

**MOLVI SA'D
AND HIS
DISPARAGEMENT
OF HADHRAT
NABI MUSAA
(Alayhis salaam)**

BY:
Mujlisul Ulama of SA
PO Box 3393
Port Elizabeth
6056, South Africa

INTRODUCTION

The controversy between the two antagonistic factions of the Tabligh Jamaat is not surprising. It is the consequence of *ghulu'* (*haraam extremism*). Warning us of *ghulu'*, Allah Ta'ala says in the Qur'aan Majeed:

“Do not commit ghulu' in your Deen.”

While this Aayat was revealed primarily for the Nasaara who had elevated Nabi Isaa (Alayhis salaam) to the pedestal of Godhood, it brings within its purview any kind of *ghulu'* committed in the name of the Deen. Of such *ghulu'*, the Tabligh Jamaat is notorious. In fact, it dangles on the precipice of becoming a cult beyond the pale of the Ahlus Sunnah. If it does not apply the brakes now, it shall slip over the precipice into blatant *baatil* and be branded a deviate sect.

The current flurry of criticism against Molvi Sa'd by the Raiwandi faction stems from pure *nafsaaniyat* camouflaged with the hues of the Deen. We hold no bias for Molvi Sa'd. Everyone is well aware of our stance pertaining to the Tabligh Jamaat. For over four decades, long before the ugly shaitaani split, have we been criticizing the Tabligh Jamaat for its Shar'i infractions and *ghulu'* while all others maintained a stony shaitaani silence.

But today, these very same silent molvis of the Raiwandi faction have become quite vociferous in their criticism of Molvi Sa'd.

In fact, they are resorting to sinister stunts, sending delegations to trustees of Musaa'jid in the endeavour of preventing Molvi Sa'd being granted platforms for his bayaans. Yet, all these Molvis know that the erroneous views of Molvi Sa'd are all old hat. His views are not new. These were his views even prior to the splitting of the Tabligh Jamaat. But no one had commented. Now in view of a power struggle for leadership, the Raiwandi faction is actively making *tashkeel* against Molvi Sa'd in the hope of Molvi Sa'd's Camperdown Ijtimia becoming a damp squib.

It should not be forgotten that never was it the policy of the Tablighis to become involved in academic disputes pertaining to Fiqhi masaa-il and issues of academic import. They were always accommodating of all and sundry regardless of the diversity and *butlaan* of views and beliefs. The deviate, Tariq Jameel is a good example of shaitaani accommodation by the Tabligh Jamaat, especially the Raiwandi faction. But as far as Molvi Sa'd is concerned, the daggers are drawn.

Molvi Sa'd and his faction are just as astray as is the Raiwandi faction. Our criticism of Molvi Sa'd is not based on the claims made by the Raiwandi faction nor on the fataawa of Darul Uloom Deoband nor on the views of any other Ulama who criticized Molvi Sa'd. Our criticism is the effect of our own independent research and is motivated by genuine concern for the Deen. We have no other agenda.

This brief treatise unravels the error of Molvi Sa'd's opinion pertaining to Nabi Musaa (Alayhis salaam) whom he had accused of being the cause for the deviation and calf-worship of 588,000 people of Bani Israaeel. Although it is claimed that he has retracted his erroneous view, some of his molvi followers are perpetuating the erroneous *baatil* view which is the product of gross misinterpretation of the Qur'aanic Aayaat pertaining to the specific episode of Nabi Musaa (Alayhis salaam).

These followers of Molvi Sa'd are vindicating him and claim that his retraction is merely to appease his detractors and the laiyety (awaamun naas). If this is true, it follows that Molvi Sa'd also subscribes to the Shiah doctrine of *Taqiyah* or holy hypocrisy which requires speaking lies and concealing one's beliefs to appease opponents.

Be this as it may. The fact remains that his followers are perpetuating an extremely corrupt opinion which disparages the lofty status of Nabi Musaa (Alayhis salaam), hence the imperative need for this treatise. This is the consequence of the grievous state of the Tabligh Jamaat's *Ghulu'* which is its intagliated hallmark. They have become the victims of the dangerous fate of *dhalaal* of which they are the initiators.

Molvi Sa'd and his Molvi cohorts have at pains laboriously attempted to extravasate from a purely academic topic support for their conception of *da'wat* by resorting to baseless extrapolation, and in this

process they floundered hopelessly as a result of their mismanipulation of *Aql*. The issue which all the Mufasssireen had elaborated on in the *tafseer* of the relevant Qur'aanic Aayaat applicable to the episode of Nabi Musaa (Alayhis salaam) is not meant for an *awaamun naas* (laeity) audience. The general public who is the target of Molvi Sa'd's so-called da'wat, lacks the intellectual and academic foundation to comprehend the details of academic (*ILMI*) subtleties.

In like vein, it is not permissible to narrate to the *awaamun naas* the internecine conflicts of the Sahaabah (Radhiyallahu anhum). Shaitaan awaits the opportunity to denigrate the lofty status of the Sahaabah, hence he springs into action to cast doubt and suspicion when corrupt brains provide the latitude for such denigration. Thus it was a grievous and a heinous error of Molvi Sa'd to interpret a difference of opinion between Hadhrat Umar (Radhiyallahu anhu) and Hadhrat Bilaal (Radhiyallahu anhu) to mean a curse invoked by Hadhrat Umar (Radhiyallahu anhu) on Hadhrat Bilaal (Radhiyallahu anhu). He compounded his villainous view by publicizing this issue to the *awaamun naas*, and this is in stark conflict of what Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) had ordered:

“Honour my Sahaabah, for verily they are your noblest, then those after them, then those after them. Thereafter will be KITHB (falsehood/lies).”

It is from the heights of their hubris that they ignore the instructions of Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam)

and thus they set aside even the *Ahkaam* of the Shariah to act in terms of the demands of their *Ghulu'* which in turns demands transgression of the *hudood* (limits of the Shariah.) Warning of such transgression, the Qur'aan Majeed states:

“These are the hudood of Allah. Whoever transgresses these limits, verily he has oppressed himself.”

DISPARAGING HADHRAT NABI MUSAA

(Alayhis salaam)

Molvi Sa'd of the Nizaamuddeen faction had mentioned in his bayaan:

“Bani Israaeel had gone astray because guidance was severed for a short while when Hadhrat Musaa (Alayhis salaam) had hastily left his nation to commune with Allah Ta’ala. Hence, 580,000 people went astray.”

Apparently, Molvi Sa'd had retracted this comment when he was criticized by Darul Uloom Deoband. He had also verbally retracted this statement more than once according to some of his followers.

A view which has been retracted may not be attributed to the person who had initially subscribed to it. Therefore, in this article we are not criticizing Molvi Sa'd for the disparaging remark which he had made and then retracted. However, some of his camp-followers have written in his defence, vindicating the comment which disparages the lofty status of Hadhrat Nabi Musaa (Alayhis salaam). Thus, our intention is to rebut those of his followers who maintain that the statement of Molvi Sa'd is correct and not disparaging of the rank of Nabi Musaa (Alayhis salaam).

In vindication they cite a number of Mufasssireen whose tafseer they deceptively spin to produce a quotient to

support the corrupt view of Molvi Sa'd, a view which we believe he has retracted. As yet we have not seen his written retraction. Nevertheless, while we shall accept that he has retracted, there still remains the need to rectify the corrupt interpretation to which some of his followers cling and circulate.

The episode on which the controversy centres relates to Nabi Musaa (Alayhis salaam) having departed from his people at the command of Allah Ta'ala to commune with Him on Mount Toor.

At the command of Allah Ta'ala, Nabi Musaa (Alayhis salaam) departed. On leaving, he appointed his Brother, Nabi Haaron (Alayhis salaam) as the Khalifah to govern Bani Israaeel. Mentioning this appointment, the Qur'aan Majeed says:

“Musaa said to his Brother Haaron: ‘Be my Khalifah (representative) for my people. Reform (them) and do not follow the path of the mischief-makers.’”
(Al-A'raaf, Aayat 142)

The command was not for Hadhrat Musaa (Alayhis salaam) to take the entire nation of Bani Israaeel consisting of 600,000 persons with him to Mount Toor. If that had been the command, appointing Haaron (Alayhis salaam) as his Khalifah would have been meaningless.

Nabi Musaa (Alayhis salaam) took with him 70 of the *Nuqaba* (seniors, elders, leaders) of Bani Israaeel. Along the journey, Hadhrat Musaa (Alayhis salaam),

eager to commune with Allah Ta'ala, stepped up his pace of walking and was somewhat ahead of the group of 70 *Nuqaba*.

Among the requisites of *safar* (journey) is for the leader to remain behind his flock, not in front. The eagerness to 'meet' and converse with Allah Ta'ala, induced Hadhrat Nabi Musaa (Alayhis salaam) to walk hastily ahead of the group. Reminding him of this etiquette of *safar*, Allah Ta'ala said:

*“What has induced you to hasten ahead
of your people, O Musaa!”
(Taahaa, Aayat 83)*

While the 'people' mentioned in this Aayat refers to the 70 *Nuqaba*, Molvi Sa'd had misinterpreted it and claimed that it refers to the 600,000 Bani Israeel who were under the jurisdiction of Nabi Haaron (Alayhis salaam). This is an egregious error. The following Aayat confirms that the 'people' in the context refers to the 70 *Nuqaba*:

*“He (Musaa) said: They are on by footsteps (heels,
i.e. just behind me), and I have hastened towards You,
O my Rabb!, so that You are pleased.”
(Taahaa, Aayat 83)*

Nabi Musaa (Alayhis salaam) mentioned with clarity that *“the people are behind me”* close by, not far from me. He was not referring to the entire nation of 600,000 because the whole nation did not accompany him. They

remained behind at their location under the guardianship of Nabi Haaroon (Alayhis salaam).

These two Qur'aanic Verses debunk the narrative spun by Molvi Sa'd, and which he is stated to have retracted, but which some of his followers are perpetuating. Molvi Sa'd had erred by claiming that the "people" mentioned in the aforementioned Aayat refers to the 600,000. On the basis of this misinterpretation, he propounded the view of Hadhrat Musaa (Alayhis salaam) being responsible for the deviation and calf-worship of 580,000 people of Bani Israaeel. Thus he said:

"...Bani Israaeel had deviated (become gumraah) because of guidance (rahbari) having been terminated for a short while when Hadhrat Musaa (Alayhis salaam) had left his people in haste to commune with Allah Ta'ala.

Thus, because of this, 580,000 members (of Bani Israaeel) were deviated. It is explicitly stated in Tafseer Roohul Ma-aani that 580,000 people became the victims of fitnah. Only 12,000 remained firm.

"The consequence of his (Nabi Musaa's) haste was that Saamiri had deviated the people."

Molvi Sa'd's molvi follower, vindicating the stance of Molvi Sa'd, avers:

"He (Molvi Sa'd) had deducted from this episode the importance of da'wat. The damage of having

abandoned da'wat for a short while was that most people of Bani Israaeel became murtad."

This interpretation is grossly *baatil*. Nabi Musaa (Alayhis salaam) did not abandon any 'da'wat'. He had proceeded to Mount Toor on the command of Allah Ta'ala. He was not responsible for the deviation of the 580,000 members of his nation. Saamiri was responsible for the deviation. The opportunity Saamiri had during the 40 day absence of Nabi Musaa (Alayhis salaam) was not due to 'haste to commune with Allah Ta'ala' by Nabi Musaa (Alayhis salaam). The absence of Nabi Musaa (Alayhis salaam) was commanded by Allah Ta'ala.

Furthermore, Nabi Musaa (Alayhis salaam) was not commanded to bring with him the 600,000 nation of Bani Israaeel. He took with him only 70 elders of the nation. The 'haste' mentioned in the Aayat has absolutely no relationship with '*termination of da'wat for a short while*'. The Aayat was a reminder to Nabi Musaa (Alayhis salaam) that it was a requisite of *safar* for the leader to walk behind his group, not ahead of them.

The attribution of the deviation to Hadhrat Musaa (Alayhis salaam) is a despicable disparagement of the lofty status of this illustrious Nabi of Allah Ta'ala. This disparagement is being perpetuated by some of the followers of Molvi Sa'd. Thus, one such molvi states in his vindication of Molvi Sa'd:

“The reason for Hadhrat Maulana Sa’d Sahib having made Rujoo’ (retraction) is to allay the minds of the masses. In fact, Hadhrat Aqdas Maulana Shaikhul Hadith Yoonus Sahib Jaunpuri (Rahmatullah alayh) and Hadhrat Raabi’ Hasan Nadwi (Barakaatuhum) forbade him from sending his Rujoo’ Naamah. Rujoo’ is the effect of baatil.”

This confirms that Molvi Sa’d’s retraction was devious and akin to the Shiah trick of *Taqiyah* to delude the ignorant and unwary in order to peddle the Tablighi Jamaat’s methodology which is loaded with *ghulu’*.

The very basis proffered by Molvi Sa’d and his camp-followers for legitimising their disparagement of Nabi Musaa (Alayhis salaam) regardless of it being unintentional, and designed to promote Tablighi Jamaat’s *ghulu’* methodology, is false and fraught with dire consequences for Imaan.

In substantiation of their misinterpretation, the camp-followers have proffered references from many Tafseer Kutub. Let us now examine the ‘evidence’ they have provided for their *baatil* opinion.

(1) Tafseer Ma-aariful Qur’aan

In the *Khulasah Tafseer* section of Ma-aariful Qur’aan, which the Molvi supporter presents, the deviation of the people is clearly attributed to Saamiri, not to Nabi Musaa having made haste. In fact, in this regard, the Qur’aan Majeed states:

“Verily, We have cast your people into a trial after you (had left), and Saamiri has deviated them.”
(Taahaa, Aayat 85)

(2) Tafseer Ruhul Ma-aani

Molvi Sa’d’s defender claiming the support of *Tafseer Ruhul Ma-aani*, avers:

“Tafseer Ruhul Ma-aani explicitly mentions that of the 600,000 Bani Israaeel, 588,000 were victims of the fitnah. Only 12,000 remained firm.”

This is simply a statement mentioning the number of people who were misled by Saamiri. Nowhere in *Tafseer Ruhul Ma-aani* is it mentioned that the deviation was the consequence of Nabi Musaa (Alayhis salaam) having made haste in being ahead of the group who had accompanied him.

Tafseer Ruhul Ma-aani states that in Aayat 83 of Surah Taahaa, the word *qaumika* (your people), refers to the *Nuqaba*, that is the 70 elders, and in Aayat No.84 *qaumikah* refers to the people who remained behind, i.e. the 600,000. It is highly erroneous to claim that Tafseer Ruhul Ma-aani attributes the deviation of Bani Israaeel to Nabi Musaa (Alayhis salaam).

There is no support whatsoever in *Ruhul Ma-aani* for the erroneous notion of Molvi Sa’d.

(3) Tafseer Fathir Rahmaan

This Tafseer also does not support Molvi Sa'd's view. In this Tafseer it is mentioned:

“Musaa journeyed with 70 men (the Nuqaba) to commune with his Rabb and to bring the Taurah. When he was near to Toor, he hastened his pace in eagerness for communing with his Rabb.”

The people who had accompanied him were the 70 Nuqaba, not the 600,000 of his nation. Thus, the deviation of the nation was caused by Saamiri, and the Qur'aan explicitly mentions this fact. The Qur'aan does not attribute the deviation of the nation to Nabi Musaa's making haste ahead of the 70 Nuqaba.

(4) Hadaaiqur Ruh war Raihaan

This tafseer is also cited in support of Molvi Sa'd's view. However, in this Tafseer the following appears:

“The qaum (people) are the 70 Nuqaba who were selected to accompany him (Musaa) to Toor.”

They were not the 600,000. Regarding the nation, this Tafseer states:

“They were the 600,000 who Musaa left with Haroon along the shores of the sea.”

(5) Tafseerul Maraaghi

This Tafseer which has been proffered in defence of Molvi Sa'd, also debunks the view of Molvi Sa'd. There is no support in this Tafseer for any disparagement of Nabi Musaa (Alayhis salaam). In this Tafseer it appears:

“The meaning of qaum (people) is the 70 Nuqaba.”

Regarding the 600,000 who remained behind, the Tafseer says:

“...We (i.e. Allah Ta'ala) have cast into a trial your people, those whom you have left with Haroon after your departure.”

The departure of Nabi Musaa (Alayhis salaam) was commanded by Allah Ta'ala. Nabi Musaa (Alayhis salaam) did not abandon da'wat for a short while as Molvi Sa'd alleged. The Tafseer further states:

“And Saamiri deviated them...”

Thus the deviation of the people was not the consequence of the departure of Nabi Musaa (Alayhis salaam). Such departure was commanded by Allah Ta'ala. The deviation was caused by Saamiri, and it was the operation of *Taqdeer*.

Besides the aforementioned five Kutub of Tafseer, the Molvi defender of Molvi Sa'd has cited another 13 Kutub. These Tafaaseer do not support the contention

of Molvi Sa'd. It was his contention that 588,000 of Bani Israaeel had deviated and fell into the worship of the calf because Nabi Musaa (Alayhis salaam) had abandoned them for a short while. This idea is indeed corrupt and derogatory of the lofty status of the Nabi.

The view of the *Jamhoor* is that Nabi Musaa (Alayhis salaam) had chosen 70 elders of Bani Israaeel who are termed *Nuqaba* to accompany him to Mount Toor where he would be in communion with Allah Ta'ala and where he would be presented with the Tauraah. There is a negligible minority view that the entire nation of Bani Israaeel was supposed to have accompanied Nabi Musaa (Alayhis salaam) to Mount Toor. But this view is palpably incorrect for the following reasons:

(1) It is in conflict with the view held by the *Jamhoor* (*the vast majority*).

(2) Nabi Musaa (Alayhis salaam) had appointed his Brother, Nabi Haaroon (Alayhis salaam) to oversee Bani Israaeel during his absence. This appointment of the Khalifah is confirmed by the Qur'aan Majeed.

(3) In response to the question posed by Allah Ta'ala, Nabi Musaa (Alayhis salaam) said: *They are closeby and following me*. The Mufasssireen confirm that the separation between Nabi Musaa (Alayhis salaam) and his people was a very short distance. This confirms that the group behind him (the Nuqaba) was constantly moving and following him whereas the 600,000 were stationed at a location where the Saamiri had all the time to construct the golden calf. It would not have

been possible for the Saamiri to have constructed the calf and for Bani Israaeel to worship it for more than 20 days if this huge concourse of people was on the march closely behind Nabi Musaa (Alayhis salaam).

(4) If this huge assembly of 600,000 was following in the footsteps of Nabi Musaa (Alayhis salaam) with their leader, the Khalifah Nabi Haaron (Alayhis salaam), never would Saamiri have acquired the opportunity to have deviated Bani Israaeel by constructing the calf. Nabi Haaron (Alayhis salaam) would have made haste and rushed to inform Nabi Musaa (Alayhis salaam) of this dangerous development.

Those who propounded the minority view did not attribute the deviation of Bani Israaeel to Nabi Musaa (Alayhis salaam). The Qur'aan explicitly attributes the deviation to Saamiri. The allegation that Nabi Musaa (Alayhis salaam) was responsible for the deviation of 588,000 members of his Flock has absolutely no support in any Tafseer. Only Molvi Sa'd had ventured this corrupt and derogatory interpretation. All the Tafaaseer Kutub state only the *ijtihaadi* error of being ahead of the group instead of the requirement being that the leader should be behind the travelling group as Allah Ta'ala had instructed Nabi Loot (Alayhis salaam) when he was commanded to leave with his family the accursed people whose destruction was imminent.

Assuming that the brief absence of Nabi Musaa (Alayhis salaam), i.e. him being ahead at a short distance, could constitute a factor for the deviation of

his group, then it relates to the 70 Nuqaba, not to the 600,000 who were under the care of the Khalifah, Hadhrat Nabi Haaron (Alayhis salaam), and who did not accompany Nabi Musaa (Alayhis salaam) to Mount Toor. But the 70 Nuqaba did not go astray. They were close on the heels of Nabi Musaa (Alayhis salaam). Thus, Molvi Sa'd's corrupt view is in entirety *baatil*.

If there was any credibility in the claim that Nabi Musaa (Alayhis salaam) was responsible for the deviation because of the very short while that he was ahead of the people on the march, then what should be the conclusion about his forty day absence commanded by Allah Ta'ala? If a brief separation of perhaps a couple of hours was the factor for the deviation of 588,000 persons, then what would have been the result of the absence of forty days – the forty days separation commanded by Allah Ta'ala?

Nabi Musaa (Alayhis salaam) was commanded to be separated from his people for 40 days. Now, based on the understanding of Molvi Sa'd, Nabi Musaa (Alayhis salaam) had abandoned 'da'wat' for 40 days, hence the deviation of Bani Israaeel. But this separation of 40 days was at the command of Allah Ta'ala. So how does the issue of abandonment of 'da'wat' develop? If the very brief separation along the journey, i.e. of him walking ahead of the 70 Nuqaba – had resulted in the deviation and kufr of 588,000 people, then what of the presumed deviation which 40 days of absence and separation would cause? But the 40 day separation was commanded by Allah Ta'ala.

And what about the deviation which will be the result of Molvi Sa'd's absence from his Nizaamuddeen headquarters when he is here in South Africa? What will be the fate of his flock in Nizaamuddeen when he, their leader, is here in South Africa? In relation to his flock, he is guilty of abandoning 'da'wat'. They are therefore sure to deviate into *baatil* and *kufr* just as he claims Bani Israaeel had deviated during the absence of Nabi Musaa (Alayhis salaam). Molvi Sa'd should also be in South Africa with some apprehension on the basis of his theory of abandonment of da'wat which he had attributed to Nabi Musaa (Alayhis salaam).

In the wake of Molvi Sa'd's temporary abandonment of da'wat in relation to his flock over there in Nizaamuddeen, there is the possibility of some avaricious Tablighi staging a *coup d'etat* just as Saamiri had executed and just as Molvi Sa'd himself had embarked on. He kicked out the other '*nuqaba*' of the Tablighi Jamaat and usurped 'power' to install himself as the Ameer. Now, according to him, it is Fardh to be subservient to him.

There is consensus of the fact that in asking Nabi Musaa (Alayhis salaam) for his reason of being ahead of the group of 70 Nuqaba, Allah Ta'ala reminded him or imparted to him the etiquette that the leader should be behind his people. The issue did not pertain to Nabi Musaa's separation from the 600,000 whom he left in the care of his Khalifah, Nabi Haaron (Alayhis salaam).

The group who had followed him did camp at Mount Toor. If the 600,000 had also been obliged to be at Mount Toor, Nabi Musaa (Alayhis salaam) would have been agitated at their absence. He would have immediately resolved to have them there. It was not possible for such a huge concourse of people to have separated itself entirely from Nabi Musaa (Alayhis salaam) without him being aware thereof, and without him instituting measures to rectify the infraction. The presence of the Nuqaba is confirmed, hence it was only this group who had to be present.

To impress the importance of da'wat there was absolutely no need for Molvi Sa'd to have selected the negligible minority view, then commit the blunder of structuring his misinterpretation on its basis. It appears that he has a fancy for digging out obscure and erroneous views which are in conflict with the *Jamhoor*. Such a flair for obscurities is sinister relative to Imaan.

Regarding the dog of Ashaab-e-Kahaf, Molvi Sa'd promotes the idea of the animal being a lion, not a dog as the Qur'aan Majeed explicitly states and which is the view of almost 100% of the Ulama and Mufasssireen. While there is an extremely small minority, perhaps just one or two, who said that it was a lion, this view is highly erroneous and in conflict with the Qur'aan.