

# The Quranic Perspective on Apostasy, Slavery and Concubines

*Translation of 'Qatal e Murtad, Ghulam  
aur Londiyan'*

*Ghulam Ahmad Parwez*

**Tolu-e-Islam Trust®**

25 B, Gulberg-II, LAHORE

*www.islamicdawn.com*



## **ALL RIGHTS RESERVED**

No part of this publication can be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, or otherwise, without the prior written permission of the publisher and/or editor, except in case of reviewers who may quote brief passages in a review.

Title of the book: The Quranic Perspective on Apostasy,  
Slavery and Concubines

Author: Ghulam Ahmad Parwez

Translated and Edited: Dr. Ejaz Rasool (Glasgow, UK)

ISBN Number: 9798680365625

Contact: Tolu-e-Islam Trust  
25 B Gulberg-II  
Lahore-54660 Pakistan  
[www.islamicdawn.com](http://www.islamicdawn.com)

## **List of Other Works in English by the Author**

1. Exposition of the Quran
2. Islam: A Challenge to Religion
3. What is Islam? (Available from Amazon)
4. The Book of Destiny
5. The Quranic Laws
6. Reasons for the Decline of Muslims
7. Letters to Tahira
8. *Lughat ul Quran* (Dictionary of Quranic words and terms) – Volume I and II (Available from Amazon)
9. The Quranic System of Sustenance (Available from Amazon)
10. The Life in the Hereafter: What Does the Quran Say? (Available from Amazon)
11. The Status of Hadeeth in Islam. (Available from Amazon)
12. The Human Self and Allah (Available from Amazon)
13. The Human Self and *Iblees* (Available from Amazon)

These books are available free for download at:

<http://www.islamicdawn.com/>

[Parwez.tv](http://Parwez.tv)

These books are also available from:

Tolu-e-Islam

25 – B Gulberg 2

LAHORE – 54660, PAKISTAN

E mail: [tolueislam@gmail.com](mailto:tolueislam@gmail.com)

Telephone: 00 92 (0)42 35753666

## **ABOUT THE AUTHOR**

Ghulam Ahmad Parwez was born in Batala, Punjab, in British India on 9<sup>th</sup> July 1903 into a profoundly religious family. His grandfather, who was deeply religious and belonged to the Hanafi school of thought, was a renowned religious scholar who intended to make the author inherit his knowledge and religious understanding. As a consequence, his education and training was carried out under the direction of his grandfather. While he studied the traditional religious teachings, he also had the desire and inkling to question its content using his intellect and reasoning. This led to his inner conflict with the external religious environment and he continued to question the prevalent religious concepts and practices. He noticed that whatever was being taught as part of the religion was being referred to some Imam or religious scholar for authority. It was also noted in the religious literature that whatever the forefathers had followed should be obeyed without any question, and this was considered to be a requirement of Islam.

For Parwez this did not satisfy his desire to seek reason and logic in every claim and statement made within the religious literature. However, he could not express these doubts and reservations initially due to his respect for his grandfather, and the constraints of the religious environment which prevailed at the time in his town. Later, due to his employment, he moved to Lahore (now part of Pakistan), and found a degree of freedom to question some of these religious concepts and beliefs. After the death of his grandfather, he found complete freedom to pursue his line of enquiry and research into the prevalent Islamic beliefs, doctrines, ideologies and religious practices.

This led to his discovering that most of these have been acquired from others. He tried to study the Quran using the traditional religious approach but was unable to find the answers to all his doubts, which required satisfaction from a logical point of view. He also studied the life of the last messenger and the establishment of the Islamic State in the seventh century in his quest to determine the cause which contributed to this greatest revolution based on the Quran. He especially paid attention to the statement from the last messenger, 'The Quran is not a product of my thinking or that of any other human being' and that this is the message from Allah. He soon learnt the procedure to understand the Quran.

Through his contact with the famous philosopher and poet, Allama Iqbal, who had a deep interest in the Quran, Parwez concluded that to understand the Quran one has to understand three fundamentally important points:

- (1) The Quran calls itself Light (*Nur*) and a light does not need any external source or aid to make itself visible. It makes itself evident and also exposes the reality of those things which are within its domain.
- (2) The Quran is revealed in the Arabic language and to understand it correctly one needs to understand the Arabic context which was prevalent at the time of its revelation.
- (3) The Quran has guided us by saying that through *Tasreef-ul-Ayat* (through cross reference within the verses of the Quran) it makes its guidance clear e.g. (6:106).

In order to meet the second requirement regarding the precise meaning of the Arabic words in the Quran, he researched and compiled a *Lughat-ul-Quran* (now translated into English), which is a dictionary of all the words and terms used in the Quran, and which includes the meanings which were prevalent among the Arabs at the time of the revelation of the Quran. For the third requirement of *Tasreef-ul-Ayat*, the Quran is different from books written by human beings, where the latter are usually divided based on various subjects - the Quran is based on mentioning a reality in one verse or verses and then its further explanation is noted in another place or places. For example, in Surah *Al An'am* the Quran states:

*And thus do We explain the signs by various verses, so that they acknowledge  
'You have explained them', and We make the Quran clear for a people who  
know. (6:105)*

In order to meet this requirement, Parwez felt the need to compile all the verses under one subject as referred in various verses of the Quran, and he compiled a book in Urdu titled *Tabweeb-ul-Quran* (Classification of the Quran). This made it easy to refer to various subjects and look at all the verses mentioned in the Quran relating to a subject.

Along with writing and producing literature on the Quran, Parwez also held a regular weekly meeting in Lahore to deliver a *Dars* (lecture explaining the Quran) in Urdu, and these are also available as audio and video recordings. He dedicated most of his life to researching the Quran and its significance in

relation to presenting an alternative solution to human problems, and answering questions relating to human creation, its purpose and the question of death and the next life.

He also participated in the struggle for Independence during the period 1938-1947 and the creation of Pakistan, which was based on the ideology of the Quran, with a view to establishing an Islamic State for the Muslims of the sub-continent. He worked very closely with the founder of Pakistan, Muhammad Ali Jinnah (*Quaid e Azam* or Great Leader) and had regular discussions with him on various aspects of the message of the Quran. In order to support the movement for a separate State for the Muslims of India, and to counter the arguments put forward by some of the religious lobby who opposed the creation of Pakistan, he published a monthly journal called *Tolu-e-Islam* (Dawn of Islam), commencing in 1938.

Parwez joined the Indian Civil Service in the Home Department in 1927, and after the creation of Pakistan he migrated to Karachi and continued to serve in the same department till 1955, when he took early retirement and devoted the rest of his life fully to his work on the Quran. He moved to Lahore from Karachi and settled there.

He left this life on 24th February 1985 in Lahore and his body was laid to rest in Lahore.



## FOREWORD

Though man is born free, those people who somehow or other gather wealth and power into their hands, by seizing the freedom of human beings, they make them their slaves and dependent on them. The Quran was sent down so that this expropriated freedom of theirs could be returned to them. Rasul-ullah established such a society in the light of the Quran in which no man was the subject or dependent of another man, and excepting those boundaries which Allah had prescribed for mankind, the aim of which was the nourishment of the self of man and the establishment of peace and security within human society, there was no constraint imposed on anyone.

After some time, this map of society changed and wealth and power again came into human hands, as a result of which those people owning wealth and power made men their dependents and subjects: not only dependents and subjects, in fact, slaves. Consequently, history informs us that in the harems of each and every caliph there used to be thousands of concubines. In the capital, there were specific markets where human beings were auctioned; men were made slaves and women were made concubines. And the irony was this, that the religious clergy had issued a fatwa that all of this is legitimate according to '*Shariat*'<sup>1</sup>.

All this was taking place through the auspices of the ruling junta. On the other side were the custodians of *Shariat*, the state of whose authority was such that if any individual differed even slightly from them, they would declare that he has become a *Murtad* (apostate) and since the punishment for apostacy is death, he would be consigned to the sword. The pages of our history are stained with these blood-soaked accounts.

After the creation of Pakistan, when this possibility arose that Islamic laws will be implemented here, some people raised this question as to whether slavery will be introduced here, and will Muslims be killed on the basis of religious differences? In reply to this, the representative of our orthodox sector, Syed Abul Ala Maududi, wrote with great vehemence that when other laws of *Shariat* will be established here, then why would the 'commands of *Shariat*' about slavery and the killing of a *Murtad* not be implemented?

---

<sup>1</sup>*Shariat* here means as devised by man, not exclusively based on the Quran. (Ed)

In reply to these articles of his, detailed commentaries were written in Tolu-e-Islam, in which it was stated that slavery and the killing of a *Murtad* are absolutely against the teaching of the Quran, therefore, how can they be allowed in Islam? In view of the significance of these commentaries, they were later compiled in the form of a booklet and published. That booklet was unavailable for a time; consequently, following revision, it is being published again. The aim of this is to make this fact clear to those readers with a questioning and intellectual outlook: what is meant by 'Islamic Laws' according to the orthodox sector, and if these laws are implemented in Pakistan, which these people declare as 'Islamic', then what will be the state of the country and what will be our position in front of the world? It should be borne in mind that these two topics have been presented merely as examples; otherwise, the case is that most of those matters which these people declare as being 'Islamic Laws,' and because of which objections are raised against Islam on an almost daily basis, are actually contrary to the Quran.

The third article in the booklet mentioned above was about 'The Inheritance of an Orphaned Grandchild'. The decision of the 'Law of *Shariat*' of these people is that if the father of a child dies while the grandfather is alive, then this orphaned grandchild cannot receive a share of the inheritance from his grandfather. This issue was also clarified by Tolu-e-Islam: that this decision is blatantly against the Quran. By the Grace of Allah, the law of the country has accepted the right of an orphaned grandchild to a share of the inheritance. On this basis, there is no need to include this article in this booklet.

We hope that people who have vision will find these articles useful from the Islamic and human point of view. The stance of Tolu-e-Islam is that any law which is against the Quran can never be declared to be an Islamic law, and it is this very proclamation on account of which it receives so much opposition.

Salaam,

Tolu-e-Islam Trust

25 B, Gulberg II, Lahore

Lahore, June 1962

## EDITORIAL NOTE

This is an English translation of the Urdu pamphlet titled '*Qatal e Murtad, Ghulam aur Londhiyan*' authored by G. A. Parwez and published by Tolu-e-Islam, Lahore, Pakistan. Two important topics are discussed by the author which many non-Muslims enquire about, namely the position of Islam regarding the issue of apostasy, and that of slaves and concubines.

When the Quran linked the purpose of human creation to the Law of Requitil, it made it absolutely clear to man that whatever he does during his life on this planet, nothing will escape the eye of this law of Allah. If he keeps this law in mind during his life, he will always be aware of the consequences of everything he does. Since man possesses choice and intent, it soon became clear to him that this law does work in his life, but despite this, mostdisregardit. The disorder whichwe witness in the world around us is a consequence of ignoring this basiclaw, while it continues to ensure that whatever we do individually, or collectively, reaps its inescapableconsequences. Regarding this law, the Quran states:

*Allah created the heavens and the earth for just ends (Haqq), and in order that each self may find the recompense of what it has earned, and none of them be wronged.*  
(45:22)

The Quran made the following facts clear at a fundamental level:

1. Every child is deserving of respect and dignity by virtue of possessing choice and intent, and due to the fact that the universe owes its existence to the creation of man, as noted in the verse above.
2. The creation of man is for a higher purpose of life, this world being the first stage of his existence, and after his physical death, he (his self) will move on to the next stage of evolution.
3. The Quran describes the two concepts of life which man will opt for in order to live in this world, one, that his life ends with physical death, if his view is that there is nothing within him which can advance beyond this earthly life; or, two, that life at the level of his self continues on beyond this physical death, which implies that he has 'something within him' which can survive this.
4. Man has the choice to structure his earthly life based purely on the decisions of his intellect alone, and the Quran has spelled out the kind of world which will emerge as a consequence of this choice. Or he can

choose to employ his intellect within the domain of *Wabi*<sup>2</sup> (the Quran), and create an entirely new world in which he will be able to live a life free from fear and grief (2:38). The world which we witness around us is based on the creation of the human intellect alone, devoid of the light of *Wabi*, and both fear and grief encompass this life both at an individual and at a collective level from all directions.

5. The attribute of choice and intent as part of the manifestation of the human self at a fundamental level meant that man must have maximum freedom and liberty to make decisions in his earthly life. However, if he lives according to the functioning of his intellect alone, then due to the limitations of this he will remain trapped within the influences of his unchecked desires and emotions and will not be able to enjoy the maximum potential of his capacity as a human being. For this, he was provided with the guidance of *Wabi* by Allah through His designated messengers. The final guidance was completed within the Quran and passed on to mankind until the Last Day<sup>3</sup> as far as this planet is concerned.

Under the guidance of the Quran, a model Islamic welfare state based on the system of Deen was established through the hands of Rasul-ullah ﷺ<sup>4</sup> (the final messenger of Allah) and his companions during the seventh century AD, which, though it did not survive very long, presented itself as a model forever more for the rest of mankind i.e. if this could be implemented at that time, then it can be implemented again at any time if mankind wishes. Those Muslims who, after voluntarily accepting Islam, established the system of Deen at that time, witnessed the true freedom which it provided to them. However, it did not endure for long, and subsequent generations of Muslims abandoned it and did not return to the system of Deen for the next many centuries.<sup>5</sup> This model of the Islamic state eliminated slavery in all its forms, while respect and dignity for a human being was restored to the same status as that which was advocated by the Quran. All men were declared as being equal, and were willingly and joyfully treated as such within the boundaries of this state; both men and women enjoyed

---

<sup>2</sup>*Wabi* – the revelation from Allah which is now finalized and preserved in the Quran as a guidance for the whole of mankind until the end of times in this world. (Ed)

<sup>3</sup> The Last Day, both as an individual with our physical death when our eyes close permanently on this earth, and also as the Last Day of the planet itself, as the earth has a finite existence too. (Ed)

<sup>4</sup> This means 'Peace Be Upon Him', written as PBUH in abbreviated form. (Ed)

<sup>5</sup> Currently, no system of Deen exists anywhere in the world. All those countries where Muslims reside observe constitutions which are assembled by mere men at the top. (Ed)

the same freedoms within their own specific areas of responsibility. There was no fear and grief in this state, the Quran was their constitution, and the system truly recognised the Sovereignty of Allah within the boundaries of this Islamic state. Those who managed the affairs of the state accepted the following with full willingness:

- (1) Allah is the ruler of the Islamic system and His rule is established through the Quran; and since everyone is equal before Allah's law, the concept of ruler and ruled is eliminated.
- (2) Through mutual consultation they formulated sub-clauses within the bounds of the laws and values given by the Quran in order to meet the requirements of the time, but they were fully conscious of the fact that they did not have the authority to alter any of the laws and values of the Quran.<sup>6</sup>
- (3) Those at the helm of affairs enjoyed the full freedom provided to them by the Quran, i.e. they were not subjects of any man-made laws, and they enjoyed this freedom together with their fellow citizens, Muslim and non-Muslim. Since their selves had become developed to a high level of eminence<sup>7</sup>, they had no desire to have their own personal rule imposed on their fellow citizens. Any constraints that were felt by non-Muslims were not imposed externally by the state but were related to the absence of the inner psychological freedom which is associated with the guidance of *Wahi*.
- (4) The human psyche became transformed as a result of following *Wahi* and removed all false concepts of Allah. This is why no one demanded of the last messenger that we wish to see Allah with our own eyes, as previous peoples had demanded from their messengers – the reason was evidently clear. They recognised the inner reality of their self and accepted the concept of Allah as explained in the Quran which served as a model for them. The emergence of this newly created self within them was sufficient evidence of the outcome of

---

<sup>6</sup> They understood that if any change is made in any of the laws and values given by the Quran, then they will not enjoy those benefits which are associated with the Quranic system of Deen i.e. they will be deprived of Allah's *Fadh*, *Rehmat*, Knowledge, Wisdom, Power, etc. In fact, they will be committing *Shirk*, which is declared to be a supreme injustice and severe crime (against man himself) by the Quran. (Ed)

<sup>7</sup> They reflected the Divine attributes in both their conduct and character as explained in the Quran i.e. Allah served as a model for the development of their selves, and this concept 'occupied' their consciousness completely. For further details, see the book, *The Human Self and Allah*, by the author. (Ed)

following the guidance of the Quran. They could see clearly through their newly created vision that which Allah wished them to see in the light of His Book. Each citizen who wholeheartedly opted to become a Muslim recognised his own significance as a creation of Allah. Having reached this level of development of the self, they fully appreciated the significance of human freedom both as a physical being and psychologically, and never thought to subjugate their fellow human beings, men or women. This was the reason why slavery in all its forms vanished from the society within just one generation.

However, those who subsequently usurped power, or who let power slip away, instead of living under the Sovereignty of Allah, they replaced it with human rule. They failed to appreciate their freedom under Allah's Sovereignty, and thus reintroduced the enslavement of human beings, the elimination of which was (and is) one of the aims of the Quran. The situation gradually went from bad to worse, and humanity sank once again into a deep quagmire of darkness as *Malukiyat*<sup>8</sup> established an iron grip on human affairs in those lands which were occupied by these Muslims. The Quran was put aside, and all the bounties associated with its guidance vanished; human beings debased themselves to the sub-human level, and subsequent generations lost sight of it completely, and this age of darkness continues to prevail in the world today. As happens under such circumstances, men produced all kinds of writings to justify evil in order to satisfy their base desires and emotions, and since they found it hard to convince the public at large in the presence of the Quran, they concocted *Ahadeeth*<sup>9</sup> two to three hundred years after the death of Rasul-ullah and attributed these to him. With the passage of time, these attributions became embedded within the beliefs of the Muslims and were commonly accepted as being the sayings of Rasul-ullah, while the Quran took a back seat and remained as a Book which was only to be read in order to gain some kind of abstract '*Sawab*' through the blind recital of its words without any kind of true comprehension whatsoever. This resulted in the 'death' of Muslims as a whole, those who had once upon a time acquired a 'new life' through the guidance of the Quran.

Though this book deals specifically with the issues of apostasy, slavery and concubines as documented and propagated in books promoting sectarian religious Islam, readers can extrapolate its points and apply them to all manner of slavery

---

<sup>8</sup>*Malukiyat* – dictatorship. (Ed)

<sup>9</sup> For more details on the origins of *Ahadeeth*, see the book, *The Status of Hadeeth in Islam*, by the author. (Ed)

which continues to exist under various cloaks throughout the world. Some of these are visible while others are more insidious, and can be imposed both externally or internally, by man upon man, and by groups of men upon the population at large. For example, economic slavery, in which people live in perpetual financial hardship (and dread of poverty), and which is created by the capitalist system of the world, and as a consequence of which most of humanity is never able to exercise their choice and intent even at the lowest level of their existence. The irony is that though there are major campaigns concerning issues such as global warming, little action is taken on remedying poverty and economic slavery. It appears to be of greater concern to these campaigners to try and save humanity from drowning at some point of time in the future due to melting ice caps, rising sea levels, and floods caused by apparent rising temperatures on the planet, than it is to address the current daily privations resulting from unremitting poverty. Other forms of slavery are self-imposed by man as a result of different religious belief systems e.g. fatalism (*Qismat*), superstitions, divisions of race, class, and caste, etc. Another kind of widespread slavery or mental subjugation is via nationalism, where people genuinely believe that patriotism defines the identity of their self. The irony is that when those same people change their nationality,<sup>10</sup> they embrace their newly acquired patriotism as a fresh identity with great ease – the same human being acquires a new self by assuming a different sense of identity. A similar type of slavery is a self-imposed political belief system. An individual allies himself with a certain political party and then sells his soul to the leader and the objectives of this party. Under the banner of party loyalty, he supports the party manifesto, some of which he may agree with, but other parts of which may include clauses which are tantamount to giving up personal freedoms. But in the name of allegiance he votes for it, and if the party comes into power, then he indirectly applies more chains around his own neck and proceeds to lose even more of his already strangled freedoms. The proof for this can be seen worldwide in the divisions caused by this democracy, with endless debates, discussions, radio shows, news articles, etc. which throw light on the internal divisions among the population. But no one addresses this question – what is the

---

<sup>10</sup> The Quran declares mankind to be one community (2:213) and the creation of nation states and borders is against this value. When man first appeared on this earth, there were no borders; he could live a free and joyful life, going anywhere and making use of its produce freely, and was advised to make use of the earth for the good of everyone, so that no one goes without food, drink, shelter, etc. However, he decided to draw boundary lines and claim ownership of something which did not belong to him, and which he had received freely; then he started to buy and sell land despite knowing that he is going to die one day and will be leaving it all behind. For further details, refer to the book, *The Quranic System of Sustenance*, by the author. (Ed)

purpose of human creation, why do we exist in this world for only a finite duration, and why do we eventually die?

From the above, let us examine these forms of slavery through an example. An individual who is born into a Muslim household will firstly hold the beliefs of the sect of Islam of that household; then he will acquire his nationalistic identity; he will then affiliate himself with a particular party and leader, and can change these loyalties if he wishes depending on the political conditions of his country; he will venerate many human models of his own choice, or as presented by the society and culture as he progresses through life – these will all form part of his belief system, and create a cognitive dissonance impacting his psyche and decision making powers. In this whole confusion of beliefs there is nothing about the creation of a new self which is based on the Permanent Values and the life in the hereafter. He will remain enslaved to these beliefs (either imposed on him or acquired through choice), thinking these to be true since others around him are following the same pattern; most will never question this condition and may not even be fully conscious of it. Living life like this, bound by these chains: is this the purpose of life? Is this the freedom which man deserves, when there is another life waiting for him in the hereafter?

Those who enslaved themselves over and above the chains placed on them by the elite of the political system, failed to comprehend or appreciate the freedom which the Quran offered them, and as a consequence fabricated such *Abadeeth* which brought back that slavery (and punishment for apostasy) which the Quran had arrived to eliminate (and which had been eliminated in the earlier era of Rasul-ullah). The religious clergy acquired the power to declare *Fatwas* on the citizens and through these subjugated them using coercion and compulsion. This severely curtailed free thought, so that hardly any intellectual development took place during this period, despite possessing the Quran: that same Quran which continuously addresses the human intellect to help it to expand its horizons to ever greater expanses, so that man becomes aware of the significance of his own reality within the universe, and even beyond this.

The books of G.A. Parwez throw light on various aspects of the Quranic system of Deen and the importance of the role of a human being in establishing this system according to the demands of the time, so that man can develop his understanding and recognise his role as a junior companion in the universe partaking in Allah's creation in order to achieve true freedom. Man takes over that part of His creation where Allah has given him free reign, so that he can change the face of the earth physically, as well as intellectually, and can achieve great enhancements in consciousness which he could never otherwise have achieved without the light of *Wabi*.

Even without the light of the Quran, man is still aware of his freedom to choose, particularly those who are not constrained by 'slavery' as imposed through religious beliefs. They assume that once the human body meets death there is no possibility of another life in the hereafter – with the death of the physical body, man is dead. We see around us how man has changed the face of the earth through research and innovations in science and technology. Those of us who come to grips with the concept of the possibility of creating a new self through the acceptance of *Eimaan*, open themselves to the realm of a new inner reality where they can use this new technology for the good of the whole of mankind, in order to usher in a new era in the world which is free from the shadow of fear and grief. It is not just some Utopian concept of human life, but it is going to become a reality at some point in the future (9:33).

Human life which is lived under layers self-imposed erroneous beliefs and then further subjected to the slavery of man-made laws imposed by those who themselves do not know the purpose of life, is akin to living in darkness upon darkness. The Quran states:

*Or (the state of those who manifest Kufr) is like the depths of darkness in a vast deep ocean, overwhelmed with billow topped by billow, topped by (dark) clouds: depths of darkness, one above another... (24:40)*

The literature (including *Abadeeth*) which has been written by those who were the product of the system of *Malukiyat*, and who never understood the significance of the Quran as a complete Book of guidance, is a production of whatever their intellect housed as a belief system in their own era and conformed to whatever was existing at that time. Even today, if we look at the literature around the world, we will mostly see a reflection of the environment in which those writers are brought up. In his book, *The Human Self and Iblees*, Parwez has written about the thought process of Rasul-ullah, who, despite being born in a restrictive environment, questioned the issues facing mankind:

*Just ponder that in this environment, from the ignorant and savage land of Arabia, a human being stands up. As has been noted previously, he should have been the same as the people around him, and even if his intellectual level is assumed to be higher than the people around him, then at the very most he could have been declared to be a wise man of that civilised world. And what the condition was of the civilised world of that era has been discussed above.*

*But that individual rises and raises the flag of rebellion against every single one of those aspects of that structure of life which was declared as being precisely in accordance with nature by the civilisation and culture, and knowledge and wisdom of*

that era. He becomes introduced as the claimant of such a revolution in which the very foundations of this structure of lies are uprooted and cast aside. He declares *Malukiyat* to be the worst curse of Allah; superstition is stated to be contrary to human dignity and he pronounces priesthood to be a saintly 'veil' of self-deception; the division of caste and creed is counted as among the tyranny of Pharaonic powers. According to him, the capitalist system is such a leprosy which has filled the body of humanity with fatal germs. His soul shivers at the thought of slavery. His proclamation about nationalism is that man acquires the form of bloodthirsty beasts as a consequence of this. He rises up, and calling on the whole world, proclaims that no human being has the right to rule over another human being. He states that the connection of man with Allah is direct; for this, there is no need for any intermediate medium of priesthood.<sup>11</sup> He announces that the criterion for human eminence and dignity, and status and righteousness, is his character and deeds, the foundation of which is on *Eimaan*. No man has priority and superiority over another human being by virtue of birth. He states that capitalism is nothing more than that a few men, by acquiring power, have usurped the rights of weak and helpless human beings. Hence, the demand of justice and accountability is that these usurped rights are snatched back from the hands of these usurpers and returned to the rightful claimants. He declares accumulation and hoarding to be a severe crime in the economic system and announces that the circulation of wealth should not be in such a way that it remains circulating within one particular category. He states that man as simply being a human being is in itself a reason for respect for him, hence, even the very notion of slavery among human beings cannot arise. By shattering all tribal and national prejudices, he makes the announcement of this supreme revolution that the whole of mankind is one as a result of its origin, therefore all people on the face of the earth are members of one universal brotherhood and are branches of one high and mighty tree. The creation of differentiation and differences in them through the unnatural barriers of race, colour, language, and nationhood, is the breaking into pieces of the body of humanity. So much so, that he makes a proclamation against all the non-natural laws and constitutions of human life (individual and collective) and not only does he make a proclamation, but also by generating a revolution, demonstrates what is the true significance of human life.<sup>12</sup>

This is how the human intellect grasps the reality of human creation through the light of *Wahi*, and matters which would have remained hidden from us otherwise, become evident when we use the light of the Quran. Those who do

---

<sup>11</sup> This is a statement of fact as the Quran states '...He is with you wherever you may be...' (57:4). (Ed)

<sup>12</sup> G.A. Parwez, *The Human Self and Iblees*, Chapter 9.

not apply their intellect according to the light of *Wahican* nevercomprehendthe true significance of the possession of choice and intent, and cannot visualise life in the hereafter as a reality. Religious emotive beliefs can provide some kind of concept of a hereafter, but it is not based on fact and is thus flawed and deceptive. This is the reason whythe concept of the hereafter which exists in even the three Abrahamic religions is at variance with each other, as is the concept of God. Parwez provides a detailed discussion on this aspect in his book titled,*The Human Self and Allah*.

The Quran arrived to eliminate all kinds of slavery, whether physical or psychological, and declared that each human child, by virtue of possessing choice and intent, has dignity and respect which is inviolable. Even if he commits a crime, he as a human being, and must be treated with respect and dignity while being punished for the crime, and this includes offeringhim opportunities to reform himself. The Quran proclaims that human beings are created for alofty purpose,they are born free and must remain free. And this is not a Utopian idea but achievable during our finite earthly life: simply alter thinking by bringing the intellect within the guidance of the light of the Quran, and the reality of the purpose of creation and of existence itself will become manifestly clear. The Quran states that this is bound to take place:

*Soon will We show them Our signs in the universe, and in their own selves, until it becomes manifest to them that this is the Truth. Is it not enough that your Rabb<sup>13</sup> does witness all things? (41:53)*

I wish to thank and acknowledge the support provided by Hussain Kaisrani of Tolu-e-Islam Trust, Lahore, Saleem Khan of Idara Tolu-e-Islam, Lahore, and Asif Jalil from Bazm Tolu-e-Islam, Karachi. I am also grateful to Dr. Hamid Mian from New York for suggesting the title for this booklet.

Finally, this work is a translation and as such any ambiguity in the text in the English version which is not present in the Urdu version, is my responsibility as a translator and editor, and not of the original author. If readers have any questions or comments after reading this work, they are welcome to contact Tolu-e-Islam.

*Dr. Ejaz Rasool*

---

<sup>13</sup>*Rabb* – this Divine attribute encompasses sustenance and nourishment of all the creations of the universe, which is required for their development from beginning to end. (Ed)

Glasgow, UK

February 2021

## Table of Contents

List of Other Works in English by the Author.....	4
ABOUT THE AUTHOR.....	5
FOREWORD.....	9
EDITORIAL NOTE.....	11
1 Execution of a <i>Murtad</i> (Apostate).....	25
1.1 Human Free Will and Intent.....	25
1.2 There is No Compulsion in <i>Eimaan</i> and <i>Kufr</i> .....	26
1.3 Not Even Miracles.....	28
1.4 There is No Coercion.....	29
1.5 Coercion is not Permitted Even in a War Situation.....	30
1.6 There is No Compulsion in Deen.....	31
1.7 The Religion of the Mullah ( <i>Maulvi</i> ).....	32
1.8 The Declarations of Syed Abul Ala Maududi.....	32
1.8.1 Proof from the Quran for the Command to Execute a <i>Murtad</i> ..	33
1.8.2 The Quranic Proof Presented by Maududi.....	33
1.9 The Correct Meaning of the Verse.....	35
1.10 Not the Quran But Narrations and <i>Fiqah</i> .....	38
1.11 The Quran Has Not Even Declared <i>Irt'daad</i> as a Crime!.....	39
1.12 <i>Tafsir</i> of <i>La-Ikrab-fid-Deen</i> (No Compulsion in Deen).....	40
1.13 Explanations of the Quran About <i>Murtad</i> .....	40
1.14 The Clear Verdict of the Quran.....	44
1.15 <i>Irt'daad</i> is Not Even a Crime, So How Can There be a Punishment?.....	45
1.16 The Authority for Continuity.....	46
1.17 <i>Abadeeth</i> and the Execution of a <i>Murtad</i> .....	47
1.18 One Interesting <i>Hadeeth</i> .....	48
1.19 The Conduct of the Companions.....	50
1.20 The Right of non-Muslims to Preach under Islamic Rule.....	51
1.21 A Similar Issue.....	52
1.22 Intellectual Arguments for Execution of a <i>Murtad</i> .....	53

1.23	The Response to These Objections .....	54
1.24	Analysis of this Reply .....	54
1.25	The Rights of Minorities .....	55
1.26	Difference between a <i>Kafir</i> and a <i>Murtad</i> .....	56
1.27	Reply to the Second Objection.....	58
1.28	The Reply to the Third Objection.....	59
1.29	The Reply to the Fourth Objection .....	60
1.30	What Will Happen to a Muslim by Birth?.....	61
1.31	The Use of Force .....	63
1.32	US and UK Law .....	63
1.33	The Idol of the State .....	65
1.34	Use of Force .....	65
1.35	But the Right to Use Force is Only . . . ..	67
1.36	Why Were <i>Abadeeth</i> About Killing a <i>Murtad</i> Invented?.....	68
1.37	<i>Malukiyat</i> and Priesthood.....	68
1.38	The Quranic Revolution.....	69
1.39	Heartfelt Obedience .....	71
1.40	Punishment for Treason .....	73
1.41	Difference Between a <i>Murtad</i> and a Traitor.....	73
1.42	Then What Happened? .....	74
1.43	Who is a <i>Murtad</i> ? .....	75
1.44	Rivers of Innocent Blood .....	76
1.45	The Biggest Loss of All.....	78
1.46	Concluding Remarks .....	79
1.46.1	One Clarification .....	80
2	Slaves and Concubines .....	82
2.1	Teaching of Quranic Islam.....	82
2.2	Two Stages Were in Front of the Quran.....	83
2.3	The Door is Closed for the Future .....	84
2.4	The Religion of the Mullah .....	85

2.5	A Contradictory Narrative.....	87
2.6	The Command of <i>Ihsan</i> is Not in the Quran.....	89
2.7	How Does the World Solve This Issue? .....	89
2.8	These Commands are Still Applicable .....	91
2.9	Arguments in Favour of Slavery.....	92
2.10	Supreme <i>Ihsan</i> on Women.....	93
2.11	No Need for <i>Nikab</i> .....	94
2.12	There is No Defined Limit!.....	96
2.13	Mental Perversion.....	97
2.14	Selling of Concubines.....	99
2.15	And if non-Muslims Also Practice This? .....	100
2.16	The Objection .....	101
2.17	Now Hold Your Breath.....	102
2.18	The <i>Abadeeth</i> of <i>Sabih</i> Bukhari .....	104
2.19	Review .....	105

***The Quranic Perspective on  
Apostasy, Slavery and Concubines***

---

# 1 Execution of a *Murtad* (Apostate)

## *(ABlood-soaked Scene of the Battleground of ‘Divine Rule’)*

The Quran has informed us about a fundamental distinction between the things of the universe and man. It states that the things of the universe are constrained to live their life according to a well-defined law. They have absolutely no choice in this matter such that, if they wish, they can keep functioning according to this law, and if they wish, they can follow some other path. Water does not have the choice that sometimes it should flow down a slope, or sometimes if it so wishes, it can begin to flow upwards. Fire does not have this permission that sometimes it should provide heat and sometimes it can transmit cold. If the earth ever moves even an inch away from its path, if the sun creates even a momentary change in its movement, if the winds change their direction contrary to their established pattern, so much so that if even the tiniest part of this marvelous machinery of the universe goes against its configuration, then this phenomenal and elegant system of the universe will become disordered and chaotic. Life and its possibilities are secured on this basis that everything in the outer universe is operating according to a precise law. Whatever is in the highs and lows of the universe, it is all meticulously operating according to the law of Allah. Every single thing is prostrated before His command, none has the ability to disobey or rebel against His law.

### 1.1 Human Free Will and Intent

As far as the code of life is concerned, man, too, has been given the law of guidance as with other things of the universe. But (and this but is very important) together with this, man has also been given the authority that if he wishes he can live his life according to this code, and if he wishes, he can leave it and adopt some other path. At the same time that ‘Adam’ was sent to this ‘world’, he was informed that:

*...when guidance comes from Me to you, then whosoever follows My law of guidance, on them shall be no fear, nor shall they grieve.<sup>14</sup> (2:38)*

---

<sup>14</sup>Note that the eradication of fear and grief is inherent in following this guidance. (Ed)

Contrary to this:

*But those people who reject this guidance, they shall be Companions of the Fire; They shall abide therein. (2:39)*

These two paths are crystal clear. After this, there is no compulsion on man as to which path he selects. The Quran states:

*And shown him the two paths. (90:10)*

He has been endowed with consciousness and reliable senses (76:2), he has been shown the path (76:3) and after this:

*...if he wishes he can adopt it, or if he wishes, he can reject it. (76:3)*

In this regard there is no compulsion on him, no intimidation, no coercion.

## **1.2 There is No Compulsion in *Eimaan* and *Kufr***

In Quranic terminology, adoption of the path which is in accordance with the Divine code is called *Eimaan*, and a path of life contrary to this is called *Kufr*. In order to live life in accordance with *Eimaan*, the code of *Eimaan* has its own requirements. Compliance with these disciplines will be mandatory for whoever adopts this path. But there is no compulsion regarding whether man opts to live life according to the code of *Eimaan*, or according to the code of *Kufr*. In other words, man possesses full authority in whether he opts for *Eimaan* or *Kufr* i.e. in the matter of *Eimaan* and *Kufr*, there can be no pressure applied on man. This is the clear, evident, and unambiguous decision of the Quran. It states:

*Say to them! that Haqq has come to you (clear and evident) from Your Rabb: Now whoever wishes can accept Eimaan, and whoever wishes can adopt Kufr. . . (18:29)*

'Whoever wishes can accept *Eimaan*, and whoever wishes can accept *Kufr*' is the decision from on high of the code of the Quran, on the foundation of which the whole structure of its teaching is erected. The one who adopts the path of *Eimaan* will prosper from the bounties and blessings of this Divine system, and the one who treads on the path counter to it will face its consequences and woes. The Quran states:

*... Whoever follows the path of guidance, benefits his own self: but he that strays, injures his own self. . . (39:41)*

The Quran states that if it was the aim to force human beings to follow a particular path (code of guidance), then by suspending their free will and intent Allah could also have created them just like the other things of the universe, which are compelled to live life according to this law. There was nothing difficult in this for Allah, but the Divine *Mashe'at* did not do it like this. His programme was in fact this: that man should be endowed with the freedom to choose and intent. To provide him with free will and intent, and to then constrain him to a particular path, does not suit Allah.<sup>15</sup> This is why Allah stated to Rasul-ullah<sup>16</sup> himself that if you desire that all the people are compelled to become Muslims, then this thing is against the *Mashe'at* of Allah. If this was His intention that human beings should be forced to become *Momineen*, then He would never have even endowed them with free will and intent:<sup>17</sup>

*If it had been in the Mashe'at of Your Rabb, then all the inhabitants on the face of the earth would have accepted Eimaan (but Allah did not create them bound in this way). Will you then compel mankind against their will to have Eimaan? (10:99)*

In the matter of *Kufr* and *Eimaan*, there can be absolutely no compulsion. There is no allowance whatsoever in this for intimidation and coercion. Allah has bestowed man with eyes and has spread the light of the sun outside everywhere. Now whoever wishes can tread carefully with eyes open, and whoever wishes can fall into a well by closing his eyes:

*(Say to them!) Illuminated signs have reached you from Your Rabb, so whoever makes use of his eyes in this light, the benefit of this will reach him, And whoever walks around with eyes closed, the loss will be his alone. I am not appointed as a guardian on you (to compel you to tread on one particular path). (6:104)*

A little later it is stated:

*And if Allah had so wished these people would not have committed Shirk, And We have neither appointed you to be a guardian over them, nor are you their disposer of affairs. (6:107)*

---

<sup>15</sup> Those who wish to control the freedom of their fellow human beings do not fully grasp this important element in the creation of man, that each self is held accountable for his deeds in this life (45:22). Anyone curtailing this right to freedom is essentially opposing the purpose of human creation. (Ed)

<sup>16</sup> The last messenger of Allah, Muhammad PBUH. (Ed)

<sup>17</sup> Since all animals follow their inbuilt instincts (which are pre-programmed), they are not accountable for what they do in the world and consequently have no life in the hereafter. (Ed)

In his *Tafsir* (exposition) called *Tafbeem ul Quran*, Syed Abul Ala Maududi<sup>18</sup> (further details about whom will appear later) writes below this verse:

*The meaning is this: that you are sent as a preacher and messenger, and not as a warden. Your task is only to present this light before the people and to expend your fullest abilities within your limitations in the proclamation of Haqq. Now if someone does not accept this Haqq, then let him be. You are neither appointed for this that you must make the people followers of Haqq, and nor is it included within your responsibility and accountability that no one should remain on the path of Batil within your sphere of Nabuwat<sup>19</sup>... If this had indeed been the requirement of Divine Wisdom that no human being in the world should remain a follower of Batil, then where was the need for Allah to have this task accomplished by you? Could not His One Divine signal have made all human beings followers of Haqq?<sup>20,21</sup>*

### 1.3 Not Even Miracles

The fact is that the Quran has presented such a pattern of life in this regard which holds the status of a landmark in the history of mankind. It states that when the human intellect was in its era of infancy, at that time, too, such situations used to arise when attempts would be made to draw him towards the right path by inducing a state of amazement in him i.e. an endeavour to make him accept something by making it appear different from normality (or miracles). But it states that now that man has reached his era of consciousness, he will not be made to accept anything through miracles. Now, everything will be made to be accepted through evidence and logic, and intellect and wisdom. Therefore, Rasul-ullah is addressed:

---

<sup>18</sup> Syed Abul Ala Maududi (1903-1979) was a leading religious figure from Indo-Pakistan who headed a religious political party called *Jamaat e Islami* which is politically still active in Pakistan. He was a prolific writer, and has published numerous books on various topics of the traditional Sunni version of Islam. He also wrote an exegesis (*Tafsir*) of the Quran titled *Tafbeem ul Quran*. His work is widely quoted in the religious context across the world. Parwez has used his literature in this booklet to discuss this issue as it represents the core sectarian viewpoint of prevalent religious Islam. (Ed)

<sup>19</sup> *Nabuwat* – messengerhood i.e. the role of receiving *Wahi* from Allah in the capacity of a *Nabi*, and then passing this message on to the people as a *Rasul*. (Ed)

<sup>20</sup> *Tafbeem ul Quran*, p 570

<sup>21</sup> Look at these explanations closely as these will become a point of discussion later.

*You may perhaps fret yourself with grief, that why do these people not accept Eimaan.  
If such were Our Will, We could send down to them from the heavens a Sign to  
which they would bend their necks in humility. (26:3-4)*

But this would have been brainwashing, hence, the Quran declared in clear terms that Rasul-ullah was not provided with any visible miracle. Now the era of miracles has come to an end,<sup>22</sup> now the evidence for every proclamation will be presented through reasoning and logic, now the invitation to Allah will be based on evidence and vision:

*Say to them! This is my path; I do invite you to Allah on evidence clear as the seeing  
with one's eyes, I and whoever follows me. (12:108)*

#### **1.4 There is No Coercion**

Our invitation is that of reason and reflection, an invitation to think and contemplate. Our appeal is to intellect and vision, understanding and rationality; there is no inclusion in this of any kind of coercion and compulsion. In the matter of *Eimaan* there will not be an iota of intellectual indoctrination, nor anything related to physical force. In the matter of *Kufr* and *Eimaan*, the Quran declares the use of physical force (oppression) to be a severe crime against humanity. Therefore, in the charge which is levied against the Pharaoh of Egypt by the Quran, it is proclaimed very clearly that the leader of this band of tyrants employed intimidation in the matter of *Kufr* and *Eimaan*. Thus, when the magicians of his court accepted *Eimaan* in Moses, he bellowed in a thundering voice:

*... Will you accept Eimaan on him before I give you my permission? (7:123)*

In the matter of *Kufr* and *Eimaan*, you have considered your own decision to be the final decision, and have not considered what my will is in this regard? Fine! You will now find out what the outcome of this will be (26:49). Then Pharaoh declared:

---

<sup>22</sup> Details of this are given in the book, *Miraj e Insaniyat*, by G.A. Parwez, in the chapter on *Mojizaat* (miracles).

*I will put chains on your opposite hands and feet<sup>23</sup> (or have these amputated) and after that will have you all hanged. (26:49)*

This was that Pharaonic command which the Quran has numbered among the list of his severe crimes. And this was not just confined to only one Pharaoh of Egypt, all the Pharaohs of their times, and *Nimrud*<sup>24</sup> of every era, used to do this during their own reigns.<sup>25</sup> The people of Shoaib had said the same thing to Shoaib: that you will have to return to our religion or else ‘we will turn you and your companions out of our village’:

*...Or you will have to return to our Millat (ways and religion)... (7:88)*

This technique was adopted against every messenger:

*Those professing Kufr said to their messengers: ‘Be sure that either we will turn you out of our land or you will have to return to our religion... (14:13)*

In other words, if you wish to live here then return to our religion once again, and if you do not do this, then we will not let you live here.<sup>26</sup>

By assigning to this crime a prominent status in the list of crimes of former nations, the Quran has made it clear that in the matter of *Kufr* and *Eimaan*, coercion and compulsion are the worst of all crimes against humanity. This is because Allah has bestowed free choice and intent in this regard. To now remove this free choice and intent of his is an open rebellion against this decision of Allah, and is a restriction and suppression of human eminence. It has placed emphasis to such a degree in this regard, that:

*If (in the situation of war) one among these Mushrikeen asks for your protection then grant it to him, so that he may hear Allah’s message; And then escort him to where he can be secure. This is because these people do not have knowledge of the truth. (9:6)*

## **1.5 Coercion is not Permitted Even in a War Situation**

---

<sup>23</sup> The meaning of *Qatta Yad* (literal translation is cutting hands) can also mean to stop the hands (handcuffing) from doing something.

<sup>24</sup> *Nimrud* is quoted in the Quran as being a tyrant who was confronted by Abraham (2:258). (Ed)

<sup>25</sup> It is still continuing under different veils when voices of dissent are silenced using various means by those in power. (Ed)

<sup>26</sup> This is still being practiced in every country and nation, where those who oppose the political system and its beliefs and values, are threatened with deportation and imprisonment. Some are even kidnapped, tortured and killed. (Ed)

In other words, do not force anyone to become a Muslim even during a state of war. Narrate the Quran to the *Mushrik*, then take him safely to his place of peace and residence, and in this way give him space so that he can reflect on what you have narrated to him (of the Quran), and if, after that his heart becomes inclined, so that he may accept *Eimaan*. Without knowledge and reasoning, nothing is gained from the acceptance of *Eimaan* because the relationship of *Eimaan* is totally with the human heart. Until the time that the human heart is not satisfied, *Eimaan* cannot enter anywhere into it.<sup>27</sup> For this reason, the Quran also clearly announces to those people who entered the *Jamaat* of the Muslims after having become influenced by their victories, desist from calling yourselves *Momineen*:

*This is because Eimaan has not yet entered your hearts. (49:14)*

And whether it is *Kufr* or *Eimaan*, its association is with the depths of the heart: until the time that this acceptance does not emerge from the depths of the heart, it simply cannot be called acceptance.

This is the same reason why they are told that if an individual is coerced into acceptance of *Kufr* while his heart is, in fact, convinced on *Eimaan*, then this kind of apparent outward acceptance of *Kufr* by him does not make him a *Kafir*:

*... Whoever is compelled to Kufr whereas his heart is content with Eimaan, he does not become a Kafir... (16:106)*

## **1.6 There is No Compulsion in Deen**

Thus the Quran has written the words in *Nur* (light) on the skies of the world that:

*In the matter of Deen, no kind of compulsion is legitimate; righteousness and evil have been made distinctly clear from each other... (2:256)*

---

<sup>27</sup> This is an important point which merits attention. Allah creates continuously and has created the universe which we witness all around us. The creation of Adam (man) is the beginning of a new mode of creation in which Allah has, through His Own choice, given free will and intent to man, and provided him with two options: either live life under the obedience of his own desires, or bring these desires under the wing of Allah's *Wahi* (the Revelation). The Quran explains the two paths clearly. The face of the earth has been transformed through the functioning of this free will and intent of man in this life. Those who choose to follow the path of *Wahi* will change the face of the world of the hereafter as well. Those who do not choose the path of *Eimaan* and righteous deeds will not be able to develop further in the hereafter. For further details see the book, *What is Islam?*, by the author. (Ed)

Whoever wishes can adopt *Eimaan*, and whoever wishes can tread on the path of *Kufr*. You are not appointed as a guardian over them, that you should make them Muslims by force.

This is the teaching of the Quran in which there is no ambiguity, there is not any kind of confusion, there is no complexity, nowhere is there an iota of doubt or suspicion.

## 1.7 The Religion of the Mullah (*Maulvi*)

But in opposition to this clear and evident teaching of the Quran, the religion of our *Maulvi* is that:

*The individual who changes his Deen, execute him.* (Narration i.e. *Hadeeth*)

And regarding this religion, the leader of *Jamaat e Islami*, Syed Abul Ala Maududi, states that this has remained as a unified theme for the Ummah for a full twelve hundred years. Upon which he writes in *The Punishment of a Murtad in Islamic Law*<sup>28</sup>:

*This matter is not concealed from anyone acquainted with Islamic law, that in Islam the punishment for the individual who returns to *Kufr* after being a Muslim is execution. The first doubt regarding this which arose in a Muslim was the dark thought in the latter part of the nineteenth century, otherwise, prior to this, for a full twelve hundred years this was the unanimously agreed tenet of the whole Ummah; and our whole literature on Deen is witness to this, that in the matter of executing a Murtad, two differing opinions were never found among Muslims.*<sup>29</sup>

## 1.8 The Declarations of Syed Abul Ala Maududi

In other words, according to Maududi, in the matter of Deen the declaration of the Quran that ‘there is no compulsion in Deen’ is the outcome of a ‘dark thought’ in the latter period of the nineteenth century, and the ‘Pharaonic command’ to hang someone (Allah forbid) who changes his Deen is a reminder of the enlightened era of Islam.

---

<sup>28</sup> English translation of the Urdu title of his book, *Murtad ki Saza, Islami Qanoon Main*.

<sup>29</sup> S.A. Maududi, *Murtad ki Saza, Islami Qanoon Main*, p 7

In the previous pages you have observed in detail the fundamental teaching which the Quran has set forth in the matter of *Kufr* and *Eimaan*. It does not tolerate even the slightest coercion and pressure in this matter, never mind consigning the one who decides to change his Deen to the sword. But Maududi has introduced his ‘research’ with the following title.<sup>30</sup>

### **1.8.1 Proof from the Quran for the Command to Execute a *Murtad***

Any individual who acknowledges the Quran to be an authority in Deen, will most certainly be taken aback on seeing this topic, because on the one hand he will have seen with what great clarity the Quran explains that there is no kind of compulsion in the matter of Deen, and on the other hand, this topic indicates to him that the Quran decrees the command for the execution of a *Murtad*. As a consequence, this point is indeed one that deserves close reflection and analysis. Maududi informs us:

*Because of the lack of means of communication, in order to satisfy those people who hold this doubt in their hearts that in Islam the punishment of a Murtad may not be execution, and that later ‘Maulvis’ may have introduced this matter into this Deen of their own accord, I will present the proof for this briefly.<sup>31</sup>*

We will explore this issue a little later, for what purpose the ‘*Maulvis*’ invented the command for the killing of a *Murtad*, despite such clear teaching of the Quran, and for what reason this was added into Islam. For the time being let us just note what proof Maududi puts forward in this respect from the Quran – note and then lament his audacity and ignorance.

### **1.8.2 The Quranic Proof Presented by Maududi**

He states that it is Allah’s decree in the Quran that (in his words):

*Then if they repent (from Kufr) and establish Namaz and give Zakat, they are your brothers in Deen. We are explaining Our Commands clearly for those people who have knowledge. But if after making a commitment (i.e. a commitment to accept*

---

<sup>30</sup>S.A. Maududi, *Hukam e Qatal e Murtad Ka Sabut Quran Say* (Proof from the Quran for the command to execute an apostate).

<sup>31</sup>S.A. Maududi, *Ibid*, p 9.

*Islam), they break their oaths and resort to profanity against your Deen, then fight against the leaders of Kufr; because there can be no trust in their oaths; that thus they may be restrained. (9:11-12)*

Maududi presents only this one verse from the Quran. He has not presented any other verse as evidence in support of his claim. The translation given above of the verse is also from him. Now let us also hear the *Tafsir* of this from his own lips. He states:

*The connection in which this verse in Surah At-Tauba was revealed is that in the year Nine Hijra, on the occasion of Hajj, Allah had given the command for the proclamation of Bar'at. The purpose of this proclamation was that those people who up until now have been fighting against Allah and Rasul-ullah, and have been trying to obstruct the path of Allah's Deen by all kinds of injustices and transgressions, are now to be given a reprieve for a maximum of four months. During this period they should ponder over their situation – if they want to accept Islam, then accept Islam and they will be forgiven. If they want to escape by leaving the country, then they should leave. During the defined period of reprieve, no difficulty will be created for them. After this, those remaining people who have neither accepted Islam, nor have left the country, will be dealt with by the sword. In this connection it was declared that 'if after repenting they become zealous in Namaz and Zakat, then they are your brothers in Deen, but if following this they again break their commitment, there will be battle with the leaders of Kufr'. Here, the breaching of a commitment cannot be taken in any way to mean a contravention of political agreements, but the context of the text clearly establishes that this means a 'turning away from Islam', and after this the meaning of 'Fa Qatilu A'imma tul Kufr' can mean nothing other than to fight with the leaders of the movement of Irt'daad (apostasy).<sup>32</sup>*

When Maududi will have explained the *Tafsir* of the above noted verse to a gathering of his followers, they must certainly have been jubilant, and the following kinds of appreciations must have been subsequently heard in the air:

*First one – Behold! What an exceptional point has been expounded today by His Holiness. We used to recite this verse daily and pass on, and our minds never thought of this, that the command for the killing of a Murtad can also be deduced from this.*

---

<sup>32</sup> S.A. Maududi, *Ibid*, pp 9-10.

*Second one – Yes sir, leaving us to one side, for thirteen hundred years Muslims have been reading this verse, hundreds of Tafasir have been written, until today we have not perceived this point anywhere. SubhanAllah! SubhanAllah!!*

*Third one – Brother, these matters are not acquired through books. For this, it is essential for someone to be able to understand the Will of Allah and His messenger. These things are perceived through hidden knowledge (Ilm ul Dunni) and are not in the fortunes of everyone.<sup>33</sup>*

But move away a little from the congregation of these courtiers, and reflect in the light of intellect and reason that is it in any way possible that this verse can be accorded these meanings! This verse was revealed at that time when the Quranic state, whose foundation was laid twenty-two years previously through the righteous hands of Rasul-ullah in the same land (in conditions of extremely limited means), was nearing the process of completion. It is obvious that both Muslims and non-Muslims would have been residing in that Islamic state. Though there was no need to have a covenant with the Muslims, since this state was established through their own hands, however, it is necessary to form an agreement with non-Muslims that they will live within the boundary of the state in peace and security. While they remain committed to this agreement they will be given every kind of assurance of protection (life, possessions, dignity, safeguarding of the covenant), but if they contravene the agreement and rebel against the state, then war will inevitably be declared against them. This is that principle whose explanation the Quran has given at numerous places. This was the very situation that had transpired in relation to the *Kuffar* of Makkah in the year Nine Hijra.

## **1.9 The Correct Meaning of the Verse**

The Quran stated that there are two options for them:

1. By becoming Muslims, these people become part of the Islamic state.
2. Or while remaining as non-Muslims, they adhere to the agreement of peace and security.
3. But if they become neither Muslims nor hold to the agreement, then in this situation there will be no other option except to fight with them.

---

<sup>33</sup> These are satirical expressions by the author about what is stated earlier. (Ed)

The matter is very clear, but Maududi says that:

- a. If these people accept Islam, then they will become your brothers in Deen, but
- b. If ‘after accepting Islam’ they again turn away from ‘their accepted Islam’ (i.e. become *Murtad*), then they should be fought with.

The words of the Quran are:

*Wa in Nakso Aimaana'hum min Ba'ade Ah'ade'hem (9:12)*<sup>34</sup>

Maududi states its meaning to be ‘if after accepting Islam, they turn away from their acceptance of Islam’ i.e. according to him, the meaning of *Ah'ade'hem* is ‘the acceptance of Islam by the *Kuffar*’. And the meaning of *Nakso Aimaana'hum*<sup>35</sup> is not the breaking up of political agreements but is that of becoming a *Murtad*. We challenge Maududi to show us even one such place anywhere in the Quran where *Ah'ade'hem* or *Aimaana'hum* means the ‘acceptance by people of Islam’. In contrast, we will show all those places in which the Quran has used the words *Ah'ad* and *Aimaan* for political agreements. If you are truthful in your claims, then present some evidence and logical proof. You will see that he will have no evidence with him. This is the Quran, not a jest. In the translation of the verse being analysed, Maududi has written these words within brackets (i.e. the agreement for the acceptance of Islam). This is purely an addition of his own making, and a slur on Allah, and a glaring example of tampering with the Quran.

Let us move on. The Quran states in this verse that if these people break their oaths after making this agreement and pact, then fight with these leaders of *Kufr* (*Fa'qa'ti'lu A'imma tul Kufr*). The word *Qa'ti'lu* which appears here means to fight a war. Maududi draws the logic for the killing of a *Murtad* from this. If the meaning from this was to kill, then the word *Faq'ta'lu* would have appeared for this; for example, the word *Qatal* (for killing) has appeared in many places in the Quran. In the event of *Fa'qa'ti'lu* (to fight a war) there is the possibility of both killing and being killed. (This is why the meaning of *Qataal* is to kill each other).

After this, the Quran further clarifies the reason to fight with the *Kuffar* by stating: *Inna'hum la Aimaana'la'hum*- because their oaths are not trustworthy. If their crime had been *Irt'daad*, then it would have been stated that their *Eimaan* no longer remained.

---

<sup>34</sup> ‘But if they violate their oaths after their covenant’... (9:12). (Ed)

<sup>35</sup> It should be made clear that this word is not *Eimaan* (root A-M-N), but is *Aimaan* (root Y-M-N). *Aimaan* is the plural of *Yameen* whose meaning is oath or covenant; *Eimaan* (developing conviction) is a different word from this.

At the end (of the verse) it is stated that permission to fight with them is given so that *La'alla'hum Yante' Hun* - so that in this way perhaps they will desist i.e. the objective was that they should remain peaceful in accordance with their pacts. If they break these, then declare war against them, but it is possible that due to fear of war they may refrain from breaking their agreement. But contrary to this, if its meanings are taken to be that if they become *Murtad* after accepting Islam then kill them, then it is obvious that in this situation the question of desisting from *Irt'daad* does not even arise -because they became *Murtad*, so they were then killed. Now regarding the one who has been killed, how can he desist from *Irt'daad*? He is dead!

Maududi has confined himself to only this verse from Surah *At-Tauba*. Had he also written down the next verse along with it, then the meaning would have become clear (but this would have conflicted with his desire).<sup>36</sup> That verse is this:

*Will you not fight with such people who violated their oaths? Those who plotted to expel the messenger from his home and then were also the first to initiate a fight with you. Are you fearful of them? If you are Momineen, then it is Allah Whodeserve to be feared more. (9:13)*

This verse provides an explanation for the verse which comes before it (which Maududi has copied). In this, further clarifications have been given for the causes and reasons to fight against these people. It has been explicitly stated in this that:

- (1) These are the very same people who have previously torn up agreements.
- (2) They have devised plots to expel Rasul-ullah from Makkah.
- (3) Many a time they have been the first to start a war against you.

This is the charge of crime which the Quran has levied against these people. Now reflect whether the breaking of agreements is noted here, or that of becoming a *Murtad* after accepting Islam? There is no reference to or any possibility whatsoever in these verses of the fact of the turning of *Eimaan* into *Kufr* being declared as a crime, and of the punishment for this being proposed as being the death penalty.

Nevertheless, this is the proof which Maududi has presented from the Quran for the 'killing of a *Murtad*'. Ponderance more on the verse quoted by him (then bring to mind again all those verses which have been written in the previous

---

<sup>36</sup> This is a common practice among those who do not accept the Quran as a complete Book of guidance. For the purposes of their own meanings and interpretations, they quote individual verses alone or only a part of a verse with a view to misguiding others (and themselves). (Ed)

pages against coercion and compulsion in the matter of Deen),and then reflect whether there is any proof in any way at all for the killing of a *Murtad* from this verse? Leaving aside obtaining any proof, just consider whether this verse has any connection even to the topic of the killing of a *Murtad*? The truth is that Maududi has just written this verse in a customary way,(just as 786 is customarily written at the top of a letter, even though it has no bearing to the subject matter of the letter, and nor is it in reality the aforethought of the writer that he is beginning the letter with the name of Allah), even though he knows perfectly well in his heart that the Quran has not proposed the punishment of the death penalty for a *Murtad* anywhere.

### **1.10 Not the Quran But Narrations and *Fiqah***

Consequently, further on he writes:

*Having heard these narrations from Hadeeth and Fiqah, some people question where this punishment is mentioned in the Quran. For the satisfaction of these people, even though we have explained the command of the Quran at the beginning of this discussion - but even if supposing this command had not been in the Quran - then the many narrations of Ahadeeth, examples of the decisions of the Righteous Caliphs, and the united opinions of Fuqaha were absolutely enough to prove this command. Those people who, considering these things as being insufficient as proof for this command, ask for reference from the Quran, our question to them is: whether in your opinion the whole constitutional Law of Islam is the same as that described in the Quran? If the answer is in the affirmative then this means that you are saying that no act other than those acts which, having been declared as crimes, have punishments proposed for them in the Quran, will be punishable as a crime under an Islamic government.<sup>37</sup>*

Now the *Maulvi* has come to his real stance – the verse of the Quran was written down solely for holiness: for the command, refer to the *Hadeeth*, see the *Fiqah*. (And these are those very places at which the pretext emerges of his claim of ‘understanding the temperament of Rasul-ullah’).<sup>38</sup>

It is correct that:

---

<sup>37</sup> S.A. Maududi, Ibid, pp 30-31.

<sup>38</sup> See the book, *The Status of Hadeeth in Islam*, by the author.

- (a) Such crimes have also been described in the Quran for which it has not proposed the punishment itself e.g. intoxication, gambling, etc.
- (b) There are also certain crimes whose mention in the Quran is merely as a fundamental command; their nature is not explained e.g. the fundamental command to forbid evil.

### **1.11 The Quran Has Not Even Declared *Irt'daadas* a Crime!**

But the question is this, that the Quran states (and repeatedly states this) that in the matter of *Kufr* and *Eimaan*, no compulsion can be applied on anyone; under no circumstances can any pressure be applied. Hence, the changing of *Kufr* and *Eimaan* is not a crime. But if contrary to this, someone says that absolutely no permission can be given for changing *Eimaan* into *Kufr*, and that anyone doing this will be committing a severe crime for which the punishment is death, is the one saying this obeying the code of laws of Deen, or committing an open rebellion against the Quran? If the person asserting this, by uttering a few Arabic sentences as proof to support his claim, declares this to be *Abadeeth* and the decisions of the companions, and opinions of the Imams of *Fiqah*, then his statement will be taken as being Deen merely because, by using these Arabic sentences, he has related it to Rasul-ullah, the companions, and the Imams of *Fiqah*, and has felt no hesitation whatsoever in doing this. Today, neither Rasul-ullah, nor the companions, nor the Imams of *Fiqah* are present among us. How can we obtain verification from these individuals that these declarations are in reality theirs, or that these have been falsely attributed to them? In contrast to this, we have the Quran present with us, the preservation of which Allah Himself has announced, and He has taken the responsibility to protect it on Himself. He declares that the changing of *Kufr* and *Eimaan* is no crime. Now tell us, whose declaration can call itself Deen in these circumstances? We say that it is Allah's declaration. Maududi says, no, it is my opinion, because if Rasul-ullah himself is not present among us today, I am, however, present among you as an expert of the frame of mind of Rasul-ullah.<sup>39</sup> I am able to say whether Rasul-ullah did, or did not, say something. And I am also able to tell you that if Rasul-ullah had been present today, then what he would have said in this matter? Therefore, do not consider my point of view as being mine, consider it to be an opinion from Rasul-ullah!

---

<sup>39</sup> For the elucidation of 'understanding the temperament of Rasul-ullah' see my book titled, *The Status of Hadeeth in Islam*, pp 36-37.

### 1.12 *Tafsir of La-Ikrah-fid-Deen*<sup>40</sup> (No Compulsion in Deen)

Maududi states that there is no doubt that the command of *La-Ikrah-fid-Deen* (there is no compulsion in the matter of Deen) is present in the Quran, but its meaning is that we cannot convert a non-Muslim by force; however, once an individual becomes a Muslim, then he can never ever be granted permission for this: that he can exit the sphere of Islam. If he wishes to do this, then he will be executed. He (Maududi) states:

*The meaning of La-Ikrah-fid-Deen is that we do not force anyone to enter our Deen, and this is indeed our modus operandi. However, if someone enters and then wishes to leave, we warn him in advance that this door is not open to two-way traffic. Hence, if you enter, then do it following this decision that you will not go back, otherwise, please do not even enter.*<sup>41</sup>

In other words, there is only one-way traffic in Islam. You possess the freedom to choose and intent up until you enter it, but after that all those choices which Allah had bestowed on you in the matter of *Kufr* and *Eimaan* will be taken away.<sup>42</sup> This is that focal point around which all the reasons for Maududi's claim revolve i.e. that very same answer which, according to the Quran, all the *Kuffar* used to give to their respective messengers:

*Those who rejected (Wahi) used to tell their messengers that either we will expel you from the land or will bring you back to our religion*<sup>43</sup>... (14:13)

This is what Maududi proclaims - that the Muslim who changes his religion will either have to leave the country, or revert to this same religion, otherwise he will be executed.

### 1.13 Explanations of the Quran About *Murtad*

---

<sup>40</sup> See verse (2:256). (Ed)

<sup>41</sup> S.A. Maududi, *Ibid*, p 53.

<sup>42</sup> The freedom to choose is a hallmark of being human and each *Nafs* possesses this attribute at a fundamental level during the entire course of earthly life. (Ed).

<sup>43</sup> The term used in the verse is *Millat*, meaning 'our way of life', which also includes their religion. (Ed)

If these verses which we have previously quoted were the only verses about *Kufr* and *Eimaan* in the Quran, then in order to understand the issue before us these would have sufficed. But Allah knew that these kinds of contentious issues would arise in Islam, therefore He did not just leave this issue there. He has made clear reference to those who turn again to *Kufr* after the acceptance of Islam, not at one place, but at numerous places. Maududi did not even touch upon these places in his pamphlet; this is because how can the ones whose hearts and minds have become clouded with foreign contaminants 'touch' the Quran?<sup>44</sup> Let us just see what the Quran declares in this regard. It is stated in Surah *Al e Imran*:

*And whoever wishes for a Deen other than Islam, this will never be accepted of him,<sup>45</sup> and he will be ruined and unsuccessful in the life of the hereafter. (3:85)*

These are the ones who never accepted Islam. After this, there is mention of those people who, after accepting guidance, adopted *Kufr* again. It is decreed about them:

*How can it be that Allah will provide guidance to that nation who chose the path of *Kufr* after *Eimaan*, although they had borne witness that Allah's messenger is true and that clear signs had come to them? Allah does not open the paths of guidance to those who move away from the right path. (3:86)*

*The consequence of this act of these people is that the curse of Allah, His Malaika and of all mankind rests on them. In that will they dwell; neither will their penalty be lightened, nor will they get respite. (3:87-88)*

*But those people who, after being in this state, repent and reform themselves, then undoubtedly Allah is All Protecting and All Merciful. (3:89)*

This is a reference to those people who revert to *Kufr* after having accepted Islam. Now just note that nowhere is it stated about them that they should be

---

<sup>44</sup> See verse (56:79)

<sup>45</sup> We need to view this statement of fact in conjunction with the Law of Requital (45:22). The Quran invites us to consider its guidance in light of the Law of Requital and then to come to this conclusion that we need to create a new self within us based on *Eimaan*. This then needs to be developed further through righteous deeds, details of which are provided in the Quran. Unless we possess this new self, we will not comprehend that reality which will enable us to succeed in the life of the hereafter. This comprehension of reality is also a pre-requisite for the establishment of Deen in this worldly life, in order to liberate fellow humans beings from the harms of man-made systems. (Ed)

executed as a punishment for *Irt'daad*.<sup>46</sup> All that is said about them is that by giving up Islam they will become deprived of all those blessings and achievements which are an essential consequence for those following the righteous path. The path of Islam is a path of success and prosperity, whereas the path of *Kufr* is a path of failure and destruction. If they had remained firm on Islam, then they would have lived a life of success and prosperity. They opted for the path of *Kufr*, so their successes turned into failures. Even after this nothing is lost, because just as they had a choice in this matter to leave the sphere of Islam after accepting it, even now they have the choice to return to its sphere if they wish. If they again choose Islam, then the bounties and favours of Islamic life will again become part of their life. Just think about this! If the punishment for a *Murtad* had been death, then there would have been no question even of returning to Islam for these people. Contrary to this, in the very next verses following this, there is mention of these people dying a natural death. The Quran declares:

*Those who turned to Kufr after accepting Eimaan, and then kept advancing in their Kufr, the repentance of such people will not be accepted. For they are those very people who strayed from the righteous path. (3:90)*

*Those people who adopted the path of Kufr, and remained firm to Kufr until their dying breath, never would be accepted from any such as much gold as the earth contains, though they should offer it for ransom. For such is a penalty grievous and they will find no helpers. (3:91)*

Note that the Quran states that there will be a chastising punishment for those people who, after accepting Islam, again adopted the path of *Kufr* (became *Murtad*) and who then died in this same state of *Kufr*. See! There is a clear reference present here of their natural physical death. If the punishment for a *Murtad* was execution, then there would have been neither any mention of an increase in their *Kufr* (because how can the one who is killed keep increasing in his *Kufr*? An increase in *Kufr* can only take place in the event that he remains alive after becoming a *Murtad*), nor would it have been written that they will die in a state of *Kufr*. Maududi did not make any mention of these verses at all in his pamphlet (nor has he raised this question of the killing of a *Murtad* in relation to these verses in his *Tafbeem ul Quran*).

---

<sup>46</sup> The *Tafsir* of Maududi, *Tafbeem ul Quran*, which has been published recently. In the *Tafsir* of Surah *Al-e Imran*, Maududi has not written under the *Tafsir* of these verses that the penalty for a *Murtad* is death.

Now let us move forward. It is stated in Surah Nisa:

*The people who accepted Eimaan, then after this became Kafir again, then again accepted Eimaan, then became Kafir again, and then kept increasing in their Kufr, these are those people whom Allah is never going to forgive, and it will never happen that He will show them the path of guidance. (4:137)*

In other words, there is mention not only of becoming a *Murtad* once, but mention of *Irt'daad* occurring twice. Accepted Islam, then became a *Murtad*, then again accepted Islam, and again became a *Murtad*.<sup>47</sup> And after this, they did not accept Islam but kept increasing in the state of *Kufr*; there will be no forgiveness for them. Have you noticed how the doors of Islam and *Kufr* remain open for two-way traffic according to the Quran? This is the decision of Allah, and it is Maududi's pronouncement against this that:

*However, if someone enters and then wishes to leave, we warn him in advance that this door is not open to two-way traffic. Hence, if you enter, then do it following the decision that you will not go back, otherwise please do not even enter.*

The 'one who wishes to go back' from Islam says: Look! Allah has kept this door open, therefore I wish to go back. Maududi declares that (Allah forbid) who is that Allah Who can keep this door open. These doors have been shut by narrations (*Abadeeth*), closed by *Fiqah*, and we are now the guardians over them. Allah had opened them, but we are closing them. Now we will see, how can Allah open them? Let us examine another verse in which '*Irt'daad*' is specifically mentioned. It is stated:

*O you who have accepted Eimaan! If any among you becomes a Murtad, (in place of such people) Allah will create such a people whom Allah will keep as friends, and they will be those who will keep Allah as a friend—they will be very compassionate and gentle towards Momineen, but mighty in opposition to enemies; Those who fight (Jihad) in the cause of Allah, and are not fearful of the disapproval of anyone. This is the Fadl of Allah which He bestows on whom He will as per His Will. And Allah encompasses all, and He knows all things. (5:54)*

You can see how clear the matter is. Allah states that whoever wishes to become a *Murtad*, let him go, he cannot cause any harm to you. We will bring such a nation in place of these people who will be models of the true attributes of *Momineen*. It also does not specify anywhere in this verse to go and kill these people. Leaving aside killing them, Rasul-ullah is even informed to this extent

---

<sup>47</sup> Maududi has also ignored this verse in his *Tafbeem ul Quran*.

that if they behave like this, then let them do so; it is not as though you have been sent as a guardian over them:

*Whoever obeys the messenger, obeys Allah. But if any turns away, We have not sent you to watch over their affairs. (4:80)*

Now let us examine these verses of Surah *Nahl*, part of which has already been noted earlier. It is decreed that:

*Anyone who, after accepting Eimaan, enacts Kufr against Allah - except the one who is compelled, his heart remaining firm on Eimaan – but such a one whose heart opens fully to Kufr, on such people is the wrath of Allah and theirs will be a dreadful penalty. (16:106)*

Here, there is very clear mention of a *Murtad*, and of the kind of *Murtad* who adopts *Kufr* not due to compulsion and coercion, but through the choice of his own heart. Nowhere has the Quran stated that the punishment for this is death, that he should be executed by the sword. The reason for this is explained in the verse following this. It is stated:

*This is because they preferred the life of this world over the life of the hereafter – and Allah does not guide those who are Kafir. (16:107)*

This was the reason why, having left Islam, they adopted the path of *Kufr*. In place of the successes and bounties of the future, they gave preference to immediate benefits, and they did this because they did not possess any farsightedness and understanding of the hereafter:

*These are those people on whose hearts, ears, and eyes Allah has set seals, and they take no heed. (16:108)*

What will be the consequence of this path of theirs?

*Without doubt, in the hereafter they will be in a state of loss. (16:109)*

## **1.14 The Clear Verdict of the Quran**

Be clear that nowhere has the Quran stated that these are those people who will be beheaded, and that in this way they will discover what the punishment is of resorting to *Kufr* after accepting Islam. The verdict of the Quran is clear. It states that in the beginning it is also only those people who do not possess the right vision who reject Islam:

*As to those who resort to Kufr, it is the same to them whether you warn them or do not warn them, they will not accept Eimaan. Allah has set a seal on their hearts and their hearing, and on their eyes is a veil.<sup>48</sup> Great is the penalty they incur. (2:6-7)*

Similarly, those people who, after accepting Islam, made this their condition, they will also meet the same end (16:106). You have seen that the Quran has not made any distinction in this respect between those people who initially reject Islam, and those who turn away after having accepted Islam. It states that the reason for the denial by both is the same i.e. that these people have lost their intellect and reasoning, and the invitation of Islam is dependent on evidence-based vision. Therefore, by paralyzing the intellect and wisdom, Islam can neither be made to be accepted for the first time, and nor can these people who have become completely devoid of intellect and understanding and in this way have made the decision to abandon Islam, be bound in Islam through coercion. The Quran states that when the cause for both is the same, then how can there be a difference in their treatment? But Maududi says No! Allah does not know (Allah forbid) about this - that there is a fundamental distinction between the two because of which the former category can be given the right to live, but the latter absolutely cannot be given this right: he should be shot!

### **1.15 *Irt'daad* is Not Even a Crime, So How Can There be a Punishment?**

In any event, these are those verses of the Quran which are not even mentioned by Maududi in his pamphlet, and from which it is clear that, according to the Quran, *Irt'daad* is no crime. Now reflect once again on this logic of Maududi in which he states that if there is no punishment documented in the Quran for the crime of *Irt'daad*, this does not mean that no punishment for this should even be prescribed. *Abadeeth* and *Fiqah* have fixed its punishment. But you would have seen from the verses which have been noted above that, with regard to a *Murtad*, the Quran has announced in manifestly plain words that it is no crime to adopt *Kufr* after Islam. Every individual has permission to remain a Muslim, or after leaving Islam, to adopt *Kufr*. Therefore, if this thing is not even a crime then how can there be a punishment for it? Consequently, the issue stands as follows:

---

<sup>48</sup> It is their choice, and when they do not use their reasoning to understand the guidance of the Quran, they close their eyes, ears and hearts, and so reject the message. (Ed)

- (1) The Quran neither declares *Irt'daad* as a crime, and (hence) nor proposes any punishment for this. Contrary to this, it states that whoever wishes can adopt *Kufr* after leaving Islam. But,
- (2) In opposition to this, the *Abadeeth* and *Fiqah* declare *Irt'daad* to be a crime and for its punishment to be death. The question is that in this situation, whose decision should be taken to be the correct one?
  - (a) The *Fatwa*<sup>49</sup> of the Mullahs (and the representative of this group, Mr Maududi) is that the command of the *Abadeeth* and *Fiqah* should be obeyed and,
  - (b) We state, however, that the decision is only the decision of the Quran, and the command is only the command of Allah. (The one who does not make decisions according to the Quran is not a Muslim but a *Kafir* (5:44)).
  - (c) As far as the issue of *Abadeeth* and *Fiqah* is concerned, in our opinion Rasul-ullah could not have given any such command which is against the teaching of the Quran, and we do not hold this kind of opinion about the Imams of *Fiqah* either. Thus, these things are concoctions and inventions of later times. Relating these to Rasul-ullah or to the Imams of *Fiqah* is an immense audacity and arrogance.

## 1.16 The Authority for Continuity

But Maududi states that:

*If such matters also become doubtful for which so many evidences can be found for continuity and links, then the issue does not remain confined to only one or two matters, as after this, not one single thing which has reached us from past times through narratives can remain secure from doubt.*<sup>50</sup>

Our contention regarding this is that whether the issue is related to one or two matters, or is related to one or two thousand, the principle should remain the same everywhere i.e. whatever matter is contrary to the Quran cannot be accepted for even one moment. This is because only the Quran has reached us in a protected form and the responsibility for its protection has been undertaken by

---

<sup>49</sup>*Fatwa* – this is the practice of issuing a decree by someone who claims to be an Islamic scholar on any matter of religion i.e. expressing his personal opinion. This can also be issued by the coming together of these people if they agree on some point of common interest i.e. to declare someone a *Kafir* according to their own criteria. (Ed)

<sup>50</sup> S.A. Maududi, *Ibid*, p 8.

Allah. Other than this, He has not taken the responsibility for protection of anything else. If we did not have the Quran in its protected form, then we would also have been forced to be dependent on 'continuity and chain of links', as happened to other Peoples of the Book (*Ahle Kitab*). But when we have the Book of Allah in our possession in its protected form, then the criterion for continuity and links in the chain will be in the Book of Allah - it will not be that by ignoring the book of Allah, our conduct will be based on continuity and chain sequence.<sup>51</sup> If continuity and chain sequence were to be the criterion for Deen, then what need was there to keep the Quran protected? In any case, these are the two ideologies which are absolutely clear and evident. Abandoning the Quran and accepting continuity and chain sequence as Deen is the school of thought (*Maslak*<sup>52</sup>) of Maududi (and all the Mullahs) and our *Maslak* is to keep continuity and chain sequencing under the obedience of the Book of Allah.

According to Maududi, their *Maslak* is precisely the *Maslak* of Islam, and our *Maslak* is the *Maslak* of *Kufr*! And since after becoming a Muslim 'the *Maslak* of *Kufr*' is *Irt'daad* and the punishment for *Irt'daad* is death, hence our punishment is death.

### **1.17 *Ahadeeth* and the Execution of a *Murtad***

After this 'evidence' from the Quran, Maududi has presented proof for the execution of a *Murtad* according to *Ahadeeth*. In this connection there is no need for us to become embroiled in any argument, because after such clear commands from the Quran, anything which is contrary to the Quran cannot be worthy of being given any significance. In this manner, what else cannot be proven from *Ahadeeth*?<sup>53</sup> The purpose for which we have touched upon this part of the discussion is something else. People commonly request that a clear example should be presented of this issue that there are also such things in *Ahadeeth* which go clearly against the teachings of the Quran. An example of this can be found in the *Ahadeeth* quoted by Maududi. It is mentioned in these *Ahadeeth* that Rasul-ullah said:

---

<sup>51</sup> This argument of continuity of narratives has no basis in the establishment of truth e.g. when the Quran gives us the Permanent Value of the Law of Requital, then we need to verify every human act and its consequences in the light of this law, rather than bring our personal opinion into it, as in the phrase, 'you are entitled to your opinion not to your facts'. (Ed)

<sup>52</sup> This refers to the ideology of a school of thought e.g. *Shia Maslak* or *Sunni Maslak*. (Ed)

<sup>53</sup> The whole literature of *Ahadeeth* is the concoction of that state of mind which rebelled against the Quran in order to follow its own base desires. (Ed)

*The blood of any Muslim is not Halal except if, despite being married, he has committed adultery; or after being a Muslim, he has adopted Kufr; or he has taken the life of someone.*<sup>54</sup>

In this *Hadeeth*, two out of the three things are those which are absolutely against Quranic injunctions. One is the execution of a *Murtad*, regarding which the Quranic verses have passed before your eyes in the previous pages. The second is the execution of an adulterer (*Rajam* or stoning to death). The Quran has stipulated the punishment for an adulterous man or adulterous woman as one hundred lashes each<sup>55</sup>; these are absolutely clear and unambiguous words. There is no distinction in this between married or unmarried. But in *Abadeeth* the punishment for the married adulterer is written as being *Rajam*; in other words, the Quran sets one punishment and the *Abadeeth* prescribes some other punishment which is totally contrary to this. When this objection appeared before them that this punishment prescribed by *Abadeeth* is totally against the Quran, then in order to save themselves from this accusation, further *Abadeeth* were concocted in which it was written that (Allah forbid) Umer (the Second Caliph) used to state that during the times of Rasul-ullah there was a verse present in the Quran about *Rajam* and we used to recite it;<sup>56</sup> now this verse no longer exists in the Quran, however the injunction for it still remains in place.<sup>57</sup> In other words, in order to prove one lie to be true, ten other lies were fabricated. And in this it did not even cross their minds (or perhaps it was done deliberately) that by doing this the claim of the Quran as being protected, on which the whole structure of Islam is based, becomes absolutely *Batil*. But what does the Mullah care about what happens about the Quran! His Deen is the worship of *Abadeeth* – he only worships personalities. Hence, he desires the preservation of his idols, regardless of whether in this process Allah remains or not.

### 1.18 One Interesting *Hadeeth*

In relation to *Abadeeth*, Maududi has quoted one very interesting narration without noting which we cannot continue. Abdullah bin Abi Sarrah used to be a

---

<sup>54</sup>S.A. Maududi, *Ibid*, p 17.

<sup>55</sup>Verse (24:2). (Ed)

<sup>56</sup>This makes the proclamation of protection of the Quran by Allah null and void according to these fabrications of the human mind. (Ed)

<sup>57</sup>This topic has been discussed earlier in *Tolu-e-Islam*.

scribe of Rasul-ullah at one time. Then *Shaitan* misguided him and he joined with the *Kuffar*. This is reported in a *Hadeeth*:

*When Makkah was conquered then Abdullah bin Abi Sarrah took refuge with Uthman bin Affan<sup>58</sup>. Uthman took him to the presence of the Nabi and requested: O Messenger of Allah, please accept his fealty. Rasul-ullah lifted his head and looked towards him and remained silent. This same thing happened three times. The Messenger would simply look at him repeatedly. Finally, after three times, the Messenger accepted his fealty. Then Rasul-ullah turned his attention towards the companions and said: How come there was not a single one among you who, when he saw that I have held my hand back from accepting fealty, should have stepped forward and killed this person. People respectfully said, O Messenger of Allah, we did not know what it was that you wished. Why did you not give some indication through your eyes? At this, Rasul-ullah replied that it does not suit a Nabi that he should deceive by the eyes.<sup>59</sup>*

Have you noticed what sort of diagram has been drawn of the court of the Messenger of Allah? There is an individual who is a criminal and, according to Rasul-ullah, deserving of death— Uthman recommends him.<sup>60</sup> Rasul-ullah (Allah forbid) does not even have enough courage to either forgive him openly or to give the command to kill him. Each time, he looks up and then remains silent and then under compulsion pardons him. And then admonishes the companions that ‘was there not even one such individual among them’ who, recognising this secret sign of Rasul-Allah (i.e. his silence), should have killed this criminal!

Our dismay is not at how the hypocrites of *Ajm*<sup>61</sup> have mutilated the character of Rasul-ullah through these narratives, our dismay is at the audacity with which today our Mullah is presenting these narratives as being ‘Deen’.<sup>62</sup> If he is doing this deliberately, then he himself is included in this conspiracy, and if he is doing this unwittingly, then no matter how much mourning there is over his ignorance, it is insufficient. But whether it is hypocrisy or illiteracy, there is only one outcome of both. By specifying these same narratives as being authentic, the world is

---

<sup>58</sup> He was a renowned companion of the messenger of Allah. (Ed)

<sup>59</sup> S.A. Maududi, *Ibid*, pp 16-17.

<sup>60</sup> Uthman was one of the closest companions of the messenger of Allah and he became the third Righteous Caliph. How could he recommend such a person in the first place to Rasul-ullah? (Ed)

<sup>61</sup> *Ajm* – a term used for non-Arabs of that era e.g. the Persians who contributed to the invention and compilation of the *Abadeeth*. (Ed)

<sup>62</sup> This is because they do not accept the Islam of the Quran, as it goes against their base desires. Their livelihood is dependent on the flourishing of sectarian Islam. (Ed)

broadcasting them, and Islam is no longer worthy of being able to show its face anywhere.

### **1.19 The Conduct of the Companions**

After the *Abadeeth*, Maududi has also presented some examples from the conduct of the companions in support of the execution of a *Murtad*. In one narrative it is stated that after becoming Muslim, a group again became Christian. At this:

*On the order of Ali (the Fourth Caliph) these people were murdered, and their family and children were made slaves.*<sup>63</sup>

Murdering those who change their religion and making their family and children slaves? This is Islam?<sup>64</sup>

Now let us continue. It is written that Ali was informed that some people are declaring him as being *Rabb*. Ali tried to make them understand but they would not desist from this belief of theirs:

*Ultimately Ali had a pit dug and a fire was lit in it. Then he addressed them again and said, look, even now retreat from your assertion, otherwise I will throw you in this pit. But they remained firm on this belief of theirs. Thus, on the order of Ali, they were all thrown into this very pit.*<sup>65</sup>

In another narration it is stated that some individuals had crafted an idol in their dwelling place and used to worship it. On hearing this, Ali went there himself. After conducting a search, the idol was discovered. Ali set this house on fire and it was burned to the ground together with its inhabitants.<sup>66,67</sup>

These are those acts of your 'Righteous Caliphate' which have been recorded in the books of *Abadeeth* under the *Ajmi* conspiracy, and which are today being enthusiastically presented with such pride by Syed Abul Ala Maududi -the

---

<sup>63</sup> S.A. Maududi, *Ibid*, p 21.

<sup>64</sup> The Quran arrived to eliminate these practices, and these did disappear in the earlier era of Islam. (Ed)

<sup>65</sup> S. A. Maududi, *Ibid*, p 22.

<sup>66</sup> S. A. Maududi, *Ibid*, p 22.

<sup>67</sup> In verses (85:4-8) the Quran refers to the practice by non-Muslims of putting *Momineem* into 'a pit of fire'. (Ed)

claimant of understanding the temperament of Islam, and who desires to prove from these that in Islam the punishment for a *Murtad* is to kill him. May Allah save Islam from such friends!

## **1.20 The Right of non-Muslims to Preach under Islamic Rule**

After this, Maududi has provided an answer to this question: whether non-Muslims will have the right to preach their religion under an Islamic government in the same way that Muslims should have the right to preach their religion. In reply to this he states:

*The decision for this issue has been made to a large extent by the law of death for a Murtad, because when we do not give the right to any individual who is a Muslim to leave Islam and accept some other religion and Maslak within our domain of rule, then inevitably this also means that within the boundaries of Islam, we also do not tolerate any other invitation counter to Islam to rise and spread. Providing other religions and Masalak<sup>68</sup> with the right to preach, and declaring it to be a crime for Muslims to change their religion – both are contrary to each other and the latter law automatically cancels the former law. Hence, the law of death for a Murtad is in itself sufficient to conclude that Islam does not tolerate the preaching of Kufr within its boundaries of rule.<sup>69</sup>*

Because this issue was extremely important - whether non-Muslims will or will not be given the right to preach their religion under Islamic rule - he therefore discussed the response to this question in detail, and from this discussion the same has been proven as noted above. Whereupon, at the end of this discussion, he again writes:

*In this, too, we do not receive any sign that the Islamic government can grant permission to any such person to come and work who wishes to preach some other religion and Maslak. Now, if afterwards (i.e. after the times of the Righteous Caliphate) the world loving 'Caliphs' and kings have acted against this, then this is not proof of this matter that Islamic law gives permission for this. But it is instead proof that these people were unfamiliar with the duties of a true Islamic government or had*

---

<sup>68</sup> Plural of *Maslak*. (Ed)

<sup>69</sup> S. A. Maududi, *Ibid*, pp 32-33.

*transgressed from it...from the Islamic point of view all these acts are to be noted in the list of crimes of these kings.<sup>70</sup>*

From the excerpts noted above you have seen that according to Maududi:

- (i) Islam does not allow the preaching of *Kufr* within its boundary and authority.
- (ii) The Islamic government cannot grant permission to any such individual to work within its boundaries who wishes to preach some other religion and *Maslak*.
- (iii) If someone has allowed non-Muslims to preach their religion under an Islamic government, then this act of his was against Islam and he is a criminal in the court of Islam.

## **1.21 A Similar Issue**

You may perhaps be aware that according to Maududi, this is also the command of Islam (and the duty of ‘the Islamic government’) that prisoners of war should be made slaves, and their women be made concubines with no limit on numbers (as many as you desire) to be kept in homes. Regarding this, someone raised the objection that if other nations also adopt this same practice and begin to treat the daughters-in-law, daughters, mothers and sisters of Muslims in the same way, then how will you take it? But how can it possibly be the concern of the ‘Islamic *Jamaat*’ and its *Amir* (leader) that they should think about what happens to the respect and dignity, chastity and virtue of Muslims? In recent days, a Sikh came to Pakistan from India (for the purpose of pilgrimage). A Muslim acquaintance of his conversed with him regarding the issue of kidnapped women and said that you people have no consideration that retaining the women of others in your homes like this is not the act of gentlemen!<sup>71</sup> The Sikh replied that we always used to consider this act to be against humanity from the beginning, but by Muslims informing us that enslaving prisoners of war and making concubines of their women is completely in accordance with Islam, this also provided encouragement to us. If this act is fully in accordance with Islam then why are we being stopped from an Islamic act?

---

<sup>70</sup> S. A. Maududi, *Ibid*, pp 40-41.

<sup>71</sup> This was at the time of the partition of India when large scale migrations took place on both sides. (Ed)

A similar second *Fatwa* is proclaimed from the court of this revered *Amir* (Maududi) that in an Islamic State a non-Muslim will be allowed to preach his religion. When this same law becomes implemented by other nations in their own countries, then there will be an outcry from Muslims!

In any case, let us continue with the matter of the execution of a *Murtad*.

## **1.22 Intellectual Arguments for Execution of a *Murtad***

Following these evidences which have been copied and quoted by us, Maududi has carried out an intellectual discussion about the killing of a *Murtad*. This part of his pamphlet is even more intriguing than the earlier part. This is because the outcome from the Mullah and his intellectual discourse is obvious. First of all, Maududi has copied those objections himself which, according to him, can be levelled as being intellectually against the killing of a *Murtad*. In this regard, he writes that the possible objections against the killing of a *Murtad* are, at the most, these:

Firstly, this is against freedom of conscience. Every man should have this freedom that whatever matter his heart is satisfied with, he should accept it, and whatever matter it is not satisfied with, he should not accept it. This freedom which should be available to every man in the beginning about whether to accept a *Maslah* or not, following the acceptance of a *Maslah* it should similarly be available in the issue of whether to remain on it or not....

Secondly, that opinion which alters under coercion, or that choice on which people remain from fear of the death penalty cannot in any case be a path of honesty. Its status will merely be that of the manifestation of a hypocritical opinion... if an individual who has become a *Kafir* within himself remains outwardly apparently a Muslim in a hypocritical way in order to avoid the death penalty, where is the benefit in that?

Thirdly, if this order is accepted that a religion has the right to force all those people who have once entered its sphere of obedience to obey it, and meting out the death penalty to those who leave this sphere is legitimate, then the door of preaching and dissemination will be shut for all religions as a consequence.

Fourthly, Islam has adopted a completely contradictory attitude in this matter. On the one hand, it states that there is no compulsion in Deen... on the other hand, it itself threatens the individual who forms the intention to leave Islam and go towards *Kufr* instead with the death penalty.

### 1.23 The Response to These Objections

Before responding to these objections, Maududi has clarified this reality that 'Islam is not merely a religion but instead is a complete system of life'. *Eimaan* is not such an opinion 'which is adopted by a person solely as an individual, but it is that opinion on the basis of which a party of people establishes a complete social system on a specific pattern and brings it into being in order to run it'. The whole structure of the responses by Maududi is raised on this foundation i.e. Islam is one state, hence, it should be seen what the attitude of a state should be in this respect. Following this introduction, let us have a look at the answers of Maududi.

The first objection was that this contention is against the voice of conscience, that an individual should be forced to accept that thing with which his heart is not satisfied. In reply to this, Maududi states:

*The real status of a Murtaḍ is this, that through this Ir'tḍād of his he provides proof of this point that not only does he not accept the foundation on which the organisation of the society and state is established, instead there can be no expectation from him that he will ever accept it. For such an individual it is appropriate that when he finds the basis on which the society and state has been constructed unacceptable for him, he should himself go out of those boundaries.<sup>72</sup> But when he does not do this, then there are only two possible solutions for him, either to allow him to remain alive after depriving him of all the rights of citizenship, or for his life to be ended. The first option is, in fact, a far more severe punishment than the second one, because this will mean that he will suffer in a condition where 'neither death comes nor will there be life'. In this state he becomes even more dangerous for society... hence, it is preferable that by giving him the death penalty, his and society's problem are solved once and for all.<sup>73</sup>*

### 1.24 Analysis of this Reply

---

<sup>72</sup> Word for word, this is the same thing which the *Kuffar* used to tell their messengers – return to our religion or else we will surely drive you out of our land (14:13). The Quran declares this to be the way of the *Kuffar*, while Maududi describes it as being in accordance with Islam.

<sup>73</sup> S. A. Maududi, *Ibid*, p 51.

Just examine this proposition and then see that Maududi states that there are only three options remaining for the individual for whom the basis on which the structure of the Islamic state and society is established is not acceptable:

- (i) Either he can leave the Islamic state and go somewhere else, or
- (ii) If he is kept within the Islamic state, then he should be kept alive by being deprived of all the rights of a citizen, or
- (iii) He should be killed.

After this, Maududi then starts to compare items (i) and (ii) himself and reaches this conclusion that since keeping someone alive through the punishment of depriving them of the rights of citizenship is far more severe, hence, the 'demand of compassion' can only be this - that he should be killed. Hanging is a thousand times preferable to tuberculosis!

In other words, according to Maududi this option is simply not possible that an individual who holds no belief in the foundations of the Islamic society should be allowed to remain alive by granting him citizenship rights in an Islamic state. He will either have to leave the country or be killed by the sword.

## **1.25 The Rights of Minorities**

But the question is this, whether in an Islamic state such an option is even available for non-Muslims i.e. that those who do not accept those bases on which an Islamic society is shaped (in other words, those who have no *Eimaan*) are to be given the rights of citizenship and allowed to live? Within the concept of the Islamic state there is also a term known as *Zimmi*<sup>74</sup>. *Zimmi* are those non-Muslims who live in an Islamic state in the status of non-Muslims. Maududi says about them in this article:

*No other system in the history of the world has shown the tolerance which Islam has shown in this matter (concerning Zimmi). With regard to those who hold fundamentally different views, all other systems either forcibly make them follow their values or totally eliminate them. It is only Islam which, by categorizing these people as Zimmi, and by giving them the maximum possible freedom of action, gives them a*

---

<sup>74</sup>*Zimmi* – a minority (Ed)

*place within its boundaries, and tolerates many such deeds of theirs which directly clash with the basis of an Islamic society and state.*<sup>75</sup>

You will surely ask with surprise that, when according to Maududi himself there is an allowance for such people within an Islamic state who do not accept its fundamental beliefs, then is not the status of the Muslim who gives up Islam also such that he considers the fundamental beliefs of Islam as unacceptable. So why is there no allowance in an Islamic state for such an individual?

### **1.26 Difference between a *Kafir* and a *Murtad***

Maududi states that there is the difference of heaven and earth between the individual who is a *Kafir* from the outset and the one who returns to *Kufr* after being a Muslim. Within an Islamic state, for the former there is permission to live with freedom of action and belief; and not only permission, but great privileges are accorded for this by the Islamic state. But for the Muslim who wishes to join these *Zimmi*, there is no place except the gallows. Now listen to the explanations for this differentiation and discrimination. The first excuse is that:

*(In relation to Zimmi) the reason for this benevolent attitude is that Islam is not despairing of human nature. It keeps hope alive in the servants of Allah right up until the end, that when they have the opportunity to witness the blessings and bounties of living under the Deen of Haqq, they will ultimately accept this Haqq whose light they cannot yet see. This is why it employs patience.*<sup>76</sup>

This is as if the nature of a Hindu is human nature of which Islam does not despair, but if a Muslim becomes a Hindu as a result of some misconception or mistaken viewpoint, or as a result of some other reason, then Islam becomes hopeless of him, because his nature does not remain as human nature - it becomes something else. It associates a noble expectation with the 'servants of God' until the end, but when a Muslim becomes a Christian then it does not associate any noble hope with him because he no longer remains a 'servant of God'! This means that according to Maududi, absolutely no possibility remains for reformation in the Muslim who changes his religion once, hence, there is no solution for him other than execution. Even though he himself quotes this narration that:

---

<sup>75</sup> S. A. Maududi, *Ibid*, p 49.

<sup>76</sup> S. A. Maududi, *Ibid*, p 50.

*Umer bin Aas, the governor of Egypt, wrote to Umer (second Righteous Caliph) that an individual accepted Islam, then became a Kafir, then accepted Islam again, and then became a Kafir again. He has performed this act many times. Should his Islam now be accepted or not? Umer replied that as long as Allah accepts his Islam, you should also continue to do this. Present Islam to him and if he accepts then leave him, otherwise cut his throat.<sup>77</sup>*

In other words, the decision of Umer was that even if he becomes a *Kafira* thousand times, do not despair. But according to the opinion of the *Amir ul Momineen* of our modern era i.e. Maududi, all hopes are severed for the Muslim who adopts *Kufr* even once, hence his treatment is nothing other than death. Not only this, but he compares this kind of conduct which was permitted by Umer to playing games. He states:

*We wish to shut the door to such people from entering our Jamaat who are suffering from the malady of indecisiveness...the establishment of a system of life is an extremely serious business. There can be no place for people of an impulsive nature playing games in the Jamaat which stands up to carry out this task.<sup>78</sup>*

Just reflect that by stating the following:

*Those who have Eimaan, then accept Kufr, then have Eimaan, and then again have Kufr... (4:137)*

Allah provides evidence of the possibility that after becoming a *Murtada* person can once again accept Islam. Umer emphasises that the door of Islam should remain open at all times for a *Murtad*. But this is our 'acquainted with the temperament of Allah and Rasul' (Maududi) for whom this act is a mere pastime for which permission can absolutely not be given in Islam.

You have seen the first explanation for the differentiation between a *Kafir* and a *Murtad*. i.e. that Allah does not become hopeless of a *Kafir*, therefore, after giving him all the rights of citizenship, he is kept alive. But regarding the Muslim who adopts *Kufr*, Allah loses hope in him, therefore he should be immediately eliminated.

Now listen to his second explanation. He contends:

*Human nature definitely differentiates between a Kafir who has not yet acquiesced (to becoming a Muslim) and the one who becomes a Murtad after becoming a*

---

<sup>77</sup> S. A. Maududi, Ibid, p 18.

<sup>78</sup> S. A. Maududi, Ibid, p 51.

*Muslim. Not agreeing does not lead to bitterness, hatred and vengeance, but dissociating after agreeing leads almost one hundred percent to these emotions.<sup>79</sup>*

We question that if this is the state of the one who leaves after joining (a *Murtad*), why is the door of *Tauba* (repentance) kept open for him? When the heart of such an individual is laden with bitterness, hatred and vengeance in almost one hundred percent of such circumstances, then why is he invited to enter again?

## 1.27 Reply to the Second Objection

The first objection was that every individual should have the freedom to be able to accept whatever his heart is satisfied with, and to not accept whatever he is not satisfied with. There should be no differentiation between a *Kafir* and a *Murtad* in this. You have noted the reply to this question -why there is the need to differentiate between a *Kafir* and a *Murtad*?

The second objection was that by keeping someone bound like this as a Muslim (through fear of punishment of death), that individual will spend life as a hypocrite which is of no benefit. The answer to this has already been noted but it is necessary to repeat it for further clarification. He states:

*It is also wrong to give this connotation regarding the execution of a Murtad, that by making him fearful of death, we force an individual to adopt a hypocritical attitude. The matter is actually the opposite of this. We wish to close the door of our Jamaat to such people entering who are suffering from the malady of indecisiveness and play the game of changing beliefs as an entertainment, and in whose opinions and character that strength simply does not exist which is required for the establishment of a system of life.<sup>80</sup>*

You are not closing the door to entry; you are closing the door to exit. After shutting this door, if those people who will remain as Muslims through fear of death are not going to spend the life of a hypocrite, then what else will it be? As far as the question is concerned of your wishing to close the door to incomers to your *Jamaat* who are suffering from the ailment of indecisiveness, then by the same logic that going from Islam to *Kufr* is a sign of impulsiveness of attitude, it is also indecisiveness of attitude to come towards Islam from *Kufr*. According to

---

<sup>79</sup> S. A. Maududi, *Ibid*, p 66

<sup>80</sup> S. A. Maududi, *Ibid*, p 51.

this reasoning of yours, (Allah forbid) all the companions of Rasul-ullah who left their first religion and entered Islam were of an impulsive nature. In contrast to them were Abu-Jahl and Abu-Lahab, beings of 'strong belief and conduct' who even when dying, died without ever leaving their religion! Sir! Just reflect in which direction you are heading.

## **1.28 The Reply to the Third Objection**

The third objection was this, that if Islam metes out the death penalty to those who leave its domain, if this principle is accepted and implemented by every religion for itself, then as a result of this the door to preaching and dissemination of the message of every religion will be closed. In answer to this it is declared:

*The basis of this objection is also wrong. In reality, the issue before these objectors is that of these 'religions' and their preaching, which has previously been defined. Such religions should, in fact, keep their doors open to those who wish to enter or leave. If they close the door to those who are leaving, then they will be committing an unjustified action. But regarding that religion in which the state and society have been constructed on intellect and practice, no individual who has some vision in collectivism can give this advice that he will keep the door open for its own destruction and dispersion of the constituents of its construction, and fragmentation of its own integrity.<sup>81</sup>*

Absolutely agreed! He should give this very advice, that all those elements who have become averse to the fundamental principles of this state and society by being forcibly bound and instilled with the fear of death, should be detained within this society. By doing this, that society will certainly become greater in strength and that state will become very durable. The state or society in which there is a higher proportion of hypocrites will be established on a proportionately stronger foundation. This is such a clear and established, proven principle of politics and sociology, with which every destructive mind is fully acquainted. Hence, who can refute the appropriateness of this answer from Maududi? He himself declares that:

*Undoubtedly, we condemn hypocrisy and in our Jamaat we wish to see everyone with an honest Eimaan. But if an individual, due to his own idiocy, puts his foot inside this door from which he knows there is no exit and falls into a state of hypocrisy, then that*

---

<sup>81</sup> S. A. Maududi, Ibid, p 52.

*is his own fault. In order to extricate him from this condition, we cannot open the door to disorder of our system.*<sup>82</sup>

Absolutely do not open it! For some people, the more worms there are in a cheese and the more one can see them wriggling, the more valuable it is considered to be! It is a fact that the more repugnant the odour becomes inside their dark and narrow cloisters, the more it suits the mind of a Mullah.

## 1.29 The Reply to the Fourth Objection

Now let us consider the fourth objection i.e. that on the one hand, Islam proclaims that ‘there is no compulsion in Deen’ and on the other hand, it decrees the command of the death penalty for a change of religion. In response to this, he states:

*As far as this objection of the complainant is concerned, through careful reading of the above discussion, a large part of this automatically becomes void. The meaning of ‘there is no compulsion in Deen’ is that we do not compel anyone to enter our Deen, and this is in actual fact our way.<sup>83</sup> But to anyone who wishes to return after having entered, we warn him in advance that this door is not open for two-way traffic... agreed, this objection appears to have some weight that when Islam dispenses punishment to its followers on the change of religion, and does not consider it to be objectionable, then if the followers of other religions dispense punishment to their co-religionists on accepting Islam, then why does it condemn them? But the apparent contradiction which seems to be present between these two approaches is not actually the case. In fact, if only one approach had been adopted in both cases, then there would indeed have been a contradiction. Islam declares itself to be Haqq (Truth), and sincerely considers itself to be Haqq. Hence, it can never view those who are coming to Haqq, and those who are turning away from Haqq, to be of equivalent status.<sup>84</sup>*

If, in a rejoinder to this, you say that every religion in the world declares itself to be based on *Haqq* then why do these religions not have the right to adopt exactly the same approach, Maududi may say in reply that even though they declare themselves to be based on *Haqq*, they do not consider themselves to be based on

---

<sup>82</sup> S. A. Maududi, Ibid, p 53.

<sup>83</sup> It is not his injunction – it is from Allah i.e. Allah’s injunction. (Ed)

<sup>84</sup> S. A. Maududi, Ibid, p 54.

*Haqq* 'with full sincerity'. Therefore, even if they adopt this approach, they have no right to do so. We are the favourite sons of God, stepsons should be shamefaced to dare to declare equality with us! We can make slaves of prisoners of war and turn their women into concubines and put them into our homes, but no other nation has the right to do the same to our women. This is because we are the ones on *Haqq*, hence, we can do whatever we like, whereas others are not on *Haqq*. Similarly, we can put the individual amongst us who wishes to abandon our religion to the sword, but people of other religions can absolutely not do the same. There you go! You have also received an answer to the fourth objection.

If you are not able to be satisfied even by this, then there is only one solution left – and that is by filling a form of membership, to become a member of *Jamaat e Islami*. The hero worship there will paralyze your intellect and vision, and after this every declaration of his holiness will appear to be a Divine word – and then there will be peace everywhere.

### **1.30 What Will Happen to a Muslim by Birth?**

In his replies Maududi has continually asserted that whichever individual wishes to accept Islam, we warn him in advance that if you enter this then there will be no permission to exit from it. Therefore, if you wish to enter then think carefully before you do so. After this announcement of ours, it is a great foolishness to allow whoever has become trapped in this spider's web as a result of 'his own silliness' to exit it. From this, one thought naturally comes to mind, and that is that you have warned a Hindu that if you want to become a Muslim, then do so after eating and drinking well. But a child is born into a Muslim family, grows up there and is a Muslim by birth, he did not accept Islam through his own choice. Now the question is that, after becoming an adult, if he wishes to change his religion, will he be given permission to do this or will he, too, be handed over to the hangman's noose? This question is very important but Maududi has provided an answer for this as well. He states:

*There is one answer to this which is in principle, and another which is in practice. The answer in principle is that no differentiation can be made between commands relating to Muslims by birth and Muslims through conversion, and nor has any Deen ever differentiated between these.*

This was the answer according to principle. The practical answer is this:

*The apprehension which our objectors describe, never, in fact, arises in the practical world... a large majority of newer generations... emerges in agreement to obedience and loyalty of this system into which they are born. In these circumstances only a few such people can be born who, due to various reasons, arose with an inclination for transgression and rebellion, or can act like this afterwards... for such people two doors are open - either go outside the boundaries of this state and defy this... or put their own life in danger, and play that game of risking their life without which no system can be changed.*

After this, the following decision is announced:

*The progeny born of the Muslim race will be considered as being Muslim, and from the point of view of Muslim law, the door of Irt'daad will never be opened for them. If any among them turns away from Islam, then he will also deserve to be killed just like the individual who, after coming to Islam from Kufr, again adopts the path of Kufr. This is the united decision of all the Fuqaha<sup>85</sup> of Islam.<sup>86</sup>*

Have you heard the answer? Can there be any possible means to escape? This is not Islam, but a farce! Apply honey to 'there is no compulsion in Deen' and keep licking it: this is the decision of Allah. What value does the Mullah place on it? The decision remains as only that one which is 'the united decision of all the *Fuqaha*'. When the Quran stated that these people abandon Allah, and make their scholars and clerics as their *Rabb*, this was only in reference to Jews and Christians: Muslims enjoy full freedom to abandon the clear decisions of Allah, and to keep making the decisions of the *Fuqaha* as Deen - who is there to hold them accountable!

But we are amazed at why Maududi stopped here, why did he not venture a step further. It is also claimed in one *Hadeeth* that every child is born into Deen by nature (i.e. Islam). After this, it is their parents who make him a Jew, Christian, or Magian. Hence, even if a child is born among Hindus, he will also be a Muslim; in other words, every child in the world is a Muslim at birth but afterwards non-Muslim parents make him a *Murtad*. And since the punishment for a Muslim by birth becoming a *Murtad* is also death, hence, every child who is born into a non-Muslim household should be deserving of the death penalty because he has adopted another religion after having abandoned his birth religion (Islam).

---

<sup>85</sup>*Fuqaha* – religious scholars who are experts in *Fiqah*. (Ed)

<sup>86</sup> S. A. Maududi, *Ibid*, p 79.

Allah be praised! What a beauty is this Islam which Maududi is presenting!

### **1.31 The Use of Force**

These were the replies to the objections. After this, Maududi addresses the ideological aspect of this issue and informs us why it is necessary to use power to forcefully stop the change of religion. This is the most important part of this discourse because the real objective for which this whole net has been laid becomes apparent once this point is reached. He states:

*The question is only whether a state which governs some piece of land has the right to declare such acts which have the potential to disturb its system as crimes or not in order to protect its existence. If someone has an objection to this, then he should say when was it that a state did not use this right in the world?<sup>87</sup> What state is there today which does not exercise this right? Leaving aside Communist and Fascist states, just take these democratic states, from whose history and ideologies the present world has learned the lesson of democracy. . . are they not making use of this right?<sup>88</sup>*

### **1.32 US and UK Law**

Following on from this, he explains that according to the law of the UK and the US, a 'change of nationality' has been declared as being a crime, so this fact also supports the legitimacy for the killing of a *Murtad*.

We do not wish to become entangled in any detailed argument about this part because let us suppose that even if it is proven that according to the law of the UK and the US there is a death penalty for a 'change in nationality', this thing cannot become a criterion of Deen according to our school of thought as a Muslim. If something is present in the law given by Allah, and some nation has implemented that same thing for themselves using their own vision, then we can present this thing as a support for the truth of the Quran. But if something is against the law of Allah, then even if all the nations of the whole world adopt it

---

<sup>87</sup> This is the level of his Quranic understanding – he considers all states in the world to be the same and does not differentiate a Quranic state from other states. This is the thinking of most of those who understand Islam at the level of a religion just like other religions. (Ed)

<sup>88</sup> S. A. Maududi, *Ibid*, p 57

as law, for a Muslim this will always remain *Batil* and will not become declared as *Haqq*. Therefore, presenting any such things as being a criterion of Deen, or as logic and evidence, can only suit Maududi, we cannot dare to do this. It can only be his *Maslak* that, on the one hand, the system of these non-Muslim nations is declared to be a *Taghuti* system, and on the other hand, the laws of these nations are presented as criteria and evidence in complete contravention of the Quran.

After this difference in principle, we will suffice with a brief discussion about one or two issues in this connection. Maududi states that:

*Whether someone is a British national by birth, or becomes a naturalized British citizen of his own accord, according to the law he does not have this right that he can adopt some other nationality and take an oath of allegiance to some other nation, or that he can return to his previous nationality while remaining within the boundaries of the British state. He can only have this right if he is outside the boundaries of the UK.*

Maududi has not given any reference for this law and nor have we seen this kind of law anywhere. We ourselves have not heard of any such restriction within the boundaries of the UK.<sup>89</sup>

After this, Maududi has written that the punishment for an individual who 'in a state of war, while holding British nationality, adopts allegiance to any such state which is at war with the British King' or 'maintains contacts with the enemies of the King' or 'is desirous of the death of the King or Queen or crown prince' is the death penalty. But then he himself has noted about this that this is because it is declared to be 'high treason'.

Now it is obvious that extracting evidence in support of the punishment of *Irt'daad* from the punishment for the crime of treason is far-fetched, and there is a difference of heaven and earth between the two. (What the command is of the Quran regarding treason will be discussed further on).

Moving on from the UK and US, Maududi asserts:

*All of this is not confined to just these two countries; instead, whichever law of any country you seek to examine, you will find this same law working there - that those elements with which a state is constructed, it prevents the dispersion of these with*

---

<sup>89</sup> The author is correct that there is no such law in the UK. The UK government allows the holding of more than one nationality. In fact, any citizen holding dual nationality can hold any public office in the UK. (Ed)

*strength, and forcibly suppresses every one of those things which has the inclination to disturb that system.*<sup>90</sup>

### **1.33 The Idol of the State**

Have you noticed which nations are becoming the ideological background of this principle of politics and constitution? The above excerpt is calling out to us and declaring that the concept of the totalitarian state is writhing in his heart; the dictatorship of Nazism, Fascism, in fact of the Communism of the Soviet Union, is pulsating in the depths of his heart, while from the lips the name of democratic governments is being uttered. The biggest god created by modern *Ibleesi* politics is the concept of the state. Whatever used to be said or done in the name of god, all of that is now being undertaken in the name of the state. The state is such a sacrificial altar on which every drop of the blood of a citizen is sacrificed as an offering. In this new religion, existence is in reality of the state, not of the individual. But the state is the name of some such abstract entity which cannot be defined tangibly; however, when you analyse the state, then only the shadow of a name remains. This class, in whose hands the reins of power reside, is that idol of the state about which Maududi says:

*This procedure has intrinsic universal approval that the essential nature of the state and government demands this fact, that for their own existence and for the protection of their system, they have the right to use force and power. This is the right of a state as an intrinsic right of a state.*<sup>91</sup>

### **1.34 Use of Force**

Have you seen! 'The intrinsic nature of state and government demands this fact...' - these words are representing Hitler, Mussolini, and Lenin, according to whom the state has an existence, just as a living, functioning human being has a nature (and like the *Kali Mata* of Hinduism). The requirement of this nature is that it should use force for the protection of its existence.

---

<sup>90</sup> S. A. Maududi, Ibid, p 65

<sup>91</sup> S. A. Maududi, Ibid, p 66

Have you noticed from what directions Maududi is seeking and unearthing authorities and reasons, and from what kinds of places he is searching for justifications for *Fatwas* in support of the ‘execution of a *Murtad*’? The aim here is to provide a justification to support his own claim: what does it matter where this justification comes from. Have you also seen the evidence for this justification? ‘This order has universal approval in its own right...’ i.e. for an order to be viewed as truthful it should have ‘universal approval’. This is that ‘universal approval’ about which the Quran declares:

*If you were to follow the path of the majority on earth, they will lead you away from the path of Allah. They follow nothing but conjecture: they do nothing but lie.*  
(6:116)

In the *Tafsir* of this verse, Maududi himself expounds:

*In other words, most people who inhabit the world follow conjecture and guesswork instead of pursuing knowledge. And their beliefs, ideas, philosophy, principle of life, and laws upon which they act, are, all of them, based on guesswork. Contrary to this, the path of Allah i.e. that way of living life in the world which is according to the Will of Allah, is unequivocally the one about which Allah Himself has bestowed knowledge, not the one that people have devised based on their own guesswork. Hence, the seeker of Haqq should not look at what path the majority of people in the world are following, instead he should tread with full steadfastness on that path which is defined by Allah, even if by treading on that path he remains as the only one doing so in the world.<sup>92</sup>*

But these matters are confined only to the writings in *Tafsir*; action should be on this principle that if something is found in the Book of Allah matching your own vested interest, then that should be produced as a justification, and if instead (in fact, even contrary to it) some ‘universally approved’ order of the world appears through which one’s own objective is fulfilled, then this should be presented as evidence!

In any case, Maududi has described this principle that the state has the right (and this is its inherent right which no one can take away) to use coercion and power for its existence and for the preservation of its system, and because by a change in religion the preservation of the existence of the state becomes threatened, hence, the state possesses the right to prevent this change by instilling fear of the death penalty and by the power of the sword.

---

<sup>92</sup> S. A. Maududi, *Tafheem ul Quran*, pp 575-576

After this 'decree' (for which no evidence was produced from the Quran because no need was even felt for this), Maududi appears brazenly before us and announces in explicit terms who has the right to wield this power. The decree was this, that the state possesses the right that 'it should forcibly prevent the dispersion of those elements which are put together for its construction, and by the use of force suppress every one of those things which has the tendency to disturb its system'. From this it was being proven that, for example, since the government of Pakistan had sent Maududi to prison, then this was also according to this same decree which has universal approval and according to which the state possesses the intrinsic right that it should prevent such disruptive elements by force.

### **1.35 But the Right to Use Force is Only ...**

But having arrived at this point, Maududi says in very clear words that No! this right does not belong to the officials of every state. This right belongs only to those who are responsible for the establishment of the Divine government. The government of Pakistan does not have this right; this right is only for the Islamic government and its *Amir* (head) because the government which will be established through their hands will be the government of *Haqq*. Hence, he states:

*For us the establishment of every government or state other than the government of Allah is illegitimate right from the start. Thus regarding the state which is based on an illegitimate foundation, we cannot accept that it should be able to use force for the protection of its illegitimate existence and its wrong system ... (the right to use coercion and power for the protection of its existence is the state's inherent right but) if something can make this Haqq as Batil then it is only this - that the state which wishes to take advantage from this Haqq is itself established on Batil, because the existence of Batil is in itself a crime, and if it employs power for its own establishment and survival, then this becomes the severest of crimes.* <sup>93</sup>

Have you noticed at what point the thread about 'killing of a *Murtad*' has broken off? In other words:

---

<sup>93</sup> S. A. Maududi, *Ibid*, p 66

- (1) The state has the right to coerce people to remain within its domain of power.
- (2) But this right only belongs to the state which has been established on *Haqq*.
- (3) Only the state in which the system of *Shariat* is implemented becomes established on *Haqq*.
- (4) The system of *Shariat* can be established through the hands of a Mullah.
- (5) Today this system will be established through the hands of the *Jamaate Islami*, because
- (6) When the reins of power come into the hands of the *Jamaate Islami*, then they will possess the right to use force and oppression against every one of those elements which, in their opinion, may be a cause for disruption of that system.

Have you observed from where the matter began and to where it has reached! And what has erupted from the bottom of this ocean? This is why it used to be said:

*For Allah's sake do not lift the cover of the Kaaba, O Mullah!*

*In case it may happen that here, too, that same Kafir idol emerges!*

### **1.36 Why Were *Ahadeeth* About Killing a *Murtad* Invented?**

You may have assessed by now why, despite such clear teaching of the Quran and such explicit commands (about religious freedom), *Ahadeeth* were invented about the execution of a *Murtad*! It is very clear that until this holy foundation was not laid down, this evil edifice of coercion by the stalwarts of *Shariat* could never have been constructed. This was all done so that power could be kept in their own hands. But before hearing the details of this 'holy tyranny,' take a brief look at what it is that is called power. How did the concept of rule come into existence and what remedy did the Quran give for it? It will be comprehended after this what the real meaning was by 'execution of a *Murtad*'.

### **1.37 *Malukiyat* and Priesthood**

Read through the pages of history: one continuous tale will be visible from beginning to end of a ruler and the ruled, a hunter and the hunted. Those people

who somehow or other acquired rulegripped others in the clutches of their subjugation, and after that used every tactic available in this objective that the one who has once become a subject never escapes from this subjugation. For this purpose the *Malukiyat* prepared shackles and chains for the human body, and the priesthood prepared camouflaged traps in the land to ensnare the human mind with beliefs of reverence. The mutual pact between these two made the Rajah the avatar of *Eshwar*, the emperor, the shadow of Allah; and the king, the holder of Divine rights. Loyalty to the crown and obedience to the throne became Divine obligations. When there was a protest in the West against the rule of the personage of royalty, their politicians devised new terminologies in place of the old ones, and in this way deceived the public; consequently, the suppressive mechanism of rule was transposed into rule through a people's democracy. After the change in this doctrine, they began to carve new idols in place of old ones. Now the term nationhood (my country) occupied the place of throne and crown; this was the terminology of democracy. In contrast to this, the fascism of the totalitarian state devised the term 'state' for nationhood: 'The state or country is higher than the people'. 'The existence of the people is for the state'. The state is the owner of intrinsic rights which can never be taken away from it under any circumstances. Whoever interferes in these rights is a traitor and a rebel. The state has the right to eliminate him by the gallows. Everything is legitimate for the protection of the state - in fact, not only legitimate, but a duty.

As has been written already, the state is an abstract term which has not been able to be defined comprehensively to date. No one can inform us as to what it is that is actually called the state. These political sorcerers have ensnared the public in the maze of this abstract term, and under its cover continued to do everything that the *Malukiyat* used to do, in fact even more than that. But with this difference that during the era of *Malukiyat*, the people knew from whose direction the injustice and suppression was coming from, but now the situation has become such that murders are taking place and nothing is known as to who the murderer is and whose responsibility it is to pay the blood money. All this takes place for the state and no one knows what it is that is called the state. If you ponder on it then this reality will dawn on you, that the way in which in the era of infancy of the human intellect priesthood had created the existence of gods and everything used to be run in their names, similarly, in the modern era an idol of the state has been carved. Only the words have changed, the soul remains the same.

### **1.38 The Quranic Revolution**

The Quran arrived and announced that the very concept of ruler and ruled is in itself *Batil*. Human beings have to live with one another and for this they require a societal system. This societal system can be of two types. One is that which man can establish using his own conjectures, the second is that which can be established according to the light of the principles bestowed by *Wahi*. The society which is established according to *Wahi* is called Islamic life. The Quran has stated that the way to establish an Islamic society is that those people who accept this reality without any coercion or compulsion that the society which is established according to *Wahi* is indeed the best society for human life, should (by uniting in this common relationship of *Eimaan*) produce that mutual discipline and cooperation through which this society can come into practical existence. It is evident from this that the foundation of this society will be based on *Eimaan*. Listen to this once more: the meaning of *Eimaan* is to accept this reality willingly that for human life the right society is only that one which is established on the foundations of the *Wahi* of Allah. Since the foundation of this society is on *Eimaan* (ideology) and *Eimaan* can only be declared as *Eimaan* when it is accepted with the agreement of the heart, therefore, even the thought of coercion and compulsion is impossible in the establishment of this society.

The individuals of this society become the constituents of this society through the decisions of their hearts. So just as that individual whose heart does not bear witness to the reality of this system cannot become part of this system, similarly that individual who even though he enters this system but after that his heart is not content with its reality, also cannot remain a part of this system. In the same way that the Quran does not compel the former to become a part of this system, it also does not compel the latter to feel obliged to remain part of the system. This is because, as has been noted above, the very foundation of this system is based on the agreement of the heart (*Eimaan*); the moment compulsion appears anywhere, this system will disintegrate. Through coercion, subjects can be held together but the constituents of a righteous (*Saleh*) system cannot be kept combined together. The mutual relationship of an individual in a righteous system is with the amalgamation of hearts i.e. unity of heart and outlook and of one colour! It is evident that mutual harmony of heart and vision simply cannot be engendered through compulsion.<sup>94</sup> Allah had informed Rasul-ullah that the one colour of hearts (unity of hearts) which is the distinguishing characteristic of the people of this system can only be born through *Eimaan*:

---

<sup>94</sup> See verses (3:103-104). (Ed)

*And He has put affection between their hearts: not if you had spent all that is in the earth could you have produced that affection... (8:63)*

Regarding those people who come together for purposes other than mutual harmony of hearts, the Quran has stated:

*... You would think they were united, but their hearts are divided... (59:14)*

And the remaining together like this of those people who are forcibly bound together can possibly occur based on hypocrisy, but cannot be through the agreement of their hearts. How can such people be constituents of this system whose very foundation is based on the mutual harmony of hearts? This is why the Quran decrees that those people who no longer have *Eimaan* in the validity of this system, let them leave the system. Allah will bring such a group in their place who will have all those characteristics from which the foundation of this system is laid. Hear what those characteristics are. It is declared:

*O you who have accepted Eimaan! If any from amongst you turns away from his Deen, soon will Allah produce a group whom Allah will keep as His companion and they will keep Allah as their Companion; They will be very compassionate towards Momineen but very resolute against Kafireen; fighting in the path of Allah and not fearful of anyone who may condemn them. This is the Fadl (bounties, favours) of Allah which He bestows according to His law. He is vast in His Fadl and is Omniscient. (5:54)*

Just consider that if these people who do not wish in their hearts to be part of this system, are compelled to remain part of this system out of fear of death, is it in any way possible for them to become holders of these attributes:

- (a) They hold Allah as their companion.
- (b) Their conduct towards other sincere members of their *Jamaat* should be extremely compassionate and of heartfelt affection.
- (c) They should be extremely firm against the opponents of the *Jamaat*.
- (d) They should not be afraid of the condemnation of anyone who condemns and
- (e) They fight with their lives in the path of Allah.

### **1.39 Heartfelt Obedience**

This is why these people can never be retained as constituents of the Islamic system. Only those people who are holders of the traits mentioned above can be declared to be constituents of the Islamic system. Islam definitely wishes

for protection of its system, but the secret of its protective power is in the staunch *Eimaan* of the members of the *Millat* which arises from the depths of hearts. Instead of being a strength of the system, the existence of those people who are forcibly bound to the *Millat* is a cause for its severe weakness. This was also acknowledged by Maududi himself at one point in time. Upon which he writes in his book titled, *Al Jihad fil Islam* (published in 1937):

*If an individual, seeing a shining sword above his head, utters La Ilaha Ill Lillah<sup>95</sup>, but his heart continues to be a temple of idols devoid of Allah, then this acceptance from his lips without the confirmation of his heart is of no benefit, and for Islam his acceptance is absolutely useless. Deen is, however, a great entity; even minor movements in the world whose aim is merely to achieve worldly benefits cannot trust such followers for their own success who only show sympathy to them through words but in their hearts are not their supporters. By taking along faint hearted, disloyal, and false followers, no movement up until today has seen the face of success; and certainly by taking along such lifeless lumps of flesh, who are completely devoid of the spirit of truth, no man can have the courage to step into the competitive arena of the world, and cannot hope to achieve success and prosperity. Then just reflect that the Deen in front of which is not worldly success, but the success and prosperity of the hereafter, the Deen which calls intention and belief as being the foundation of the deed, the Deen which does not consider any deed of any value without the spirit of devotion and truth... could it have been that by abandoning devotion and truth, it would satisfy itself with the acceptance of forced obedience and helplessness?... if it did this, then could it have achieved that success which it has, in reality, achieved?<sup>96</sup>*

These are the reasons on the basis of which the Quran states that those people who, as a result of dedication and honesty and by the affirmation of their heart, do not remain as supporters of your ideology, their forced acceptance or agreement as a result of perceived obligation is of no value. Therefore, nothing will be achieved by forcing them to obedience and detaining them as a member of your system in this way. Say to them that there will be no loss to this system with your departure. The secret of the strength of this system is in the *Eimaan* of those people whose condition is such that:

*... a people whom He will love as they love Him... fighting in the path of Allah, and never afraid of the reproaches of such as find fault... (5:54)*

---

<sup>95</sup>There is no *Ilah* (god) except Allah. (Ed)

<sup>96</sup> S. A. Maududi, *Al Jihad fil Islam* (Jihad in Islam). Translated from Urdu. pp 125-126

There is no doubt that the nations of the world maintain such forces and armies for their protection which are kept held together at the point of a sword, but the Quran declares these to be Pharaonic states and *Taghutis* systems. In the Islamic system and the Quranic state, there can be no role for intimidation and subjugation, or coercion and compulsion. This state is constituted by those people who, before bowing their heads in this path, have already bowed their hearts. Thus the heart of the one who has adopted rebellion against the fundamental concepts of this state cannot remain included among the constituents composing this state. His position in this state is exactly the same as those people whose hearts are not convinced about the ideology of this state, but who wish to live their life under the shade of its peace and security. They are called *Zimmi* or *Mustaman*, though if these people (whether living as hypocrites as part of the system of the *Millat* i.e. calling themselves Muslims, or living as *Zimmi* by falling into the lap of *Kufi*) try to overturn the Islamic system, then defending against them will be carried out by the power of the sword.

#### **1.40 Punishment for Treason**

The Quran has given a clear command in this regard and has decreed:

*Those people who wage war against Allah and His messenger (the Islamic system) and strive with might and main to cause chaos in the land, undoubtedly, their punishment is that they should be killed or hanged, or their hand and foot should be amputated on opposite sides, or they should be expelled from the land. There is humiliation for them in this world, and a severe chastisement in the Hereafter. (5:33)*

In other words, the punishment for treason according to the Quran is the death penalty, or some other penalty out of other punishments according to the demands of the circumstances. Even in the case of treason the Quran has retained some allowance, so that if before their arrest the rebels become remorseful by repenting on their act, then they can be forgiven. As a consequence, in the next verse it is stated:

*But if they repent before you capture them, then know that Allah is Forgiving and Merciful. (5:34)*

#### **1.41 Difference Between a *Murtad* and a Traitor**

Have you noticed that the Quran holds a *Murtad* and a traitor in very different categories? A *Murtad* is one who develops discord with Islamic ideology but after this he wishes to live as a peaceful citizen of the state. According to the Quran, there is no punishment for this because holding a difference of opinion with Islamic ideology is not any crime. Contrary to this, a traitor is one who attempts to overthrow the Islamic system. This is a crime, and a penalty has been fixed for this by the Quran. Whatever kinds of reasons Maududi has put forward to support the killing of a *Murtad* are, in fact, about treason against the state (look back on the reasons presented by him and the matter will become clear). By creating a mixture from both (treason and *Irt'daad*) in this way, in his opinion he has proven the case for the execution of a *Murtad* intellectually too. Even though whatever he has proven is merely this: that no state in the world can allow permission for treason against it. Similarly, the Islamic state also cannot allow traitors to roam free. There was no need even for any lengthy discussion about this since a clear command is present in the Quran for this. But he has not quoted this verse anywhere because if he had quoted it then readers would have come to know that the Quran differentiates between a traitor and a *Murtad*, whereas Maududi wishes to seek proof for his claim by fixing the reasons and commands about traitors on the *Murtadeen*.

It is possible that some individual or gang of individuals, together with *Irt'daad* from Islam, may also instigate a rebellion against the state. In that case, counter action will be taken against them based on the crime of treason, not because of *Irt'daad*. If some such incident is uncovered in history during the era of the Righteous Caliphs in which a battle may have been conducted against the '*Murtadeen*', then the reason for this could only be that these *Murtadeen* must also have resorted to treason due to which this kind of action was taken against them. This is because we simply cannot conceive such a thing that it could be considered that the companions of Rasul-ullah would have committed such a blatant transgression against such clear teaching of the Quran. If Maududi and his cronies have the audacity to do this, let them, but we cannot do this.

#### **1.42 Then What Happened?**

This is an outline of the system which the Quran wishes to have shaped i.e. a system based on those individuals who have declared the fundamental and basic principles of this system as the aim before them of their life, and who have wholeheartedly made the establishment of this system the purpose of their life. In this system the question of coercion and intimidation simply does not

arise. This is in fact the difference between the *Taghuti* system and the Quranic system. This system was established by Rasul-ullah and his companions, but when *Khilafat* mutated into *Malukiyat*, then this map of the Islamic system in which the system used to be created with willingness, agreement, and inclination, also altered completely. Now differentiation between ruler and ruled and the same coercion and compulsion was set in motion again. Along with *Malukiyat*, dualism also made its appearance and Deen became divided into politics and religion. The flagbearers of politics were the holders of the reins of power, and the representatives of religion were the members of *Shariat*. The holders of *Shariat* saw that the punishment for rebelling against the king is death, however, there is no punishment for rebelling against them. They simply could not tolerate this, that the king should acquire so many powers while the holders of *Shariat* should be left to simply hand out hollow *Fatwas*. They contrived that the punishment for transgression (*Irt'daad*) against religion should also be the death penalty. Since no authority for this could be obtained from the Quran, they therefore did the same that is done regarding other aspects of religion: they simply and easily fabricated a few *Abadeeth* for this and attributed them to Rasul-ullah. So there you have it! The powers of the religious clergy increased beyond even that of the holders of the reins of government. You may be wondering in your heart how did their powers increase beyond those of the holders of the reins of government? Listen to this also!

### **1.43 Who is a *Murtad*?**

Up until now, you may have been thinking that the meaning of a *Murtad* is that individual who announces this fact that, leaving Islam, I wish to adopt some other religion i.e. instead of being a Muslim, I wish to be a *Kafir*. As a result, in his pamphlet Maududi has taken great care to also ensure this fact that the reader's mind simply does not divert to any other meaning apart from this meaning. But for the bearers of *Shariat* this is not the only definition of a *Murtad*. You may be reading on almost a daily basis that a *Fatwa* of *Kufr* has been declared against such and such an individual. As a result of this news there is neither any particular effect on you, nor on the individual against whom this *Fatwa* is declared, rather, these *Fatwas* of *Kufr* have now acquired a semblance of comedy, but during 'Islamic rule' (i.e. the rule of Muslim kings) this *Fatwa* of *Kufr* was no joke. Whoever had a *Fatwa* of *Kufr* placed upon him was held to be a *Murtad* and the punishment for a *Murtad* was to be killed. Therefore, the death penalty used to become mandatory with a *Fatwa* of *Kufr*. Consequently, the blood of the one against whom a *Fatwa* of *Kufr* was declared would become legitimate. If you look

in the books of *Fiqah* you will find lengthy discussions there on this topic, how a Muslim becomes a *Kafir* (i.e. a *Murtad*) over minor differences in 'beliefs'.

Now just contemplate whether the powers of the Mullah were wider, or those of the king? The king still had to do something to prove the crime of treason, but for the Mullah finding an excuse for *Takfir*<sup>97</sup> was not at all difficult. For him, it was sufficient to simply announce that the beliefs of such and such an individual are incorrect, or that a certain belief of his is at odds with that of the populace. After this the *Fatwa* of *Kufr* was imposed on him, and he was killed right in the open square. Neither any lawyer, nor any scope for appeal. This state of affairs was also very beneficial for the kings. If they desired to kill someone for their own reasons but were unable to prove any severe crime against him, then a *Fatwa* of *Kufr* would be obtained from the Mullah, and after that he was conveniently handed over to the executioner. According to *Shariat*, a pardon could be given to even a rebel, but for a *Murtad* there was no room for reprieve anywhere. Furthermore, no other individual could even utter a word against his murder, because doing this was criticism and finding fault with '*Shariat*', and its punishment was also death!

#### **1.44 Rivers of Innocent Blood**

If you want to gauge what an Armageddon this *Kufr* declaring workshophas unleashed, cast a glance at the history of Muslims (post *Khilafat*), and then see which of its pages is not stained with splashes of blood? The degree of mercilessness and senselessness with which Muslims themselves have killed other Muslims in history in the name of every single belief in turn, even the deliberate machinations of the *Kafireen* must not have done this to them. There is an extremely honest and righteous, compassionate Muslim who differs with a tiny part of a belief, therefore, because of this difference, a *Fatwa* of *Kufr* was declared against him, and this *Fatwa* proclaimed him to be a *Murtad* and he was slaughtered by the blunt knife of the Mullah. As an example, let us take a belief about *Khalq e Quran* (creation of the Quran). When the Mu'tazila (a group of Muslims of that time) invented the belief of *Tanzeeh*<sup>98</sup> of the self and the denial of attributes, from this the question then arose whether the Quran (*Kalam Allah*) is

---

<sup>97</sup>*Takfir* - declaring someone as a *Kafir*. (Ed)

<sup>98</sup>*Tanzeeh* - purification. (Ed)

*Makbluq* or non-*Makbluq*.<sup>99</sup> At this point you may perhaps enquire, what was the significance of this question anyway which was raised like this, but ask the pages of history, how many streams of innocent blood were there that this one question filled? In the second century A.H., Ja'ad bin Durham claimed the Quran to be *Makbluq*. Following in his footsteps, Jahm bin Safwan made this claim. The *Muhaddithin* declared this pronouncement to be against Islam and declared the holders of this belief to be *Murtad*. As a punishment for this crime, Khalid bin Abdullah Qasri, administrator of Iraq, slaughtered Ja'ad bin Durham on the day of Eid-ul-Adhain the form of a sacrifice, and Jahm bin Safwan was killed by Salma bin Ahauz in Maro. During the era of Mamun ur Rashid (an Abbasid Caliph), circumstances took a turnaround, and he himself, along with his courtiers, became convinced of the Quran being *Makbluq*. Now *Fatwas* of *Kufr* began to be issued against the *Muhaddithin* and they began to be killed for the crime of *Irt'daad*. The majority of scholars saved their lives by stating under compulsion that the Quran is *Makbluq*, but many of them, by remaining steadfast on their belief, suffered severe hardships and continued to be killed. Among these there were also renowned personalities like Imam Ahmad bin Hanbal. The soul shudders at the suffering which the Imam was subjected to as a result of the punishment of imprisonment. He would be brought to the court and whipped, and when he lost consciousness he would be sent back to the prison. This process did not last one or two days but continued for a full two and a half years. Moatsim (a successor of Mamun ur Rashid) used to have all those people killed who used to declare the Quran to be non-*Makbluq*. But he did not dare to kill the Imam for whom the public had great veneration. The successor of Moatsim, Wathic, also expanded these streams of blood, so much so, that by killing Ahmad bin Nasar with his own hands on the basis of this same belief, he became deserving of 'supreme *Sawab*<sup>100</sup>'. The body of Ahmad was hanged on the gallows in Samra and after that his head was sent to Baghdad. A note was hung on his ear on which it was written:

*This is the head of Ahmad bin Nasar, the Mushrik and misguided one, who has been killed by Amir ul Momineen with his own hands in order to earn nearness to Allah.*

Eventually, Mutawakkul somehow managed to put an end to this curse and barbarism, and the *Muhaddithin* could finally breathe a sigh of relief. From Mamun to Wathic, during the eras of three '*Khulfa*<sup>101</sup>', the extent to which this one minor

---

<sup>99</sup>*Makbluq* – creation. (Ed)

<sup>100</sup>*Sawab* – this means Divine reward. (Ed)

<sup>101</sup>*Khulfa* – plural of *Khalifa* (Caliph) (Ed)

difference became the cause for so much bloodshed and destruction cannot even begin to be imagined. The *Shariah* justification for this curse and barbarism were those few *Abadeeth* which were concocted as grounds for the killing of a *Murtad*. This tale is of that era which is said to be the bright chapter of Islam in the history of Muslims i.e. the Abbasid period, and within the era of the Abbasids even that of Mamun ur Rashid. In such a 'civilised era' when knowledge and prosperity were abounding and 'Islamic civilisation and culture' was at its peak, and this was the environment of coercion and intimidation created by *Fitna e Takfir* and *Irt'daad* - you can then assess for yourselves what must have been taking place during the dark eras of Muslims? Due to the fear of accusation of *Irt'daad*, the condition of the people would become such that they would have to keep a certificate of correct beliefs in their pocket, because without this certificate from the Mullah there was always the fear that who knows when someone might impose a *Fatwa* of *Kufr*, and the head becomes severed. The European religious trial (the Inquisition) is quoted as an example of the evidence of the cruelties of priests. But in our own history, the extent to which cruelties and tyrannies based on differences in beliefs have taken place is no less than the 'accountability' by the priests.

#### **1.45 The Biggest Loss of All**

The illegitimate bloodshed of so many innocent people of the Muslim *Ummat* under the cloak of '*Irt'daad*' is certainly no lesser loss, but due to this 'religious tyranny' a greater loss than even this occurred. At every step, the Quran has emphasised the use of intellect and reasoning, research and enquiry. As a result of this, Quranic facts were being uncovered throughout every era, and this is what Allah had advised was the method by which to confirm the truth of the teaching of the Quran (41:53). But when the religious junta issued this command that whoever says anything which is against their belief will be declared as a *Murtad*, the door to reflection and deliberation in the Quran became closed and the minds of the *Ummat* were locked in a torpor of blind obedience to their forefathers. The result being that the world advanced multifold, and this *Ummat* which was created to provide *Imamat* and leadership to mankind, is still standing where it was one thousand years ago. In our time, this inertia and blind obedience (*Taqleed*) has made the situation very fragile. Our educated youth want to accept everything through reason and evidence, but they cannot be satisfied by our orthodox and religious clergy. These people desire that this section of the youth should continue to accept everything in the way that they wish them to without any reasoning and evidence, but they are not minded to accepting it in this way.

The consequence being that this section is not only becoming indifferent to religion but is becoming antagonistic. The orthodox group becomes angry at this, and instead of reflecting on why this is happening, they declare them to be atheists, devoid of Deen, duped by the West; in fact, by declaring them *Kafir* and *Murtad*, they give vent to the frustration of their hearts. However, it is obvious that this kind of situation cannot be welcome for any nation, and for the nation (Islamic *Millat*) whose very foundation is on Deen, it cannot be declared to be bearable in any way whatsoever. But what can its remedy be, when our religious class makes absolutely no attempt to realise this and even now insists on treading that same path, so that whenever someone utters any word which is inconsistent with their own thinking, they declare him to be a *Kafir* and a *Murtad*. How painfully sad is this state of affairs!

#### **1.46 Concluding Remarks**

The thought processes and justifications of Maududi regarding the execution of a *Murtad* have appeared before you. You have also seen the relevant verses of the Quran which are against this. In light of these, you can decide for yourself whether, according to the Quran, a change of religion by a Muslim is deserving of the death penalty and what is this the objective of the Quran, that those people whose heart is not satisfied with Islamic ideology should be made Muslim and bound as such through fear of death? If you think that this is not, in reality, the decree and desire of the Quran, then reflect whether those narrations on the basis of which this whole structure of the execution of a *Murtad* has been raised, is absolutely against the teaching of the Quran or not!

After this, pay attention to what we say and to what the Mullahs (and their representative, Maududi) say. We state that such narrations (*Abadeeth*) which are against the teaching of the Quran can never be the sayings of Rasul-ullah, because according to our understanding, such a thing cannot even be conceived of (Allah forbid) that Rasul-ullah could say or do any such thing which is against the Quran.

But contrary to this, the Mullahs (and their representative, Maududi) claim that the real teaching of Islam is only that which is contained within these *Abadeeth*. After this, just think what is that crime of ours in retaliation for which we

are condemned and sentenced to have our throat cut, and the *Maslak* presented by Tolu-e-Islam is proclaimed as being the greatest *Fitna*<sup>102</sup> of our time?

After viewing all of this, just ponder for a while on this: that if, Allah forbid, that 'system of *Shariat*' is implemented in the country for the establishment of which Maududi and his *Jamaat* are striving, and in this way, under the guise of implementation of matters of *Shariat*, the reins of power pass into the hands of these people, then what will the condition of the people living in Pakistan become. And the world will witness a *Tamasha*<sup>103</sup> of what kind of Islam. Will this Islam not be the 'sacred being' of that same Pharaonic spirit which used to issue a *Fatwa* of death against every one of those individuals who held even the slightest difference with it, by saying the following:

...*Did you change your religion without our permission (and accepted Eimaan on Moses)...(7:123)*

Understand this reality once again, that the meaning of 'execution of a *Murtad*' does not only mean that if some Muslim becomes a Hindu, or Christian, he should be killed; it also means that if these 'holy scholars' declare about some individual that his beliefs are incorrect and that in this way he has become a '*Kafir*', then he will also be killed. Very few such incidents will be found in our history where someone gave up Islam and adopted some other religion and was killed. But the whole of history is full of such incidents where, whenever it was declared about an individual or a sect that their beliefs were incorrect, then that individual or thousands of people connected to that sect were consigned to the sword. In our history, the practical implementation of this command has only been on Muslims who were convinced about Allah, Rasul-ullah, the Quran, and the hereafter, etc., but they had differences in some minor issue with these scholars. You can appreciate how dangerous this situation is.

#### **1.46.1 One Clarification**

Finally, we wish to make it clear once again that in this discussion we have particularly quoted the name of Maududi because he has specifically published a pamphlet on the topic of 'Killing of a *Murtad*' otherwise the belief of all of our 'scholars' is very much that:

---

<sup>102</sup>*Fitna* – an issue which causes trouble. (Ed)

<sup>103</sup>*Tamasha* – a grand commotion, show or dance. (Ed)

- (i) Any individual who holds a difference with them in even the most minor of beliefs is a *Murtad*. And,
- (ii) The punishment of a *Murtad* is execution.

Hence, in this connection, the question is not of a Zaid, or Bakar, or of Umer. The real issue is about this wrong belief which has unfortunately been prevalent among us for centuries. Until the time that this wrong belief does not become corrected in accordance with the Quran, there can be no possibility of rectifying the situation. Remember! The Quran is the greatest proponent of freedom of thought, opinions, ideas, and beliefs in the world, and it does not wish to have any of its values accepted through duress. It neither wishes to make anyone a Muslim by coercion, nor does it enforce on anyone who wishes to leave Islam for some reason and adopt another religion that he cannot do this. It holds freedom of ideas and beliefs to be the fundamental right of a human being. Its fundamental ruling is:

*... Whoever wishes should accept Eimaan and whoever wishes should accept Kufr...*  
(18:29)

## 2 Slaves and Concubines

If you listen to an address on the truthfulness and reality of Islam from the platform of any mosque, you will always hear these grand and lofty claims that:

*Islam has bestowed religious freedom; Islam has erased every sign and remnant of slavery from the world...*

It is a fact that these claims of our speakers and reformers contain great truth, but together with this, it is also a fact that they are also based on an equally great lie. You will obviously be astounded at how it is that we have written such contradictory things? But this contradiction does, in reality, exist, and it contains thousands of chronicles of instruction and lessons in it for every discerning mind. Undoubtedly, Islam provided religious freedom to mankind and removed any sign of slavery from the world. Hence, Islam has earned this right that it can present as lofty a claim as it wishes in front of the world, and in this regard, it has conferred a supreme favour on mankind. But which Islam? That Islam which was sent down by Allah, which Rasul-ullah passed on to the world, and which even today is preserved and present within the folds of the Quran. This is the certification for the supreme truth of these claims. But if these claims are put forward from the direction of the scholars of *Shariat* regarding the Islam which they present, then they are, in fact, based on a tremendous lie: this is because Islam has neither given religious freedom, nor has eliminated slavery. How this Islam has strangled the throat of religious freedom, you have seen a picture of this under the topic of '*Qatal e Murtaf*'. In the chapter under view, take note of what the opinion is of that Islam regarding slavery, which was concocted by *Ajmi*<sup>104</sup> intrigues, and which the Mullah, by connecting it to Allah and His Rasul, is becoming a cause for the defamation of Islam and the humiliation of mankind.

### 2.1 Teaching of Quranic Islam

First let us see what the teaching is of the Islam of the Quran in this respect. At the time when Rasul-ullah became a *Nabi*, slavery was also prevalent as an established fact just like *Malukiyat*, priesthood, capitalism, racism, and

---

<sup>104</sup>*Ajmi*—reference to a non-Arab. (Ed)

nationalism. Leaving the tyrannical kings to one side, the state of worldly scholars was such that Aristotle had seventy slaves, and he used to present seventy reasons to justify slavery. In Arabia, slaves and concubines had become an intrinsic part of their society. Slaves used to work outdoors while inside the homes concubines were employed for sexual gratification. This same practice had been continuing among them for centuries, hence, as has been written above, slaves and concubines had become apart of their society, and the greater part of their economic life was dependent on this. The Quran had come to break these chains and bonds in which mankind was continuously being gripped. Obviously, how could it have allowed the worst of curses like these chains of slavery. The message of the Quran is a message about the eminence of humanity and its invitation is an invitation to the dignity of humanity. The proclamation of Allah of the Quran is:

*Surely, we have honoured the children of Adam... (17:70)*

This means that man as a human being is deserving of respect. His being a human being is a cause for eminence, and this eminence and respect is for every child of Adam. All of mankind has been created from a 'single cell' (4:1) and 'Divine energy' (*Ruh*<sup>105</sup>) has been breathed into every human being; in other words, every human being is a holder of the potentialities of these Divine attributes. And the purpose and meaning of a Quranic society is only this, that by manifesting these potential attributes they should become completely developed. It is self-evident that in the Deen in which this is the fundamental teaching about man, human slavery cannot even be envisaged.

## **2.2 Two Stages Were in Front of the Quran**

There were two important questions before the Quran:

- (1) At the time of the revelation of the Quran, to provide a route for the emancipation of those slaves and concubines who had become a part of the social and economic life of the Arabs (and in other countries). And,
- (2) For the future, to shut the gate through which slaves and concubines used to enter.

---

<sup>105</sup>*Ruh* – see verse (32:9). (Ed)

Regarding the first point, it is obvious that all of these slaves and concubines could not be made to disappear in one day. The objective of Islam was that by giving them freedom, to make them stand side by side with the rest of humanity, but in the social and economic circumstances which are mentioned above, this aim could only be achieved gradually. If all of these slaves and concubines (who were present at that time) had been freed and released immediately, then not only would a severe disruption have taken place in that society, but even for these slaves and concubines themselves there would have been untold hardships, and more often than not, they would not even have wished to abandon those families with whom they were well adjusted. The Quran adopted such a practical technique regarding them, through which they became absorbed by degrees into free society. They were given the right that if they wished, then by paying some compensation, they could achieve permission to be free. At other places, Muslims themselves were instructed to set slaves free as an atonement for some of their errors. Similarly, concubines were gradually accorded the status of free women. Until such a time that these slaves and concubines had not been gradually absorbed, the command was given to treat them well so that they are not deprived of human conveniences. Whatever instructions there are in the Quran regarding slaves and concubines, they are all related to those who existed at that time in that society in the position of slaves and concubines. Wherever they are mentioned in the Quran, it is in these words '*Ma Malakat Aiman'okum*'<sup>106</sup> (those possessed by your right hands), who have come (as slaves and concubines) into your ownership; nowhere as: 'Those whom you make after this as slaves and concubines'. This was regarding the first point i.e. about those concubines and slaves who were present in the society of the Arabs at the advent of Islam.

### **2.3 The Door is Closed for the Future**

Now let us address the second point i.e. closing the door on slavery for all time to come. For this, the Quran has given a command so unequivocally that there is no room remaining for any doubt or suspicion whatsoever; and what command is there of the Quran in which there can be room for doubt and suspicion, provided that it is viewed with an open mind and without any preconceived ideas. It is our spectacles coloured by orthodoxy which make its clear and transparent teaching tainted.

---

<sup>106</sup>See verse (23:6). (Ed)

During the era of ignorance, prisoners of war were made into slaves and concubines, and would also afterwards be sold (sometimes children were also kidnapped and then sold, but the true source of slaves and concubines was prisoners of war). What should be done with prisoners of war is described in Surah *Muhammed*:

*When you have a confrontation with the Kuffar, then bring them under the control of the sword until they no longer retain the force to confront you (their power is dissipated), then tie up the rest of the force... (47:4)*

This is about the prisoners of war. After this it is decreed that these prisoners of war should be:

*...either to be released in kindness as a favour or in return for compensation (Fidia)... (47:4)*

This is the only command concerning prisoners of war in the whole of the Quran. Study this instruction, and then contemplate whether any possibility can arise from any aspect whatsoever to make them into slaves; or can there even be a glimmer of the thought that the wish of the Quran is for Muslims to make prisoners of war into slaves, have sexual relations with their women, and then to sell them like a flock of sheep when you wish. After being sold, they become the slaves of the new buyer, and concubines fall into their use, and until the Day of Judgment, unless their owners set them free, generation after generation, they remain as slaves and deprived of every manner of human rights. The son of a slave remains a slave and will never become the owner of a single coin all his life (even if he becomes a Muslim). Just reflect whether this command can be deduced in any way at all from the verse quoted above. The command of the Quran is crystal clear. If there is a war with the enemy, then in that situation captives of war will fall into your hands. These will be prisoners of war. While there is a war situation, they will be kept imprisoned. After this, the question of their disposal will arise before you, which is why the Quran has presented two alternatives for this i.e. either to accept compensation (in which exchange for your own prisoners is also included), or these prisoners should be released as a favour (*Ihsan*). The Quran has neither given the command to kill them nor to make them into slaves.

## **2.4 The Religion of the Mullah**

But the *Shariat* of the Mullah says No! this command of Allah is incomplete: its completion is through that Islam which I put forward and that command is that:

*Those people who are prisoners in a war should either be released as an act of kindness or should be released in return for compensation, or they should be exchanged for Muslim prisoners. But if simply releasing them is against the circumstances of the war, and compensation cannot be received, and the enemy is also not agreeable to exchange prisoners of war, then Muslims have the right to keep them as slaves.*<sup>107</sup>

In his *Tafsir* Maududi writes with even greater elaboration that this matter resides within the authority of the government, that it can adopt whatever option it chooses:

*The government has the authority that, if it wishes, it can release them (women captured in a war); if it wishes, it can take compensation from them; if it wishes, it can exchange them with those Muslim prisoners of war who are in the hands of the enemy; and if it wishes, it can distribute them among the soldiers so that the soldiers can make use of them.*<sup>108</sup>

This means that the command of Allah is only to the extent that prisoners of war are to be released either as an act of kindness, or by the taking of some compensation or return. But Maududi informs us that (Allah forbid) this command of Allah is flawed. The full command is like this: if it is wished, prisoners of war are to be released as an act of kindness, or if it is wished, release them after taking compensation, and if it is wished, make them slaves and keep them, and bring their women into your own use. The truth is that the whole foundation of the religion of the Mullah is based on this belief that no command of Allah is ever complete; its completion occurs through other sources. As a consequence, Maududi writes very frankly in this regard that:

*The true cause of the error of the writer is that he has tried to deduce the law of slavery exclusively from the Quran.*<sup>109</sup>

What doubt is there in that? What greater 'error' can there be by a Muslim than that he views the Quran as a complete code of life and makes efforts to derive

---

<sup>107</sup> S. A. Maududi, *Tafheem ul Quran*, Volume 2, p 293

<sup>108</sup> S. A. Maududi, *Tafheem ul Quran*, Volume 2, p 340

<sup>109</sup> The writer referred to here is Allama Aslam Jairajpuri, from whose book, *Teachings of the Quran* (in Urdu), this discussion was initiated by Maududi that the order for slavery exists in Islam, and that this is a severe error on the part of the author when he writes that Islam has eliminated slavery.

the laws of life from it! This is not merely an ‘error’ but in the court of the Mullah it is such a supreme crime in recompense for which such a Muslim can be consigned to the gallows by declaring him to be a *Murtad!* To be a Muslim and to be attempting to derive law purely from the Quran! *Tauba! Tauba!* What an immense accusation against Allah and what immense audacity against the Quran! Who knows what answer such Muslims will give when they go before Allah, when He will ask them, did you consider My Book to be the complete code of law? Did you entertain such a suspicion about me, whether I could give complete instructions? Did you indeed take this decree of Mine to be the truth, that:

*... The laws of your Rabb have reached their completion with truth and justice. No one can change these Divine laws... (6:115)*

Did the holders (Mullahs) of the secrets of *Shariat* not repeatedly tell you that the commands of Allah are flawed and in need of non-Allah additions for their completion? You remained stubborn on your stance and did not accept a single thing of theirs. Now speak, what answer do you have for this?

In the mind of the Mullah, the image of Allah is something very much like this.

## 2.5 A Contradictory Narrative

This was the extent to which Maududi had written in reply to Hafiz Aslam Jairajpuri, but when someone quizzed him directly that ‘having sex with concubines without *Nikah*<sup>110</sup> is sexual perversion and Islam is against this’, he wrote in reply that:

*Before answering these questions, it should be known that, based on the right of ownership, permission for *Ma'tah*<sup>111</sup> is clearly revealed in the Quran in numerous verses. Many people raise objections in this matter with great bluntness, thinking that perhaps this is a ploy concocted by ‘Maulvis’; and some deniers of *Ahadeeth*, considering this to be from among the ‘nonsense of *Ahadeeth*’, begin to be excessively vocal. Therefore, all these people should remain aware that their issue is*

---

<sup>110</sup>*Nikah* - the formal marriage contract between a man and a woman in Islam. (Ed)

<sup>111</sup>*Ma'tah* – establishing a sexual relationship of convenience with a woman with her consent on a temporary basis. This is an extra-marital relationship for which there is no authority in the Quran. (Ed)

*not with the Fiqah of the 'Maulvis' and the Ahadeeth of the Muhaddithin, rather it is with the Book of Allah Himself.*<sup>112</sup>

First of all, look at this statement in which Maududi has said that: 'The true cause of the error of the writer is this, that he has tried to deduce the law of slavery exclusively from the Quran'; and now it is being said that whatever I say is not an issue concocted by a Maulvi himself, it is the command of the Quran itself. Just reflect how great a game it is that is being played with Deen i.e. when it suits, to then say that Deen is not only present in the Quran, along with this *Fiqah* and *Ahadeeth* are also essential; and when it feels the need, to then say that we do not quote authorities from *Fiqah* and *Ahadeeth*, we present the Quran.

After this, Maududi has copied those verses of the Quran which are about those slaves and concubines who existed at the time of the revelation of the Quran and which have been referred to above.

Quoting the Quranic verse pertaining to prisoners of war, Allama Aslam Jairajpuri had written that nowhere in it could any permission be found about making prisoners into slaves. The translation of the verse was as follows:

*...then either release them through (Manna) Ihsan (as a gesture of generosity) or by taking Fidia... (47:4)*

About this translation, Maududi states:

*After this the word Manna is in need of deliberation. The meaning of Manna is only Ihsan. 'Free them through Ihsan' is an addition of the translator.*<sup>113</sup>

But at another place, Maududi himself writes that:

*This happens to be the law of Islam, that people who are captured during war should either be released as an Ihsan...*<sup>114</sup>

And at another place:

*Islam presented this principle before the world that regarding those people who are made prisoners in war, take Fidia from them and free them, or exchange them as prisoners of war, or release them as a way of Ihsan.*<sup>115</sup>

---

<sup>112</sup> S. A. Maududi, *Tafheem ul Quran*, Volume 2, p 308

<sup>113</sup> S. A. Maududi, *Tafheem ul Quran*, Volume 2, p 301

<sup>114</sup> S. A. Maududi, *Tafheem ul Quran*, Volume 2, p 293

<sup>115</sup> S. A. Maududi, *Tafheem ul Quran*, Volume 2, p 310

In other words, if Allama Aslam Jairajpuri states ‘release them as an Ihsan’ then this is an addition from his own direction, it is not the law of Islam; and when Maududi declares ‘release them through Ihsan’, then this is a law of Islam, and is not an addition from his own direction.

## **2.6 The Command of *Ihsan* is Not in the Quran**

In this connection another very interesting matter also comes before us. Maududi states that:

*The word Manna is in the verse, which means to have Ihsan, and nowhere in the Quran is the command for Ihsan given.*<sup>116</sup>

Have you observed to what extent the Mullah is prepared to go in order to support his own stance? He states that the command for *Ihsan* is not given anywhere in the Quran. This is about that Quran in which this verse also exists:

*‘In’allaha Ya’moru Bil’adal e wal’Ihsan’... (16:90)*

*Surely, Allah commands you to do Adal and Ihsan... (16:90)*

From this you can ascertain how great an *Ihsan* this is of Allah’s that He has taken responsibility for the protection of the Quran upon Himself, otherwise that Mullah whose state of audacities is such that despite the existence of such commands in the Quran, he declares that ‘no command of *Ihsan* has been given anywhere in the Quran’, if the Quran had been within his jurisdiction, then who knows what he would have done to it!<sup>117</sup>

## **2.7 How Does the World Solve This Issue?**

Maududi repeatedly comes out with this, that if the opposing party does not get their prisoners freed, and the prisoners do not have any means for payment of *Fidia*, then in that event what should be done to these prisoners! But what we

---

<sup>116</sup> S. A. Maududi, *Tafheem ul Quran*, Volume 2, p 293

<sup>117</sup> The original text of the Quran would also have been corrupted if its protection was not assured by Allah Himself. Browse through different translations and you will see that the interpretations of some of the verses vary greatly and in many cases sections from the Bible and Torah have also been used to distort the message. (Ed)

ask is this, whether there is no other answer to this question than that they should be made slaves and their women should begin to be used. There are wars in the world every other day, prisoners are also captured in these wars, problems also arise relating to these prisoners. In front of our very own eyes, two dreadful great wars have taken place in which the total number of captives reached tens of millions. Did the mind of any among these nations consider this aspect, that by making these prisoners slaves and their women concubines, they should be sold for pennies among men? The minds of these *Kuffar* and *Mushrikeen* did not venture in this direction, but when this same question appears before these *Muftis* of *Shariat* of ours (whose claim is that our system of life is not one devised by men but is bestowed by Allah Himself, and there is no example or model like it seen anywhere in the world), then they cannot see any practical option other than that these prisoners should be made slaves and sold, and their women should be taken possession of for their personal use.

The Quran provides a clear solution to this problem. It states that until such time that your situation demands, keep these prisoners as prisoners, and since these prisoners are human beings, therefore treat them with humaneness. After this, when the question arises of freeing them, then you are permitted to have your men who have been captured, released in exchange for them; or if the opposing party does not hold your prisoners (or they are fewer in number), then free them after taking payment in *Fidia*, and it is also permitted to release them as an *Ihsan*. Whichever situation appears suitable, act accordingly, right up until 'the war itself lays down its weapons' (47:4) i.e. your objective should be that the issue of war should end from the world. One link in this process is also this, that you treat these prisoners of war in such a way that in the future they do not even lift up weapons in opposition to you. And behave towards the opposing nations in such a way of *Ihsan*, that their heads become bowed before you automatically. This was the Will of the Quran, but the religion of our Mullah is that prisoners of war should be made into slaves and their women should be made use of for sexual gratification, 'so that war becomes eliminated from the world'. Very true! Since people who are (mis)treated in this way will never be able to incline towards enmity in the future, as they will become the unpaid slaves of such a nation!

Since the very concept of slavery is such that man's sense of humanity is hurt by this (provided that this feeling is not paralysed by the drug like influence of blind obedience or veiled due to vested interests), hence, in this regard many objections against this reached Maududi. On seeing these objections, Maududi argues:

*Today, people are experiencing difficulties in understanding these laws which Islam had formulated regarding the rights of prisoners (concubines and slaves) captured in war, because the circumstances of that era no longer exist today for which these laws were formulated.<sup>118</sup>*

From this excerpt it appears as if Maududi is saying the same thing which we presented at the beginning i.e. that the instructions in the Quran regarding ‘what their right hands possess’ are about those concubines and slaves who existed at that time in Arab society. When those slaves no longer remained, then those instructions also finished. (Although, if after this a similar situation arises again i.e. some nation accepts Islam in which concubines and slaves are already in existence, or even those nations of Muslims themselves in which concubines and slaves used to be kept, or are even today continuing to be kept e.g. the ‘holy’ land of Hejaz, and in the ‘pure Islamic’ government there<sup>119</sup>—then they should turn towards the Quran again, and then the same instructions will again become applicable which used to be implemented during the time of Rasul-ullah).

## **2.8 These Commands are Still Applicable**

But Maududi is actually saying something quite different from this. He is saying that even today prisoners of war can be made into slaves and their women into concubines. Consequently, after the creation of Pakistan, when Maududi was demanding the implementation of the system of *Shariat*, he was asked (in 1948):

*Will there be permission to make prisoners of war slaves and concubines under the system of Shariat and will there be a right to sell these slaves and concubines?<sup>120</sup>*

And he replied, Yes! This has been permitted under the system of *Shariat*. After this, he described those circumstances in which prisoners of war can be made into slaves and presented those ‘justifications’ according to which these instructions are absolutely based on wisdom (as per Maududi). If anyone has any doubt then he can again enquire of Maududi, whether in the system of *Shariat* which he wishes to establish, there will be permission to make prisoners of war into slaves and their women into concubines or not? His *Tafsir (Tafheem ul Quran)*

---

<sup>118</sup>S. A. Maududi, *Tafheem ul Quran*, Volume 2, p 309

<sup>119</sup>This practice has ended there for some time. (Ed)

<sup>120</sup>S. A. Maududi, *Tafheem ul Quran*, Volume 2, p 321

has been recently published. In it, the command to make women captured during war into concubines and to then be distributed among the soldiers is permanently included (an excerpt has been given above, whoever wishes its detail, can see it there). And this is because, in the concocted *Shariat* of the Royal Courts during the era of the Middle Ages, what was the point of a society in which there were no concubines!

## **2.9 Arguments in Favour of Slavery**

Now examine those arguments according to which slavery is being declared to be fully in accordance with Divine wisdom. He states:

*In the system of Shariat, permission for making prisoners of war into slaves and concubines has been given in that situation when a nation with whom we are at war is neither agreeable to the exchange of prisoners, nor on accepting Fidia to release our prisoners, and nor by giving Fidia, to release its own prisoners. If you ponder on it, then you can understand that in this situation those prisoners who are left remaining with the government will either be killed by it, or will be kept in those kinds of human containment areas which are nowadays called concentration camps, and it will continue to obtain forced labour from them without giving them any kind of human rights. It is obvious that this situation is far more merciless... the model which Islam has adopted for such circumstances is that these prisoners should be distributed individually among Muslims and their status in law should be defined.<sup>121</sup>*

The question is not what 'any government' may do with the prisoners of war in these circumstances, the question is this: what will the government responsible for the system of Islamic *Shariat* do in these circumstances? Will they also possess similar concentration camps in which forced labour will be extracted without giving these prisoners any kind of human rights? In this system of *Shariat* will there be no obligation to treat human beings like human beings? Will there be no allowance to keep these prisoners as 'state guests' in it? Will that system only be such a one in which prisoners of war will be grateful that they are made slaves, otherwise who knows how they would have been treated. From this it becomes obvious that in this system of *Shariat* such treatment will be meted out to human beings that, compared to this treatment, slavery for them will be as if it were a great *Ihsan!* Will this be that system of *Shariat* about which we have been

---

<sup>121</sup> S. A. Maududi, *Tafheem ul Quran*, Volume 2, p 322

continually proclaiming to the whole world that it has descended from the heavens?

Then note that instead of developing some solution to reform concentration camps and enjoining the world to treat prisoners of war as human beings, we tell them that 'Islam' has presented the following solution to this problem: that their men should be made slaves and their women made into concubines? *Subhan Allah!*<sup>122</sup> What a 'descended from the heavens' reformation! Humanity will be proud of this balanced treatment, and prisoners across the world will become prostrate before this supreme *Ihsan* when they will witness in front of their eyes that their wives, daughters, sisters are becoming victims for the sexual and hedonistic pleasures of these 'righteous and honourable' Muslims. They will be grateful that forced labour is not being extracted from them...only forcibly being subjected to ...

Maududi also stated that by making them slaves, their lawful status becomes established. Do you know what that lawful status is?

- (1) A slave cannot be the owner of even one penny of his labour.
- (2) The son of a slave is also a slave (so much so, that even if a non-Muslim slave becomes a Muslim, even then he remains a slave).
- (3) Whenever the owner wishes, he can sell him to whoever he wishes.
- (4) Sexual relations with a slave woman (i.e. concubine) are established without *Nikah*, and in this there is no limit even on numbers.
- (5) The status of a concubine with whom such sexual relations are established is not similar to that of 'respectable ladies', so much so, that the mark of slavery remains even on her children.
- (6) Regarding sex with a concubine, withdrawal can be practiced as well as anal sex (details and authority for this will come later).
- (7) And when the desire is satiated, then the concubine can also be sold on to someone else.

Have you witnessed how great this lawful status is which is being bestowed on slaves and concubines!

## **2.10 Supreme *Ihsan* on Women**

---

<sup>122</sup> This expression is used to extend gratitude to Allah for some blessing. (Ed)

Maududi states that:

*For women captured in war... what solution can be better than that the individual into whose ownership the woman is consigned by the government should be given the lawful right to establish sexual relations with her. If this was not done, then these women would become a permanent source of spreading immorality in the country.<sup>123</sup>*

In other words, if in a society every individual appropriates ten or twenty women, establishes sexual relations with them against their will, and then whenever he wishes, passes them on to others, and also puts the proceeds of their sale in his own pocket, then all of this is *Masha'Allah*<sup>124</sup> included in those ethics which lead to purification. And if these women are not distributed among others in this way, and are neither bought and sold in this way, then they will become a cause for the spread of 'permanent immorality' within society. What more can be said about this, other than that every one of those immoral acts for the justification of which a *Fatwa* can be obtained from the court of the Mullah, is precisely in line with morality. Apart from this, what other definition can there be for 'morality' and 'immorality'? Consequently, Maududi has himself further clarified this. The following objection was raised against him:

*Having sexual relations with concubines without Nikah is merely a sexual perversion, and Islam is against this.<sup>125</sup>*

## **2.11 No Need for *Nikah***

You have heard the objection, now look at the answer. He maintains:

*The aversion which is seen is merely an imagined distaste. Since minds have become habituated to the common and prevalent concept of Nikah, hence people seem to think that the only relationship which is legitimate between a man and woman is one in which a Qazi mediates, two witnesses are present, and there is approved acceptance, and a Khutbah of Nikah is read; any form other than this is merely debauchery. But Islam is not a conventional religion, rather it is a rational religion. It looks at the reality, not the custom. A woman who becomes Halal for a man through Nikah ultimately becomes Halal on this basis that the law of Allah has made her Halal.*

---

<sup>123</sup> S. A. Maududi, *Tafheem ul Quran*, Volume 2, p 323

<sup>124</sup> The author has intended this as a sarcasm on the issue of the sale of women among men. (The term means 'What God has willed' – it is used to say something good has happened). (Ed)

<sup>125</sup> S. A. Maududi, *Tafheem ul Quran*, Volume 2, p 307

*Similarly, if Allah's law makes her Halal on the basis of Malak e Yameen (what your right hands possess), then what is so distasteful in this.<sup>126</sup>*

Did you see! The individual raising the objection was squirming uncomfortably at having *Ma'tab* with concubines without *Nikah*, whereas according to Maududi, never mind the issue of concubines, even the original *Nikah* is in fact unnecessary. An important question arises from this:

With the agreement of the woman, Zaid establishes sexual relations with any such woman with whom a *Nikah* can take place according to the Quran. In this way, they both live together in mutual agreement but do not do a *Nikah*.

The question is whether this sexual relationship of theirs will be legitimate or not according to *Shariat*, and will their progeny be declared as *Halal* or *Haram*?

According to Maududi these relationships are absolutely legitimate. Those people who consider such a relationship (without *Nikah*) to be illegitimate according to *Shariat*, should go and get this matter clarified from Maududi themselves. We are discussing concubines for the present, so would like to confine our discussion to only this issue. Regarding the *Halal* and *Haram* nature of sex, it is extremely important to understand that every one of those women who has been declared as *Halal* by Allah does not become *Halal* automatically: for this, there is also another important condition, and that condition is intrinsic in the same way that the condition of *Halal* is from the direction of Allah. And that condition is the agreement of the woman herself. For example, Allah declared the daughter of his father's younger brother as *Halal* for Zaid (i.e. according to the Quran, the *Nikah* of Zaid can take place with the daughter of his uncle). But this girl does not become *Halal* for Zaid merely by Allah declaring her to be *Halal*; for this, the agreement of the girl herself is also fundamental (that she wishes to become the wife of Zaid). If that girl does not agree to this, then (despite being made *Halal* by Allah) she will remain *Haram* for Zaid. Therefore, for sexual relations to be legitimate, two conditions<sup>127</sup> are intrinsically linked:

- (1) Firstly, this woman has been declared as *Halal* by Allah. And,
- (2) Secondly, this woman should be in agreement for this man and woman relationship.

---

<sup>126</sup> S. A. Maududi, *Tafheem ul Quran*, Volume 2, p 315

<sup>127</sup> The established conditions are three in number: 1) Allah should have declared this woman to be *Halal*. 2) The man and woman should be in mutual agreement. 3) And this agreement should be pledged through *Nikah*. Because the third condition has been declared as unnecessary by Maududi, we wish to discuss the first two conditions with him.

If even one of these conditions is not met, then those relations will be *Haram*. And as has been noted above, if the woman does not agree, then even if declared *Halal* by Allah, she will not become *Halal*.

Now consider, does the second condition become fulfilled in the case of a relationship with a concubine? Do sexual relations become established through the agreement of a concubine? It is obvious that the question of agreement does not even arise in this. Whoever's share she falls into and to whoever she is sold, she will, in any case, have to share a bed with him.

Now just think, is there any such code of ethics in the world which will declare this kind of relationship as legitimate? Leave the code of laws of Allah on one side, have the atheists of Europe, the *Kuffar* and the *Mushrikeen*, declared these kinds of sexual relations legitimate for themselves? Even among these people these liaisons are declared to be simply rape. But it is an irony that if such liaisons are allowed, then it is with the (so called) followers of this Deen, which happens to be the highest trustee of ethics and the proponent of the purest chastity and honour. And the worst thing of all is that permission for these forced sexual relations is being referred to the being of Rasul-ullah, who was the greatest teacher and flag bearer of purity of ethics, chaste vision, and cleansed thought and deed in the world! After this, what can a human being do other than beat his head with his hands and sit back. Just reflect to where these intrigues of *Ajma* have taken us i.e. those matters which even atheists and *Mushrikeen* consider shameful have been made into a part of our 'religion' and have been associated with Allah and Rasul-ullah!

## **2.12 There is No Defined Limit!**

Now let us continue. When this objection was raised before Maududi that:

*In Islamic Shariat a limit of four has been established for Nikah ... but in the case of concubines, no limit has been defined from the outset. What is the reason for this? It appears as if the benefits of the limit of four have been made Batil by this permission. It has opened the door to limitless debauchery for wealthy people and provided an excuse for the rich and powerful to purchase countless women and ensconce them in their*

*homes and derive great gratification from them. This is not just an assumption but what has commonly been taking place in the past history of Muslims.*<sup>128</sup>

And in response he said:

*The limit of numbers for Ma'tah with concubines has not been defined because it is not possible to know the number of women who will turn up having been captured in war. Supposing that a large number of such women accumulates, what scheme can there be to absorb them into society, if the number for Ma'tah with concubines has already been defined.*<sup>129</sup>

But if someone confronts you and queries that, in the case of married women, there is a limit of up to four defined among you, and the justification you present for this is that when the number of women increases they can be absorbed into society in this way, but if a situation develops in which the number of women in society increases greatly, what will you do in that eventuality? From your line of reasoning it becomes proven that in the final limit fixed by Allah regarding married women, farsightedness has not been employed (Allah forbid). Only the law of the Mullah is based on farsightedness, in which no limit to the number of concubines is defined.

And if (according to Maududi) the law about concubines is also made by Allah, then it is strange that in the case of married wives this was not taken into account that if the number of women increases beyond this, what will be done, while in the matter of concubines this was specifically catered for?

## **2.13 Mental Perversion**

What holy excuses man devises to satiate his hedonistic lusts! After this, Maududi states:

*As far as this suspicion of yours is concerned, that by permitting Ma'tah with countless numbers of concubines, this opens the door for mental perversion, and because concubines are able to be bought and sold, there is the possibility that by purchasing many concubines, rich people will avail themselves of a large contingent and will turn their homes into an abode of perversion. These and most similar*

---

<sup>128</sup>S. A. Maududi, *Tafheem ul Quran*, Volume 2, p 319

<sup>129</sup>S. A. Maududi, *Tafheem ul Quran*, Volume 2, p 324

*doubts usually arise for this reason, that only one aspect of the matter is before them and other aspects remain hidden. This issue should be kept well in mind that Sharay<sup>130</sup> has made his law for the welfare of mankind, and the conveniences and allowances that have been retained in this law have been kept for those real needs which are generally faced by man or could face him. If some people take these kinds of wrong advantages of these allowances, for which, in fact, Sharay had not kept these allowances, then it is a result of their lack of understanding or mischievousness of their selves. But due to fear of the possibility of such individual errors or their occurrence, creating such restrictions in the law because of which hardships can occur in meeting the real needs of the common people, cannot be the work of a Hakeem<sup>131, 132</sup>.*

In this connection he writes at another place:

*In the era which followed, it is obvious that the way in which the rich and elite made this tolerance in the law as an excuse for hedonism, was against the will of Shariat.<sup>133</sup>*

It is hard to comprehend that when large numbers of concubines are pouring into the country, their numbers are also not fixed, they can also be passed to and from others, then which 'perversion' is it that you can declare to be against the will of *Shariat*? If someone acquires a concubine (whether from the government or purchased) and '*Shariat*' grants permission for establishing sexual relations with her, then how could having *Ma'tab* with this concubine become an excuse for perversion? Firstly, providing the means for perversion yourselves, and then heaping accusations on those who derive advantage from this. Are the accused those who provide these means of perversion, or those who engage in *Ma'tab* with them?

In this connection Maududi states that:

*If some rich man wishes to indulge in perversion and is bent upon taking advantage of the allowance in the law -against the requirement of the law -then how can even the code of *Nikah* become an obstacle for him. He can have a *Nikah* with a new woman every day and can give her a divorce the next day.<sup>134, 135</sup>*

---

<sup>130</sup> *Sharay* - used here in reference to an undefined pronoun meaning someone who is responsible to implement this. (Ed)

<sup>131</sup> *Hakeem* - one who is extremely wise. This is also an attribute of Allah. (Ed)

<sup>132</sup> S. A. Maududi, *Tafbeem ul Quran*, Volume 2, p 320

<sup>133</sup> S. A. Maududi, *Tafbeem ul Quran*, Volume 2, p 324

<sup>134</sup> S. A. Maududi, *Tafbeem ul Quran*, Volume 2, p 324

<sup>135</sup> Maududi displays his total disregard of the procedure for divorce which is clearly given in the Quran. (Ed)

This circumstance is also only possible through that ‘*Shariat*’ which is the concoction of the Mullah himself. According to Quranic *Shariat*, giving a divorce is not asport like an auction, where you say one, two, three, and kick the wife out. For a Quranic divorce, after passing through many stages a decision will need to be sought through the court. This jest will not be played in it that just sitting at home, utter *Talaq*<sup>136</sup>, *Talaq*, *Talaq* and the matter is ended.

## 2.14 Selling of Concubines

After this Maududi responds to this objection that the selling of concubines is an extremely degrading act. He contends:

*Permission for selling these kinds of concubines and slaves is actually in the sense that an individual ... until the time that Fidia is received or Fidia is not received by him, the right that he has to obtain service from them, he transfers that onwards to another person after receiving compensation. The reason for which this permission is kept within the law can only be fully understood if you have experienced keeping an enemy prisoner of war. It is not an easy matter to obtain service from army soldiers, and in the same way, it is not an easy matter to keep a woman of an enemy state in your household. If this provision had not been retained for an individual that he could deal with the imprisoned man or woman by transferring the rights of ownership to someone else, then into whoever's hands these people were given, they would have become a torment for him.*<sup>137</sup>

What logic this is! In other words, it is very difficult to get work out of prisoners of an enemy and keeping their women in your homes is fraught with danger, but when these same prisoners are made slaves, then this difficulty is made easy, and when sexual relations are established with their women against their will in front of their men, then as a result all those dangers from them are removed which could have been faced due to their being members of an enemy nation. From this, their revengeful sentiments will most certainly convert into affection.

Now the state of affairs is this, that when these slaves and concubines become a problem for someone, the solution for this is that they should be sold on into the hands of another. And these marketed slaves and concubines will ‘really’ become an assured source of comfort for their new owners? From this, a heartfelt affection

---

<sup>136</sup>*Talaq* – divorce. (Ed)

<sup>137</sup>S. A. Maududi, *Tafheem ul Quran*, Volume 2, p 323

will become forged in them? And in this way, when he sells them onward to a third buyer, then as a result of this an even greater affection will spring up for this new master! Their enmity was actually already present from the very first one who acquired them free of cost; what shame will they have in harbouring enmity towards the ones who have purchased them by handing over a sum of money?

## **2.15 And if non-Muslims Also Practice This?**

Now let us look at this objection:

*If non-Muslim warring nations dispense the same treatment to captured Muslim women, then, logically, what right do Muslims have to protest against it.*<sup>138</sup>

In reply to this, Maududi states:

*As far as this final question of yours is concerned – it looks as if at the time of posing this question, you had assumed that regarding those Muslim women who are entering the custody of the enemy, they will be maintaining them literally as daughters in their homes. Is this assumption of yours correct? And your argument that what right do we have to protest about it? The answer to this is that, not only did we not wish to make women slaves, we also did not wish to make men slaves. If the enemy had agreed to exchange prisoners of war, then we would not have insisted on keeping even one man or woman of theirs with us as a slave. Hence, if slavery remained as a custom for centuries in the world, and if the chaste women of one nation came into the use of another nation by becoming concubines, then this was not because of our view, rather those people were responsible for this who for centuries were not agreeable on the adoption of some reasonable and civilised attitude towards the prisoners of war.*<sup>139</sup>

This statement is somewhat vague. But if we analyse it, then it appears that Maududi wishes to say that if other nations will make concubines of our women, then why should we not make their women concubines! In other words, Islam has no principles of its own, whatever others do to them, they will do the same back to them – that is, in short, the principle. They will carry out robberies in their area, and so they will also begin to carry out robberies among them. They tell them lies; they will also tell lies to them in return. If they are dishonest with them, then, in response, they will also begin to be dishonest with them. If they

---

<sup>138</sup>S. A. Maududi, *Tafsheem ul Quran*, Volume 2, p 308

<sup>139</sup>S. A. Maududi, *Tafsheem ul Quran*, Volume 2, pp 318-319

tease their passing women or kidnap them, then they will also start teasing their women and will forcibly take them away. If they make their women concubines, then they will also make their women concubines! This will be the principle of life of Muslims and the model of the *Maslak* of life in dealing with other nations! How illuminating are these principles and how lofty is this *Maslak*! This *Maslak* and practice is described as being of that nation whose Allah says to them, do not even curse the idols of these *Mushrikeen* lest they also use profanities against your Allah. Those whose Quran commands them:

*...your enmity with a nation should never incline you to do injustice towards them; you should always do justice towards them. Be just... (5:8)*

Never let justice and righteousness be abandoned from your hands. If they descend to despicable conduct, do not forsake your elevated status and descend to their low status. You have been created as a witness on mankind, you have to become a possessor of righteous ethics and a model of eminent character. If you also start committing the same kinds of immoral acts as them in a fury of revenge, then what difference will there remain between them and you!

## **2.16 The Objection**

But the criticism of the objector is still there. His stance is that there is no law among the nations of the world today where, after having established sexual relations with female prisoners of war, they can begin to be bought and sold. But according to Maududi's statement, this clause is present within Islamic *Shariat*. If such circumstances now arise that the women of Muslims are imprisoned by the enemy in some war, and their women are held by the Muslims, and the enemy does not exchange its prisoners, nor releases them by payment of *Fidia*, then in such circumstances (according to the *Shariat* of Maududi) Muslims will have no option other than to establish sexual relations with these imprisoned women. The objector states that in these circumstances, if the enemy (after the Muslims initiate that which they will enact according to their '*Shariat*') also perpetrates this kind of behaviour with Muslim women, then in that situation Muslims will not have the right to protest against this behaviour of the enemy. But Maududi did not give any answer to this, even though (according to his line of thinking and the *Maslak* presented by him) its answer was clear, that the laws of Islam are universal. And since the outcome of all the endeavours and efforts of Muslims should be that the laws of Islam should become commonplace everywhere, then if some nation implements that very same law in their land which exists in the

system of *Shariat* of Muslims, then this will be a matter of great rejoicing and a source of immense pride for them. Hence, if some nation of the world (after Muslims initiate it) starts to commit this kind of immoral act with their captive women, then for Maududi and his associates who share the same ideology, this moment will be one for a thousand celebrations and jubilations because the law of their god is becoming commonplace, and the nations of the world (without becoming Muslim) are starting to follow Islamic laws. In fact, they will call this as evidence of Islam being the 'Deen of *Fitrat*' and will say, Look! The world has got rid of slavery after so much striving, but since slavery was the demand of 'human *Fitrat*', therefore these nations had to return to it again. This is how 'God' makes His 'Deen' accepted by mankind. How delightful will be that scene in which Muslims will be forcibly spending the night with the women of the enemy, and the enemy will be doing the same with their daughters and daughters-in-law, and there will be drumbeats of jubilation and celebration among the Muslims that the Deen of Allah is becoming universal. At this point *Iblees* will gather up his bedding and will go back to Allah, saying that I am no longer required on earth, my objective has been accomplished.

## **2.17 Now Hold Your Breath**

Maududi described the following as being a great favour on concubines:

*After coming into the use of her master, if a woman gives birth to a child, then she becomes a member of this family. She is termed the mother of the child. Her offspring is viewed as being legitimate and is entitled to inheritance from the father as per Shariat.*

But whether anyone else is aware of this or not, Maududi himself will certainly know that 'his *Shariat*' itself has presented a ploy whereby sexual relations with concubines can be established, while the fear that they may bear children is also removed. Now hear what that ploy is?

But before hearing this scheme, hearken to a sob from our aching heart. For Tolu-e-Islam that occasion is one of severe pain and despair when it has to describe a certain matter which causes the eyes to be lowered in shame when it is presented before the world, and due to which Islam is debased in the eyes of others. Then an even more excruciating occasion is when these kinds of narrations are quoted by being declared to be '*Abadeeth*'. This is because by a *Hadeeth* it is meant that this narration is being related to the being of Rasul-ullah. The lofty being of Rasul-ullah, holder of the stature of the final *Nabi*, is of such

eminence that Allah Himself has pronounced him to be '*Khulq e Aẓeem*' and elevated the esteem in which he is held.<sup>140</sup> Hence, for such a thing to even be mentioned in the pages of Tolu-e-Islam as a result of which even the slightest shadow is cast on this eminent being is an occasion equivalent to the Day of Judgment for us. But what can we do when sometimes the situation becomes such that we have no option other than this. For example, just take this subject of slavery. If we move on at this stage by merely stating that there are certain kinds of shameful things present in our books of *Abadeeth* at the very thought of which our forehead breaks out in a sweat, then the Mullah will immediately announce that: 'Tolu-e-Islam is talking rubbish. The holy *Abadeeth* of Rasul-ullah -and these kind of narrations in them – Allah forbid, Allah forbid! Does this brazen liar have no shame that it fabricates such accusations and then vilely attributes them to Rasul-ullah'. Because the population remains ignorant of the narrations in these books of *Abadeeth*, and it also seemingly stands to reason that these kinds of shameful matters cannot exist in such holy books, hence this tactic of the Mullah becomes effective. This is that point at which we are forced, with a heavy heart, to quote these kinds of examples from those holy books of *Abadeeth*, so that readers come to know that this is, in truth, recorded in them. The fact is that Tolu-e-Islam has commenced an opposition to the religion of the Mullah for this very reason: that because of this religion, Muslims are being disparaged in the world; Islam is being severely tarnished. The torchbearers of Muslims are becoming a target for insult and ridicule among the nations of the world. Such an image of Rasul-ullah himself is portrayed from which (Allah forbid) the blood of a human being begins to boil, and what is more, such a concept of Allah Himself is formed which appears to be a product of man's era of ignorance and savagery. If these kinds of *Abadeeth* are ever reproduced in the pages of Tolu-e-Islam, which weigh heavily on the refined feelings of the readers, it is only because without quoting them, this matter can never be comprehended, whether the religion which the Mullah presents in the name of Islam, is it really the same as that which Tolu-e-Islam describes?

This is that necessity due to which Tolu-e-Islam sometimes has to perform this bitter and unsavoury duty. The Mullah alleges that Tolu-e-Islam receives pleasure from this 'raking up of dirt'. From where can we cast that vision into his eyes through which he could see what great and deep wounds are tearing at our heart. If he could become endowed with this kind of vision from somewhere, then he would be able to see what we are saying and why we are saying it.

---

<sup>140</sup> See verses (68:4, 94:4). (Ed)

## 2.18 The *Ahadeeth* of *Sahih* Bukhari<sup>141</sup>

Bearing these explanations in mind, let us now return to the original topic. We were saying that the Mullah's *Shariat* has itself proposed a solution for this -that sexual relations can be established with concubines without the resultant risk arising of children being born. Like us, place a heavy stone on your chest and then hear that solution! And after this, bang your head against the wall of the Kaaba, split your head and perish. This *Hadeeth* is noted in '*Sahih*' Bukhari:

*It is quoted from Abu Saeed Alhuzri that one day while he was sitting beside Rasul-ullah, he mentioned to Rasul-ullah that we have sex with captive women, but we desire that they do not become pregnant because we wish to sell them. Then what is your opinion regarding performing Uzal<sup>142</sup>. He replied, is this what you do? There is nothing wrong with you doing this. Because the child which is declared by Allah as going to be born, will certainly be born.<sup>143</sup>*

Have you perceived from which gathering this image is being drawn? The companions are enquiring and Rasul-ullah is responding. After this, you can gauge for yourself in what kinds of multiple ways the hypocrites of *Ajm* have destroyed us.<sup>144</sup> This is that portrait which they have drawn of your beloved messenger and his companions, and today this portrait exists in that book which the Mullah presents along with the Quran by declaring it to be 'just like the Quran'. The excerpt quoted above about *Uzal* is not merely passing conversation, this narrative is, in fact, also present in Bukhari:

*During the time of Rasul-ullah, we used to practice Uzal and the Quran was being revealed.<sup>145</sup>*

This was that solution which (according to the religion of Mullah) used to be adopted for this purpose that concubines should not become pregnant, so that their value is not depreciated in this way. And if even this is followed, or if she is already pregnant, then what should be the form of sexual intercourse? In the same Bukhari (Volume 2) this *Hadeeth* also exists for this:

---

<sup>141</sup>*Sahih* – means accurate. Bukhari, who was from Persia, was a compiler of narrations. His book of compilations is itself also often referred to as simply 'Bukhari'. (Ed)

<sup>142</sup>*Uzal* – this means that at the time of ejaculation, to not allow it to happen within the vagina.

<sup>143</sup>*Sahih* al-Bukhari, *Kitab ul Buah*, published in Egypt, Volume 2, p 18

<sup>144</sup> Though since we have the choice not to accept it, blaming the *Ajm* is not appropriate. (Ed)

<sup>145</sup>*Sahih* al-Bukhari, *Kitabul Nikah, Bab ul-Uzal*, Volume 3, p 162

*There is no objection in this either if sexual intercourse is performed with your pregnant concubine in some other place apart from the vagina.*

Allah forbid! Allah forbid! These are those ‘holy *Ahadeeth*’ which are associated with the eminent character of Rasul-ullah and the great companions, and there is no feeling of shame about what answer they will have in front of Rasul-ullah and Allah on the Day of Judgment!<sup>146</sup>

And these are those *Ahadeeth* due to which we are being declared as *Munkar e Hadeeth* because we repudiate them. We wish to ask the readers regarding these narrations, do they have the courage to accept that these are, in reality, true *Ahadeeth* from Rasul-ullah or Rasul-ullah’s companions?

This is, in brief, the *Maslah* regarding concubines and slaves in that system of *Shariat* which Maududi and his cronies are busily engaged in attempting to implement in Pakistan. Just consider that if those laws are implemented in Pakistan which these people declare as being ‘Islamic laws’, then what kind of society will be established here, and what will be your status among other nations of the world? We wish to pose this question to every one of those Pakistanis who has any concern for the dignity of Pakistan and feels any pain regarding the image of Islam. Reflect on this issue and then just think, what is the reason for the opposition of Tolu-e-Islam to these matters? And on the basis of what crime of Tolu-e-Islam’s do these people who declare it to be *Kafir* and devoid of Deen, do so? Remember that these matters also concern you, because, ultimately, you and your future progeny will also have to reside in this country.

## **2.19 Review**

In the previous pages, two important topics have appeared before you: one, the killing of a *Murtad* and the second, slaves and concubines. Both of these topics are such that they have a profound connection with the collective system of humankind. Clear and explicit teaching from the Quran regarding these has also been presented to you, and you have seen, too, what our orthodox religious class says about this. Pay careful attention to these explications, and then decide for yourself, can whatever is being stated before us in the name of *Shariat* ever be

---

<sup>146</sup> The fact is that these people have not understood the Quran at all and exist at a very basic level as human beings, where they are entirely comfortable with such literature. Such a belief system can never allow one to benefit from the pristine guidance of the Quran. (Ed)

the proclamation of Allah and the action of His true Rasul? The assertion of these people is that since the support of these matters is through our books of *Abadeeth*, therefore, these are precisely in accordance with the *Shariat* of Islam. In opposition to this, our stance is:

1. The Quran is the Book of Allah and it is present with us in its original form, word for word.
2. Allah Himself has taken the responsibility for its protection.
3. No saying or action of Rasul-ullah can ever be against the Quran.
4. The books of *Abadeeth* were compiled through the individual efforts of people two to three hundred years after the demise of Rasul-ullah, and that, too, not from any prior written record, rather derived from word-of-mouth narrations. This is why all kinds of narrations became amassed in these compilations, correct and incorrect. The criterion we now have in order to differentiate between correct and incorrect is that, whichever *Hadeeth* among them is against the Quran, it should be taken to mean that it has been wrongly attributed to Rasul-ullah.<sup>147</sup>

But our orthodox class insists that whatever has appeared in these books of *Abadeeth* should be accepted as being accurate just like the *Wahi* sent down from the direction of Allah. The one who says that there are also wrong narrations among them is a '*Munkar e Hadeeth*'<sup>148</sup> and *Munkar e Shaan e Risalat*<sup>149</sup>. In other words, if there is any such *Hadeeth* which is against the Quran or because of which an aspersion is cast on the being of Rasul-ullah, if some individual says about it that it cannot be *Hadeeth*, then he is a *Munkar e Shaan e Risalat*, and the one who maintains that it is Rasul-ullah's is in their eye the one who acknowledges *Shaan e Risalat*<sup>150</sup>. In our eyes, this is far, far from the great eminence of Rasul-ullah that he will state such a thing that whichever women fall into your hands during a war, use them, and whenever you wish, sell them on to others. And it is the command of our 'respected scholars' that you will have to accept this, that this is the verdict of Rasul-

---

<sup>147</sup> Rasul-ullah did not leave any of his sayings in writing for posterity, except the Quran, as he never felt the need to do so. The system of Deen was established by following the Quran. Whoever studies the Quran as a system of Deen will also find this to be true that the Deen of Allah is complete in all aspects, and this is clearly declared by Allah (5:3). Those who search for Deen outside the folds of the Quran are not interested in the Deen of Allah. Thus, the attribution of any of these *Abadeeth* to Rasul-ullah is a blatant lie, even if it sounds plausible, as he never said it and never left anything in writing. (Ed)

<sup>148</sup> Rejector of *Abadeeth*. (Ed)

<sup>149</sup> Rejector of the eminence of messengerhood. (Ed)

<sup>150</sup> Eminence of messengerhood. (Ed)

ullah; if you do not accept this, then you are a *Munkar e Hadeeth* and a *Munkar e Namooos e Risalat*<sup>151</sup>.

We leave the decision to the readers as to whose *Maslakin* this regard is correct, and if we proclaim to the world that this is the teaching of Islam, then what will the world say about this Islam?<sup>152</sup>

---

<sup>151</sup>*Munkar e Namooos e Risalat* - the one who blasphemes against Rasul-ullah. (Ed)

<sup>152</sup> The world already knows about these books of *Abadeeth*, and Western writers and historians have quoted extensively from them, while the available translations of the Quran are considered to be equivalent to other religious books such as the Bible and Torah. (Ed)