhin say "Ashhaadu anna muhammadur rasoolullah" he would kiss his thumbs and fingers (Index) and then touch his eyes and the prophet saw said whoever does this like my beloved has done then my intercession will be compulsory for him.

It has been narrated in Musnad Firdaus by Daylamee

Tadhkirrah al-Mawdhoo'aat pg.36, al-Mawdhoo'aat Kabeer pg.75, Ahmad Yaar khaan Bareilwee in Jaa ul-Haq pg 378 from Maqaasid Hasanah pg.384, Mukhtasar al-Maqaasid pg.174, Muhammad Umar Bareliwee in Maqyaas Khaafiyat pg. 603, also al-Lulu Wal-Marsoo'a no.505, at-Tamayyiz pg.154, al-Khisf 2/269-270, al-Asraar al-Marfoo'a pg.306, al-Masnoo'ah pg.168-169, al-Fawaa'id pg.19, Asnee al-Mataalib pg.276 and Nukhbah al-Baheeyah pg.112)

Answer

Allaamah Muhammad Taahir writes "Wa Laa Yasaheeh" not Saheeh (Tadhkirrah al-Mawdhoo'aat pg.36)

Mulla Alee Qaaree from Allaamah Sakhawee that this narration is not Saheeh (al-Mawdhoo'aat Kabeer pg.75)

Shaikh Muhammad Khaleel Tarbulusee Hanafee (d.1305) said, "Sakahwee has rejected it and said this is not authentic." (al-Lulul al-Marsoo'ah Feemaa al-Asal Lahu WaBaa Asli Mawdhoo no.505 pg.168)

If the hadeeth is not Saheeh then how can you act upon it. Ahmad Yaar Khan Bareilwee quotes Sakhawi that he said "wa lam yasaheeh" and translates it as "its level of authenticity does not reach a high level". What Muhammad Umar did was even more strange, he mentions the hadeeth from Tadhkirrah al-Mawdhoo'aat and al-Mawdhoo'aat Kabeer and does not mention "la yasaheeh" deliberately.

In addition to this, it opposes the established Sunnah of the Messenger of Allaah (Sallalahu Alayhee Was-Sallam) where he informed us to repeat the words of the A'dhaan when the mu'adhin says the a'dhaan and then send salutations upon me and Allaah will shower 10 blessing upon him. (Saheeh Muslim 1/166, Abu Dawood 1/77), in another hadeeth he said, "Whoever says these words (of the A'dhaan) with sincerity then he entrance into Paradise." Saheeh Muslim 1/167, Abu Dawood 1/78).

Answering the A'dhaan has been narrated by a number of companions, Abu Hurairah, Abee Raaf'e, Umm Habeebah, Abdullaah bin Rabee'a, A'ishah, Mu'adh, Mu'awiyah and others (Radhiiallahu Anhumaa). (refer to Tirmidhee with Tuhfah 1/183, Talkhees al-Habeer 1/211, Tamheed 10/134, Irwaa ul-Ghaleel 1/258, Baihaqee 1/409)

The Mistake of Ahmad Yaar Khaan Na'eemee Bareilwee.

He writes "Not reaching the level of Saheeh does not necessarily mean that it is Da'eef because the rating of Hasan is after Saheeh, and if this is Hasan then it is enough" (Jaa ul-Haq pg.382).

But he should know that when the Muhaditheen say "la yasaheeh" mutlaq (absolutely) it means nothing else except that it is Da'eef. If it was Hasan they would have explained and said Ya laisa bissaheeh bil hasanun,

Removing a Doubt.

Mulla Alee Qaree says "If this hadeeth is Saheeh up to Abu Bakr (Radhiallaahu Anhu) then it is enough to act upon it because the Prophet (Sallallahu Alayhee Was-Sallam) said "my Sunnah and the Sunnah of my rightly guided Khulapha is obligatory upon you" (al-Mawdhoo'aat al-Kabeer pg.65]

Ahmad Yar khaan (Jaa ul-Haq pg.382) and Muhammad Umar (Maqyaas Khaafiyat pg.602) also use the same reasoning.

But this is Mulla Alee Qaaree's conscious because if this hadeeth was Mauqoof up to Abu Bakr (Radhiallaahu Anhu) then it would have been a Hujjah but the narration that is attributed to Abu Bakr (Radhiallaahu Anhu) is Marfoo and its Sanad is not Saheeh all the way so then to say that the Marfoo hadeeth is not Saheeh and the mauqoof is Saheeh then how is it enough to say that this is sufficient.

The Ruling On Actin Upon Weak Ahadeeth

Ahmad Yaar Khaan writes "That if it is accepted that this hadeeth is Da'eef, then in virtuous actions Daeef hadeeth are enough." (Jaa ul-Haq pg.383].

This is also his incorrect understanding, that every Da'eef ahadeeth is accepted in actions of virtue, this is totally wrong.

Imaam Qadhee ibn al-Arabi al-Maliki (d.543H) and others have said regarding Da'eef ahadeeth "{La ya'mal bihi mutlaqan), it is Absolutely incorrect to act upon them." (al-Qawl al-Badee'a pg.165]

Those who act upon them have conditions so Imaam ibn Daqeeq al-Eed (d.702h) writes "Acting on Da'eef ahadeeth has conditions." (Imaam 2/171)

What are those conditions, Imaam Sakhawi (d.902h) writes by quoting his Shaykh Haafidh ibn Hajr, "Acting upon Da'eef ahadeeth has three conditions,

1. That all the Muhaditheen agree that the hadeeth is not extremely Daeef ie the hadeeth in which the narrators are not kadhaabs, who may be suspected or accused kadhaabs, or any such narrator who is munfarid (alone), who made a lot of mistakes then his Daeef hadeeth will not be a normal Daeef ahadeeth.
2. That the Hadeeth is not present under baseless principles.
3. While acting one has the belief that the hadeeth is not proven from the Prophet (Sallalahu Alayhee Was-Sallam) so that something is not attributed to him that he did not say. (al-Qawl al-Badee'a pg.195, Tadreeb ur-Raawee 1/298-299, Fath al-Mugeeth 1/268)

So we find that if anyone of the criteria above are missing, then in any circumstances the hadeeth does not need to be acted upon. Especially the 3rd condition because the that which is not proven from the Prophet (Sallalahu Alayhee Was-Sallam) and if one tries to attribute it to him and then to accept it as proven from him is a major crime indeed because it totally opposes the Mutawatir Narration of "He who intentionally attributes a lie to me, then let him take his seat in the Fire of Hell"

Maulana Abdul Hayy Lucknowee writes "The claim that acting upon Da'eef ahadeeth in the issue of virtue without difference is Baatil, Yes this is the opinion of the majority but the condition is that the Hadeeth is not severely Da'eef otherwise it will also not be accepted in the issues of virtues actions" (al-Aathaar al-Marfoo'aah Fee al-Akhbaar al-Mawdhoo'aah pg.310)

It's a pity the innovators put heels on end to prove such Ahadeeth. What beautiful words said a Bareilwi (Which is extremely rare) who said "To accept Ahadeeth and attributing it to the Prophet (Sallalahu Alayhee Was-Sallam) needs proof, an attribution without proof is not permissible. (Arfaan Sharee'at 3/27)

As A result acting on Da'eef Ahadeeth pertaining to virtues actions must comply with the 3 conditions and acting upon them is Mustahab on the

condition that it is not Mawdoo. If the narration is Mawdoo then there is no action upon it.

Haafidh Ibn Daqeeq writes "If the Hadeeth is Da'eef on the condition that it is not Mawdoo, then acting upon it is permissible. But if by it a new custom arises or is born in the Deen as a result then it also forbade from." (Ahkaam al-Ahkaam 1/51)

So here another point has been resolved and that is that the Da'eef ahadeeth is only acted upon when it is not Mawdoo (Fabricated) or forged bearing in mind that any Da'eef hadeeth which leads to a custom in the Deen, will be stopped. The people of innovation try to make such actions as the Sunnah

Haafidh Sakhawee writes, "That it is permissible and Mustahab to act upon Da'eef Ahadeeth which Command virtues actions and encouragement, but the condition is that the Ahadeeth are not fabricated or forged." (al-Qawl al-Badee'a pg.195)

He also said, "However The Mawdoo Hadeeth, Then it is not permissible to act upon them in any circumstances." (al-Qawl al-Badee'a pg.196)

The summary is that it permissible to act upon Da'eef Ahadeeth in actions of virtue and this has some conditions set by the Muhadditheen and the Ahadeeth which are Mawdoo or forged then there is no action upon them neither in the issue of virtues or encouragement.

Not only are the Ahadeeth concerning the kissing of the thumbs Da'eef but infact it is mawdoo ie fabricated and forged.

Shaikh Jalaal ud Deen Suyootee writes, "Those ahadeeth which mention the kissing of the fingers and then placing them on the eyes when the Mu'adhhdhin mentions the name of the Prophet (Sallalaahu Alayhee Was-Sallam), all of them are fabricated." (Tayseer al-Maqaal Lil Suyootee from E'emaad ud-Deen pg.123]

There is another narration from Khidr (Alayhee Wassalaatu Wasalaam) which mentions the thumbs in Tadhkirrah al-Mawdhoo'aat pg.36, al-Mawdhoo'aat al-Kabeer pg.75, Ahmad Yaar khaan Bareilwee in Jaa ul-Haq pg.378 from Maqaasid al-Hasanah, Muhammad Umar in Maqyaas Khaafiyat pg.601.

Allaamah Muhammad Taahir and Mulla Alee Qaaree write, "There are a lot of Majhool (Unknown) Narrators in the chain and it is also Manqat'a (Disconnected)." (Tadhkirrah al-Mawdhoo'aat pg.36, al-Mawdhoo'aat al-Kabeer pg.75)

Then how can we insert this narration in the Deen, Imaam Baihaquee writes in one place, "That in this chain there are a number of unknown narrators, and Allaah has not made us responsible that we take our Deen from unknown narrators." (Kitaab al-Qir'ah pg.127)

Allaamah Muhammad Naasir ud Deen al-Albaanee said, "This hadeeth is not Saheeh and has been attributed to Abu Bakr as-Siddeeqe (Marfooan) by Daylamee in Musnad al-Firdaus. But ibn Taahir says in at-Tadhkirrah that it is not Saheeh and Imaam Shawkaani also says the same in al-Hadeeth al-Mawdhoo'aah (pg.9) and Sakhawee has also said that it is not Saheeh in al-Maqaasid." (Silsilah Ahadeeth ad-Da'eefah Wal-Mawdhoo'ah no.73)

al-Imaam al-Allaamah al-Faadhil Muhammad Nazeer Hussain Muhaddith Dehlawee was asked about this and other similar ahadeeth that mention the wiping of the eyes upon hearing the A'dhaan, he replied, "All of the ahadeeth in this regard are not authentic not a single one nor is a single one established nor can they be found in any reliable book. The investigators and criticisers of hadeeth spoke about all these ahadeeth and concluded they are not authentic and are infact fabricated.

Allaamah Shams ud deen Abul-Khair Muhammad Wajeeh ud deen Abdur-Rahmaan as-Sakhawee in Maqaasid al-Hasanah, shaikh ul-Islam the translator of Bukhaari, Hasan bin Alee Hindee, Ibn Rabee'a ash-Shaafi'ee,

Zarqaanee Maalikee and Muhammad Taahir Fitnee Hanafee all said about this hadeeth, "Laa Ya-Sahah." and La Ya-Sahah means the hadeeth is not established. Allaamah Muhammad Taahir Patnee wrote in his Tadhkirrah, "Our words La Ya-Sahah are used when something is not established." Shaikh ul-Islaam wrote in his translation of Bukhaari, "After mentioning the hadeeth for wiping the eyes after hearing the words of the A'dhaan) These ahadeeth are established at all."

Hasan bin Alee Hindee, the author of Sabeel al-Janaan wrote in his notes (Ta'leeqaat) to Mishkaat al-Masabeeh, "That which has been narrated about wiping the eyes when hearing the words of the A'dhaan, then they are not established."

Mahmood Ahmad Aynee said, "It is obligatory upon everyone who hears the A'dhaan to stop anything they are doing and to answer the A'dhaan." and he goes onto further explain.

Muhammad Ya'qoob Nabnaanee mentioned in Khair al-Jaaree Sharh Saheeh al-Bukhaari the statement of Aynee and said, "From those things that are prohibited are the wiping of the eyes when hearing the words of the A'dhaan."

Allaamah Abu Ishaq bin Abdul-Jabbaar Kaabulee wrote in Sharh Risaalah Abdus-Salaam Lahooree, "The ahadeeth mentioing the wiping of the eyes when hearing the words of the A'dhaan are not established and they are weak narrations and this is why the scholars of hadeeth have clearly said all such ahadeeth are fabricated."

Imaam Abul-Hasan Abdul-Ghaafir Faarsee, the author of Mufham Sharh Saheeh Muslim and Majma'a al-Gharaa'ib, has written in Kitaab Aqwaal al-Aakazeeb after mentioing the hadeeth from Daylaamee's Musnad al-Firdaus, "There are many narrations mentioning the kissing of the thumbs when hearing the words of the A'dhaan, but they have no basis, nor with a weak chain and Haafidh Abu Nu'aym Asfahaanee said all that which has been narrated in this regard, then all of them are fabricated."

Imaam Suyootee wrote in Kitaab Tayseer al-Maqaal, "Those ahadeeth which mention the kissing of the fingers and then placing them on the eyes when the Mu'adhhdhin mentions the name of the Prophet (Sallalahu Alayhee Was-Sallam), then all of them are fabricated." The Imaam has also mentioned this in his book ad-Durar al-Muntathirah Fee Ahadeeth al-Muntashirah." (and much more refer to Fataawa Nazeeriyah 1/248-251)

Shaikh al-Allaamah Muhammad Abdul-Jaleel Saamroodee said, "Issue: the issue of wiping the eyes with the thumbs when hearing the A'dhaan, Shaamee pg.413 mentions from Jarhee who said nothing of this is established from the Messenger of Allaah (Sallalahu Alayhee Was-Sallam). Allaamah Lucknowee writes in Sa'ayah 2/46, "The haqq is that there is no hadeeth or report (authentic) from the Prophet concerning the wiping of the eyes when hearing the A'dhaan." So whoever says this is correct is indeed a big liar and this is a despicable innovation, which has no basis in the books of Sharee'ah and whoever does bring any evidences, then it is just for argumentation. Allaamah Muhammad Taahir Fitnee said in Majma'a Bahaar al-Anwaar pg.511, "The hadeeth that mentions the kissing of the thumbs is not authentic." Similarly that which has been narrated from Khidr (Alayhis-Salaam), Shaah Abdul-Azeez said in his Fataawa this action is not mentioned in any reliable hadeeth nor has it been reported from the rightly guided khulafa, nor is this Sunnah or something recommended rather it is an innovation and one should refrain from doing this and that which has been mentioned in the books of jurists is not reliable and so on..." (Zahrah Riyaadh al-Abraar Maa Ya'anee an-Naas Ann Hamal al-Asfaar pg.76-77)

So the following scholars held this narration to be fabricated

Shaikh Muhammad Taahir in Tadhkirrah al-Mawdhoo'at pg.36

Muhammad Khaleel Tarbulusee in al-Lulu Wal-Marsoo'a no.505

Shaikh Mulla Alee Qaaree in al-Asraar al-Marfoo'a pg.306

Shaikh Mulla Alee Qaaree in al-Masnoo'ah Fee Ma'arifah al-Mawdhoo'ah pg.168-169

Imaam Shawkaanee in al-Fawaa'id al-Majmoo'aah pg.19

Imaam al-Albaanee in Silsilah Ahadeeth ad-Da'eefah Wal-Mawdhoo'ah no.73. and others.

and finally we conclude with the position of the leader and Imaam of the bareilwee soofee sect, the Imaam of Gibril Haddad and others, Ahmad Raza Khaan Bareilwee said, "When hearing the name of the Messenger of Allaah (Sallalaahu Alayhee Was-Sallam) and then kissing the thumbs and rubbing them on the eyes is not established from any marfoo hadeeth and that which is narrated concerning this is not free from any speech, so whoever considers such an evidence (ie one that has speech concerning it) or considers (the action) to be practiced or considers the abandoning of this practice to be worthy of censure, then indeed he is upon error." (Abar al-Maqaal Fee Qiblatil Ajlaal pg.12)

Part 4

The Hinduism of the Soofee Bareilwee Religion

The rabid soofee Gibril Fouad Haddad in his born again soofee book, 'Albani and his friends' quotes from one Fadl al-Rusul Badayuni the soofee church father and what a great history he had we will mention his affair in detail in this series when we get to the stage of answering his book in great detail, but for now look at what this Badayuni said,

"Making idols for the purpose of being worshipped is not disbelief (Kufr)." (Fataawa Maulana Fadl Rasool Badayooni pg.14, Mufeed Khalaa'iq Press ShaahjahaanAbaad 1228H).

So this is the one who Haddad saw fit to quote from in order to rebuke Imaam Muhammad Ismaa'eel Shaheed, the one who promoted and allowed idol worship, need we say anymore.

Ahmad Raza Khaan "Our peer (holy men) can be present in every place in 10,000 places in 10,000 cities at one time" and he gives an example, "it was possible for Sayyidee Fathe Muhammad Quddus to be present in 10 different gatherings at once." Then Ahmad Raza gives an evidence for this which was, "Look at Krishan Kehnayah, he was a disbeliever and he would also be present in a number of places at once." (Malfoozaat (1/141-142).

Ahmad Raza Khaan said in another book, "Shaikh Abul-Fath Jaunpooree was invited 10 times by the Messenger of Allaah (Sallallahu Alayhee Was-Sallam) on Rabee ul-Awwal to come after the Dhuhur prayer, so he accepted his invitation from every place. So someone asked him, "Oh sir you accepted the invitation from all 10 places and agreed to be (in all 10 places) after the Dhuhur prayer, but how is this possible." He replied, "Krishan who was a disbeliever, would be in different places at one time, so Abul-Fath can be present in 10 places, so then what is the amazement in this." (Ahkaam Sharee'at 2/192).

Ahmad Raza Khan said, "If someone is in the land of the disbelievers residing in a village, for example if there are only hindus there and this person is unable to leave the place for some reason. So then tell us if a situation arises then who will he immediately ask (ie ask for a fatwa)? Then it will be said to him, "Ask the Pandit (a Pandit is a hindu priest)." (Fataawa Rizwiyyah 3/253)

Similarly on one hand Ahmad Raza Khaan held the nikah (marriage) of a Wahhabee to be invalid yet on the other hand he says if a Brahman (A high form of Hindu priest) performs the nikah, the nikah will be valid!!!! His exact words, "The nikah will be valid as a nikah is the accepting of the vows, even if a brahman performs it." (Ahkaam Sharee'at 2/225)

So with the rabid soofee bareilwee's, the church fathers of Haddad, the nikah if performed by a hindu brahman priest is valid and what does a hindu priest recite, they recite nothing but from their holy books the Ashlook from the Vedas and Pauthiyah, because they do not know the Qur'aan and yet on the other hand if a follower of the Qur'aan, Sunnah, Hadeeth and aathaar, a Wahhaabee performs the nikah it is invalid!!!!

It is not just marriage that is allowed, he Ahmad Raza Khaan allows their food which they distribute on their holy days. Ahmad Raza Khaan said, "Question, the sweets and other foods the kaafirs distribute on Haulee and Diwalee (Hindu and Sikh Festivals), is it permissible for the muslims to accept this or not? He replied, "Do not accept it on the day but if they give it to you the next day then you may take it." (al-Malfoozaat 1/115).

An eminent soofee bareilwee scholar, Moulwee Ghulaam Jahaaniyyah said in a poem, "Having Ishq (love (of sexual nature) for Muhammad is not specific to the muslims, the Kautharee hindus also call upon the Muhammad." (Hafat Aqtaab pg.123)

So this bareilwee soofee is trying to say the hindus will be at the Pool of Kauthar because they call upon Muhammad (Sallalaahu Alayhee Was-Sallam) and are his true lovers!!!!

Ahmad Raza Khaan was influenced so much by the hindu religious books that his poetry full of shirk is written based on the hindu sanskrit. (refer to his despicable book Khadaa'iq Bakhshish 3/70)

Ahmad Raza Khaan's faithful disciple, Ahmad Yaar Khaan Na'eemee Gujraatee the author of Jaa ul-Haqq said concerning Ibraaheem Alayhis-Salaam, "The mushrikeen (polytheists) show him respect by calling him Krishan." (Noor al-A'rfaan pg.492)

He said in another place, "The mushriks of Hindh praise him by calling him Krishan and the mushrikeen of Arabia refer to themselves as Ibraaheemee." Noor al-A'rfaan pg.590)

And this Ahmad Yaar Khaan Na'eemee said, "A religious hindu said to me, "The person you call Ibraaheem we call him Krishan Jee and we call Ismaa'eel, Arjun." (Noor al-A'rfaan pg.492)

So all the above shows the influence of the hindu religion upon the bareilwee religion and this duality is much deeper than we have mentioned here

Part 5

The Fadl al-Rasul al-Badayuni Affair

What follows, is a series of articles in response the work of the rabid soofee G F Haddad titled 'Albani and his friends' which are not in any particular order, similarly this series is also part of the ongoing and continuous series of Answeing the Rabid Soofee's series, Inshallaah. We have and will named our series in this regard to be titled 'The Hanafiyyah and their muqallids'

Haddad the rabid soofee quotes from one Fadl al-Rasul al-Badayuni in 'Albani and his Friends pg.51-55)

However

as mentioned in part 4, al-Badayuni said, "Making idols for the purpose of being worshipped is not disbelief (Kufr)." (Fataawa Maulana Fadl Rasool Badayooni pg.14, Mufeed Khalaa'iq Press ShaahjahaanAbaad 1228H).

So this is the one who Haddad saw fit to quote from, in order to rebuke Imaam Muhammad Ismaa'eel Shaheed, this Badayuni the one who promoted and allowed idol worship. We seek refuge in Allaah from the disease of Shirk

Sayyiid Abdul-Hayy Husainee said about him, "He was a trouble maker, bigoted, a debater, a strong exposor of the Sunnah and a caller to innovations, an enemy of the people of the Haqq and a friend of wordly affairs. He worked for the british government and used to receive money (ie on the payroll) from the leaders of rural states and in addition to this his writings (books, and treatises and articles) would be printed by the British government from their presses." (Nazhatul-Khawaatir 7/377-378, Akmal at-Taareekh, this is the biography of Fadl ar-Rasul al-Badayuni authored by Munshee Muhammad Ya'qoob Hussain Badayuni and refer also to Tadhkirrah Ulama Hindh pg.381 printed from Karachee)

As mentioned above, the biographer of Maulana Fadl al-Rasul al-Badayuni, Munshee Muhammad Ya'qoob Hussain Dhiyaa al-Qaadiiree Badayuni (a

soofee) also mentioned that he used to work for the British government and was on their payroll and receive money from the leaders of rural states and provinces. (see his Akmal at-Taareekh 2/372, 380, 512 printed in 1331H)

He would also receive money from the leaders of Hydraabaad and they would look after him, give him sittings in their gatherings and the rest of the affair and they would help him financially. (Fuqaaha Of Paak and Hind 3/133-134.)

He was very bigoted and staunch, reaching the realms of extremeism and in this he refuted and rebuked Mujaddid Alf Thaane and Shaah Waleeullaah Dehlahee and in their affair he would go beyond bounds. (Fuqaaha Of Paak and Hind 3/134.)

Haddad says on the other hand shows some respect and reverence for Shaah Waleeullaah Dehlahee and Mujaddid Alf Thaane yet al-Badayuni did not even spare them, so what hope could have been expected when it came to Imaam Muhammad Ismaa'eel Shaheed.

Badayuni also wrote some books against Ahlus-Sunnah, ie al-Bawaariq al-Muhammadiyah, Tas-heeh al-Masaa'il, Sayf al-Jabbaar, al-Mu'taqad al-Muntaqad and others. This enemy of Ahlus-Sunnah and the muslims also wrote an explanation of Fusoos al-Hikam, the book of the Kaafir, disbeliever Ibn Araabee.

Fadl al-Rasul al-Badayuni worked for the british government, first he was a mufti for them and then moved to being a clerical worker, he also worked for Raajah Nawaab Singh. Later when his home town of Badayun fell out of the hands of the British government during the war of independence in 1857ce, he helped the british, saving their wealth and lives just to maintain their control. (Fuqaaha Of Paak and Hind 3/134)

A bareilwee historian Doctor Muhammad Ayoob Qaadiiree wrote, "When the control of british government finished in Badayun there was chaos everywhere but Moulwee Fadl Rasul Badyuni restored some order (for the

british) and tried to save the lives of the people (And whose lives he tried to save is clarified further). Hence the newspaper Jabeeb of Badayun 25th June 1857ce corresponding to 3 Dhul-Qadah 1273H mentions, "And because the Holy scholar and Soofee Moulwee Fadl al-Rasul had organised things very well, there were no major incidences. He by risking his life from the hooligans and mob saved attempted to save the people and the people were the soldiers of the british government and he tried fully to restore peace and order." (The War of Independence 1857ce, Events and Personalities pg.140)

Another british government worker Bihaaree Laal the deputy inspector of Badayun also said the same about Moulwee Badayuni and his affair and connection with the british government. (The War of Independence 1857ce, Events and Personalities pg.140-141, The Freedom Struggle 5/318)

The bareilwee historian Ayooob Qaadiree also mentions that some of the followers, close associates like the biographer of Moulwee Fadl al-Rasul Badayuni attempted to brush this aside and hide the reality of this affair but the reality is apparent and well known to those who consult the books of the history of India. (The War of Independence 1857ce, Events and Personalities pg.141).

In addition to this, for his work and his support of the british government he was rewarded substantially and the British Commisioner of Muradabaad gave him a peice of land for this feat. (Fuqaaha Of Paak and Hind 3/136)

refer also Tadhkirrah Ulama Hindh pg.380-383, Qamoos al-Mashaheer 2/127 and Nazahatul-Khawaatir 7/377-378)

Haddad on pg.55 of 'Albani and his friends' mentions 2 books of Badayuni but none of these were a direct refutation of Imaam Muhammad Ismaa'eel. From the works of Badayuni one was Tas-heeh al-Masaa'il which was a refutation of Shaikh Muhammad Ishaq Dehlawee's two treatises, Arbaa'een al-Masaa'il and Mi'yatul-Masaa'il.

Badayuni attacked Imaam Muhammad Ismaa'eel in most of his books but the work which he authored specifically in refutation of Imaam Muhamamd Ismaa'eel's Taqwiyyatul-Eemaan was his al-Bawaariq al-Muhamamdiyyah and in it he does not only attack Imaam Muhammad Ismaa'eel, but he unlawfully makes takfeer of him, he also attacked Ahlus-Sunnah, refuted the works of Shaah Waleeullaah Dehlawee, in specific his Izaalatul-Khafa Ann Khilaafatul Khulafaa and his Durratul-Aynayn and others and concluded these books were gainst Ahlus-Sunnah. (refer to Badayuni's al-Bawaariq pg.27-32).

Alhamdulillah, all praise be to Allaah, the scholars of Ahlul-Hadeeth answered all of his allegations and despicable lies and errors. So Shaikh Qadhee Basheer ud deen Qanoojee answered Badayuni' al-Bawaariq and obliterated its contents in his 'as-Sawaa'iq al-Aalhiyyah Lee-Radd Shayateen al-Lahbiyyah' and in answer to Badayuni's Tas-heeh al-Masaa'il Qaadhee Basheer ud deen authored 'Tafheem al-Masaa'il'

Also in answer to Badayuni's works, Shaikh Muhammad Taquee Khaan Dehlawee authored 'an-Nashr' and Shaikh Siraaj Ahmad Sehsawaanee (d.1279H) authored 'Siraaj ul-Eemaan' in support of Taqwiyyatul-Eemaan and answered all the allegations levied by Badayuni and other soofee's. In addition to this Shaikh Haider Alee Taunkee (d.1272H) authored his monumental 'Siyaanatul an-Naas Ann Waswasatul-Khannaas' in refutation of Badayuni's allegations, which he raised in his books and much more, so this is the affair of al-Badayuni

Part 6

The Mulla Saahib Baghdaadee Affair.

Haddad on pg.51 mentions the issue of those who affirm that Allaah can lie, 'Imkaan al-Kaadhib' and claims Imaam Muhammad Ismaa'eel Dehlawee was the first of the Wahhabis of India to forward this heresy. He goes on to say, "Refutation were published by Mulla Saahib Baghdadi and Mawlana Fadl al-Haqq Kayrabadi..." (Albani and his Friends pg.51).

So the affair is that in about 1240H some of the opponents of Ahlus-Sunnah started to raise some false allegation regarding the book Taqwiyyatul-Eemaan. Mulla Baghdaadee became influenced by them, that resulted in him writing a letter which he then sent to Imaam Muhammad Ismaa'eel in Kaanpoor.

So as soon as the objection was received by Imaam Muhammad Ismaa'eel, he immediately answered it and returned it back to him in Dhelee. From the people who witnessed this reply and also heard it were the grandson of Shaikh Abdul-Azeez Muhaddith Dehlawee Maulana Muhammad Ya'qoob, also Maulana Naseer ud deen, Maulana Mahboob Alee and others. Alhamdulillah, all praise be to Allaah the Rabb of everything that exists, we have this response of Imaam Muhammad Ismaa'eel and inshallah if possible will present the full response later.

So the opposers created doubts and confusion regarding Taqwiyyatul-Eemaan in the mind of Mulla Baghdaadee, as Taqwiyyatul-Eemaan was written initially written in Arabic as the book 'Radd al-Ashraak' which was later translated into Urdu, as the first chapter and was titled as the famous work of Taqwiyyatul-Eemaan. Imaam Muhammad Ismaa'eel sent the arabic edition to a handful of people but the edition that became well known was the Urdu one and Mulla Baghdaddee did not understand the language and relied on translation and interpretation of others, the ones who caused the confusion.

After the response of Imaam Muhammad Ismaa'eel the doubts and confusion of Mulla were cleared and later Mulla Baghdaadee met Imaam

Muhammad Ismaa'eel and personally apologised for his false allegations and admitted that his confusion was based upon what was incorrectly conveyed to him by the opposers of Ahlus-Sunnah. (refer to Tadhkirrah Imaam Muhammad Ismaa'eel pg.235-236)

Imaam Muhammad Ismaa'eel mentions in his response that Mulla Baghdaadee himself praised the book Taqwiyyatul-Eemaan but argued that a particular statement was correct and from the aspects of Belief but mentioning it was disrespectful.

Imaam Muhammad Ismaa'eel said, "..All praise be to Allaah that he guided many a man and woman by this treatise and no one looked at it with doubt or revilement except a handful of ignorant opposers. I have also come to know this treatise of mines was read to you and you praised it. Also with this you said that from the creation of Allaah, he creating the idols and making them equivalent to the Prophets is something true and from the aspects of belief but it is a form of disrespect and dishonour...." (The Response to Mulla Baghdaadee's Letter pg.1-2). Imaam Muhammad Ismaa'eel then goes onto answer this claim in great detail.

So this is the affair of the "refutation" that WAS NOT published as falsely claimed by Haddad, by Mulla Baghadadee and his position regarding Imaam Muhammad Ismaa'eel