

## Table of Contents

<b>Introduction</b> .....	3
Misconception # 1 (Qur'an prescribes to kill infidels wherever we find them) .....	4
Misconception # 2 (Qur'an prescribes to rape female ware captives) .....	8
Misconception # 3 (Prophet Muhammad – Peace be upon him, married a child bride Aisha) .....	14
Misconception # 4 (Prophet Muhammad tried to commit Suicide) .....	25
Misconception # 5 (The Satanic verses) .....	29
Misconception # 6 (Qur'an says Jews and Christians cannot be taken as friends) .....	31
Misconception # 7 (Islam oppresses Women) .....	33
Misconception # 8 (Prophet raided Caravans).....	46
Misconception # 9 (Quran prescribes terrorism).....	49
Misconception # 10 (Islam prescribes to kill innocent Civilians) .....	53
Misconception # 11 (Jihad means holy war on all infidels) ...	65
Misconception # 12 (Suicide Bombing is allowed in Islam) .	84
Misconception # 13 (Islam ordains slavery).....	91
Misconception # 14 (Polygyny).....	98
Misconception # 15 (Black Magic was casted on Prophet) ..	100
Misconception # 16 (Prophet says he is commanded to fight till people confess to faith in Islam).....	102

Misconception # 17 (800 Jews of Banu Qurayza were indiscriminately killed) .....104  
Misconception # 18 (Prophet Muhammad was poisoned to death so he was not true Prophet) ..... 107  
Misconception # 19 (Prophet Muhammad tortured Kinana a Jew for treasure).....109  
Misconception # 20 (Qur'an is not preserved)..... 111  
Bonus - Misconception # 21 (Allah is moon God and Muslims worship the Ka'ba).....115

**Misconceptions**  
**about Islam**

**Aamir Ibrahim Khan**

## Introduction

Let us start with the greeting of peace i.e. Salamun Alaykum which means: Peace be unto you (says Qur'an 6:54, and that Allah is Himself Peace, see: 59:23), *Shalom Aleichem* as Jews say (God is Peace, See: Judges 6:24) and as Jesus used to often say: Peace be unto you. [Book of Luke 24:36 (KJV), Rather the exact wording actually used by Jesus too was "*Shalom Aleichem*" John 20:19, 21, 26]. The Prophet of Islam who is Mercy to the worlds (see Qur'an 21:107) commanded us to spread (the greeting of) Peace [Ibn Majah, Vol. 5, Book 33, Hadith 3693. Grade: Sahih]

Amongst all faiths, Islam is the most misinterpreted, accused, and distorted faith. After September 9/11 and illegal wars of America on Muslim countries which were based on false grounds (such as Iraq having weapons of mass destruction) due to which millions of Muslims have been unjustly killed, there are many non-Muslims who show interest in learning about Islam.

The biased Media like Fox News, anti-Islamic propagandists, and terrorists have painted Islam to be some sort of an evil religion. Terrorist groups like ISIS, Al-Qaeeda, Boko-Haram, Al-Shibab, Jandullah, and others make it to headlines of News channels which makes the unaware people to assume that Islam is responsible for all terrorism. All these groups belong to same extremist Wahabi/Salafist ideology which has nothing to do with mainstream Sufi-Sunni Islam nor Shia school of thought.

The Anti-Islamic propagandists and Islamophobes (see Merriam Webster dictionary for meaning of word

Islamophobia) misquote and misinterpret certain verses out of context, also use fabricated or weak hadiths, or Seerah/Tarikh narrations to depict our Noble Prophet (Peace be upon him) in bad light. Sometimes they also misinterpret the authentic narrations and verses too which I shall explain God willing.

So let us begin.

### Misconception # 1 (Qur'an prescribes to kill infidels wherever we find them)

The most oft-repeated verses out of context by Islamophobes are the following 2 verses.

Verse # 1: Slay the **infidels** wherever you find them (9:5)  
[Quoted from Nabeel Qureshi's book: Seeking Allah, Finding Jesus. Chapter Thirty Six: Muhammad Revisited. Read the complete rebuttal to Nabeel Qureshi's book: [Here](#) ]

First of all, that is a false translation of verse as the verse does not use the word "infidels" but "polytheists." Secondly the verse has a context starting from 9:1 to 9:13. It is talking about

1. Treaties with polytheists of Mecca which they had broken.
2. Forced Prophet Muhammad (Peace be upon him) and companions to migrate.
3. Killed his companions and waged war upon them first.

Verse 9:1 states: [This is a declaration of] disassociation, from Allah and His Messenger, **to those with whom you had made a treaty** among the polytheists.

Verse 9:4 states: **Excepted are those with whom you made a treaty** among the polytheists and then they have not been deficient toward you in anything or supported anyone against you; so complete for them their treaty until their term [has ended]. Indeed, Allah loves the righteous [who fear Him].

And then 9:5 states: And when the sacred months have passed, then kill the **polytheists** wherever you find them and capture them and besiege them and sit in wait for them at every place of ambush. But if they should repent, establish prayer, and give zakah, let them [go] on their way. Indeed, Allah is Forgiving and Merciful.

Verse 9:6 states: **And if any one of the polytheists seeks your protection, then grant him protection** so that he may hear the words of Allah . Then deliver him to his place of safety. That is because they are a people who do not know.

Verse 9:10 States: **They do not observe toward a believer any pact of kinship or covenant of protection. And it is they who are the transgressors.**

Verse 9:12 states: **And if they break their oaths** after their treaty and defame your religion, **then fight** the leaders of disbelief, for indeed, there are no oaths [sacred] to them; [fight them that] they might cease.

Verse 9:13 (This is most important to understand) states:  
**Would you not fight a people who broke their oaths and determined to expel the Messenger, and they had begun [the attack upon] you the first time?** Do you fear them? But Allah has more right that you should fear Him, if you are [truly] believers.

Hence it stands proven from context of Qur'an itself that it is not asking to kill "all **infidels**" as wrongly translated but 9:5 is talking about "**polytheists only**" who broke the treaty and "INITIATED THE FIGHT FIRST"

Also another verse of Qur'an in relevance is to be read which states: **Permission [to fight] has been given to those who are being fought, because they were wronged.** And indeed, Allah is competent to give them victory. [22:39]

Hence Qur'an does not sanction to kill non-Muslims wherever we find them as falsely asserted by Islamophobes due to their false translations and misquotations.

The second verse they misquote is: **And kill them wherever you find them... (2:191)**

This is how Islamophobes mostly quote the verse partially. They do not even quote the verse itself completely let alone the context. Let us now look at the context and also the complete verse itself.

Previous Verse states: And fight in the way of Allah **with those who fight with you, and do not exceed the limits**, surely Allah does not love those who exceed the limits. [2:190]

The Islamophobes cleverly hide this context. The verse 2:191 is linked to 2:190 and this fighting was only with those Pagans of Makkah who had waged war first, but still Allah tells not to transgress limits. The commentators of Qur'an have explained that not transgressing limits is "not to kill women, children, old men, non-combatants, religious people, not to destroy infrastructure, burn trees, and so on"

So after this verse Allah says: And kill them wherever you find them, **and drive them out from whence they drove you out**, and persecution is severer than slaughter, **and do not fight with them at the Sacred Mosque until they fight with you in it, but if they do fight you, then slay them**; such is the recompense of the unbelievers. [2:191]

The next verse says: But if they desist, then surely Allah is Forgiving, Merciful. [2:192]

So the context is clear now, It is only about fighting those pagans who had waged war first, but still Qur'an tells not to transgress limits and to stop fighting if they stop fighting. These verses nowhere tell to kill infidels wherever we find them as Islamophobes have us believe.

## Misconception # 2 (Qur'an prescribes to rape female war captives)

The hater of Islam David Wood has been noted making videos on this topic and quoting verses and hadiths by misinterpreting them.

Nabeel Qureshi in his book: Seeking Allah, Finding Jesus. Chapter Forty Three (Those Whom Their Right Hands Possess), used Qur'anic verses 4:24, 23:6, and 70:30, and then misread the hadiths due to David's misinterpretation that Companions of Prophet had sexual relations with war captives without their consent (although those hadiths do not say that anywhere, rather hadith in Abu Dawud 11.2150 which Nabeel mentioned clearly says: "This is to say that they are lawful for them **when they complete their waiting period**" which clearly proves they had accepted Islam because this ruling only applies on Muslim women, hence it was not forced sex but consensual relationship after they had accepted Islam as I will prove).

Let us first understand verse 4:24

Imam at-Tabri the classical commentator on Qur'an explains 4:24 from many companions that previous marriage of the captive is annulled after she has been captured. Now keeping that in mind the verse does not tell to rape married slaves rather it is to be understood from another verse of Qur'an which states:



And “MARRY THE UNMARRIED” among you and the  
“RIGHTEOUS AMONG YOUR MALE AND FEMALE  
SLAVES... [24:32]

Hence according to Qur’an only consensual sex after marriage or with female captives who willingly accepted Islam was allowed. When they had accepted Islam then their previous marriages automatically became invalid. Qur’an makes it clear in 2:256 that there is no compulsion in religion, so those captives could not have been forced into religion.

Imam an-Nawawi explains 4:24 as:

لا يحل وطؤها بملك اليمين حتى تسلم فما دامت على دينها فهي محرمة

Translation: “Sexual intercourse cannot be done with those your right hands possess “UNLESS THEY ACCEPT ISLAM” but if they are following their (past) religion they are forbidden (to approach) [Sharh Sahih Muslim, under Hadith # 2643]

Now it becomes absolutely certain due to irrefutable proofs that according to Qur’an sex is allowed only after marriage and with those captives who willingly accepted Islam and gave consent.

Also 4:24 itself forbids “unlawful sexual intercourse” which will include not having sex with slaves without their consent and also if they do not accept Islam.

The next verse to 4:24 states:

And whoever among you cannot [find] the means to marry free, believing women, **then [he may marry] from those whom your right hands possess...** [4:25]

Qur'an in context is telling to marry the slaves. Had Islam allowed rape of slave women then 4:25 would not have told to marry them. Why go through the procedure of marriage (which according to Islam is allowed only with mutual consent) if Islam allowed rape?

Islam forbids rape of any woman whether free or slave.

Imam Malik (rah) states:

What is done in our community about the man who rapes a woman, virgin or non-virgin, if she is free, is that he must pay the bride-price of the like of her. "IF SHE IS A SLAVE" he must pay what he has diminished of her worth. "THE HADD-PUNISHMENT IN SUCH CASES IS APPLIED TO THE RAPIST" and there is no punishment applied to the raped woman. (Book 36, Hadith 1418 Muwatta Imam Malik)

Imam ash-Shafi'I (rah) said:

"IF A MAN ACQUIRES BY FORCE A SLAVE-GIRL, THEN HAS SEXUAL INTERCOURSE WITH HER" after he acquires her by force, and if he is not excused by ignorance, then the slave-girl will be taken from him, he is required to pay the

fine, "AND HE WILL RECEIVE THE PUNISHMENT FOR ILLEGAL SEXUAL INTERCOURSE" (Ash-Shaafi'i, al-Umm, Volume 3, page 253)

Had sex without consent been allowed in Islam then these mighty scholars would not have called it rape and applied legal punishment on the rapist.

Nabeel presented hadiths from Sahih Muslim and others, although none of them prove that captives were forced into sex.

Now let us look at Biblical verses in this regard. Remember Old Testament is binding upon all Christians as they consider Jesus to be an eternal God and all this was sanctioned by Jesus, also Jesus did not come to abolish the law but to fulfill and authenticate it fully (read Matthew 5:17-20). Even if Christians say Old Testament laws are outlawed then still they have to accept that God ordered these things in past on humans, so was God barbaric in past?

**Book of Deuteronomy states:** If they refuse to make peace and they engage you in battle, lay siege to that city. When the Lord your God delivers it into your hand, "**PUT TO THE SWORD ALL THE MEN IN IT, AS FOR THE WOMEN**" the children, the livestock and everything else in the city, you may take these as "**PLUNDER**" for yourselves. "**AND YOU MAY USE THE PLUNDER**" the Lord your God gives you from your enemies"[Deuteronomy 20:12-14]

Use the plunder, God of Bible says!!!

Things do not just stop here, Book of Numbers after talking about a bloody war talks about Moses himself saying: *Now kill all the boys and all the women who have slept with a man. **Only the young girls who are virgins may live; you may keep them for yourselves.*** [Numbers 31:17-18]

Wait there is a lot more, Bible even tells the rapist to marry the woman raped and to never divorce her!

It states: *If a man is **caught in the act of raping a young woman** who is not engaged, he must pay fifty pieces of silver to her father. **Then he must marry the young woman** because he violated her, **and he will never be allowed to divorce her.*** [Deuteronomy 22:28-29]

One last one, although there are tons more. This one clearly endorses forced marriage with war captives!

It states: ***When you go out to war** against your enemies and the LORD, your God, delivers them into your hand, **so that you take captives, if you see a comely woman among the captives and become so enamored of her that you wish to have her as wife, you may take her home to your house.** But before she may live there, she must shave her head and pare her nails and lay aside her **captive's garb.** **After she has mourned her father** and mother for a full month, you may have relations with her, and you shall be her husband and she shall be your wife. However, if later on you lose your liking for her, you shall give her her freedom, if she wishes it; but you shall not*

*sell her or enslave her, **since she was married to you under compulsion.***” [Deuteronomy 21:10-14]

*Do the answering Mr. David Wood and other fanatical Christian apologists as Nabeel is dead. Remember all this was sanctioned by Biblical Jesus your Eternal God!*

### Misconception # 3 (Prophet Muhammad – Peace be upon him, married a child bride Aisha)

The Islam haters use this as their biggest weapon to distract people from Islam. They call Muhammad (Peace be upon him) as a pedophile who married a 6 year old girl and consummated the marriage at 9. Even if we consider these hadiths to be correct, then nobody before 1900 century objected on Prophet (Peace be upon him) due to this issue. Plus, during the life of Prophet Muhammad (Peace be upon him) none of the polytheists, Jews, or even Christians objected on it, although they were always looking to defame our Prophet. This proves that it was not considered wrong or even taboo at that time in past. Anyways these hadiths are to be checked according to Qur'an and Usool ul hadith (principles of hadith).

Qur'an states: O you who believe! **You are forbidden to inherit women against their will**, and you should not treat them with harshness... (4:19)

This verse clearly proves that **women** cannot come into wedlock against their will. It is a fact that 6 or 9 year old girl cannot give proper consent. Plus Qur'an uses the word "WOMEN" so question of marrying "GIRLS" is clearly out of question according to Qur'an.

Qur'an states: And test the orphans [in their abilities] **until they reach marriageable age**. Then if you perceive in them sound judgment, release their property to them... (4:6)

The great commentary on Qur'an called Tafsir al-Jalalyn states: ... until they reach the age of marrying, that is, until they have become eligible for it through puberty or [legal] age, which, according to al-Shāfi'ī, is the **completion of fifteen years**... [Tafsir al-Jalalyn under 4:6]

Qur'an clearly links marriageable age to when orphans can make sound judgment. It is a fact that 6 year old cannot give sound judgment, so the hadiths about Prophet marrying Aisha at age of 6 contradict Qur'an. Some intellectual Sunni scholars and Shia both reject these reports.

Here the author would like to share an article written by a knowledgeable Sunni friend:

Aishah's Age of Marriage [عائشة أم المؤمنين رضي الله عنها]

There is nothing in our religion that is shameful: we don't apologise to anyone and we are proud of our religion.

Now getting to the topic:

### **First question:**

Did Aishah claim that the Prophet married her at 6 and consummated the marriage at 9?

Yes , it is authentically established that she said this:

Imam Bukhari narrates:

عَنْ عَائِشَةَ - رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا - أَنَّ النَّبِيَّ صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ تَزَوَّجَهَا وَهِيَ بِنْتُ سِتِّ سِنِينَ، وَأَدْخَلَتْ عَلَيْهِ وَهِيَ بِنْتُ تِسْعٍ

**Aishah narrated that the Prophet (ﷺ) married her when she was six years old and he consummated his marriage when she was nine years old.**

['Sahih Bukhari', 5133].

These are her words... any attempt to weaken the chains of these Ahadith is futile.

About 8 different students of Aisha reported her words - so its a solid report - mass-transmitted.

### **Second question:**



Could Aishah be mistaken about her age?

Yes , this is also possible:

1- The Prophet (ﷺ) said:

إِنَّا أُمَّةٌ أُمِّيَّةٌ، لَا نَكْتُبُ وَلَا نَحْسِبُ

**"We are an illiterate nation;  
we neither write,  
nor know accounts."**

['Sahih Bukhari', 1913].

إِنَّا أُمَّةٌ أُمِّيَّةٌ لَا نَكْتُبُ وَلَا نَحْسِبُ

**"We are an unlettered Ummah, we do not use astronomical counting (to calculate dates/time) or computation."**

(‘Sunan an-Nasa’i’, 2140 - Sahih).

2- The Qur'an states:

هُوَ الَّذِي بَعَثَ فِي الْأُمِّيِّينَ رَسُولًا

**'He is the One Who raised among the illiterates a messenger.'** [62:2].

3- The Qur'an states:

وَقُلْ لِلَّذِينَ أُوتُوا الْكِتَابَ وَالْأُمِّيِّينَ أَاسَلَّمْتُمْ

**'Say to those who were given the Scripture and the illiterates: "Do you submit yourselves (to God)?" [3:20].**

In those times, dates were guess work from memory....

The Arabs remembered dates by linking them to big events, like "the year of the elephant" or "the year of the famine".

These things were not always written down.

She had one of the greatest minds no doubt, but she was not infallible, so it is possible that she was mistaken.

It is also possible that she may have narrated this in her old age, and we know that even the sharpest memories deteriorate with old age.

**Third question:**

Is there any historic evidence that suggests that Aishah may have been mistaken?

Yes - The Syrian Hadith specialist, Salahudin al-Idlibi has provided 10 historical evidences which indicate that Aishah must have been 14 at the age of marriage and 17 at the age of consummation.

Read the English translation of his research here:

<https://hawramani.com/aisha-age-of-marriage-to-prophet.../>

What indicates that Aishah was guessing as well is that she sometimes said her marriage was at 6 and sometimes 7, and that the consummation was sometimes 9 and sometimes 10 - so she herself wasn't sure.

These are all authentic narrations.

Even today in some lands, many people don't know how old their are...they just use guesses.

**Fourth question:**

Did scholars rely on History to cross-check narrations?

Yes, they did:

Imam al-Sakhawi dedicated an entire book to this topic - its called:

الإعلان بالتوبيخ

لمن ذم أهل التوريق

It's a 400 page book in which he argues the importance of history and criticises those who downplay its importance.

History was not some external tool - it had become an integral part of the process in Hadith sciences.

He brings many examples from the Salaf, relying heavily on History, such as:

1- Sufyan al-Thawri said (p. 38):

لَمَّا اسْتَعْمَلَ الرُّوَاةُ الكَذِبَ اسْتَعْمَلْنَا لَهُمُ التَّارِيخَ

**"When the narrators started using lies, we started using history against them."**

2- Hassan Bin Zayd said (p. 39):

لَمْ نَسْتَعِنْ عَلَى الكَذَّابِينَ بِمِثْلِ التَّارِيخِ

**"We did not rely on anything against the liars more than on history."**

3- A man was narrating from Khalid bin Ma'dan (p. 39).

Ismail bin Ayyash asked him: "In which year did you write narrations from Khalid bin Ma'dan?" He replied: "In the year 113."

Ismail said:

أنت تزعم أنك سمعت من خالد بن معدان بعد موته بسبع سنين؟

**"So you claim to have heard from him 7 years after his death?"**

4- [Al-Mu'allā] said (p. 41): 'Abū Wā'il narrated to us, he said: 'Ibn Mas'ūd attacked us on the day of Siffīn'.

So Abū Nu'aym said:

أُتْرَاهُ بُعِثَ بَعْدَ الْمَوْتِ

**'Do you think he was raised after death?'**

[Ibn Mas'ūd passed away in 32 or 33H, several years before the day in question]

5-Hafs Bin Ghyath said:

ورويانا عن حفص بن غياث أنه قال : " إذا اتهمتم الشيخ ، فحاسبوه بالسنين " ، يعني احسبوا سنه و سن من كتب عنه .

6- A man narrated something from Ibn Humaid and they asked him about his age. When he told them his age, he was born 13 years after Ibn Humaid had died.

They said:

سمع هذا الشيخ من عبد بن حميد بعد موته بثلاث عشرة سنة

**'This Shaykh claims to have heard Ibn Humaid speak thirteen years after he had died.'**

7-Al-Zarkhashi :

معرفة التاريخ المتعلق بالمتون

8- Muhadith Al-Mu'allimi Al-Yamani says 'Al-Fawaid al-Majmua' (353):

النظر في متن الخير ، كل من تأمل منطوق الخبر ، ثم عرضه على الواقع ، عرف حقيقة الحال

**"... Then present [the content of the narration] to reality and you will know the truth of the matter."**

9- It is reported in 'Mizan al-'itidal', [3/225]:

يحيى الوحاظي، حدثنا عفير بن معدان، قال: قدم علينا عمر [بن موسى] (1) حمص، فاجتمعنا إليه، فجعل يقول: حدثنا شيخكم الصالح

فقلنا: من هذا؟ فقال: خالد بن معدان.

قلت له: في أي سنة لقيته؟ قال: في سنة ثمان ومائة في غزاة أرمينية [قلت: اتق الله] (1)  
يا شيخ، لا تكذب

مات خالد في سنة أربع ومائة، وأزيدك أنه لم يغز أرمينية قط.

**A man reported that Khalid bin Mi'dan narrated something to him in a certain year, at the battle of Armenia.**

**The scholars who knew history rebuked him and said: 'Fear Allah', saying that he had already died in that year and that he didn't even take part in the battle of Armenia!**

So they used historical evidences against him... if they didn't know history, they would have believed him.

10- It has been reported:

كان في عهد الخطيب البغدادي قد أظهر بعض اليهود كتاباً وادعى أنه كتاب رسول الله صلى الله عليه و سلم بإسقاط الجزية عن أهل خيبر وفيه شهادات الصحابة وأن خط علي بن أبي طالب فيه فعرضه رئيس الرؤساء ابن المسلمة على أبي بكر الخطيب فقال: هذا مزور. قيل: من أين لك؟ قال: في الكتاب شهادة معاوية بن أبي سفيان ومعاوية أسلم يوم الفتح وخيبر كانت في سنة سبع، وفيه شهادة سعد بن معاذ وكان قد مات يوم الخندق فاستحسن ذلك منه.

ينظر هذه القصة في: المنتظم في تاريخ الملوك والأمم لابن الجوزي: 265/8، وسير أعلام النبلاء للذهبي: 280/18، والطبقات الكبرى للسبكي: 35/4، وغيرها

**In the time of Khatib al-Baghdadi, the Jews produced a document to the Muslim ruler, in which the Prophet apparently removed the Jiziyah tax from the Jews on the day of Khaybar.**

**Khatib al-Baghdadi said: 'This is a forgery'.**

**They asked why?**

**He explained that one of the witnesses to this document mentioned are Mu'awiyah, and he became Muslim on the day of the conquest, and Khaybar was before this!**

**And secondly, another witness mentioned in this list is Sa'd bin Mu'adh, and he had already died on the day of Khandaq, which was before Khaybar.**

So, he used history to proof this document was fake.

-----

So, what scholars did in terms of gathering these historic evidences to show Aisha was older is not a deviation, but perfectly in line with the methodology of Hadith scholars.

This is why Imam Bukhari wrote: 'Tarikh al-Kabir' [التاريخ الكبير] [The Great History], in which he listed the bioographies of about 40,000 narrators, when they were born, when they died, who they met, where they lived, etc.

History has always been important to scholars of Hadith.

And history is not only used to catch liars - but also genuine mistakes of truthful people, who may have mistakenly mixed up some events.

What also puts big question marks around this narration is the following authentic narration:

خَطَبَ أَبُو بَكْرٍ وَعُمَرُ رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمَا فَاطِمَةَ فَقَالَ رَسُولُ اللَّهِ صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ " إِنَّهَا صَغِيرَةٌ " . فَخَطَبَهَا عَلِيٌّ فَزَوَّجَهَا مِنْهُ

Abu Bakr and 'Umar, may Allah be pleased with them, proposed marriage to Fatimah but the Messenger of Allah said: '**She is a saghirah (small).**'

Then 'Ali proposed marriage to her (later on) and he married her to him.

(‘Sunan an-Nasa’i’, 3221 - Sahih).

Is it conceivable that the Prophet would oppose a marriage because the girl is small, and then marry a 6 year old child himself?

**Conclusion:**

We could easily turn the tables on them, but we also don't have to fight every battle and defend every accusation people make ... especially when the evidences are not conclusive.

If someone accuses our Prophet of these things, then simply say:

Yes, it is confirmed that Aishah made that claim, but we also have multiple historic evidences which indicate that she may have been mistaken about her age.

That's it.

And if they then reject history and insist that she cannot be wrong, we can then put 100s of Ahadith in front of them in which these same Sahaba & Sahabiyat witnessed miracles of the Prophet with their own eyes.

They should then accept those as well and embrace Islam if they're truthful.

Authored by the brother in Islam: [Mohmand Afghan](#)



## Misconception # 4 (Prophet Muhammad tried to commit Suicide)

The Islam haters use a hadith from Sahih Bukhari to assert that Prophet Muhammad (Peace be upon him) was a false Prophet who tried to commit suicide (Naudhobillah).

Here is the part of hadith which Islamophobes use: ... But after a few days Waraqa died and the Divine Inspiration was also paused for a while and **the Prophet (ﷺ) became so sad as we have heard that he intended several times to throw himself from the tops of high mountains** and every time he went up the top of a mountain in order to throw himself down, Gabriel would appear before him and say, "O Muhammad! You are indeed Allah's Messenger (ﷺ) in truth" whereupon his heart would become quiet and he would calm down and would return home. And whenever the period of the coming of the inspiration used to become long, **he would do as before**, but when he used to reach the top of a mountain, Gabriel would appear before him and say to him what he had said before.... [Sahih Bukhari 9.87.111]

Now this longer version and also shorter version i.e. 1.1.3 have both come from a narrator called **“Ibn Shihab al-Zuhri”**

**who was renowned for making interpolations in hadiths.**

Many classical hadith experts had criticized Zuhri for not clarifying which were words of actual hadith and which were his own words. **So a narration from a someone who makes interpolations is guaranteed to be rejected in light of Usool ul hadith (Principles of hadith).**

Secondly this hadith comes from Aisha the wife of Prophet. She was not present at the time when early revelations started to come on Prophet, nor is this hadith traced to be Marfu (elevated to Prophet i.e. Prophet narrating the hadith himself), so that is second technical flaw in hadith.

Here are proofs from hadith specialists that Zuhri made interpolations:

**Imam al-Sakhawi (rah) said:** Ibn Shihab al-Zuhri used to (himself) explain many hadiths, many times he would not mention the particle [of speech] from which would be known if the words were from the Prophet (Peace be upon him) or from Zuhri himself. Hence some (scholars) of his time would always ask him to separate his words from those of the Prophet (Peace be upon him). [Sakhawi, Fath-al-Mughees, 1/267-8]

Zuhri tried to show as if there was rift between Companions and family of Prophet through his interpolations too. Imam al-Bayhaqi exposes Zuhri on one such important issue by saying:

وقول الزهري في قعود علي عن بيعة أبي بكر رضي الله عنه حتى توفيت فاطمة رضي الله عنها منقطع

Translation: This part that Ali abstained from giving pledge to Abu Bakr till Fatima died, is saying of al-Zuhri and it is broken (munqata) [Sunnan Bayhaqi al-Kubra 6/300, Hadith # 12512]

So Zuhri was dubious and used to insert many things from himself. Hence the hadiths which Islamophobes show are to be rejected. Remember no book other than Qur'an is divine, Bukhari has many weak and even fabricated reports in it. It is the Wahabis and extremists who try to assert that Bukhari and Muslim have everything authentic in it, but intellectual Muslims and scholars have long ago declared that Bukhari/Muslim have weak and fabricated reports in them too.

If Christians are stubborn and still do not accept these narrations to be interpolations of Zuhri, then let us look at Temptation of Biblical Jesus when he was hanging out with Satan on a mythical mountain from which whole world could be seen. It states:

Book of Luke: Then the devil took him to the holy city and had him stand on the highest point of the temple. If you are the Son of God," he said, "**throw yourself down. For it is written: "He will command his angels concerning you, and they will lift you up** in their hands, so that you will not strike your foot against a stone. Jesus answered him, "**It is also written:** 'Do not put the Lord your God to the

test. [Luke 4:5-7]

Look closely, Jesus does not rebut Satan on the point that Angels will lift you if you throw yourself down, meaning Jesus knew it was written in scripture that if Prophets tried to do such a thing then Angels would save them. Plus what on earth was Jesus doing hanging out with Satan when according to Christians he was the one who expelled Satan out being God? Why did Satan ask Jesus to worship him, when Satan already knew that God would never do that? This passage from Luke also destroys concept of divinity of Jesus.

## Misconception # 5 (The Satanic verses)

In Nabeel Qureshi's book: *Seeking Allah, Finding Jesus*. Chapter Thirty Nine (Muhammad Rasul Allah). David Wood, uses the oft-repeated fabricated report of Satanic Verses used by Islamophobes and Anti-Islamic propagandists. He quoted from Ibn Ishaq the grand liar who was criticized by Imam Malik the giant and many hadith masters. Imam Malik called Muhammad Ibn Ishaq a "DAJJAL (GRAND LIAR)" and many other hadith specialists called him liar too [See *Tahdhib ut Tahdhib* of Ibn Hajr al-Asqalani, Volume 9, under narrators starting with letter M (meem)]. Seerah, Tarikh, and Tafsir books are third grade sources in Islamic academia. All the reports about Satanic Verses are fabrications. The actual incident is to be understood from the verse of Qur'an which states:

Never sent We a messenger or a prophet before thee but when He recited (the message) Satan proposed (opposition) in respect of that which he recited thereof. But Allah abolisheth that which Satan proposeth. Then Allah establisheth His revelations. Allah is Knower, Wise [22:52, Pickthal]

Nowhere does this verse prove that Prophet (Peace be upon him) recited the Satanic verses himself, or Satan revealed them to him as said in fabricated reports. It was actually Satan who made that voice up and people thought it was Prophet. Those verses were never made part of Qur'an nor part of

Qur'anic recitation of Prophet Muhammad (Peace be upon him).

From companions of Prophet Muhammad (Peace be upon him) this report is only spuriously narrated by Ibn Abbas (ra) with fabricated and broken chains. Remember the incident of Surah Najm (53<sup>rd</sup> chapter) took place before Migration and age of Ibn Abbas (ra) at the time of migration was only 3 years. Those people who concocted this lie forgot while attributing to Ibn Abbas (ra) that he could not have witnessed such an incident as an adult and then narrated it. Also had this incident been true then many other companions would have narrated it but this report is only a singular narration from Ibn Abbas and not from other companions.

Secondly the above verse i.e. 22:52 is in a Madani Surah (i.e. revealed in Madina) and there is gap of many many years between both Surahs and incidents, so had incident of Gabriel coming to Prophet and saying to him that you have recited verse from Satan been true then Allah would not have revealed 22:52 after many years to condole the Prophet.

Qadhi Iyaadh the great scholar of Islam summarizes the opinion on Satanic Verses as: **This report is not narrated by any of the six compilers of hadith, nor is it “NARRATED WITH ANY AUTHENTIC AND CONTINEOUS CHAIN.”** This report is narrated by some of those commentators and historians **who “GATHER” all kinds of “STRANGE AND RARE” things** [Ash-Shifa, Arabic: Volume # 2, Page # 106-110]

Imam al-Karmani wrote: The story of cranes (satanic verses) is **“Batil (false)” and it is not “LOGICALLY NOR TEXTUALLY CORRECT”** [Sharh al-Karmani (6/153)]

Even a commentator of Qur’an who used to explain through logic i.e. Imam Fakhr ud din al-Razi said: This report is **“BAATIL (FALSE) ACCORDING TO QUR’AN, SUNNAH, AND PROOFS OF LOGIC”** ...then he presented 7 verses of Qur’an in proof of it being false. He also quoted hadith experts who called this report as false. [Tafsir al Kabeer (8/237-238)]

Imam al-Qurtubi yet another top commentator of Qur’an after rejecting this narration said: We Ask Allah’s refuge from this narration, there is no need to interpret it [Tafsir al-Qurtubi (12/75-76)]

Many other Commentators of Qur’an rejected it such as Abu Hayyan al Andalusi, Allama Alusi and others. Hence people like David Wood and bandwagon only rely on fabricated reports to malign our noble Prophet (Peace be upon him)

Misconception # 6 (Qur’an says Jews and Christians cannot be taken as friends)

Haters of Islam often misuse this verse: O you who have believed, **do not take the Jews and the Christians as allies.** They are [in fact] allies of one another. And whoever is an ally to them among you - then indeed, he is [one] of them. Indeed, Allah guides not the wrongdoing people. [5:51]

This verse is about a specific historical context i.e. regarding those Jews and Christians who were maligning Islam and waging war on Muslims during time of Prophet Muhammad (Peace be upon him). It is not a general verse. Also this verse is about not taking them as allies in faith but one can take them as friends in other worldly matters. This is made clear from following verse # 57 which states:

“O you who have believed, take not those **who have taken your religion in ridicule and amusement among the ones who were given the Scripture before you nor the disbelievers as allies.** And fear Allah, if you should [truly] be believers” [5:57]

Other verses of Qur’an prove that one has to be kind and friendly to non-Muslims, hence we can indeed befriend Jews and Christians. Qur’an rather says to an extent.

“Surely those who believe, **and those who are Jews, and the Christians,** and the Sabians, whoever believes in Allah and the Last day and does good, **they shall have their reward from their Lord, and there is no fear for them, nor shall they grieve**” [2:62]



## Misconception # 7 (Islam oppresses Women)

Among the misconceptions spread about Islam is that women are oppressed generally i.e. they are forced to cover themselves, they get half the inheritance, they are deficient in the mind, and that they can be beaten, and so on. I will come to these misconceptions later but first let us look at verses and hadiths which prove that men and women are equal, rather some proofs elevate the status of womankind higher to men. According to Qur'an we are created equal from a single pair of male and female and best among us is most righteous (i.e. noble, kind, pious, or well mannered).

**Qur'an states: O mankind! We created you from a single (pair) of a male and a female, and made you into nations and tribes,** that you may know each other (not that you despise each other). Verily the most noble of you in the sight of Allah is the most righteous of you. And Allah has full knowledge and is well acquainted (with all things).  
[Glorious Qur'an 49:13]

In another verse Qur'an gives equal reward to both righteous men and women, and there is no superiority of one on the other.

**Qur'an states: For Muslim men and women, for believing men and women,** for devout men and women, for true men and women, for men and women who are patient and constant, for men and women who humble themselves, for men and women who give in Charity, for men and women who fast (and deny themselves), for men and women who

guard their chastity, and for men and women who engage much in Allah's praise, - **for them has Allah prepared forgiveness and great reward.** [Glorious Qur'an 33:35]

Qur'an mentions them as equals and promises equal reward. Let us now look at hadiths in regards to women. It is an undeniable fact that the most glorified form of womankind is mother!

Here is a hadith about paradise lying beneath the feet of the mother:

Jahimah came to the Prophet (ﷺ) and said: "O Messenger of Allah! I want to go out and fight (in Jihad) and I have come to ask your advice." He said: "DO YOU HAVE A MOTHER? HE SAID: YES" HE SAID: "**THEN STAY WITH HER, FOR PARADISE IS BENEATH HER FEET**" [Sunnan Nasai'i Vol. 1, Book 25, Hadith 3106. Declared Authentic]

The hadith does not say the same about father, although Father in Islam has many rights and merits too. Only the mother is privileged with paradise beneath her feet.

Please note: This hadith does not use the word Jihad, it has been wrongly inserted in brackets by Wahabi translator. I shall explain later that Jihad literally means "to strive and struggle against lowly traits of soul, to say word of truth in front of a tyrant ruler, to serve our parents, to eliminate poverty, to perform pilgrimage, and do other such noble acts" It is not to be confused with Qitaal (i.e. fighting) which is only allowed in self-defense against invading oppressive forces.

There is also another hadith that mothers have three times more rights over us than fathers. Also See Qur'an 46:15 to know why Mothers have advantage over Fathers.

Another great form of womankind is “daughter”

Abu Hurayrah reports that the Prophet (Peace be upon him) said: "Whoever has three daughters, and shelters them, bearing their joys and sorrows with patience, Allah will admit him to Paradise by virtue of his compassion towards them." A man asked, "What if he has only two, O Messenger of Allah?" He said, "Even if they are only two." **Another man asked, "What if he has only one, O Messenger of Allah?" HE SAID, "EVEN IF HE HAS ONLY ONE."** (Musnad Ahmad, 2/335)

So Paradise is confirmed for Father if he is compassionate and takes care of even a single daughter. Whereas same is not said about a son.

Another great form of womankind is “Wife”

Qur'an states: O you who have believed, **it is not lawful for you to inherit women by compulsion.** And do not make difficulties for them in order to take [back] part of what you gave them unless they commit a clear immorality. And live with them in kindness. For if you dislike them - perhaps you dislike a thing and Allah makes therein much good. [4:19]

Qur'an forbids to marry women against their will, and to make difficulties for them in life. It orders to deal with them kindly, and even if we dislike any of their attribute then Allah has placed good also in that.

The Messenger of Allah (Peace be upon him) said: **“A widow, and a virgin cannot be married until her permission is sought.”** [Ibn Majah, Hadith # 1944, With Authentic chain from Abu Huraira]

Husbands and wives are protectors of one another. Qur'an states:

**The believing men and women are protectors of one another:** they enjoin what is just and Forbid what is evil: they observe regular prayers, practice regular charity, and obey Allah and His Apostle. On them will Allah pour His mercy: for Allah is Exalted in power Wise. (9:71)

Now let us see what Islam says about women in general:

Qur'an has a complete chapter named after women i.e. Surah an-Nisa but there is no chapter named after men i.e. Surah ar-Rijaal. Let's see what Islam says about women in general:

A great Sufi poet Allama Iqbal said:

Wujood-e-Zan Se Hai Tasveer-e-Kainat Mein Rang  
Issi Ke Saaz Se Hai Zindagi Ka Souz-e-Darun

Translation: The picture that this world presents, from woman gets its tints and scents: She is the lyre that can impart pathos and warmth to human heart. [Poet of the East, Muhammad Iqbal]

The Prophet of Mercy (Peace be upon him) said in a hadith under chapter title:

باب حُبِّ النِّسَاءِ  
Chapter: Love of Women

Two things of your world were made lovely to me, perfume and women; and the coolness of my eyes is in prayer [Sunnan Nasai'i, Hadith # 3939. With good (Hasan) chain of transmission]

This hadith is about women in general and not specific to wives. The comparison is made with perfume for a reason because Atr (the perfume in Arab world) is considered the most precious gift, therefore woman becomes the most precious gift from Allah.

Let us now come towards misconceptions about Islam as I mentioned in the beginning.

1. Does Islam oppress women in general and force women to cover themselves?

The simple answer to this comes from Qur'an which states:  
**“THERE IS NO COMPULSION IN RELIGION;** truly the right way has become clearly distinct from error... (2:256)

Many people do not know but Qur'an just gives a guideline to women to cover themselves (hijab without covering the face which is the dominant opinion of majority of scholarship) **“SO THAT THEY ARE KNOWN AS FREE WOMEN”** whereas actually it is Bible (NT) which imposes a strict condition for women to cover their heads.

**1 Corinthians 11:6** states: **Yes, if she refuses to wear a head covering, she should cut off all her hair!** But since it is shameful for a woman to have her hair cut or her head shaved, she should wear a covering.

NT also states: In like manner also, that women **adorn themselves in modest apparel, with shamefacedness and sobriety; not with broided hair,** or gold, or pearls, or costly array **“LET THE WOMAN LEARN IN SILENCE WITH ALL SUBJECTION”** But I suffer not a woman to teach, **“NOR TO USURP AUTHORITY OVER THE MAN”** but to be in silence For Adam was first formed, then Eve. And Adam was not deceived, **“BUT THE WOMAN BEING DECEIVED WAS IN THE TRANSGRESSION”** (1Timothy 2:9-14)

Now the anti-Islamic propagandists who falsely blame Islam should know that oppression and degradation of women comes from Bible not Qur'an.

Points to note are:

- a) Woman is asked to dress with MODEST APPAREL, WITH SHAMEFACEDNESS AND SOBRIETY; NOT WITH BROIDED HAIR
- b) Not allowed to wear even pearls and gold in public.
- c) Cannot have authority over man.
- d) Has to learn in silence.
- e) Eve was the one who got really deceived not Adam (according to Qur'an both were to blame not just the woman eve)
- f) 1 Corinthians 11:3 states: Head of every man is Christ, **“AND THE HEAD OF THE WOMAN IS MAN”** and the head of Christ is God. (Disapproves trinity or Jesus being god as well)

## 2. Do women get half the inheritance than man?

Some Islamophobes show this verse as proof:

Qur'an states: Allah instructs you concerning your children: for the male, what is equal to the share of two females.... [4:11]

What they fail to realize is that according to Islam a woman ends up getting more wealth and property than men If we study the laws of inheritance in detail. A woman inherits wealth and property through different channels in Islam i.e.

through Dowry, through inheritance from father, and also through inheritance from husband. If we join these three then we get to understand why Islam has made inheritance to be half for woman from father's side. Also remember a woman can ask for as much dowry she wants in shape of either cash or property so there is no limit to her inheritance according to Islam.

On the other hand a man only gets inheritance from his father.

Another reasoning for man inheriting more from father is that it is prevalent in many countries in the world (prime example being India) that it is mostly men who have to earn the bread and butter not only for himself but for whole family and even for other relatives at times.

I personally believe that men should run the families and this happens in majority of cases too throughout the world. Women can indeed work but I believe it is an extra burden on them after multiple pregnancies, taking care of children, educating children, taking care of the house especially kitchen, and not to forget husband himself.

### 3. Are women deficient in the mind?

The Qur'an says nowhere that women are deficient in mind. The hadith which is used by Islamophobes is to be rejected as it contradicts Qur'an. According to many high ranking scholars such as Imam Abul Hasan al-Ash'ari (rah) after whom the mainstream Sunni school of theology is based,



Imam al-Qurtubi al-Ash'ari (rah), Ibn Hazm, and others, Allah chose many women as Prophets such as Holy Mary, wife of Pharoah, Mother of Moses, and others. Had women been deficient in mind then Allah would not have chosen them as Prophets.

Plus the first person to accept Islam was wife of our Prophet i.e. Khadija (ra). Khadija was a businesswoman and our mighty Prophet even worked for her. Imagine the greatest of all Prophets working diligently under a woman boss.

Then you have Sayyidah Fatima (a.s) who is called leader of women in paradise, the blessed daughter of Prophet (Peace be upon him). The Prophet is special unlike other men that his lineage continues from a daughter and not son (all his sons died). According to Imam Malik (rah) and many scholars she has the highest status among all companions of Prophet Muhammad (Salallahu alaihi wasalam).

Then you have Sayyidah Aisha (ra) who is among the most knowledgeable of companions in both men and women. She has narrated third highest number of hadiths from Prophet (Peace be upon him) and has taught many male Sahaba too. Had Islam considered women deficient then such a young woman would not have led from the front.

It is actually western societies which have let down women in different fields of knowledge. Whenever we ask who were greatest scientists and philosophers then names like Sir Isaac Newton, Albert Einstein, Galileo, Socrates, Plato and such came into mind. Yes there have been and still are great

women scientists too but they are outnumbered by male scientists, doctors/surgeons, and philosophers. Greatest of inventions have been credited to men.

Whereas on the other hand Muslim countries such as Bangladesh and Pakistan had the first ever elected female Prime Ministers whereas USA the so called champion of democracy has never had a woman President.

#### 4. Can men beat women?

The anti-Islamic propagandists misuse a verse from Qur'an which states:

Qur'an states: Men are the protectors and maintainers of women, because Allah has given the one more (strength) than the other, and because they support them from their means. Therefore the righteous women are devoutly obedient, "AND GUARD IN (THE HUSBAND'S) ABSENCE WHAT ALLAH WOULD HAVE THEM GUARD". As to those women on whose part ye fear disloyalty and ill-conduct, admonish them (first), (Next), refuse to share their beds, "(AND LAST) BEAT THEM (LIGHTLY)" but if they return to obedience, seek not against them Means (of annoyance): For Allah is Most High, great (above you all). [4:34]

This verse has to be understood in an overall context of Qur'an and hadith. Here are important points to note:

- a) First of all this verse has to be understood from another verse in Qur'an which talks about Pagan Meccans burying their daughters (women) alive (see: Qur'an 81:8-9). Islam abolished that practice by this verse by stopping them to kill women but to beat them, however even this was later forbidden. Remember evil practices and norms in societies take time to get abolished.
- b) Many scholars have interpreted the word ""idribuhunna"" in 4:34 as "Leave them" for example like we say "Beat it" or "Drop it" in English. In Qur'an the word "Darabtum" which originates from word "Daraba" (literally meaning to beat)" is also used in meaning of "Going abroad" ..see verse 4:94
- c) Thirdly, Men have been made protectors and maintainers of women as they are given more strength i.e. they give women shelter and refuge. It is a fact that men who are strong and who can safeguard a woman from molestation and harassment are considered very sexy and attractive by women. There are many movies made on this when a man protects a woman from getting raped, molested, or harassed and she ends up falling in love with him.
- d) We should not be shy to accept that it is duty of a man to provide house, wealth, and other necessities of life to woman. This still happens in majority of the countries throughout the world. Yes Women can indeed work to take care of the house but that is not binding upon her according to Islam.
- e) The verse talks about guarding in husband's absence. This means guarding his dignity, his wealth, maintaining

the house, upbringing the children, and last but not the least not to indulge in sexual relationships with other men.

- f) However women who breach all these together and are ill mannered, abusive, who even beat men, indulge in sexual relationships behind men. Then Qur'an tells a procedure how to tame such a beast of a woman.
  
- g) The procedure is first to admonish her and believe you me this alone is enough for the woman to mend her ways. If she still persists then there is something severely wrong with her and she is intrinsically bad, therefore Quran then tells us to stop having sexual intercourse with her and separate the beds as a punishment to her. If even this does not work then believe you me she is intrinsically evil, who abuses, beats you, does not take care of the children, and does sexual intercourse with others. Only then does Qur'an gives the final solution i.e. beating her lightly.

I know Islam haters would say that it is still not justified so the answer to them is that there are many men who are severely oppressed by women and they cannot divorce them too. They face daily mental trauma, verbal, and physical abuse from women, they have their children being mistreated and mismanaged, they have their wealth being misused, and on top of that woman doing sexual intercourse outside marriage, so all this immoral behavior finally justifies a man to "SLIGHTLY" beat the woman to tame her.

The Islamic scholars on basis of hadiths have said that beating is just symbolic, the face cannot be hit, it should not leave any marks, nor should there be any lashing or using of any hard object. The beating has been compared to just like beating with a tooth-stick (siwak) which is an utterly soft beating and even with it no mark should be left i.e. One can only softly use it like we tap our hand with our finger.

There is a hadith which proves that man should never beat the woman in literal sense.

Volume 4, Book 55, Number 548: (Sahih Bukhari)

Narrated Abu Huraira: Allah 's Apostle said, "Treat women nicely, for a women is created from a rib, and the most curved portion of the rib is its upper portion, "SO IF YOU TRY TO STRAIGHTEN IT, IT WILL BREAK, but if you leave it as it is, it will remain crooked. So treat women nicely."

Although I have made it clear by showing the hadith of "RIB" that Islam does not allow beating women. But for further clarity here is another hadith.

A'isha said: the Messenger of Allah (saws) never struck a servant or a woman. [Sunnan Abu Dawud, Hadith # 4768. Hadith is Authentic].

As Prophet Muhammad (Peace be upon him) is our role model, therefore beating wives stands forbidden according to sacred law.

## Misconception # 8 (Prophet raided Caravans)

I have already proven from Qur'an above i.e. 9:1-13 that Meccan Pagans were the ones who persecuted Muhammad (Peace be upon him) and his companions, forced them to migrate from their own homeland i.e. Mecca, attacked Muslims first and killed some companions (as authentic reports prove that Summayyah bint Khayyat was martyred by Meccans. See Kitab Tabaqat al Kabir by Ibn Sa'd Volume 8, Page 185-186, Translated by Aisha Bewley), also they went to assassinate the Prophet and Abu Bakr in cave Hira while they were migrating, but they were saved by Allah, see Qur'an 9:40 and Bukhari 6.185, hence it is decisively proven that pagan Meccans were the aggressors. The pagan Meccans after expelling Muslims took over properties of Muslims, and only after this constant persecution did the event of "Nakhla" happen, and even that was not sanctioned by Muhammad (Peace be upon him) at all.

We do not have to turn towards even hadiths let alone historical reports to know for sure that Pagan Meccans were the aggressors and not Muhammad (Peace be upon him)

Qur'an states: **Would you not fight a people who broke their oaths and determined to expel the Messenger, and they had begun [the attack upon] you the first time?** Do you fear them? But Allah has more right that you should fear Him, if you are [truly] believers. [9:13]

Also another verse in relevance is this: **Permission [to fight] has been given to those who are being fought, because they were wronged.** And indeed, Allah is competent to give them victory. [22:39]

Fanatical Islamophobes like David Wood and Sam Shamoun often misinterpret 2:217 in regards to raid on Caravans. When we read the verse properly and also the report about Nakhla incident then it is clear that Muhammad (Peace be upon him) "DID NOT SANCTION" to raid the caravan or to kill anyone, he had just sent Abdullah bin Jahsh to gather information, but Ibn Jahsh acted contrary to Prophet's order and attacked the caravan. Then the verse 2:217 was revealed which still proves Muhammad (Peace be upon him) to be innocent and no blame can be put on him.

It states: They ask thee concerning fighting in the Prohibited Month. Say: "**Fighting therein is a grave (offence);** but graver is it in the sight of Allah to prevent access to the path of Allah, to deny Him, **to prevent access to the Sacred Mosque, and drive out its members.**" Tumult and oppression are worse than slaughter. Nor will they cease fighting you until they turn you back from your faith if they can. And if any of you Turn back from their faith and die in unbelief, their works will bear no fruit in this life and in the Hereafter; they will be companions of the Fire and will abide therein. [2:217]

This verse clearly proves that Muhammad (Peace be upon him) did not sanction Nakhla raids rather Abdullah bin Jahsh disobeyed the Prophet and Qur'an calls his action a "GRAVE OFFENCE (SIN)" However what Meccan Pagans had done and were doing was far more offensive. They had already declared war by expelling Prophet and companions out, not letting them back to Mosque of Makkah, looted their properties, broken the treaties, killed companions (like Summayyah), and initiated the war first as 9:13 and 22:39 proves.



## Misconception # 9 (Quran prescribes terrorism)

There is a guy with the name of "Masked Arab" who has made a YouTube mini-series trying to assert that whatever ISIS and such terrorist groups do is justified from Islamic sources.

I have refuted each episode of his series one by one Alhamdulillah. In Episode # 1 which is on "Terrorism & Extremism" he claimed that spreading terrorism is justified from Qur'an.

Here is what I wrote:

### Refutation of Part # 1 (Terrorism & Extremism)

One thing common in Islamophobes and ISIS is that they both quote Qur'an out of context. The masked Arab in his videos has claimed that he will not do so, but the very first verse he quoted was quoted out of context and he also used false translation of the word "**Turhibun.**" Let us first see how majority of translators translate Turhibun in 8:60.

1. Pickthall translates it as "**Dismay**"
2. Shakir translates it as "**Frighten**"
3. Dr.Ghali translates it as "**awe**"
4. Muhsin Khan/Hilali translate it as "**Threaten**"

Hence it is proven from overwhelming majority of translators that it does not mean terrorism. If we look at the verse 8:60 in context then it is in regards to preparing weaponry against militant armies of Mecca who had broken treaties of peace. The verse is not in regards to general non-combatant disbelievers. Hence even if assuming word “terror” is used then to strike terror in hearts of an opposing militant army is absolutely justified.

The context of 8:60 starts from verse 8:56 which states:

"The ones with whom you made a “TREATY” but then they break their pledge “EVERY TIME” and they do not fear Allah"

It continues till 8:61-62 which state:

**"AND IF THEY INCLINE TO PEACE, THEN INCLINE TO IT** and trust in Allah; surely He is the Hearing, the Knowing. And if they intend to deceive you-- then surely Allah is sufficient for you; He it is who strengthened you with His help and with the believers" (8:61-62)

Hence 8:60 teaches to make ready the steeds of war against the militant armies of Mecca. The correct translation of Turhibun is “Frighten or Threaten” and by no means terrorize. Even if assuming it means to cast terror in hearts of disbelievers then it just refers to those disbelievers who had broken treaties of peace to attack Muslims militarily.

I do not want to make this lengthy, but as we know now that he started with a lie therefore his whole series is based on misinterpretations just like ISIS do to Islam.

Now let us come to verse 8:12 which he also misinterpreted.

The verse states: When your Lord inspired the angels, (saying): I am with you. So make those who believe stand firm. **“I WILL THROW FEAR INTO THE HEARTS”** of those who disbelieve. Then smite the necks and smite of them each finger. (PICKTHALL 8:12)

Pickthall the convert to Islam translates **ar-Roab as fear**. **Dr Ghali translates it as horror**, whereas many other translators translate it as terror. Even if its meaning is taken as terror then it does not mean it is talking about casting terror in hearts of general disbelievers. The context of verse talks about Battle of Badr and it is a historical fact that Meccan pagans initiated that battle after being extremely oppressive to Muslims and exiling them from their homeland. In battlefield casting horror or terror in hearts of opponents is indeed justified.

Plus if we look at the verse then it is talking about angels casting horror/terror in hearts of Meccan "HUGE ARMY"

Let us now look at context and Tafsir of this verse:

8:11 states: (Remember) when He covered you with a slumber as a security from Him, and He caused water (rain) to descend

on you from the sky, to clean you thereby and to remove from you the Rijz (whispering or dirt) of Shaytan, **and to strengthen your hearts, and make your feet firm thereby**

Ibn Kathir explains it as: Allah reminds the believers of the slumber that He sent down on them as security from the fear they suffered from, **“BECAUSE OF THE MULTITUDE OF THEIR ENEMY AND THE SPARSENESS OF THEIR FORCES”** They were given the same favor **“DURING THE BATTLE OF UHUD”** [Tafsir Ibn Kathir under 8:11-12]

After this verse, 8:12 mentions about striking horror/terror in hearts of combatant forces of Meccan pagans.

## Misconception # 10 (Islam prescribes to kill innocent Civilians)

The guy masked Arab in Episode # 2 used verse 5:32 and claimed that ruling of killing one person being equivalent to killing whole of mankind is revealed in regards to Jews only and not Muslims. Let us first look at the verse:

On that account: We ordained for the Children of Israel that **“IF ANY ONE SLEW A PERSON – UNLESS IT BE FOR MURDER OR FOR SPREADING MISCHIEF IN THE LAND – IT WOULD BE AS IF HE SLEW THE WHOLE PEOPLE”** and if any one saved a life, it would be as if he saved the life of the whole people. Then although there came to them Our messengers with clear signs, yet, even after that, many of them continued to commit excesses in the land.  
[5:32]

The Islamophobes claim that this verse is not valid for Muslims, but is rather a ruling that was prescribed only to Israelites. They give example of Sabbath which was prescribed for Jews but is not binding upon Muslims.

Imam Baghawi the classical commentator explains this verse as: Suliman bin Ali said: **I asked Hasan al-Basri, Does this apply to us as it applied to the Children of Israel?** He replied, **‘Yes [Ma`alim at-Tanzeel under 5:32]**

Hence it is proven from Islamic Jurisprudence that verse 5:32 has a general guideline and it is applicable on Muslims too. Masked Arab and all Islamophobes are proven as liars that verse 5:32 is not for Muslims.

A golden principle is to be remembered that if there is no other verse in Qur'an which nullifies this ruling then the ruling will stay intact. The Islamophobes are asked to bring forward a proof from Qur'an where it states that verse 5:32 is abrogated or nullified.

Here is proof from Tafsir Ibn Kathir where authentic hadiths are shown that verse 5:32 is binding on Muslims too.

Ali bin Abi Talhah reported that **Ibn `Abbas said**, “It is as Allah has stated, (if anyone killed a person not in retaliation of murder, or (and) to spread mischief in the land – it would be as if he killed all mankind, and if anyone saved a life, it would be as if he saved the life of all mankind.) **SAVING LIFE IN THIS CASE OCCURS BY NOT KILLING A SOUL THAT ALLAH HAS FORBIDDEN.** So this is the meaning of saving the life **of all mankind**, for whoever forbids killing a soul without justification, **“THE LIVES OF ALL PEOPLE WILL BE SAVED FROM HIM”** [Tafsir Ibn Kathir under 5:32]

Ibn Kathir also explains: Al-A`mash and others said that Abu Salih said that Abu Hurayrah said, **“I entered on `Uthman** when he was under siege in his house and said, ‘I came to give you my support. Now, it is good to fight (defending you) O Leader of the Faithful!’ He said, ‘O Abu Hurayrah! Does it please you that you kill all people, including me’ I said, **‘No.’**

**“HE SAID, IF YOU KILL ONE MAN, IT IS AS IF YOU KILLED ALL PEOPLE”** Therefore, go back with my permission for you to leave. May you receive your reward and be saved from burden.’ So I went back and did not fight.”  
[Tafsir Ibn Kathir under 5:32]

So the rightly guided Caliph Uthman whose Sunnah we are ordained to follow took this verse as general, hence this verse according to Islamic jurisprudence gives us a general ruling.

Masked Arab then tried to create doubt on the word “Mischief” used in the verse and showed Tafsir al Jalalyn that it refers to disbelief, fornication, ,and waylaying.

Please note that the Arabic word used for mischief in this verse is “Fasaad.” The Classical jurists took it to refer to the legal category of Hirabah, comprising armed assault, rape and murder.[Sayyed Nasr Hussain, The Study Quran: A New Translation and Commentary. Commentary to 5:33]

Sayyed Nasr Hussain also explains it as: Armed crimes falling under the legal category of Hirabah, which comprises armed robbery, assault (including rape), and murder, particularly of innocent travelers on the road.[ The Study Quran: A New Translation and Commentary. Commentary to 5:33]

Masked Arab then claims that killing and saving life here refers to believers only and not disbelievers. He used some quotes from Tafsir Ibn Kathir in this regard, whereas we have shown you hadiths above from greater companions of Prophet i.e. Ibn Abbas (ra) and Uthman bin Affan (ra) that verse is

general. Please remember that Ibn Abbas (ra) was among those companions who was chief commentators of Qur'an, therefore his Tafsir on this verse will supersede all others.

Masked Arab then misused a verse that Islam prescribes killing of innocent people in retaliation of murder. He misused this verse:

O ye who believe! The law of equality is prescribed to you in cases of murder: the free for the free, the slave for the slave, the woman for the woman. But if any remission is made by the brother of the slain, then grant any reasonable demand, and compensate him with handsome gratitude, this is a concession and a Mercy from your Lord. After this whoever exceeds the limits shall be in grave penalty. [2:178]

In Tanwir al Miqbas, Tafsir Ibn Abbas it states: This verse was revealed regarding two Arab clans **“BUT IS ABROGATED”** by the verse: (... a life for a life) [5:45]

**Hence according to Qur'an life for life means killing the murderer whether he/she is a believer or not. Qur'an does not differentiate between Muslims and non-Muslims in 5:45 hence life for life includes all murderers.**

Therefore Islam only prescribes death penalty for the murderer and not other people. 2:178 is abrogated by 5:45

Let us look at an authentic hadith now:



It was narrated that 'Abdullah bin 'Amr said: "The Messenger of Allah said: 'Whoever kills a person from among Ahl Adh-Dhimmah, he will not smell the fragrance of Paradise, and its fragrance may be detected from a distance of forty years.'" [Sunnan Nasai, Vol. 5, Book 45, Hadith 4754. Hadith is Authentic]

Ahl Adh Dhimmah means people from the non-believers. Hence killing non-believers is a severe crime in Islam and the killer shall be punished with death as we shall explain, and he shall not enter Paradise.

Masked Arab then used some hadiths that a believer cannot be killed for killing a disbeliever. **The answer to it is that the greatest Imam of jurisprudence i.e. Imam Abu Hanifa used Qur'an 5:45 as proof that all murderers will be killed in retaliation whether they are Muslim or not.** According to Imam Abu Hanifa and rightly so, 5:45 is a general verse and does not distinguish between murder of Muslim or disbeliever. Hanafi school is the most dominant and widely followed school of jurisprudence in Muslim world. The scholars interpreted the hadith of not killing a Muslim who killed a disbeliever as:

Al-Mawsalai Al-Hanafi comments on this tradition, saying:

وَالْمُرَادُ بِقَوْلِهِ عَلَيْهِ الصَّلَاةُ وَالسَّلَامُ لَا يُقْتَلُ مُسْلِمٌ بِكَافِرٍ الْحَزْبِيِّ

The meaning is of this tradition is that a Muslim is not killed for killing a "WARRIOR" disbeliever [Al-Ikhtiyar li Ta'leel 506]

And Abu Bakr Al-Jassas writes:

كَانَ قَوْلُهُ لَا يُقْتَلُ مُؤْمِنٌ بِكَافِرٍ بِمَنْزِلَةِ قَوْلِهِ لَا يُقْتَلُ مُؤْمِنٌ بِكَافِرٍ حَرْبِيٍّ فَلَمْ يَثْبُتْ عَنِ النَّبِيِّ صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ نَفْيُ قَتْلِ الْمُؤْمِنِ بِالذَّمِّ

The tradition means that a believer is not killed for killing a “WARRIOR” disbeliever, for it has not been established that the Prophet nullified the punishment of execution for a believer who kills a non-Muslim citizen. [Ahkam Al-Quran 1/176]

Umar ibn Al-Khattab the 2nd Caliph of Islam said:

وَاللَّهِ لَوْ أَنَّ أَحَدَكُمْ أَشَارَ بِأُصْبُعِهِ إِلَى السَّمَاءِ إِلَى مُشْرِكٍ فَزَلَّ إِلَيْهِ عَلَى ذَلِكَ فَقَتَلَهُ لَقَتَلْتُهُ بِهِ

By Allah, if one of you were to give a gesture of safety to an idolater and he came trusting you and you killed him, then I would execute you for it. [Sunan Sa’eed ibn Mansur 2439]

This proves that hadiths which talk about not killing a Muslim in retaliation of murdering a non-Muslim are misunderstood, if we take them apparently then they contradict Qur’an and many other reports. It is primary principle that any hadith which contradicts Qur’an and other authentic reports is to be rejected. Umar bin Abdul Aziz (rah) who is counted as righteous Caliph of Islam, he implemented punishment on Muslim who killed a disbeliever.

عبد الرزاق ، عن معمر ، عن عمرو بن ميمون بن مهران ، قال : شهدت كتاب عمر بن عبد العزيز قدم إلى أميرالجزيرة أو قال : الحيرة في رجل مسلم قتل رجلا من أهل الذمة أن ادفعه إلى وليه فإن شاء قتله ، وإن شاء عفا عنه قال فدفع إليه فضرب عنقه ، وأنا أنظر

Umar ibn Mihran said: I testify that Umar ibn Abd al-Aziz wrote to his deputy about the Muslim man who kills a man from the people of dhimma, "Give him to his guardian (wali), and if he wants, he can kill him, and if he wants, he can forgive him." So, he turned him over to them, and they struck his neck, and I was watching. [Musannaf Abdur Razzaq, Hadith # 17904]

It is not possible that Umar bin Abdul Aziz (rah) who came way before the 6 compilers of hadiths (including Ibn Majah, from where Masked Arab used the hadith), did not know the hadith of not killing a Muslim in retaliation of murder a disbeliever.

Then Masked Arab used this following hadith to claim that Islam prescribes war on all disbelievers.

Narrated Ibn 'Umar: Allah's Messenger (ﷺ) said: "I have been ordered (by Allah) to fight against the people until they testify that none has the right to be worshipped but Allah and that Muhammad is Allah's Messenger (ﷺ), and offer the prayers perfectly and give the obligatory charity, so if they perform that, then they save their lives and property from me except for Islamic laws and then their reckoning (accounts) will be done by Allah." [Sahih Bukhari Vol. 1, Book 2, Hadith 25]

We should remember that ultimate source for Muslims is Qur'an. Qur'an is the only divine book whereas even hadith books like Bukhari can have what we call "Chinese whispers (i.e. a message is passed on, in a whisper, by each of a number of people, so that the final version of the message is often radically changed from the original – Collins dictionary)"

We should therefore see what Qur'an says about general disbelievers.

Qur'an says to Prophet Muhammad (Peace be upon him): If it had been your Lord's will, they would all have believed, all who are on earth! **"WILL YOU THEN COMPEL MANKIND, AGAINST THEIR WILL, TO BELIEVE"** (10:99)

There is no way the Prophet could have contradicted Qur'an. This verse proves that it is not desired by Allah that all people should believe in Islam. People are spread into nations and tribes and have different faiths/ideologies.

Qur'an states: "O MANKIND" We created you from a single (pair) of a male and a female, and made you **"INTO NATIONS AND TRIBES"** that ye may know each other (not that ye may despise (each other). Verily the most honoured of you in the sight of Allah is (he who is) the **"MOST RIGHTEOUS OF YOU"** .And Allah has full knowledge and is well acquainted (with all things). [49:13]

Let us now look at the complete chapter in Qur'an called Surah al-Kafiroon (disbelievers). Islamophobes would assume that this chapter with its name would ask for compelling disbelievers to accept Islam, but here let us give them a shock of their lifetimes.

It states:

109.1: Say: O disbelievers!

109.2: I worship not that which ye worship;

109.3: Nor worship ye that which I worship.

109.4: And I shall not worship that which ye worship.

109.5: Nor will ye worship that which I worship.

109.6: UNTO YOU YOUR RELIGION, AND UNTO ME MY RELIGION

[Translation by a revert from Christianity to Islam i.e. Marmaduke Pickthal]

This short chapter of Qur'an which has been shown in totality, proves beyond doubt that Islam prescribes right in its most holy scripture that everyone has freedom to choose any religion or ideology and there can be no compulsion on any person to accept Islam.

As compared to overwhelming verses in Qur'an which were shown, the hadith even if in Bukhari does not stand a chance. Masked Arab showed hadith about Banu Quraizah and claimed that all boys who had reached puberty and grown up men were killed and not just warriors.

Let us again read Qur'an. Qur'an orders to deal with all disbelievers kindly (except for those who wage war): Allah forbids you not, with regard to those who fight you not for (your) Faith nor drive you out of your homes, **"FROM DEALING KINDLY"** and justly with them: for Allah loves those who are just. (60:8)

Qur'an also states: ...So if they remove themselves from you and do not fight you and offer you peace, **"THEN ALLAH HAS NOT MADE FOR YOU A CAUSE [FOR FIGHTING] AGAINST THEM"** [4:90]

Again the Prophet (Peace be upon him) could not have contradicted Qur'an therefore we should stick to Qur'an. It is a fundamental principle in Islam that any hadith which contradicts Qur'an is to be rejected. The hadith about killing all boys with pubic hair contradicts the other authentic hadith of **"KILLING ONLY THE WARRIORS"** Here is the hadith:

Narrated Abu Sa`id Al-Khudri: The people of (Banu) Quraiza agreed to accept the verdict of Sa`d bin Mu`adh. So the Prophet (ﷺ) sent for Sa`d, and the latter came (riding) a donkey and when he approached the Mosque, the Prophet (ﷺ) said to the Ansar, "Get up for your chief or for the best among you." Then the Prophet (ﷺ) said (to Sa`d)." These (i.e. Banu Quraiza) have agreed to accept your verdict." Sa`d said, **"KILL THEIR (MEN) WARRIORS"** and take their offspring as captives, "On that the Prophet (ﷺ) said, "You have judged according to Allah's Judgment," or said, "according to the King's judgment." [Sahih Bukhari 5.447]

This hadith categorically mentions them as “WARRIORS” hence only the combatants were killed and the hadith of killing boys who had reached puberty is false. It stands established that there was no genocide committed as falsely asserted by Islamophobes.

Masked Arab used a Shadh (odd) hadith that after women and children were killed in one raid, the Prophet said: They are from them!

Let us see what Qur’an states even when we are in state of war:

Fight in the way of Allah, those who fight you, “**BUT DO NOT TRANSGRESS LIMITS**” for Allah verily loves not transgressors (2:190)

This verse proves that fighting is only prescribed against combatants who attack Muslims. Plus the verse tells us not to transgress limits i.e. not to kill non-combatants, kill women and children, destroy infrastructure, burn trees, destroy mosques/churches/synagogues and heritage.

Tafsir Ibn Kathir explains 2:190 as:

أي قاتلوا في سبيل الله، ولا تعتدوا في ذلك، ويدخل في ذلك ارتكاب المناهي، كما قاله الحسن البصري من المثلة والغلول وقتل النساء والصبيان والشيوخ، الذين لا رأي لهم، ولا قتال فيهم، والرهبان وأصحاب الصوامع، وتحريق الأشجار، وقتل الحيوان لغير مصلحة، كما قال ذلك ابن عباس وعمر بن عبد العزيز ومقاتل بن حيان وغيرهم

This (verse) means: Fight in the way of Allah and do not be transgressors, such as, by committing prohibitions. **Hasan al-Basri said that transgression refers to mutilating the dead bodies, theft, killing women, children, and old people who are non-combatants, killing religious figures and residents of houses of worship, burning down trees and killing animals without real benefit."** This is also the saying of Ibn Abbas, Umar bin Abdul Aziz, Muqatil bin Hayyan and others. [Tafsir Ibn Kathir under 2:190]

Islamophobes use verse 191 and 193 without the context. Verse 190 makes it clear that fighting was only allowed against those combatants who waged war on Muslims.

The hadiths on not killing women and children in war are many and narrated with multiple chains, whereas the hadith of Prophet saying "THEY ARE FROM THEM" is a singular (ahad) hadith and is thus Shadh (odd). Let us conclude with a principle of scrutinizing hadiths:

Imam an-Nawawi (rah) said:

قاله المحققون والاكثرون فانهم قالوا أحاديث الصحيحين التي ليست بمتواترة انما تفيد الظن فإنها آحاد والآحاد انما تفيد الظن على ما تقرر ولا فرق بين البخاري ومسلم وغيرهما

Most of the (scholars) and Researchers said that the Hadiths of Bukhari and Muslim which are not Mutawattir (multiply narrated from many companions), they imply conjecture



(Zann) since they are from Ahaad (singulars), and the Ahaad imply nothing but conjecture (Zann). This is based on what was already known and agreed upon. This rule applies without distinguishing between Bukhari, Muslim or others. [Sharh Sahih Muslim, Volume # 1, Page # 20]

### Misconception # 11 (Jihad means holy war on all infidels)

It is unfortunate that concept of Jihad is often misunderstood not only by non-Muslims but even by some ignorant Muslims out there. English dictionaries, the biased Media, anti-Islamic propagandists (Islamophobes), and also terrorist groups like ISIS bring a lot of bad name to Islam and concept of Jihad. Our respected readers should therefore precisely know what it means.

Before we write in detail about Jihad, let us first look at definition of it. We do not need to consult Arabic dictionaries because definition of Jihad is established directly from Qur'an itself.

Qur'an states:

And whosoever **STRIVES (JAAHADA), STRIVES (YUJAAHIDU)** only for himself (29:6).

As for those who **STRIVE (JAHADU)** in Us (the cause of Allah), We surely guide them to Our paths, and lo! Allah is

with the good doers. (29:69)

These verses clearly use the word “JIHAD” and they refer to Jihad an Nafs (striving against the lowly traits of our soul).

Hence it stands proven from Qur’an that word Jihad originates from root word “Jaahada” which refers to striving. This striving could be in many forms such as striving against lowly traits of our soul (which is proven to be the bigger Jihad), striving to serve our parents, saying word of truth in front of a tyrant ruler, performing hajj, striving to end poverty, and last but not the least fighting (Qitaal) against the “OPPRESSIVE” invaders who “INITIATE” war upon Muslims.

Contrary to this, Merriam Webster the famous English dictionary falsely defines jihad only as: a war fought by Muslims to defend or spread their beliefs. (In simple definition)

1. In full definition it states: 1. **a holy war** waged on behalf of Islam as a **religious duty**; *also* : a personal struggle in devotion to Islam especially involving spiritual discipline
2. **a crusade** for a principle or belief

Dictionary.com also falsely defines it as:

1. **a holy war** undertaken as a **sacred duty** by Muslims.

2.  
any **vigorous, emotional crusade** for an idea or principle.

Collins English dictionary defines it as:

a **holy war against infidels** undertaken by Muslims in defence of the Islamic [faith](#)

Due to such false definitions the concept of Jihad is deeply misunderstood especially in the western societies. To define it as “HOLY WAR” is totally wrong because actual wording for the holy war is “al-Harb-u-Muqaddasah” a term never used in Qur’an. There is not a single verse in Qur’an that calls Jihad a “holy war”

Masked Arab in Episode # 3 claimed that Prophet Muhammad (Peace be upon him) always waged offensive Jihad. Instead of quoting Qur’an which clearly proves that fighting was only allowed in defense, this guy ran straight to not even hadiths but rather Sira (biography) and that too without citing authentic chain of narrations and providing reference. Let us first understand the facts mentioned in Qur’an that Muslims were told to fight against disbelievers only in defense.

The first verses revealed about warfare in Qur’an clearly state:  
**“TO THOSE AGAINST WHOM WAR IS MADE”**  
permission is given (to fight), **“BECAUSE THEY ARE**

**WRONGED”** and verily, Allah is most powerful for their aid.  
[22:39]

Imam al-Qurtubi states:

وهي أول آية نزلت في القتال

Translation: This is the first verse revealed about fighting (war). [Tafsir al-Qurtubi, under 22:39]

The very next verse says:

**“(THEY ARE) THOSE WHO HAVE BEEN EXPELLED FROM THEIR HOMES”** in defiance of right, (for no cause) except that they say, "our Lord is Allah". Did not Allah check one set of people by means of another, there would surely have been pulled down monasteries, churches, synagogues, and mosques, in which the name of Allah is commemorated in abundant measure. Allah will certainly aid those who aid his (cause);- for verily Allah is full of Strength, Exalted in Might, (able to enforce His Will). [22:40]

These verses prove beyond any shadow of doubt that Prophet Muhammad (Peace be upon him) did not take part in any wars for 13 years of his Meccan life in spite of constant oppression. He then along with his companions were expelled from their homeland Makkah. The Meccans even plotted to kill him but Ali (ra) the cousin of Prophet laid on his bed while the Prophet migrated with others. The Meccans followed him while he was migrating and tried to assassinate him and Abu

Bakr in the cave of Hira but Allah saved him (See Qur'an 9:40 and Bukhari 6.185).

Even after migration the Meccans wanted to exterminate the new religious community. The Meccans waged the war of Badr on Prophet. Hence in a nutshell Islam only prescribed to fight back against those who initiated fight and had expelled Muslims from their homeland Makkah.

We have already explained meaning of transgression in refutation of Episode 2 i.e. it refers to not fighting non-combatants, not killing women and children, not destroying trees, infrastructure and so on.

The Prophet (Peace be upon him) categorically forbids to "INITIATE WAR" It is stated in Sahih hadith authenticated by al-Haythami:

Verily, the most tyrannical of people to God the Exalted is he who kills those who did not fight him [Majma uz Zawaid , Hadith # 11731]

Qur'an states: And the servants of (Allah) Most Gracious are those "WHO WALK ON THE EARTH IN HUMILITY AND WHEN THE IGNORANT ADDRESS THEM, THEY SAY, PEACE!" [25:63]

This verse categorically proves that Islam is a religion of peace which teaches us humility and not to fight even when provoked. The "ignorant" mentioned here refers to

disbelievers (as they are ignorant of truth). In Tanwir al Miqbas “the ignorant” is interpreted as “the disbelievers and sinners”

Qur’an states: **“IF THE ENEMY INCLINES TO PEACE, THEN INCLINE TO IT ALSO”** and rely upon Allah. Verily, it is He who is the Hearing, the Knowing. [Surah Al-Anfal 8:61]

This verse yet again proves that Qur’an forbids to wage war if enemy inclines to peace. Hence when we are not in state of war then Islam forbids to wage war on disbelievers.

Qur’an states: So if they remove themselves from you and do not fight you and offer you peace, **then Allah has not made for you a cause for fighting against them.** [Surah An-Nisa 4:90]

So according to Qur’an there is no excuse to wage war if enemies do not fight us.

Ammar bin Yassir (ra) narrates:

وَقَالَ عَمَّا رُ ثَلَاثٌ مَنْ جَمَعَهُنَّ فَقَدْ جَمَعَ الْإِيمَانَ الْإِنْصَافُ مِنْ نَفْسِكَ وَبَدْلُ السَّلَامِ  
لِلْعَالَمِ وَالْإِنْفَاقُ مِنَ الْإِقْتَارِ

Whoever has three qualities together will have gathered the faith: equity with yourself, **“OFFERING PEACE TO THE WORLD”** and spending from small amounts. [Sahih Bukhari, Hadith # 28, in chapter titles]

This hadith categorically says “offering peace to the world” hence Islam is proven to be a peaceful religion for all mankind.

Masked Arab quoted from Tafsir at-Tabri that verse “**THERE IS NO COMPULSION IN RELIGION (2:256)**” is abrogated and that the verse means that disbelievers are to be forced in religion whereas Jews/Christians are not forced if they pay Jizya.

Now what this clever sophist tried to hide from people is that the narration in Tafsir at-Tabri comes from Qatada who is a Mudallis (cheater) himself let alone his interpretation be accepted.

Tafsir Ibn Kathir explains 2:256 as: (There is no compulsion in religion), meaning, "**DO NOT FORCE ANYONE TO BECOME MUSLIMS**" for Islam is plain and clear, and its proofs and evidence are plain and clear. Therefore, there is no need to force anyone to embrace Islam. Rather, whoever Allah directs to Islam, opens his heart for it and enlightens his mind, will embrace Islam with certainty. Whoever Allah blinds his heart and seals his hearing and sight, then he will not benefit from being forced to embrace Islam."

It was reported that the Ansar were the reason behind revealing this Ayah, "**ALTHOUGH ITS INDICATION IS GENERAL IN MEANING**" [Tafsir Ibn Kathir under 2:256]

In Tanwir al Miqbas, Tafsir Ibn Abbas it states: (There is no compulsion in religion) **“NO ONE FROM AMONG THE PEOPLE OF THE BOOK AND THE MAGIANS SHOULD BE COERCED TO BELIEVE”** in the divine Oneness of Allah after the Arabs' embrace of Islam.

Tafsir al-Jalalyn states: There is no compulsion **“IN ENTERING THE RELIGION”**

Hence it is proven that the verse is general and interpretation of Qatada is false as he was a Mudalis (cheater).

Masked Arab then quoted yet another verse about warfare and tried to make it general. Qur'an states:

So do not falter and cry out for peace when ye (will be) the uppermost, and Allah is with you, and He will not grudge (the reward of) your actions. [47:35]

Tafsir Ibn Kathir explains it as: (So do not lose heart) meaning, do not be weak concerning the enemies. (and beg for peace) meaning, compromise, peace, **“AND ENDING THE FIGHTING BETWEEN YOU AND THE DISBELIEVERS WHILE YOU ARE IN A POSITION OF POWER”** both in great numbers and preparations. Thus, Allah says, (So do not lose heart and beg for peace while you are superior.) meaning, in the condition of your superiority over your enemy... [Tafsir Ibn Kathir under 47:35]



This ignorant person is misusing a verse revealed about battleground and claiming that Islam teaches us not to ask for Peace generally.

He then misused a hadith about virtues of fighting in battlefield. The Hadith states: By the Being in Whose Hand is Muhammad's life, I love to fight in the way of Allah and be killed, to fight and again be killed and to fight again and be killed. [Sahih Muslim]

This hadith is not saying anywhere to fight non-combatants or to initiate wars. It is talking about fighting in Allah's way during a battle. It is a universal fact that great warriors in times of war are considered as chivalrous, courageous, and most noble people. One of my favorite movies is "Brave Heart by Mel Gibson" and in that the Scottish people under William Wallace bravely fought against the oppressive English regime. William Wallace before being executed cried out "Freedom" and the scene brought tears to many eyes who watched the movie. The English regime considered Scots as terrorists just like Islamophobes consider even the legitimate freedom fighters (not terrorist groups like ISIS) as terrorists today.

Then he used a hadith which states: Abu Hurairah reported the Prophet (ﷺ) as saying "He who dies without having fought or having felt fighting (against the infidels) to be his duty will die guilty of a kind of hypocrisy." [Sunnan Abu Dawud]

Please note that "against the infidels" is put in brackets and is not part of hadith, the actual meaning of this hadith is encouraging Muslims to become good warriors against

oppressive or invading forces. I want to clarify here without being apologetic that Islam like all great ideologies is indeed not pacifist. Islam does prescribe Jihad against evil. The very next hadith which masked Arab used proves that great Muslims will always keep on “FIGHTING FOR TRUTH,” Please note that this fighting does not specifically refer to physical fighting but rather fighting against wrong opinions and intellectual fighting against the tyrant rulers. The hadith states:

It has been narrated on the authority of Jabir b. 'Abdullah who said: I heard the Messenger of Allah (ﷺ) say: **A group of people from my Umma will continue to fight “IN DEFENSE OF TRUTH”** and remain triumphant until the Day of judgment. [Sahih Muslim # 4718]

The Wahabi terrorists such as ISIS cannot misuse this hadith for their evil motives because a longer version of this hadith states:

...whom Allah wants to do a favour, **He grants him an understanding of religion.** A group of people from the Muslims **"WILL REMAIN ON THE RIGHT PATH"** and continue until the Day of Judgment to triumph over those who oppose them. [Sahih Muslim #4720]

**The “understanding of religion” here refers to “FIQH (JURISPRUDENCE)”** Hence this hadith is talking about scholars who fight with their knowledge against terrorists, tyrant rulers, oppression, and misguidance.

Masked Arab then used the verse 2:216 which states: Fighting is enjoined on you, and it is an object of dislike to you; and it may be that you dislike a thing while it is good for you, and it may be that you love a thing while it is evil for you, and Allah knows, while you do not know.

This verse is only for Prophet and his companions who were exiled from Makkah. Abdullah Yusuf Ali the great translator of Qur'an explains this verse as: "The intolerance and persecution of the Pagan clique at Mecca caused untold hardships to the holy Messenger of Islam and his early disciples. They bore all with meekness and long-suffering patience until the holy one permitted **them to take up arms in self-defence**"

This becomes clear from the next verse which states: ... but graver is it in the sight of Allah to prevent access to the path of Allah, to deny Him, **"TO PREVENT ACCESS TO THE SACRED MOSQUE, AND DRIVE OUT ITS MEMBERS."** Tumult and oppression are worse than slaughter. **"NOR WILL THEY CEASE FIGHTING YOU"** until they turn you back from your faith if they can... [2:217]

Hence it is proven that this fighting being enjoined was only for the oppressed Prophet and his companions. Plus in context it proves that Pagan Meccans would never stop fighting until they made Muslims revert to polytheism. Now remember when Muslims won their freedom back and conquest of Makkah (without shedding blood) took place, the Prophet (Peace be upon him) forgave all disbelievers and did not kill them (except for some murderers who were killed as Qisas).

A commander from Muslims exclaimed loudly:

Today is a day of revenge (fight), at this the Prophet (Peace be upon him) **“BECAME ANGRY AND SAID: TODAY IS A DAY OF OPEN FORGIVENESS”** then he asked his enemies: How should I treat you today? They replied: We expect you to treat us Just like Prophet Joseph treated his wrongdoing brothers, the Prophet said in reply the same sentence which Joseph had said to his brothers: **“THERE IS NO QUESTIONING FROM YOU TODAY AND YOU ARE ALL FREE”** [Imam Ibn Hajr al-Asqalani, Fath ul Bari, Volume No. 8, Page No. 18]

**The biggest enemy of Muslims at that time was Abu Sufyan**, the Prophet (Peace be upon him) said: Whosoever takes shelter in **“ABU SUFYAN’S HOUSE IS SAFE”** [Sahih Muslim, Volume No. 3, Hadith # 1780]

The west boasts about their "so called" wars for democracy, but they have never set such an example, rather they got Saddam and Gaddafi killed after which many Middle Eastern countries are in state of civil wars. The groups like ISIS are an outcome of state sponsored terrorism of USA.

Masked Arab then used Qur’anic verses 61:10-11 to give wrong meaning of Jihad. Let us see many hadiths on Jihad.

Some people say that Jihad is among the fundamentals of Islam and go to the extent of calling it sixth pillar of Islam.

This is again extremely false as Islam only has 5 pillars that are:

1. Shahadah (to testify that there is no god but God, and Muhammad is his Messenger)
2. Salat (Prayer)
3. Zakat (Charity)
4. Hajj (Pilgrimage to Mecca)
5. Sawm (Fasting in month of Ramadan)

Adding one more pillar is altering the religion and its beliefs. It is a severe sin to add an extra pillar.

The verses about warfare/fighting use the word “Qitaal” and not Jihad. The former is only prescribed in situation of war (that too initiated by invading forces and not from Muslims)

Having described Jihad in a simple manner, we should now know that Islam is indeed not a pacifist religion and one should not be shy to accept this fact. Every great ideology cannot be pacifist in approach due to existence of crimes and violence in this world that could only be tackled with an iron fist. One cannot shower flowers on a gunman entering a school for instance and killing children.

Let us now see hadiths contrary to propaganda against Islam that Jihad only refers to fighting against disbelievers.

Hadith # 1 (Jihad is to strive against lowly traits of our soul)

Read this following hadith in relevance to Qur'anic verse which states: ..."By the soul and the proportion and order given to it, and its inspiration as to its wrong and its right; **“TRULY HE SUCCEEDS WHO PURIFIES IT, AND HE FAILS THAT CORRUPTS IT”** (Holy Qur'an, 91: 7-10)

The Prophet (Peace be upon him) said:

وَسَمِعْتُ رَسُولَ اللَّهِ صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ يَقُولُ " الْمُجَاهِدُ مَنْ جَاهَدَ نَفْسَهُ

**The Mujahid (One who does Jihad) is one who strives against his own soul.** [Sunnan Tirmidhi, Hadith # 1621]

Imam at-Tirmidhi declared this hadith as “Good and Authentic”

It also states in another hadith:

الْمُجَاهِدُ مَنْ جَاهَدَ نَفْسَهُ فِي سَبِيلِ اللَّهِ عَزَّ وَجَلَّ

**The Mujahid (one who does Jihad) is he who makes Jihad against his nafs (ego) for the sake of Allah.**[Sahih Ibn Hibban (#1624, 2519): Authenticated by; Shu`ayb al-Arna'ut (Commentary on Ibn Hibban): authentic; al-Hakim said: Sahih; `Iraqi confirms him]

Hadith # 2 (Jihad by serving our parents)

Narrated `Abdullah bin `Amr: A man came to the Prophet (ﷺ) asking his permission to take part in Jihad. The Prophet (ﷺ) asked him, "Are your parents alive?" He replied in the affirmative. The Prophet (ﷺ) said to him, "**Then exert yourself in their service.**"

Another hadith states:

There came to Allah's Apostle (ﷺ) a person and said: I owe allegiance to you for migration and Jihad seeking reward only from Allah. He (the Holy Prophet) said: Is one from amongst your parents living? He said: Yes, of course, both are living. He further asked: **Do you want to seek reward from Allah? He said: Yes. Thereupon Allah's Messenger (ﷺ) said: Go back to your parents and accord them benevolent treatment.** [Sahih Muslim, Hadith # 6186]

Yet another hadith states:

It was narrated from Mu'awiyah bin Jahimah As-Sulami, that Jahimah came to the Prophet (ﷺ) and said: "O Messenger of Allah! I want to go out and fight (in Jihad) and I have come to ask your advice." He said: "**Do you have a mother? He said: "Yes." He said: "Then stay with her, for Paradise is beneath her feet.**" [Sunnan Nasai'i, Hadith # 3104. The Hadith is Authentic]

Hadith # 3 (Jihad is to say word of truth in front of a tyrant ruler)

إِنَّ مِنْ أَعْظَمِ الْجِهَادِ كَلِمَةً عَدَلٍ عِنْدَ سُلْطَانٍ جَائِرٍ

Abu Sa'eed Al-Khudri narrated that the Prophet (Peace be upon him) said: "Indeed, **among the greatest types of Jihad is a just statement before a tyrannical ruler.**" [Sunnan Tirmidhi, Hadith # 2174, Grade of Hadith is :Good]

Another hadith states:

Abu Umamah reports that the Prophet (Peace be upon him) said:

أَحَبُّ الْجِهَادِ إِلَى اللَّهِ كَلِمَةٌ حَقٌّ تُقَالُ لِإِمَامٍ جَائِرٍ

The most beloved Jihad in sight of Allah is a **word of truth in front of a tyrant leader** [Mu'jam Al-Kabir # 8002, Hadith is "GOOD"]

Hadith # 4 (Jihad to perform hajj)

The Mother of the Believers, 'Aishah, narrates: "I said: 'O Messenger of Allah, shall we not go out and fight in jihad with you, for I do not think there is any deed in the Qur'an that is better than jihad.' He said: 'No. the best **and most beautiful (type) of jihad is Hajj to the House;** Hajj Al-Mabrur. "[Sunnan Nasai'i, Hadith # 2628. It is Authentic]

Similar hadiths are also in Bukhari (# 1520, 2684)

Hadith # 5 (Jihad to end poverty)



Narrated Abu Huraira: The Prophet (ﷺ) said, "The one who looks after a widow or a poor person is like one who strives in the cause of Allah, or like him who performs prayers all the night and fasts all the day." [Sahih Bukhari, Hadith # 5353]

There are many more hadiths, which prove that Jihad does not refer to military campaigns only.

Military aspect of Jihad.

Very often do we see ignorant people restricting Jihad only to its military aspect. The translation of Jihad to be "holy war" is an absolutely wrong translation. Muhsin Khan Wahabi in his English translation of Qur'an and Hadith has used this wrong translation many times. We should remember that Wahabis are heretical extremists who should not ever be considered as authorities in Islam, they neither belong to Sunni nor Shi'ite ideology, rather they are offshoots of Khawarij who are considered heretics according to Islam.

Qur'an states: Fight in the way of Allah, those who fight you, but do not transgress limits; for Allah verily loves not transgressors (2:190)

The wording used in this verse is "**QITAAL**" hence the actual wording for fighting is Qitaal and not Jihad.

This verse proves that fighting in Islam is only prescribed against those who fight us first. Still one should not transgress

limits in war (i.e. one cannot kill non-combatants, women, children, burn trees, destroy infrastructure, and so on. This has been proven before).

Qur'an states: **And what is the matter with you that you do not fight in the cause of Allah "AND FOR THOSE WEAK, ILL TREATED AND OPPRESSED"** among men, women and children whose only cry is; 'Our Lord, rescue us from this town whose people are oppressors and raise for us from you one who will protect and raise for us from you one who will help(4:75)

**Again word "Qitaal" is used** in this verse and not Jihad. Reading this verse completely proves that fighting should only be done against oppressors to rescue the weak and ill-treated, for example to liberate Palestine from oppression of Zionist Israel. No preemptive war like waged by USA on other countries is proven from this verse.

Qur'an states: Those of the believers who sit still, other than those who have a (disabling) hurt, are not on an equality with those who strive in the way of Allah with their wealth and lives. Allah hath conferred on those who strive with their wealth and lives a rank above the sedentary. Unto each Allah hath promised good, but He hath bestowed on those who strive a great reward above the sedentary (4:95)

**This verse after mentioning word Jihad links it to wealth and lives.** Even this verse proves that striving in Allah's cause with our wealth is prescribed. Yes the wording "lives" points towards fighting in the cause of Allah. It has

been clarified above that fighting is only prescribed against those disbelievers who wage war on us first. Hence all verses mentioning military Jihad should be understood in light of Surah Baqarah, Verse # 190.

Qur'an states: Not all of the believers should go to fight. Of every section of them, why does not one part alone go forth, that the rest may gain knowledge of the religion and admonish their people when they return, that perhaps they may take warning " (Qur'an 9:122)

This verse proves that those who seek knowledge are at times even more superior to warriors who are fighting for a legitimate cause.

## Misconception # 12 (Suicide Bombing is allowed in Islam)

Masked Arab in Episode # 4 claimed that when he grew up (i.e. was younger) suicide bombings were supported “OVERWHELMINGLY” by Muslims. This is a blatant lie as majority of Sunni Muslims are against Wahabism. The mainstream Sunni Sufis never supported suicide bombings. The polls which he used show drastic decline in support of suicide bombing but even the very few who supported it were and are Wahabis. It is to be noted that all terrorist groups like ISIS, AL-QAEEDA, JANDULLAH, BOKO HARAM, AL-SHIBAB, and others belong to Wahabi ideology.

Let us first of all see Qur’anic verses from which suicide bombing is clearly proven to be haram.

Verse # 1

**...And do not kill yourselves (nor kill one another).**  
Surely, Allah is Most Merciful to you. [4:29]

This verse categorically forbids to kill ourselves by any means. Allah has made life sacred then how come suicide bombing be allowed in which you do not only kill yourself but other innocent people too!

Verse # 2

And spend of your substance in the cause of Allah, **“AND MAKE NOT YOUR OWN HANDS CONTRIBUTE TO (YOUR) DESTRUCTION”** but do good; for Allah loveth those who do good. [2:195]

Although the verse in context is talking about spending in way of Allah, but in Islam different rulings are derived from verses. Some scholars have used this verse to prohibit anything harmful to our body which includes killing ourselves.

Here is a hadith from which it is absolutely proven that Suicide is Haram even in battle and thus suicide bombing too.

Hadith # 1

Volume 4, Book 52, Number 297: (Sahih Bukhari)

Narrated Abu Huraira: We were in the company of Allah's Apostle in a Ghazwa, **“AND HE REMARKED ABOUT A MAN WHO CLAIMED TO BE A MUSLIM, SAYING, THIS (MAN) IS FROM THE PEOPLE OF THE (HELL) FIRE”** When the battle started, the man fought violently till he got wounded. Somebody said, "O Allah's Apostle! The man whom you described as being from the people of the (Hell) Fire fought violently today and died." The Prophet said, "He will go to the (Hell) Fire." Some people were on the point of doubting (the truth of what the Prophet had said) while they were in this state, suddenly someone said that he was still

alive but severely wounded. **“WHEN NIGHT FELL, HE LOST PATIENCE AND COMMITTED SUICIDE” ...**

Hence Suicide sends one to hell fire even if one commits it after having fought bravely in a battle, let alone suicide missions on non-combatants as approved by extremist Wahabi cults like ISIS and company.

Hadith # 2

It is narrated on the authority of Abu Huraira that the Messenger of Allah (ﷺ) observed: **“HE WHO KILLS HIMSELF WITH STEEL (WEAPON) WOULD BE THE ETERNAL DENIZEN OF THE FIRE OF HELL”** and he would have that weapon in his hand and would be thrusting that in his stomach for ever and ever.. [Sahih Muslim # 199]

This hadith clearly forbids suicide bombing i.e. killing oneself with any weapon. Please note that bombs were not invented during time of Prophet (Peace be upon him) hence this hadith totally refutes a suicide bomber today. Such a person will always be in hell fire. Therefore suicide bombers are not going to paradise but to hell.

Masked Arab misused some hadiths such as:

Of the men he lives the best life who holds the reins of his horse (ever ready to march) in the way of Allah, flies on its back whenever he hears a fearful shriek, or a call for help, flies

to it “SEEKING DEATH AT PLACES WHERE IT CAN BE EXPECTED” ...[Sahih Muslim]

He however conveniently ignored the chapter title in Sahih Muslim which states:

“(34) Chapter: The virtue of Jihad **and** “KEEPING WATCH OVER THE FRONTIER”

Hence this hadith is about a warrior who keeps guard and watch over a frontier. A guard over frontier should not fear seeking death where it can be expected. This hadith nowhere gives justification to suicide bombing.

Masked Arab then misused another hadith which states:

Messenger of Allah (ﷺ) said: Surely, the gates of Paradise are under the shadows of the swords. A man in a shabby condition got up and said; Abu Musa, did you hear the Messenger of Allah (ﷺ) say this? He said: Yes. (The narrator said): He returned to his friends and said: I greet you (a farewell greeting). “THEN HE BROKE THE SHEATH OF HIS SWORD, THREW IT AWAY, ADVANCED WITH HIS (NAKED) SWORD TOWARDS THE ENEMY AND FOUGHT (THEM) WITH IT UNTIL HE WAS SLAIN” [Sahih Muslim]

Again this hadith nowhere gives a hint towards justification for suicide bombing. It is just mentioning bravery of a single man who advances towards an army to fight with courage and

is slain, this is done to set an example and lift morals of others.

He then used Tafsir al-Qurtubi which itself refuted him. It talks about a man going forward and causing great harm to the opposing force, or “OPENING UP A PATH WHICH MUSLIMS CAN USE” Tafsir al Qurtubi also states that if the intention of the attacker is to “ENCOURAGE OTHER MUSLIMS TO FOLLOW HIM” then it may be permitted as “BECAUSE OF THE BENEFIT OF THE MUSLIMS INVOLVED”

Hence the hadith of Sahih Muslim proves chivalry and bravery of a single man who motivates others to fight the opposing combatants.

He then quoted Yusuf al-Qardawi who was Wahabi influenced when he passed the verdict on Suicide bombing. Please note that Qardawi nowhere shows proofs from Qur’an and hadiths in his talk.

Here is another fatwa from same Qardawi which forbids suicide bombing:

Qardawi said: Even in times of war, Muslims are not allowed to kill anybody save the one who is indulged in face-to-face confrontation with them.” He added that they are not allowed to kill women, old persons, or children, and that haphazard killing is totally forbidden in Islam. Shaykh Qaradāwī on another occasion defined terrorism as “the killing of innocent



people...with no differentiation between the innocent and the foe. [See Sufi website fatwa: [Here](#)]

He then quoted an extremist Wahabi, Muhammad Hasaan. Please note that Wahabism has nothing to do with Islam. The Wahabis came in power with the help of British by fighting against last Muslim Ottoman Sultanate in Arabia. They killed Muslims there and named the country as “KINGDOM OF SAUDI ARABIA” although Kingship has nothing to do with Islam.

Next scholar he quoted was another Wahabi cleric Muhammad ibn Uthaymeen, but this time the cleric forbade suicide bombing.

Finally he quoted yet another Wahabi authority Abdul Aziz bin Baz and even he forbade suicide bombing.

Now the point to remember here is that Sunni Sufi scholars like Dr. Tahir ul Qadri, Shaykh Hamza Yusuf, Abdul Hakim Murad, and many others have categorically declared suicide bombings as Haram. It is only the Wahabi sect which have had some spurious fatwas in favor of it, but even their biggest authorities like Ibn Uthaymeen and Bin Baz forbade it.

There is general consensus of Muslim scholars that suicide bombing is haram and the perpetrator goes straight to hell. (Whereas very few terrorism sympathizers are never considered as representatives of Islam, rather Wahabism as a whole is a heretical sect. Masked Arab and Islamophobes

mostly quote from Wahabi islamqa website and Wahabi websites to defame Islam).

## Misconception # 13 (Islam ordains slavery)

Masked Arab in Episode # 5 misinterprets verse 4:24 which mentions “Those whom your right hands possess” and claimed that Islam prescribes male/female slavery and “RAPING” women even those who were married.

We have already explained about female captive issue in “Misconception # 2”

Coming to the issue of slavery itself then It is a historical fact that slavery was deeply rooted in world societies even before advent of Islam (refer to Bible for instance). Islam is the first religion which considered slavery a social illness but Islam abolished slavery with passage of time just like alcohol being a social illness was prohibited gradually. There were many Companions of Prophet who kept on consuming alcohol for many years while Qur’an was being revealed until it was finally forbidden. Similarly there was wisdom behind Islam not abolishing slavery instantly, rather this social illness was so widely spread that it took time to be abolished.

The wisdom behind slow prohibition was to safeguard slaves from barbaric enslavement of them in pre-Islamic cultures. So Muslims enslaved them to give them equal rights, shelter,

food, care, and finally manumitting them at appropriate time when they could live a happy independent life.

It was a war custom in past to take men and women as captives. Islam did not start it, rather it was going on since ages before advent of Islam. However we need to know that in Islam slavery was just by name and slaves enjoyed the rights equal to other citizens.

Hadith states that the Prophet (Peace be upon him) said: **“YOUR SLAVES ARE YOUR BROTHERS”** and Allah has put them under your command. So whoever has a brother under his command should feed him **“OF WHAT HE EATS AND DRESS HIM OF WHAT HE WEARS. DO NOT ASK THEM (SLAVES) TO DO THINGS BEYOND THEIR CAPACITY (POWER) AND IF YOU DO SO, THEN HELP THEM”** [Sahih Bukhari Vol. 1, Book 2, Hadith 30]

This hadith proves beyond doubt that slavery in Islam was just by name, whereas they had equal rights to the extent of being called our brothers. They were to be given same food as ours, dressed the same way, not labored beyond their capacities and if they were given hard work to do then masters were to help them equally in it.

Now compare this to slavery in pre-Islamic times and also in recent past when Americans enslaved the blacks. Slaves in these times were considered as sub-humans, not given similar luxurious food, not given same dresses, overburdened, tortured, and even killed.

Islam took many slaves out of poverty and made them one of the greatest companions of all. Here are the following slave companions who are ranked as one of the greatest.

1. Bilal al-Habashi (the black slave)
2. Salman the Persian (who was a Jew but willingly accepted Islam. He is called as part of Prophetic family in hadith)
3. Ammar bin Yassir (the great warrior)
4. Zayd bin Haritha (the adopted son of Prophet)

And many others. All slaves in Islam enjoyed equal rights and they did not complain about bondage at all. There is not a single example in Qur'an or hadiths where it is allowed to beat up, mistreat, not provide shelter, and food to slaves.

It is to be noted that slavery was so strongly rooted in Arab society and other religions that it took time for Islam to gradually end it. The steps Islam took were treating them equally so that they believe themselves to be equal citizens as we proved from above hadith, then Islam calls it a great reward to free them

Qur'an states: The alms are only for the poor and the needy, and those who collect them, and those whose hearts are to be reconciled, **“AND TO FREE THE CAPTIVES”** and the

debtors, and for the cause of Allah, and (for) the wayfarer; a duty imposed by Allah. Allah is Knower, Wise. [9:60]

Zakah (Charity) is among the 5 compulsory pillars of Islam and Qu'ran prescribes to free slaves/captives from the wealth spent on Zakah. So Islam strongly encourages freeing slaves.

Hadith states: Narrated Abu Musa: Allah's Messenger (ﷺ) said, "He who has a slave-girl **“AND EDUCATES AND TREATS HER NICELY AND THEN MANUMITS AND MARRIES HER, WILL GET DOUBLE REWARD”** [Sahih Bukhari Vol. 3, Book 46, Hadith 720]

This hadith clearly proves that educating slaves, treating them nicely, freeing them, and above all marrying them gives **“DOUBLE THE REWARD.”** We have already explained above that sex cannot be done with non-Muslim slaves until they accept Islam willingly, and even then consent is necessary.

Out of so many hadiths of manumitting slaves, Masked Arab chose and misused a hadith that Prophet (Peace be upon him) discouraged manumitting a slave and told to pass her on. Here is the hadith he misused:

Narrated Maimuna, the wife of the Prophet (ﷺ) that she manumitted her slave-girl and the Prophet (ﷺ) said to her, "You would have got more reward if you had given the slave-girl to one of your maternal uncles." [Sahih Bukhari 1.767]

The reasoning behind this was that it would have been hard for the slave-girl to find means of living independently, rather she would have enjoyed good shelter, food, and care under maternal uncle of Maimuna (ra) instead. Nonetheless the Prophet still did not annul the manumission and called Maimuna (ra)'s manumission a deed worthy of reward.

He misused another hadith which states:

Narrated Jabir: A man manumitted a slave “AND HE HAD NO OTHER PROPERTY THAN THAT” so the Prophet (ﷺ) canceled the manumission (and sold the slave for him). Nu'aim bin Al-Nahham bought the slave from him.

Please note that the man “DID NOT HAVE ANY PROPERTY” so the Prophet sold the slave to give him income. Such hadiths nowhere prove that those slaves disliked to be sold, rather as we have explained above in detail that the slaves enjoyed equal rights and technically they themselves did not want to go out of slavery. Islamophobes try to misguide people by comparing the Islamic concept of slavery to that of what west did (i.e. to Afro-Americans, or what English did).

Masked Arab then went off tangents by showing references from Sirat Ibn Hisham which do not prove that Islam allows sex with slave girls without consent or accepting Islam. Also he did not show chain of narrators. Remember Sirat Ibn Hisham is not even counted as authentic books on hadith, therefore as compared to Qur'an and so many hadiths which have been shown above, the references shown by Masked Arab are worthless.

In present times there is consensus among genuine Islamic scholars that slavery is totally abolished in Islam.

For our Christian readers, here are some verses on Slavery from Bible. Remember Christians believe Jesus to be an Eternal God, so this is all sanctioned by him:

Book of Leviticus states: **However, you may purchase male and female slaves from among the nations around you.** You may also purchase the children of temporary residents who live among you, including those who have been born in your land. **You may treat them as your property,** passing them on to your children as a permanent inheritance. **You may treat them as slaves, but you must never treat your fellow Israelites this way.** [Leviticus 25:44-46. NLT]

Book of Exodus states: **If a man beats his male or female slave** with a club and the slave dies as a result, the owner must be punished. But if the slave recovers within a day or two, then the owner shall not be punished, **since the slave is his property.** [Exodus 21:20-21. NLT]

Now let us look from New Testament.

***Slaves, obey your earthly masters with deep respect and fear. Serve them sincerely as you would serve Christ. (Ephesians 6:5 NLT)***



Also See: 1 Timothy 6:1-2

## Misconception # 14 (Polygyny)

Islamophobes say that Islam allows Muslim men to marry more women without any strings attached. Let us look at the verse which is often misquoted.

Qur'an states: **And if you fear that you will not deal justly with the orphan girls**, then marry those that please you of [other] women, **two or three or four. But if you fear that you will not be just, then [marry only] one** or those your right hand possesses. **That is more suitable that you may not incline [to injustice].** [4:3]

This verse only allows polygyny “IF A MAN CANNOT DEAL JUSTLY WITH ORPHAN GIRLS” so that extra wives can take care of them. Plus later the same verse says you have to be just between women, hence if one cannot be fair between wives then he “SHOULD” only marry one wife. Let us understand this verse in light of another verse.

Qur'an states: **And you will never be able to be equal [in feeling] between wives, even if you should strive [to do so].** So do not incline completely [toward one] and leave another hanging. And if you amend [your affairs] and fear Allah - then indeed, Allah is ever Forgiving and Merciful. [4:129]

Hence the verdict of Allah is to marry only one. It is only allowed to marry more women in extreme situations such as

taking care of orphans, or marrying widows to give them shelter and provision. Islam does not prescribe to marry more women just for pleasure or sexual desires.

Analogy cannot be made with what Prophet did as he was allowed to marry many women through divine revelation.

The reason why Prophet Muhammad (Peace be upon him) was allowed to marry more women is because many tribes accepted Islam and gave their daughters to Prophet, people wanted their daughters to be associated with Prophet.

Majority of his wives were widows and elderly women so he married them to give shelter and protection to women. Also remember that polygyny has been practiced by previous Prophets too like Abraham, David, and Solomon (last two holy men had many wives and concubines and according to Judeo-Christian faiths they have to be considered as righteous Kings at least according to scriptures), plus Old Testament and even New Testament does not prohibit Polygyny at all. It is an evangelical Christian lie that they link polygyny to Islam only.

Book of Samuel states: After moving from Hebron to Jerusalem, **David married more concubines and wives,** and they had more sons and daughters. [2 Samuel 5:13]

Abraham had also 2 wives i.e. Sarah and Hagar.

## Misconception # 15 (Black Magic was casted on Prophet)

In Nabeel Qureshi's book, Chapter Thirty Nine (Muhammad Rasul Allah), he mentioned David Wood using hadith that Prophet had black magic casted on him. He used Bukhari 4.54.490. Again this hadith contradicts Qur'an and is to be rejected. Islamophobes and unfortunately some Muslims who are influenced by Wahabis try to assert that everything in Bukhari and Muslim is absolutely Sahih.

Qur'an states: We are most knowing of how they listen to it when they listen to you and [of] when they are in private conversation, **when the wrongdoers say, "You follow not but a man affected by magic."** [17:47]

Just like Jesus was accused of casting out devils through Beelzebub the prince of devils (see: Matthew 12:24), similarly Prophet Muhammad (Peace be upon him) was falsely accused of many things and one of them was being affected by magic. The Prophet was neither mad, nor affected by magic at all.

Plus the hadiths on this topic do not reach real level of "MUTAWATTIR (MULTIPLY NARRATED)" but are only Ahaad (singular in chain), and as this is an issue related to belief i.e. integrity of Qur'an depends on this issue, therefore only a Qur'anic verse will work in this regard which should categorically say that Magic was casted on Prophet and he was affected by it, but no such verse exists, rather Quran calls such

people as wrong doers who accuse Prophet of being affected by magic.

Misconception # 16 (Prophet says he is commanded to fight till people confess to faith in Islam)

Haters of Islam use this hadith to call our Prophet of Mercy as a Prophet of sword!

**Narrated Ibn 'Umar:** Allah's Messenger (ﷺ) said: "I have been ordered (by Allah) to fight against the people until they testify that none has the right to be worshipped but Allah and that Muhammad is Allah's Messenger (ﷺ), and offer the prayers perfectly and give the obligatory charity, so if they perform that, then they save their lives and property from me except for Islamic laws and then their reckoning (accounts) will be done by Allah." [Sahih Bukhari 1.2.25]

Every hadith has to be checked according to Usool ul Hadith (principles of hadith) and the primary principle is that any hadith which contradicts Qur'an is to be outright rejected. Secondly you have seen yourself that David and Mike denied hadiths altogether as they were compiled over 200 years after Prophet, why do not the Christian apologists and Islamophobes keep the same rule for all hadiths?

Qur'an categorically says to Prophet Muhammad contrary to this hadith: If it had been your Lord's will, they would all have believed, all who are on earth! **Will you then compel mankind, against their will, to believe!** (10:99)

Hence it is not the will of Allah that all should believe. Prophet Muhammad (Peace be upon him) was a perfect Muslim and Islam is all about submitting to “WILL OF ALLAH” so how can he go against Allah’s will? Therefore this hadith contradicts Qur’an and is to be rejected. There are many more verses which could be cited but this is most relevant to debunking the hadith.

Qur’an ordains forgiveness and kindness by saying: Keep to forgiveness (O Muhammad), **and enjoin kindness**, and turn away from the ignorant. [7:199]

Qur’an orders to deal with all disbelievers kindly (except for those who wage war): Allah forbids you not, with regard to those who fight you not for (your) Faith nor drive you out of your homes, **from dealing kindly** and justly with them: for Allah loves those who are just. (60:8)

Hence the hadith is rejected according to many verses of Qur’an.

## Misconception # 17 (800 Jews of Banu Qurayza were indiscriminately killed)

Haters of Islam bring forward fabricated historical reports which contradict each other, some saying 500, while others saying 800 or 900 Jews of Banu Qurayza tribe were killed indiscriminately by Prophet Muhammad (Peace be upon him). They also bring forward a hadith which is false due to it contradicting Qur'an and other hadith in Bukhari. Let us look at that hadith.

**It was narrated that 'Abdul-Malik bin `Umair said:** “I heard 'Atiyah Al-Quradhi say: 'We were presented to the Messenger of Allah (ﷺ) on the Day of Quraidhah. **Those whose pubic hair had grown were killed**, and those whose pubic hair had not yet grown were let go. I was one of those whose pubic hair had not yet grown, so I was let go.” [Sunnan Ibn Majah 3.20.2541]

This incident of Banu Qurayza is also highly disputed. The other authentic narration is present in Bukhari and that contradicts with this report. Let us look at hadith in Bukhari.

**Narrated Abu Sa`id Al-Khudri:** When the tribe of Bani Quraiza was ready to accept **Sa`d's judgment**, Allah's Messenger (ﷺ) sent for Sa`d who was near to him. Sa`d came, riding a donkey and when he came near, Allah's Messenger (ﷺ)



said (to the Ansar), "Stand up for your leader." Then Sa`d came and sat beside Allah's Messenger (ﷺ) who said to him. "These people are ready to accept your judgment." Sa`d said, "**I give the judgment that their warriors should be killed** and their children and women should be taken as prisoners." The Prophet (ﷺ) then remarked, "O Sa`d! You have judged amongst them with (or similar to) the judgment of the King Allah." [Sahih Bukhari Vol. 4, Book 52, Hadith 280]

The reports which say that all boys who reached puberty were killed contradict this hadith of Bukhari which says that "ONLY WARRIORS WERE TO BE KILLED"

Points to note from this hadith are the following.

- a) Jews themselves accepted Sa`d to judge over them.
- b) It was Sa`d who gave judgment not Muhammad (Peace be upon him)
- c) Only the warriors were killed, not others. The remaining were taken as captives according to Law of Old Testament which was binding on Jews. Sa`d was well versed in Jewish law, so he passed verdict according to Deuteronomy which states: "If they refuse to make peace and they engage you in battle, lay siege to that city. When the Lord your God delivers it into your hand, **PUT TO THE SWORD ALL THE MEN IN IT**" **As for the women, the children, the livestock and everything else in the city, you may take these as**

**plunder for yourselves.** And you may use the plunder  
the Lord your God gives you from your  
enemies"[Deuteronomy 20:12-14]

## Misconception # 18 (Prophet Muhammad was poisoned to death so he was not true Prophet)

Islamophobes mention Prophet being poisoned from Bukhari 3.47.786. Now this does not prove that he was a false Prophet. Many Prophets were killed by Jews according to testimony of Biblical Jesus himself.

Strange biblical Jesus after sending many woes not on ordinary Jews but their scholars, calling them Snakes, brood of vipers, hypocrites, and blind fools which is Anti-Semite to the core, although he was a Jew by race himself, and another verse says that anyone who says you fool is in danger of hell fire; Matt 5:22. He says:

“Jerusalem, Jerusalem, “YOU KILL THE PROPHETS” and stone those sent to you, how often I have longed to gather your children together, as a hen gathers her chicks under her wings, and you were not willing” [Matthew 23:37]

Qur'an also states that Jews killed many Prophets prior to Muhammad (Peace be upon him). Qur'an states: ... That was because they [repeatedly] disbelieved in the signs of Allah and **killed the prophets without right**. That was because they disobeyed and were [habitually] transgressing. [2:61]

Regarding the reports that a Jewess wanted to test if Muhammad (Peace be upon him) was a true Prophet or not, if he was he would have survived, then those reports are not authentic first of all. It is just proven that Prophet was poisoned but extra wordings are not accurate and are contradictory to each other. Plus Prophet survived the poisoning for many years whereas another companion who ate it died instantly. Those reports contradict in wordings, some say the Prophet (Peace be upon him) forgave that Jewess (as Hadith of Bukhari proves which David wood mentioned) while others say she was killed in retaliation. Some say the meat told the Prophet it was poisoned, while some do not mention that, therefore the extra wordings are all fabrications. Only this bit is true that Prophet was poisoned and he died after few years due to that poison. A Prophet being poisoned or killed has no effect on his Prophethood as many Prophets were killed in past too, a Prophet can indeed die by Poison because Prophets are human in nature.

## Misconception # 19 (Prophet Muhammad tortured Kinana a Jew for treasure)

Again they quote Ibn Ishaq's fabricated story which states: "Kinana al-Rabi, who had the custody of the treasure of Banu Nadir, was brought to the apostle who asked him about it. He denied that he knew where it was. A Jew came (Tabari says "was brought"), to the apostle and said that he had seen Kinana going round a certain ruin every morning early. When the apostle said to Kinana, "Do you know that if we find you have it I shall kill you?" He said "Yes". The apostle gave orders that the ruin was to be excavated and some of the treasure was found. When he asked him about the rest he refused to produce it, so the apostle gave orders to al-Zubayr Al-Awwam, **"Torture him until you extract what he has." So he kindled a fire with flint and steel on his chest until he was nearly dead. Then the apostle delivered him to Muhammad b. Maslama and he struck off his head, in revenge for his brother Mahmud."**

This report has no authentic chain to start with at first place. Plus Ibn Ishaq was a grand liar and story teller as it has been proven countless times.

Qur'an and multiply narrated authentic hadiths clearly forbid torture.

Sahih hadith states: Narrated `Abdullah bin Yazid Al-Ansari: The Prophet (ﷺ) forbade robbery (taking away what belongs to others without their permission), **“AND ALSO FORBADE MUTILATION (OR MAIMING) OF BODIES”** [Sahih Bukhari 3.654]

When mutilation of bodies is forbidden then how can torture be allowed in Islam?

Qur'an ordains forgiveness and kindness by saying: Keep to forgiveness (O Muhammad), **and enjoin kindness**, and turn away from the ignorant. [7:199]

Qur'an orders to deal with all disbelievers kindly (except for those who wage war): Allah forbids you not, with regard to those who fight you not for (your) Faith nor drive you out of your homes, **from dealing kindly** and justly with them: for Allah loves those who are just. (60:8)

So such reports are to be outright rejected. I know David wood and Islamophobes uses a report from Bukhari about Camel urine which towards the end talks about torturing the people who had killed the herder. That hadith is also rejected because Quran forbids to consume impure things and prescribes to only consume Tayyabat i.e. pure (see 5:4) and also forbids torture as I proved above from verses.

Any hadith which contradicts Qur'an is to be outright rejected and this is primary principle of checking hadiths according to Usool ul hadith (principles of hadith).

## Misconception # 20 (Qur'an is not preserved)

Nabeel Qureshi in his book: Seeking Allah, Finding Jesus. Chapter Forty two (Hadith and the history of the Qur'an) talked about preservation of Qur'an and brought forward some hadiths in order to confuse people. According to consensus of Muslim scholars when Qur'an itself says Allah is guardian of it then Qur'an is completely preserved and we do not have to turn towards hadiths. Let us first look at the glorious verse:

Qur'an states: Indeed, it is We who sent down the Qur'an and indeed, **We will be its guardian.** [15:9]

All the hadiths which Nabeel brought, none of them talks about this chapter of Qur'an, therefore they become irrelevant and Qur'an is proven as fully preserved. Now let us come towards hadiths which Nabeel misused.

Nabeel accepted the fact that Prophet (Peace be upon him) orally taught his companions the Qur'an and his companions memorized the Qur'an. He also tacitly accepts that Qur'an was dictated to companions which was written by them and this is proven from many hadiths. Nabeel then touches the issue of "DIFFERENT RECITATIONS" and Muhammad (Peace be upon him) calls different recitations between companions as right while he is alive. Remember different recitations have absolutely no effect on compilation and writing of Qur'an.

Nabeel then talked about tenure of Abu Bakr the first caliph of Islam i.e. when Prophet had passed away. Abu Bakr took part in battle against people who denied Zakaah and many memorizers of Qur'an died then, so Abu Bakr planned to compile Qur'an under supervision of Zaid bin Thabit who compiled Quran by checking every verse with 2 witnesses except for one verse i.e. last verse of Surah at-Taubah which was brought by Khuzayma whose testimony was considered equal to two according to Sahih Hadith.

Then Nabeel talked about Uthman bin Affan's tenure i.e. third caliph of Islam. Here Nabeel has a misunderstanding that Uthman "EDITED" the Qur'an whereas that is a lie. What Uthman did was that he made one master copy and made copies out of it and distributed them to different parts of Muslim world. Uthman burns all other copies so that there are no copyist errors.

Then Nabeel came towards a "LONE" narration of Abu Musa al-Ash'ari in Muslim claiming that a Surah similar to size of Surah Baraat was revealed and he recited a verse from it which is not present in Qur'an today. Now we should remember that this hadith is "AHAD (SINGULAR)" and not "MUTAWATIR (MULTIPLY NARRATED)" and singular narrations are never taken as proof on belief issues. Plus thousands of other Sahaba had memorized the Qur'an but none of them mention a Surah similar to the size of Surah Baraat, thirdly had there been such a long surah then there would have been many other Sahaba talking about it in different hadiths but we do not have other Sahaba saying that.



Then Nabeel mentions the hadith about a goat coming and eating a paper on which a verses were written. The hadith is a fabrication as it comes from same Muhammad bin Ishaq who is called a Dajjal (grand liar) by Imam Malik and many great hadith specialists, plus he is Muddalis (cheater) too and he narrated this hadith with “UN” and in Usool ul hadith a Mudalis when he narrates with “UN” then his hadith is not accepted [See Tahdhib ut Tahdhib of Ibn Hajr al-Asqalani, Volume 9, under narrators starting with letter M (meem)]. Remember the Wahabi authentications found online at [www.sunnah.com](http://www.sunnah.com) or Dar us Salam publications are not correct at many occasions. Wahabis make huge blunders in authenticating and weakening hadiths.

Regarding verse of stoning the 2<sup>nd</sup> Caliph of Islam talked in detail about it in hadith of Muslim where he says it was revealed and we memorized it but later people will not find it in Qur’an [See: Muslim 4194] This clearly proves that some verses were revealed but “NOT ORDERED BY ALLAH AND PROPHET TO BE MADE PART OF QUR’AN”

Hence all these hadiths which Islamophobes use have no effect on integrity and preservation of Qur’an. All they prove is that some verses were revealed but they were not made part of Qur’an. According to Islam the Prophet did not speak except what Allah revealed to him, but that did not mean everything was made part of Qur’an.

Qur'an states: Nor does he speak from [his own] inclination. It is not but a revelation revealed [53:3-4]

Nabeel then partially quoteed from as-Suyuti's al-Itiqan by hiding what he said about such reports, Nabeel said: In addition to the previously quoted hadith in which he refused to stop reciting certain verses, Ubay is known to have had 116 chapters in his Quran, two more than Zaid's edition. Ibn Mas'ud had only 111 chapters in his Quran, insisting that the additional chapters in Zaid's Quran and Ubay's Quran were just prayers, not Quranic recitation. - End Quote.

But what Nabeel hid is that the Same as-Suyuti said:

هذا كذب على ابن مسعود وموضوع، وإنما صح عنه قراءة عاصم عن زر عنه، وفيها المعوذتان والفاتحة

**It is a lie attributed to Ibn Mas'ud and a fabrication.** It is authentically proven from him the Qiraat (recitation) of Asim from Zirr, and in it are Muawizatain (last 2 chapters) and al-Fatiha". [As-Suyuti in al-Itqaan fi Ulumil Qur'an, where he quotes ibn Hazm's opinion]

It is also not proven that Ubay ibn Ka'b believed Qur'an had 116 chapters.

## Bonus - Misconception # 21 (Allah is moon God and Muslims worship the Ka'ba)

I conclude by refuting the widely spread misconception by Islamophobes. This is ludicrous and hilarious, thus very easy to refute. Allah is the same God of all Abrahamic, rather all religions and people on earth. He was called as “ALAHA” by Jesus in Aramaic, as “ELOH” in Hebrew, and also with similar sublime names in other past religions whose teachings have not survived in accurate scriptural forms.

One should watch the movie “The Passion of the Christ” by Mel Gibson and see clear resemblance to pronunciation of word Alaha to word Allah in Arabic. The languages Hebrew, Aramaic, and Arabic are sister languages and are very similar. Any person who knows these languages closely and is not hell bent in hating Islam will accept that Allah is God in Arabic just like Alaha is in Aramaic and “ELOH OR ELOHIM” is in Hebrew.

The claim that **Allah was worshipped as a moon god in Arabia** is a fringe theory that has been promoted by some groups of American evangelicals since the 1990s. The idea was supposedly promulgated by Hugo Winckler in 1901, and proliferated from a publication of Robert Morey’s pamphlet *The Moon-god Allah: In Archeology of the Middle East* (1994) which was eventually followed by his

book *The Islamic Invasion: Confronting The World's Fastest-Growing Religion* (2001 [Taken from Wikipedia])

Now the reason why Islamophobes say that Allah is moon god is because pagans of Makkah also had some vague concept of Godhood. They did believe in Allah but in a vague way. The orientalist and even some misguided Muslims like Wahabis wrongly believe that parents of Prophet Muhammad (Peace be upon him) were idolaters, and his father having name Abdullah (i.e. Slave of Allah), and mother having name Amina (one with Faith) somehow proves that pagans of Makkah worshipped Allah as a pagan idol prior to Muhammad (Peace be upon him).

According to mainstream Sunni Islam and also Shia theology, the parents of Prophet were Hanif (monotheists) and they believed in 1 God (Allah). There were traces of Abrahamic tradition in Arabia prior to Muhammad (Peace be upon him) and this is proven from our noble sources.

Secondly, even if pagans had some vague concept about God and knew the name Allah, that does not mean Allah becomes a moon-God. Majority of religions even non-Abrahamic faiths have concept of God in it (such as Hinduism which has many textual proofs even against idolatry and for worship of 1 God). There is no proof from Qur'an and authentic hadiths that pagans of Makkah considered Habul to be idol of Allah and considered it to be moon god. Plus Prophet Muhammad destroyed all the idols after conquest of Makkah, so did he destroy the idol of Allah too??

Qur'an states: **And if you asked them, "Who created the heavens and earth?" "THEY WOULD SURELY SAY, "ALLAH"** Say, "[All] praise is [due] to Allah "; but most of them do not know. [31:25]

Hence Qur'an proves that polytheists of Makkah did know of Allah and even believed that Allah was the creator of heavens and the earth. But still they were confused and they denied other names of Allah and attributes, such as Qur'an states:

When it is said to them Prostrate before the Most Merciful! **They reply What is the Most Merciful**, should we prostrate before whom you instruct us to? (Qur'an 25:60).

Also: **And they argue about [the divinity of] Allah** (Qur'an 13:13)

Mushrikeen had not made any idol with the name of Allah. There is absolutely no proof of that from Qur'an nor authentic hadiths/reports. It is only speculation of some ignorant Christian apologists and Islamophobes, which has nothing to do with academia.

Some Christians (not Jews) claim that name of God is Yahweh (Jehovah), whereas intellectual Christians who know Old Testament well in Hebrew have to accept that there is no known pronunciation of four lettered word "YHWH" which is why Jews considered it a blasphemy to speak this name of God. It has to be accepted that Book of Genesis both in Hebrew and Arabic Bible mentions God as "ALLAH IN ARABIC AND ELOHIM IN HEBREW WHICH ARE SAME."

For Aramaic usage I have already asked to watch the movie “The Passion of the Christ”

Regarding crescent being on flags of many Muslim countries, or on some mosques, then remember we Muslims do not worship symbols or take them like Christians take them. The Crescent does not represent God by any means but just represents Islamic calendar as Islamic calendar is lunar. Also it represents the holy month of Ramadan and other months which are determined by citing moon. Above all this tradition started very late among Muslims, there is no verse or hadith which tells us to put crescent on mosques or flags.

Regarding Ka’ba then it is just a symbol of direction towards which all black, white, rich, and poor Muslims pray in unity. It is just a symbol of direction not that Muslims worship it. The black stone Hajr al Aswad whom Muslims kiss is not kissed out of worship but just out of practicing a Sunnah. No Muslim considers it as God, son of god, or deity worthy of worship.

Peace!