

## **From the Editor's Desk...**

One of the recent and most grave concern parents are facing these days is that kids are obsessed with smartphones. Small little kids are busy watching cartoons on internet or playing games non-stop, and the older ones are looking at it every few minutes, texting friends all the time, checking to see how many "likes" they've got after they've posted on social media.

This is a gadgets internet and cyber world has become a necessary evil. We have no choice but to accessorize our children with laptops and smartphones in this gadget-filled world, so we must take responsibility for their disciplined behavior and moderation in use as well.

As parents, we can take steps to change this situation. Our duty as parents is outlined very clearly in the following hadith. Ibn 'Umar reported that the Prophet ﷺ said:

"Each of you is a shepherd and each of you is responsible for his flock. The ameer (ruler) who is over the people is a shepherd and is responsible for his flock; a man is a shepherd in charge of the inhabitants of his household and he is responsible for his flock; a woman is a shepherdess in charge of her husband's house and children and she is responsible for them; and a man's slave is a shepherd in charge of his master's property and he is responsible for it. So each of you is a shepherd and each of you is responsible for his flock.' [Abu Dawud]

Hence, it is essential for parents to discuss and decide how to tackle this situation together as a team. There are many benefits which these technical gadgets bring to our life but there are quite a lot of risks associated to the use of gadgets. To flourish in the real-world children still need emotional resilience,

social competence and the basic skills of reading and writing, so we must ensure that too much technology too soon doesn't threaten their real-life development or expose them to harmful material.

Controlled and Sensible use can bring a lot of value which can help them in learning and education in addition to recreational activities, but lack of supervision may give them access to violent or visually explicit movies as well.

We should set rules for the use of all devices and all the kids. Only allow mobile phone usage at certain hours in the evening or after homework is done. Breaking the rules should not have a lesser consequence than if they broke a rule in the offline world.

Further make sure you know as much as possible about any hardware and software that comes into your home. If you can't put in the time and energy to find out about an electronic device, don't let it come into hands of your family.

Always remember that it is better to be scared that to be unaware. Just as we prepare our kids for life in the real world, we should prepare them for life online.

If you think it's too late and your child is already too addicted. Maybe it's turned into a default activity simply because there's nothing else to do. Develop some healthy exciting and thrilling daily activities that will help them stay away from their gadgets longer.

Let's take guidance for our priorities from Allah and His Messenger ﷺ and focus on our kid's real needs. **Arif Mateen Ansari**

# Spiritual Culture in Islam

His Eminence Maulana Shah Muhammad Abdul Aleem Siddiqui al-Qaderi (رحمة الله عليه)

Every religion and every ideology has in every age its great exponents whose personality reflects in a distinguished manner the cause they cherish and uphold and whose labors for that cause form land-marks in human history. One such great personality of recent times was His Eminence Shah Muhammad Abdul Aleem Siddiqui Al-Qaderi (رحمة الله عليه). Born in the Pak-Bharat sub-continent, his noble soul soared beyond the limitations of territory and race. Imbibing Islamic as well as Western education, he rose to combine the best in ancient and modern disciplines and became a distinguished exponent of the message of orthodox Islam to modern humanity. With these great qualities of head and heart, he travelled continuously for forty years from town to town, country to country and continent to continent, until his labours of love for the spiritual reform and uplift of humanity covered a major part of the world. Millions of human souls belonging to diverse races and nationalities in Asia, Africa, Europe and America received spiritual blessings through his dynamic and refulgent personality and numerous Islamic missionary societies, mosques, schools, hospitals, libraries, infirmaries, orphanages and periodicals sprang up in the wake of his immortal missionary labors. He worked with single-minded devotion for the cause of Islam and humanity until his noble soul returned to Allah's Mercy at Medina in 1954. His 65th death anniversary has been recently celebrated in different countries of the world—Ed.

The last wish expressed by one of the greatest philosophers of Greece, Aristotle, was: "O Man know thy self". He commanded his pupils to engrave these words on the walls of his school-room. It is obvious, therefore, that to know the reality of man was so important and at the same time so difficult a task that such a great intellectual genius devoted a whole life-time to the study of the problem but in the end found it impossible to arrive at any positive and clear idea and had, therefore, to adopt that course in the hope that someone from amongst the posterity might eventually succeed.

Common-sense, which is the starting point of all philosophy, is unanimously agreed that a human being is composed of two distinct constituents, the body and the soul. There is such an affinity, such close relationship, between the two that we call this being a "person" only so long as the soul remains with the body; no sooner does that state obtain when it is realized that it has left the body, the

term "person" ceases to be applied to it. However, despite there being such a correspondence between the two, no satisfactory explanation regarding the real nature of the soul has been so far placed before the world by the representatives of scientific thought.

The physiologists have left no stone unturned in exploring the body thoroughly. They have not only carefully observed the bones, the muscles, the nerves and the glands and have subjected even the tiniest parts to their lancets, but they have also succeeded in photographing the complete human organism by means of the X-ray. These researches and investigations have enabled them to establish the presence of life-germs in the blood. Accordingly, they have concluded that what we call life is due to the hormones, the corpuscles which carry the oxygen, taking it up from the air into the lungs and passing it on to the body-cells. But this discovery, however important it might be regarded from the

scientific point of view, does not carry us far enough. The mystery of the soul remains unsolved.

Closely connected with physiology is the science of psychology. It deals with the mental phenomena and processes and has therefore a far greater claim than any other science for acting as our guide in solving the problem of the soul. But there again we meet with nothing which is conclusive and positive. The earlier exponents of modern philosophy, nay, even the nineteenth-century psychologists, felt satisfied with such vague definitions as this: "the soul is a plurality of psychical experiences comprehended into the unity of consciousness in a manner not further definable. We know nothing whatever of a substance outside of behind or under the ideas and feelings". (Paulsen). But the twentieth century has witnessed a more aggressive attitude among the psychologists. Consequently, there have cropped up several schools represented by the Existentialists, the Behaviourists, the Purposivists, the Configurationists, etc., each one claiming infallibility and finality in method for its own self. But behind the smoke-screen of all their grand terminology, the naked fact stands that, despite the valuable contribution which they have made to human knowledge in many ways, they cannot be regarded to have penetrated behind the surface-view of the workings of the soul. They have still to traverse many a circuitous and lengthy path before they can hope of attaining a clear idea even of the right method of approach, not to speak of the formulation of exact conclusions and the denial or affirmation of the existence of the soul. In this connection, we may listen with advantage to the pertinent remarks of Dr. Robert S. Woodworth, an American historian of psychology. He says in his *Contemporary Schools of psychology* (p. 2):

"The past thirty years have been remarkably

productive of new movements in psychology, with the result that we now see the curious phenomenon of schools differing radically from one another in their ideas as to what psychology should be doing and how it should go to work. These schools remind one of schools of philosophy and are scarcely to be paralleled at present in the other natural sciences. Perhaps their existence in contemporary psychology is a sign of the youth of our science and of the vast number of unexplored possibilities that we have still to examine.

However, it would be utterly wrong to infer that because our scientists and philosophers have so far failed to find out the reality of the soul empirically, there has been none who has succeeded. The fact is that, to quote a Persian saying: "Everyone has been assigned a particular function and has been accordingly endowed with the requisite aptitude".

A logician may be a master of the art of controversy and fully conversant with the technique of debates. But that will not qualify him for analyzing the properties of elements; for that is the task of the chemist. Again, a botanist may know every possible thing about plants, but surely, he can have no say in the sphere of physiology. Similarly, the right of speaking authoritatively on the problems relating to the soul goes to those who have specialized in what may be called spiritual science, both theoretically and practically. What I propose to do, therefore, at the present occasion is to put forward some important and basic facts in connection with the subject under discussion, in the light of the findings of these specialists, and to treat those facts in such a simple and plain language that even people of ordinary intelligence and education may be able for grasp them. I would also like to lay a greater emphasis on the practical aspect of the subject, and that because I believe in practice and not in idle theorization.

Nature has allotted distinctly defined functions to all the organs of the body, which they cannot interchange with each other. For instance, the eyes can see and not hear; the ears can listen and not look; the tongue can taste and speak but not smell. In the same way, the brain can know and understand material objects and phenomena only, and this because its constitution is through and through of a material (physical) character. If, however, an idea of something immaterial (non-physical) enters its orbit, it is explainable and understandable only through analogies drawn from material things, because its real nature must necessarily be beyond its scope.

What about the knowledge of the soul, then? We saw just now that the physiologists have ransacked the whole body, but they could not trace it in any material substance to which they could assign the name of the soul. But we know also that a belief in the existence of the soul is held universally by mankind, in one form or the other, even though none can claim to be able to see it, or touch it, or feel it through the physical senses. The natural conclusion to which these two facts, when viewed together, lead us is not that the soul does not exist, but that it is something immaterial, something above and beyond physical reality. That being the case, it becomes evident that a knowledge relating to the soul cannot be acquired through material or physical means. On the other hand, we must fall back upon the soul itself and seek enlightenment from it.

Now, what course should we adopt to attain this end? Or, in other words: what is the way of spiritual illumination, of spiritual knowledge? The way is open and clear. Just as schools, accurately planned courses of study, and teachers are necessary for training our intellect, ultimately with a view to acquire the knowledge of the physical reality, it is similarly indispensable to have a spiritual teacher for the attainment of spiritual

knowledge.

Before, however, we proceed in our search to locate such a spiritual school, etc., let me refer to an important connected fact, and it is this:

Just as the scientists and philosophers, after making a comprehensive study of all the visible and experienceable aspects of life, have found themselves unable to deny positively nay, have even affirmed that behind the intricate mechanism of the complex machinery that goes to make a human being, there is some intangible force or energy that is called soul. They have similarly found it impossible not to postulate an Ultimate Principle behind the universe in some form or the other. And not only that several eminent scientists of our days, like Eddington, Whitehead and James Jeans have come forward to affirm confidently that there is some changeless eternal Reality behind the ever-changing experiences of this mortal life, some Being who is solely responsible for the creation of the universe and all that it implies.

One of the distinguished living scientists is Dr. Michael Pupin. He is the President of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, a Professor of Electro-Mechanics at the Columbia University, and an inventor of high standing. In an article which appeared in the American Magazine for September 1927, he wrote:

“Wherever science has explored the universe, it has found it to be a manifestation of a coordinating principle. It leaves us no escape from the conclusion that at the back of everything there is a definite guiding principle, which leads from chaos to cosmos. We are faced with two alternatives. We can either believe that cosmos, the beautiful law and order, is simply the result of haphazard happenings; or, that it is the result of a definite intelligence. Now which are you, as an intelligent being, going to choose?”

“Personally, I choose to believe in the coordinating principle, the Divine Intelligence. Why? Because it is simpler. It is more intelligible. It harmonizes with my whole experience. The theory that intelligent beings like ourselves, or intelligent processes like the movements of the stars, are the outcome of unintelligent, haphazard happenings are beyond my understanding. And why should I accept such a theory when I observe the evidence of a direct intelligence every day?

‘When you see the stars, each moving in its own pathway, or see a seed grow after a definite plan into a tree, or see a baby develop into a full-grown, self-directing human individual, can you conceive of all that taking place as the result of haphazard happenings? Well, I cannot. It seems obvious that there is some directing intelligence behind all things. And not a single discovery that science has made tends in the least to contradict this innate feeling, that a definite Intelligence is at the back of everything. Indeed, the more deeply science penetrates the laws of the universe, the more it leads up to a belief in an Intelligent Divinity.”

The question now arises as to who and what this Being is, whom the scientists and philosophers identify with the First Cause or the Ultimate Principle, and whom in religious terminology we know as God the Creator of

the universe and the Fountain-head of all life and light and perfection?

In connection with this query also we find ourselves compelled to adopt the same line of approach as the one relating to the reality of the soul. It is admitted that there is some Being behind the total physical reality. It is also admitted that no physical experience of Him has been possible in spite of carrying out the most profound investigations and searching with the help of all those material means with which our latest advances in the fields of the natural sciences have equipped us. The only inevitable conclusion, then, at which we can arrive in the light of these two facts is that the Being in question is also immaterial like the soul and an approach to Him is possible only through means other than material or physical.

When we place these two conclusions side by side, it becomes clear to us that this Being, the First Cause or God, and the soul possess a similarity in one respect, which is that they both are non-physical in their natures. Hence the school that instructs us about Him must also enable us to get a clue to the true nature of the soul. And such a school, I may be allowed to say, is the school of Faith or Religion.

(To Be Continued)



# Morphology of Religious Consciousness (Part-I)

Mr. A. K. Brohi

The most distinctive feature of man's life is not, I submit, as fully spelled out in the well-known Aristotelian dogma that man is a rational animal as it is in the recognition of the truth that he is a religious animal.

The moment man begins to be aware of himself he sees himself reflected in an undifferentiated ensemble which is other than himself, and in the very process of this perception, he finds that he has transcended himself. More precisely, his awareness of himself comes to him from his going out of himself and his encounter with the Not-self. Just as the eye cannot see itself, except perhaps in a mirror, the 'self' within us has no direct awareness of itself except as it sees itself reflected in the elements that are outside its power and control, but with which it nevertheless, has a strange kind of affinity and contact.

It is the essence of religious experience that it makes us feel bound in some way to something that is other than ourselves – may that other be an object of worship, a system of belief; and practice or some well-defined way of life. The word "religion", even etymologically considered, conveys the idea of being bound, of being re-linked to something. All we are and all we do, is evidence of this very link that we have with the world around us. The differentiation in the quality of life between man and man is, in principle ultimately possible only because each individual proceeds to recognize more or less consciously this link and in the process arrives at a conception of that "other" with which he nevertheless feels somehow connected in the depth of his soul. The whole life of man is an attempt to elaborate this relationship and to discover the precise nature of the ground that he has for affirming it. I

know of no life possible in the human sense unless it is in some measure capable of attaining to this level of transcendence and consequently of experiencing a certain degree of enlargement of its powers and the freedom of its movement. Everything else in the world simply exists; man, however, knows what he is and he wants to be what he has recognized as his truth, as his true existence. His rational powers are born in the very struggle to gain a glimpse of true existence-but the quest for the discovery of truth is born of his religious nature, of his instinctive craving for self-transcendence.

Animal life motivated by the desire to seek satisfaction of biological needs like the preservation of individual life through the intake of food and the preservation of the life of the species through the inter-play of sex instinct. The satisfaction of these biological urges, be it noted, is secured through a series of somewhat complicated instinctive responses and the whole process of stimulus and response is called into play by a pre-nasally ordained inherent mechanism which ensures the organism the possibility of its own continuance as also the preservation of the species to which it belongs. But a higher degree of evolution in man is reached the moment life transcends the demand that his mere biological instincts make upon him and the possibility of choice between good and evil is thrown open before man for a moral decision. It is at this point that the religious attitude is born, bringing with it the necessity for man to act upon a ground which is not completely presented to him through his powers of sense perception but is discovered in response to the metaphysical need of finding out some explanation of the "why", "wherefore" and "how" of this moral

predicament.

The various traditional systems of religious belief, thought, and practice find their fulcrum in this basic need of man to achieve transcendence, to go beyond himself. Thus, it is that man, as if by escaping the life hitherto lived by him in the darkness of instinctive and mechanical life, comes to live in a world of light, of larger truth.

The question whether a certain system of religious beliefs is valid or not raises other tormenting difficult issues. These have no doubt to be settled independently of the basic truth, viz that, as matter of fact, psychologically considered, man's religious attitude a concomitant condition of a level of life higher than that which we ascribe to the animals. Life is completely immanent in animals – but it becomes; partly at least, transcendent in man when the 'empirical self' in him becomes aware of its loneliness in a world which it comes to view as constituting the 'other'.

It is impossible, in purely rational terms, to account for life's evolution from the animal to the human plane. This transition from the animal phase of life to the human is an enigma to us, a case in which, not the rational explanation, but the religious symbolism as reflected in the myths of mankind, is apt to render more intelligible to us the way evolution accomplished these miracles. The creation of man is a miraculous intervention of a 'power' whose manifestations we see within ourselves but whose operations we are, from the present plane of our consciousness, not yet qualified to comprehend. The mystery of life defies us at all levels. To illustrate: When I desire to raise my hand, lo and behold: the hand goes up. How does this miracle occur? How is it that my desire to move the arm, moves the arm? How does mind at all

succeed in moving matter? The psychologist, if pressed for an answer to solve the riddle, would only say: "Oh, it is a case of idea-motor action" — as if a pompous phrase ever explained anything. But precisely, how the idea imparts motion to my arm: is the question to which no answer has so far been given by analytical psychology.

The metaphysical justifications for the maintenance of a given type of religious belief or its relevance to life must be provided by our feeble powers of reason and the explanations have to be treated by us for what they are worth. But no matter what we say concerning them, we have no option but to admit that man's awareness of himself as an entity separate from that which surrounds him and his belief that despite this 'separateness' he is somehow linked up with life of his environment, seem to be the indisputable premises upon which to explain the emergence of man from the life of the brute—that is from the forms of life which preceded him in evolution and which, in some sense, continue to be an integral part of his psychic structure and experience.

Comprehensively stated, religious consciousness in the sense described above, has a reference to some supra-personal ground which we have to affirm just to be able to give meaning to our existence. How otherwise would it be possible to explain the phenomenon of moral choice? In order to make a choice from the possible courses of action spread out before us, we really are attempting— are we not?—to move out of the predicament in which we are involved, to another which our imaginative reconstruction presents to us as a desirable one for us to be in. But how do we at all choose— and, why do we talk about one course of conduct being right and the other being wrong, one leading us to the end which is felt to be good and the

other believed to be evil? The urge to move on from moment to moment to ever newer and newer phases of existence is something we witness within ourselves directly because of our link with the unchanging supra-personal ground. And it is the perception of this ground that not only gives us a sense of moral direction but also our time-sense and confers upon us the capacity to see either the frustration or fruition of our conception of good life in the succession of events as they unfold themselves before us. All this awareness of the moral predicament of man and his role as an agent of change in his environment and history is possible only because we are, through our immediate experience, constantly in contact with that enduring and abiding ground of our being which is other than ourselves. It is the supra-personal life which lies at the base of our temporal and moral consciousness that give us a sense of responsibility in all we do or do not do.

Sometimes the picture that we have formed within ourselves of our environment, thanks to discursive thought, gets rudely contradicted by the failure of action which was designed by us in terms of our conception of what the nature and operation of the forces that govern that environment are like. This leads us to revise and correct, from time to time, the portrait that we have in our mind of the world outside. Appearances thus corrected go on progressively changing in the light of new experience and the growth of our consciousness takes place precisely in the way we steadily succeed in altering for the better the picture "inside our heads" and making it an adequate representation of our environment. Very soon, the evidence furnished by our senses is found to be in conflict with what, according to our discursive thought, the picture of the environment ought to be like and, from that moment on, we begin

to evolve that inner eye of wisdom through whose deliverance in the felicitous phrase of Plato, we eventually become "the spectator of all time and all existence" and in the wise words of Sophocles, begin "to see life steadily and to see it as a whole."

The cognitive adventure of life in man, which is responsible for the progressive refinement of his representational reconstruction of the reality outside him, has itself been called into play in the service of action, and its findings are valid only in so far as a plan for action is to be drawn up to deal with the environment. But, this plan for action is fundamentally conditioned by the fact that life finds itself being constantly challenged by all kinds of emergencies; and serviceable action has to be improvised to deal with these emergencies if life is at all to survive. As life advances and attains a greater measure of freedom, it begins to discover that the real ground of action lies completely outside the narrow precincts of its immediate consciousness. A simple illustration would make this clear. A farmer sets out to cultivate his field: the ground of his action is not what is presented to him in his immediate perceptual consciousness but has something to do with the imaginative construction of the ultimate fruits of his labour. It is this belief, namely, that what he sows today he shall reap tomorrow, which forms the ground of his action. But the harvest scene which he pictures to himself is not there; it is far away—and if he acts at all it is because he sees with the eye of wisdom that the harvest season, too, is there. Direct perception of the world of the Unseen thus gets implicated in all transactions of life and the mystical tradition of mankind merely extends this same ground of belief in the reality of the Unseen when it states that there are certain needs of our real self which can only find fulfillment if we can secure the



merger of our finite self with a wider Being that engulfs it. The farmer in the foregoing illustration acts on a partial environment; the religious man acts on his total environment.

And indeed a considerable bulk of testimony that is offered by the best that the human race has produced, tends to show that, in his relation to the universe, man must postulate the existence of "Objective Reality", which is not adequately conveyed to him by his sense perception or even by his cognitive consciousness but which is responsive to his whole being and is at once the transcendent and immanent ground of his experience of it. Thus it is that the combined wisdom of the religious tradition of mankind admonishes us to realize the truth of this relationship within the framework of that very ground—and which is what, in the last resort, gives to man's labour here below a meaning and a purpose.

There are, in main, three attitudes possible in principle for the comprehension of this relationship which in my reckoning man has with the ground of his experience :

1. He could proceed to personalize the ground, to treat it as a kind of a higher magnificent presence. Thus conceived, the 'ground' becomes the creator, sustainer, preserver of the world of appearance, and because it is a Person, a communication with it becomes the highest goal attainable for man. He submits to the will of this presence conceived as a Higher Person, adores and worships Him.
2. He could regard the ground as something impersonal, e.g., a sort of law, a kind of energy or power, and then proceed to explore the possibility of taking advantage of that law or power or process in order to plan action with a view to change successfully itself and the world of

appearance. There can be no question here of man's sense of inward fulfillment or his experiencing a sense of exhilaration in the pursuit of this purpose, for the main consideration behind knowing the law or power is one of expediency and is born of his desire to exploit it by taking advantage of the forces that are at work in the universe.

3. He could develop an attitude of psychological indifference to his relationship to this ground and in consequence proceed to decry and to denounce all attempts to gain a knowledge of the nature of that ground of man's experience as being at all relevant to man's capacity and competence for tackling his tasks here below. Here the point is not that man's link with the supra-personal ground does not exist; only that relationship is considered as completely meaningless and irrelevant for the purpose of satisfying the basic needs of his terrestrial life. Here man's phenomenological experience is itself interpreted to be a sufficient premise for discerning what his task on earth is like and the problem of securing his liberation or enlightenment is considered exclusively within the framework of his experience. Generally it is a hall-mark of this attitude that the 'personality' aspects of man's life are not given such importance and this world is generally viewed, cynically and pessimistically, as a sort of valley of sorrow and suffering, of toil and tears.

I would like for the purpose of the present argument to characterize the first attitude, theocentric the second anthropocentric, and the final one as nihilistic.

A word by way of explanation is necessary to clarify the philosophic ideas that underlie the foregoing terms.

The first two terms are self-explanatory. An attitude is theocentric if the over-riding consideration for man in all that he does is the awareness of his link with a meta-cosmic presence; but it is anthropocentric if it is the man who is the measure of all things. The first approach provides an absolute norm for adjudging man's conduct, but in the latter case since man himself is constantly evolving and changing, this norm would have to be to that extent subjectivist, relativistic and variable.

What is not so clear, however, is the implication of the third term: "nihilistic". Nihilism, according to the Oxford Dictionary, means: "negative doctrine, total rejection of current beliefs, in religion or morals; (philos.) scepticism that denies all existence, etc." I suggest that a total denial of current belief in religion and morals is itself a positive basis for action and is therefore a religious attitude: all significant denials are, in this sense, really affirmations. (Continued)

---

(Continued from page #. 21)

investment consumption mix in educational good, the rate of return analysis, and the earnings capitalization approach can be extended. Islamic political economy system being essentially a value-oriented and egalitarian system, removed from sheer

abstraction, can provide new theoretical and empirical grounds for this inquiry. Economic theory as it stands today will undergo a truly genuine revolution only when this challenge is met and surmounted. The responsibility nevertheless lies on the Muslims.

---

(Continued from page #. 26)

the world stands with the tray on her head (like a slave) and you remain seated comfortably (like her master). The world becomes a slave of the person who stands in the service of God, she puts him to shame who stands in her

service. It is lawful to keep the world in your hand or in your pocket and save it for some good use in future, but it is not lawful to let it enter your heart or fall in its love."

---

(Continued from page #. 27)

endows their hearts with everlasting life by revealing His beauty. The followers of annihilation (fana) regard haybat as superior,

but the followers of subsistence (baqa) prefer uns.



# What is Philosophy of Religion and How is it Possible

Dr. Hafiz Muhammad Fazl-ur-Rahman Ansari Al-Qadri (رحمة الله عليه)

The subject, "What is Philosophy of Religion and how it is Possible", involves two concepts. Philosophy and Religion.

Philosophy is one of the most misunderstood and misinterpreted terms, in common parlance, it has been sometimes used as a synonym for day-dreaming, pessimism, silence, etc. This is how the layman misunderstands and misinterprets philosophy.

Among the learned, philosophy is defined in so many different ways that we are perplexed to pick out the proper definition for the term. For instance, Professor Lipps will tell you that philosophy is the inquiry into the inner experience. He is confining the scope of philosophy to mental sciences alone. According to Doring, philosophy is the investigation of goods and values. For him, therefore, Ethics and Aesthetics constitute philosophy. Another tendency is to consider it the science of knowledge, thereby reducing it to Logic and Epistemology.

These definitions remind us of the blind men who examined different parts of an elephant and formed different notions about it. Paulsen, writing in the middle of the nineteenth century, professes to overcome this fault by calling philosophy the sum-total of scientific knowledge. His view is also misleading, as it deprives philosophy of the necessity of existing apart from the sciences.

Now I shall try to put, very briefly, the real implications of philosophy. Philosophy, as the etymology of the term denotes, is love of wisdom. Love is rather a process than a result attained by a process. So, it is more correct to understand by the term "philosophy", the

doctrine of wisdom: It includes the knowledge of the real purpose of life and actions directed to the attainment of that purpose. This shall be achieved by understanding the universe, its relation to man, man's ultimate destiny, and the life he should lead in conformity with this understanding.

Philosophy is, therefore, an attempt to understand life. It is a critical enquiry into the meaning of experience. It is an attempt to arrive at a comprehensive and systematic knowledge of the form and connection, the meaning and import, of all things. Ferrier has adequately defined philosophy as the pursuit of absolute truth, that is, of truth as it exists for all intelligences.

The next concept which forms part of my subject is Religion. Religion is one of those varieties, which have passed without being very much questioned. In every age and in every country everyone held some religion or the other.

Religions differ so widely from one another that it is very difficult to deduce unity out of the diversity. All the same we may use the process of abstraction and arrive at the common element in religion. It involves the admission of something supernatural. It is the human attitude towards the supernatural which is for it the ultimate reality.

Man sometimes, nay, often, finds himself confronted with insurmountable difficulties. He has his yearnings after moral perfection, beauty and knowledge. But he finds the world corrupted and ugly, and its mysteries beyond his comprehension. There must be a Being who has the Power as well as the Will to rescue him in these difficulties. Hence the

expression of religious yearning displayed through one religion or the other. It is a real fact.

The age-long permanence and the world-wide acceptance of religion are testifying to its sanctity and importance. Humanity could never dispense with it in the past. The religious conception of the Ultimate Reality always remained intact, and the vicissitudes of history and knowledge could not affect any serious disturbances in the religious convictions.

It may be asked whether religion would survive the present-day scientific advancement. As an answer to this question, I need only remind you that man is not mere intellect. He is a willing and feeling being. Feelings of humility and reverence and yearnings after perfection determine his attitude towards reality more immediately and profoundly than the concepts and formulae of science. So religion is an every-day fact from times immemorial, and for all time to come.

We have seen that philosophy and religion have their goal in ultimate reality. But they are the expressions of different consciousnesses. Necessarily their approach is different. Philosophy begins with intellectual apprehension and its main object is to discover the nature of reality. That primarily includes the enquiry into the nature of human ideals. But the problem of religion is the quest as to how I can realize my ideals. While the one begins from doubt, the other is based on faith.

Now I come to the problem of the Philosophy of Religion. Philosophy and religion are not so different as to exclude all possibility of their meeting together. Religion exists because man is a willing being. Philosophy appeared because he is a knowing being. A philosopher cannot leave any one of the human

consciousnesses without thoroughly inquiring into its nature and contents.

“Philosophy”, says the renowned philosopher, Professor S. Z. Hasan, “is not a matter of choice. You cannot help reflecting on the nature of the universe and your relation to it. What is it all? What am I? What is my function here? Whence I come and where do I go? A rational being cannot help putting these questions”.

Let me tell you that the reason for enquiring into such problems is the simple fact that they are the most vital problems. Would it then be possible for anyone to refrain from enquiring into that which has formed an inseparable part of his deepest self, namely, Religion. So philosophy of religion is not only possible but it is there before we seek it.

Sometimes it has been seriously questioned as to how religion, primarily a matter of faith, can be subjected to philosophic inquiry, which is primarily rationalistic. I find the basis of such a notion in the ignorance of the complete connotation of the terms “philosophy” and “religion”.

Philosophy is, following the pre-Kantian method, misunderstood by being conceived as purely rationalistic where everything is examined by reason and its validity affirmed or denied by it. On the side of religion there is the misconception that it is a matter of pure faith, or to be more correct, a matter of blind faith. Neither is philosophy necessarily rationalistic nor is religion a matter of blind faith.

Kant, the greatest philosopher of the modern era, has established beyond the shadow of doubt that reason is not an omnipotent faculty. It has its limits. Hence the correct method of philosophy is not Rationalism but Criticism. This gives greater scope in philosophic investigation. Whatever could not be reduced

to the categories of reason had to be rejected as false according to Rationalism. But Criticism enables us to accept those aspects of truth which are found to lie beyond the scope of reason, if they are in perfect harmony with the results of other inquiries.

In the realm of religion, we find that the growing tendency is to welcome reason within reasonable limits. When we thus understand the complete connotations of philosophy and religion, the one to be more than merely rationalistic and the other to be more than a faith, we will realize that the philosophic inquiry into religion is quite consistent with its spirit.

It is worthwhile at this stage of our discussion to understand the function of the philosophy of religion. Philosophy claims to inquire into the nature of the ultimate reality. It is not the business of philosophy to deny reality itself. It is to discover its nature, and in that attempt follow the inquiry to the ultimate limit.

In philosophy of Religion, too, the same thing is done.

Religious concepts, I mean, the facts of religious consciousness, form the subject-matter of philosophic investigation. The object is not to deny them because the facts of religious consciousness are, like the facts of knowledge consciousness, real, existing facts. The object of the philosophy of religion is only to explain them.

In philosophy of religion, we deal with the concept of religion and attempt to show that it is what it really claims to be. Here we study the nature of the human attitude towards God, and its implications in order to find out the ground of the validity of religious faith and the possibility of the ideals of religion. Then we proceed to show that its implications are perfectly in harmony with the knowledge arrived at through other inquiries.

It is the duty of the philosophy of religion to remove any conflict, real or apparent, between religious doctrines and other established truths. Religion has its own view of reality quite in consonance with its aspirations. It, as I have pointed out at the very outset, necessarily involves certain fundamental concepts. The question before the philosopher of religion is: What is the ground of their validity? The results of rationalistic inquiry have rather distorted these concepts. Therefore, the question arises: Do we really possess any such faculty which is competent to grasp these religious verities?

If the conclusion we arrive at is in the negative, and if we are able to show that faith in these verities alone is in harmony with the yearnings of man as man, the task of the philosophy of religion is accomplished. And the highest philosophical inquiry does really lead to this conclusion. The modern world has not produced a greater philosophical genius than Kant.



# Philosophy of Religion

Dr. Basharat Ali

(Continued from the last issue)

2. The other type of conclusion proceeds from an empirical standpoint, the particular reality in experience and the way in which this reality is conceptualized and influenced by man. We like the following two instances in support of our inference above:

(a) God alone is one in reality; in Him essence and existence are one. Four names only can be given Him by reason: the first, the one, the truth and the creator.

(b) Man cannot know the real nature of God, only if he knows certain qualities in himself. Can he recognize them in God—existence is essential in God, in man it is contingent, coming from outside himself.

My objection in the light of the Quran to the quotations above is that nothing physical or visually observable can be involved in such person-like qualities, since motivational system have no corporal existence except for their physiological basis in the nervous system of the human body. Similar view has been taken by Ibn Qyyuma and Ibn Taymiyya. In the modern terminology, I can say that the Higher Power is an Independent Force in personality which possesses energy of its own.

“To Allah belongs whatever is in the heavens and whatever is in the earth. And whether you manifest what is in your minds or hide it, Allah will call you to account according to it. So He forgives whom He pleases and chastises whom He pleases. And Allah is possessor of power over all things”. (2:284).

Sweetman in 1945 published a comparative book on the topic of Islam and Christian theology, and he has attempted to show that

like Christianity, philosophy of religion and theology in Islam are one and the same. This is contrary to the fact. Historically speaking, Abdul Qadir al-Baghdadi, Abdul Rahim, Abdul Rahman al-Ashrai, al-Ghazali, al-Husain al-Basri, al-Jahiz, Imam al-Haramain, al-Mawardi, Fakhr al-Din al-Razi, Muhammad bin Ishaq Ibn Qutaiba and not in the least among others, according to Abu Hashim and Abu Rashid are the greatest philosophers of theology in Islam, the incident of which is not to be found in the modern literature of the philosophy of religion. A succinct account of this development will be included in this series. The most fallacious hypothesis formulated by Sweetman is the allegation of anthropomorphism with Islam on a similar pattern found in Christianity. We do admit that Hisham bin Salimat-Jawaliki, Hisham bin al-Hakam, Muhammad bin Karram and others tried to formulate their religion and used words which implied that God was like man or had a body. The orthodox Islam condemned such heretic ideas, because the Qur’anic philosophy of religion repudiates such fantastic notions—He begets not, nor is He begotten; And none is like Him (112; cf 6:104: 42:11; 16:15; 4:17; 2:116; 19:35; 19:90-3). Without any critical vision into the philosophy of religion in Islam, he asserts that these person-like characteristics are much the same as those believed by monotheists to be the characteristics of their God. Most persons think of their God as a person with a will, purpose and plan, and having the means in human beings through whom he works for the accomplishment of His will. This is nothing but a hideous form of Shirk (شرك) repudiated categorically by all the Muslim thinkers. Among others the work of Abdullah bin Asad

al-Afai will remain an everlasting document for the scientific repudiation of things unknown and contrary to Islam. Ambivalence on the question is evidenced by a group such as the Christian scientists, who refer to God in personal and impersonal terms, and furthermore, who sometimes use feminine, as well as masculine gender in referring to God.

Another most audacious mistake committed by our so-called scholars of Islamology, owing to lack of understanding of the idea and nature of God, is the idea of worship or prayers. It is neither intercessory, such as prayers by Catholics to saints to intervene with God, nor private. I need not go in detail about this problem, because Allama Iqbal in his lectures and Dr. Syed Abdul Latif in his "Meaning of Prayer," has scientifically and philosophically dealt with this problem. This is the focal topic of the Muslim thinkers. The scholars of our own sub-continent like WaliUllah and Maulana Qamruddin in our nearest past have dealt with this problem with sociological and philosophical points of view. All prayers in Islam are socio-cultural. Private prayer is not a genuine prayer. When a descriptive statement i.e. the recital of Quran in an audible form is made, there is a transfer of meaning from one person to another. Often with the transferred meaning also undergoes growth in its implications in the others mind. The verbal stimulus used typically by the repetition of Fatiha in each Raka't (ركعت) with a suitable necessary addition of a few verses arouses a new and expanded meaning in the mind of the other. This is what is employed in the Quranic axiomatic theory of (or add to it, and recite the Quran in a leisurely manner) (73:4). No scholar ever hinted at this important fact of prayer that when something is asked of God in prayer, the answer appears in the form of new ideas, impulses and actions in the functioning of personality.

"Surely, we have given thee abundance of good. So pray to thy Lord and sacrifice (108: 1-2)."

The type of stimulus and the effect of the stimulus are the same as in communication between people, although the appeal and the response in the form of an enlarged meaning both take place within the congregational party and within a single personality system. What we have stated above forms the content and meanings of the sura Al Inshirah (99). A prayer conducted by an "Imam" is an appeal to God in the psychic experience of all the participants. By philosophical theorizing the Muslims while offering prayers in congregation, expand their concept of God into a supernatural realm to take account of problems of life and death and the origin and destiny of the universe beyond present experience:

"To Allah belongs whatever is in the heavens and whatever is in the earth. And whether you manifest what is in your minds or hide it, Allah will call you to account according to it. So He forgives whom He pleases and chastises whom He pleases and Allah is possessor of power over all things (2:284).

"The Messenger believes in what has been revealed to him from his Lord, and (so do) the believers. They all believe in Allah and His angels and His Books and His messengers. We make no difference between any of His messengers And they say: We hear and obey, our Lord, Thy forgiveness (do we crave), and to Thee is the eventual course. (2: 285).

"Allah imposes not on any soul a duty beyond its scope. For it is that which it earns (of good) and against it that which it works (of evil). Our Lord. punish us not if we forget or make a mistake. Our Lord, do not lay on us a burden as Thou didst lay on those before us. Our Lord, impose not on us (afflictions)! which we

have not the strength to bear! And grant us protection' And have mercy on us! Thou art our Patron, so grant us victory over the disbelieving people." (2:286).

Research in extrasensory perception by Gardner and Murphy stoutly defends the validity of extrasensory perception in religion. Association of ideas in prayers affects association of ideas in the mind of the person for whom the prayer is made.

Those who conceive of God as existing outside of experience of the empirical philosophy of the modern times may be true themselves, but such a concept in the philosophy of Islam is a delusion and farfetched. According to the Quran the interior experience is dim and evanescent at best, so the demonstration does not proceed with the facile obviousness of disclosing objects which perceptual experience of the exterior world contains.

One of the outstanding features of the philosophy of religion is the over-all refutation of the doctrine of Trinity—Father, Son and Holy Spirit—by the Muslim-thinkers of the triological fields of theology, philosophy of religion and Kalam. We need not go into the detailed arguments of this doctrine, by the Muslims except as a passing reference here.

The analysis of religion by the modern thinker has been challenged at various levels by the Muslim thinkers. As a matter of fact, the theological or philosophical discussions by the western scholars, to us are just superficial. After Macintosh published his work on theology as an empirical science, his work was beset by Pratt and others who complained of the subjectivist implications in it. The philosophical reasoning set forth by him in his book "Problem of Religious Knowledge (1940)," is to show that objects in space keep on existing when no one

experiences them. This philosophical problem is absurd, and has been invalidated by the philosophers of Islam, who are bound to concord with the view point of the Qur'an. This point has variously been enunciated by the Quran. We quote a few verses:—

(a) Nearer to man than life vein (50:16)

(b) In all directions you face God (2:115)

(c) None can hide himself from God (4:108)

(d) He is the fourth in every three (58:7)

Imam Ghazali in his refutation of philosophy argues that when the philosophers can so easily become lost in the world of tangible objects, they can much more easily do so when investigating objects in inward experience, such as motives and beliefs. One of the important contributions of the Muslims is to be discovered in their desire to establish the objective existence of God whom man finds in his inward experience. If I am not wrong, this is the suggestion followed by the thinkers of Islam, given by the Quran in its sura Rahman which starts:

"The Beneficent, taught the Quran. He created man, taught him expression. The sun and the moon follow reckoning, and the herbs and the trees adore (Him). And the heaven, He raised it high, and He set up the measure, that you may not exceed the measure, and keep up the balance with equity, nor fall short in the measure. And the earth, He has set it for (His) creatures; Therein is fruit and palm having sheathed clusters, and the grain with (its) husk and fragrance. Which then of the bounties of your Lord will you deny?" (55:1 to 13).

It is absolutely wrong as stated by one of the scholars of this country that in Islamic history there came only Waliullah as philosopher of religion. There has been an array of Muslim



philosophers from the beginning upto the death of Waliullah. There is no doubt that Waliullah played a magnum opus role in the integration and systematization of the philosophy of religion. No scholar has yet equaled Waliullah in his contributions in this field.

In Waliullah's view as propounded by him as an integral part of his philosophy of A'lami-Misal, in Tafhimat, the experience of God bears the same relation to an objective reality as sensory perceptions do to their external objects. In either case, the experience may be transitory, but the object giving rise to the experience is permanent. It is not from the mere idea of God that we can prove the existence of God, but from a consciousness of God which is at the same time an experience of God. One of the criticisms most commonly made against proposed scientific empirical theology, brought into light by Waliullah, is that the religious realism is dogmatic in pre-supposing the real existence of God. In reply it might be maintained that the religious expert has the same logical right to pre-suppose it as the physicist has to presuppose the existence of electricity. It is sufficiently sure on the basis of the pre-scientific experience; scientific method is to be employed to find out more exactly what it is.

Waliullah does not interest himself, like his predecessor Ghazali in the philosophical effort to prove the permanence of objects underlying sensory or psychic experience. His concern for philosophical questions about the reality of objects, apart from experience, has been so slight that he was occasionally found willing to concede subjectivist argument brought from a philosophical standpoint against the existence of God as an object in religious experience. At various occasions he has to repeat that no one can know what God is. We must therefore take Him as we

experience Him. Now that neo-physics has launched on the sea of higher research, matter has been conclusively proved to be emerging congeneric. The findings of Waliullah in the field of A'lami Misal stand on firm scientific ground. Maulana Qamruddin, the last Mutakallim, stresses in his "Nur-ul-Karamatain" that the common sense knowledge by which people live indicates that realities more enduring exist beyond sensory perception or inward experience. Ibn Hazm who is the founder of the science of religion in Kitab al-Fisal-ful-Milal rightly remarks that the data for the science of religion are as real as anything else in inward or outer experience, and it is unnecessary to resolve philosophical complexities for scientific investigation for people in everyday life who depend upon the data of religion and use them. While elaborating this topic in his 'Tawq-al-Hamama', says Schreiner in his Theologische Bewegung, Ibn Hazm stringently remarks that the motivational system (نية) involved has a continuing existence in the functioning of personality whether one is aware of it or not. Philosophers may mystify themselves or others as to whether perceptual objects or motives of religious phenomena are real or nothing but reflection, but scientific research does not include these intellectual problems. Philosophical inquiry into realism beyond or beneath experience is a pursuit but it is not included in practical steps, which move from sensory or motivational tad.

Abd-al-Qabir al-Baghdadi in his 'Al-Furq Bain-al-Firaq', commenting on the Qur'anic verses referred to the above, says the inclusion of God within personality means more an enlargement of the limits of personality than it does a diminution of God. The inclusion is an acknowledgement that man's highest aspirations are not isolated and inaccessible, and that the domain of personality is not

limited to self-seeking impulses. In this sense D. Kaufmann in his 'Geschichte der Attributenlehre', rightly suggests, that the motivational system empirically identified as God includes man's spiritual efforts to seek for more of God.

Imam Ghazali concluded the controversy coming from the angle of Kharajites that it must be recognized that neither empirical nor rational analysis of religious beliefs is sufficient by itself. Among man's religious needs is that a faith which goes beyond experience cannot be adequately answered on the verdict of the Quran, it might be well concluded that philosophizing which neglects empirical aspects of religion makes of it another worldly phenomenon divorced from the day-to-day struggles and victories of life. This had been the characteristic of ideational religions like Christianity, Hinduism and Buddhism etc., which has been stringently rejected by the Quran.

Causation of Religion.—Pines and Rueling, the two outstanding German Orientalists in their 'Beitragc Zur Islamischen Atomenlehre' and 'Beitragc Zur Eschotologic Des Islams', point out that the phenomena which the scientist seeks to explain by means of orderly cause and effect principles, that is religious behavior, is the most profound. Most of the thinkers of Islam have studied the problems of the development of human personality on the lines suggested by the Quran; to cite one instance, let us quote Rumi and Abdul Kareem Aljili. No doubt man is endowed with unique personal gifts, but they are latent and have to be discovered at every step of the development of life. Among other facts, the

story of Adam clearly indicates that without adequate knowledge no formation of personality is possible. And again, this knowledge makes possible fuller control over the processes of the personality development. At least such a result follows from the verse 45 of the Sura Al-Ahzab.

"O Prophet, surely We have sent thee as a witness, and a bearer of good news and a warner, (33:45)." There are divergent schools about the heredity. One school affirms and the other fully negates, but the Quran lays emphasis on heredity as a factor which forms and influences the structure and the personality of man. What has been laid down as law by the Quran has further been propounded and expanded by Ahadith. From the Qur'anic view point, whatever constituents are present in personality at birth, or strictly speaking at the moment of conception in the oviduct, are given by heredity, that is by the parents and preceding ancestors. And again, it is clear from the Quran that the characteristic transmitted by heredity is not a mechanical process of putting together of pieces of machinery. None of the scriptures expressed these facts so glaringly and decisively as Al-Quran. It is stated that most beliefs and aims result from the progressive differentiation of experience into components. Heredity gives a capacity for concept to be distilled from experience so that a single characteristic or principle is incorporated into an idea. More than other aspects of life, religion is concerned with ideas which are differentiated from psychic experience with difficulty.

(To be continued in next issue)

# Islamic Political Economy and the Human Investment Revolution

A. N. M. Masudul Alam Chowdhury

Human investment is a term used to signify the formation of productive capacities in the individuals on whom the investment is made. This investment gives rise to a stream of future benefit to the individuals on whom it is made. These benefits may be purely monetary, or a combination of monetary and non-monetary returns. The most important type of human investment is expenditure in education. This expenditure could be undertaken by the individual on himself, or by the State on the individuals. In either case, the notion of education as a consumption-investment mix commodity is ever present. The consumption component comprises the 'psychic' returns to the individual and the State through education. The investment component comprises the purely monetary returns to the individual and the state through education.

Human investment revolution in the history of economic thought started with the works of T. W. Schultz. Schultz analyzed input-output series for the United States and linked his analysis with the theme of investment in human beings. He was the first economist to recognize the importance of school-time in the formation of human capital. His important contribution was to treat earnings foregone during the period of schooling as the opportunity cost of education.

Denison's pioneering work on the contribution of education to economic growth gave rise to an unceasing flow of literature on the measurement of the residual. The residual may be defined as a technical progress parameter in the aggregate production

function; the technical progress being essentially embodied in the labor input created through human capital investment. The residual is found to explain significant shifts in the production technology over time, economies of scale, etc.

Becker has used a neo-classical earnings capitalization approach to compute the ex-post rates of return to college education in the United States. Backer also analyzed human capital theory in the context of general and specific training offered by the employers to the employees.

These pioneering studies along with many others in the area of economics of education are devoted to the evaluation of only the purely economic returns from human capital investment. They do not satisfactorily inquire into the external benefits of education. The evaluation of the external benefits of education is, however, a very important issue for policy analysis. Weisbrod has made some attempt in this direction. Weisbrod's work, however, cannot, be claimed as path-breaking from theoretical and methodological points of view. To my opinion the human investment revolution that started with the works of T. W. Schultz cannot be called a total revolution in economic thought in the absence of a viable theory and methodology to evaluate the non monetary benefits and value system conferred by the investment-consumption mix of educational good. It is only through such a new media of economic analysis and theory that the new 'human economics' can emerge. I am of the opinion that at this critical juncture, when some of the most notable minds are

reaching for the discovery of a new 'human economics', the Islamic Political Economy has much to offer.

This note merely touches on the emerging possibility of a new economic order in the context of the Islamic Political Economy. I will thereby introduce the following issues of human capital investment theory in economic.

What forms will such concepts as the consumption-investment mix of educational good, the rate of return analysis, and the earnings capitalization theory, take in the Islamic Economic System ?

Let us begin by indentifying the basic features of the Islamic educational philosophy. The primary purpose of education in Islam is to imbue individuals and the society with the meaning and purpose of life and man's socio-economic position in this world through the doctrine of tauheed (Unity of God), risalah (prophet-hood), and akhira (Life Hereafter). The essential sources of knowledge in Islam are therefore, the Qur'an and the Sunnah (traditions of Prophet Muhammad (ﷺ)), the principles of which are to be applied to the needs of society at different ages, through the process of ijihad or seeking application of Islamic principles to new situations and ijma or concensus. We can, therefore, say that the Islamic educational system is highly value-oriented.

In such a value-oriented educations system, earnings will not prove to be a meaningful variable in an earnings capitalization approach, because earnings will grossly underestimate productivity. The earnings variable must therefore be replaced by another variable or a function that takes account of the pure economic as well as the imputed values of the non-monetary returns from education. A good 'variable' could be an

'atemporal' utility function transformed to an inter-temporal utility function by converting the pure non-monetary returns of education into economic equivalents. A suitable mechanism for bringing about such a transformation must be, and indeed can be, developed in the context of the Islamic social system. One such method is developed in the author's doctoral dissertation at the University of Toronto, but is too elaborate to be included in this brief note.

When private benefits and costs are evaluated, the individual 'intertemporal' utility function is to be used. When social benefits and costs are evaluated, then the social welfare function is to be used. Because of the proposed change in the definition of the capitalized variable, the concept of the rate of return will also change. One alternative could be to define the rate of return as follows:

$$\left( \frac{1}{\text{marginal utility of consumption of a future individual}} \right)$$

In other words, the private rate of return could be defined as the marginal utility of consumption by a member of the next generation, less unity. The social rate of discount in the above context may be defined as the excess over unity, of the ratio of the marginal utility, to an individual of his contemporary's consumption, to the marginal utility that the individual places upon a future individual's consumption. In a truly Islamic social system, education will become a pure public good. In such a state, the private and the social rates will be equal. In relation to education, consumption here means the external benefits derived from educational good.

These are some of the areas in which the concepts of (Continued on page #. 11)

# Sheikh Abdul Qadir Jilani رحمه الله عليه

Syed Abdul Hye Bukhari

## Among the Robbers:

Along the winding caravan route in Northern Iraq a large and lively caravan was progressing southwards. It was a caravan of rich traders who were taking their merchandise to Baghdad with the hope of gaining considerable profit. It was the eve of the fifth century of the Hijra and the Islamic civilization had reached its very zenith. Baghdad, being the capital of the Muslim world, was the richest city in the world; it was also the centre of civilization, culture and education. Hence, it would not be wrong to say that all roads, in those days, led to Baghdad.

The caravan progressed steadily and merrily along the mountain passes. The pine clad mountain slopes presented a beautiful scenery to the onlookers. Little did the travelers think that behind that green foliage there lurked a dangerous enemy who was constantly watching them and seeking an opportunity to pounce upon them. It was a robber infested area and none was aware of that fact except those who often traversed the route.

After sunset the caravan camped at the foot of a hill to rest for the night. Camp fires were lit, food was being cooked and gossip flourished. It was a merry sight to look at.

Suddenly there arose horrible cries from all sides, arrows flew in all directions and swords began to flash. It was all confusion within the camp and none could recognize friend from the foe. The camp had been attacked by a band of robbers; the meager resistance the merchants and their mercenaries offered

availed them nothing and soon the defenders were overcome by the robbers and tied hand and foot. The robbers were not content with the camels and mules loaded with merchandise, they also searched the clothes of the traders for cash.

While confusion prevailed everywhere in the camp a handsome youth of fair complexion sat under a tree apparently unperturbed by all the confusion. He seemed to be in his late teens and belong to a poor but respectable family. While he had been watching the proceedings with a look of remorse, a robber approached him with a drawn sword in his hand and shouted:

“Hai! how much cash have you about your person?”

The youth looked at him serenely and said” Forty Dinars (Gold Coins).”

The robber could not believe that a person who looked so humble and poor in his outfit could be the owner of forty gold coins. He thought that the latter was fooling him, so he dragged him to the captain and said “Captain! this rogue of a lad says he has forty gold coins about his person”.

The Captain cast a searching glance at the youth and asked him: “Where have you concealed them, young man?”

They are sewn under the folds of my waistcoat, the lad replied in a calm tone.

At the order of the captain the waistcoat was taken off from the youth and the folds were cut open. Lo and behold! there dropped from it forty glittering gold coins. The captain was amazed to see so much wealth in the

possession of a person of such humble appearance. He was no less amazed at the simplicity of the youth who gave away his wealth so easily.

“Young man! you are a fool”, said the Captain to the youth. “None would have suspected that you carried so much wealth about your person had you not given out your secret yourself”.

“That is quite right”, said the lad in his usual calm tone. He seemed not in the least moved even at the loss of all his wealth. “I am a student”, he continued, “and am on my way to Baghdad to pursue my studies. While I was leaving home, my mother advised me to be truthful on all occasions and I made a solemn promise that I would act on her advice. So, when your man asked me if I carried any cash about my person, I told him the truth. I could not prevail upon myself to disobey mother.” While the youth was explaining to the Captain why he had given away his secret, his simple words were penetrating into the very soul of the latter. He was deeply absorbed in introspection. He thought to himself: “this simple lad detests to disobey his mother and has lost all he had on that account. But here am I, an accursed disobedient servant of the Almighty, nay, a rebel. I have enjoyed His blessings throughout my life but have disobeyed him in all respects. It is a shame on my part, I should learn a lesson from this lad who may still prove for me a guiding angel.”

Tears of remorse rolled down his cheeks and shone on his beard like dew drops on the grass. There he stood, a changed person, a repentant soul. When the reverie was over, he assembled his men around and ordered them to return to the travelers their goods. He told them that he was going to abandon his sinful ways and asked them to follow him,

The next morning, the caravan set out on its

way as merrily as ever and the youth who had saved their lives and wealth walked along with his usual calmness.

### **Life and Mission:**

The Youth who had caused the Captain of the robbers' band to be repentant was none other than the illustrious saint Sheikh Abdul Qadir Jilani who is justly regarded by Muslims of the world as the greatest of all saints. He was a descendant of the Holy Prophet (ﷺ).

Born in Jilan in 470 A.H. he lived in his native town till he was eighteen. Then he felt a keen urge for the study of Theology and Tassawwuf. As Baghdad was in those days the centre of education and culture he requested his mother to let him travel to Baghdad. The poor lady who was already a widow grieved at the thought of separation but she detested to prevent her son from the achievement of his noble aims. She gave him forty gold coins and said: “My son! your father had left eighty gold coins of which I give you forty and the rest I keep for your younger brother. Baghdad is far from here and it may be that I never see you again in life, but I shall not stand in the way of your noble aims. Go my son! with the blessings of God and remember that you shall always be truthful.”

After a long and arduous journey the Sheikh reached Baghdad. It was the richest city in the world in those days and a paradise of the epicurean. But the Sheikh, youthful though he was, concentrated his attention to his studies. Among his tutors in Theology, Abul Wafa Ibn Aqueel Muhammad and Abu Zakariah Tabrazi are most famous. He received his training in Tasawwuf from Abul Khair Hammad bim Muslim and Quadi Abu Saied Makhzumi.

After the completion of his education he became a tutor at the seminary of Sheikh Makhzumi. His lectures were so fluent, so energetic and inspiring that his fame was soon

spread far and wide and people from all walks of life began to attend his lectures. The space within the building of the seminary proved insufficient to hold the audience, hence, it was soon enlarged. Even the Caliphs and important officers of the state attended his lectures. At the seminary, the Sheikh taught Tafsir, Hadith and Fiqah. He also used to write Fatwa often in accordance with the canonical schools of Shafii and Hambali. But the most important of his activities were his lectures which were attended by Muslims and non-Muslims alike. His lectures were almost always followed by the conversion of a number of Jews and Christians to Islam. Once, the Sheikh himself told to one of his friends: "I had wished to live in deserts or forests so that nobody could see me nor I saw anybody. But God wished to benefit His servants through me. Over five thousand Jews and Christians have embraced Islam at my hands by now and over hundred thousand sinners have become repentant. This is indeed a great blessing of God."

A number of miracles were wrought by the Sheikh but he disliked their publicity. If someone happened to witness one of his miracles, the Sheikh would ask him not to reveal it to anybody as long as he lived. He would say: "When a humble servant serves God sincerely and patiently for a long period of time, God reveals to him one of His secrets. But if that poor fellow reveals that secret to others God becomes displeased with him. The person who has the power to work miracles is told not to reveal his power till the time When God finds it suitable to reveal it."

Unlike some of our modern sufis who are regardless of the laws of the Shariah, the Sheikh paid due respect to it. He had faith in the fact that Shariah is complete; what is lawful in the Shariah is lawful forever and what is unlawful in it is unlawful forever. There can

be no change in it at all. Once he said:

"Once I witnessed a great light which filled the horizons. Then appeared a face which said to me: "O, Abdul Qadir! I am your creator, I have rendered lawful to you everything which had so far been unlawful".

When I heard this I said: "Be you gone you nasty thing!" As I uttered these words the light turned into darkness and the face became smoke. Then there came a voice: "Abdul Qadir! God saved you on account of your knowledge and wisdom while I had deceived a number of Sufis in the same way."

"But how did you discover it was Satan?" asked one of the listeners.

The Sheikh smiled and said: "It was not very difficult: for, had not he said that he had rendered lawful unto me all that is unlawful in the Shariah?"

Despite the high social status the Sheikh associated freely with the humble and poor. He would sit with them and clean their clothes for them. He would spend his wealth freely to relieve the poor and the needy. None who approached him for help did ever return dejected. The Sheikh used to say:

"If I am given all the wealth of the entire world, I will spend it all to feed the hungry. It seems to me as if there is a hole in my palms through which everything escapes. Even if a thousand gold coins come to me at night nothing will remain with me till the dawn".

Humble though he was while he associated with the poor, he observed his dignity and self—respect in his dealings with the rich and the officers of state. He never rose from his place to greet them. He would not even stand for the caliphs who frequently attended his lectures. He would even chastise the caliphs for their misconduct and negligence. When Caliph Muqutazi le-Amrillah appointed Abul

Wafa Yehya bin Said, who was notorious for his cruelty, as Chief Justice, the Sheikh chastised him from the pulpit and said:

“You have appointed as ruler over Muslims a person with most tyrannical disposition; what would be your excuse before the Most-Gracious, Most Merciful?”

When the Caliph heard this, he began to tremble. Tears of remorse began to flow from his eyes and he immediately issued orders for the dismissal of the Qadri.

The Sheikh would not accept any present from the caliphs or the officers of the state for he believed that the wealth they had amassed was not honestly earned by them. Once, Caliph Al-Mustanjid Billah presented the Sheikh with ten purses of gold coins. But the Sheikh refused to accept them as usual. At the insistence of the Caliph he took two of the purses and rubbed them against each other. It seemed to the caliph as if a stream of blood gushed forth from the purses and he heard the Sheikh saying: “Why man! don’t you feel ashamed. You suck human blood and present me with the same!” The effect of what the caliph saw and heard was so strong that he fainted away.

The Sheikh continued to guide humanity towards the right path and help them in the efforts of their spiritual development until he breathed his last in 561 A. H. at the age of ninety.

Among the books the Sheikh wrote, the following are most famous;

1. —Gunyaḥ Al-Talibeen (a work on canonical law based on the Hambalite School).
2. —Futuh al-Gaib (on Tasawwuf).
3. —Al-Fath al-Rabbani (a collection of sermons).

Other books include:

Jila al-Khatir.

Al-Yawaquit wal-Hikam.

Al-Fuyumt al-Rabbaniah.

Al-Mawahib al-Rahmaniah.

### **Sermons of the Sheikh:**

The Sheikh was the greatest missionary of his time. He preached Islam both through his own example and his sermons which were irresistibly impressive. The effect of his sermons is as strong today as it was during the life of the Sheikh. The following are a few selections from his sermons:

### **Trust in God:**

“When certain misfortune befalls a servant, he tries to come out of it by using his own resources. But when his own resources fail him, he approaches others for help. He goes to kings, the officers of state or the people who enjoy power and authority. If it happens to be an ailment, he goes to the physicians. But when even these resources fail him, he approaches his Creator with prayers and praises. That is, as long as his own resources work, he does not approach others among his fellow creatures whose resources are stronger than his own and as long as the resources of his fellow creature’s work, he does not approach God. But God also tires him of his prayers and praises and finally the servant is plunged into a state of dejection. This is the proper time when God exercises His Will in the soul of the servant and causes him to be regardless of the system of cause and effect. He then learns to look at the Almighty as the cause of all causes and learns with certainty that everything rests in the Hands of God.”

On another occasion he said:

“Look at the entire creation as a captive in the hands of a great King whose dominions are



boundless, whose commands none can disobey and whose awe fills everyone's heart. Now picture to yourselves that the King had tied his captive hand and foot and hung him on a pine tree at the bank of a river whose breadth none can measure, whose depth none can fathom and whose current is extremely swift. The King has taken his seat on a high throne which none can reach. There is by the King's side a large pile of arms including bows, arrows and spears and the King takes whichever arm he pleases and throws it at the captive. Now, is it wise on the part of the lookers on to become careless of the King and concentrate their hopes in the captive or be afraid of him? Whosoever is guilty of such miscalculation (with regard to the power and authority of the King and the captive) must be a lunatic or not a human being."

On yet another occasion he says:

"Remember Him Who constantly watches you; be with Him Who remains with you forever; give your hands to Him Who can uphold you and take you out of the darkness of ignorance, save you from doom, clean you of your filth and protect you from your misguided and misguiding associates."

#### **Unitarianism (Tawheed) :**

"You concentrate your trust in your own capacities, in your wealth, in the ruler of your city or in others among the creatures of God. But remember that whosoever becomes the object of your trust becomes your 'Ma'abud' (The worshipped one). The person whom you

fear becomes your Ma'abud and the person about whom you believe that God has authorized him to cause you either harm or benefit, becomes your worshipped one."

He further says:

"All creatures are helpless; none can cause you harm or benefit except that they play the role of instruments in the Hands of Allah. He, the Almighty, is the motivating force in you and in all creatures. Whatever is good for you or is bad, is recorded and finalized in the Profound Knowledge of God and nothing contrary to it shall ever take place. . .

. . . Brave is the person who has cleansed his heart of everything other than God; who stands at the entrance of his heart with the sword of Unitarianism and Shariah in hand with the determination that he would let none enter it. He reserves the sanctuary of his heart solely for God. Such is the person who is benefited by the Shariah and whose innerself is trimmed by the Ma'arifah."

#### **Relative Position of the Muslim and the World:**

The Sheikh personifies the world as an old hag who becomes the mistress of a person who loves her and becomes the slave of the one who detests her. He says:

"Do not take your share of the worldly provision while she (the world) sits (as a mistress) and you keep standing (as a slave). Take your share at the table of the King (God) while (Continued on page # 11)

# Sufiism: The Uncovering of the Tenth Veil: Uns and Haybat, and the difference between them

Uns (intimacy) and haybat (awe) are two states of the dervishes who travel on the Way to God. When God manifests His glory to a man's heart so that His majesty (jalal) predominates, he feels awe (haybat), but when God's beauty (jamal) predominates he feels intimacy (uns): those who feel awe are distressed, while those who feel intimacy are rejoiced. There is a difference between one who is burned by His majesty in the fire of love and one who is illuminated by His beauty in the light of contemplation. Some Shaykhs have said that haybat is the degree of gnostics and uns the degree of novices, because the farther one has advanced in the presence of God and in divesting Him of attributes the more his heart is overwhelmed with awe and the more averse he is to intimacy, for one is intimate with those of one's own kind, and intimacy with God is inconceivable, since no homogeneity or resemblance can possibly exist between God and Man. If intimacy is possible, it is possible only with the praise (dhikr) of Him, which is something different from Himself, because that is an attribute of Man; and in love, to be satisfied with another than the Beloved is falsehood and pretension and self-conceit. Haybat, on the other hand, arises from contemplating greatness, which is an attribute of God, and there is a vast difference between one whose experience proceeds from himself through himself and one whose experience proceeds from the annihilation of himself through the subsistence of God. It is related that Shibli said: "For a long time I used to think

that I was rejoicing in the love of God and was intimate with contemplation of Him: now I know that intimacy is impossible except with a congener." Some, however, allege that haybat is a corollary of separation and punishment, while uns is the result of union and mercy; therefore the friends of God must be guarded from the consequences of haybat and be attached to uns, for uns involves love, and as homogeneity is impossible in love (of God), so it is impossible in uns. My Shaykh used to say: "I wonder at those who declare intimacy with God to be impossible, after God has said, 'Verily My servants,' and 'Say to My servants', and 'When My servants shall ask thee', and 'O My servants, no fear shall come on you this day, and ye shall not grieve' (Qur.xlii,68). A servant of God, seeing this favour, cannot fail to love Him, and when he has loved he will become intimate, because awe of one's beloved is estrangement (beganagi), whereas intimacy is oneness (yaganagi). It is characteristic of men to become intimate with their benefactors, and inasmuch as God has conferred on us so great benefits and we have knowledge of Him, it is impossible of Him, it is impossible that we should talk of awe." I, 'Ali b. 'Uthman al-Jullabi, say that both parties in this controversy are right, because the power of haybat is exerted upon the lower soul and its desires, and tends to annihilate human nature, while the power of uns is exerted upon the heart and tends to foster gnosis in the heart. Therefore God annihilates the souls of those who love Him by revealing His majesty and (Continued on page #. 11)

# WORLD FEDERATION OF ISLAMIC MISSIONS

## LIST OF ENGLISH PUBLICATIONS

S.No.	NAME OF BOOK	AUTHOR
1	Al-Fath Al-Rabbani (Unveiling the Divine Values)	Shaikh Abdul Qadir Al-Jilani (R.A) Translated by: S.A.H Bukhari
2	Why Religion?	S.Z Hassan
3	Principles of Islam	M.A.A. Siddiqui
4	Quest for true happiness	M.A.A. Siddiqui
5	The Forgotten – Path of Knowledge	M.A.A. Siddiqui
6	Cultivation of Science by the Muslims	M.A.A. Siddiqui
7	Shavian and a Theologian	M.A.A. Siddiqui
8	Pilgrimage to Mecca	M.A.A. Siddiqui
9	Woman and their status in Islam	M.A.A. Siddiqui
10	Islam Versus Marxism	F.R. Ansari
11	What is Islam?	F.R. Ansari
12	Islam and Christianity in the Modern World	F.R. Ansari
13	Through Science & Philosophy to Religion	F.R. Ansari
14	Foundation of Faith	F.R. Ansari
15	Which Religion?	F.R. Ansari
16	Islam and Western Civilization	F.R. Ansari
17	Beyond Death	F.R. Ansari
18	Philosophy of Worship in Islam	F.R. Ansari
19	The Qur'anic Foundation and Structure of Muslim Society (Two volumes)	F.R. Ansari
20	Islamic System of Education	Dr. H.H. Bilgrami
21	What is Christianity?	Y.S C.histy
22	Integration of Science & Religion	Dr. M.H. Shah
23	Science & God	S. Shamim Ahmed
24	The Myth of The Crucified Saviour	W.J Sheard
25	Who Founded Christianity Jesus or Jewry?	W.J Sheard
26	The Way of Islam	Muhammad H.I Dobinson
27	Islam and Contemporary Science	S.S.N. Naqvi
28	Scientific Religion or Reverent Science	Maria Leyvinskaya Antonoff
29	Islam and Buddism in the Modern World	Imran N. Hosien
30	Codification of Islamic Law	M.A.A Siddiqui
31	The Beacon Light	Dr. F.R. Ansari
32	Dr. F.R Ansari The Ghazali of his Age	Dr. F.R Ansari
33	Communist Challenge to Islam	Dr. F.R Ansari
34	Guidelines for Islamic Propagation	Dr. F.R Ansari
35	Muhammad Glory of the Ages	Dr. F.R Ansari
36	A New Muslim World in the making	Dr. F.R Ansari

نیک سیرت نیک صورت نیک دل روشن جبین

رحمت للعالمین یا رحمت للعالمین

آب و گل نے کس سے پائی ہے نمود ز ندگی بخش دی کس نے شب تاریک کو تابندگی  
کس نے انساں کو دیا درس رموز زندگی کس کے صدقے سگریزوں کو ملی رخشندگی  
آپ ہی کے دم قدم سے رفعتیں سب کو ملیں

رحمت للعالمین یا رحمت للعالمین

منظر علی خان منظر

ابو جہل کے مارے جانے کے بعد قریش کی سرداری ابو  
سفیان کو مل گئی۔ اُس نے منّت مان رکھی تھی کہ بدر کے مقتولین کا  
انتقام لئے بغیر غسل نہ کروں گا۔ اور نہ سر میں تیل ڈالوں گا۔ معرکہ بدر  
کے دو ماہ بعد دو سو آدمیوں کے ساتھ مدینہ کی طرف بڑھا۔ یہودیوں  
سے مدد کا خواہاں ہوا۔

حی بن اخطب نے منہ نہ لگایا گو بنو نضیر کے سردار سلام بن  
اشکم نے پذیرائی کی۔ مگر حوصلہ نہ ہوا۔ مدینہ سے تین چار فرسخ پہلے  
غریض پر حملہ کیا۔ ایک انصاری کو قتل اور چند مکان اور گھاس کے انبار  
جلادئے۔ آنحضرت ﷺ کو خبر ہوئی تو آپ ﷺ نے تعاقب  
کیا۔ ابوسفیان گھبرا کر بھاگ نکلا۔ بوجھ ہلکا کرنے کیلئے اونٹوں پر  
سے رسد کے سٹو کے بورے پھینکا گیا جو مسلمانوں کے ہاتھ آئے۔  
ستو کو عربی میں سویق کہتے ہیں، اس لئے یہ واقعہ غزوہ سویق کے نام  
سے مشہور ہے۔ اس بھاگ دوڑ کو معرکہ قرار دے کر ابوسفیان نے اپنی  
منّت پوری کر لی۔

وَضُرِبَتْ عَلَيْهِمُ الذِّلَّةُ وَالْمَسْكَنَةُ وَبَاءُوا بِغَضَبٍ مِّنَ  
اللَّهِ ذَٰلِكَ بِأَنَّهُمْ كَانُوا يَكْفُرُونَ بِآيَاتِ اللَّهِ وَيَقْتُلُونَ النَّبِيَّ  
بِغَيْرِ الْحَقِّ ذَٰلِكَ بِمَا عَصَوْا وَكَانُوا يَعْتَدُونَ ٥

(البقرة: ٦١)

”اور (یہود پر) ذلت اور محتاجی چمٹادی گئی اور وہ اللہ کے غضب میں  
گرفتار ہو گئے، یہ اس لئے کہ وہ اللہ کی آیات سے انکار کرتے تھے اور  
(اس کے) نبیوں کو ناحق قتل کرتے تھے، یہ نتیجہ تھا ان کی نافرمانیوں کا  
اور اس بات کا کہ وہ حدودِ شرع سے نکل نکل جاتے تھے۔“

بدر میں مسلمانوں کی کامیابی نے مدینہ کے یہود کو چوکنا  
کر دیا۔ اسلام کی بڑھتی ہوئی طاقت کو کچلنے کے ارادہ سے اُن کے سب  
سے قوی اور بہادر قبیلہ بنو قینقاع نے عہد شکنی کی۔ ایک انصاری خاتون  
کی بھرے بازار میں بے حرمتی کی جس سے ایک مسلمان نے غیرت  
سے بے تاب ہو کر مرتکب یہودی کو مار ڈالا اور یہودیوں نے ہلہ بول  
کر اس مسلمان کو وہیں شہید کر دیا۔ آنحضرت ﷺ نے جب اُن  
سے باز پرس کی تو نہایت گستاخانہ انداز سے پیش آئے۔ اُن کی طرف  
سے عہد شکنی اور اعلانِ جنگ کے بعد مقابلہ کے سوا کوئی چارہ نہ رہا۔  
پندرہ دن کے محاصرے کے بعد اُن کے پچھلے چھوٹ گئے اور فیصلہ کی  
درخواست کرنے پر مجبور ہو گئے۔ عبداللہ بن اُبی اُن کا حلیف تھا۔ اُس  
کی درخواست پر بنو قینقاع کے سات سو افراد جن میں سے تین سوزرہ  
پوش بھی تھے، شام کے علاقہ میں جلاوطن کر دئے گئے۔

اسلام کی ترقی کا دروازہ کھل گیا۔ مقتولین بدر کے علاوہ  
ابولہب، مطعم بن عدی، اور مشہور بھو گو شاعر اُمیہ بھی جہنم رسید ہو گئے۔  
آنحضرت ﷺ کے چچا حضرت عباس ﷺ مشرف باسلام ہو گئے گو  
قیامِ مکہ کے دوران اس کا اعلان نہیں کیا۔ آنحضرت ﷺ کے رتبہ  
عالیہ کی تائید میں آیتِ درود نازل ہوئی۔ مدینہ منورہ میں حالات پر  
سکون ہونے لگے تو حضرت عبداللہ بن مسعود ﷺ نے حبشہ سے  
مراجعت کی۔ آنحضرت ﷺ کی سب سے چھوٹی صاحبزادی سیدۃ  
النساء حضرت فاطمہ رضی اللہ عنہا کا عقد حضرت علی ﷺ سے ہوا اور رخصتی  
عمل میں آئی۔



محسوس کرتے ہوئے مکہ کی طرف قاصد دوڑادیئے اور قریش ایک ہزار کا مسلح لشکر لے کر مسلمانوں سے لڑنے کے لئے نکل پڑے۔ اُدھر مسلمان آنحضرت ﷺ کی قیادت میں اس بلائے ناگہانی کو روکنے کے لئے آگے بڑھے اور بدر کے مقام پر دونوں لشکروں کا آمنا سامنا ہو گیا۔ لشکرِ اسلام میں کل تین سو تیرہ جانباڑے تھے۔ اسلحہ اور سواری کے جانور بھی گنتی کے تھے۔

اپنی بے سروسامانی اور دشمن کی کیل کا نئے سے لیس فوج کو دیکھ کر مسلمانوں کو فطرتاً اضطراب ہوا۔ اللہ نے تسلی کا سامان پیدا کر دیا۔ بارش فرما کر پاک صاف اور نیند طاری کر کے تازہ دم کر دیا۔ قیادت آنحضرت ﷺ نے فرمائی، لشکرِ اسلام کی صفیں ترتیب دیں، مقابلہ کے لئے بہادرانِ اسلام کو نام بنام نامزد فرما کر بھیجا اور جب دست بدست لڑائی شروع ہوئی تو بارگاہِ رب العزت میں التجا کی کہ ”بارالہا! تو نے جس نصرت کا وعدہ مجھ سے کیا ہے اُسے پورا کر۔ اگر یہ مٹھی بھر مسلمان ہلاک ہو گئے تو پھر اس نطلہ زمین پر تیرا کوئی عبادت گزار باقی نہیں رہے گا۔“ دعا قبول ہوئی۔ قرآن مجید شاہد ہے:

وَلَقَدْ نَصَرَكُمُ اللَّهُ بِبَدْرٍ وَأَنْتُمْ أَذِلَّةٌ فَاتَّقُوا اللَّهَ لَعَلَّكُمْ تَشْكُرُونَ ۝ (آل عمران: ۱۶۳)

”یقیناً اللہ نے بدر میں تمہاری مدد کی جب تم کمزور تھے۔ تو اللہ سے ڈرتے رہو تا کہ تم شکر گزار ہو جاؤ۔“

اللہ تعالیٰ نے مسلمانوں کو فتح سے ہمکنار فرمایا۔ نامور رؤسائے قریش اور اسلام کے بدترین دشمن اُمیہ بن خلف، ابو جہل، شیبہ، عتبہ، ابوالجہتر ی اور زمعہ بن الاسود وغیرہ مارے گئے اور مجموعی طور پر ستر آدمی قتل ہوئے اور اتنے ہی گرفتار ہوئے۔ مسلمانوں میں سے صرف چودہ حضرات نے جامِ شہادت نوش کیا۔ اسیرانِ جنگ اور مالِ غنیمت لے کر مدینہ واپس پہنچے تو رومیوں کی اہلِ فارس پر فتح کی خبر

آئی اور قرآن مجید کی پیش گوئی، کہ ایشیائے کوچک میں رومی چند سال میں غالب آجائیں گے، پوری ہو گئی۔ آنحضرت ﷺ نے اسیرانِ جنگ کو صحابہ کرامؓ میں تقسیم کر دیا۔ اور تاکید فرمائی کہ اُن کے ساتھ عمدہ برتاؤ کیا جائے۔ اور اُن میں سے اکثر کو فدیہ پر رہا کر دیا۔ جو قیدی لکھنا پڑھنا جانتے تھے اُن کا فدیہ مسلمانوں کو نوشت و خواندگی تعلیم مقرر فرمادی۔ بدر کی فتح اسلام کی ترقی کی راہ میں ایک اہم قدم تھا۔

قریش کے وقار اور قوت کو زبردست دھچکا لگا۔ عرب کے قبیلے اگرچہ مسلمان نہیں ہوئے مگر مرعوب ہو گئے۔ مدینہ میں عبد اللہ بن اُبی جو اللہ کے رسول ﷺ کا سخت دشمن تھا بظاہر مسلمان ہو گیا گو تمام عمر منافق ہی رہا۔ غزوہ بدر کی شکست نے مکہ کو ماتم کدہ بنا دیا۔ کوئی گھرانہ ایسا نہ تھا جس کا فرد اس معرکہ میں مارا نہ گیا ہو تو می عزت کے خیال سے لوگ بر ملا نوحہ خوانی نہیں کرتے تھے مگر نجی صحبتوں میں مقتولین بدر کو یاد کر کے روتے تھے۔ عمیر بن وہب قریشی جو اسلام کا سخت دشمن تھا صفوان بن اُمیہ کی شہ پر آنحضرت ﷺ کے قتل پر آمادہ ہو گیا اور دونوں کے خفیہ مشورہ سے زہر میں بچھی ہوئی تلوار لے کر مدینہ پہنچا، بہانا یہ بنایا کہ بیٹے کو چھڑانے کے لئے آیا ہوں مگر ناپاک ارادہ یہ تھا کہ حاضر ہوتے ہی تلوار کا وار کر کے قصہ تمام کر دوں گا۔ حضرت عمرؓ نے اس کے تیور دیکھ کر بھانپ لیا اور پکڑ کر دربار رسالت میں لے گئے۔ آپ ﷺ نے فرمایا تم نے اور صفوان نے میرے قتل کی سازش کی ہے۔ اور تم اس ارادہ سے آئے ہو۔ بیٹے کو چھڑانے کا بہانہ غلط ہے۔ عمیر یہ سن کر سٹائے میں آ گیا۔ اور بولا کہ بیشک آپ ﷺ پیغمبر ہیں۔ میرے اور صفوان کے سوا اس معاملہ کی خبر کسی کو نہ تھی۔ اور پھر صدقِ دل سے مسلمان ہو کر دعوتِ اسلام میں بہت کوشش کی۔

سنگ ہوا گو ہر پہنچ کر آپؐ کی سرکار میں بن گئے خواجہ گدا بھی آپؐ کے دربار میں جس باطن جاگ اٹھی سینہ احرار میں آپؐ کا تھا تذکرہ احباب میں اغیار میں



سے قریش کے چند افراد سے مٹھ بھینٹ ہو گئی۔ جس میں ایک کا فر عمر بن  
الحضرمی مارا گیا اور دو گرفتار ہو گئے۔ آنحضرت ﷺ نے اُن کے  
اس فعل کو پسند نہیں فرمایا۔ اور حکم کی خلاف ورزی میں قتل و خون کرنے  
پر صحابہ ؓ نے بھی حضرت عبداللہ ﷺ کے اس فعل سے ناپسندیدگی کا  
اظہار کیا۔ یہ تینوں قریشی معزز خاندان کے لوگ تھے چنانچہ اس بنا پر  
قریش مشتعل ہو گئے۔ اور عرب قبائل کے دستور کے مطابق خون کے  
انتقام کی بنیاد قائم ہو گئی۔ اور معرکہ بدر میں یہ جذبہ انتقام بھی کار فرما  
تھا۔

جب مسلمانوں پر دشمنان اسلام کے حملے اور اُن کے  
خلاف سازشوں میں کمی نہ آئی تو آیت قتال و جہاد نازل ہوئی اور  
مسلمانوں کو دشمنوں سے لڑنے کی اجازت مل گئی:

اِذْ نَالِ السِّدِّينَ يَقتُلُونَ بِاَنَّهُمْ ظَلَمُوا ؕ وَاِنَّ اللّٰهَ عَلٰى نَصْرِهِمْ  
لَقَدِيرٌ ۝ الَّذِيْنَ اُخْرِجُوْا مِنْ دِيَارِهِمْ بِغَيْرِ حَقٍّ اِلَّا اَنْ يَقُوْلُوْا  
رَبُّنَا اللّٰهُ ؕ (الحج: ۳۰-۳۹)

”اجازت دیدی گئی اُن لوگوں کو جن کے خلاف جنگ کی جارہی ہے  
کیونکہ وہ مظلوم ہیں اور یقیناً اللہ اُن کی مدد پر قادر ہے۔ یہ وہ لوگ ہیں  
جو اپنے گھروں سے ناحق نکالے گئے صرف اس قصور پر کہ وہ کہتے تھے  
'ہمارا رب اللہ ہے'۔“

قریش مکہ کی سازشیں اور جھڑپیں ناکام رہیں اور حضرمی  
کے قتل کے انتقام کا جوش بڑھا تو انہوں نے ایک فیصلہ کن جنگ کا  
منصوبہ بنایا۔ ابوسفیان کی سرکردگی میں ایک بڑا قافلہ تجارت شام کی  
منڈیوں میں بھیجا ہر شخص نے اس میں سرمایہ لگایا اور منافع سامان  
جنگ کی فراہمی کے لئے مخصوص کر دیا۔ یہ قافلہ واپسی میں جب مدینہ  
کے قریب سے گزرنے والا تھا تو مسلمانوں نے ارادہ کیا کہ روک دیا  
جائے تاکہ دشمن کی جنگی تیاریاں سینے نہ یائیں۔ ابوسفیان نے خطرہ

رہے۔ وہ فخر کرتے تھے کہ مسلمان بھی ہمارا قبلہ تسلیم کرتے ہیں مگر  
تحویل قبلہ کے بعد برہم ہو گئے اور کہنے لگے کہ مسلمانوں کے پیغمبر ہر  
بات میں ہماری مخالفت کرتے ہیں اب قبلہ بھی الگ کر لیا۔ ادھر مکہ  
میں قریش مسلمانوں کو مدینہ میں مطمئن دیکھنے کے روادار نہ تھے۔  
انہوں نے سازشوں کا جال پھیلانا شروع کر دیا۔ مدینہ کے بااثر  
عبداللہ بن اُبی کو اُکسایا کہ آنحضرت ﷺ کو اور مسلمانوں کی مختصر  
سی تعداد کو وہاں سے نکال دے اور ڈر دیا کہ اگر ایسا نہ کیا تو ہم حملہ  
کر دیں گے جس میں گیہوں کے ساتھ گھن بھی پس جائے گا مگر  
عبداللہ بن اُبی کو اس اقدام کی جرأت نہ ہو سکی۔ پھر قریش نے  
یہودیوں سے ساز باز شروع کر دی جس کے نتائج چند سال بعد ظاہر  
ہوئے۔ ساتھ ساتھ ٹولیاں بنا بنا کر مدینہ پر حملے کرنے لگے۔ اور کرز  
بن جابر التہمی تو مدینہ کی چراگا ہوں سے آنحضرت ﷺ کے  
موسیٰ ہانک کر لے گیا۔

قریش مکہ آنحضرت ﷺ کی جان کے درپے رہتے  
تھے۔ چنانچہ شہر میں رات کو پہرہ دیا جاتا تھا اور آپ ﷺ کی حفاظت  
کا خصوصی بندوبست کیا گیا تھا۔ احتیاط اور دوراندیشی کا تقاضا تھا کہ  
دشمن کی حرکات و سکنات پر کڑی نگاہ رکھی جائے۔ مسلمانوں کی چھوٹی  
چھوٹی جماعتیں ٹوہ لگانے کی غرض سے گرد و نواح، راستوں اور  
معروف مقامات تک پھر کر آتی تھیں۔ یہ تدبیریں حفاظت خود  
اختیاری کی تھیں۔ اور اس مقصد کے لئے کہ کفار مکہ کے تجارتی  
قافلے، جن کا گذر مدینہ کے قریب سے ہوتا تھا، روک دیئے جائیں  
تاکہ قریش مجبور ہو کر صلح کر لیں اور یہ روز روز کے خلفشار ختم ہوں۔  
لڑائی مقصود نہ تھی۔ ایسی مہم کو ”سریہ“ کہتے ہیں۔

رجب کے مہینہ کا واقعہ ہے کہ حضرت عبداللہ بن جحش  
قریش کی ٹوہ میں بارہ آدمیوں کے ساتھ بطن نخلہ بھیجے گئے۔ اتفاق



# نقشِ پیمبر صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم (فراستِ پیغمبری) وصی الحسن انصاری

اتنے میں مغرب کے اُفق سے مہر رسالت کی ضو اُبھری  
خنداں خنداں روشن روشن افزوں افزوں محکم محکم  
چاک ہوا باطل کا پردہ اِنَّ الْبَاطِلَ كَانَ زَهُوقًا

نورِ ہدایت آیۂ رحمت صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم

عاصی کرنا لی

قیامِ مکہ کے دوران آنحضرت ﷺ بیت المقدس کی  
جانب منہ کر کے نماز ادا فرماتے تھے۔ مدینہ میں پہنچ کر بھی یہی عمل  
رہا۔ مگر آپ ﷺ کا دلی منشا یہ تھا کہ مسلمانوں کا قبلہ حضرت  
ابراہیم علیہ السلام کی تعمیر کردہ مسجد الحرام یعنی کعبہ شریف ہو۔ اس کی تعمیر بھی  
ہیصل سلیمانی سے ۹۲۱ سال پیشتر ہوئی تھی۔ روئے زمین پر یہ سب  
سے پہلا اللہ کا گھر بنا اور روحانی اور تاریخی عظمت کی بنا پر مرکزِ توحید اور  
اُمّتِ مسلمہ کا نقطہ اجتماع ہوا۔ چنانچہ ہجرت کے سترہ مہینے بعد تھوہیل  
تبلہ کا حکم آیا:

فَوَلِّي وَبَجَّهَكَ شَطْرَ الْمَسْجِدِ الْحَرَامِ ط وَ حَيْثُ مَا كُنْتُمْ  
فَوَلُّوْا وُجُوْهُكُمْ شَطْرَهُ ط (البقرہ: ۱۴۴)

”اپنا منہ مسجد حرام کی طرف پھیرو، اور تم جہاں کہیں بھی ہو اس طرف  
اپنا رخ کرو۔“

یہودی بیت المقدس کو قبلہ مانتے تھے۔ جب تک مسلمان  
بیت المقدس کی طرف منہ کر کے عبادت کرتے رہے یہودی خوش

وَ قُلْ رَبِّ اَدْخِلْنِيْ مُدْخَلَ صِدْقٍ وَّاَخْرِجْنِيْ مُخْرَجَ صِدْقٍ  
وَاجْعَلْ لِّيْ مِنْ لَّدُنْكَ سُلْطٰنًا نَّصِيْرًا ط وَ قُلْ جَاءَ الْحَقُّ وَ  
زَهَقَ الْبَاطِلُ ط اِنَّ الْبَاطِلَ كَانَ زَهُوقًا ط

(بنی اسرائیل: ۸۰-۸۱)

”اور (اے حبیب ﷺ یوں) عرض کرو (کہ) اے میرے رب  
داخل کر مجھے سچائی کے ساتھ اور باہر لے جا مجھے سچائی کے ساتھ اور مجھے  
اپنی طرف سے مددگار غلبہ دے۔ اور فرما دیجئے کہ حق آیا اور باطل مٹ  
گیا، بے شک باطل کو مٹنا ہی تھا۔“

آنحضرت ﷺ نے غیر مسلموں اور یہودیوں سے امن و  
سلامتی کے معاہدے کے بعد اسلام کی اشاعت اور حکومتِ الہیہ کی  
بنیادوں کو استوار کرنے کی طرف قدم اٹھایا، اسلامی معاشرہ کے قیام کے  
لئے بارگاہِ رب العزت سے احکامات کا نزول شروع ہو گیا۔ عبادات  
میں رمضان المبارک کے روزے فرض ہوئے، فطرہ اور زکوٰۃ کی ادائیگی  
اور عید الفطر اور عید الاضحیٰ کی نماز اور قربانی واجب ہوئی۔ جسمانی  
پاکیزگی، روحانی بالیدگی اور معاشرہ و ماحول میں دلچسپی کا ظہور ہوا۔

آپ کی آمد سے پہلے تھا ہر منظر ہر نقش دو عالم

اَجْزَا اَجْزَا پھیکا پھیکا ہلکا ہلکا مدہم مدہم

چاند کی زمین میلی میلی صبح کے جلوے دھندلے دھندلے

کوچہ ہستی سونا سونا محفلِ فطرت برہم برہم