

ISLAM AGAINST INEQUITY AND MAUDOODI'S CORRUPTIONS

SADAR UDDIN AHMAD CHISTI

Published by Anwar Ahmed (Shiblee)
Imamia Chistia Publisher,
Chunkutia, Aminpara
South Keranigonj, Dhaka-1310
Bangladesh

© Copyright reserved by Writer's family

Cover by Writer
3rd Print : February 2021
First Published : February 1971

Imamia Chistia Publisher,
36 Banglabazar (Ground Floor)
Dhaka-1100

Imamia Chistia Publisher

ISBN-978-984-95356-2-1
E-mail: imamiachistiapubbd@gamil.com

Price : 140 Tk. US \$: 2.00

Printed by : Hera Printers 2/1, Tanugonj Lane, Dhaka-Sutrapur

Content of this book mainly about Mr. Moudoodi's misconception of Quran. Particularly on the subject of social distribution of wealth. To give an answer by a letter in the newspaper. The writer started his writing and later decided to elaborate this and write this book. This book was first published in February in 1971. Though the subject matter is distribution of wealth depicted in Holy Quran still some related matters like human mind and its tendency is also came in the book.

Readers will enjoy this book because they will find here many socio-economic solution prevailing in our society.

—Publisher

INTRODUCTION

This booklet is in pursuance of my Bengali essay "Maudoodi Fetna" which has already been circulated by the publisher in my name. The essay was purely on the line of religion, since I am not and was never a member of any of the political parties of this land. I am sorry to mention that any how there was a little omission and alteration made therein, beyond my knowledge, and thereby some characteristics of party politics were focussed in it.

I am to take, therefore, personal initiative and supervision in publishing the correct ideology of the Bengali booklet in English, mainly for the intelligentsia of Pakistan. A sketch on "Zakat" is the new addition in it. This booklet contains only few Synopsis of ideological Islamic state, that is a brief socio-religious concept of Islam.

I am neither an advocate of Socialism nor of capitalism but truly prompted by the present political trend of affairs of the people relating to the acute economic problems and sufferings of this unfortunate part of our motherland, which is so generously gifted by nature.

The Holy Quran and Hadith is full of social equity and justice. It contains the perfect code of life. Social equity and Justice is no less important from worldly points of view than those of the directions contained in the Quran and Hadith for the illumination of the soul (that is "Nafs"). Thus materialism and spiritualism have both been perfectly unified for the salvation of the eternal human life in this world and the next.

But to our dismay and sorrow we find that our religious leaders have started using Islam and the Holy Quran against social equity and Justice. This is to serve the political end of the rich, by which they are misled and are misleading the common minds. This may also seriously undermine the high estimation of the Holy Book in the minds of the educated persons who are not much acquainted with Quran and Hadith.

Sadar Uddin Ahmad Chisti
1971

Note

This book was first published before the independence of Bangladesh (1971) so in this book Pakistan meant East Pakistan (Bangladesh) and West Pakistan together. Readers are requested to understand this matter.

Contents

MISREPRESENTATION OF QURAN BY MAUDOOD	9
DISCOVERY OF MATERIAL INEQUITY IN THE QURAN BY MAUDOODI	10
DIN AND DUNIA IN SHORT AND ALLAH'S REJEK	15
WAHABI RELIGION	16
MUSLIMS AGAINST SOCIALISM	18
ZAKAT AND SADQA	19
NO WAHABISM IN ISLAM AND POLITICAL CONCEPT OF MUSLIMS	28
SOME VERDICTS OF THE ULAMAS AGAINST SOCIALISM	30
THE NATURE OF PRIVATE PROPERTY IN THE QURAN	34
ARGUMENT AGAINST PRIVATE OWNERSHIP	35
RELIGIOUS MATERIALISM IN WAHABISM	39
MAUDOODI : AN AGENT OF BOURGEOIS	42
RENUNCIATION OF WORLDLINESS AND CHRISTIAN ASCETICISM	44
ADOPTION OF ISLAM IN THE STATE	52
ISLAM IS BASICALLY SOCIALISTIC IN CHARACTER	55
NO CLASS PRIVILEGE FOR ISLAMIC SOCIETY	59
CONCLUSION	63

MISREPRESENTATION OF QURAN BY MAUDOODI

In the process of explaining the Quran Mr. Maudoodi is one of those who dare express most reckless opinions of his own. Of those who stand high in this respect Mr. Maudoodi is a very well-known figure. Of those who are responsible for corrupting the Quranic thought due to the application of personal views, Maudoodi has surpassed many.

If the Quranic expressions are not judged from the view points of the Quran itself, one can have only a kind of satisfaction of expressing one's own views and opinions instead of understanding the trend of thought in it. This is a truth for all readers.

There is neither a single utterance in the Quran and Hadith in support of material inequity nor can it be possible to have any such utterance in either of them, because there are about a hundred Hadith from the Holy Prophet in favour of equity and social justice. Mr. Maudoodi has however discovered in the Quran a number of utterances of material inequity which he used as quotations in favour of his own political and religious views. Mr. Maudoodi cannot be held responsible for this blunder as he is not acquainted with the very philosophy of the Quran. When a child begins to express his mind in writings he will naturally commit so many mistakes that his writings cannot be criticised against. He may, however, be taught and then be brought to such a stage of his advancement of learning that he fits him for a real criticism. One who will make childish and unauthorised expressions, far below any criticism, will naturally commit many mistakes because the very foundation of his views is based on wrong notions. So instead of criticising Mr. Maudoodi's views let me try to give a real interpretation of those Quranic verses supposed by him to be against material equity.

I am sorry to mention that it is very difficult to give a real interpretation of those verses without making the reader acquainted with the Quranic philosophy as a whole. This is because a short expression out of a whole, is linked up with the whole trend of thought of it. That is why no reader can be made acquainted with the interpretation of small expression out of a big verse without making him acquainted with the technical meanings of specific words used in the Quran. Meanings of such words as will be found in the dictionary will not help the readers at all. Many of the Quranic words have got their own meanings quite independent of the meanings generally used in the Arabic literature.

DISCOVERY OF MATERIAL INEQUITY IN THE QURAN BY MAUDOODI

Mr. Maudoodi has long been publishing his misleading works and writings on religious and political views for this land. It is not Mr. Maudoodi alone, there are many Arabic learned persons who are quite ignorant of Quranic trend of thought and philosophy. So this humble attempt is made to refute an essay written by Mr. Maudoodi, the Bengali translation of which was published in the monthly Bengali Magazine "Prithibi" in the month of August, 1969.

In this connection, I shall request the readers to go through a Bengali Book named "Masjid Darshan" written by me. In this Book there have been defined a number of Quranic words which I think would help the reader to have a clear conception of the analysis of the quotations placed below.

(The Cattle vi : 165) It is He who hath made you inheritors of the Earth; and He hath raised you in ranks, some above others; in order to try you in the matters He hath given. Surely your Rob (i.e. Lord) is quick in punishment, and surely He is indeed forgiving Most Merciful.

Explanation : "Inheritance of the Earth" means ownership after the present possessors to whom a life tenancy has been given by the owner, have passed away. In fact ownership belongs to Allah alone. Quran says in (xv : 23) "We give life and death, and we are the Heirs (that is Inheritors)" In this verse No.

165 private ownership or authority over any property has not been mentioned. It carries a double meaning (i) spiritual and (2) worldly.

(1) Those who are true vicegerent of Allah on Earth like Adam are permanent owners of Earth and sky. This ownership is not of the common man but only of the saints of high order, which is beyond the reach of a worldly man. They have their respective ranks given by Allah.

(2) The common man lives on the Earth as inheritors and descendants of their ancestors. And they have their ranks one above the other so far their gift of faculties and senses given by Allah is concerned. Allah is and will be trying man in the gifts He hath given him.

By the words "Raising in ranks" here does not mean the giving of material wealth. This means the difference of the gifts of human faculties and senses that characterises one man's superiority over the other.

All faculties in man are meant for attaining to the nearness of Allah. If instead these faculties are used to earn material wealth, which is disliked by Rob (the Lord), then surely Rob (the Lord) is quick in giving punishment. On the other hand if these faculties are properly used for attaining to the nearness of Rob (the Lord), then surely Rob (the Lord) is forgiving, the Most Merciful.

In this verse the word "Rob" has been used and not "Allah". Let us have a short explanation and implications of the word "Rob". Allah as Rob in man does not recognise any superiority of material wealth or "Dunia". He only cares for His own elevation in man.

There is a distinct and remarkable difference between the use of Rob and Allah. Allah as "Rob" is in every creation. He exists in man whether he or she be a believer or an unbeliever. But His existence in oneself is not known by an unbeliever. Rob in man, only expects that man should fly from his own human self and elevate His Existence in him.

If the processes of self annihilation is followed, Rob will ultimately blot out or cover up the human short-comings and will

Himself work in man. Man in that stage moves and behaves only as an instrument, a dummy.

So forgiveness of a man means covering up or blotting out all human short-comings and defects by Allah and transcending him from "Dunia" to "Din". In "Din" Allah bestows this Mercy as "Rahim" and not as "Rahman". In "Dunia" He bestows His mercy on man as "Rahman." Mercy from Rahman is therefore common mercy which is given to all whether they be believers or unbelievers.

The rendering of this portion of Arabic into English as "Oft-forgiving, Most Merciful" is not correct. When one is forgiven and transcended to Din he does not come back to sin again so that repeated forgiveness would be necessary for him.

The difference of ranks given by Rob to His Servants is not in "Dunia" but in "Din". This difference is due to the difference of devotion and utilisation of human faculties to His cause. Rob does never recognise the difference of material prosperity nor does He care to give priority to one over the other in this respect. In fact this priority is no priority, because to earn "Dunia" is prohibited in Islam. The difference of material possessions and the growth of the rich & the poor are due to social systems made by man. A pardoned man is free from the bondage of "Dunia" and he obtains a rank in "Din" in accordance with the choice and will of Allah with reference to his devotional purity. So Allah makes a gulf of difference in respect of ranks and honour and He dignifies one over the other according to His just will and plan in His "Din".

As for the difference of ranks and dignities in His Din, there prevails perfect justice which will be fully recognised and clearly understood even by the humbled and punished ones as they will be convinced of the justification for their humiliation in "His Din" i.e. the next world.

It is very difficult to analyse small extracts of the Quran because there are many technical words that the readers should

first be acquainted with. That is why a real discussion of Quranic quotation is not possible in short.

Without understanding the Quran if Mr. Maudoodi would place Quranic quotations how can those be expected to be correct. It is no good in balming Mr. Maudoodi alone. There are many like him who have the same habit of setting blind quotations.

Again, small quotations of big verses without any reference to the context are always devoid of correct meaning. So small references are in most cases misleading.

Let us now proceed to analyse the next nine quotations of Mr. Maudoodi from the Quran by which he tried to assert his supposed material inequities in Islam, and these Quranic inequities according to him should be accepted in cool brain and allow these to prevail in the society, if not for other reasons, at least for the sake of Islam.

To avoid detail let us examine the cardinal point of our discussion which has variously been expressed in those verses of the Quran exhibited by Mr. Maudoodi by words such as these:—

"To whom so ever we please, We grant Our 'Un-accounted Rejek' (i.e. unbounded sustenance) and to whom so ever We please We bestow a 'limited Rejek'. And some expressions read like this : 'Say, surely my Rob enlarges Rejek for whom so ever He pleases out of His servants and He restricts it for whom so ever He pleases."

Explanation : Not to speak of Mr. Maudoodi alone, it is not known to many persons that the meaning of "Allah's Rejek" is not worldly wealth and riches. "Allah grants un-accounted Rejek to whom so ever He pleases". This expression of the Quran is a declaration of an ever lasting and un-resistable truth. In a land of material equity, having any form of Government, Allah becomes deprived of this un-resistable authority of His granting "Un-bounded Rejek" to any of His servants He chooses, if "Allah's Rejek" means transitory, worldly and material wealth.

Thus it may be proved that if whole Globe adopt material equity in the distribution of wealth under any form of Govt.,

whether be it with Divine religion or without religion, Allah proves Himself to be false in His declaration of the power of his bestowing "His unbounded wealth" to any of His servants He chooses at any part of the earth. This is absurd and foolish.

In fact expressions in the Quran like "Pure Rejek", "Unaccounted Rejek," "Allah's Rejek" etc. are all the same. And they all mean "Divine Rejek" which is out of the bound of "Dunia" i.e. worldliness. So, these "Rejeks" that is divine sustenance is only for those holy persons who are or will be beloved servants of Allah and so become chosen by Him for this holy gift.

On the contrary one who will be inclined to Dunia instead of Allah, will have a limited worldly Rejek. He will be able to enjoy this worldly gift of Allah so long he lives. This Rejek is limited by time and place. However rich a worldly man may be his riches are not un-accounted. He has got his men to earn for him and keep account for him. The term "un-accounted" is not applicable there.

One who has surrendered himself to the will of Allah, Allah may favour him in this earthly life with "unlimited Rejek" which he will enjoy in this world as well as the next. Of course this category of persons are very few and far in number. This Rejek does not mean enough of riches and properties in the worldly sense. This world and the next world of such a Holy person has come almost on the same line, though it cannot be felt or understood by men living in the "Dunia". Such a man is mentally detached from all concerns excepting the concerns of his Rob.

Rejek, if given by one's Rob, is rather everlasting and it is mainly next worldly sustenance for him. Persons of exceptional devotion earn it as a gift even at this life. That the Rejek given by one's Rob is neither transitory nor worldly, may be proved by many verses of the Quran. For example see (xx :131).

The good things of this life may make a brave show to which human eyes become attracted with a keen desire for them, but they are as nothing in comparison with the good things of the hereafter. Quran says : "We have provided mankind with this temporary showy Dunia only to test mankind in all these splendours. But the Rejek of your Rob is better and everlasting."

Both the Rejeks are provided by Allah. But the Rejeks of Dunia is as nothing compared with the Rejek of the hereafter, which is given by the Lord only to His devoted servants.

Let me cite an argument to the fact that Allah's Rejek is not the worldly wealth and riches. We find in a narration of the Hadith that : "The Rejek of a Mumin (that is believer) is increased during the month of Ramzan (that is the month of fasting of the Mohamedans)." Thus Mohamedan believers are taking a grand chance of increasing their Rejek during the whole length of a month in every year. Yet they are generally found to be poorer than those persons who care little for increasing their Rejek by this process. So Allah's rejek is nothing but Divine sustenance or special gift for the righteous in his next world (that is not in Dunia but in Din), in which a believer may enter even before death.

DIN AND DUNIA IN SHORT AND ALLAH'S REJEK.

A child is not born in Dunia. After birth it continues its life in "Allah's Din" till with the growth of its faculties. Dunia begins to grow in it. So a child is a Muslim like any other creation that has not been given free will and choice. When man becomes full grown he becomes fully arrested in Dunia, unless his faculties are diverted towards Allah, instead of Dunia. Thus it is a creation of Divine process that man will naturally fall in transgression and blasphemy unless he alerts himself and exerts for entering into "Allah's Din" again. If his attentions are all diverted towards; "Allah's Din", Allah may choose him if He likes and grant him His Rejek as He is the most Benign and Merciful Rob in man. This Rejek is un-accounted and without limitations.

Allah's "unlimited Rejek" has thus been placed before all men to earn. Those who will not put any obstruction to it by the earnings of Dunia, will earn this great gift of Allah even from this earthly life of them. And such persons are saints of high order.

If Allah's Rejek would mean wordly riches, then surely Allah would grand this favour to His dear ones. But this is not at

all true. He rather likes to keep His dear ones deprived of this wordly gift. So the verse No. 33-35 of Sura Zukhruf express like this :—

"Had it not been that all men would follow the same way of life, We would have provided every one that blasphemes against the Gracious Rahman, silver roofs for their houses, silver stair-ways, silver doors and thrones and also adornments of gold. But all this are nothing but short conveniences of the life of Dunia. And the Hereafter is with your Rob for those who are eagerly inclined to Him."

This means, as a corollary, that Allah had not the mind and intention to provide with any of the worldly riches to His beloved ones. Only for the reason that believers in that case would fail in their patience, and so run after transitory Rejek of Dunia, Allah has therefore, granted some portion of it for them also. Without understanding all these, one cannot follow the Quran. In order to understand the definitions of the technical words of the Quran one must understand both the ins and outs, the apparent and the transcendental aspects, the material and spiritual significance of the terms of Quran. Otherwise it is not possible to understand the Quran. Those who will abandon the inner and spiritual aspects of the Quran and again seek after the meanings, for them Quran does not bear the Quranic meanings but only a stock of their own conjectures.

WAHABI RELIGION

Wahabi religion¹ cannot be maintained or be in existence if this fact be accepted that a man of highest devotion may earn "*Allah's Rejek*" even in his earthly life, before his natural death. That "*Allah's Rejek*" may mean something beyond Dunia, and in which case it becomes spiritualised, an Wahabi cannot therefore accept it to be a fact. They wont accept what is beyond their

1. "Wahabi" is not a religion. There is no religion by this name. It is an "Ism" followed by men of the present world at large, remaining under different sects and groups of religions. As a distinct and separate ideology in religious groups, I like to name it as a religion, instead of naming this as a sect in Islam, because there is no Islam in it.

worldly knowledge. That is why Wahabis will not accept or recognise a superman, for the main reason that according to them there is no spiritualism in Islam. Supermen are men with Divine forces and qualities in them. That is why an Wahabi will not recognise them as such.

In fact spiritualism runs all through the Quran in various metaphorical forms, colours and expressions. So the denial of it, will render a person to such a state of mind that he will never understand the Quran. That is the tragedy with wahabism.

Those who profess to follow Quran and Islam keeping spiritualism aside, their technical name is "Wahabi". So they will not follow or place "Allah's Rejek" beyond the gifts given in Dunia. Significance of the word "Allah's Din" is beyond their concept. Quran must be understood from the Quranic points of view. Due to Wahabi predominance on our Quranic interpretations, Quran has become neglected and is supposed by most of the people of the world to be full of contradictions and jumbles of opposites. In fact Quran is free from any such defect and has rather have got a perfect sequence of thought all through. The kind of religion which the Wahabis think as Islam is nothing more than a kind of human code to perform a concerted action like that of a military organisation based on worldliness.

Wahabism is a wrong materialism devoid of anything that is spiritual. So it is not a Divine religion though its followers profess to believe in the revealed books of Allah.

Over 90% of the Arabic learned persons and Ulamas of our society are of the opinion that there is practically no Wahabi in the world today. Why so? Because the opposing groups, that is the real Sunnis are very few in number and very feeble in their voice against them. People are used to say that Wahabism does not practically exist any where in the present world. This is because they simply bear in mind some thing like a political party or a distinct religious party of that name, but not the philosophy of the creed and the fundamentals of the belief. This is because almost the whole of the Arabic learned Muslims are modified Wahabis. And people at large have become accustomed to it. So they do not find any Wahabi element in the world. They do not know themselves. They are blind with their

own belief. On the contrary they rather find deviation of Islam among those and at those places where something of anti-Wahabism exist, that is a few centres of spiritual guides and shrines of passed saints. According to them "Shirk" and "Bedat" exist in these places.

MUSLIMS AGAINST SOCIALISM

It is known to Mr. Maudoodi that our religion is not separated from socio-political aspects of life. But only for want of the knowledge of religious theology it is not at all possible for Mr. Maudoodi to chalk out the Islamic principles of political theory.

To a Muslim, religion should always have the priority to state. A muslim cannot support anything in which religion would seem to be adversely affected. For this reason a true Muslim does not like to accept Communism for the supposed fear that religion may be ignored in the state in the long run, if the state affairs are allowed to be manipulated by unreligious persons. Why this has so happened with the Muslim idea? Because we see that there is a section of Communists who are known as Nihilists, the un-believers. According to them religion is nothing but an opium and a weapon of the Bourgeois against the proletariat.

This idea is of course from the practical experience of the past socio-political history of human races. This has become a proved fact that religion has always been used by the Bourgeois as a weapon for exploiting the helpless common people. Past experience is not the only thing to be judged. It is also quite evident that the so called leaders of religion namely the Ulamas, the Clergymen and such other persons are generally living temporal life in the gurb of religion. They rarely were found to have fought for truth. On the contrary religion has always been used by them as a shield of worldly interest. These are the reasons for the growth of Nihilism and of their misconception about religions.

In fact Mohammadanism is a religion with equity. State has no separate identity from religion. State must be within the jurisdiction of religion. Of course this is a theory only, that exists

in its full spirit in books, like Quran and Hadith, but cannot be proved by practical instances of ideology from the past history of the Muslims excepting something of a sketch from the reigns of the first four Califs.

On the contrary Communism is a state of material equity only, without any concern with religions. Islam supports the material equity of Communism but not its so-called non-intervention of religious affairs far from going against Islamic religions. So far the equi-distribution of material wealth is concerned the first four Califs of Islam were proceeding to some extent on an experimental basis in some aspects of social order. But they could not have the time and opportunity to implement a regularised system of material equity at every nook & corner of the vast state under them.

After the fall of the Califate, kings and rulers ruled their state in the name of religion. But more or less they all exploited the interest of the people in some way or other. This deviation from religion commences from Muabia right upto now. The only exception to this was the short rule of Omar Bin Abdul Aziz who attempted to follow the first four Califs in his principles.

The finding out of a proper working policy for the distribution of wealth was being naturally experimented in the Muslim State of Arabia which was suddenly brought to an end by the crooked Amir Muabia. He openly declared the public treasury to belong to the ruler and his family. And never again a real form of Califate was tried to be introduced or experimented.

A wrong notion has therefore grown up in the minds of the Muslims against equi-distribution of national wealth because of long non-existence of equity in the Muslim states all through. This notion has further been deeply rooted in our minds because of the existence of a poor Tax called Zakat, though the meaning of the word "Zakat" in the Quran and Hadith is not "poor Tax" as it is supposed to be.

ZAKAT AND SADQA

The word Zakat has come from the root word "Zakka". This means "Purifying oneself." Man by nature is impure, though by birth he was pure. With the growth of his faculties and senses in

him, that is his human self or ego in him, along with his growth to his manhood, he becomes naturally quite impure. That is why he now lives in his own self. Prophets and apostles are all sent to mankind to make man purified of his human ego.

"Zakat" was the name of a taxation of the Muslim states. This word "Zakat" in the Quran and Hadith does not mean this particular taxation levied on the well to do citizens for the benefit of the poor and for other specific purposes as mentioned in the Quran and Hadith. This tax has been named in the Quran and Hadith as "Sadqa" though the name of the tax is generally and widely known as "Zakat". As for instance it is to be particularly marked in the Hadith that where ever assesment of this tax is mentioned, the word "Sadqa" is a must, though the name of this tax is known to the people as "Zakat". This is because state has named this tax for Sadqa as "Zakat".

Sadqa means charity. Or it may be called a charitable tax, not only meant for the relief of the poor but for 7 charitable works. This tax is compulsory on the economically well up persons the limitation of which has been well defined in 'fiqah'.

In reality "Zakat" in the Quran and Hadith means surrender of the entire possessions of a man including his faculties and senses to the will of Allah. That means surrender of the human ego to the Divine Self and then use all such possessions according to the will and directions of Allah. This is the reason why Zakat has mostly been mentioned with "Salat". Salat in short means attempts for Divine union at the begining and lastly union itself. If Zakat will mean only a "poor Tax" it need not be mentioned so many times in Quran itself. And in that case it becomes very queer that a tax has been mentioned with Divine union or prayer.

Quran says "wakimus Salata watuz Zakata" that is "make attempts for the union with Allah & give up or surrender your human ego". This is because without the giving up of the ego in man, he cannot make communion with Allah. And giving up of the ego is impossible without the attempts & works for making union, that is Salat, "Zakat" is therefore primarily & particularly an abstract act or mentality which is more a will of the mind than actual giving of material wealth to the poor & needy. Zakat is therefore compulsory on all, irrespective of the rich & poor.

"Sadqa" that is charity is of two kinds. One is compulsory payment of 2.5 percent of net annual income by persons having certain limit of wealth called "Nisab". The other kinds of charity are optional. Charity is a great virtue and charity has been given a very wide meaning. It means any benefit done to any person either economic, moral, spiritual or even consolatory. Every good action to others is charity. To advise a man to do good and to desist from wrong is charity. Meeting with a Muslim brother with cheerful face is charity. Besides the compulsory charity in the form of "compulsory Sadqa" which has verbally been named as "Zakat". Islam recognises optional charities of various denominations, because charity has been expressed in Divine religion in a broad sense. All good acts such as charity to the poor & needy, spending for wife & children, service to humanity, giving food to the hungry & drink to the thirsty, taking care of orphans and management of their property, nursing & visiting the sick etc. are all charity.

Two categories of charity are compulsory (1) 2.5% tax and (2) Fitra charity on the day of Eid. All other benevolent expences are optional charities. The compulsory tax realised from the well to do persons are to be spent on the following categories, such as Quran says :-

"(Sura Tawba IX : 60) Sadqa are for the poor and the needy and those employed to administer (the fund), for those whose hearts are full of love (for the truth), for those in bondage and in debt, and in the way of Allah, and for the wayfarer. (It is) compulsory from Allah. And Allah is wise & just."

Explanation : This 2.5% tax named "Sadqa" is meant for spending on the categories mentioned in the above quoted verse of the Quran as follows : (1) Poor persons, (2) Needy. A needy person may not be poor but due to some reason or other has for the time being become needy. (3) Employees of the Dept. employed for the realisation and utilisation of the fund will have their wages or salary from this fund. (4) Persons whose hearts are so much filled with Divine love that they have become abnormally engaged with Divine service, so much so that they are not in a position to work for their own maintenance, that is the saints and hermits. (5) For freeing of bondmen. "An

individual or a group of men may be kept in bondage by the enemy. They may be ransomed with money from out of this fund. So long slavery was in vogue in society this fund might be utilised for freeing bondmen. Not only slaves should be helped to freedom (so long slavery will remain in the society) but also those in bondage of ignorance or superstition or unfortunate environment should be helped to freedom to develop their own gifts. (6) Those who are in the grip of debt may be helped to economic freedom if their case be considered by the proper authority. (7) Those who are striving in the cause of Allah by teaching, preaching or fighting. Or in duties assigned to them by the Calif or a righteous Imam who are those unable to earn their ordinary living. The saints and hermits are specially struggling in the cause of Allah in the spiritual and real sense of the term. (8) Strangers stranded on the way. A travelling stranger falling under economic troubles may also be helped out of this fund.

All these eight categories of persons including the department itself have a right to this compulsory part of charity. They should be relived by organised effort in a responsible way by the state.

In the absence of such organisation this duty should be discharged by individual initiative, as it is compulsory duty for a Muslim, if he lives in a state which does not take up this administration of compulsory part of charity in any form or other.

There are persons among us who profess to remove poverty from the society only by the introduction of the institution of "Zakat" as one of the state functions. Of course by "Zakat" they mean this 2.5% compulsory Sadqa. They are very wrong in their views. Other things remaining the same this Sadqa or Income Tax of 2.5% is a very poor amount to meet up the basic demands of the poor, even if the entire amount of this tax is spent out for the poor alone, ignoring the seven other items of expenditure under this category as has been indicated in the Quran.

We have no right to ignore the other items of services in favour of any one of them. Whatever may be the process and sources of income adopted by the state, all these categories of

social services must be carefully rendered to the people of the Muslim state as a kind of compulsory charity. The process of realising or making the required fund either by taxation or by any other means is not so important as the services are. The process of taxation or the method of realising the fund for these services may change with the changed circumstances of social and economic conditions of a land, but the required services to the people and to the cause of Allah will remain for ever.

So the idea of removal of poverty of Pakistan by the introduction of so-called "Zakat" is nothing but a conjecture and in most cases a bluff of the rich, used in their propagation against economic equity and justice.

Richer section of the people are generally fond of citing the significance of the existence of "Zakat" of Islam in support of their class privilege. According to them rich and poor must remain! One is to give and the other to receive "Zakat". If all become of fairly equal income who will receive their grant of favour to the poor. This is nothing but their lame argument in the name of Islam. They intentionally forget the seven other items of expenditure and services mentioned in the Quran, which are within the jurisdiction of expenditure of this tax, commonly known as "Zakat" or "Poor Tax", the documentary name of which is "Sadqa".

There are seven items of social function under this taxation named "Sadqa". So the expenditure of this department will go under eight heads, including expenditure for the maintenance of the staff and the department itself.

In the absence of the problem of poverty due to any change of social circumstances, this Sadqa as a department does not go. There are still other six items of various import, the services of which a Muslim society will always demand.

Due to some reason or other if and when any one or more of these seven categories of state functions and services be not required in the society, functions of the remaining items of Sadqa must be carried on as usual by a Muslim state. For instance, there may not be any poor person due to the adoption of a very fair distribution of national wealth. In that case helping of the poor from the fund of Sadqa will no longer be required,

yet there will be persons who are physically disable. They may fall under this category. Or the disable persons may be counted as a separate category and a separate subject of the state, not financed from the fund of Sadqa. Transfer of subjects and funds there may be, but the seven items of services under Sadqa, declared as compulsory cannot be dispensed with. These services of religion to humanity and Allah must be worked out and financed from the public treasury. The change in the system of finance does not matter, if the change be for the interest of the people at large.

In fact, "Zakat" is a compulsory spiritual duty on all adult persons irrespective of rich and poor. Zakat is one of the five pillars of Islam. Zakat in the Quran has also been differently termed as "Karje Hasana" means "Beautiful loan to Allah". In the ordinary sense in our social transaction "Karje Hasana" means a loan to a needy man for which there would be no demand for return, if the debtor be not in a position to repay the same. The Quran does not carry this meaning.

Zakat means human faculties and capacities to be given up to the service of Allah instead of earning "Dunia" that is worldliness. A believer should give all his capacities and attention to his Rob, so that his Rob would increase manifold its return to the believer who would so offer the beautiful loan to Allah. As a reward for this beautiful loan to one's Rob, Rob has promised him forgiveness of his sins and grant of Heaven to him. So Zakat is directly accepted by Allah in exchange of Heaven. Mere paying of "Poor Tax" of 2.5% of one's surplus net income of the year cannot be a surety for Heaven, unless this Zakat is nothing short of the dedication of the human self to the service of the Divine Self.

Because of this dedication of the faculties and senses to the service of one's Rob, one will not be in a position to earn enough of "Dunia" that is worldly earnings. So Rob has promised to accept it as "Beautiful Loan" from him, which He must increase manifold in return for the dedication's eternal life in "Din" that is "the next world".

Man has nothing of his own to offer to Allah. The gifts, of his faculties and his temporary possessions earned therewith are

the only things to offer to Him and to His services. If these are dedicated to Allah instead of toward the earnings of Dunia then He accepts gladly all these as Zakat or as a loan to be doubly returned to the giver for his eternal life.

Quran says : "Allajina hum lizzakate fayeloon" means, "Believers are ever active for Zakat." If Zakat would mean the paying of the monetary tax, then one cannot remain active in the process of the same payment. He or any body on his behalf may calculate the payable amount of a year within a short time and rest at ease for the whole year. The question of being engaged in the act of Zakat does not arise unless the use of his faculties are always to be kept alert and remain watchful to see whether these are actually being used for attaining to Allah or engaged in earning Dunia i.e. worldliness.

Of the required qualities of a believer it has been defined in the Quran that a believer keeps himself engaged in the acts of Zakat. If Zakat is the tax, then a poor man is not supposed to have this quality in him and so he falls short of the definition of a believer, set in the Quran. This is absurd, for poverty is no bar to be a true believer.

If "Zakat" be accepted to be the "Poor Tax" as it is supposed to be, then the repeated mention of it in the Quran is unscientific. Because "Salat" which is supposed to be "Prayer" is compulsory for all, whereas "Zakat" is said to be for few. How then these two words scientifically be coupled together in the Quran, as a repeated order and an injunction, if a part of this order is for the few and the other part for all? Nothing of this nature of unscientific composition can be detected in the Quran.

A unit of a common order should be common for all. One portion of it, if directed for few, should not be associated with the portion directed for all.

If the meaning of "Poor Tax" or "Poor Rate" be accepted for the word "Zakat" in the Quran, then there is much of anomaly in the sequence of thought and philosophy running in the Quran, which is quite absurd.

Of course there is a scientific reason for the naming of this tax as "Zakat". This tax has been so named to keep it aloof from

the other optional acts of Sadqa (that is charity) so that the seriousness of this tax may be particularly indicated to the people, and its social importance may be shown separately from the optional acts of other "Sadqas", if this tax would have been named as "Sadqa" then other acts of "Sadqas" i.e. charitable works and kindness would naturally lose their importance, because people would think that they have already done their duty of Sadqa by the paying of the tax for it. So this naming of this tax as Zakat was really very wise and beautiful from the points of view of human psychology. This is nothing but wise application of a wise leader.

Please also note that the Quran is silent about the percentage and process of realisation of the fund for the charitable works within the jurisdiction of the compulsory portion of the social services of "Sadqa". We find the solution of this process in Hadith. The Holy Prophet chalked out a beautiful process, most suited to the circumstances of his time. That is 2.5% of the net surplus income of the richer section of the people.

Quran, the direct Code of Allah lays down the fundamentals and principles only. We find its application in varied forms and details from the sayings of the apostle. This means that the compulsory charitable social services under Sadqa must be worked out for the spiritual and material well-being. Does not matter whether the volume of these services be increased by levying higher rate of taxation in the case of a country being unusually wealthy. A rich country may realise a higher rate of this tax for the help of another Muslim country that may be poorer.

This change of the rate and the process of the taxation is not a deviation from religion if the principles are adopted in its spirit. Islam has a religion which is not to be confined by time and place. It is rather universal in application. Who the fool says that a system of equi-distribution of national wealth in a Muslim state will go against Islam, unless it is made to go by the people themselves?

"Zakat" is only a minimum taxation. In Quran and Hadith there are many reminders and urgings to actions of various kinds of charitable duties toward the orphans and the needy. These are

not concessions to the poor and needy but a part of one's duty to the society if a person wants to consider himself to be a Muslim. For instance Quran says that one of the characteristics of a "Musalli"* is that he recognises the right of others in his wealth possessed by him. This right is not only for the needy who ask for help but also for those who do not ask for (LXX :24-25). Man will suffer punishment in the next world for the reason that "He would not encourage the feeding of the indigent. So he has that day no friend there" (LXIX : 34-35).

Please note that mere feeding of the indigent will not do. One's personal duty does not end there. One must at the same time encourage others of the society to do the same duty. That means-this is a duty on society as a whole. Personal responsibility cannot be shrunk by doing this duty personally. This must be tried to be established among others in the society. Does this not tend to a socialistic form of management?

The reader is requested to go through the significance of the responsibilities and duties of a free citizen to his city as has been depicted in the chapter named "Sura Balad" (XC) in the Quran. The whole of this chapter is a picture of perfect dedication of an individual citizen to the service of his people and to his Allah, if he wants to be considered as a believer and a member of those who enjoins truth and patience. If he does not try to do all those duties assigned to a free citizen then he is destined for hell-fire. These are only very few quotations from the Quran.

What are all these injunctions and reminders of the Quran for? Are these not for an equitable and justified social order, so far worldly and material justice is concerned? Is man meant for earning wealth for himself and his family only? Are not these few quotations enough to prove a socialistic form of production and distribution of wealth for the society as a whole?

If the richer section of the people would not discharge their duties out of their own initiative at the present system of government, then will it not be justified for the people to find out a socialistic form of government and thereby brush out all social injustice and inequities and thus save themselves from exploitation's and social corruption's of a colossal magnitude?

* "Musalli" means one who is in "Salat" that is prayer.

If collective production and co-operative distribution of wealth is a crime then it may also be proved that collective operations of prayer and religious functions have also become a crime in the same way. This is because individual taste and temperament of a devotee of Allah has to be sacrificed to some extent when he joins a congregation, specially in these days of Wahabi regime. Yet congregational prayer must be given preference to individual meditations. Why so? Is it not for the general interest of the society at large?

NO WAHABISM IN ISLAM AND POLITICAL CONCEPT OF MUSLIMS

Islam is not materialistic in character. So its religion is not based on anything which is materialism, though materialism cannot be dispensed with in this probationary life of ours. Islamic religion is based on love and spirit. On the contrary Wahabism is a materialistic religion without any idea of "Din" in it, and so devoid of anything that is spiritual. That is why love and ecstasy, spiritualism and Din which are the main basis and fundamentals of Quran and Sunnah* are not to be found in Wahabism. Wahabism is nothing but a kind of easy man-made religion to console oneself of observing a kind of piousness in a very materialistic sense of the term.

Private ownership of material property and its possession is not a basis of Islam. Materialists who like to prove themselves as Muslims having materialism as a basis of their religion at the same time, cannot imagine that the private property and its ownership is nothing but like a shadow or mirage in Islamic proforma of affairs. Private ownership of property has no real basis of its own but only a given basis circumstance by time and necessity. So this has got no real basis on Quran and sunnah.

We do not like to bother much about all these points which will invite only conflict and controversy among us as the very

* The Quran contains the principles of the Din and Sunnah is the manifestation of it in the life and works of Muhammad (D).

basis of our Quranic concept in the society is wrong. So a discussion on a petty matter out of the Quran will only invite meaningless controversies and conflicts unless it is elaborately discussed. If conflicts on petty matters like that of "private ownership of property" is to be avoided Quran is to be understood altogether from a different angle of vision which is of the Quran itself. Without a proper discussion on the basic philosophy of the Quran, one cannot be convinced of this point, as because it is natural in a human being to cling to materialism rather than to attach oneself to what is spiritualism and "Din-e-Elahi". In the absence of the concept of Din among the Ulama at large it is quite futile to speak things like this. Wahabism being the dominating factor in them, they will not try to understand it. It is now the dominating "Ism" all over the so-called Muslim World.

To a Muslim, religion has priority to his state, because religion will lead him to Din-e-Elahi, the goal of human life. He cannot therefore support anything that is likely to hamper his approach toward the Din. Religion is nothing but the code of human conduct and outlook in all his actions of twenty four hours to make him proceed gradually to Din-e-Elahi. These codes of twenty four hours of religion should prevail over all the duties he has to do. That is the nature of the preference of religion to all other duties of him. So the modes and processes of religion may be altered but the fundamental characteristics of it must be kept intact, so that the following of those processes would rather help a man to enter into din of Allah, snatching him slowly out of "his own Din" that is Dunia. Mere permission of the state for saying five times prayer is not enough for a Muslim.

I am not going into details of Din and Dunia, but what I like to say is that the Muslims have not been accustomed with equi-distribution of national wealth due to long absence of this idea in them since the rule of Muabia, the usurper. Moreover they see now a days equi-distribution of wealth in states where religion is purely a private matter and such states are concerned purely with secularism. So called Muslim states of Arabia and Pakistan are also secular in character though their governments are inclined to favour Islam as their religions, because people of this belief are a

vast majority in these lands. Yet they have not in their constitution acceded religion as a predominating subject prevailing over all other items of governmental works. They are simply inclined to keep religion as a separate subject to be considered, which they have not yet done. Thus religion is cornered out from rest of our social and political activities of life, whereas life of a real Muslim is religious in its entirety. No work and no thought should be unreligious to a Muslim. The entire frame-work of the state, must therefore have a religious direction all through. But who is going to do this gigantic socio-political work for the Muslims? Mr. Maudoodi? The blind and the bigot? Not only he knows not Islam, but is also determined not to know it. Because he is out and out a Wahabi in character and in outlook, so far his religious views are concerned, like that of late Maulana Akram Khan of Bengal. Instead of trying to know the Quran they try to find out a kind of materialistic dogmatism in the Quran for supporting their own views.

So I shall like to see Mr. Maudoodi and his type of political thinkers do politics without giving any reference of religion as other politicians are doing. In that case I have no objection against them. This is because I am not concerned with politics and politicians. Or let Mr. Maudoodi engage himself purely in religious activities without making any political views like any other misguided Maulana. Let him not mislead the people of Pakistan as he knows nothing of the Quranic philosophy and trend of thought therein. If he is at all eager to meddle in Islamic politics, let him first of all understand the Quran and Sunnah. Wahabi mentality will never permit him to know Islam in its true sense and colour.

SOME VERDICTS OF THE ULAMAS AGAINST SOCIALISM

Wrong and reckless verdicts have been passed by many of the Ulama groups of Pakistan against Socialism without going deep into the matter. They say : (1) Socialism has been invented by Karl Marx who was an unbeliever and in Socialism there is no independence for an individual.

Answer : Socialism is not a new invention of Karl Marx but its out-lines and principles were already drawn up by the Holy Prophet of Arabia. Karl Marx had only defined the matters clearly to the present world which others before him did not do so clearly and scientifically. He detailed only the material aspects of social life. His personal belief or unbelief matters little because his solutions were economic and not religious. Just like the invention of Penicillin. Inventor of Penicillin was an unbeliever in God, but his invention relates only with our body and not mind. Belief or unbelief in God has nothing to do with Penicillin. Will a Maulana abstain himself from the use of Penicillin, only because this is an invention of an unbeliever in God? In the same way an economic solution for the society, if given by a disbeliever may also be utilised conveniently so far social economy is concerned. Make it not entangled with anything of the social religion or belief. Let it not be allowed to affect Islam in any way. But alas, the argument of the Ulamas on this point is nothing new and constructive. They have only reproduced the exact argument of the unreligious Bourgeois so far this point of view is concerned.

(2) Private ownership of property and individual initiative and independence is no doubt curtailed to some extent by Socialism. But what independence and whose independence will go? And who will be deprived of private ownership of property? Very few exploiters and industrialists will lose their independence of exploiting the masses. Thus, at the cost of individual initiative and independence of the few persons the vast number of Proletariate will have their necessities and independence of life which have been crippled and usurped by the few exploiters. People will have their rations and dwellings in a very liberal way, from which they have been ousted by few exploiters.

They also argue : "There is private ownership of property in the Quran. And if Quran and Sunnah is strictly observed, men will not then go astray."

Answer : Strict following of the Quranic injunction will no doubt dispel the love of material wealth. But that kind of observance cannot be enforced by law. Excess wealth must be taken out of individual possessions by means of law of the state

existing in some form or other. Otherwise man in general will not by their own accord spend their surplus earning for the benefit of the needy.

People cannot be compelled to observe Quran and Sunnah strictly, because strict adherence are matters of the mind and subject to strong resolution for the renunciation of the "world". Without a strong resolution of the mind no body, not even a Maulana can observe the injunctions of the Quran and Sunnah to the words and to the spirit. Strict or real observances are mainly spiritual and not at all material. Strict observance is of high spiritual value and so this is beyond the jurisdiction of state functions of a Muslim state. State is concerned only with superficial observance. Function of the state regarding observances of religious ceremonies and rites from the stand point of spiritual standard, as laid down in the Quran and Hadith, should always be confined in advices and instructions only. This is simply because the angle of vision of the Quranic injunctions is spiritually so high that it is beyond the reach of the worldly man.

Change in the process of production and distribution of material wealth does not adversely affect the mental inclinations to spiritualism, unless it is made to do so. The Russians and the Chinese have by-passed religion in their material workings and processes of the state which the Muslims of Pakistan should follow. They should follow the ways of life enunciated by the spirit of the Quran.

The question of private ownership of property was a matter non-existent of those who resolved to live their lives according to Quran and Sunnah. For the sake of Allah they dedicated their property to the service of the state in the same way as they submitted themselves at the hands of their Lord.

The question of private ownership of property was a matter non-existent of those who resolved to live their lives according to Quran and Sunnah. For the sake of Allah they dedicated their property to the service of the state in the same way as they submitted themselves at the hands of their Lord.

For instance (1) The first Calif Hazrat Abu Bakr dedicated his all for the service of Islam and the state. And at the end he advised his son to refund the amount which he accepted as bare subsistence allowance from the public treasury in return of his services as haed of the state. (2) How much of the right of private ownership of property was asserted by Hazrat Omar for himself, even though he was the ruler of a vast state, is a clear fact of history which explains the position of a true believer in relation to material property and its ownership. (3) Hazrat Ali put out the lamp while talking with a person of his acquaintance only because according to them public oil cannot be spent for talking with friends even though it is concerned with the chief ruler himself.

Quran exhorts man to surrender his entire self (that is his Nafs) to his Rob. Attachment to ones Nafs is far more stronger than his attachment to wealth and riches. Where the question of the dedication of Nafs is involved the attachment to materialism automatically dissolves and reduces to insignificance.

It is easier to dedicate property than to dedicate one's Nafs. The importance of private ownership of property becomes quite insignificant where the question of self dedication is involved in Islam. How then one can dedicate himself to Allah if he clings to the love of material property?

So the claim of private ownership of property is befitting for those who have forsaken or lost of their private ownership of their own selves (i.e. Nafs or their ego-centricity). To speak of the private ownership of property in the name of Islam and its wrong advocacy is therefore nothing but ignorance and selfishness of those who are worshipers of materialism.

The real Ulamas of Islam who are engaged in the services of the society are really very few in number and out of the picture. They have not yet been able to come forward at the fore-front of the society. Those who are found at the helm of affairs are mostly materialists in outlook. And such Ulamas would naturally have more support of the present societies dominated by the Wahabi out-look and the Bourgeois.

Ulamas also argue that marriage, divorce, business transactions etc. are nor performed in the socialistic states according to Quran and Sunnah, and that socialist rulers are unbelievers.

Answer : In a land of non-Muslims it is natural that marriage and rules of divorce would be followed by them as they think it to be good for them. They do not follow the rules of "Iddat"* only because they are not Muslims. On the contrary there is no reason why in the land of Muslims, things like marriage, divorce and other mutual transactions should not be made according to the rules of Quran and Sunnah. These rules have no conflict with the socialistic economy of a land. Observance of these rules depends merely on the consent and willingness of the people for such rules in the state.

Socialism itself is not anti-Islamic. Far from being so, if it is promulgated by believers, then it is more Islamic than any of the present systems prevailing in the world.

Again a true believer in Quran and Sunnah cannot even agree to vest any authority of the state upon a Wahabi, only because he is against spiritualism, and so unconsciously against Islam, though he seems outwardly to be very religious is his habits and manners. Such a ruler is as good an enemy to Islam as Muabia or yazid was. Or like any of the others after them who was found to be so. Present rulers of Soudi Arabia are of this nature. That is the main reason why Islam in the Arab lands is in the ebb-tide.

THE NATURE OF PRIVATE PROPERTY IN THE QURAN

Quran has laid down the process of distribution of the possessions of a deceased person among his near and distant relatives. So private ownership of property may be said to have been recognised in the Quran. This is the only point of argument in favour of private ownership as found in the Quran. Let me cite

* "Iddat" is the prescribed period of waiting from marrying again after divorce or death of one of the pair.

only one argument against this point and clarify the peculiar characteristics of this ownership as laid down in the Quran, so long this may be allowed to exist.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PRIVATE OWNERSHIP

(1) Men and women were used to be sold in the market like commodities. They were used as slaves. The master had an absolute right over the slaves. The women slaves were used as wife. Quran and Hadith accepted and recognised this right of copulation with slave girls and the right of exacting labour from slaves. Islamic rules and directions contain many instructions to the people to behave well with the slaves and to feed and clothe them as the masters do. This does not mean that this is a fundamental principle of social order of Islam.

All these rules of good behaviours and the right of copulation with slave girls do not exist when the system of slavery be abolished from the society.

The Holy Prophet recognised slavery as it existed in his time. But at the same time he encouraged his followers to free the slaves because this is one of the greatest virtues which a man can earn. There are many hadith (that is sayings of the Prophet) recorded in this direction. What he wanted is that slavery should go from the society, but he did not utter a single word saying that slavery is "Haram" that is prohibited. When slavery goes out of the society there remains no right of copulation with slave girls and the right of exacting labour by force from such slaves. So is the case with private ownership of property. When private ownership goes the process of distribution of properties of a deceased person will also become obsolete. Because this is social management of material wealth and not concerned with any thing of a man's spiritual life of the next world, that is why this change does not affect Islam in any way.

Due to the directions of the Holy Prophet slaves were behaved well in later Muslim societies and that was the reason why slavery was not a problem in the Muslim world. So is the

case with private ownership of property. This having been accepted as a principle in the social system was brought under certain limitations by the promulgation of different forms of Sadqa and specific division of property after the death of a person. Prior to the industrial revolution Private ownership of the Muslims was not a problem.

Let us now examine the rules of "Farayez" that is the rules of inheritance of the Muslims.

(1) General characteristics of the rules of inheritance is that the property of a deceased person is divided among a large number of near and distant relatives that tends to prevent accumulation of wealth in the hands of few.

(2) Quran declares that the property of a deceased person should be distributed among those poor persons and orphans also who will present themselves at the time of such distribution among his relative inheritors. Because the number of the poor and needy and the orphans cannot be precisely determined so this item of legal inheritors has been dropped out in the working out of the process of rules of inheritance, which is declared so clearly, in the Quran. We don't know from when and why this order of the Quran was abrogated in the frame work of the legal code of inheritance.

Quran says : (IV : 8) And when at the time of division (of the heritage) near one (whether relatives or not relatives) and orphans and the poor are present, give sustenance to them therefrom, and speak to them words of kindness and justice.

Explanation : This verse contains a clear order on the society to give of the heritage to three categories of persons of the society besides the recipient relatives of the dead person as laid down in the other verses of the Quran. No practice has been retained in the Muslim law of inheritance so far the direction of this verse is concerned. This is because a system of precise portion for the relatives cannot be ascertained if the uncertain number of persons who may present themselves at the time of

division from "among the near ones," "orphans" and "the poor" is taken into account.

Let us now analyse the three categories of persons who are going to inherit the property of any person of the society who dies, besides the usual heirs of the deceased.

- (i) Near ones of the deceased means any relative other than those for whom a fixed portion has been allotted in other verses regarding inheritance. Besides them this implies any near ones who has got nearness due to association with him and his business whether by working as a labour for him or by dint of friendship or by dint of being neighbour.
- (ii) Then comes the orphans. Orphans of the society must have social protection. So one of the items for their maintenance is the inheritance of property of those persons of the society who will die leaving some property.
- (iii) Third and the last item is the poor and needy persons of the society who will also inherit the property of the deceased, if they present themselves and put a claim.

If action to this verse of the Quran is to be given in the society then there cannot be any accumulation of wealth with few individuals of the society.

(iv) The last portion of this verse is to be considered, very deeply, "And speak to them words of kindness and justice." The number of these three categories of persons may be so great that in some cases a fair division among all of them may cause undue sufferings to the children of the deceased. In that case these categories of persons may be allotted a lesser portion of the left out property making them satisfied with words of kindness and justice. The distributors cannot be unjust to any person related to this property.

This verse is different in character from all the other verses relating to the distribution of property of a deceased person. Other verses indicate the portions of shares to different relatives, but this verse is silent about the exact portion of share to be given to these three kinds of people. Fixation of the amount of their shares

have been left to the judgement or decision of those who will represent the society. Circumstances of justice and fairness may some times compell the judges or the distributors to give them a lesser amount then to the other heirs for whom fixation of their shares has been mentioned. So the mention of "Pleasing them with words of kindness and justice" arises in this verse.

Let me now comment. If this injunction of the Quran is followed in the society, there can be no accumulation of wealth to few persons at the cost of the vast proletariat of the society. In some Muslim societies there is a practice of purchasing some food grains for distributing among the poor persons after death of a person. This practice, I think, is in response to the injunction of this verse. If so, this is something like mockery to this direction of the Quran.

Once the Holy Prophet said :—"Jibril is coming to me with so much words of stress for the rights and responsibilities to neighbours that I am afraid that Allah may make them (the neighbours) owners of property."

This means, Allah intends that neighbours be made owners of properties of all, that is something like equidistribution of national wealth be established. In view of the Prophet's being afraid Allah did not put the Prophet into an additional trouble of managing this difficult task at that time, which bears no more than that of materialistic importance. Prophets of Allah are mainly meant for spiritual development of mankind in preference to that of material.

These are not the only limitations within which private ownership was allowed to stay. In the way of explaining the natures and definitions of a "Musalli" (that is one who attempts for Divine Union), Quran says :—"Those are 'Musallis' who recognise a right in their wealth for him who asks for and for him who is prevented from asking" (LXX : 24-25).

Explanation : Not only the needy persons asking for any help but also those of society who do not ask for any help must have a recognition of right of property in the possession of others. This is not a gift like the giving of alms to a beggar but it is a declared right of the needy people who have been prevented

from asking for their right due to some reason or other.

All these indicate that like slavery, the Prophet adopted an evolutionary process of removing mal-distribution of property and gradually advance towards equidistribution.

Attachment to materialism is the greatest stumbling block to Islam. So the Quran has repeatedly warned mankind in many ways to keep them alert from its trap. This is why the Holy Prophet says : "Love of Dunia is the head of all evils."

If the definition and nature of a believer is followed in the Quran it is found that a believer cannot earn much of material property if he is at all to remain as a believer. He is not supposed to give much of his attention to material earnings, if he is at all inclined to abide by the general rules of Quran and Sunnah.

So far material interest of individual nature is concerned one is warned all thorough the Quran not to incline himself to such attachments at the cost of his loss in the next world.

Lastly it may be said that private ownership has become a serious problem and a social curse in these days of industrialisation particularly for countries which are economically undeveloped.

RELIGIOUS MATERIALISM IN WAHABISM

Wahabism is nothing but a kind of "Religious Materialism" of its own. Religious materialism is a very important subject of the Quran and Hadith, that requires a separate book for a fair discussion on it. In short human mind naturally tends to rely on materialism and the mundane world. But the Quran wants him to place above all these and make him the master of the material world.

As against this, a religious mind naturally tends to seek according to his own conjecture a kind of religious approval of materialism for an easy approach to the goal. But Allah totally denies to approve of this wrong ideology for His servants. There are many direct injunctions of this kind in Quran. In this way Wahabi religion is more of the character of indulging nature-

worship than worship of "Tauhid" (i.e. Monotheism), because it advocates the worship of one's own human nature. Of course, due to their ignorance they think their religion to be a really Monotheistic religion in comparison with all other groups of Islam.

This is the wrong side of religious materialism and in fact such materialism is unreligious. The right side of religious materialism which the Quran is approving and the deductions of which have been tried to be prescribed very leniently by our Imams in their Fiqah.

It is not expected that all men believing in religion will materialise the gravity of intentions of Allah in man. But the believers must at least recognise the gravity and spirituality in religion. Wahabism is against this recognition. Thus they are against islam in reality.

A very wisely book of about one thousand pages based on the Quranic quotations may be written against Wahabism, without even mentioning of the Wahabi ideology in it. This is because the whole philosophy of the Quran is against the obnoxious views held by the Wahabis. A true interpretation of the Quran will itself be a work against it. Then what need the mentioning of Wahabism?

Let me set a small example of the wrong thinking of Wahabism. Without knowing what "Hur" and "Ghelman" actually is, Mr. Maudoodi once expressed in his party paper wrong opinion about it. According to him Non-Muslim blooming beautiful girls are "Hurs" and blooming beautiful boys are "Ghelmans". In fact this gift of Allah is not bestowed to His servants in "Dunia". Hundreds of his opinions on Quranic expressions are of this kind. These mis-interpretations are not intentional but these are basic mistakes of Wahabism in him. He, like any other Wahabi, cannot understand Quran till he remains an Wahabi in out-look.

Deobandy ideology of religion which is followed by the vast majority of the Ulamas of Indo-Pak is nothing but a modified form of Wahabism, that has totally crushed the true Islamic ideology of our land. Philosophy and fundamentals of Wahabism have all been accepted by Deobandists as their principles. But

they have adopted the ceremonial processes of their daily performances of prayer just like the Sunnis. This method was adopted only to hoodwink the mass people to their views. They are against the processes and practices of meditations and religious activities practised by saints and Sufees, because these are according to them mere innovations made after the passing away of the Holy Prophet. So I like to remark them as the worst of the type of Wahabis, because they concern their Wahabism in the garb of Sunnis. They have thus become more dangerous than an open enemy of Islam. Of course the present Ulama's are so much adopted to Wahabi ideology, remaining Sunni at the same time that they are not aware of Wahabism in them and do not really understand Wahabism excepting the few outer differences of physical movements in the performances of prayer.

Wahabism as an ideology, prevails all over the world. Its followers are a brute majority every where. But they rarely do exist as a separate class or a tribe except in very few parts of the world. Such as the so-called "Ahle Hadith" of our land. They are a class who try to follow it some thing like a heredity. Others follow only the theory of this ideology a bit independently. So we like to entitle them to be the "Staunch or the real Wahabis". Others may be called "Mild or Pro-Wahabis".

It is really strange that most of the Ulama's of the present world are not aware of their position in the religious world and of their Wahabi characteristics as such. This is because it has become the go of the Muslim world.

Religions of Islam is universal and Divine in character, Wahabi religion is communal in out-look, material in character and without any thing of the spirit in it. This is because it denies the attainments of Divine attributes in man. This denial is quite contradictory to the philosophy of Islamic religions. This is the reason why they are not willing to honour the saints, Sufees and hermits, as the followers of all other religions do. Divine attributes or "His colour" is the best of colours by which saints of high order take on a colour of Allah and absorb His goodness in them. This is possible only by serving Him and Him alone.

In this connection I shall request the reader (who knows Bengali), to go through a book-let named “ইসলামের বর্ণদোরা শব্দ”

কারা? It is a pen-picture of Wahabism. I have composed some more fundamental points of this religion which have been shown in it.

MAUDOODI : AN AGENT OF BOURGEOIS

Maudoodi has no Islam in his politics. His political theories are a kind of total corruption of a religious bigot. I consider that his political sayings are nothing more than that of a purchased bourgeois for opposing anything of a socialistic form of government which a large number of the people of Pakistan and specially of East Pakistan is demanding today.

If the policy of Maudoodi is followed, we shall lose two things (1) Islam and (2) Economic emancipation. If socialism is adopted, people can expect economic emancipation of a fair order. Social, political and economic corruptions of a colossal magnitude, from which we are suffering under the present system of administration, will also be removed. So far Islam is concerned it will be upto the people whether they will keep Islam in its present form (that is a private concern having governmental holidays and other concessions for the performances of religious functions as is going on under present form of government) or whether the people will try to establish Islamic out-look in almost every item of their social concerns and business. And thus try to establish a true form of Islamic state. This will depend entirely upon the people and their wise leading. I dare express this opinion not from the view points of politics, as I have no knowledge of that kind, but what I say is purely from the view points of Quran and Sunnah. Quran and Sunnah is far above all pettiness of so-called Mawlanas, so far their views on Islam is concerned.

Let me cite only one example in support of this view point. In the early part of 1970 a lecture of Maulana Maudoodi was published in Newspapers in which he said that nationalisation is not only illegal but also un-Islamic. The only point of argument he would try to raise in his favour is the existence of so-called private ownership of property. Besides this, there is no

expression in Quran and Hadith in support of this point, either direct or indirect nor can there be any. In spite of this fact, if Maudoodi would express such opinions in the name of religion, how then can we keep faith with him? And why should he not be called as an agent of exploiters? Wrong advocacy for inequities in the name of religion is worse than usual.

1. Caliphate created after Prophet Muhammad (A) was broken by imperialism of Muabia and activities of Marwan from the very time of Usman and thereby brought out a spirit of partisanship among the Muslim masses.

2. Moudoodi not only followed the materialistic Wahabi mentality of the former imperialists after the Caliphs but also added with it the American Colonialism from the time of the previous President Johnson most probably as an agent of C.I.A.

3. In the name of religion Maudoodi party captured the mosques and the madrasas as centres of their propagation almost all over Pakistan. A false religion Zeal was roused among the religious minded people of the land who do not understand the real spirit of the Quran and Sunnah.

4. Like Wahabi and Faraji movements of India Maudoodi movement was a kind of materialistic political movement in the colour of Islam.

5. To maintain the establishment of his religious imperialism and colonialism he did not hesitate to shake hands even with the American C.I.A which is purely a non-religious sectarian exploiting agency of a colossal magnitude.

The policy of C.I.A is in no way in line with his religious policy. Yet he sought his own end through this foreign agency as it coincides with his selfmade views on matters that may be called secular in Islamic religions.

i. That a materialistic religion can commit any social crime has been proved from the very beginning of Caliphate and has been committed by Maudoodi in his time.

ii. Islam is basically a peaceful religion, Sufistic in outlook and spiritualised in character and that is why a Muslim with

basic outlook of Quran and Sunnah always becomes a source and peace of justice, benevolent in character and sacrificing in spirit, humble and loving in nature but strong in principle.

iii. The dis-service which he has rendered in the name of Islam is really lamentable. Not only the common people who know not the matters in detail but also to the intelligentsia, religion has become some thing to be avoided or rather abhorred. They think that all matters of religion to be eliminated from politics.

This is altogether a wrong idea. Religion is the source of all peace and harmony, not only for the society but to every individual self. Life is worse than a desert if there is the absence of the concepts of any of the religions of the world.

Eat and drink and to be merry is not end all and be all of life. Man has great significances of his probationary life on earth.

RENUNCIATION OF WORLDLINESS AND CHRISTIAN ASCETICISM

Let us now analyse the 2nd part of the essay of Maudoodi under discussion. He wrote that there is no "Apathy to Dunia" in Islam and there cannot be anything of the kind. In support of this, he quoted two verses of Sura Araf (VII : 31-32). In fact these two verses are direct order for and approval of "Apathy to Dunia", whereas he refers them as quotations against it. Why this is so? Because of Wahabi out-look. There is a gulf of difference between Islamic religion and Wahabi religion.

I am not going to give the detail interpretation of these two verses as this will cover about a dozen pages to explain the points of view therein, with reference to the context. But I shall only explain the most well-known verse regarding "Rahbaniyat" (i.e. renunciation) in the Quran.

Christian Asceticism has been named as "Rahbaniyat" in Quran and Hadith. This means abandonment of domestic responsibilities by living the life of a bachelor, which the Christian clergymen are used to do. This sort of life may be adopted for practising apathy and renunciation of worldliness

from the mind, which is an essential quality for attaining to Allah. Mere shrinking of the duties and living a bachelor life is no virtue in itself, if it is not really meant for removing the worldly attachments and love for it. It should only be for the sake of developing love for the Divine self by engaging oneself deeply in His services and meditations.

"Dunia", which may be called Worldliness is against Godliness. Dunia is therefore "Haram" (that is some thing to be abandoned), because Dunia is abomination. "Dunia" does not mean domestic or social duties and services. It only means an attachment and love of the mind toward worldly matters, at the cost of Divine attachments and love. It may, therefore, be called in short the human ego or egocentricity in man. That is why "Seeking after Dunia" is quite unreligious in Islam.

One Hadith says, "La Rahbaniata Fil Islam" means "Islam has no Asceticism of an unmarried life like that of the Christian clergymen". This Hadith simply means that renunciation of the domestic responsibilities in itself is of no virtue. Virtue lies in the renunciation or abandonment of Dunia. That is abstaining the human mind from all its inclinations and love for worldly matters, because this counteracts Divine inclinations and attachments.

Asceticism in general has not been condemned by this Hadith. But what has been condemned is only the type of Christian asceticism adopted by them, not as a means of entering into truth but itself to be considered as a virtue and as an end.

The following verse is one of the few verses in the Quran that speaks of "Rahbaniyat". (Sura Hadid-57:27) :

And Rahbaniyat (i.e. Monasticism)? Begining of this practice? We prescribed it not on them : but only the seeking for the good pleasure of Allah. Thus they did not observe it as its true observance should have been. So we gave the reward to those of them who believed. And the majority of them are transgressors.

Explanation : Allah did not prescribe the so-called Monastic life for the Christian. What Allah has actually prescribed for man is the keen desire and attempts for seeking the good pleasure of Allah. He did not prescribe Monasticism as

an object of life, yet the Christians started the observance of this custom for themselves. But they did not observe it as they should have done. The fault with them is that they did not take this as an opportunity for engaging themselves in Divine services. What Allah wants of man is to seek for the pleasure of Allah, that is to be pleased with Allah. So they may observe bachelor life only as a means of practising devotions for Him, which most of them did not observe on that line. Only the seeking for the nearness of Allah is desirable for man, whatever may be the means for it. So Monasticism itself is not a virtue excepting the pleasure and nearness of Allah, which one has actually earned.

Thus we see that Monasticism has not been severely condemned. What is desirable for a man is practice of faith, whether be it with Monasticism or without Monasticism, that matters little. This verse has particularly hinted to the Christian world that had fallen into great depths of degradation at the time of the Holy Prophet, yet they had a pride of their Monasticism.

Thus Monasticism has not been so much condemned that it is prohibited in Islam. Anything prohibited in Islam cannot be adopted by our saints and persons who are exceptionally dignified and honoured by Allah. This is why we see that many of our Divine persons lived bachelor lives of Mendicants.

Muslims by mistake are now accustomed to interpret "Rahbaniyat" as "Apathy to Dunia". Due to age long Wahabi propaganda, the philosophy of the "Quranic Apathy to Dunia" has been suppressed and ousted from the society. And thus Sufism is being termed as a deviation from Islam, only because Sufees are in the struggle of resigning from Dunia. Strangely enough, blunt materialistic and worldly out-look of Wahabism is now a days going as Islamic opinions. Thus the entire Maudoodi conception of religion is astray and founded on wrong ideology of Wahabi-materialism.

The Word "Dunia" (i.e. worldliness) bears a technical meaning in Quran and Hadith. Resignation from Dunia is the spirit and goal of Islam, because without this one cannot meet his Rob. "Dunia" does not mean the duties and responsibilities of

domestic and social life, but it is only the inclination of the mind toward its attachments and dependence on materialism. Materialism in its polluted form has been termed in Quran as "Tagut". So "Tagut" is the friend and guardian of a disbeliever as also of a man who lives in Dunia. On the other hand guardian and friend of a true believer according to Quran is Allah Himself.

According to all divine religions, that in religions of Islam, Dunia is therefore "Haram", that is prohibited and so to be carefully abandoned. Thus religions of Islam have expressed a deep apathy to Dunia in all ages and prescribed ways and means of resignation from Dunia all through. What has been condemned here, and is very lightly condemned, is the type of Christian Monasticism that avoids the domestic duties of a husbandman and a house-maid, probably because, very wrongly they represent their Monasticism for "The resignation from Dunia". It is easy to be physically aloof from contacts of worldly duties but very difficult to be mentally aloof from the contacts of Dunia, that is worldliness.

To shun Dunia is a great virtue and so it is obligatory in Islam. Christian Monasticism is not particularly to set aside Dunia, but is only to remain bachelor and thus avoid domestic concerns only. So neither there is Monasticism in Islam nor it is an abomination in Islam. But the Christians have adopted it for their clergymen as a rule of their Islam.

There is another verse in the Quran which reads like this :—Sura Maida (chapter V : 85) :—Thou wilt find the most vehement of mankind in hostility to those who believe are the Jews and polytheists. And thou wilt find the nearest of them in affection to those who believe are those who say : Low! We are Christians. That is because there are among them "Persons of religious learning" and "Persons in Rahbaniyat", and because they are not proud.

Here the Holy Prophet is informed that among mankind Jews and Polytheists are the strongest enemies of the believers. In fine the Polytheists are those who are materialists. They depend not on Allah but on creation. The Jews of that time were also materialists.

Materialism as against spiritualism is the root enemy of religious belief. The Holy Prophet is also informed that nearest among mankind in affection and love to the believers are the Christians, because there are among them persons "devoted to religious learning" and "persons in Rahbaniyat" (that is Ascetics and Monks). Thus we see that Christian Rahbaniyat has not been condemned, though Rahbaniyat is not an essential requirement or feature for Islam (that is surrender of the human self to the Divine self). Christian Ascetics have rather been praised here as lovers of believers, because they are of the same humble nature with the believers.

Let us now discuss the following two verses of the Quran which Maudoodi has quoted in support of worldly enjoyments in Islam as against abhorance and apathy to Dunia.

Sura Araf (chapter VII : 31-32)

31. O, children of Adam, have your adornments near at every mosque and eat and drink, and waste not, surely He does not love the wasters.

32. Say : who forbids the adornments of Allah, which He hath brought out (from His Ownself) for his servants and that which is holy of the "Rejek"? Say : this is, in the very life of Dunia and more particularly in the day of doom, for those who believe. Thus we explain the signs for the wise people.

Let the reader try to follow these two verses of this chapter with reference to verse No. 26 and onward. Let us now discuss in brief the cardinal point of our discussion and the difference that distinguishes Quranic out-look from that of a Wahabi out-look in the above two verses. Allah orders the children of Adam to catch hold of the "Adornments of Allah" near at all mosques. Mosque is not what we generally understand it to be. If so, then it is practically impossible for a human being to go near at all mosques of the Earth. Again, the word is not "IN ALL MOSQUES" but "NEAR AT ALL MOSQUES". Why should a man be not in all mosques but only near at all mosques, if "mosque" means a praying place in the ordinary sense of the term?

In fact man may go near the Mosque but cannot enter it with his own efforts. Every work of a man should be performed near the Mosque of that work, if that work is to be freed from the faults of "Shirk" (that is faults of associating anything with Divine Authority).

Subject-matters of these two verses begin from verse No. 26, in which the main topic is "Fahesha" that is abomination of the sexual tendency. The very indulgence of the sexual greed of the human self is "Fahesha".

"Jina" is outraging of social legality of sex conduct and "Fahesha" is the outraging of the moral legality of sex conduct. "Jina" is severely punishable by law. Fahesha is not punishable by law if it is not openly executed into action. Open execution of Fahesha turns it into Jina. Besides the sexual indecency of the human mind and its inclination towards the opposite sex, "Unreligious copulation" with legal wife is also called Fahesha, if it is conducted merely by the impulse of greed.

While in Heaven, Fahesha was forbidden for Adam and Eve, and so it is disliked by Allah that we also commit the same fault, though this has not been made punishable in "Islamic shariat" that is Islamic law. How the kind of fault of copulation with legal wife can be avoided? Quran says that this can only be avoided if this work is done near at the "Mosque of Allah", having all attentions directed to Him with an effort of entering into "His Din". That is, efforts of entering from Dunia into Din of Allah (vide Quran VII : 26—29). It is easier to remain bachelor than to avoid "Fahesha" even by a married man.

Fahesha is the mental inclination of outraging of the modesty and Jina is the illegal execution of the desire into action. Jina is severely punishable in "Shariat." On the other hand Fahesha, which is the natural instinct of the human mind is not punishable by law though it is condemned and disapproved by Allah.

I am not, however, going to explain all these points contained in these two verses with reference to the context. Divine Adornments are nothing short of Divine Attributes which grow in man living in the gurb of "Taqwa". What are Divine Attributes which are to be adopted or to be adorned with by a

man? These are Divine qualities. The attempts and exertions of attaining to the Divine Attributes of Allah, renders a man unmindful and careless of worldly attentions, which therefore, a worldly man will think to be un-acceptable (that is prohibited). Because of the apparent loss of worldly gains for persons attempting to acquire the "Adornments of Allah", should itself be no plea for its prohibition. That is the sense expressed in these two verses.

"Allah's adornments" does not mean our dresses and furnishings of our external life as Mr. Maudoodi has thought it to be. In reality these adornments are the Divine Attributes and Qualities which Allah has released from His Own Self as a grace. This is a grace and a great gift to be acquired by the believers who live in "Taqwa". "Taqwa" in short means turning out of the attentions from Dunia to Him. All attentions and eagerness are meant to be directed to Him, detaching the inclinations of the human faculties and senses for the love of Dunia. The attempts for earning of the Divine virtues and adornments by man is a great virtue in Islam. But it costs much of worldly attainments and so it may be supposed by some persons to be prohibited as it requires great exertions and extreme abstention from Dunia. Verse No. 32 says :—"Who prohibits the adornments of Allah?" The very foundation of Wahabism is to deny those spiritual state of affairs which a Sufee is inclined to earn at the cost of his worldly comfort.

A materialist or a worldly person cannot tolerate the spiritual state of affairs in a man having "Allah's adornment" and "His pure Rejek (i. e. sustenance)" which are purely meant for a true believer even in this life, and particularly in the hereafter. These two things (i.e. the Divine Attributes and the fruits of these Attributes in the form of Pure Rejek) are for the believers only. If these are worldly adornments and sustenance like food, dress etc. then surely it is for all, whether one be a believer or an unbeliever. Most of the readers of Quran do not even know the definition of a believer as has been depicted in the Quran. So lies the tragedy with their poor understanding.

Who desires to prohibit for himself good dresses, furnishings and foodings which Allah makes lawful for us?

I appeal to the reader to consider the process of expression of the Divine Self. If the verses would mean "dresses", "furnishings", "wealth", "good food" etc., then the expression should be like this : "We created these for men" as these are very common things for man in general irrespective of believers and unbelievers. But the word used here is—"Yakhruju" means "got these out" or "brought these forth", and these are only for the believers.

Unless He brought forth from His Own Self His Divine Attributes in creation, only for His selected servants, man cannot be raised to so much distinction and honour as against other creatures of Allah. Here lies the distinction of the believers that they possess something Divine in them. Divine Attributes and qualities enable them to do wonders and to create anything they like for their own use or for anybody else they like. Of course this state of affairs are generally kept concealed from the eyes of Dunia. Had Allah not gushed forth His own Divine Attributes out of Himself, no believer would be able to dignify himself with those gifts. In that case a believer is no better than a common man. These are matters of great import and significance to consider, otherwise no understanding of the Quran is possible. Quran has not a single contradiction all through, where as any common reader will find hundreds of them.

We have finished discussions of Maudoodi's quotations supposed to have approved the attractions to the allurements of Dunia. Let me now cite only one example from the Quran, out of hundreds of the kind, that warns us against our attractions to the splendours and adornments of the life of Dunia.

Sura Taha (XX : 131)

Do not wide open your eyes toward those things which We have associated with the eyes, only for a short while. These are splendours only for the life of Dunia, in order to test people therein. And the Rejek of your Rab is better and ever-lasting.

Explanation : Allah desires that our eyes should not be longing for the short-lived splendours and enjoyments of this

probationary worldly life. Worldly progress and show are no doubt pleasing for the eyes and other sense organs. But these are only for a trial. But the Rejek that comes from one's Rab is better and ever-lasting. The temporary Rejeks are also Divine gifts, but short-lived and common to all, and these are made for alurement of the eyes for a while. So our eyes should not be very eager to associate itself with the temporary splendours of worldly alurements.

Love of Dunia is a great crime in Islam, because one cannot enter into the "Din" so long he will love Dunia. In order to avoid Dunia, a Muslim (that is one who surrenders) must be adorned with garments of "Taqwa". Taqwa in short means turning out all attentions from Dunia and then to be eagerly attentive to one's Rob.

ADOPTION OF ISLAM IN THE STATE

There are persons who are not in favour of keeping religious supervision of the state in its affairs, because of the fear of different opinions and conflict among the religious groups. That is why they want the state to be of multi-religious character. That is, the belief of each group or individual will be his own matters concerned with himself only.

As an advocate of religion, I like to put forward my humble opinion that Islam has such a religion that its applications in the society will not hamper the religious belief of any of the religious groups or person of what-so-ever religion he may be. This is because Islam is very scientific in character. It will only hamper the vested interest of the rich and the privileged classes who are enjoying an unbridled economic exploitation of the proletariat. That was one of the two main reasons why Prophet Muhammad (A) was not allowed to stay in Mecca by those who were enjoying a vested interest in the society. It was not the saying of prayer, fasting, dedication of the individual self to the Divine Self and the performance of Hajj that disturbed the vested authority. The cause of opposition and annoyance was the proletariat economy of Islam and placing of the common people on an equal footing so far their honour and social importance is concerned. The main objection was why the

commoners should be given honour and position at the cost of the privileged few? It was the preaching of a kind of socialistic economy suited for that time, that annoyed the privileged persons like Abu Sufian, Abu Jehel, the Jews of Medina and others of the opposition. Honour belongs not to the wealthy or the influential persons but according to Quran : "Honour is only for Allah, His Apostles and the believers."

Prohibition of the idol worship, that is worship of the self and the material gods was the other cause. It is human tendency that man is prone to worship or follow his own fancy and conjectures, instead of giving himself up to the Divine Self. Because to give up one's self is to give up one's ego and his all to the service of the people and to Allah. This is not very easy and welcome to the egoistic man. Surrender of the self is Islam. So it was and is never welcome to mankind.

These are the two main reasons that annoyed the unbelievers who refused to believe and worship the universal "Ela" or the Authority, that is the universal God of man and nature. To worship the only "Ela" is to give up the vested self both in mind and matter. This is never pleasing to man enjoying materialistic life of unrestricted nature. The religion of Islam is therefore the only religion, the religion of the proletariat, having materialism and spiritualism coupled together in all matters of life. Islamic religion is therefore not confined in material Mosques, Churches and Temples. This comprises the entire daily life of a man.

Do not take Mohamadanism to be the only religion of Islam. Judaism, Christianity, Hinduism and all other Divine religions are religions of Islam. Of course corruptions of various kinds have entered into all of these religions in course of time. Islamic religions begin from Adam to the present day. If the fundamentals of Islam is adopted in the state, no groups of these religious ideology will have any basic objection excepting the class that enjoys some vested material interest. To reiterate, I am to say that the state should adopt and should try to establish "Dinul Islam" but not any religion of Islam in particular. Mohamadans as a religious group should naturally have more religious concessions and advantages in Pakistan than any other group as they are a vast majority here.

The state should adopt "Din Islam" as its principle and guiding force above all, but not any of the religions of Islam in particular. People will have freedom of adopting any of the

religions that leads to "Din Islam". Ceremonial differences of rites and manners matters little. But the deviation from the ideology and concept of "Din Islam" matters much. However, these are matters to be discussed elaborately. It is not possible to go into detail in a book-let like this. These should be given a separate treatment.

"Dinul Islam" that is "The Divine Constitution" and its fundamental codes of surrender, is existing from Adam to the present day. Islam is therefore not confined in any age or to any race. Islam had and has many religions promulgated at different times by different apostles of Allah. These are all Divine religions meant to preach the same "Dinul Islam". Islamic religion is therefore the religion of each and every Prophet and Apostle.

Evolution of religion is an essential feature, because religion must have coincidence with social and physical conditions and habits of men. Human civilization is evolutionary in character and that is why the process of evolution in the promulgation of Divine religions must be an essential feature.

In the process of religious evolution Mohamadanism is the last and final form of Divine religions. Muhammad (A) is the last Apostle of Islam and so in him was finalised the gradual evolution of religion that began from Adam.

Of all the religions of Islam, Mohamadanism is therefore very elastic and detail in character, applicable for all ages to come, as it is the finalised form of its evolution. This does not mean that anybody following any of the previous religions of Islam will not find the way to Allah.

Allah changeth human religions' from time to time, but He changeth not His Din (that is Divine Constitution). Fundamental characteristics of His Din, for His creatures, is to surrender to Him. Quran says :—"Inna Dina Endallahel Islam", means: (1) "Surely 'Din Islam' is the only Din acceptable to Allah". Or it may also be rendered like this : —(2) "Surely the Din, which is near to Allah, is Islam." That is any human constitution which is framed for the surrender of the human self to the Divine Self is acceptable to Allah and such a constitution goes very near to Allah, provided that the same has been approved by a Divine man, enlightened by Noor-e-Mohammadi (Divine light) (A). Otherwise the surrender of man will naturally tend to be to the desires of human senses and faculties and to the laws of nature.

There are many such constitutions (such as the Orders of Tariqa) promulgated by spiritualised persons. These may vary from time to time and from man to man. But the fundamental theory of surrender there must be, the which must not have any change. Din of Allah is unchangeable.

Quran says :—"Sunnatallahe Laa tabdila" means "The commands and actions of Allah do not change". So the change that we come across is only the change of religions, but not the fundamental codes of surrender of His creatures to the will of the Divine Self. The process of surrender may change, but surrender there must be, if we are at all prepared to please Him.

He repeats Himself in the same way so far His commands and actions in the process of His manifestation in creation is concerned. The fundamentals of surrender of His creatures and creations have always been preserved to be the same. In fact the condition or the state of surrender of individual selves is the Divine Din.

The meaning of Islam is not peace at the first sight. It is surrender of the self to the Divine Universal Self. This surrender is not pleasing and peaceful to the human mind until a devotee of Allah is accepted by Him. Allah relieves His devotee from the conflicts and tortures of nature at the end, and thus grants him an ever-lasting peace. So "Islam" that is "surrender of the self", becomes peaceful at the end when all reliance on creation is surpassed by the devotee of Allah. Fight against baser self is therefore a must in Islam.

An Islamic society is therefore based on simplicity, self sacrifice, universal love and brotherhood. To establish all these conditions, fighting for the truth in the society and the self is therefore an essential feature in Islamic life and society. That is why "Zehad", in a very wide sense is compulsory in Islam. Of course "Fighting against the self" is "Zehade Akbar" as has been termed by the Holy Prophet. To a materialistic mind abhorrence to Islam at the first sight is a must. This is because man by nature is ease-loving and fond of Dunia.

ISLAM IS BASICALLY SOCIALISTIC IN CHARACTER

From the days of historic age Islam has not given any particular form of government. It has given certain principles of life and code of human conduct both in his private and public life in

relation to his Rob and man. These principles and conduct of life may be fitted and implemented in any form of government which a people may consider fit and proper for them. Of course the main characteristics of an Islamic administration must be based on fairness and justice because Islam is a kind of universal brotherhood of socialistic nature. This is the main reason why Islam recognises no geographical boundary of its Ism. No form of government is Islamic, unless Islam is implemented in it. A real implementation of Islam is possible only by a true Muslim—that is one who has actually surrendered his whole self to the will of Allah and his apostle and in this way has earned a real knowledge of the Islamic state of affairs.

Had Islam recommended for any particular form of government then that form would become obligatory for the Muslims of all ages and societies, and in that case it would have lost its universal characteristics and thus become inapplicable to all ages and in all societies due to changes of social and economic conditions.

The nature of Islamic government is so much of socialistic in character that the chief administrator, the Caliph gets no pay or priority over others so far material gain is concerned. During the time of the Caliphs, we see that they were used to receive so scanty an amount of subsistence allowance that it could hardly meet up their bare necessities of daily life, not to speak of constructing palaces or mansions for their luxurious living. Was it not purely of a socialistic form of government which was set aside by Ameer Muabia? This ideology of proletariat economy was tried to be observed and maintained in all the departments of government, so long the Caliphs were in power, although a stablised form of the socialistic shape of their government was yet to be given. This was because the boundary of the state had been continuously increasing and the conquerers were busy engaged in maintaining their military authority for political peace and order all through.

The social and economic works of the countries were yet to be regularised. Time did not allow the Caliphs to formulate a truly Islamic ideology of economy all over the state. No sooner the Muslim rule was almost established than corruptions of imperialism and self-agrandisement and group interest was set in by Ameer Muabia.

From our religious points of view it is quite evident that Islamic religion is fundamentally and basically socialistic in

character. And its socialistic character is not quite different in out-look and political philosophy from that of Russian or Chinese socialism.

In Islam there is no interest to be earned from the investment of capital and so there exist no capitalism and capitalistic banking system in Islam. The economic role of private capital and its earning of interest cannot be dispensed with, without the adoption of a kind of socialistic form of economy. For a true Islamic state, socialism there must be, in some form or other. Wheather that socialism be with or without limited ownership of property, is altogether a different question.

In this age of the 20th Century, it will be very difficult to keep private ownership of property in a socialistic state, because of the want of a deep rooted faith and allegiance to religion. People cannot be made mentally prepared for socialistic economy if private ownership be maintained in this land. Mere Quranic instructions "to recognise the right of others in the property possessed by individuals" will not help the state unless forced by law. Private ownership has now become something like a curse in our society. Of course there may be a bit difficulty in promulgating a socialistic economy of Islam, because of the fact that we have not a detail and practical ideal of it before us in the past. An ideal leader of clear Islamic conception, supported and helped by a number of men of character, is an essential condition required for the establishment of a real Islamic socialism.

If the "Ulamas" fail to find out a socialistic form of religious economy for Pakistan, they will fail to resist socialism altogether. Instead of siding with the capitalists, as they are doing now, they must have to form a socialistic group of their own if they at all want a real solution of the present problems. They must change their wrong and unreligious policy they are supporting in Pakistan. Otherwise they are simply paving the way of chaos and confusion, bloodshed and massacre of their own ideology of Islam.

Prophet Muhammad (A) has given the fundamentals of socialism of a very high order. His socialism is religious and spiritualised, because that was Divine in character. Worldly men would naturally not like that type of socialism because man is

prone to be inclined towards Dunia. In later days Karl Marx has only modernised the theory of socialism befitting to the present day materialistic economy of the world.

Karl Marx, being a materialist, cannot have that spiritual knowledge of matters and a correct insight even towards material aspects of life which a Prophet has. Karl Marx only detailed the process of a fair distribution and production of material wealth purely from a materialistic angle of vision.

The socialism is secular in character. All the governments of the present so-called Muslim countries are also secular in character. They should set up spiritualised characteristics of Quran and Sunnah on the Marxist socialism. But who can do this? An Wahabi in out-look cannot do this, only for the reason that he does not understand the Quran and Sunnah, due to his abhorrence to spiritualism. Not more than one fifth of the Quranic words deal with external life of man as a social being. Only these kinds of worldly expressions of the Quran is easy for all readers to understand. This is the reason why a Wahabi-like-mind commits mistakes in almost each and every expression of the remaining major portion of the Quran, because the very basis of Quran and Sunnah is a thing foreign to him.

I believe that there is no power on earth that can stop the onward march of communism excepting Mohamadan Islam i.e. Mohamadanism. This is because this Islam is far superior to communism. So-called Islam of Maudoodi cannot stand as a check to communism, because "Maudoodi's Islam" is not Quranic Islam, and so it is inferior to communism.

There is no real ownership in Islam but only spiritual ownership. Allah has not made the common man real owner of anything of the Earth and Heaven. All ownership lies with Him and so with His chosen servants. Common man enjoys only a legacy of use of material property upto his death. Allah makes no man legal heir of anything on the earth excepting His vicegerents. They are chosen persons from among those who serve Him best. Please note carefully that His vicegerants, who are the real owners of Heaven and Earth, are men of such a character that they care little for material wealth for themselves. These are matters of great significance of the Quran, too high for the common reader to understand. In fact

man is owner of nothing till he becomes a saint. That is why fair and equitable distribution of worldly matters is the rule of Islam, although there is difference of dignity in spiritual matters of the next world. This is due to the difference of righteousness among God's servants.

NO CLASS PRIVILEGE FOR ISLAMIC SOCIETY

There is a wrong notion about the religion of Islam. They think that Mohamadanism is a religion of class privilege. But in fact there is no approval of class in Quran and Hadith, although creation of class was the outcome of all the so-called Muslim rulers after the fall of Caliphate. Ameer Muabia ceased to follow the foot prints of the Caliphs and the Holy Prophet. Thus the Muslims having lost of their religious ideology could not come out and had never made any attempt to come out of the prevalent feudalism that prevailed all over the world.

There is neither any advocacy for class privileges in the Quran and the Hadith nor any recognition of class distinction in the material sense of the term. There is, of course, classes but it is in respect of moral and spiritual achievements. The Quran clearly notifies the categories of persons so far as their spiritual activity in connection with purification of their Nafs are concerned. Such as "the believers and the unbelievers are not alike." Believers are directed not to take unbelievers as their friends. The pure are directed not to marry impure girls and vice versa.

According to spiritual gradation there is the distinct mention of the classes like : Siddiqueena (the testifiers of truth), Shuhada (the witnesses of the truth), Saleheen (the doers of good for the annihilation of their own human ego) and so on.

So far recognition of material classification is concerned there is not a single mention in the Quran. Of course there is the mention of the poor people and the helpless orphans, but there is the direction in the Quran to feed them and to help them on social basis and not individual basis only. That is why the Quran directs the individuals to encourage the society to feed them, because it is a social duty. Had there been recognition of the existence of class privilege then there would not have been such direction to encourage the society

to do this duty. Directions to the richer section of the people for doing this duty would be enough in that case. But no, it is a social duty and that is why the society is to be encouraged to take up this duty collectively for themselves and thus dissolve class privilege. But alas, the feudal characteristics of the Arab society which was being converted to a kind of classless socialistic form by the Caliphs was suddenly crushed by Muabia, the great feudal.

In those days system of slavery was so deep rooted in all societies of the world that the Prophet did not deem it fit to adopt any revolutionary process for eradication of this evil, rather he took the recourse of evolutionary principles. From the steps he took in this connection it appears that he could clearly foresee that this evil would one day go out of vogue. His therefore were evolutionary steps. He discouraged the system of slavery and in this regard he directed his followers that they might keep slaves provided there should be no distinction between the masters and the slaves so far as the standard of clothes, fooding and shelters were concerned. In sort, the slaves were to be treated as equal members of the family. But the Prophet laid much emphasis on their manumission. Thanks to the teachings of the Prophet, in the earlier part of the history of Muslims, the slaves were no more slaves of their masters, they were rather affectionate children of the family. Although Islam in India lost its original vigour yet we find Sabuktigin father of great Sultan Mahmood to succeed his master Alaptagin, Sultan Kutubuddin Aibek to succeed his master Mohammad Ghorī and Sultan Shamsuddin Altamash to Kutubuddin Aibek himself. They were not only successors of their masters' thrones but were sons-in-law too.

Quran declares : "Allah is rich and you are only the seekers from Him". Anything we get is from Allah, whether material or immaterial. A materialist may not accept this truth that Allah is the source of all creations. So all sovereignty belongs to Him. The creation of ego in man and practice of human maldistribution has put a bar to understand this truth. Quran is less concerned with material aspects of life than the spiritual, because Quran wants to elevate Man from material attachments to the Divine Truth. Attractions and attachments to material aspects of human life has been severely condemned all through the Quran.

Quran declares : "He created you all from one Nafs." As all men are descendants or outcome of the same single Nafs, how then can there be recognition of classes between man and man, so far their material requirements and well-being is concerned? Basic demands for material goods of all Nafs is the same.

On the other hand classification or gradation of Nafs has been made in the Quran so far its spiritual developments and achievements are concerned. Such as :—

(1) Nafse Ammara, (2) Nafse Lauama, (3) Nafse Mutmainna and (4) Nafse Mulhema.*

Thus we see that gradation of man according to the purification of his Nafs, is a recognised classification in the Quran.

On the contrary there is no mention of classification of man in view of material inequity.

Quran says :—"Atiullahi wa Atiur Rasula Wa Ulil Amr Minkum." (IV : 59) means :—"Obey Allah and obey the Apostle and those of you who possess command or authority (of Allah and His Messengers)."

There is generally a wrong notion about "Ulil Amr" (that is persons having the command). It is not the ruler who usurps authority nor an elected authority unless it is permitted or approved by Allah and His Apostle. Any authority without Divine approval is not of "Ulil Amr". Thus no priority has been given even to the rulers of the state as a class, unless they are crowned with the Divine approval or distinction for the purpose of guiding mankind. "Ulil Amr" includes not rulers only but all saints spiritually authorised to guide mankind. Chosen persons of Allah and of His Apostles are men of spiritual insight having

* Man is graded into 4 classes in the Quran.

- (1) Nafse Ammara = One who is inclined to act according to his human desires and sweet will.
- (2) Nafse Lauama = One who is on the alert for controlling his baser self and human desires—that is, he is engaged in fighting against his own self.
- (3) Nafse Mutmainna = One who has been able to control his human self and thus has become satisfied, because he has won over his passions.
- (4) Nafse Mulhema = One who is guided only by Divine Words inspired from his own self. Allah guides him through His direct speech.

communion with Divinity and so they would be of real service to the people.

They care a fig for materialism and do not therefore tend to create class privilege on material basis.

Quran reminds us "Kanan naasu ummatan wahedatan" means "Mankind were one community or class."

There are few direct expressions in the Quran in this respect but the spirit of the Quran as a whole is in support of classless society. Unless one can be made acquainted with the spirit of the Quran it is very difficult to make a deep conviction of this fact into the mind of the reader. Those persons in whom Quranic spirit was implemented were all classless in spirit in their expressions of political doctrine, activities and outlook.

With the fall of Caliphate this ideology evaporated from the Muslim society till today. Muavia had ideological difference with Hazrat Ali (K). Muavia represented the class of bureaucrats and vested interests. He was imperialist from the core of his heart while Hazrat Ali (K) was for the suffering humanity. From history we learn that a great majority of supporters of Hazrat Ali (K) were proletariat and they were poor too. Piety and poverty were their characteristics.

Quran says (V : 51) :—"To each of you we have appointed a divine law and a traced out way. And had Allah willed He could have made you one community, but to test you in what He hath given you. So strive as in a race in all virtues. You will all return to Allah, and He will then inform you of that wherein ye differ".

Explanation : This is the last half of a very mysterious verse. For every man a "Shariat" (that is divine law for the conduct of life) has been given and also a "Menhaj" (that is a traced out way or an open way). This "open way" is above the rules of "Shariat", and peculiar to the character of individuals, which is available for every one like a sort of open highway, for reaching upto Him. So we are ordered to vie one with another in good works, following the above mentioned two processes towards Allah, our goal.

To every person Allah has traced out a way and given him a divine process of going out of the bonds of materialism and reach to the Divine Unity of Truth, if one is really desirous of reaching to the Truth. All dispositions and diversities of lives of

different communities and individuals are meant to test mankind to see that Unity is achieved in Him, out of all apparent diversities. Here, in this verse, creation of different communities is mentioned in respect of their modes and thoughts of life, and not of economically different standard of classes in the same community or nation, but only differences of trades and activities and thoughts of life. Unity in God is to be sought in all diversities of community-life, which Allah has made in man. This does not refer to economic disparity. Economic disparity within the same community or nation is not His creation but it is the creation of selfish classes of men.

Diversities of human life in pains and happiness, diversities in the creation of human species, male and female, and in the changes of seasons etc, are all standing on the way of realising Unity of His Existence in creation. Here lies the real test in man, whether he will try to realise the Unity of the Divine Self manifested in creation or forget Him and be lost in the contacts of diversities made by Him. The whole of "Sura Lail" has treated with this point of human life with deep philosophical bearings of life in relation to his world.

CONCLUSION

This is an age of Multi-religious states. Religious toleration to all people should be a must, irrespective of caste, creed and sects. So-called Muslim themselves are divided into many creeds and opinions, not in their minor points only, but in their fundamental views on Islam.

So-called Muslim states of the world have adopted Western democracy and Western nationality as their state policy which is not Islamic in spirit. Islam is an ideology that does not recognise geographical boundary of state or Nationality. Western democracy is not Islamic in spirit, yet Maudoodi seems to be satisfied with these state of affairs. His religion has not been hampered here. Socialism, which a better democracy and a better economic solution for a poor country like Pakistan has become a dread to Maudoodi. Like democracy, socialism also does not keep any concern with religion. It is simply theory of economy. Whether people will set religion in it or not, will depend on the choice of the people.

We being Muslims in Pakistan, we should surely keep our religion in our private life more than we are keeping today. Islam (that is in its applied form Mohamadanism) should be declared as the state religion having full tolerance to all sects and divisions of all religious and unreligious groups in the state socialism. A religious bigot like Maudoodi cannot form an Islamic state as he has no knowledge of the workings and fundamentals of Islam itself.

Of course a real Islamic state is such a kind of religious state that it can satisfy all sorts of peoples :—believers and unbelievers, theists and polytheists, spiritualists and materialists. This is because it will have an advisory directive in respect of conduct and character of private and social life. How far the people can follow it or not, is not the look out of the state. State will try to maintain only a common interest of the society as a whole. Functions of a Muslim state are always more secular than religious. Religious functions on the part of the state are more confined to instructions than practical executions on private life of peoples.

Islam is tolerant in character. Every man is born a Muslim, but when he is grown he becomes naturally a non-Muslim. To be a Muslim again is very difficult. Thus the whole society is nothing but a combination of non-Muslim members. This is the main reason, why Islamic rules are more optional and instructive than compulsory and obligatory in character from the social points of view. Compulsory portions are also mostly for private life and matters in which state has nothing to do but only to instruct.

True revival of religion, in letter and spirit is possible only under the leadership of a saint of high order, directly sent by Allah with the mission of salvation of the world.

THE END