

Sa'd's Deviation

Written by Administrator

Wednesday, 18 January 2017 11:46 - Last Updated Wednesday, 18 January 2017 12:18

Sa'd's Deviation

Urdu below

Molvi Sa'd is a *fattaan*. He has created great fitnah in the name of the Deen. He uses *goondas* (thugs) to entrench himself in the position of leadership.

The context in which Sa'd mentioned the episode and the manner in which he presented the opinion of Mazhari, differ vastly from that of Mazhari and the other tafaaseer. Sa'd's citation denigrates the lofty status of Hadhrat Nabi Musa (Alayhis salaam). Mazhari stated his personal opinion in an academic manner. But Sa'd regurgitated the view in a way to bring disrepute to Nabi Musaa (Alayhis salaam), and he did so in an abortive attempt to 'prove' that Tabligh Jamaat 'khurooj' and methodology are compulsory and the best.

If he had sound brains, and if he was not driven by power-lust, he would have understood that in the Qur'aan Allah Ta'ala had ordered Nabi Musa (Alayhis salaam) to come to the Mountain for 40 days communion. But Mr. Sa'd presented this episode as if Nabi Musa (Alayhis salaam) had deserted his people when in reality, he went at the command of Allah Ta'ala.

The opinion in Mazhari and in some other Tafaaseer is personal opinion. It is not official Tafseer. It is a personal view with which we disagree. But there is no need to publicize it among the ignorant masses who will become more confused as Sa'd has done. But the manner in which Mazhari has presented the view does not denigrate Nabi Musa (Alayhis salaam).

It is essential to understand that Nabi Musa (Alayhis salaam) went to converse with Allah Ta'ala for 40 days on the instruction of Allah Ta'ala. He did not abandon his people. This idea which Sa'd had planted in the minds of his thugs is tantamount to kufr. He felt no shame and no

Sa'd's Deviation

Written by Administrator

Wednesday, 18 January 2017 11:46 - Last Updated Wednesday, 18 January 2017 12:18

inhibition in opening his mouth and wagging his tongue against such a great Nabi of Allah Azza Wa Jal. This is a clear sign of his deviation.

Furthermore, Sa'd was very selective in citing the view of Mazhari. In his bayaan, Sa'd had unequivocally mentioned that *hidaayat* depends on *mehnet (effort)*, and by this he implied Tabligh Jamaat khurooj. He made it clear that

hidaayat

is not the effect of the Nabi's

Roohaaniyat.

In fact, the moron said that

hidaayat

is not even in Allah's control. This is explicit kufr which expels him from the fold of Islam, and renders his Nikah invalid.

Now, in Tafseer Mazhari and the other Tafaaseer which Sa'd cites in his defence for his kufr, it is explained in the very same tafseer of the Aayat pertaining to Nabi Musa's departure for communion with Allah Ta'ala, that *hidaayat* stems from the *Roohaniyat* of the Nabi. But, Sa'd conveniently ignores this aspect, and selectively adopts the other part of the view which he abortively presents to justify his warped idea of *hidaayat*.

Since he had extracted from Mazhari a view which he utilized to denigrate Nabi Musa (Alayhis salaam), he should have taken the whole view expressed by Mazhari on this issue, not only part of it. However, since one aspect of the tafseer negates the convoluted idea of Sa'd – his claim that a Nabi's *Roohaaniyat* has no role in the *hidaayat* of his Ummah – he selected only the other aspect to defend his indefensible ideology.

In his bayaan, Sa'd said:

“You are labouring under the idea that hidaayat is in the Hands of Allah. However, if hidaayat was in the Hands of Allah, then why did Allah send Nabis? For giving hidaayat,

Sa'd's Deviation

Written by Administrator

Wednesday, 18 January 2017 11:46 - Last Updated Wednesday, 18 January 2017 12:18

Allah Ta'ala sent Ambiya (Alayhimus salaam) for the purpose of mehnat (effort).

The Nabis did not spread hidaayat with their inner (i.e. spiritual) tawajjuh and roohaaniyat. All of you listen carefully to what I am saying. In this age there is the deception among Muslims that the Ummat will attain hidaayat by means of the spiritual state (the roohaaniyat) of the Allahwaalo (the Buzrugs). This idea is erroneous."

It is palpably clear that Sa'd has negated the role and efficacy of the *Roohaaniyat* of the Ambiya (Alayhimus salaam) in the transmission of *hidaayat* to their followers. When he has the blatant kufr belief of negating control of *hidaayat* from even Allah Azza Wa Jal, then it should not be difficult to understand his greater negation of the emanation of *hidaayat* from the *Roohaniyat* of the Ambiya (Alayhimus salaam).

In the light of this corrupt, convoluted belief of baatil, read the following tafseer of Mazhari and of the other Mufasssireen whose tafseer he has cited to vindicate his denigration of Hadhrat Nabi Musaa (Alayhis salaam).

"I say that the Risaalat of the Ambiya has two objectives: (1) To teach the people Islam and the ahkaam of Allah and inviting them to act accordingly.

(2) To draw the people to Allah with the strength of their baatini (spiritual) ability, and thereby to inspire their hearts with the Noor of Imaan and Ma'rifat so that their breasts

Sa'd's Deviation

Written by Administrator

Wednesday, 18 January 2017 11:46 - Last Updated Wednesday, 18 January 2017 12:18

become bright to enable them to distinguish between Haqq and baatil. But this obligation of the Ambiya could be fully discharged only when the Nabi's focus is fully on the Makhloq (his followers). At the time (of the meeting with Allah), Hadhrat Musa was overwhelmed with eagerness and love to be in the Divine Presence to commune with Allah Ta'ala. He was in the state of Sukr (spiritual ecstasy), hence his Baatini Tawajjuh was not focused on his Ummah (at that time). This is why Bani Israaeel was embroiled in fitnah and deviation."

Thus, Tafseer Mazhari as well as other Mufasssireen unequivocally confirm the emanation of *hid aayat*

as a consequence of the

Tawajjuh

and

Roohaniyat

of the Nabi, and in this specific case it was Hadhrat Nabi Musaa (Alayhis salaam). Discarding this conspicuous aspect of the tafseer pertaining the Nabi's

Roohaaniyat

for the attainment of

hidaayat

for his followers, Sa'd conveniently adopts only one aspect of the view which proffers the idea of the predication of Bani Israaeel's deviation as a consequence of Nabi Musaa's departure.

While Tafseer Mazhari and others present this view to an Ulama audience, which is a view based on their personal opinion (*Tafseer Bir Raai*) in an academic manner without the slightest vestige of denigration or cast of aspersion on the lofty status of Hadhrat Musa (Alayhis salaam),

Mr. Sa'd stated this academic intricacy in a bayaan to a crowd of juhala, and the manner he acquitted himself in the delivery of this bit of

afseer bir raai

, was calculated to impugn the lofty

Maqaam

of Hadhrat Musaa (Alayhis salaam) who is second in rank to Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam). This audacity of Sa'd is intolerable.

Sa'd's Deviation

Written by Administrator

Wednesday, 18 January 2017 11:46 - Last Updated Wednesday, 18 January 2017 12:18

The manner of Sa'd's presentation to his jaahil audience was to convey the clear impression that Hadhrat Musa (Alayhis salaam) had, *Nauthubillah!*, failed in his mission of Nubuwwat and Risaalat for having caused almost 6 hundred thousand persons of Bani Israaeel to go astray and worship the golden calf. In essence, Sa'd blamed Nabi Musa (Alayhis salaam) for the calf-worship and shirk of Bani Isaaeel.

It is indeed moronic to formulate such a kufr idea on the basis of the academic intricacy mentioned in Tafseer Mazhari. The strongest daleel to discount and refute this kufr idea of Sa'd is the categorical statement of Allah Azza Wa Jal:

"And (remember) when We promised Musaa forty nights (of communion), then you (Bani Israaeel) worshipped the calf after him and you were indeed oppressors/transgressors." ﷻ (Baqarah, Aayat 51)

"And We promised Musaa thirty nights, and We completed it with (another) ten. Thus the promise of His Rabb was completed with forty nights."

(Al-A'raaf, Aayat 142)

Sa'd's Deviation

Written by Administrator

Wednesday, 18 January 2017 11:46 - Last Updated Wednesday, 18 January 2017 12:18

The first fundamental of this issue which every moron can also understand is that Hadhrat Musaa (Alayhis salaam) had gone to Mount Tur at the command of Allah Ta'ala. He did not abandon his post of Nubuwwat to go into l'tikaaf on the mountain. The second fundamental is that his departure was not a desertion of his people. He left Nabi Haroon (Alayhis salaam) as his Khalifah. The third fundamental is that the incumbent corollary of answering the Command of Allah Azza Wa Jal, was separation from his Ummah for forty days. Thus, Hadhrat Musaa's (Alayhis salaam) had no alternative but to separate himself from his flock. The attribution of the calf-worship to Hadhrat Musa (Alayhis salaam), and that too, because he fulfilled the command of Allah Ta'ala, is a blasphemous injustice.

Even if it had to be stupidly assumed that Bani Israaeel's deviation was the effect of Nabi Musaa's departure, he had no choice in the matter. He was answering the command of Allah Ta'ala. The Qur'aan Majeed explicitly attributes the deviation of Bani Israaeel to Saamiri. Furthermore, the Qur'aan states: "*We had cast Bani Israaeel in a trial...*" The circumstance for the trial, namely Musaa's departure, was by the command of Allah Ta'ala, not by the volition of Hadhrat Musaa (Alayhis salaam) or any act which he had executed arbitrarily.

The *tafseer bir raai* of an Aalim many centuries after Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam), may not be cited as a basis and justification for a corrupt view which denigrates the lofty status of one of the greatest Ambiya, and which also is in conflict with the text of the Qur'aan Majeed. Such self-opinion should be set aside, and not cited as daleel.

Since Sa'd was seeking a basis and justification for his view of Tabligh Jamaat khurooj being Fardh, he conveniently extracted one aspect of Tafseer Mazhari's opinion while concealing the other aspect which is in total conflict of his corrupt view of the denial of the emanation of *hidaay at* from the Roohaaniyat of the Ambiya (Alayhimus salaam).

Sa'd's Deviation

Written by Administrator

Wednesday, 18 January 2017 11:46 - Last Updated Wednesday, 18 January 2017 12:18

Question: Why is Sa'd being castigated, not Mazhari? Answer: When Fir'oun said: "*I am your almighty rabb.*", he became mardood and mal-oon. But when Hadhrat Mansur Al-Hallaaj, uttered the same statement expressed with a slight difference, viz., "*Anal Haq (I am Haq-i.e. Allah)*", he remained maqbool and muqarrab. This is the difference. Sa'd followed in the footsteps of Fir'oun, while Mazhari and others were in the footsteps of Mansur (Rahmatullah alayh).

Sa'd blurted out his satanic statement in denigration of Hadhrat Musaa (Alayhis salaam) while Mazhari propounded the view to highlight the lofty status of Nabi Musaa (Alayhis salaam). In the view of Mazhari, the *Tawajjuh* and *Roohaaniyat* of Hadhrat Musaa (Alayhis salaam) are highlighted. No one ever developed even a *wasah* of denigration against Hadhrat Musaa (Alayhis salaam) from the tafseer of Mazhari. But in the eyes of every miserable jaahil, the manner of Sa'd's acquittal demoted the lofty status of Hadhrat Musaa (Alayhis salaam).

May Allah Ta'ala save us all from the evils of the nafs and the snares of shaitaan. Imaan is suspended between fear and hope, said Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam).

سعد کی گمراہی

استفتاء:

۱۔ نبی موسیٰ علیہ السلام کے بارہ میں نظام الدین کے مولانا سعد کا جو خیال ہے اس کے متعلق دارالعلوم دیوبند کا فتویٰ میں نے دیکھا۔ مولانا سعد نے جو رائے اپنی ظاہر کی کیا اس سے نبی موسیٰ علیہ السلام کی تنقیص شان تو نہیں ہوتی، جیسے دیوبند کے فتویٰ میں مذکور ہے؟

۲۔ مولانا سعد کے نزدیک جو رائے انہوں نے ذکر کیا ہے وہی تفسیر مظہری، روح المعانی اور حضرت مفتی شفیع صاحب کے معارف القرآن میں بھی مندرج تفسیر ہے۔ اس رائے کی وجہ سے مولانا سعد پر کیوں تنقید کی جا رہی ہے، جبکہ مفسرین پر تنقید نہیں کی جا رہی ہے؟

الجواب:

مولوی سعد فغان ہیں۔ دین کے نام سے انہوں نے بڑا فتنہ برپا کیا۔ گنڈوں کی مدد سے اپنے آپ کو امیر کے مقام پر جمانا چاہتے ہیں۔

سعد نے جس موقع و قرینہ میں واقعہ بیان کیا اور جس انداز سے اس نے مظہری کی رائے پیش کی، اس میں اور مظہری و دیگر تفاسیر میں بڑا فرق ہے۔ سعد کے بیان سے حضرت نبی موسیٰ علیہ السلام کے مقام رفیع میں تنقیص لازم آتی ہے۔ مظہری نے اپنی ذاتی رائے علمی انداز میں بیان کی۔ لیکن سعد نے اسی کو اس طور سے اگالی جس

Sa'd's Deviation

Written by Administrator

Wednesday, 18 January 2017 11:46 - Last Updated Wednesday, 18 January 2017 12:18

[Download full Urdu document](#)