



**INTERMINGLING  
OF THE SEXES  
AND THE KUFR  
OF THE  
COPRO-‘MUJTAHIDS’**

BY:  
The Majlis  
PO Box 3393  
Port Elizabeth  
6056, South Africa

## FOLLOWERS OF IBLEES

**“Among people are those who dispute about Allah without *Ilm* whilst they follow every rebellious *shaitaan*.”**

**(Al-Hajj, Aayat 3)**

A mushrik once asked Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) whether Allah Ta’ala was made of gold or silver. Although Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) ignored this copro question of the jaahil mushrik, he persisted with contumacy with his *jahaalat*. A bolt of lightening apprehended him. This follower of Iblis was thus decapitated.

The aforementioned Aayat was revealed in regard to this episode.

Those who dispute about the established Shariah of Allah Ta’ala without having any valid *Ilm* are of the ilk of this mushrik. They follow the vile, rebellious Iblees, hence they set themselves up as ‘mujtahids’ to dispute in the Laws of the Shariah which has been reliably and authentically transmitted down the long corridor of Islam’s more than fourteen century history.

The two paper ‘mujtahids’, following a ‘*shaitaan mareed*’, have assumed upon themselves the kufr liability of denying the Prohibition of Intermingling of sexes, and their satanic denial is based on crass *jahaalat*. They are devoid of *Ilm*.

*ILM* is not mere textual knowledge. The texts are the shadows of *Ilm*. *Ilm* is a *Noor* from Allah which settles in the heart of Men of Taqwa. Those following shaitaan are also shayaateen. They have no affinity with *Ilm* regardless of their textual proficiency. Only followers of Shaitaan have the satanic temerity to deny such a Command of the Shariah which stands dazzling like the rays of the sun. – a Command which is substantiated by *Qat’i Nusoos* – Aayaat of the Qur’aan and Ahaadith of the Absolute Certitude.

## INTRODUCTION

A dunderhead duet, *Zeeshan Chaudri and Muntasir Zaman* in their screed of *ghutha* (*rubbish and flotsam*) has abortively and recklessly laboured to abrogate Islam’s law of the Prohibition of intermingling of men and women. Setting themselves up as ‘mujtahids’, they have stupidly succeeded in only highlighting their *jahaalat*, in fact, *jahl murakkab* (compound ignorance).

With their ignorance and misinterpretation of the Qur’aan and Hadith have they exposed their *zandaqah* which is a form of kufr which is the effect of some shaitaani veronal substance which deranges the mind. With their flapdoodle arguments and stupidities have they miserably failed to scuttle and cancel the more than fourteen century Shariah Prohibition on intermingling of sexes. Their absolutely *baatil* narrative is the inspiration of Iblees and driven by crass *nafsaaniyat*.

This Prohibition is so well-known and embedded in the Ummah that even fussaag whose Imaan has not been nullified with kufr, understand and accept the Prohibition despite their indulgence in the infraction of non-observance.

The basic theme of the copro ‘ijtihad’ of the miscreant duet is to unravel the stringent Qur’aanic Prohibition of intermingling by creating obfuscation with some

seemingly conflicting Hadith narrations. Their modus of argument is to search for substance to bolster a preconceived agenda, namely, to nullify the Prohibition. These vile copro deviates are not interested in the Shariah and its *Ahkaam* which are well-established and which have been transmitted to the Ummah reliably and authentically down the ages of Islam’s history.

Their quest is not the *Haqq*. They have a sinister agenda, hence they search for crumbs and straws on which they clutch and labour to hoodwink the ignorant and unwary. But even ignorant Muslims whose Imaan is intact will not accept the copro rubbish which these miscreant chaps are promoting.

These moron self-promoted ‘mujtahids’ have demonstrated gross ignorance of the *Usool* of the Shariah, and assuming that they have some awareness of these Principles, why would they take cognizance thereof when their pernicious objective is to demolish the Qur’aan’s Prohibition of Intermingling of sexes to gratify the bestial carnality of the nafs which free mixing with women promises?

Almost 15 centuries after Allah Ta’ala has announced in the Qur’aan Majeed the perfection and finalization of the Shariah, pops up this duet from some festering pile of modernist manure to unravel the Law of Allah Ta’ala as confirmed and commanded in the Qur’aan and Sunnah. Their satanic effort is to open a wide

gateway for zina (fornication/adultery). In stark and reckless conflict with the Qur’aan and Sunnah, have these two miserable miscreants discarded the Qur’aan’s command: *“Do not approach even near to zina.”* While the Qur’aan has blocked all avenues leading to the commission of zina, these morons have conducted themselves in diametric opposition of this Command.

Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) described all steps leading to zina as zina, hence intermingling of sexes, men looking at women, speaking with them, and even gazing with desire at their garments, and vice versa (that is women perpetrating the same infractions) are all within the purview of zina. In this regard Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) said:

*“The eyes commit zina, and their zina is to look;  
the hands commit zina, and their zina is to touch;  
the feet commit zina, and their zina is to walk...”*

Thus the Fuqaha have ruled:

*“Looking with desire is a kind of zina and zina of all  
kinds is haraam”*  
(*Al-Muheetul Burhaani*)

In fact, the Fuqaha have mentioned that it is *haraam* to look with desire at even the garments of a woman, and likewise is it to offer Salaam to her and to respond to her Salaam. Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) said:

*“On the Day of Qiyaamah rods will be driven into the eyes of the one who looks with desire at an ajnabiyyah (ghair mahram woman).”*

Only a confounded, satanic LIAR will disgorge the egregious LIE that the gazes of males cast on females are bereft of *shahwat* (carnal lust).

Enemies of the Deen, agents of Iblees, in this era abound in the form of molvis, muftis and sheikhs. These miscreants are members of this League of Iblees, but they will miserably fail and be discarded as kufr waste by the *Haqq*.

***“In fact, We strike baatil with the Haqq, then the Haqq crushes out it’s brains. Then suddenly it (baatil) vanishes.”***  
***(Qur’aan)***

Jamadal-Ula 1446  
November 2024

## HARAAM INTERMINGLING IS WELL-DEFINED BY THE SHARIAH

### **Their stupid fallacy of ‘ikhtilaat’**

In their introduction to their copro-disgorgement of *zandaqah* (*kufr in disguise*), the copro-authors, Zeeshaan Chaudri and Muntasir Zaman, in their abortive attempt to negate the Shariah’s strict *ahkaam* pertaining to intermingling of the sexes, say:

*“The term ikhtilāt and its cognates, commonly used to describe certain forms of gender interaction, linguistically refer to the intermixing, commingling, or blending of things. However, there remains significant ambiguity regarding their precise legal definitions. Unlike well-defined legal concepts such as theft (sariqa), usury (ribā), and murder (qatl) [notwithstanding peripheral points of disagreement], ikhtilāt and its related terms are not strictly defined. Consequently, determining guidelines for appropriate gender interaction necessitates extensive analysis and the application of various legal tools.”*

This is a cunning shaitaani abortive attempt to create ambiguity in the *Ahkaam* of the Shariah. There is no ambiguity in the Shariah’s rules of Hijaab which is a multi-faceted, well-defined concept elaborately explained in the Qur’aan and Sunnah. The insinuation

made by these *Zindeeqs* is that Allah Ta’ala despite having declared the finalization and perfection of the Deen in the Qur’aan Majeed, has left the act of Hijaab of which *intermingling* is a branch, in ambiguity for clarification and determination to posterity of the breed of these copro-authors whose *Aql* is clearly malfunctioning as an effect of satanic manipulation. Allah Ta’ala declares in the Qur’aan Majeed:

*“This day have I perfected for you your Deen, and completed for you My favour and have chosen for you Islam as Deen.”*

*(Al-Maaidah, Aayat 3)*

This finalization and perfection of the Deen debunk the copro-claim of the copro-authors whose objective is to severely dilute the strict *Ahkaam* of *Hijaab*, hence they initiated their flapdoodle twaddle with the attempt to scuttle the more than fourteen century understanding of the Ummah on the issue of intermingling and Hijaab in general.

The “*peripheral points of disagreement*” to which these miscreant chaps allude are factors in all the *Ahkaam* of the Shariah from Kitaabut Tahaarah to Kitaabul Miraath, and all such differences of the Fuqaha are structured on *Usool* (Principles) formulated on the basis of the Qur’aan and Sunnah. Just as such “*peripheral points of disagreement*” do not adversely affect the well-defined concepts of *Sarqah*, *Riba*, *Qatl*, etc., similarly, the Shar’i concept of *Hijaab* of which

*intermingling of the sexes* is a prohibition, is not cast into ambiguity. The *ambiguity* which the copro-zindeeqs have fancifully imagined with regard to intermingling of sexes, and on which basis they have structured their entire haraam argument in direct contradiction of the Qur’aan and Sunnah, is devoid of Shar’i substance.

The deviates have not explained the ‘cognates’ and the ‘related terms’ of their imaginary *ikhtilaat* concept. They have used a term which according to the Shariah has only a literal meaning, then arbitrarily on the basis of their sinister whimsical objective have they attempted to hoodwink with the idea that ‘*ikhtilaat*’ is one of the many Chapters of Fiqh categorized by the Fuqaha. However, in terms of their copro-theory, that while all the other Chapters of Fiqh are well-defined, this specific ‘chapter’ of intermingling of the sexes has been left in ambiguity. Since it is not a well-defined concept according to these copro-chaps, its imagined ambiguity provides wide scope for interpretation. Thus, developing acts of *fisq* and *fujoor* do not negate the prohibition of intermingling of sexes. Acts which are explicit *fisq* and *fujoor* are accorded permissibility on the basis of their satanically imagined idea of an undefined, ambiguous so-called *ikhtilaat* concept- a concept which has no reality in the Shariah.

### **Ikhtilaat**

This is an inspiration of Iblees. There is no Fiqhi designated chapter such as *Ikhtilaat*, hence the analogy

with *Sarqah, Riba and Qatl* is false, baseless and underlined by a sinister and pernicious motive, and that shaitaani motive is to eke out Shar’i accommodation for the *fisq* and *fujoor* of these *dajjaali mudhilleen*, that is, to provide wide latitude for them to intermingle with the opposite sex as is their current practice for which they now seek a Shar’i basis of condonation.

Intermingling of the sexes is a *haraam* act by itself. It has no ‘cognates’ as the morons have asserted. *The Nusoos* (of the Qur’aan and Sunnah) are numerous and define the prohibition with clarity. The Shariah has left no such ambiguity in this regard which requires elucidation and extrapolation by dumb characters more than fourteen centuries down the Line of this Deen which Allah Azza Wa Jal has finalized and perfected, and not left to the vagaries of wildly fluctuating *nafsaaniyat* whose gratification is the motive of the men of bestial lust. It was this vile motive which has constrained these *fussaaq and fujjaar juhala* to fabricate their *nafsaani* theory of an *undefined ikhtilaat chapter* of the Shariah.

Everything of this Deen is well-defined and without ambiguity. The idea of Shar’i *ahkaam* having ambiguity is a kufr insinuation. It implies that this Deen has not been perfected. It implies the denial of the declaration of finalization and perfection announced by Allah Azza Wa Jal.

The very finalization of Nubuwwat precluding the arrival of a new Nabi refutes the copro-contention of ambiguity in the understanding of intermingling/hijaab, and in any other aspect of this perfected Deen of Islam. If there was the need for clarifying a *Hukm* fifteen centuries after Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam), *Risaalat* would not have been terminated.

Furthermore, it is horribly stupid to accept that the intermingling facet of Hijaab had remained cloaked in ambiguity for more than fourteen centuries and that two chaps with stercoraceous brains have mushroomed up to clarify the ambiguity and to present to the Ummah the concept which by implication, Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) had not defined sufficiently for the correct understanding and proper practising of the Ummah.

It is necessary to understand that whatever clarification the *Ahkaam* based on the *Usool* of the Deen required, was thoroughly defined during the Khairul Quroon era by the Aimmah Mujtahideen who were a special noble species of Muslims created by Allah Ta’ala for the specific objective of Clarification of the *Ahkaam*, hence Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) ordered his Sahaabah to deliver from him whatever they have heard because there will be those (that is the Fuqaha) in later times who will have a greater understanding of the Hadith than some of the Sahaabah narrators.

The Fuqaha did not promulgate any new laws. Their function was to deduct the *masaa-il* latent in the Qur’aan and Ahaadith. Their function was merely to elaborate on the *masaa-il* which are within the fold of the Qur’aan and Ahaadith, and for this function had Allah Ta’ala created the Aimmah Mujtahideen. Just as Nubuwwat has ended, so too has the Age of Ijtihad ended with the termination of the era known as *Khairul Quroon*. In this regard, Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) said:

*“Honour my Sahaabah, for verily they are your noblest, then those after them (the Taabieen), then those after them (Tab-e-Taabieen). Thereafter will be KITHB (falsehood).”*

In another narration, Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) said that after the *Khairul Quroon* will be people who will love “*obesity*”. These are the molvis and sheikhs who fatten themselves with *nafsaaniyat* and haraam nourishment.

### **The kufr of the ‘guidelines’ of the copro-juhala**

The miserable specimens of *Zanadaqah* say:

*“Consequently, determining guidelines for appropriate gender interaction necessitates extensive analysis and the application of various legal tools.”*

Their very idea of determining guidelines, i.e. new guidelines, for a well-defined Prohibition, is kufr. The

Prohibition of intermingling of sexes does not “necessitate extensive analysis” as the juhala have claimed. It is this satanism of ‘extensive analysis’ which these chaps seek as a basis for scuttling the Prohibition ordained by Allah Ta’ala and His Rasool. And, it was for providing latitude for the operation of the *shaitaaniyat* of their ‘extensive analysis’ that they had conjectured the imaginary chapter of ‘*ikhhtilaat*’.

Any ‘guideline’ which negates any aspect of the Prohibition on intermingling is *shaitaaniyat* and *kufr*. The ‘*legal tools*’, that is the *Usool* of the Shariah are not extant for negating any of the established *ahkaam* of the Shariah. The application of the “legal tools” is for unearthing the *hukm* for an expedient or a new development – an act which did not exist during the *Khairul Quroon* era, hence the need to invoke the *Usool* of the Shariah. These ‘*legal tools*’ may not be applied in a way to scuttle the existing *Ahkaam*. The prohibition of intermingling is not the effect of a passing or temporary *urf* or custom. The Prohibition is not the custom of a specific tribe or nation. It is a universal command of the Shariah which was ordained by the Qur’aan and announced by Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam). It does not tolerate any interference. The ‘legal tools’ do not and cannot override the *Mansoos Ahkaam* of the Shariah.

### **The obligation of covering the awrah**

The miscreants have proffered some rules pertaining to the *aurah* of men and women although this issue is

unrelated to their imaginary *ikhtilaat* chapter. *Aurah* and intermingling of sexes are two separate issues. The prohibition of intermingling has no relationship with the Fiqhi technicalities pertaining to *Aurah*. Regardless of the *Aurah* being correctly covered, intermingling of sexes remains haraam. *Urf* cannot scuttle the Prohibition. Any *urf* which seeks to displace the effects of *Nusoos* is satanism, not valid and haraam. The introduction of the *aurah* issue is stupidly redundant.

The *Aurah* in its Fiqhi technical sense, is not a fundamental principle for the validity of the Prohibition of intermingling as averred by the copro-ignoramuses.

The copro-charlatans have to concede that looking at the *Aurah* is haraam. From this perspective, *Aurah* will be a fundamental principle on which the Prohibition is based. Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) said:

*“Woman is Aurah. When she emerges,  
shaitaan lies in ambush for her.”*

The meaning of *Aurah* in this context is neither the Fiqhi meaning nor the literal meaning. It means that the entire body of a woman is an object of concealment. Such concealment is absolutely negated by intermingling. Hence, regardless of the covering of the Fiqhi *Aurah*, the very act of intermingling is the antithesis of the Prohibition. It is for this very reason that the Qur’aan Majeed commands the Screen/Veil to separate men and women when there develops a need

for some interaction. In the absence of a Screen, the Prohibition of looking at the *Aurah* of the female is impossible. Thus the discussion of the technical Fiqhi meaning of *aurah* in the context of intermingling is superfluous, redundant and a stupidity excreted by brains soiled by stercoral substances of Iblees.

### **Looking at the Aurah**

In this regard, the two juhala say:

*“This categorical prohibition does not apply to those areas of the body that are not considered awra. Concerning these, the scholars do not find an inherent cause for the prohibition (i.e., it is not qabī li-dhātihi) and state that looking at these body parts (e.g., face and hands) only becomes impermissible when it is done with an impermissible cause: sexual desire.”*

This understanding is in conflict with the Hadith definition of *Aurah*. In the context of intermingling, the entire body of a female is *Aurah* while the Fiqhi definition refers to *Aurah* for the validity of Salaat. In fact, the Fuqaha themselves, notwithstanding their definition of *Aurah*, prohibit looking at even the garments of a female, and also prohibit offering Salaam to a *ghayr mahram* female as well as prohibiting responding to her Salaam. Thus, in the context of Hijaab, they include even the female’s voice in the meaning of *Aurah*.

Thus, the categorical prohibition also applies to even the garments and voice of the female regardless of their exclusion from the meaning of *Aurah* for Salaat purposes. Regardless of there being no “inherent cause” for the prohibition, but for practical purposes (*amal*) the prohibition applies categorically.

The Fiqhi principles of *Qabeeh li zaatihi* and *Qabeeh li ghayrihi* have no relevance to the haraam practice of intermingling. Intermingling never becomes permissible. While the female’s face is excluded from the *Aurah* as applicable to Salaat, it becomes *Aurah* in terms of the principle, *Qabeeh li ghayrihi* since the element of *fitnah* is ever present, hence the Fuqaha have ruled on the *Wujoob* of the Niqaab, and the Niqaab was in vogue since the very era of Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam). The noblest and most pious women who flourished during the age of Nubuwwat would cover their faces notwithstanding the fact that the face is excluded from the *Aurah* as applicable to Salaat.

It is an egregious error to believe that looking at the face and hands of a woman becomes impermissible only when sexual desire is present. Even if initially while looking at her face, the *fitnah* of desire is not present, looking at her face subsequently stirs lust. Thus looking at her face is prohibited on the basis of the Qur’aanic Aayat: “*Do not approach even near to zina.*”, and Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) said: “*The zina of the eye is to look...*”

Whether the prohibition is on the basis of the principle, *Qabeeh li ghayrihi*, it does not dilute the prohibition. The consequence of violating the prohibition regardless of its basis, is the Fire of Jahannam. Thus the averment of the copro-character, viz,

*“In other words, the presence of sexual desire brings in an impermissibility to the action not found inherently within the action (i.e., it is qabī li-ghayrihi), is twaddle with which they twiddle in matters of grave Shar’i import. The secondary degree, that is in terms of Fiqh, of prohibition based on the principle qabī li-ghayrihi, has no relevance to practical implementation. It is of mere technical import. The element of fitnah is ever present regardless of the absence of the first principle, Qabeeh li zaatihi. For amal the element of sexual desire is always present, and there is greater cause for fear in this era of extreme fitnah with the preponderance of fussaag and fujjaar, and vile molvis and sheikhs who perpetrate moral felony on a wholesale scale, which they justify by means of Satanic ta’weel (interpretation) of the Nusoos.*

In conflict with their own copro-deduction, the miscreant authors say:

***“Prohibition of Physical Contact: As a general principle, physical contact with a non-mahram is impermissible, regardless of whether it involves sexual desire or not.”***

What is the basis for this prohibition averred by the miscreant juhala? On which *Nass* is physical contact prohibited? What is their *daleel* for claiming that physically touching a woman is haraam even if touched without sexual desire? The only logical argument forthcoming will be the grave element of *fitnah* stemming from physical touch. Nevertheless, they will be constrained to concede that the prohibition here too is *Qabeeh li ghayrihi*.

Should they proffer a Hadith for the prohibition of touching, then Hadith can also be cited for the prohibition of looking. In fact, even the Qur’aan can be cited for the prohibition of looking while there is no Qur’aanic aayat for the prohibition of touching. Allah Ta’ala says:

*“Say to the Mu’mineen that they  
should lower their gaze...”*  
(An-Noor, Aayat 30)

*“And, say to the Mu’minaat that  
they should lower their gaze.”*  
(An-Noor, Aayat 31)

Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) said: *“The zina of the eyes is to look...”* Confirming the absence of lust/sexual desire for confirmation of the Prohibition, the Qur’aan states: *“Do not approach even near to*

*zina...*” It is the **approach** which creates the factor of prohibition, namely, lust/sexual desire.

However, in so far as the act of looking at the female’s face is concerned, the copro-juhala maintain that in the absence of sexual desire, looking is permissible, but regarding touching they create a distinction despite the common principle of prohibition. The only difference between looking and touching is one of degree. The *fitnah* in touching is greater. But the greater *fitnah* does not negate the lesser *fitnah*. Both degrees of *fitnah* confirm the prohibition. But on the basis of the logic of the juhala, touching without sexual desire is permissible. But every ignorant Muslim will refute this stupid incongruency stemming from the cognitive dissonance of the fussaag authors of the flapdoodle article excreted for rendering intermingling permissible.

Just as the Hadith cautions and warns against touching, it also warns against looking which is described as the zina of the eyes. There is *fitnah* in both acts, and this is the pivot of the Prohibition.

Further arguing their flaccid case, the chaps say:

*“Beyond these fundamental rules, upon which there is general agreement, the prohibition or permissibility of a given interaction is determined by assessing various contextual factors; the multiplicity of the secondary factors determines the particular ruling.”*

The rules proffered by these fellows do not in any way dilute the prohibition of intermingling. The ‘contextual factors’ are the figments of their nafs –figments which they conjecture for negating the Prohibition to allow for intermingling. The Prohibition of intermingling of sexes is a simple Law of the Shariah which all Muslims understand. It cannot be negated or refuted by the labyrinthal stupidities designed to mislead and deceive the ignorant and unwary.

Their ‘secondary and contextual factors’ are the effects of misinterpretation of the Ahaadith to suit their whimsical fancies.

### **Close proximity**

In their attempt to scuttle the Prohibition of intermingling, the copro-juhhaal say:

*“As for men and women being in close proximity to one another, there is no precise physical measurement to determine what is too close, since factors such as the width of the pathway and the number of people present are not mentioned in the hadith. However, if the proximity is such that it directly causes touching, then that would be prohibited.”*

There is no need for a measuring tape nor for an engineer to determine the measurement for determining ‘close proximity’. Every moron can understand the meaning of close proximity. Women and men in a

mall, in a hall, in the streets, in the shops and in all places constitute intermingling regardless of the measurements not specified in the Hadith. This argument of measurement is another display of copro-stupidity of the miscreant paper ‘mujtahids’.

These moron fellows have introduced this stupid measurement factor to provide permissibility for the fussaag and fujjaar so-called ‘scholars’ who give discourses to men and women in the same hall.

Clutching at another straw like a drowning man, the ignoramuses say:

*“This hadith establishes the rule that a man can only visit a non-mahram woman whose husband is not present if he is accompanied by another man or by multiple men. The reason for this is that being alone with a non-mahram woman (known as khalwa) is haram. However, the presence of another person removes the potential for any inappropriate actions and eliminates potential suspicion.”*

This conclusion scuttles the entire concept of Shar’i Hijaab. In terms of this conclusion two or three men may visit a woman in her bedroom even if her husband is not present. She may open the door for two strangers, let them into her bedroom and indulge in conversation with them. It is absolutely felonious, flagitious and shockingly lamentable to dig out a Hadith to justify

interaction of two ghair mahram males with a woman in the privacy of her house.

Such lewd interaction is not permissible even with the presence of the husband who will be described as a *dayyooth* for allowing strange males to converse with his wife. It is revolting to the *ghayrah* of a Mu’min. Since there is considerable ambiguity pertaining to such narrations which are in conflict with the understanding and practice of the Ummah from the very era of Nubuwwat, masaa-il may not be structured on their basis.

It is the penchant of the fussaag and fujjaar ‘scholars’ of this era to dig out such narrations which are in conflict with the popular understanding and *amal* of the Ummah. What will a husband of *ghayrah* think and do if he suddenly comes home to see his wife in the bedroom with two ghair mahram males serving them tea and happily conversing with them? Indeed shaitaan has not only urinated in the brains of these jaahil ‘scholars’. He has excreted in their brains as well.

### **The Fundamental Factors of Prohibition**

Regardless of the definitions of intermingling in which there exist much conflict and ambiguity, the fundamental factors which prohibit intermingling are:

(1) *Khurooj* (emergence) from the homes for no pressing valid reason is haraam. The Qur’aan Majeed explicitly prohibits their *Khurooj*.

(2) When there is a real need to speak to women, it must be from behind a screen as commanded by the Qur’aan.

(3) The omnipresence of the element of *fitnah* – bestial lust.

Thus, the discussion of the separating gap between the seats of men and women in a hall is a stupid superfluity which highlights their *jahaalat*. Since all the fundamental factors are being violated, it is haraam to lecture to women in a hall even if there are no men present, leave alone when males are present.

There is no imperative need for females to be in a hall where some faasiq lout masquerading as a ‘scholar’ will be disgorging his twaddle. When they are not permitted to go to even the Musjid for Salaat, how can it ever be permissible for them to go to a hall where there will be a preponderance of fussiaaq and fujjaar males and to listen to a faasiq/faajir bogus scholar?

It is untenable and ludicrous that after more than fourteen centuries of the Ummah’s understanding of the meaning of the Prohibition of intermingling, copro opinions are proffered by copro louts masquerading as ‘scholars’ on the basis of narrations which are in total conflict of the *amal* of the Ummah, and in conflict with Kitaabullah (the Qur’aan Majeed). There are numerous narrations which conflict with the popular

understanding and standing practice of the Ummah – practices which have been transmitted from the very inception of Islam, and also in conflict with the Qur’aan and Hadith *Nusoos*. Such narrations have to be incumbently set aside. Such narrations may not be proffered as a basis for abrogation or for deflecting from the well-established Popular Ruling of the Shariah.

### **Their Stark Ignorance**

There is no scope for Ijtihad on the basis of rarities and obscurities to abrogate the Popular Rulings of the Shariah. The factors of Prohibition mentioned above override any contrary view gleaned from some Hadith narrations. The ignorance of these self-appointed paper ‘mujtahids’ is absolutely scandalous. They lack understanding or even awareness of the basic *Usool (Principles)* of Fiqh, yet they display audacious stupidity by copiously citing the Fuqaha in an abortive endeavour to extravagant some capital for their copro imaginary idea of permissibility of intermingling.

A basic Principle of Fiqh is that if a Hadith is in conflict with Kitaabullah (the Qur’aan), it will be interpreted to conform and be compatible with the Qur’aan. If such interpretation is not possible, the Hadith, if authentic, shall be set aside, leaving its meaning to Allah Ta’ala. But, never shall the Hadith be presented to override Kitaabullah or to abrogate Qur’aanic *Nass*.

In addition to their gross *jahaalat* of the *Usool of Fiqh*, is their crass stupidity regarding the application of Hadith narrations. Thus, their compound *jahaalat* is breath-taking. Their sinister designs have crippled their intellectual ability which operates retrogressively in conflict with the Shariah which these humbug ‘mujtahids’ mangle and mutilate for gratifying their bestial lusts of fisq and fujoor, hence their craving for female audience and company. It is with emaciated or deracinated Imaan that these copro characters view the *ahkaam* of the Shariah.

### **The Barrier/Screen**

In another abortive attempt to legalize intermingling of sexes, the copro juhhaal say:

*“Some have built on this definition by adding “men gazing upon” and “teaching and lecturing adult females without a barrier or screen,” and consequently have passed the judgment that “those openly engaging in such activities are considered fussāq (unashamed and overt sinners) and are subject to specific legal rulings.”*

Most certainly, without the slightest vestige of doubt, those bogus ‘scholars’ who lecture to an intermingled crowd of morons are fussaag and fujaar of the worst kind. They are in flagrant violation of the Qur’aan which commands:

*“When you ask them (women) for anything, then*

*ask them from behind a screen. This is purer for your hearts and their hearts.”*  
(Al-Ahzaab, Aayat 53)

This Aayat emphatically precludes face-to-face talk with females. When this was the Prohibition for even the noblest personalities of mankind, namely, the Holy Wives of our Nabi (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) and the Sahaabah, what is the logical and Shar’i conclusion for the vile fussiaq and fujjaar slaves of bestiality of this era of supreme *fitnah*? The Qur’aanic rationale for the Prohibition is stated explicitly to be the element of bestial lust (*purer for your hearts and their hearts*).

This rationale has not disappeared. On the contrary it has intensified a thousand fold. It is satanic insanity to claim that the element of fitnah applied exclusively to the Azwaaj-e-Mutahharah and the noble Sahaabah, and not to the *ghutha* –flotsam- of the human race of this era of supreme fitnah. Thus, the copro-scholars who lecture to an intermingled audience are in violent contravention of the Qur’aan and Sunnah.

Hadhrat Anas Bin Maalik (Radhiyallahu anhu) was in the service of our Nabi (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) since the age of ten. He had free access to the homes of Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam). On the occasion of our Nabi’s marriage to Hadhrat Zainab Bint Jahash (Radhiyallahu anha), when Hadhrat Anas (Radhiyallahu anhu) who was 15 years of age, attempted to enter the house as was his usual practice,

Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) prevented him. The earlier permissibility was abrogated. The Prohibition of intermingling will therefore endure until Qiyaamah, and no amount of copro juggling of the brains of copro-characters will succeed to dismantle the *Ahkaam* of the Shariah.

Thus, the attempt to scuttle the Prohibition with stray and obscure narrations which conflict with the Qur’aan is a despicable display of ignorance and even kufr.

### **Post Hijaab interactions**

The deviates who are intent on opening a wide avenue for fitnah in this age of supreme fitnah, aver:

*“Does this hadith imply that it is now prohibited for a man to see and even recognize a woman? How does this interpretation align with other hadith, and what was the nature of gender interactions post-hijab?”*

Most assuredly the Hadith of Prohibition does not merely imply, what the chaps ask. It emphasizes the prohibition. A ghair mahram man may NOT see and NOT recognize a woman. The *fitnah* is omnipresent. Only men with diseased hearts and corrupt copro-brains have the satanic temerity of denying this reality. There is no imperative need for ‘alignment’ with narrations indicating an opposite view because:

- (1) The element of *fitnah* in this era of supreme *fitnah* is glaringly present. It simply swamps

and overwhelms the narrations indicating the opposite.

- (2) The “other hadith” is in conflict with Kitaabullah, hence any seemingly conflicting “*gender interactions post-hijab*”, will be set aside and not proffered as a basis for opening the gateway of massive *fitnah* which is today the most salient feature of the age.

All narrations from which latitude is gleaned for contact and communication with women have to be incumbently set aside and not cited in abrogation or in conflict of the *Nusoos* of the Qur’aan and Hadith which explicitly and emphatically prohibit interaction of the sexes. These vile characters who seek to override the Qur’aan and Ahaadith pertaining to the Prohibition with some narrations which depict the practice of pure and holy persons of the highest standard during the noblest era, suffer from the malady of *Takhabbatush Shaitaan* – a madness created in their brains by Iblees.

When the Qur’aan Itself states the *Illat (rationale)* for the Prohibition being the *fitnah* lurking in the heart, then it is absolutely preposterous and tantamount to kufr to open the doorway for this *fitnah* in these times of evil, villainy and immorality in which Muslim society is drowning. This *Illat* is enduring and it will continue and intensify until Qiyaamah, hence the Prohibition will remain extant and enduring, and no amount of skulduggery of the copro-muftis of this era

of fitnah will be able to abrogate this Prohibition based on the explicit *Nusoos* of the Qur’aan and Hadith.

### **Alignment/Reconciliation of the conflicting narrations**

The onus of ‘alignment’ and reconciliation settles squarely on these copro-bogus ‘scholars’ who are hell-bent to open the gateway of *fitnah* with intermingling. It is for them to ‘align’ and reconcile the ‘other narrations’ with the Qur’aan and the Prohibiting Ahaadith. Thus, the Hadith of Hadhrat Aishah (Radhiyallahu anha) which constitutes a fundamental basis for the Prohibition, may not be cited in subservience to the other narrations from which permissibility is gleaned. On the contrary, those narrations should be reconciled with the Hadith of Hadhrat Aishah (Radhiyallahu anhu) and to a greater degree, with the Qur’aan Majeed which explicitly and emphatically commands the strictest segregation of the sexes.

It is indeed deviation (*dhalaal*) manifest to cite a Hadith to negate the Qur’aanic command of a Screen, and to dilute or argue away the other Ahaadith pertaining to Hijaab. Since Hijaab is mandatory, all narrations indicating the opposite should compulsorily be interpreted to conform with the Prohibition, and where such reconciliation cannot be effected, they should be set aside and not utilized in an abortive attempt to scuttle the Standing Prohibition.

However, since the brains of these zindeeq juhala operate retrogressively, they ask for the *Nusoos* of the primary *Hukm* to be reconciled with the secondary narrations pertaining to cultural practices which the primary *Nusoos* prohibit, but which lingered on due to embedded habit. Their stupid request is like asking for the *Nusoos* which prohibit wine to be ‘aligned’ and reconciled with the narrations which mention wine-consumption prior to the prohibition. Such a request reflects compound *jahaalat*. The *Nusoos* prohibiting wine cannot be diluted or interpreted to provide leeway for wine-consumption on the basis of narrations pertaining to pre-prohibition wine-consumption. The latter narrations have to be interpreted and explained to be reconciled with the primary narrations stating the Prohibition.

The permission of men speaking to women in the absence of their husbands if they are more than one, is similar to the permission granted to females to attend the Musjid. Despite the explicit permission granted by Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam), the Sahaabah had prohibited the most pious ladies of this Ummah in the noblest ages of Islam from attending the Musjid for even the Fardh Salaat.

The element of *fitnah* and the moral and spiritual ruin in the wake of this *fitnah* were recognized by the Sahaabah, hence they prohibited women from the Musjid. Such *fitnah* was non-existent during the time of Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam), hence the

permissibility. In this day of total, intense and chaotic corruption and immorality, never will it be permissible for men to speak or even look at women regardless of the presence of their husbands. A husband who allows men to interact with his wife has been described as ***DAYYOOOTH*** by Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam). Such a man is like a swine.

Furthermore, regardless of the existence or non-existence of the factor of *fitnah*, the general law of Hijaab and the Qur’aanic command of the Screen effectively prohibit intermingling of every kind, hence it is only diseased brains which seek to override the primary *Nusoos* of Prohibition with secondary narrations pertaining to cultural practices in vogue during that era.

The presentation of the variety of definitions and comments of Ulama for opening up the gateway of *fitnah* is most despicable and demonstrates breath-taking ignorance and contempt for the objective of the rules of Hijaab ordained by Allah Ta’ala. Such technicalities and conflicting narrations should remain a closed subject, and not be dug out from the grave to negate the popular and standing practice of the Ummah which is structured on the *Nusoos* of the Qur’aan and Sunnah.

In the same way as women have been prohibited from the Musjid despite having been allowed by Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam), is all

interaction/intermingling with women prohibited. However, the prohibition of intermingling is more explicit and has greater emphasis than the prohibition for females attending the Musjid. Despite the fitnah of attending the Musjid being relatively negligible in comparison to the *fitnah* of two men sitting in the bedroom with another man’s wife to indulge in conversation, it (Musjid attendance) was prohibited by the Ijma’ of the Sahaabah, and such prohibition remains the Law to this day despite the numerous infractions of the modernists, juhala and zanaadaqh.

What has happened to the brains of these juhala copro-scholars? Just imagine! They are promoting *zina* while the Qur’aan Majeed commands: “*Do not come near to zina.*” Is the scenario of two ghayr mahram males with a woman alone in her house not fertile ground for the devil and the nafs to ensnare the three into the filth of *zina*? At the very minimum, the *zina* of the eyes and heart? *Zina*, about which Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) said:

*“He who looks at an ajnabiyyah (strange/ghayr mahram woman) with lust, hot rods will be inserted into his eyes on the Day of Qiyaamah.”*

Every person, besides these copro-human devils, even if he is a faasiq-faajir, will concede the grave and real danger of lust developing by gazing at women. This is a disease in which almost 100% of the people are involved. They gaze with lust at women in the public,

leave alone two chaps being alone with a woman in her bedroom.

### **Conceding the Fitnah element**

Conceding the existence of fitnah, the morons say:

*“In our time, more caution is required, but if certain precautions are taken to mitigate the potential for fitna, then those scenarios will be allowed, e.g., the gathering is large, pious people are present, etc. These factors help garner permissibility when the woman’s husband is absent. If the husband is present, then the rules are further relaxed.”*

Our times are the worst of times. Obscenity, immorality, total lack of piety, ignorance and female exhibition in all worldly realms and dimensions do not dictate simply ‘more caution’. The scenario of intensive pervading *fitnah* demands total Prohibition of intermingling at all levels, not only at the Musjid level.

Although the Qur’aanic prohibition of female *khurooj* (*emergence*) from the home is final and emphatic regardless of *fitnah* or no *fitnah*, in this era of intense *fitnah*, the Prohibition of *khurooj* from their homes has greater emphasis. The prohibition on emerging from the homes effectively negates intermingling in the public domain such as halls, malls, Musaaajid, etc.

The measures of ‘caution’ proposed by the two jaahil copro-scholars for justifying intermingling are in

negation of the Qur’aanic prohibition of *khurooj from the homes*, and the Qur’aanic command of the *separating Screen*.

It is also noteworthy, that the Screen prescribed by the Qur’aan was not for a public venue such as a hall. It was for homes. When there is a real need to speak to a woman at her home, then the Screen is an imperative command. No amount of fanciful *nafsaani* interpretation of Hadith narrations can ever abrogate the **Fardh** command of the Screen. When the Qur’aan explicitly states that the objective of the Screen is for **purity** of the hearts, that is, to abstain from zina of the hearts, which is the opening chapter of the ultimate act of fornication/adultery, then it is shaitaani perversion and pernicious to discard the Screen on the basis of the whimsical and stupid factors proffered to justify intermingling.

Regardless of the piety of the persons of this age, if there is a real need, then it is Fardh for the sexes to be separated by a Screen. It is this Fardh command which the vile morons seek to abrogate and scuttle for accommodating the lustful designs of the copromolvis/sheikhs who crave to gaze at the women who are in the hall in defiance of the Qur’aanic prohibition of *khurooj*. They should locate some other project in their quest for bestial gratification, and desist from *nafsaani* gratification under deeni guise.

The juhala say: *“If the husband is present, then the rules are further relaxed.”* That is even the precautions necessary for prevention of *fitnah* are of no significance and strange men may interact with a man’s wife merely on the basis of his presence. The Hadith brands such a vile, shameless man bereft of Imaani *ghayrah* as a **Dayyooth**. While literally this term means ‘cuckold’, in effect it has the harshness and scorn percolating from the word *swine*. Such a man is like a *swine* since he is bereft of every vestige of shame. He is a *swine* without Imaani *ghayrah*.

## **Culture**

Acknowledging the fact that conversation between men and women was integral to Arab culture, the morons quoting Qaadhi Iyaadh (Rahmatullah alayh) say:

*“Elsewhere, Qādī Iyād states that it was common in Arab culture for men and women to converse, which was then abrogated by the verses of hijab.”*

Here they concede that such conversation was prohibited by the Verses of Hijaab. But then, without valid evidence, they attempt to nullify their concession by saying:

*“We should understand his comments in reference to casual chitchat, since purposeful conversations continued to take place between non-mahrams, as demonstrated by the numerous hadith mentioned.”*

On what valid basis is such ‘understanding’? The Verses of Hijaab make no such distinction as imagined by the copro-scholars. The Prohibition is general, not restrictive to ‘chit-chit’ nonsense. Qadhi Iyaadh does not differentiate between stupid ‘chit-chat’ and ‘purposeful conversation’. The differentiation is the figment of the copro brains of the copro agents of Iblees. Whatever is ‘demonstrated’ in narrations contrary to Hijaab does not override the strictness and rigidity of the Hijaab Law stated in the Qur’aan and Ahaadith of the *Mutawaatir* class. Thus the differentiation is the bunkum of the miscreant molvies.

*“An He (Allah) casts RIJS (filth) on those  
who lack intelligence.”  
(Yoonus, Aayat 100)*

### **In the ‘private quarters’ of women**

Excreting more zina shaitaanियat, the copro fellows say:

*“Qādī Iyād’s commentary was provided in the broader discussion of men entering women’s private quarters and the general prohibition of seclusion (khalwa)”*

The Prohibition in fact applies to intermingling at all levels. It is not restricted to a woman’s ‘private quarters’ or her bedroom. Furthermore, these miserable miscreants should not exclude a woman’s bedroom from their permissibility rubbish. It is their contention that two or more men may enter the home of a woman even during the absence of her husband and happily

converse with her. Their brains and hearts are filthy with carnal lust.

The venue of conversation is not specified. The venue may be the bedroom or the kitchen or anywhere in the house. Thus the context which the copro chaps desire for the comments of Qaadhi Iyaadh is palpably baseless.

### **Overriding the Qur’aanic Barrier/Screen command**

The juhhaal copro-miscreants says:

*“One may argue that if such a mixed gathering were to take place, the woman must be behind a barrier or at least have her face covered, according to the practice of ‘Ā’isha i. Though this was undoubtedly practiced by some, the important question for us is whether the Prophet stated this as a condition for permissible interactions or not?”*

Most assuredly Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) had commanded whatever Allah Ta’ala had decreed and commanded. The Qur’aan states explicitly:

*“When you ask them anything, then ask from behind a **SCREEN**. That is purer for your hearts and their hearts.”*

This command cannot be abrogated or set aside on the basis of any stray act or incident to the contrary. This Command is the Final Word which absolutely refutes

the intermingling concept of the copro-sexual pervert molvis who have embarked on the kufr of overriding the Qur’aan with narrations which may not be cited in opposition to the Qur’aan’s command.

These miserable sexual perverts are at pains with their Satanistic arguments to create the impression that the Screen and the Niqaab are exclusive with Hadhrat Aishah (Radhiyallahu anha) and perhaps with the other Wives of our Nabi (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam). These morons in whose bodies permeate the effects of sexual-perversity, conveniently overlook the *Illat* for the Screen stated in the Qur’aanic Aayat. The primary reason for the screen as stated by the Qur’aan is: “*That is purer for your hearts and their hearts.*”

It was to guard the purity of the hearts. Now if there was the need for even the Holy Wives and the Sahaabah to have a separating Screen, then what should be concluded regarding the people of this era drowning in moral filth, fisq and fujoor? Is there no need for the purity of the hearts of Muslims of our age? If the danger of lust in the Sahaabah had necessitated the compulsion of the Screen, is it not simple Imaani understanding that for us in this age of fisq and fujoor, in whose bodies lust pulsates in every capillary, that the imperative need of the Screen is a thousand fold more? The morons are ignorant of the operation of the *Usool of Fiqh*. They are too dumb in their copro brains to understand the transference of a *hukm* on the basis of the principle of *Dalaalatun Nass*.

Are the hearts of these sexual perverts purer than the hearts of the Noble Wives of Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) and the hearts of the Sahaabah? Indeed, Allah Ta’ala has cast RIJS on their brains and in their hearts.

Covering the face was practiced by all the Ladies of the Sahaabah, not by ‘some’ as the rubbish sexually perverted scholars of Iblees aver. All the Ladies observed this obligatory facet of Hijaab.

### **The Niqaab**

The vile scholars of Iblees, in their bid to scuttle the Wujoob of the Niqaab, say:

*“The discussion on niqāb (face veil) is a secondary topic in this paper and therefore will not be elaborated upon in detail.”*

The covering of the face is of primary importance. The face is the greatest attraction for the commission of zina, hence the Fuqaha have ruled on its *Wujoob* (compulsion). The principle on which this ruling is based is irrelevant. Regardless of it being the effect of *Wujoob lighayrihi*, it is a major sin for a woman to expose her face to ghair mahram males.

It was the permanent practice of the females of the Sahaabah, and for all females in the entire history of Islam to cover their faces. In this age of immorality,

this imperative need has greater emphasis. The attempt to attribute the imperative observance of the Screen and Niqaab to only the noble Wives of Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) is satanic.

The shaitaani plot of the copro-morons is to halaalize intermingling of the sexes. This pernicious exercise therefore requires nullification of the Wujoob of the Screen and Niqaab for the Ummah at large, hence the sinister ploy of arguing to establish exclusivity of these Acts for the Wives of our Nabi (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam).

In this satanic attempt, the rubbish scholars demonstrate breath-taking jahaalat of the *Usool* of Fiqh on which *Ahkaam* are based. Regardless of the first instance for the revelation of the command of the Screen being the noble Wives, it has greater emphasis for all women of this Ummah, hence the principle of *Dalaalatun Nass* establishes *Wujoob* for all the females of this Ummah.

The *Illat* for the Screen and Niqaab are clearly stated by the Qur’aan. The rationale is for the ‘*purity of the hearts which lust contaminates*’. This *Illat* is not exclusive to the noble Wives of our Nabi (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam). The danger of the *fitnah* is a million fold more in other women, hence the obligation of the Screen and Niqaab has greater need and emphasis for all the women of this Ummah. Only ignoramuses intoxicated with lust fail to understand this Shar’i

Hukm. The divinely cast *Rijs* on their brains precludes comprehension of this simple reality.

To achieve their pernicious objective, the copromorons proffer a plethora of technicalities and conflicting views and opinions, then on the basis of the hogwash which they have brewed, they proffer their satanism of permissibility of intermingling. All such technicalities and erroneous views and concepts presented for justifying intermingling are dismissed with contempt. Despite the existence of the conflicting ideas, the Ummah’s practice throughout Islam’s history based on the Qur’aan and Sunnah was strict segregation of the sexes and the covering of the faces.

The logical and Imaani conclusion despite the plethora of conflicting opinions, is that Hijaab for the women of the Ummah is more stringent than the Hijaab of the Holy Wives of Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam), based on the greater *fitnah* concomitant with other women. The *hukm* will have greater emphasis where the *fitnah* of concupiscence is greater. We are in the era of the greatest *fitnah* hitherto known. Nudity, immorality, obscenity, *fisq* and *fujoor* never were on such a massive, intensive and extensive satanic scale as we see in this age. Thus, the argument of the Screen and Niquaab being exclusive for the Holy Wives of our Nabi (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) has been excreted into the brains of these sexual perverts by Iblees.

While the rubbish flotsam copro characters concede that intermingling can lead to adultery, according to them it is only ‘advisable’ to abstain from adultery. Thus in regard to this attitude of breath-taking disdain for the notoriety of such a flagitiously abominable sin of immorality, they say:

*Yet, at the same time, the Lawgiver, in His Wisdom did not prohibit each and every means that could potentially lead to adultery as this would cause great hardship and place impractical restraints on daily life. In between that which is clearly haram in light of the sacred texts and that which is clearly halal, there are grey areas where doubt can arise and should be avoided. In such cases, it is advisable to stay away from adultery by implementing the general maxim that the Prophet (g) has taught us: “Leave that which gives you doubt for that which does not.” (Tirmidhi)*

*There are still other cases where qualified jurists may give a ruling of prohibition (tahrīm) based on the principle of sadd al-dharā’ah, otherwise known as “blocking the means to evil”. This is an ijtihādī principle that scholars sometimes employ when something that might otherwise be permissible has a high likelihood of leading to harām.”*

The Screen, Niqaab and segregation of the sexes as commanded by the Qur’aan and Sunnah are not ‘great hardship’ and ‘impractical restraints on daily life’ as these vile morons allege. This lifestyle of the Ummah did not inhibit any branch of life of the Ummah.

Women refraining from going to a *mal-oon* hall where men and women will mingle, is never a ‘great hardship’ nor is it an ‘impractical’ imposition on women. What is the ‘great hardship’ which these rubbish juhala discern if women do not go to halls and malls to mingle with fussaag, fujjaar and kuffaar?

The reasoning of these deviates is absolutely devious, satanic and putrid. The “Lawgiver”, that is, Allah Azza Wa Jal, in His Command: “*Do not come near to zina*”, has blocked every avenue leading to zina. The claim made by these munaafiqeen is tantamount to kufr. Their brains are overflowing with copro substances. That is why they are able to shrug off the abominability of zina by saying “*In such cases, it is **advisable** to stay away from adultery.*” How can it ever be only ‘advisable’ to stay away from zina when Allah Ta’ala has commanded to stay away from coming even near to zina? This satanic statement reveals the evil in their hearts. How can it ever be only ‘advisable’ to abstain from zina when the Shariah prescribes *Rajm (Stoning to Death), and Whipping* for the perpetrators?

The Qur’aanic command to stay far from factors leading to zina is explicit, emphatic and Fardh. It is not an issue of choice or option assigned to the bestial-carnal nafs of sexual perverts. In all and every case it is Fardh, not ‘advisable’, to abstain from zina.

Intermingling is a stepping stone to zina. However, since the objective of the copro scholars is to halaalize

what Islam has prohibited and what the Ummah has practiced for more than fourteen centuries, these evil characters seek to dilute the command of Allah Ta’ala, viz. “*Do not come near to zina*”. If they achieve their pernicious objective of diluting the imperativeness and Fardhiyat of this Command, the door will open for legalizing the immorality of intermingling.

In the annals of Islam no one has ever minimized and diluted the gravity of the abominability of zina and of the Qur’aanic Command to remain far, very far from all factors leading to zina. These rubbish copro scholars of Iblees are the first agents of Dajjaal who have ventured such kufr.

The command of Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) to abstain from *Mushtabah* (the doubtful) in no way whatsoever dilutes the Fardhiyat of staying far from zina. The copro villains have attempted to utilize this Hadith to water down the compulsion of not coming near to zina. But in reality, this Hadith has absolutely no relevance to the command of not coming near to zina. The Shariah has closed and effectively blocked every conceivable avenue leading to the commission of zina, hence the stringent hijab measures to the extent of it being prohibited to look with desire at even the garments of a woman or to drink from the same glass from which a woman drank, if this is known.

Once a young man came to the shop of Imaam Abu Hanifah (Rahmatullah alayh) and sat on a chair. Imaam Abu Hanifah immediately requested him to vacate the chair, explaining that a short while ago a woman had sat in the chair. Thus, the spiritual effect of her body was still in the chair and this would be harmful for the *roohaaniyat* (spirituality) of the man.

Only a harum-scarum person whose attitude is deeply criminal will venture the name of a personality such as Imaam Abu Hanifah (Rahmatullah alayh) to bolster his necrotic idea of permissibility of intermingling of the sexes and legitimize mixed gatherings of this era which abound with fizzgig females. Indeed these copromolvies are intellectually impuissant which is the effect of the shaitaani disease known Qur’aanically as *Takhabbutush Shaitaan*. They have been driven into madness by the touch of Iblees, hence they fail to understand the villainy of their exercise of attempting to scuttle the Prohibition of intermingling which has been the standing practice of the Ummah since the era of the Sahaabah notwithstanding the seemingly contrary narrations proffered by these *shayaateenul ins* characters. They say that it is ***only advisable to abstain from zina*** because of the rabid degree of their concupiscent lusts.

The notion that the Niqaab is not Waajib which these rubbish copro scholars attribute to Imaam Abu Hanifah (Rahmatullah alayh) and the Fuqaha, is slander hurled at them. The Fiqhi category to which Fuqaha assign the

*ahkaam* does not negate the reality of *amal* (practical implementation) in daily life. While the *aurah* of a man is from the navel to the knees, and while his Salaat with only his *aurah* covered is valid in terms of the technical interpretation of Fiqh, it is practically haraam for him to go to the Musjid nude, with only his *aurah* covered.

Similarly, the technical definition of the female’s *aurah* does not negate the *Wujoob* (compulsion) of the Niquaab. It is haraam for her to appear in the presence of *ghair mahaareem* with her face exposed.

Likewise, the Fiqhi technicality of the validity of three Talaq issued in one breath or one session, does not permit a man to administer three Talaq in a single statement. Availing himself of this Fiqhi technicality is a major sin.

The Fiqhi technicality of the validity of a nikah contracted by a woman in defiance of her father’s prohibition, does not permit her to contract her own nikah. In doing so, she is guilty of a major sin notwithstanding the validity of the nikah according to the Hanafi Math-hab.

The Fiqhi technicality of the permissibility of a wife spending her own wealth as she deems fit does not practically permit her to do so. She has to incumbently consult with her husband in this regard as ordered in the Hadith.

There are innumerable examples of Fiqhi permissibilities – technicalities – which are in conflict with the popular, standing practices of the Ummah since the very inception of Islam. It is pure shaitaanīyat to utilize Fiqhi technicalities to halaalize evil and harmful practices. Such an attempt is a foul venture motivated by despicable objectives of lust and carnality which are glaringly conspicuous in these deviates. They are noted for their haraam dalliances with females under deeni guise. Such is their conduct in girls madrasahs, female gatherings and the like.

Since in terms of their satanic philosophy abstention from zina is *only advisable*, concupiscent conduct being a lesser evil than actual adultery, is halaal for them.

### **A despicable lie attributed to Imaam Abu Hanifah**

The villainous copro scholars of Iblees say:

*“Rather, the purpose is to demonstrate that Imam Abū Hanīfa and his students interpreted the Qur’anic verse as allowing a woman to uncover her hands and face in front of non-mahrams. It is incumbent on the man to lower his gaze if he experiences desire; otherwise, he may look at her. The text goes on to state a similar ruling for a woman looking at a man.”*

This is a monstrous lie peddled falsely in the names of Imaam Abu Hanifah (Rahmatullah alayh) and his

illustrious Students. They did not interpret the Qur’aanic verse to ‘allow’ women to uncover their faces in the presence of non-mahrams. They only stated the Fiqhi order, not what is required in the practical domain.

The incumbency of lowering the gaze for both males and females, is not conditioned on the premiss of experiencing desire as these rubbish agents of Iblees assert. Lowering the gaze is to prevent the development of lust. The existence of lust is indisputable. Even a sexually impotent person is possessed by lust in his mind and heart. A woman’s face is the primary attraction which arouses passion which leads to zina – zina of varying degrees and kinds. It is precisely to curb the developing of lust that the Qur’aan has prescribed the Screen, and it is for this same reason that the Fuqaha have unanimously decreed the *Wujoob* of the Niqaab regardless of the face being excluded from the *aurah*.

The Fuqaha who have explained the *aurah* of the female, which excludes her face and hands, nevertheless have ruled that if looking at even a mahram woman (sister, niece, etc.) arouses passion, then it is not permissible to look at even such a mahram female. This prohibition may not be nullified with the technicality of the non-application of hijaab for mahrams.

The entire rubbish attempt to deny the WujooB of covering the face is debunked in the following discourse of Mufti Aashiq Ilaahi in his Tafseer, *Illuminating Discourses on The Noble Qur'aan*

### ***A REJECTION OF FOOLISH STATEMENTS MADE ABOUT HIJAAB***

Many so-called Muslims who have no regard for the Deen, and who wish to adulterate Islaam are trying to get Muslim women to roam the streets like the immoral women of the west. Certain Egyptian and Indo-Pak writers have penned some notes on these lines.

The only substantiation that they can fabricate is based on the verse:

"They (the women) must not expose their beauty, except what becomes apparent of it."

Since they find the commentary of Hadhrat Abdullaah bin Mas'ood (Radhiyallahu anhu), i.e. (the verse refers to the outer garment of the woman), to be contrary to their whims, these ignorant writers have chosen rather to adopt an interpretation reported from Hadhrat Abdullaah bin Abbaas (Radhiyallahu anhu). He says that it refers to the face and the hands.

They have no valid reason to ignore the interpretation of Hadhrat Abdullaah bin Mas'ood (Radhiyallahu anhu). Rasulullaah (sallallahu-alayhi-wa-sallam)

himself mentioned: *"Hold fast to the religious laws that are told to you by the son of Umm Abd i.e. Hadhrat Abdullaah bin Mas'ood (Radhiyallahu anhu.)."* [Mishkaat Pg. 578]

Rasulullaah (sallallaahu-alayhi-wa-sallam) supplicated that Allaah grants Hadhrat Abdullaah bin Abbaas (Radhiyallahu anhu) the knowledge of the Qur‘aan.

Even if his interpretation is assumed, it does not permit women to roam around as they do. Allaah says that a woman may expose those parts of the body that “become apparent” not those parts that they deliberately expose. Therefore, when a woman exposes her face and emerges from her home, she will be making her face apparent. Her face will not “*become apparent*” by itself (as the verse states).

Another factor to be remembered is that the verse does not discuss exposure of the body to non-mahram men. These people themselves arbitrarily apply the laws to non-mahram men. Hadhrat Abdullaah bin Abbaas (Radhiyallahu anhu) never sanctioned exposure of the face and the hands to non-mahram men. His statement means that a woman is allowed to expose the face and the hands when working in her home and that these may be seen by the mahaarim of the house.

There are also those enemies of chastity who pass rulings that covering of the face is preferable (mustahab) and not Waajib (compulsory). These

ignorant muftis have no understanding of the Qur’aan and Ahadeeth. They do not realise that women will not stop at merely exposing the face, but that they will soon expose much more than this, as can be seen today.

These people have totally misinterpreted the statement of Hadhrat Abdullaah bin Abbaas (Radhiyallahu anhu) to serve their own ends. Their “knowledge” is really ignorance.

### ***THE COMMAND TO ADOPT HIJAAB IN SURAH AHZAAB***

Allaah says in Surah Ahzaab , “So when you ask them for anything, then ask them from behind a curtain. This is purer for your hearts and for their hearts.” What is the necessity for asking from behind a curtain if there was nothing like Hijaab? Women are not wandering naked in their homes, but generally expose only their faces at home. Despite this, Allaah commands non-mahram men to only speak to them from behind a curtain. This clearly indicates that their faces are not to be seen.

This verse is a command which indicates a obligatory act. Furthermore everyone understands that the face is generally the most attractive part of a person.

Allaah also says in Surah Ahzaab, “O Nabi (sallallahu-alayhi-wa-sallam)! Tell your wives, your daughters and the women of the believers that they

should draw down their ‘jalaabeeb’ over themselves. This is best for their recognition so that they are not harmed.”

Hadhrat Abdullaah bin Abbaas (Radhiyallahu anhu) has mentioned that this verse commands all Mu'mineen women to cover their heads and faces with large cloaks (and to expose nothing) except one eye. In this way, they can be recognised as free women (because slave women were not required to be so thorough in covering themselves).

This is that same Hadhrat Abdullaah bin Abbaas (Radhiyallahu anhu) who has mentioned that faces and hands are implied in the verse, "They (the women) must not expose their beauty, except what becomes apparent of it."

Since he has stated that only one eye is to be exposed when a woman leaves her home, it is obvious that he meant to permit exposure of the hands and face only when a woman is at home as mentioned above.

Shaytaan is extremely clever. He has persuaded people to believe that the laws of Hijaab apply only to the wives of Rasulullaah (sallallaahu-alayhi-wa-sallam). However, the above verse of Surah Ahzaab clearly refutes this concept. In fact, any sensible person will realise that if the law was addressed initially to Rasulullaah (sallallaahu-alayhi-wa-sallam)’s wives, it

will then surely apply to other women to a greater degree.

This is so because Allaah has mentioned that Rasulullaah (sallallaahu-alayhi-wa-sallam)’s wives are the "Mothers" of the Mu'mineen. If they were commanded not to draw attention to themselves, it is obvious that women who desire to be attractive and who lack the modesty of Rasulullaah (sallallaahu-alayhi-wa-sallam)’s wives, must also be commanded to preserve their chastity in a similar manner.

### ***THE COMMAND OF HIJAAB IN THE AHADEETH***

Mention has already been made of the incident of the slander against Hadhrat Aa’isha (Radhiyallahu anha). When Hadhrat Safwaan bin Mu’attal (Radhiyallahu anhu) saw her lying on the sand, he exclaimed, "*Innaa Lillahi wa Innaa Ilayhi Raaji'oon!*" She awoke with this and immediately covered her face.

When recounting the incident she mentioned that he had recognised her because he had seen her before the laws of Hijaab were revealed. This clearly indicates that the law of Hijaab included covering of the face as well.

Hadhrat Anas bin Maalik (Radhiyallahu anhu) reports that Hadhrat Umar (Radhiyallahu anhu) once told Rasulullaah (sallallaahu-alayhi-wa-sallam) that he should instruct his wives to observe Hijaab because all types of good and evil people visit him at his home.

Thereafter, the laws of Hijaab were revealed. [Bukhari Pg.706]

This hadith also indicates that the face is to be covered because it’s obvious that Rasulullaah (sallallaahu-alayhi-wa-sallam)’s wives never exposed anything else to the visitors.

Hadhrat Anas bin Maalik (Radhiyallahu anhu) also narrates that many people were invited to Rasulullaah (sallallaahu-alayhi-wa-sallam)’s Walima meal (an invitation to meals hosted by the bridegroom) when he married Hadhrat Zaynab bint Jahash (Radhiyallahu anha). Most people left after eating, but three persons continued to sit behind to talk. Rasulullaah (sallallaahu-alayhi-wa-sallam) was shy to tell them to leave, so he went to Hadhrat Aa’isha (Radhiyallahu anha’s) room.

Hadhrat Anas (Radhiyallahu anhu) says that he later informed Rasulullaah (sallallaahu-alayhi-wa-sallam) that the men had left. Hadhrat Anas (Radhiyallahu anhu) was about to enter the room with Rasulullaah (sallallaahu-alayhi-wa-sallam) as he usually did, because he was a servant, when the Nabi (sallallaahu-alayhi-wa-sallam) drew a curtain between himself and Hadhrat Anas bin Maalik (Radhiyallahu anhu). The verses of Hijaab had then been revealed viz. "O you who believe! Only enter the rooms of the Nabi (sallallaahu-alayhi-wa-sallam) when you are permitted to do so to partake of a meal..." [Bukhari Pg.706/7]

Hadhrat Anas (Radhiyallahu anhu) served Rasulullaah (sallallaahu-alayhi-wa-sallam) for ten years. It is obvious that Rasulullaah (sallallaahu-alayhi-wa-sallam)’s wives never exposed more than their faces to Hadhrat Anas (Radhiyallahu anhu) during the period before the command of Hijaab. Since Rasulullaah (sallallaahu-alayhi-wa-sallam) did not allow Hadhrat Anas to be with him, it is therefore certain that Hijaab entailed the covering of the face as well. The laws of Hijaab were especially meant to conceal faces from men because the other parts of the body had already been concealed from before.

Abu Dawood reports that when the son of Hadhrat Umm Khallaad (Radhiyallahu anha) passed away in a battle, she came to Rasulullaah (sallallaahu-alayhi-wa-sallam) while wearing a veil over her face. A Sahabi asked, "You have come to find out about your son, yet you never failed to remember to cover your face?" She replied, "I have been afflicted with the calamity of losing my son, but will not be afflicted with the calamity of losing my modesty." Rasulullaah (sallallaahu-alayhi-wa-sallam) told her that her son has attained the reward of two martyrs. When she enquired about the reason, Rasulullaah (sallallaahu-alayhi-wa-sallam) said, "Because the Ahlul Kitaab had killed him." [Vol.1 Pg.336]

This hadith also refutes the belief of those who think that the face need not be covered. It also serves as a lesson to those who think that the laws of the Shari’ah

do not apply to one who has been afflicted with any calamity. It is often noticed that women wail excessively when any relative passes away. They then insist on following the janaazah out of the house, totally heedless of the laws of Hijaab. The Shari’ah will always be of paramount importance whether one is suffering from a calamity or whether one is overjoyed about something.

Detailing the laws of Hajj, Rasulullaah (sallallaahu-alayhi-wa-sallam) has mentioned that the woman performing Hajj should not cover her face. This tells us that women used to cover their faces during the time of Rasulullaah (sallallaahu-alayhi-wa-sallam). Women are under the misconception that Hijaab is not necessary during Hajj. Dispelling this misunderstanding, Hadhrat Aa’isha (Radhiyallahu anha) says, "When we were in Ihraam with Rasulullaah (sallallaahu-alayhi-wa-sallam), we would draw our shawls over our faces when any men passed by. We would then remove it when they passed." [Mishkaat Pg. 232]

Another hadith quoted by those who refute Hijaab of the face is one narrated by Hadhrat Asmaa bint Abi Bakr (Radhiyallahu anhu). She narrates that Rasulullaah (sallallaahu-alayhi-wa-sallam) told her, "O Asmaa! When a girl comes of age, nothing should be seen of her except the face and the hands."

The first thing to bear in mind is that the chain of narrators who transmitted this hadith is broken i.e.

some narrators are unknown. This causes the hadith to be unreliable. This hadith also does not specify that non-mahaarim can see these parts of the woman and it could very well refer to her attire at home.

Those who refute the institution of Hijaab want others to be just as immoral as they are. They seem to want their mothers, sisters and daughters to parade in the streets as a passing show for all.

*(End of Mufti Aashiq Ilaahi’s discourse)*

### **The Niqaab – the Face-Cover – The Clarity of the Hadith**

The Discourse of Mufti Aashiq Ilaahi (Rahmatullah alayh) is a synopsis of the View of all the Fuqaha of the Ummah. This has always been the view and practice of the Ummah since the age of the Sahaabah. We shall now mention some Ahaadith which explicitly mention the Niqaab.

Imaam Ahmad (Rahmatullah alayh) narrated: *“Ummul Mu’mineen Aishah (Radhiyallahu anha) said: “Whenever riders would pass by us, we would hang our jilbaab over our faces.”*

In Majmaul Anhaar it is mentioned that Aishah (Radhiyallahu anha) said:

*“The entire body of a free woman is aurah except one eye.”*

Ad-Durrul Manthoor narrates that Ibn Abbaas (Radhiyallahu anhu) said:

*“Allah has commanded the wives of the Mu’mineen that when they emerge from their homes for a need, they should cover their faces from above their heads with jalaabeeb and that they should expose (only) one eye.”*

Bukhaari narrates from Safiyyah Bint Shaibah (Radhiyallahu anha):

*“Verily, Aishah (Radhiyallahu anha) said: When was revealed the Aayat: ‘They should draw their khumur over their bosoms.’, they (women) tore their thicker shawls into two with which to cover their heads and bosoms, i.e. they covered their faces.”*

The fact that they are not allowed to wear Niqaab during the state of Ihraam, is conclusive evidence for the practice of covering the face at other times.

Abu Dawood reports that when the son of Hadhrat Umm Khallaad (Radhiyallahu anha) was martyred in a battle, she came to Rasulullaah (sallallaahu-alayhi-wa-sallam) while wearing a veil over her face. A Sahaabi asked, “You have come to find out about your son, yet you never failed to remember to cover your face?” She replied, “*I have been afflicted with the calamity of losing my son, but will not be afflicted with the calamity of losing my modesty.*”

The norm for women of the Sahaabah when they emerged from their homes for needs, was to thoroughly cover their faces and to leave only one eye exposed. This was not a restriction for only the Holy Wives of Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam).

Whatever the copro characters have excreted in denial of the *Wujoob* of covering the face, is pure conjecture and assumption. Their stupidity is glaringly manifest. While they concede the revelation of Hijaab, they satanically labour to dilute and abrogate the Qur’aanic laws of Hijaab on the fallacious basis of interpreting some episodes mentioned in the Hadith.

Persons of healthy Imaan will interpret contrary narrations to conform with the laws established on the solid basis of the Qur’aan and Ahaadith of the highest category of certitude.

### **Covering the FACE is commanded by the Qur’aan**

In Surah Ahzaab, aayat 59, Allah Ta’ala announces the command of Hijaab/Purdah pertaining to the covering of the entire body, including the head and face. Thus, Allah Ta’ala says:

“O Nabi! Tell your wives, your daughters and the women of the Mu’mineen that they draw over themselves their jalaabeeb (outer-cloaks or shawls)..”

Tafseer Mazhari (as well as other Tafaaseer) describe the *Jilbaab* as follows:

“It is a sheet (or shawl) which a woman wraps around her, on top of her dress and head-scarf (khimaar)... Ibn Abbaas and Abu Ubaidah (radhiyallahu anhuma) said: ‘The women of the Mu’mineen were commanded to conceal their heads and their faces with the jalaabeeb, except one eye.”

Tafseer Ibn Katheer states in its description of the jilbaab:

“Jilbaab is the shawl over the head-scarf (khimaar). This has been stated by Ibn Mas’oud, Ubaidah, Qataadah, Hasan Basri, Saeed Bin Jubair, Ibraaheem Nakh’i, Ataa Khuraasani and others.

Ali Bin Ali Talhah narrates that Ibn Abbaas said: “Allah ordered the women of the Mu’mineen that when they emerge from their home for a need, they should cover their faces from on top of their heads with the jalaabeeb and leave exposed one eye.”

Muhammad Bin Sireen said: “I asked Ubaidah Salmaani about Allah’s statement (viz. they should hang over themselves their jalaabeeb). He then (practically demonstrated) by concealing his face and head, and exposing his left eye.”

Tafseer Abi Sa-ood defines the jilbaab as follows:

“Al-jilbaab: Is a cloth bigger than the khimaar (head-scarf) smaller than the ridaa’ (shawl). A woman covers her with it from on top of the head.

It is said that it is the shawl. It is every garment with which women conceal their faces and their bodies when they emerge (from their homes) for needs. Sadi said that it conceals her one eye, and her face.”

Commenting on the aayat 59 of Surah Ahzaab, Abu Bakr Jassaas says:

“In this verse is the indication that young women have been commanded to conceal their faces from strange males when they emerge.”

Imaam Qurtubi states in his Al-Jami li Akhaamil Qur’aan:

“Since it was the practice of the Arab women to leave their faces open like slave-girls, and this would invite the gazes of men, Allah and His Rasool ordered them (women) to hang down (irkhaa’) the jalaabeeb over them when they intend to emerge for their needs.”

Ibn Abbaas and Ubaidah Salmaani said that it covers a woman so much that only her one eye remains exposed to enable her to see.

All other authoritative books of Tafseer describe the jilbaab and the method of donning it in the same way as mentioned above, i.e. the jilbaab was worn from on top of the head and covered the face as well.

The encyclopaedic LISAANUL ARAB of Ibn Manthur Jamaluddin Muhammad al-Ansaari defines Jilbaab as follows:

“Jilbaab is bigger than the khimaar (the long head-scarf) smaller than the ridaa’ (the outer shawl). The woman conceals with it her head and breast.”

These definitions presented by the authorities of the Shariah are adequate for understanding that the jilbaab is not a garment worn from the neck downwards. Even if it was worn in this fashion prior to the command issued for the observance of PURDAH/HIJAAB (i.e. to conceal the head and face), ayat 59 of Surah Ahzaab ordered women to conceal their heads and faces with their jalaabeeb henceforth. Their style of wearing the jilbaab beyond the home precincts was changed by this ayat of Surah Ahzaab. There is unanimity of the Shar’i authorities on this issue.

It should be further understood that the Arab Muslim ladies (i.e. the Sahaabiyyah or female Sahaabah) were accustomed to don a khimaar and a ridaa’. Khimaar is a big, long head scarf. Ridaa’ is the big sheet which is wrapped around the body. When they ventured out of their homes (i.e. even prior to the revelation of the PURDAH ayat of Surah Ahzaab), their hair, head, breasts and body were well covered. The command to ‘hang over them’ their jalaabeeb will be meaningless, if the purpose was merely to cover the hair. The order would have been redundant since the khimaar already took care of the hair and head. The ridaa’ took care of

the body. But for greater and complete PURDAH with a view to thwart the evil and lustful gazes of the fussaag and munaafiqeen, the command was issued to conceal the face with the jilbaab. And on this score there is copious evidence and the authoritative ruling of the Sahaabah and Fuqaha in general.

In Saheeh Muslim, the jilbaab is described as such a big garment which could be wrapped around two women.

The garment which normally covered the bosoms of the women was the large head-scarf (ornhi) which extended from over the head, down over the bosoms until the waist and even lower down. The Qur’aan Majeed mentions the khimaar distinct from the jilbaab. Thus, in aayat 31 of Surah Noor, the Qur’aan declares: “They should put their khumur (plural of khimaar) over their bosoms....”

With regard to the jilbaab, aayat 59 of Surah Ahzaab commands that they ‘hang their jilbaabs OVER them’. The head is part of ‘them’ and it is the point from which ‘hanging’ of the jilbaab is instructed. Its function is apart from the function of the khimaar. Its primary function is to conceal the FACE while the primary function of the khimaar is to conceal the head and the bosom. After the command was revealed, ladies would cover their faces in varying degrees depending on circumstances. Some covered their faces completely exposing only one eye to enable them to see. This was

the standard way in which the jilbaab was donned. At times both eyes were exposed while some say that the greater part of the face was covered. But there is unanimity among the authorities of the Shariah that the purpose of the jilbaab was to conceal the FACE from the lustful and shaitaani gazes of the fusaq and munaafiqeen and to distinguish the chaste females of Islam from slave-girls and prostitutes.

A jilbaab is an outer sheet or cloak which during the time of Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) was large enough to conceal two women. The way in which the ladies during the time of Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) and the Sahaabah wore the jilbaab covered them from head to feet including the face. The term (yudneena – they should lower or draw down) appearing in the above aayat orders that the cloak be drawn over from above and lowered in such a way as to conceal the face as well. Covering the face outside the home precincts was the standard and normal practice of the womenfolk during the time of Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam). In this regard Hadhrat Aishah (radhiyallahu anha) narrates:

*“During the occasion of Hajjatul Wida when people passed near to us, we (the ladies) would draw the jilbaab over the head and the face. When they (the people) departed from us, we would open our faces”.  
(Abu Dawood)*

Imam Ghazaali (rahmatullah alayh) mentions in Ihyaul Uloom:

*“Women emerged (during the time of Nabi (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) with niqaabs on their faces”.*

In Durrul Mukhtaar, the following verdict of the Shariah is recorded:

*“Young women are compulsorily prohibited from revealing their faces in the presence of men”.*

These narrations are sufficient to indicate that it is an Islamic demand of compulsion for women to conceal their faces when circumstances compel them to leave the home boundaries. This practice of concealing the face was not a later introduction, but existed from the very time of Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam). Certain narrations which indicate that, women appeared in the presence of Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) should not be misconstrued and understood to have been the normal practice. Such narrations pertain to either incidents prior to the revelation of the Law of Hijaab or to special circumstances which were exceptional cases and not the normal rule.

Thus, *jilbaab* was the large outer-garment which completely concealed the FACE. Tafseer Mazhari describing the *jilbaab*, says:

Furthermore, the Arab Muslim ladies (the Sahaabiyyah) were accustomed to don a *khimaar* and *ridaa*’. The *khimaar* is a big, long head scarf and *ridaa*’ is the big sheet/shawl which is wrapped around the body. Even prior to the revelation of the Hijaab aayat of Surah Ahzaab, the Sahaabiyyah would cover their hair, head, breasts and body when they ventured out of their homes. Thus, the command to ‘hang over themselves’ their *jalaabeeb* would be meaningless if the order applied to merely covering the hair. The order would have been an exercise in redundancy since the *khimaar* already took care of the hair on the head while the *ridaa*’ took care of the body.

It was for greater and complete purdah/hijaab that the decree in Aayat 59 of Surah Ahzaab applied. It was for the prevention of the evil/lustful gazes of the fussaag and munaafiqeen that covering the face was commanded.

The garment which normally covered the bosom of a woman was the large head-scarf which extended from above the head, down over the bosom until the waist and even lower. The Qur’aan Majeed mentions the *khimaar* distinct from the *jilbaab*. Aayat 31 of Surah Noor states:

“*They should put their khumur over their bosoms.....*”

While they were required to put their *khumur* over their bosoms, they are commanded in Aayat 59 of Surah Ahzaab to “*hang their jilbaabs OVER them*”. Thus, the

jilbaab is hung from above the head, concealing the head and the face. The function of the *jilbaab* is apart from the function of the *khimaar*. The primary function of the *jilbaab* is to cover the face.

It was only after the revelation of Aayat 59 of Surah Ahzaab that the Ladies would cover their faces when need constrained their emergece from the homes.

In *Ihyaaul Uloom* Imaam Ghazaali (Rahmatullah alayh) says:

*“Women emerged (during the time of the Nabi – Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) with niqaabs on their faces.”*

Ad-Durrul Mukhtaar states:

*“Young women are compulsorily prohibited from exposing their faces in the presence of men.”*

Dispelling and debunking the absolute rubbish of the paper ‘mutahids’ whose satanic mission it is to dismantle the Shariah, Hadhrat Umme Salmah (Radhiyallahu anha) said:

*“When the verse: ‘...they should draw over them their jalaabeeb’, was revealed, the women of the Ansaar would emerge (from their homes covering their faces in such a manner) as if on their heads were crows on account of blackness (of the cloth concealing their faces).” (Abu Dawood)*

## THE PROHIBITION OF WOMEN ATTENDING GATHERINGS AND LECTURES

**The following is the Fatwa of Mufti Kifaayatullah  
(Rahmatullah alayh)**

*Question 1* What ruling do the ‘Ulamaa-e-Deen (Scholars of Religion) give regarding women attending Lecture gatherings. Is it permissible or not?

*Question 2* If on such occasions special arrangements are made for women, where there is Purdah and it is separate —then will such a condition affect the ruling of permissibility or not?

*Question 3* Does the husband have a right to prevent the wife from attending such gatherings or not?

### **Answer to Question 1**

“The Fuqahaa (Islaamic jurists) have ruled on the prohibition of women attending Jamaa’at Salaat, ‘Eid Salaat and attending lecture gatherings. The Books of Fiqh (Islaamic Jurisprudence) clearly state that for women to attend lecture gatherings and Salaat with Jamaa’at and ‘Eid Salaat is Makrooh-e-Tahreemi — and this is close to Haraam.”

*(The Fuqaha say that the consequence of Haraam and Makrooh Tahrimi is the Fire of Jahaanam. For practical purposes, there is no difference between the two technically designated acts, viz. Haraam and Makrooh Tahrimi.*

*In a futile attempt to deny the above-mentioned Fatwa of Mufti Kifayatullah and of the Fuqaha in general, a Tablighi Mufti insipidly asserts in his book:*

*“In this regard there are two groups of Fuqaha. (1) Some Fuqaha said that generally women emerge adorned, perfumed and dressed in gaudy apparel, hence it is Makrooh for them to emerge. On the contrary, most of the Fuqaha say that it is permissible for them to emerge whilst observing the conditions and limits of the Shariah.”*

*This claim is baseless and designed to confuse and mislead. This erroneous subjective view by the Tablighi Mufti is for justifying the haraam women’s jamaats of the Tablighis.*

*That there is consensus of the Fuqaha on the prohibition of women attending public lectures, is stated by many Ulama. In this regard, Mufti Kifayatullah says:*

*“The Ulama have ruled by **consensus** that it is Makrooh-e-Tahreemi for women to attend Salaat in Jamaa’at, and from this, every intelligent person will*

understand that since this is the ruling regarding the Compulsory gatherings (Jamaa’at Salaat) then **there is no way that gatherings of lectures, etc. can ever be permissible.”**

*Furthermore, there is not a single Faqeeh who has prohibited women from **Khurooj (emergence)** for their needs. The dispute does not centre on emergence for needs as allowed by the Nusooos of Shariah. The question being discussed is women going in droves on journeys for tableegh – on women emerging en masse – a development which never existed in Islam and which is fraught with great moral and spiritual disasters.*

*The categorizing of the Fuqaha into two groups on this issue by the Tablighi Mufti is chicanery. All the Fuqaha unanimously state that it is haraam for women to emerge into the public adorned and perfumed, and to attend gatherings ostensibly for listening to lectures. There is no ikhtilaaf on this issue. It is not a group of the Fuqaha who is of this view. There is not a single Faqeeh who maintained that it is permissible for a woman to emerge for her need dressed in her finery, perfumed and adorned. In this age, the very idea of women emerging in the state of ‘tafil’ is repugnant and revolusive. Perfume and dress finery are nowadays incumbent for women when they emerge from their homes.*

*Since reality and values have become inverted and brains thinking upside down, women and their copro*

*male supporters reserve the state of ‘tafil’ to be practiced at home*

*Similarly, there is not a single Faqeeh who said that a woman may not emerge for her needs despite observing the conditions and limits of the Shariah. Since this is not the issue, the Tablighi Mufti is trying to pull wool over the eyes of the public by baselessly categorizing the Fuqaha into two groups. The simple consensus of the Fuqaha is on the prohibition of women attending the Musjid for any and all purposes which include lectures since such emergence was never among their needs.*

*The Fuqaha clearly state that Jamaa’t Salaat is superior to lectures. When emergence for this superior ibaadat is not permissible, the Fuqaha say that to a greater degree will the prohibition apply to lectures which is an act of lesser importance.*

*The Fuqaha unanimously maintain that the conditions which were observed by women during Rasulullah’s era and the then prevailing atmosphere of khair (goodness) no longer applied after the lapse of that noble era. The fitnah and fasaad of the times have been incremental with the passage of time. It is only one who chooses deliberate intransigence or whose Imaan has been eroded by excessive indulgence in fisq and fujoor who says that our current age is not an era of fitnah and fasaad, and that it is possible for droves of women to observe the Shar’i stipulations which had existed*

*ONLY in the era of Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam).*

*Piping his monotonous and baseless theme, the Tablighi Mufti Sahib says: “Those Fuqaha who have said that emergence is Makrooh, they themselves have permitted Khurooj elsewhere.”*

*This is precisely what we are saying. But the Mufti Sahib is presenting it in a manner to confuse and to create the impression that the Fuqaha who permit Khurooj, do so for purposes of lectures and Salaat. But this is blatantly false. It is subjective obfuscation intentionally designed to cater for the haraam act of female emergence which the Tablighis promote.*

*We have earlier mentioned that **all** the Fuqaha permit Khurooj for Shar’i needs. Thus, the Fuqaha who permit Khurooj do not permit it for lectures and Salaat. The impression traded by the Tablighi Mufti Sahib is that some Fuqaha had at one time prohibited women from attending public lectures, and at another time permitted them. This idea is a false and deceptive narrative spun by the Mufti.*

*The Tablighi Mufti further adds: “Those Fuqaha who have prohibited, did so for observing the right of the husband. But, if the husband himself is with, then the prohibition is waived.”*

*This is another fork tongued deception or it could be attributed to misapplication of the mind. The ‘right of*

*the husband’ never transcends the Right of the Shariah. In fact the husband does not have a Shar’i right to condone the haraam acts of his wife. Both will be accursed for committing haraam. The Fuqaha unanimously state that even the husband will be sinful if he permits the khurooj of his wife in times and ways of fitnah. The husband has no right to permit his wife or to accompany his wife into the world of fitnah and fasaad for a purpose which the Shariah does not impose on women.*

*The prohibition of the Fuqaha on which exists consensus is unrelated to the imagined husband’s right. The husband has the right to prohibit his wife from emerging for even a perfectly **halaal** purpose, and it is obligatory on her to obey him despite violation of her right. For any violation, Allah Ta’ala will hold the husband responsible, but the wife has to incumbently obey as long as her obedience does not clash with the Shariah.*

*The prohibition pivots on the fitnah and fasaad of the times – the fitnah of men, the fitnah of women, and the fitnah in the public domain. All of this is unrelated to the right of the husband.*

*Another conspicuously baseless and insipid argument presented by the Tablighi Mufti Sahib, is his claim: “Some Fuqaha have in our age prohibited women from attending the lectures of jaahil (lecturers). They have not issued a total prohibition.”*

*This deception is also debunked by Mufti Kifayatullah in his Fatwa in which he clearly states that even if the lecturer is a genuine and a pious Aalim, then too it is prohibited for women to attend his lectures because khurooj in times of fitnah is not permissible for this purpose. The factor of the jaahil lecturer is simply an aggravating element which places greater emphasis on attending such lectures. In fact, it is not permissible for even men to attend lectures by juhala, fussiaaq and fujaar lecturers, especially the facebook, television and radio-type molvis and sheikhs of this age. The Tablighi Mufti Sahib’s entire argument is utterly baseless and deceptive. – The Majlis*

Continuing with his Fatwa, Mufti Kifayatullah says:

“And the proof of this ruling is the following Hadeeth narrated by Hadhrat ‘Aishah (radhiyallaahu ‘anha) which appears in Bukhaari Shareef:

“Hadhrat ‘Aishah (radhiyallaahu ‘anha) is reported to have said that had the actions perpetrated by the women of today been prevalent during the time of Rasulullaah (Sallallaahu ‘Alayhi Wasallam) then he most certainly would have prevented them (women) from the Masjid, just as the women of Banees Israaeel were prevented.”

The narrator of this Hadeeth further states,

“I asked Hadhrat Aishah (radhiyallaahu ‘anha) if they (women of Banees Israaeel) were prevented from

attending the Masaajid?” She replied, “Yes.”  
(Bukhaari)

From this Hadeeth it is quite clear that during the era of the Sahaabah (radhiyallaahu ‘anhum) the condition of the women had degenerated to such a state that their emergence from their homes and their attending the Masjid for Salaat was a cause of Fitnah (mischief). Thus, Hadhrat ‘Aishah (radhiyallaahu ‘anha) and other prominent Sahaabah (radhiyallaahu ‘anhum) prevented women from attending the Jamaa’at Salaat.

‘Allaamah ‘Aini (rahmatullaahi ‘alayh) states in his kitaab, *Umdatul Qaari*, which is a commentary of the Saheeh Bukhaari – regarding that Hadeeth in which is mentioned that women used to attend the ‘Eid Salaat during the lifetime of Rasulullaah (Sallallaahu ‘Alayhi Wasallam),

“The Ulama have stated that the women during the lifetime of Rasulullaah (Sallallaahu ‘Alayhi Wasallam) used to attend ‘Eid Salaat because that was an era wherein there was goodness and blessings and there was no fear of Fitnah. However, in these times a woman is most certainly not allowed to attend. It is for this reason that Hadhrat Aishah (radhiyallaahu anha) said that ‘had Nabee (Sallallaahu ‘Alayhi Wasallam) seen the condition of the women of today he would most surely have prevented them from attending the Masjid, just as the women of Banee Israaeel were prevented.’

This statement of Hadhrat ‘Aishah (radhiyallaahu ‘anhaa) was not long after the demise of Rasulullaah (Sallallaahu ‘Alayhi Wasallam). However, today – we seek protection in ALLAAH – consent can never be given for the emergence of women (from their homes) for either ‘Eid or other Salaats.”  
(Aini - Sharah Bukhaari)

Since Allaamah Aini (rahmatullaahi ‘alayh) mentions that in his era the condition of women had deteriorated to such a (lewd) level, then may Allaah Ta’ala save us (from the fitnah of our present age). In our era (which is the 15<sup>th</sup> Islamic century), the degenerate condition of women (*as well as of men*) is beyond description!

Allaamah Aini (rahmatullaahi ‘alayh) states in another place in his kitaab, “Umdatul Qaari”,  
“The ruling of our companions is that which the author of Bada’i has stated – whereupon there is a consensus of opinion that a woman cannot attend ‘Eid or Jumu’ah Salaat. In fact she is prohibited from attending any/all Salaat. This ruling is based on the Aayat of the Qur-aan (regarding women) – *‘And remain steadfast (glued) to your homes.’* The emergence of women from their homes is a cause of Fitnah.”

(Aini and Bada’i Page 275, Vol 1)

It is further stated in Bada’i,  
“Women are not allowed to attend Salaat with Jamaa’at – the proof is in that narration of Hadhrat ‘Umar

(radhiyallaahu ‘anhu) wherein he prohibited women from emerging from their homes.

The prohibition was for the reason that their emergence is a cause of Fitnah – and Fitnah is Haraam – therefore whatever leads to Fitnah also becomes Haraam.”

(Bada’i page 157, Vol 1)

It is stated in Fataawaa-e-Hind (known as Fataawaa-e-Aalamgiri),

“The Fatwaa (ruling) of these times is that it is impermissible for women to attend any Salaat because this is an era of social decay and mischief (Fitnah and Fasaad).”

(Fataawaa Aalamgiri Page 93, Vol 1)

It is said in the Kitaab, Bada’i,

“The Shar’ee ruling regarding women is that women are placed in the service of their husbands, and they are (according to Shariah) prevented from attending the gatherings of men, because the emergence' of women from the home is a means of Fitnah, and it is for this reason that there is no Jamaa’at or Jumu’ah Salaat for them.”

(Bada’i, Page 258, Vol 1)

From the foregoing texts, it is ascertained that for women to attend the five daily Salaat, ‘Eid- Salaat and Jumu’ah Salaat is Makrooh-e-Tahreemi and their emergence from their homes is a means of Fitnah. This prohibition was sanctioned by Hadhrat Umar, Hadhrat

‘Aaeeshah, ‘Urwah bin Zubair, Qaasim, Yahyaa bin Sa’eed Ansaari (radhiyallaahu ‘anhum), Imaam Maalik and Imaam Abu Yusuf (rahmatullaahi ‘alayhim). The ‘Ulama have reached a consensus of opinion on this matter (that women should not leave their homes). This is clear from the texts of Aini and Bada’i.

Notwithstanding the fact that during the era of Nabee (Sallallaahu ‘Alayhi Wasallam) women used to attend the five daily Salaat (in the Masjid) and the ‘Eid and Jumu’ah Salaats, and these Salaats with Jamaa’at are compulsory congregations and they are from amongst the salient features (Shi’aar) of Islaam, but due to the difference of eras and the changing of conditions, the Sahaabah-e-Kiraam (radhiyallaahu ‘anhum) and the great and learned ‘Ulama (Rahmatullaahi ‘alayhim) of Islaam have ruled on the prohibition of women attending even these gatherings. The Ulama have ruled by consensus that it is Makrooh-e-Tahreemi for women to attend Salaat in Jamaa’at, and from this, every intelligent person will understand that since this is the ruling regarding the Compulsory gatherings (Jamaa’at Salaat) then **there is no way that gatherings of lectures, etc. can ever be permissible.**

Firstly, nowadays most lecture gatherings are such that, let alone women, it is not even permissible for men to attend them, because most speakers/lecturers' who are regarded as Molvis, have scanned through a couple of Islaamic reference books and have become orators. (*In our current age, they are the likes of Menk, Solomon*

*Moolla, Reverend Abraham Bham, and many other copro-moron characters masquerading as ulama – The Majlis).*

Then in their lectures, besides a few stories, some half-true narrations and fabricated tales, (*and bootlicking promotions – The Majlis*), there is nothing else. It is not permissible for anyone to attend these types of lectures.

Then again some speakers are not even Molvis, but because their means of livelihood is to give bayaans (lectures) and to please the masses is their objective, so for their benefit they formulate their lectures upon generally accepted topics. They terminate their lectures with some stories in order to satisfy the listeners. To add some 'spice' to their talk they add a few incidents regarding the Auliya-e-Kiraam (pious predecessors). They relate a few concocted narrations, thereby displaying their stupidity and incompetence. It is not beneficial to attend talks of such “Molvis”, and it is not permissible for men or women to attend these lecture programmes.

*(This prohibition of listening to the lectures of ‘molvis’ and ‘shaikhs’ masquerading as Ulama, applies to a greater degree to the ‘molvis’, muftis’ and shaikhs’ who appear on the immoral media such as facebook, television and radio stations of shaitaan. And, remember that all so-called ‘islamic’ radio stations, are haraam appendages of Iblees. There is no exception. It is not permissible to listen to the talks of*

*these scoundrels pretending to be men of the Deen. They corrupt the Imaan and ruin the Akhlaaq of the masses. – The Majlis.)*

Continuing, Mufti Kifaayatullah says:

Now there remain a few ‘Ulama who in the true sense are learned men imbued with knowledge. Their objective in giving lectures is the dissemination, teaching and propagating of the Deen. Their objective is not to attain the dunya (worldly benefits). Their talks are free from nonsensical stories, half-true narrations etc.

It is Jaaiz (permissible) for men to attend such talks, **but not women, because, since it is not permissible for women to attend the Masjid for Salaat then all the more it is not permissible for them to attend a lecture, be it a good talk. The Fuqaha of Islam have explicitly ruled on this.**

Numerous reliable rulings (Fataawaa) regarding this matter are clearly mentioned and available. A few are mentioned hereunder for the benefit of the reader.

“And women should not attend the Jamaa’at (Salaat), taking into consideration the Aayat of the Qur’aan – ‘*And remain steadfast (glued) to your homes,*’ and the Hadeeth of Rasulullaah (Sallallaahu Alayhi Wasallam) that the Salaat of a woman in the innermost corner of her house is better than her Salaat in the courtyard of

the house, and her Salaat in the courtyard of her house is better than her Salaat in the Masjid, and her house is better for her than the Masjid. The author of the kitaab, *Kanzud-Daqaaiq*, says in the kitaab, *Kaafi*, that the Fatwa (ruling) of this era is that it is impermissible for women to attend any/all Salaat (in the Masjid) because of social decay and immorality being common. And when it is not permissible for women to attend the Masjid for Salaat, **then to attend Lecture gatherings, especially the lectures of such ignorant speakers, who pose as ‘Ulama, is all the more not permissible.”**

(Bahur Ra’iq Page 380)

Allaamah Badruddeen Aini (rahmatullaahi ‘alayh) states in *Sharah-e-Kanz*:

“Women, be they young or old, are prohibited from attending the Masjid for Jamaa’at Salaat because this is an era of social decay and immorality.”

It is reported from Imaam Abu Haneefah (rahmatullaahi alayh) that it is permissible for old ladies to attend Fajr, Maghrib and Eshaa Salaats. Saahibain (Imaam Abu Yusuf and Imaam Muhammad) and the other 3 Imaams (Maalik, Shaaf’i and Ibn Hambal -- (rahmatullaahi ‘alayhim) say old ladies can attend all Salaats. However, the ruling of these times is that old and young women are all prohibited from attending Salaat in Jamaa’at. And the author is also of the opinion that Jumu’ah, ‘Eid and Istisqaah Salaats and **Lecture gatherings are all included in this**

**prohibition**, specifically those lectures of persons posing as ‘Ulama whose object is to satisfy their desires and to earn worldly benefits.’ (*Such as the facebook, television and radio scoundrels who are shaitaan-incarnate. Today even old hags simulate the ways and styles of young women, hence they too come within the purview of the prohibition. – The Majlis*) (Aini Sharah Kanz, Page 39)

It is stated in “Durrul Mukhtaar”,  
“It is not permissible for women to attend Salaat in congregation, whether it be Jumu’ah or ‘Eid Salaat or a **Lecture, even if she is old and it is night time. This is the final ruling (regarding this Mas-alah).** This ruling is given due to the present (lamentable) state of social immorality.” (Durrul Mukhtaar, Page 397, Vol. 1)

From the texts of (major kitaabs such as) – Bahur Ra’iq, Aini Sharah of Kanzud-Daqaq’iq and Durrul Mukhtaar, it can be clearly seen and ascertained that **it is Makrooh (Tahrimi) and impermissible for women to attend gatherings of lectures**, specifically those lectures where the object (of the speaker) is to earn worldly benefits; that is if the lecturer is an ignorant person or one whose livelihood is (to lecture), then to attend such gatherings is undoubtedly impermissible. There is no question regarding this.

**For women to attend gatherings of ‘Ulama and good lectures is also impermissible due to this being an age of social immorality (Fitnah).**

Mullah ‘Ali Qaari (rahmatullaahi ‘alayh) states in Mirqaat (The Sharah – commentary – of Mishkaat):

“Our beloved Nabee (Sallallaahu ‘Alayhi Wasallam) had prevented women from visiting the graves, hence, this prohibition can be used as a basis for logical analogizing that neither old women who apply perfume or beautify themselves, nor young women who don even ordinary garb, are allowed to attend the Masaajid because their **emergence from their homes, is in itself a Fitnah.**”

(Mirqaat Sharah-e-Mishkaat, Page 470, Vol 1)

From this and preceding texts, it is clearly ascertained that **emergence of women from their homes, and their participation in the Jamaa’at is a sure cause of Fitnah, and the ruling of prohibition is for the prevention of this Fitnah.** The visiting of graves, ‘Eid, Jumu’ah and Istisqaah Salaats and **Lectures** are all included within the ambit of this prohibition.

It is established that young women, whether they emerge adorned or ordinarily clad (without perfume and finery), in all instances their emergence (from their homes) is not permissible. And even though there appears to be a concession in some narrations for the emergence of old women for Fajr, Maghrib and Eshaa

Salaats, on condition that they are not adorned in any way, the final ruling (Muftaa Bihi) on this matter is that even they (old ladies) are not allowed to emerge from their homes. (*Because they act like young women oblivious of their hag status*) -*The Majlis*)

This is clearly proven from the texts of Allaamah Aini’s (rahmatullaahi ‘alayh) Sharah-e-Kanz and Durrul Mukhtaar.

If the Lecture gatherings include poems (nazams) which appeal to the passions of people, then the ruling regarding the attendance of women at these gatherings is not such that any knowledgeable person will have any doubt or hesitation regarding it (i.e. its prohibition). Hadhrat Anas (radhiyallaahu ‘anhu) has reported that Nabee (Sallallaahu Alayhi Wasallam) had a caravan leader (one who leads/drives the camels by singing to them). His name was Anjasha and he had a beautiful voice. Nabee (Sallallaahu ‘Alayhi Wasallam) said to him: “*Hold on (i.e. sing softly); do not break the glass.*” Hadhrat Qataadah (radhiyallaahu anhu) said that by “glass” Nabee (Sallallaahu Alayhi Wasallam) meant the (fragility of) women.

(Mishkaat, Page 410)

Maulana Shaykh ‘Abdul Haqq Dehlwi (rahmatullaahi ‘alayh) explains this Hadeeth saying, “Nabee (Sallallaahu Alayhi Wasallam) gave Anjasha the order to lower his voice, because Nabee (Sallallaahu ‘Alayhi Wasallam) feared that the hearts of the women

(accompanying them) would be passionately affected (by this voice), thereby giving rise to a Fitnah, since the will-power of women is weak and their hearts are easily influenced by such things.” (Lam'aat, also in Footnote of Mishkaat)

From this Hadeeth we ascertain that Nabee (Sallallaahu Alayhi Wasallam) prevented a person from reciting a poem in a melodious voice because women were also present with them and Nabee (Sallallaahu Alayhi Wasallam) feared that because of the melodious voice some evil thoughts may enter the hearts, and this may lead to Fitnah. Hence, if Nabee (Sallallaahu Alayhi Wasallam) had this fear even in his own era when all were awed, influenced and aware of his Mubaarak presence, that the womenfolk may be negatively affected by a sweet voice, then what is the position of the women of today?

Similarly, just as it is Haraam for men to listen to the singing of Ghair Mahram (strange) women, so too is it Haraam for women to listen to the singing of Ghair Mahram men.

It is not permissible for women to attend such gatherings where poems are recited in melodious voices and where singing takes place. (*especially the qawwaali and nasheed singing which the juhala molvis of our age have introduced in the Musaajid – The Majlis*)

## Answer to Question 2

Regarding special arrangements for women to be accommodated separately at lecture gatherings, the question is: Will it then be permissible for women to attend these gatherings or not?

The reply is: **That the very emergence of women from their homes is in itself impermissible.** And in this emergence, due to there being a possibility of Fitnah, most Fuqahaa (Islamic Jurists) have given the ruling of **absolute impermissibility**. Also, the Fuqahaa have given the ruling of impermissibility for women to attend Salaat with Jamaa’at, **Lectures**, Jumu’ah and ‘Eid Salaat, because this leads to Fasaad (immorality/mischief). This is clearly ascertained from the above mentioned Ahaadeeth.

And in the narration of Hadhrat Aishah (radhiyallaahu anhaa) the words **ما أحدث النساء** (i.e. the /actions which women have created, also emphasise this point.

Also in the narration (Abu Dawood, Page 84, Vol 1) **فيأخذنه دخل** (i.e. they will falsify/corrupt the matter) the object is this, that if women are permitted to emerge from their homes, then they will use this as an excuse, and from behind this cover they will fulfil all their desires. If this possibility was not considered by the Fuqahaa, the matter would be quite simple to solve. They would have ruled that in the Masaajid a separate arrangement should have been made (with Purdah) for

women. The Fuqahaa would not have prohibited the attendance of women from the Masaajid and **Lecture** gatherings. But no Faqeeh (Islaamic Jurist) has written this alternative (of separate ladies facilities) in any kitaab, viz., to provide separate accommodation for women in the Masaajid or allow them to attend the Jamaa’at Salaat.

*(‘Separate’ ladies facilities’ is a gigantic farce. It is a trap of immoral scoundrel ulama-e-soo’ to lure women out of their homes, and to impress them with stupid flamboyance which the buffoon molvis and shaikhs display in their talks specifically designed to attract the attention of the ladies. – The Majlis)*

It is conspicuously evident that they (Fuqahaa) have understood that the **emergence of women is the vehicle of Fasaad (moral corruption)**, and have thus **prohibited the emergence from the home** (*as commanded by the Qur’aan*). And for this reason most Fuqahaa have in their texts at this juncture, used the word **“Khurooj”** (emergence) to explain this Mas-alah.

The undermentioned Hadeeth further emphasises the subject matter (under discussion):

Hadhrat Ibn Mas'ood (radhiyallaahu anhu) reported that Nabee (Sallallaahu ‘Alayhi Wasallam) said:

“A woman is (an object of) concealment; whenever she leaves the home, shaytaan surreptitiously pursues her (lies in wait).” (Tirmidhi)

In this Hadeeth Rasulullaah (Sallallaahu ‘Alayhi Wasallam) has clearly indicated that the **emergence of a woman from her home is an avenue for Fitnah**, and that shaytaan surreptitiously pursues her, so that he may mislead her to some undesirable place, or that he may mislead some man to be attracted to this woman, and Fitnah will then spread.

Reflect, once again on the Hadeeth reported in “Bahrur Ra’iq”, which we have mentioned earlier, wherein Nabee (Sallallaahu ‘Alayhi Wasallam) said that a woman’s Salaat is best which is read in the innermost corner of her house compared to her Salaat in her courtyard, and that Salaat read in her courtyard is better than Salaat in the Masjid. Why is this.? Only for this reason, that a woman in her home, with the best concealment and peace of mind, to whatever degree further she remains (concealed), that much further is she from Fitnah. It is for this reason that Nabee (Sallallaahu ‘Alayhi Wasallam) said, “their (women’s) homes are best for them.”

Hence, it is established that the **emergence of women from their homes is a cause of Fitnah. It is for this reason that to make Purdah arrangements at Lecture gatherings is of no benefit, and there will be no effect by it being made permissible.** Otherwise it will then become incumbent to make separate arrangements in the Masaajid, for women to attend the Salaat and join in the Jamaa’at (congregation), and permission will have to be granted for this as well, as a

matter of priority. But this is not established from any kitaab.

*(Separate, so-called ‘purdah’ arrangement’ is a dastardly deceptive snare of Iblees in which almost all the molvis and sheikhs of this age are entrapped. They bamboozle themselves with the satanism of ‘separate ladies facilities’. There is no such thing as ‘separate ladies facilities’. It is a subtle, cunning ploy of shaitaan whom all these ‘separatist’ molvis and sheikhs follow. They are the mureeds of Iblees. –The Majlis)*

Continuing his Fatwa, Mufti Kifaayatullah says:

Now, let us examine the next possibility, that is of strange men looking at women. Although this possibility appears to be removed if separate arrangements are made for women at Lecture gatherings, however, when one considers the reality of the situation, one knows full well that the purdah facilities at Lecture gatherings also do not remove this possibility. Many such careless opportunities arise when the gazes of strange men fall on the women. Those who participate in these types of gatherings will bear testimony to this fact.

Even if we accept that the purdah facilities at Lecture gatherings are such that they prevent the gazes of strange men falling on women, then the possibility of women’s gazes falling on strange men is certainly not removed in such instances. The women from behind

the purdah peep at and observe all the people at the gathering. And this ‘sickness’ is common amongst women of today, probably two to four women in a generation are exceptions to this rule. In fact, this estimate may also be too high. Hence this avenue of Fitnah is not in any way removed if separate accommodation is arranged for women at Lectures.

In fact, this type of purdah in reality provides an ideal opportunity for women to gaze and peep at strange men. This fact cannot be refuted by any level-headed, just believer. This should be remembered that just as it is Haraam for a man to gaze at a strange woman, similarly it is Haraam for women to gaze at strange men. Therefore, it is mentioned in the following Hadeeth that:

Hadhrat Umm-e-Salmah (radhiyallaahu ‘anhaa) reports that she and Hadhrat Maymoonah (radhiyallaahu ‘anhaa) were in Rasoolullaah’s (Sallallaahu ‘Alayhi Wasallam) company when Hadhrat Abdullah Ibn Maktoom (radhiyallaahu ‘anhu) a blind Sahaabi, came to visit Nabee (Sallallaahu ‘Alayhi Wasallam). Nabee (Sallallaahu ‘Alayhi Wasallam) said to his wives, “Adopt purdah (i.e. conceal yourselves).” Umm-e-Salmah (radhiyallaahu ‘anhaa) says, “I said, ‘O Rasoolullaah (Sallallaahu ‘Alayhi Wasallam), he is blind, and cannot see us.” Nabee (Sallallaahu ‘Alayhi Wasallam) replied: “Are the two of you also blind, can you not see him..?”

(Ahmad, Tirmidhi, Aboo Dawood, Mishkaat)

This Hadeeth clearly demonstrates that it is Haraam for women to look at strange men. That is why Nabee (Sallallaahu ‘Alayhi Wasallam) gave his two wives the order to make purdah.

“It was the method of the Sahaabah-e-Kiraam (radhiyallaahu ‘anhum) to cover the holes and gaps in the walls of their homes, so that their women-folk were not able to peep at strange men.”

Hadhrat Mu'aaz (radhiyallaahu ‘anhu) once saw his wife peeping through a hole in the wall, and he admonished her. Therefore it is appropriate that a man do this, and that he prevents his women-folk from carrying out such undesirable actions.”

(Majaalisul Abraar, Page 563)

Hence, this much is very clearly illustrated that the “purdah” facilities at Lecture gatherings etc., are of no benefit. And this customary “purdah”, which is only in name, definitely does not remove the possibility of Fitnah. Especially if we consider the first possibility of Fitnah (i.e. **the emergence from the home**) then most certainly these (i.e. purdah facilities) do not even have any validity (*for legalizing khurooj of women*) – if the first possibility is removed – because the **primary and principal cause (of Fitnah) is the emergence from the homes.**

The second possibility (i.e. of men seeing the women) is also not removed if separate accommodation is made for women, due to negligence and acting without restraint (on the nafs).

The third possibility (i.e. women seeing the men) is most certainly not removed by separate facilities, taking into consideration the present condition and habits of women (*as well as the habits of the men. The current rotten state of affairs prevailing at all the Musaaajid with their so-called ‘separate’ ladies facilities loudly testify to the villainy and immorality of both men and women. – The Majlis*

Now, one should be objective and just, and consider exactly what the effects would be if permission is granted (for separate accommodation for the ladies)? At this juncture we should also consider the following: Why is separate accommodation arranged for women at Lecture gatherings? Special arrangements are being made for women to attend Lecture gatherings, whilst no arrangement is made for them to join the Jamaa’at Salaat at the Masaajid. Is there any reason for this?

If we set aside the intentions of the lecturer/speaker (i.e. we assume he has good intentions), then it will be a matter of giving preference and priority to the one over the other, namely, that Lectures hold preference over Jamaa’at Salaat. This concept or notion is completely spurious and false.

And if we consider the intentions of the speaker, that by allowing women he would be benefitting more in that his desires of accumulating more wealth (i.e. by donations, fees, etc.) will be more speedily achieved, (*and that the females would be emotionally attracted to him – The Majlis*), then this would be another reason to add to those already outlined above. All of this emphasize the impermissibility of women attending Lecture gatherings.

*(Since during the time of Mufti Kifayatullah Sahib, women NEVER attended the Masjid for Salaat, he presented this argument. However, today, the shamelessness and audacity of women and the immorality of men have multiplied manifold, hence so-called, farcical ‘separate’ ladies facilities’ are provided at most Musajid for women for Salaat purposes. Shaitaan entraps people by degrees. He is not stupid, at least not as stupid as the molvis and sheikhs who lure women out of their homes in diametric contradiction of the Qur’aanic and Hadith prohibition.*

*In our age, the disease of ogling by both men and women and even worse, is entrenched in the hearts and minds of those attending such mixed gatherings with their so-called separate ladies facilities. Women come in droves driving cars. They park alongside the males. There are no separate parking facilities. They alight from their vehicles in full view of the fussiaaq and fujaar males. Furthermore, these women stink of zina*

*perfume. They mingle outside the venue and with a massive hyperbolic self-deceptive attitude of abiding by purdah injunctions do they enter the venue by separate doors. They fool only themselves whilst Iblees mocks them. – The Majlis)*

### **Answer to Question 3**

Does the husband have the right to prevent his wife from attending Lecture gatherings or not?

The answer to this question is that in the foregoing discussion, this much was established, that it is not permissible for women to attend Lecture gatherings. Hence, the husband has, as a matter of priority, the right to prevent his wife from attending. The husband has the right, owing to the rulings of the Jurists of Islaam, to prevent his wife leaving the house even to enquire about necessary Masaa-il, on condition that he enquires from the ‘Ulama (what she needs to know), and informs her.

If the husband does not enquire about the relevant Masaa-il himself, then ONLY in matters of EXTREME URGENCY, when the occasion arises, can the wife leave the home (*like a smelly old hag –The Majlis*) and enquire regarding the need in question, provided of course that her enquiry be of a necessary nature.

The rulings of the jurists follow hereunder:

“The husband has this right to prevent his wife from attending gatherings of Knowledge, unless such an occasion arises (where she needs a ruling (Mas-alah) and her husband does not obtain it for her (i.e. If the need is immediate and the husband is neither available nor does he make an effort to ask an ‘Aalim), then under such circumstances she may leave the house to enquire from a learned person.” (Raddul Mukhtaar, Page 683, Vol 2) *(However, in our present age, even such a genuine need does not permit her emergence from the home. The methods of e-mail, cellphone, etc. are available to every person in this age – The Majlis)*

“If no URGENT NEED arises and the wife needs to know about Wudhu or Salaat etc. and she wants to go out of the house to enquire regarding this, then the husband has the right to prevent her, provided that he knows the Mas-alah and shows her (or he enquires from an ‘Aalim and informs her).” (Raddul Mukhtaar, Page 683, Vol 2)

“Unless, an urgent need arises where a woman finds it IMPERATIVE to leave the house in order to enquire about it, it is NOT PERMISSIBLE to leave the house. And if she leaves the house without the husband's permission, then all the angels in the skies, and also all objects she passes by, except mankind and jinn, curse her.” *(And the husband too is sinful for allowing her emergence) –The Majlis)*

‘Allaamah Ibn Humaam (rahmatullaahi ‘alayh), author of “Fathul Qadeer”, states that on those occasions when a woman is allowed to leave the home (strictly Shar’ee reason), then too it should be done in such a manner that she adopts no beautification or fanciness, and emerges from her house in such a condition that no man even desires to look at her nor is his heart inclined towards her.” (*She should effectively transform herself into a smelly old-hag according to the Hadith of Rasulullah – sallallahu alayhi wasallam – and the Rulings of all the Fuqaha of all Math-habs. – Mujlisul Ulama*) (Majaalisul Abraar, Page 563)

Hence, from the foregoing, this much is established that the husband holds the right to prevent his wife from attending Lecture gatherings, since it is NOT PERMISSIBLE for a woman to attend Lecture gatherings etc. in the first place, and it is his OBLIGATORY DUTY to prevent her from impermissible and undesirable acts. (Allaah Knows Best)

*(End of Mufti Kifaayatullah’s discourse)*

Thus, the claim denied by the copro-juhhaal, viz.,

*“Therefore, unrestricted assertion to the contrary—such as the claim that “teaching and lecturing adult females without a barrier or screen” makes someone a fāsiq (open sinner) – is not justified.”*

is thoroughly debunked and dumped into the sewerage rat-drain.

In addition to the claim of such vile molvis/sheikhs who sit in a female audience without screen/barrier being fussiaaq and fujjaar, the denial of the screen command is *kufr*, and likewise is the ‘eye contact’ permissibility *kufr*. Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) said: “*The eyes commit zina.*”, hence believing ‘eye contact’ with the opposite sex to be halaal is *kufr*.

### **A ludicrous copro ‘daleel’**

When brains are corrupted with lust and the desire is to give expression to the nafs under cover of the deen, then mindboggling stupidities are proffered as ‘daleel’.

One of baseless and ridiculous arguments of stupidity presented by these miscreants is an act of Fisq committed shamelessly by Mufti Taqi Usmani. Since he is a Mufti, the copro mongrels deemed it appropriate to proffer the Fisq of the Mufti with the idea that his seniority will succeed to hoodwink Muslims. Thus the miserable deviates say:

*“To illustrate these principles in a practical context, consider a 2019 interview conducted in Moscow with Mufti Taqi Usmani on Islamic finance.*

*\* The interview was led by a Muslim woman who was properly dressed, wearing a hijab.*

*\* Mufti Taqī maintained eye contact with the interviewer and kept the conversation courteous and gentle, yet the interaction adhered strictly to the fundamental principles we have discussed, ensuring that none were violated.*

*\* The setting was carefully managed: There was a respectful distance maintained between the interviewer and Mufti Taqī with no physical contact whatsoever.*

*\* The conversation itself remained entirely professional, focused on the subject matter at hand.*

*\* The presence of a cameraman and the public nature of the setting further ensured that there was no possibility of khalwa, as others were likely present.”*

Since when is Mufti Taqi a ‘daleel’ to override the Qur’aan which commands:

*“When you ask them (women) something, then ask from behind a **SCREEN**. That is purer for you and purer for them.”?*

Since when does the nafs of Mufti Taqi not require the protection of the Screen, when it was Fardh for the Pious Wives of Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) and the noble Sahaabah to be separated by a Screen? Since when is the Qur’aanic SCREEN not a requisite for the purity of Mufti Taqi’s nafs, when it was an imperative requisite for the purity of the hearts of the Holy Wives and the Sahaabah?

Mufti Taqi’s flagrant disregard of the Qur’aan’s command pertaining to the Screen, his shaitaani and

nafsaani eye-contact with the faasiqah-faajirah woman, his ‘courteous’ chatter with her, her alluring chatter with him and the presence of the camera man to take haraam pictures are the major sins which render the Mufti *persona non grata* from the Shar’i perspective.

He committed zina of the eyes, zina of the ears, zina of the mind, zina of the tongue and zina of the heart in the interview conducted in the utterly shameless and haraam manner described by the copro morons. Yet, these morons quote him as a ‘daleel’ for their intermingling permissibility fiction.

The ‘courteous and gentle’ demeanour was in fact a zina misdemeanour. It was an ingredient and a stepping stone of zina. The entire interview was bedeviled by zina of a variety of kinds. Thus the Mufti’s fisq and fujoor are confirmed.

### **Another ludicrous stupid argument**

Similarly, the morons cite a function of yesterday to bolster their haraam, baseless idea of intermingling being permissible. Thus, they say:

*“To take another example, consider the 2019 symposium on Sahih al-Bukhārī conducted by Ibn Haldun University. The conference was attended by both male and female scholars, including Shaykh Muhammad Awwāma, who addressed a mixed-gender audience. However, it was noticeable that the attendees maintained a professional decorum, dressed*

*appropriately, and focused on the subject matter with purpose.”*

The same rebuttal of Mufti Taqi’s haraam interview stated above, applies to this deceptive, shaitaani ‘bukhari’ function. Only madmen –maddened by the touch of Iblees - are capable of proffering the haraam acts of the fussiaaq participants to bolster their haraam stance. Their brains are truly dysfunctional. Referring to such brains contaminated with gross nafsaniyat, the Qur’aan Majeed states:

*“And Allah afflicts those who do not understand with RIJS.” (Yoonus, Aayat 100)*

Thus, they are incapable of understanding basic realities such as the *hurmat* of intermingling of the sexes which is a primary cause for zina.

### **Conceding their own flaccid, flapdoodle bunkum**

Although these moron miscreants have proffered nonsensical arguments in their nefarious exercise to legalize intermingling, they do understand the ludicrousness of presenting yesterday’s intermingling functions conducted by fussiaaq scholars in substantiation of their copro view, hence they aver:

*“There are numerous other instances of contemporary scholars from various regions delivering lectures in similar settings. The aim here is not to present these practices as definitive evidence—though in cases of*

*scholarly disagreement, the collective practice of many scholars can be significant. Instead, these examples illustrate how the principles discussed in this paper can be applied in real-world contexts.”*

To hoodwink ignorant Muslims and to soothe the palate of modernist fussaag and fujjaar of their ilk, have they cited the incidents of *fisq* conducted by fussaag scholars who have strayed from Siraatul Mustaqeem. For them the haraam scenarios constitute ‘definite evidence’ for their haraam ideas. Since the many Ahaadith they have proffered along with their screeds of misinterpretation, do not satisfy themselves, they have deemed it necessary to supplement the Hadith narrations with the *fisq* practices of fussaag molvis and sheikhs of our current era. This highlights their moral and academic bankruptcy. But, the Mu’mineen of today are not of the ilk of Bani Israaeel about whom the Qur’aan states:

*“They took their molvies and buzrugs as gods besides Allah.....”*

The Mu’mineen do not assign to Mufti Taqi and Shaikh Awwaamah the pedestal of *Rabb*. These scholars, in the interests of their Imaan and for their *aafiyat* in the Aakhirah need to issue public statements of Taubah for their misdemeanours of *fisq* and *fujjoor* by which they have opened the gateways of *Fitnah*.

All the Ahaadith which they have proffered to support their haraam idea are in conflict with the Absolute Command of Hijaab stated in the Qur’aan Majeed as the Final Word on this topic of segregation of the sexes and observance of stringent Hijaab.

Regardless of a Mufti’s prominence, seniority and piety, his conduct may not be presented as argument for legalizing any Shar’i contravention. Therefore, citing the participation of some Deobandi Ulama who had condoned the haraam political activity of the cow-worshippers of India, in an attempt to bolster the intermingling shaitaanīyat, only highlights the intellectual and moral bankruptcy of these wayward molvis and sheikhs.

The Shariah is the Criterion. The labyrinthal meandering in the maze of opinions, technicalities and suppositions does not alter the Standing Practice of the Ummah – the Practice based on the Qur’aan and Sunnah – which has been inherited from the Sahaabah. Fiqhi technicalities do not alter this position of the Ummah.

Morons of this century have assumed on themselves the satanic objective of abrogating a Practice which the Ummah has always known and adhered to down the long corridor of Islam’s history. These evil morons have embarked on a satanic mission – a mission which no Authority of the Shariah had expounded in the history of Islam. The prohibition of intermingling never

was a contentious issue in the history of Islam notwithstanding infractions of the Shariah perpetrated in this regard. While Muslims violated this Prohibition, they were fully aware of the sin. But these agents of Iblees seek to halaalize a practice which is a major sin and which is a confirmed and recognized introductory step to zina.

### **Another donkey ‘daleel’ of the Moron miscreants**

Attempting to bolster their haraam idea of permissibility of intermingling, the morons proffer another incongruent donkey argument. Thus they say:

*“A more recent example is the 2024 Islamic conference in Uzbekistan titled *Islām dīn al-salām wa-l-khayr*.” This conference was attended by Muftī Taqī Usmānī, Shaykh Muḥammad Awwāma, Mawlānā Arshad Madanī, and other senior scholars from different parts of the world. The gathering was also attended by women seated in their own chairs, dispersed among the men, and **some of the women did not observe the basic requirements of hijab**. Nevertheless, the scholars remained present, focusing on the lectures and maintaining the necessary decorum of modesty.” (Our emphasis-The Majlis)*

It is really ridiculous for even ignoramuses to accept that this gathering of fussaag lends support to the haraam idea of intermingling being permissible. Muslims of healthy Imaan recoil with opprobrium at the attitude of satanism of these juhala who proffer a

confirmed function of fisq and fujoor to substantiate their haraam endeavour of scuttling the Qur’aan’s command of Hijaab.

The presence of Mufti Taqi, Shaikh Awwaama and Pundit Arshad Madani lending copro colour to the evil gathering – the crowd of fussiaaq and fujjaar males and females – never legalizes a practice which is in blatant violation of the Qur’aan, Sunnah and the Standing Practice of the Ummah. Just imagine the degree of *jahaalat* of these copro paper ‘mujtahids’! They present in justification of their haraam stance Pundit Madani, a chap who suffers from the malady of bootlicking the Hindu cow and idol worshippers, going to their temples and promoting the kufr interfaith ideology.

These juhala have no qualms about women being interspersed with the fussiaaq men in the haraam function. It was a confirmed zina crowd. Every person present, including the Mufti and the Shaykh are *faasiq* for their blatant contravention of the Shariah. Their presence among the women sitting among them, renders them *faajir*. Thus all of them, without exception are fussiaaq and fujjaar.

Although the juhala concede that “*some of the women did not observe the basic requirements of hijab*”, they still proffer this haraam conference where fussiaaq and fujjaar were dominant, as argument to support their haraam idea of intermingling being permissible. Their

brains have thoroughly exploded in cognitive dissonance, hence they tender such copro arguments which even ignorant Muslims view with revulsion.

They attempt to accord respectability and Islamic acceptability to a gathering bedevilled by *faajiraat* on the basis of the participation of some ‘prominent’ molvies and sheikhs who themselves have deviated from Siraatul Mustaqeem.

The type of muftis and shaykhs who participate in such evil gatherings and functions are worse than the ignorant fussiaq who were present. They are *mudhilleen* for whom Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) expressed greater fear than fear for even Dajjaal.

The entire argument proffered by the miscreants is based on conjecture inspired by Iblees. Even the Qur’aan has been submitted to the mutilation of personal opinion and a liberal bias for intermingling which they have inherited from the west. The endeavour of these miscreants is to dilute the Shariah to make it palatable for those who are satanically influenced by the western concept of female emancipation and free mixing. The desire is to make this Deen appear ‘progressive’ to the west, hence the need to dilute and mutilate the Ahkaam as known to the Ummah since the earliest eras of Islam.

Notwithstanding the many differences of opinion among the Fuqaha regarding the technicalities of the Ahkaam, as far as *amal* (practical implementation) is concerned there always existed unanimity. The technical interpretations did not create latitude in the practical domain for accommodating intermingling which was always considered haraam and loathsome by the Ummah.

Despite his liberalism and fisq, Mufti Taqi commenting on intermingling says:

**“Separate Madaris for Females:**

It is necessary to have separate Madrasas for males and females, and the females must not study in the madrasa of the males. Indeed there are many harms of Madaris accommodating both genders. Among the harms are:

1. Free mixing of men and women, which is against Islamic Shariah.
2. The free mixing will corrupt the mannerism and will cause fitna for the youth.
3. This will be an obstacle in the concentration of the students towards their study.

Mixed Madaris are nothing but an imitation of Western World. Some harms have manifested which are not hidden from anyone with eyes. It is necessary upon the Muslim world to beware of this.”

*(Maqaalaatul Usmaani)*

Whilst practically Mufti Taqi indulges in the fisq of intermingling, he has not hitherto claimed it to be halaal as the copro paper ‘mutahids’ have claimed in their rubbish paper.

### **The Stupidity and Mockery of ‘professional decorum’**

The stupid paper ‘mujtahids’ making a mockery of themselves, in their satanic bid to dismantle the Qur’aanic command of Hijaab, proffer what they term ‘professional decorum’ as *the* factor to justify mixed gatherings, men and women sitting interspersed and looking at one another. Thus the morons say:

*“To take another example, consider the 2019 symposium on Sahih al-Bukhārī conducted by Ibn Haldun University. The conference was attended by both male and female scholars, including Shaykh Muhammad Awwāma, who addressed a mixed-gender audience. However, it was noticeable that the attendees maintained a professional decorum, dressed appropriately, and focused on the subject matter with purpose.”*

In terms of the Islamic ideology expounded by Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) this vile gathering of fussiaaq and fujaar was a Zina symposium. Indulgence in blatant *FISQ* has become ‘*professional decorum*’ for these miscreant paper ‘mujtahids’ who are unable to distinguish between faeces and jam. Their concept of ‘*professional*

*decorum*’ in their brains deranged by Iblees, overrides the Qur’aan and the Sunnah with their *Ahkaam*. The very act of intermingling of the fussaag and faasiqaat at the stupid conference is FISQ which has no scope for the corrupt *professional decorum* idea of the copro morons. In Islam, there is no decorum for such an evil gathering .

The presence of persons holding ‘mufti’ and ‘shaykh’ titles does not nullify the FISQ of the intermingled gathering. These muftis and shaykhs themselves are fussaag because of them having participated in a function in a haraam setting. These types of muftis and shaykhs are among the dangerous clique of *mudhilleen* for whom Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) had expressed considerable fear.

These are the kinds of ‘scholars’ who mislead the ignorant and unwary masses of the Ummah. They are worse than jaahil fussaag and fujjaar who acknowledge their sins, regret and resort to Taubah. But the *mudhilleen* muftis, shaykhs and imams are deprived of the bounty of Taubah because they believe that their *fisq* is permissible and beneficial.

### **The Incumbent Condition of Tafilah**

*Tafilah*, that is, a woman dressed shabbily, wrapped in a large outer-garment, from whom not a vestige of perfume is emitted. In brief, she is like a smelly old hag. Literally *tafil* means *malodorous, evil-smelling*.

Being in the state of *tafil* is an incumbent condition for the permissibility of women to emerge from their homes when constrained by need. But, instead of simulating old smelly hags, women emerge from their homes all dressed-up in finery, adornment, powdered, painted and perfumed. Thus, they are deserving of the epithets *faasiqaat*, *faajiraat* and *zaaniyaat*. Regarding these vile women, Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) said:

*“A woman who perfumes herself and passes by a gathering is like an adulteress.”*

Women of today will rather extinguish their Imaan, but never will they accept to be outside the home among fussaag males in the state of *tafil*. On the contrary, they deem adornment, perfume and gaudy apparel incumbent for the public domain. In fact, even old hags of today will not leave home as *tafilaat*. Yes, in conflict with the ta’leem of Islam, women of today will incumbently be as *tafilaat* inside their homes, but outside, to attract the filthy lustful gazes of fussaag and fujjaar, will they beautify, paint and powder themselves like clowns.

Against this description of women, understand the shaitaanīyat of the following averments of these copro juhhaal:

*“A more recent example is the 2024 Islamic conference in Uzbekistan titled Islām dīn al-salām wa-l-khayr.” This conference was attended by Muftī Taqī Usmānī, Shaykh Muḥammad Awwāma, Mawlānā Arshad*

*Madanī, and other senior scholars from different parts of the world. **The gathering was also attended by women seated in their own chairs, dispersed among the men, and some of the women did not observe the basic requirements of hijab.** Nevertheless, the scholars remained present, focusing on the lectures and maintaining the necessary decorum of modesty.” (Our emphasis)*

*“To take another example, consider the 2019 symposium on Sahih al-Bukhārī conducted by Ibn Haldun University. **The conference was attended by both male and female scholars, including Shaykh Muhammad Awwāma, who addressed a mixed-gender audience.** However, it was noticeable that the attendees maintained a professional decorum, dressed appropriately, and focused on the subject matter with purpose.”*

Every person whose sanity has not been compromised by shaitaniyat, will understand that all of these women who had attended these stupid conferences ‘full of sound and fury, signifying zero’ were faasiqaat, faajiraat and zaaniyaat in terms of the explicit and implied labelling by Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam). These women were never *Tafilaat* when they sat ‘dispersed’ and interspersed with the moron male fussiaaq, fujjaar scholars.

It is indeed shockingly lamentable that senior ‘scholars’ attended such gatherings which are immoral

in terms of the Shariah. They were sitting among women in a zina setting. They were in violation of every rule of Hijaab. Yet they say that “*the attendees maintained a professional decorum, dressed appropriately*”.

Their concept of proper dress is the understanding of the immoral west. But in terms of Islam, these so-called ‘appropriately dressed’ women were all improperly dressed. They were lewd, immoral and *zaaniyaat*.

## **THE EVIL CONSEQUENCES OF INTERMINGLING**

While the copro miscreant self-appointed ‘mujtahids’ are at pains to convey the idea of ‘*professional decorum and proper dress*’ being maintained by the rubbish ‘scholars’ and the faasiqaat at intermingling functions and gatherings, the opposite is the norm. We reproduce here some from the numerous immoral incidents which are consequences of intermingling, and this is just the tip of the iceberg.

### **‘RELIGIOUS’ CHILD-RAPISTS, HOMOSEXUALS AND SEX-MOLESTERS ARE ALL SHAITAANI SWINES**

Two so-called ‘religious’ leaders/personnel – one in Cape Town and one in Durban – are currently under

police investigation for alleged perpetration of horrendous sex-crimes on children – boys and girls.

One victim of the Durban Swine has reported the matter to the police. He has also issued a detailed statement in lurid detail of the obnoxious devilish sex-treatment the Devil-Incarnate perpetrated on him. An arrest is expected. The other Swine was already arrested and is out on bail. Both these illegitimate sons of Iblees utilized their ‘religious’ positions to trap and rape their child victims. The details of the Satanism committed by the Swines are available in the local press and in the statement issued by the Durban victim.

The Mashaaiikh say that when Allah Ta’ala wills to disgrace people who profess to be Deeni, then He entraps them with females and lads. Islam has its strict code of morality to prevent sex-crimes, concupiscence and immorality of all kinds. But, Muslims nowadays – the bogus ‘religious’ leaders, parents who entrust their children to satanic swines, and miscreant molvis and sheikhs, are all complicit in the crimes of moral turpitude, immorality, sexual, molestation of children, rape of children, homosexuality, etc., which are being committed as a ‘norm’ in religious institutions.

These vile sex-crimes are diseases afflicting religious personnel of all religions. The ground is made fertile for these horror satanic sex-crimes by abandonment of the precautionary measures decreed by Allah Ta’ala for the prevention of the concupiscent filth of the nafs. The

Qur’aan Majeed commands: ‘*Do not approach even near to zina.*’

The consequences of the abandonment or relaxation of Islam’s very strict Code of Hijaab are zina, rape, sexual molestation of children and the like. Let it be known that every male teacher, every molvi and every sheikh who teaches girls, even 6 year olds, is a potential ‘rapist’, sex-villain, and paedophile. Parents who entrust their girls to male ustaadhs are satanic villains who prepare the ground for the sexual abuse of their little daughters.

A male Ustaadh who teaches girls is a SWINE. While he teaches the Qur’aan Majeed even in Ramadhaan, his shaitaani lust overwhelms him. Intoxicated with carnal lust he becomes an atheist, hence he is capable of committing the worst acts of sexual villainy on the girls he teaches. A molvi/sheikh who teaches girls is a shaitaani scoundrel. His *adaalat* is eliminated, and he becomes a *faasiq/faajir*.

To relieve themselves of the *Amaanat* of their children, the scoundrel parents entrust their little girls to molvis and sheikhs without understanding that these molvis and sheikhs are agents of Iblees and the slaves of their lusts, especially when they teach the girls.

They ruin the *hayaa* and morality of the girls. But the selfish parents refuse to understand. They deliberately opt for blindness and present implausible and haraam

arguments to soothe their conscience and to justify their gross dereliction of duty and responsibility by casting their children to devils and wolves in sheep’s skin.

The cases which surface are the tip of the iceberg. Numerous cases are not reported and are merely swept under the carpet. Girls who attend madrasahs, whether they are *baaligh* or *nabaaligh*, are not safe from the lustful prowling of their male teachers. This evil is more acute at so-called ‘darul ulooms’ established for girls. These are actually *darul devils*. The outer religious façade is deceptive. It conceals the devils inside these institutions – molvis and sheikhs who love to teach girls. The community reeks with the foul stench of these rotten devils and swines who perpetrate these horrendous crimes on the children entrusted to their care.

When a girl is six years old, purdah becomes imperative. While this is the age mentioned by Hadhrat Maulana Ashraf Ali Thanvi (Rahmatullah alayh), the *fitnah* and *fasaad* of these times demand that even four year old girls should be kept away from ghair mahram males, even of the family. Too many cases of sexual molestation occur when such purdah is not observed.

All such Swines who wallow in this type of Satanism use religion as a camouflage for their villainous sex-crimes. It applies to the devils in all religious groups. Christian priests, Buddhist monks, etc. are notorious

for acts of moral turpitude and sex-crimes. But while such satanism is expected of them, it is expected of Muslims only when they throw overboard the *Ahkaam* of the Shariah. Members of other religions are in reality atheists. They have no valid conception of Allah’s Presence, hence their misdemeanours are entirely expected and are the natural consequences of their atheism.

However, such satanic misbehaviour is not expected from Muslims. It is only when the strict Moral Code of Islam is abandoned that Muslims too become ensnared in the Satanism of the nafs. Even Auliya had fallen prey to the nafs when they relaxed their guard and relied on their hallucinatory ‘will-power’ and ‘taqwa’. The *ahkaam* of the Shariah are applicable to all and sundry – to laymen and to Auliya alike. No one is exempted from observing the laws and etiquettes of the Shariah on the basis of Taqwa. In fact, the greater the degree of Taqwa, the greater will be the degree of caution and observance of the laws of the Shariah.

Parents who value their daughters, should keep them at home and understand that it is haraam to send them to madrasahs and to a daarul jahl.

### ***SEXUAL MOLESTATION OF LITTLE GIRLS***

THE CONSEQUENCE OF SCORNFUL KUFR  
REJECTION OF THE SHARIAH

*The Star* newspaper in its edition dated 23 April 2014 under a headline caption, *MOSQUE PHOTO ABUSE*, reported the vile episode of a Madrasah teacher in the town of Evaton having subjected little girls to acts of sexual molestation on a frequent basis. The matter has been reported to the police who are investigating.

According to the Shariah, the parents of little girls attending the Madrasah need to be investigated for their gross dereliction of their Islamic duties and obligation, and for casting their little girls into the den of maniacal wolves. These reckless parents should now parley with their souls the demise of the *hayaa* and innocence of their little girls whom Allah Azza Wa Jal has bestowed as a sacred *Amaanat* in their custody. These little children are Allah’s property which He has assigned temporarily to the custody and care of parents. Along with the assignment of this *Amaanat*, Allah Ta’ala has, via His inviolable Shariah, attached many rights and obligations to the children and on parents respectively.

One of the sacred rights which the Shariah has awarded to a little girl is that her parents must ensure that she is treasured more than gold, silver and valuables. This sacred right, according to the Shariah, entails that once the girl attains the age of six years, she has to be completely secluded from males. Scornfully rejecting this divine command, parents recklessly entrust their little girls to scoundrel male teachers in whose *shaitaani suhbat* (satanic company) the little girls remain for hours daily.

Merely to satisfy their worldly cravings and their inordinate pursuit of mundane objectives, parents, especially mothers, renounce their Shar’i responsibilities with their wanton abandonment of the care of children, which Allah Ta’ala has obligated them. While mothers engross themselves in their haraam worldly pursuits, their little girls are being abused in the care of scoundrels operating under religious garb and guise.

Not so long ago, a shaitaan in Port Elizabeth who was supposed to be a Madrasah teacher, had perpetrated acts of sexual molestation on multiple little girls who were entrusted to his care. This kind of satanic misdemeanour is happening widely. Occasionally when the haraam shaitaani philandering of the teacher comes to light, the parents of the children who were the victims of the devil, crow much. They stupidly express ‘shock’ and ‘revulsion’. But they fail to understand that they are just as guilty as the scoundrel who had perpetrated the villainy, for they had allowed it to happen. They had paved the path for the ruin of their little girls.

It is **HARAAM** for a male to teach girls of six years and over even if the teacher has the countenance of a Buzrug. Shaitaan and the Nafs are the constant companions of even Buzrugs. Even Buzrugs may not be trusted with females and little girls. When the Shariah is recklessly, flagrantly and scornfully violated,

the haemorrhaging consequences should be accepted without a murmur of surprise or shock. Allah Ta’ala punishes severely those who recklessly rebel against His Commands.

Leave alone kuffaar secular school, a girl may not be assigned to even a Madrasah where she will be under the tutelage of a male teacher. Nafsaaniyat and shaitaaniyat are always latent in a male. In a moment of *ghaflat*, a man drops his spiritual guard, and even the Buzrug is instantly transformed into a *jaahil* scoundrel with the greater part of his *Aql* becoming inoperative. Imaam Ghazaali (rahmatullah alayh) said that when the sexual instinct in man overwhelms him, the consequence of which is haraam involvement with females, 80% of his brain cells cease to function.

Don’t parents shame themselves for entrusting their little innocent girls to male teachers? Have they no regard for the responsibilities Allah Ta’ala has imposed on them regarding the care of their children? Yes, precisely because they lack shame and because they have abandoned their responsibilities, is the calamity of the violation of the innocence of their little girls imposed on them as a divine punishment.

It is the Waajib obligation of parents to ensure that their girls are taught by only female teachers. If a female teacher is not available, keep your daughters at home and devote some time to teach them within the sacred precincts of your home. Don’t shove them into

the streets to be ambushed by the agents of Iblees. Then after Iblees has committed his acts of heinous notoriety, you want to blame the devil for having done his job.

When the evil comes to light, then excoriating the scoundrel in no way exculpates the parents who are Islamically complicit and culpable with the male teacher who had perpetrated his lustful villainy on the children.

**REMEMBER THAT IT IS HARAAM FOR MALES TO TEACH GIRLS OF SIX YEARS. WHAT THEN SHOULD BE THE REACTION WHEN MALE USTAADHS TEACH BAALIGH AND MURAAHIQ (CLOSE TO BULOUGH) GIRLS? MAY ALLAH TA’ALA BESTOW AQL-E-SALEEM TO MUSLIMS WHO HAVE BEEN TORN FROM THEIR IMAANI MOORINGS.**

### ***THE IMMORAL SHAITAANI SHENANIGANS OF THE MOLVIS & APAS***

What goes on behind the scenes and behind the kurtas, tops, beards and burqahs in the so-called ‘islamic’ schools and even in the maktabas where apas and molvis satanically mingle, is absolutely shocking and lamentable in the extreme. The rotten transpirations bedeviling these institutions are not rarities. These shenanigans are the norm.

It is not one or two apas nor just one or two molvis nor just one or two students who have written and explained the haraam rot which cannot be concealed under the carpet for too long. The following is the most recent complaint received from an Apa who has by Allah’s fadhl guided to abandon her teaching post at one of these evil schools in Gauteng. The Apa has provided her name, the name of the school and the names of the vile molvis involved in these shaitaani shenanigans. But, for the present we deem it inappropriate to publish these names.

Allaah Ta’ala is *Saatirul Uyoob (The Concealer of sins)*. We hope and make dua that the scoundrels reflect, regret, resort to Taubah, and desist from their zina villainy perpetrated under cover of the ‘deen’. If they fail to understand the notoriety of their shaitaani perpetrations, Allah Ta’ala will thoroughly humiliate them.

The Apa writes:

*(The words in italics in brackets are our comments)*

“I was teaching Islaamiyah at the Islamic school in ... I have taught there for 8 years and I was thriving during my time there. Although I was an aalimah (*a jaahilah – The Majlis*) and in pardah (*mock purdah to deceive the stupid masses*), I am ashamed to say I had no regard for true pardah at all.

I would speak and intermingle with all the teachers at the school particularly the young males and the

Christian male teachers (*What type of Islamic school is this?*) as well as the old male teachers. I would consider them to be like grandfather's to me. (*Massive shaitaani self-deception to soothe the conscience*). For years I was very happy and considered ... (*name of school*) to be like a home until I started to realise that I have indeed lost my hayaa (*Imaani shame and modesty which is the intrinsic attribute of a Muslim female*).

The ameer of the school Maulana... became like a ‘brother’ to me and I would engage with him on the phone telling him my life's ploughs, my ambitions and even my desires. (*He was in fact the elder brother of Iblees who had seduced you*).

What is more disturbing about this factor is that he is an aalim (*a jaahil of the worse kind of Rijs and Hufaalah*). He is married. Once he requested to see my face and even though I was in pardah I allowed him because he was just ‘my brother’ as we termed it. After that folly, it led to a handshake before we leave school everyday, and then to a hug. (*This is the way in which shaitaan operates. Hadhrat Masihullah – Rahmatullah alayh – explained to us this gradual spreading of shaitaan’s snare. By degrees he cunningly tightens the grip of his tentacles. Ultimately the trapped moron no longer realizes what is happening to him/her. Shaitaan swallows him whole.*)

Once he (*i.e. the ‘maulana’ ameer*) realized that this was a matter that could be seriously implicating and

disgrace him, he pointed out to me how bad this was and I needed to have more modesty. *(What a shameless rubbish comment! Unconcerned and unrepentant regarding his own zina commissions, he attempted to brush his seduction under the carpet by accusing only you).*

I then felt extreme discomfort in his surroundings because it was almost so as to say that I had evil intentions with him and it weighed very heavy on my heart. Thereafter I started to get terribly sick, frequently fainting. It dawned on me that as a woman, automatically it would seem as I was the seducer and he would be let off scotch free since his married into a rich family. I never realised that due to my ignorance of observing proper hijab and upholding it correctly *(No, it was due to your shaitaaniyat)*, I was now a victim of this sin and little did I know how deeply it would affect my life. *(You were the victim of your evil nafs. You were with the scoundrel molvi an equal perpetrator of zina. You have no valid excuse for your misdeeds of moral turpitude).*

As months went by, the fainting became more and more. Whenever I would be in his company I would have an uncomfortable amount of discharge flowing to the point where I would sit in the toilet at school and cry my eyes out. My life was becoming a nightmare. At night I would see things in my room tugging at me, trying to hurt me and even trying to sleep with me.

*(You used the cover of the Deen for the vice and immorality, hence shaitaan became your companion).*

I realised that even though he (*the scoundrel molvi*) might have looked like the man with integrity, and to say we need to stop talking, he instead took his filthy game to a worse level where nobody would understand and know. After that the old male teachers started touching on me and even another staff member who is married and who is a haafiz started touching me inappropriately and on inappropriate places. I now knew that to protect myself and my izzat (*honour*), I needed to give up the (*deceptive*) status I enjoyed, and give up the money I received, and to walk out of that disgusting environment. (*Express your gratitude to Allah Ta’ala for having guided you and for having extricated you from that moral mess and rot.*)

My family said that I am over reacting and that because I am the one experiencing the trouble it must be me that is having impure thoughts about these men. Nevertheless, I left ...(*the school*) with no warning.

In the afternoons I established a maktab/madressah at my home where I had over 100 students that I taught. When my uncle and his friend from Johannesburg, Maulana... stepped in to assist I continued getting more and more sick to the point where I was barely teaching anymore. I figured out that every time I would be around this maulana at maktab, the same conditions and symptoms that I experienced with the maulana at

the school, were occurring. I thought maybe it is me, maybe I am impure.

I became thoroughly depressed as it seemed that being so casual about my hijab, Allah was surely punishing me. But later on Allah revealed to me that this maulana was looking for a second wife, and I understood why I felt so uncomfortable around him. I was proud of my decision to leave even though the madressah was my life and greatest achievement.

The more seriously I wore my hijab the more I could see the evil of these ‘aalims’ (*scoundrel jaahils*) and how they take advantage of women. They protect the izzat of their own wives and daughters but will take advantage of other women and ruin their izzat. I came to the point where I knew that I had to choose the maktab or my izzat, and I chose my izzat. I am now currently at home.

I feel a heavy weight of guilt. The attacks I receive from these jinnaat happens all the time and I am still in this horrid environment. My family then did a ritual on me from the khanqah in Lenasia and an aamil from Durban was in charge of this ritual. The evening before this ritual was done while I was affected negatively with jinn my brother called his brother in law Maulana... and put me on speaker phone while he listened to my brother entertaining the creature.

The ritual consisted of clay pots that were used. Strange blue inked symbols were drawn on sheets of paper and burned wrapped in cotton wool with mustard oil. We had to stare at the fire till it burnt out. Thereafter my hair nails and underwear were placed in a packet with a red cloth with the intestines of a sheep and moved around my head like tawaaf. It was said to me that its to remove jinn but it hasn't helped me. I realized that the ritual was haraam and I pointed it out to them.

They said I don't know what I'm saying and mufti... sanctioned it with the jamiat... They asked me if I am claiming to be better than muftis and more knowledgeable. I told them I didn't care which mufti sanctioned it, haraam is haraam. They forced me to do the ritual and my life is in greater darkness ever since. My family doesn't know the difficulties I am undergoing and if I tell them, they say that I am living in a jinn's world. I carry so much guilt of my ignorance about men but more so it feels as though these people are all hurting me in a way where no one can physically see I am drowning in an ocean of darkness and I don't know how to get out of it.

I can't sleep at night as I see jinn coming to me I feel them trying to sleep with me. I was taught how to do ruqya to protect myself but my mom has forbade me further as she says that it is just putting me in a jinn's world. My mom, brother and uncle's have no backbone to protect me physically from the atrocities of these

evil men. They want me to pretend that none of this exists and that it's all imagination. I must just move on they say.

The initial reason for this email was because I know there are many women like me suffering and we are silenced because: “Where is the proof?” I want these people to be investigated and exposed for whatever evil they have done. But, I have heard a clip from mufti menk (*this character is among the vilest agents of Iblees*) where he said that Allah’s curse is upon the person who speaks ill of the ulama and the person who speaks bad of what the ulama do, and that they shouldn't be bashed openly in public. (*These rubbishes are not Ulama. They are the worst scoundrels-veritable devils in human form*). So now I am not sure what exactly should be done. However, this is my condition. I don't expect anyone to understand, and as women we are always blamed to say perhaps we are the ones who seduced the men, or perhaps we having the evil thoughts, but, Allah Knows best. (*The women and the men indulging in zina shenanigans under cover of holy veneers, are equal in blame. Neither are there extenuating circumstances for the women nor for the scoundrel molvis who perpetrate such disgraceful and revolting acts of zina abomination. Understand well, that the punishment commanded by Allah Ta’ala for zina, applies equally to men and women. Women should not find excuses for exculpating themselves. The women and the men are equal in the satanism of*

*seduction.)* May Allah grant understanding and aafiyah. Jazakallah Wasalaam  
*(End of the Apa’s letter)*

## **OUR RESPONSE**

The evil effects you are currently suffering are the consequences of having violated the laws of Allah Ta’ala under Deeni guise. The so-called ‘aalims’ who have seduced you are agents of shaitaan. They camouflage their zina perpetrations with a false ‘deeni’ veneer. They advertise themselves as Deeni personnel when in reality they are devils in human form (shayaateenul ins).

You and they have recklessly and flagrantly sinned and violated Allah’s Laws. The sins which you and the satanic moron molvis have been persistently committed are worse than the zina of known prostitutes who do not sin under ‘deeni’ cover. The maktab, madrasah and so-called ‘islamic’ school are used as cover for filth and immorality. Therefore, the effects you are now suffering are forms of Allah’s punishment.

Allah Ta’ala has been merciful to you by taking you out of that filthy, immoral environment where human-devils donning Islamic garb indulge in zina as a norm. This is the rotten state of affairs in all so-called ‘islamic’ schools. The vast majority of these apas and the molvis who are at these shaitaani institutions are rotten with vice and immorality whilst they project an

outward facade of piety and knowledge. But in reality they are juhala and shayaateen.

You are not the only apa who have apprized us of the rotten state of the molvi-apa vice which bedevils these institutions. Your parents are complicit in the evil and in your spiritual ruin. They lack Deeni understanding in entirety hence they are advising you to follow the path leading to Jahannam.

Recite Aayatul Kursi, the last Ruku’ of Surah Baqara and the three Qul Surahs daily, night and day, and supplicate to Allah Ta’ala for protection against the evil satanic forces attacking you. Engage frequently in Taubah. Allah Ta’ala forgives all sins when a person makes Taubah sincerely. Do not participate in the evil rituals to which they had subjected you. All of them are scoundrels.

These molvis, according to Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) are the worst rot under the “*canopy of the sky*”. They are *rijs (filth)*, rotten to the core, and their abode is Jahannam. Their sins are not like the sins of ordinary *juhala*. They sin like immoral atheists. They believe in the ‘*fadhaa-il’ (virtues)* of their filth and immorality. That is why they use the Deen, the Madrasah and the Musjid as cover for their immoral villainy. They have draped themselves in immoral *shaitaaniiyat* without suffering the slightest vestige of Imaani conscience. They justify their flagrant violation

of the Shariah’s *ahkaam* of Hijaab by twiddling with the Deen.

They will continue cavorting with the devil in their fisq and fujoor until the *Athaab* of Allah Azza Wa Jal overtakes them and thoroughly disgraces them. You are fortunate that Allah Ta’ala has extricated you from the vortex of immorality which these shaitaani molvi scoundrels operate in their so-called ‘deeni’ institutions.

It is our supplication that Allah Ta’ala saves the Ummah from these highway robbers and scoundrels who rob Muslims of their morality and Imaan.

## ***MADRESSA TEACHER ON SEX CHARGES***



### ***IMMORAL MOLVIES TEACHING FEMALES- EVEN PIOUS ULAMA SHOULD REFRAIN FROM TEACHING FEMALES***

A Brother explaining the immoral scenario of a girls madrasah, writes:

“I want to ask regarding Moulana ..... (name has been provided) and his girls madraasah. When the moulana gives nasihat he does not give it behind pardah. The girls have their pardas on but there is no parda or barrier between him and them. So the girls can see him clearly. Also when moulana addresses some of the girls he calls them to his office and speaks to them 1 on 1.

He also has cameras in the madraasah with the cctv monitor in his office so he can clearly see the girls faces when their pardas are off. I asked one of his students who completed in the boys madraasah as to why he does so. He said that moulana is "old & who will desire him". Please comment and advise.” (*End of letter*)

### COMMENT

This ‘moulana’ is a lewd scoundrel who seeks gratification for the bestial lusts of his nafs under deeni cover. It is haraam for him to be teaching girls. It is haraam for the girls to view the scoundrel. And, it is doubly haraam for them to see him in deeni guise whilst he is motivated by *nafsaaniyat* and *shaitaaniyat*.

It is an aggravated haraam misdeed to call a girl to his office. This is shaitaan’s trap for zina. The Qur’aan Majeed states:

**“Do not come near to zina....”**

It is also mentioned in the Hadith, that when a man and woman are alone then the third scoundrel present is

Iblees. This scoundrel molvi is bereft of *hayaa* and *khauf*. Girls should have greater fear for an old scoundrel. This molvi is hiding under cover of his ‘deeni’ façade and his age. He and the girls are in deception.

Parents should be more concerned about their daughters when they are sent to madrasahs. Firstly, these girls institutions are dangerous for Akhlaaq. They are stepping stones for zina. Secondly, the aggravating factor is the presence of male teachers who abuse the trust of the stupid girls.

The sexual misdemeanours of male teachers and molvis with the girls placed in their trust are shockingly abundant. No male, be he a molvi, mufti or buzrug should be trusted with girls.

From the age of six girls should be placed in full Purdah in relation to ghair mahram males. Do not place reliance and confidence on the piety of a Buzrug. Shaitaan and the nafs are ever present and lying in ambush.

## **THESE SHEIKHS ARE DIRTY!**

A Sister from the U.S. writes:

“Assalamualaykum

A Sheikh in the US had his female student send porn type of videos. He even convinced her to make her 10 year-old daughter do the same. Now he’s behind bars. This has shocked the Muslim community, but it’s not all that surprising when you see how many Sheikhs are out there hitting on us sisters.

A lot of us sisters don’t have a wali or a male relative to ask our questions to, and these Sheikhs take full advantage of that. With the older generation of scholars passing away, it’s scary to think about who my sisters will turn to when they need help.

So, my question is, looking ahead — what should we do? There are heaps of single mums, divorced, and widowed sisters out there. Sometimes we need help, especially with our kids, but how can we trust these Sheikhs? How do we protect ourselves when even with digital communication, there’s so much fitna floating around?

Us sisters see a totally different side of these Sheikhs. We’ll ask a straightforward Islamic question, and they come back with something dirty. They’ll write and quickly delete it. It’s downright sickening. And to

make it worse, we don’t even have access to knowledgeable sisters half the time, because they’re more Western than the actual Western women. It’s a really confusing and tough time to navigate.”

*(End of the Sister’s lament)*

These are the kinds of stercoraceous sheikhs and molvis who clamour for intermingling and interaction with females. They are obsessed with zina. They are ‘dirty’ as the sister says. They are sex maniacs seeking to gratify their bestiality under deeni cover. They are drowning in a cesspool of obscenity and iniquity.

***Miscellaneous immoral shenanigans of the sex maniacs who are supposed to maintain “professional decorum”***

- A religious teacher sexually touched a schoolgirl as she prayed, a court heard. Suleman Maknojioa, 40, of Audley Range, Blackburn was said to have ‘squeezed’ the youngster’s chest, by placing his hand beneath the long folds of her headscarf.

The schoolgirl said the problems began some months after she started tuition of the Koran in Arabic. She said inappropriate touching, which had occurred over several months, started ‘gradually’, beginning with the arms and head, then moving to the legs, feet and chest and her thigh.

- A Muslim cleric has been jailed for a year after sexually assaulting a young girl while he was meant to be teaching her the Qur’an.

He went to the 15-year-old victim's home and molested her when they were left alone.

A judge described the attack as the ‘worst breach of trust imaginable’ and said he believed it would have continued if the girl's father had not unexpectedly returned home. A jury of eight men and six women at Portsmouth Crown Court took less than two hours to find Rahman guilty of sexual activity with a child.

The former Imam at Jami Mosque in Portsmouth, Hampshire, is a Hafiz - someone who has memorised the entire Qur'an. He was supposed to be teaching the 15-year-old girl about the Qur'an but was caught molesting her by her father.

The Judge commented:

‘On the jury's verdict and on abundant evidence, for whatever reason, you took advantage of that situation for your own sexual gratification.

‘It must have been a very frightening experience for that girl. Given your position in the Muslim community and the respect with which you were accorded as a result by the family that you were visiting, this was as bad a case of breach of trust as it is possible to imagine.’

- There are numerous similar and worst cases and scenarios of moral turpitude and sexual depravity of ‘religious’ personnel who happen to have been placed in positions of Trust. Even so-called ‘shaikhs’ of khaankas (bogus khaanqas) are known to have perpetrated vile acts of sexual misdemeanour with their female *mureedahs*.

One rascal, scoundrel ‘sheikh’ who was set up as a ‘spiritual guide’ had actually murdered his mureedah who had spurned and rebuffed his zina overtures and shaitaanijat. He administered his death potion in the

form of radiator liquid which he said was ‘holy’ water. The female was the victim of his murder plot.

Then there is also a notoriously known ‘sheikh’ of tasawwuf in Pakistan who had manipulated the type of ‘dalaal’ which these miscreant copro juhala ‘mujtahids’ have proffered to legalize intermingling of sexes, and to camouflage his immoral relationship with female mureedahs. He had degenerated to such a base level of moral turpitude which constrained even some of his khalifahs and mureeds to abandon him.

A bulky volume can be compiled of all the filth and immorality of these sex maniacs who manipulate the proffered ‘loopholes’ for relaxing Islam’s most stringent rules of Hijaab.

The genuine Mashaikh have said that when Allah Ta’ala wills to disgrace a man, He involves that person with females and lads. Thus he rots in zina and homosexuality, and all these evils and acts of satanism are the consequences of halaalizing intermingling which according to the Qur’aan is a stepping stone of zina.

## **IMMORALITY UNDER COVER OF THE DEEN**

A Brother, lamenting the shenanigans of a Madrasah principal, wrote:

“Tuesday, 5 Rabi'ulAwal 1440, 13 November 2018

I would like to inform Hadhrat of what I believe to be a danger to the Muslim Female community in Johannesburg South. I have previously written to Hadhrat regarding this.

In Robertsham, a Moulana has opened a Daarul Uloom for both males and females under the names Madrassatus Saadiqeen and Madrasatus Saadiqaat.

This Moulana used to teach at Daarul Uloom Azaadville, then was the principal of the NNB Jamiat madrassah and has now opened the abovementioned Madrassah.

In Ramadhaan during the Tafseer after Taraweeh, the Moulana on 3 occasions mentioned females in a way that led me to feel uncomfortable. He very briefly and subtly mentioned the Monalisa. He mentioned about explaining Surah Maryam to a lady who sat next to him on an airplane and he mentioned the happiness his female students felt when he explained a certain lesson in class.

I know of a woman who personally went to Moulana’s house for advice some years back. This woman is not in Hijaab and Moulana sat face to face with her in discussion. Over the years all this is starting to link up leaving me with a deep feeling of suspicion which I have been trying to ignore out of respect for the Moulana.

The Moulana is a very learned man and many people respect him in the community. His Madrassah has grown significantly in the last few years. If I am not mistaken, close to 100 students now. He has many young Ulama from the area teaching and about 5 or 6 Aalimahs.

The above female related issues which are a concern, however the entire thing now makes sense to me.

A few days ago I happened to pass by the Madrassah while the students were exiting the Madrassah. The boys and girls were leaving at the same time. The parking lot looked a mess with boys in Kurtah and girls in Hijaab. Mothers and fathers waiting in and out of their cars to receive their children. While the two entrances are totally separate the parking lot can never be so.

But what really stunned me was that the Moulana himself, standing on the balcony right at the girls door where the girls exit over looking the parking lot. Moulana was leaning on the rail overlooking the scene

while many many girls in Hijaab were right near him walking out of the door, down the steps to their cars.

How can a man of such knowledge, so well respected, dressed in a white Kurtah and topi of our Akaabireen style, who hosts programmes like 'Akabireen week' and teaches the Dars-e-Nizaami stand freely amongst so many young girls out in the open public? What kind of Hijaab is he teaching and what example is he setting?

Everyone of the young boys studying the Aalim course will grow up under his wing having no care for true Hijaab just like their Ustaad. And if this is what is going on on the outside, one can only imagine the degree of lack of Purdah on the inside.

I write this to Hadhrat for perhaps a warning can be sent out.”

*(End of the Brother’s letter)*

This, and worse happens at girls madrasahs. The “*professional decorum*” which the scoundrel miscreants proffer to justify their denial of Qur’aanic Hijaab, is a satanic figment of their corrupt minds. Wherever sexes mingle, the director of the operation is Iblees himself.

On the occasion of his expulsion from the heavens, Iblees had supplicated to Allah Ta’ala for traps to enable him to ensnare his victims. Allah Ta’ala, granting his supplication, said: “*Your traps are*

women.” On hearing the wonderful news of the acceptance of his dua, he tripudiated with delight. Thus all these scoundrels who argue against Islam’s laws of Hijaab, are trapped in the snare of Iblees. They are his agents.

- A Sister from U.K. who had studied at a girls Madrasah under molvies with zina tendencies, provided the following comments:

“I apologise for even sending this document, waste of energy and time, as well as infuriating to read our Islam being distorted for the desires of the men. (*The document refers to the copro baatil booklet of the miscreant agents of Iblees- The Majlis*)

What we know of this document is that the misguided molvis love to freemix. Sisters (even brothers) we know have fallen into zina with some of these molvis.

When we had male teachers at Madrasah, we had a curtain, yet somehow numbers were exchanged between Ustadh and student. How, I don't know but this led to the Ustadh meeting with a female student in the building, and also meeting another student outside of Madrasah somewhere. There are much worse examples replicated all over the UK. Girls talk, and in madrasah days we would talk about how so and so Mufti or Moulana is doing haraam with so and so student.

Times are much worse now. In these events attended by the writers and the endorses of this paper, neither are sisters covered, nor is there a curtain. They are sitting uncomfortably close to the men.

We do not need academic discussions and papers to attend to a simple rule of Islam. “Do not come near to zina.”, says the Qur’aan. We are living in such a time, where even those misguided molvis who have fallen into haraam relationships with sisters they had contact with, are promoting this paper. We do not need academic discussions to know what a man feels when he sees a woman.

I know men who are extremely loyal to their wives, but I’ve also seen them lose 80% of their brains as Hadhrat has mentioned, in front of ghair mahram women.

I also know how women do not talk in a harsh voice to men. They talk alluringly and they alter the position of their limbs when in front of non-mahram males. They might not even like him, but this is the effect of being in a mixed environment. What is even worse is these misguided scholars will have contact with each female student, each one of them is his prey and the victim of his lust.

We are living in times where every prophecy of Nabi sallallahu 'alayhi wasallam regarding Ulama is happening in front of our eyes. Unfortunately people are too naive. On one hand they say there's so much

fitnah, on the other hand they produce a host of reasons to allow mixed gatherings in the name of Islam, even though there's so much fitnah. Contradiction upon contradiction.

The best thing for a woman is that her father, brother, husband protect her from these Dajjali scholars. These are the times of fitnah in which we find ourselves.

## **“FAATIMAH IS A PART OF ME”**

**Said Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam)**

Once Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) said to a group of Sahaabah:

*“What is best for a woman?”* All the Sahaabah, unable to proffer a response, remained silent. Hadhrat Ali (Radhiyallahu anhu) who had also been present and who also was unable to answer the question, went home and said to his wife, Hadhrat Faatimah (Radhiyallahu anha):

*“What is best for women?”*

The noble Daughter of Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) said:

*“They should not look at men nor should men look at them.”*

When Hadhrat Ali (Radhiyallahu anhu) mentioned this answer to our Nabi (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam), he

commented: “*Certainly, she is right. Faatimah is part of me.*”

But today fussiaaq muftis and shaykhs in the public sit, ogling the lewd women in their midst – “*maintaining eye contact*” – then dwell in the satanism of self-deception, deceiving themselves with their monstrous lie of “*professional decorum*”. Their decorum is pure shaitaanīyat.

Hadhrat Faatimah (Radhiyallahu anha), being *Part of Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam)*, designed for the females of this Ummah a stringent system of Purdah which will remain until the Day of Qiyaamah. In addition to the Shar’i prescribed five sheets in which the female deceased is wrapped, the female body wrapped in FIVE sheets is shielded from the gazes of males by a canopy held over her. This was designed by Hadhrat Faatimah (Radhiyallahu anha), and it remains the Sunnah of the Ummah until the Day of Qiyaamah.

Now just reflect at this lofty degree of Purdah/Hijaab of Islam. The dead body is not a source of attraction and lust. It is furthermore draped in five sheets, supplemented by a covering canopy at the time of lowering her body into the Qabar. But we have these copro scoundrels promoting ‘eye contact’-zina contact – with young women dressed in finery and adornment. Their motive is philandering with the women in ‘academic’, shaitaani deceptive style.

What has happened to their brains? Their brains are thoroughly putrified with their lusts, hence they are unable to understand the mass and mess of immoral villainy they have disgorged to justify intermingling of sexes. Their hypocrisy is indeed gargantuan. They disgorge damnable lies in the name of the deen. But this Shariah of Allah Ta’ala is immitigable. The impuissance of their brains is the effect of the villainy of their hearts which are bereft of *khauf* (fear for Allah Ta’ala).

The Qur’aanic Aayat: “*Do not come even near to zina.*”, supplemented by many Ahaadith of similar kind have obturated all conceivable avenues and loopholes of zina. These are the blocked avenues which the scoundrels are seeking to open up wide with their copro arguments. But they cannot succeed in their pernicious scheme to scuttle Islam’s stringent Law of Hijaab.

***“In fact, We strike baatil with the Haqq. Then it (Haqq) smashes out its (baatil’s) brains. Then suddenly baatil vanishes.”***

***(Qur’aan)***

## **THE SHAITAANIYAT OF QIRA'T AND JALSAS FOR GIRLS**

A Concerned Sister lamenting the evil and shaitaaniyat of qira't being taught to girls by male qaaris, writes:

“As salamu alaikum wa rahmatullahi wa barakatu

I have turned to The Majlis with an earnest appeal as this ummah is surely drowning in ignorance and sin. A new fitnah in the girls madrasahs have cropped up, namely **QIRAT FOR GIRLS AND FEMALE QIRAT JALSAS**.

A male "qari" teaches the girls and after a few years course they celebrate with a jalsa where qarīs like "ismail londt" who firstly doesn't even have a Sunnah beard and poses for pictures, as well as "qari" 'saleh peck' and the lot attend. It is so sad to see now that another girls madrasah is also following suit. Madrasah Saalihaat in Mayfair, is following the evil path of Madrasah Mueinul Islam of Zakariyya Park. I have not heard any of our ulama speak out against this.

Please make the Ummah aware of the evils of such filth. The girls recite in beautiful voices to their male qari teacher.

It is so heart breaking to see this. Now the girls started opening their own qirat courses online. This fitnah is spreading like wildfire. It is so sad to know that these madrasahs are run under ulama, muftis and such personalities.”

*(End of the Sister’s lament)*

Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) mentioned that among the Signs of Qiyaamah is that *“the dunya will be pursued with the amal of the Aakhirah, and that the Ilm of the Deen will be taught for purposes other than the Deen.”*

Qira’t is related to the Qur’aan. The Qur’aan Majeed is recited for gaining the Pleasure of Allah Ta’ala and thawaab in the Aakhirat. Qira’t is an *amal of the Aakhirat*. But today its knowledge is being acquired for gratification of the nafs and for mercenary objectives.

Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) said: *“Most of the munaafiqeen of my Ummah are its qaaris.”* In so far as girls are concerned, the evil is magnified manifold because the male qaaris teaching the girls are *zaanis (fornicators)* and the girls under them are *zaaniyaat*. Zina is of a variety of kinds and all kinds are haraam. Zaaniyaat reciting the Qur’aan to Zaanis is pure satanism. These copro specimens of mankind who use the Qur’aan for sexual gratification are among the worst fussiaq and fujjaar imaginable. Never in Islam’s more than fourteen century history was such immorality perpetrated under cover of the Qur’aan Majeed.

When a woman is not permitted to project her voice for even Allah Ta’ala during Salaat, then by what stretch of Imaani logic do these immoral, uncouth, miserable

lesbian-type girls and sex-maniac munaafiq qaaris advertise the voices of girls? Then they seek nafsaani gratification with the compounded stepping stone of zina, namely, girls reciting in satanically ‘beautiful’ and alluring voices to male villains who are utilizing the Qur’aan Majeed for achieving their concupiscent nafsaani objective - sexual gratification.

These girls qira’t studies and jalsas are abominable invitations for zina. The Qur’aan Majeed states: “*Do not approach even near to zina.*” The brains of these rubbish, sex maniac munaafiq qaaris and these evil lesbian type zaaniyaat have been totally deranged by shaitaani manipulation, hence they are unable to understand the filth of their immorality perpetrated under cover of the Qur’aan Majeed.

These munaafiq male qaaris are agents of Iblees whose mission is to plunder the *haya* and *akhlaaq* of the stupid girls who are acquitting themselves like lesbians and zaaniyaat. The issue of zina is set to explode further as we move towards Qiyaamah. Zina between male teachers at girls madrasahs is becoming incremental. Girls madrasahs are institutions of Iblees. Shaitaan has thoroughly gripped and ruined the Muslim community with these immoral haraam girls madrasahs. Molvis and moron muftis perpetrating acts of immoral turpitude with the girls of these madrasah aberrations are not rare episodes. The filth is on the increase and is set to become worse with the passing of the days toward Qiyaamah.

People who have the Deen at heart should not allow their daughters to become zaaniyaat under Qur’aanic and Deeni cover. A male who teaches girls is a confirmed confounded adulterer. Allah Ta’ala warns:

***“And do not come even near to zina.”***

The female’s voice is a step towards zina. A rubbish man teaching girls qira’t is a huge leap towards zina. According to all four Math-habs, the female’s voice is Aurah. According to a minority Hanafi view, while her voice is technically not Aurah, nevertheless being a factor of fitnah, concealment of it is incumbent.

### ***THE NIQAAB OF SHAITAAN***

While the Niqaab of the Qur’aan is loathsome for these modernist, copro paper ‘mujtahids’, the niqaab of Shaitaan is acceptable and even necessary. The niqaab of Iblees came to prominence during the era of the covid satanism.

Molvies of the ilk of the juhhaal dunderhead copro paper ‘mujtahids’ went overboard in their bootlicking support for the covid shaitaani niqaab. They shamelessly promoted it to the degree of *wujoob* for both females and males. On the contrary, their opposition to Qur’aanic Niqaab is tantamount to kufr.

According to these miserable juhhaal the covid devil’s niqaab was necessary for protection against physical

disease. The Qur’aan has decreed the Niqaab as protection against the moral and spiritual diseases of carnal lust. But these latter diseases are of absolutely no concern to these deviated modernist bootlickers of the Yahood and Nasaara.

Their wholehearted acceptance of Shaitaan’s niqaab and disdain and revulsion for the Niqaab commanded by Allah Ta’ala exposes the kufr lurking in their hearts. While fear of contracting an imaginary physical disease had constrained them to don the devil’s niqaab and to halaalize a range of kufr protocols of their kuffaar handlers, they enter into laborious, baseless and stupid arguments to deny the Niqaab of the Qur’aan which is designed to specifically protect Muslims from contracting the many abominable moral diseases stemming from carnal lust.

## **THE LAMENT OF HAZRAT MAULANA ASHRAF ALI THANWI REGARDING WOMEN'S SINFUL EMERGENCE**

(By a UK Brother)

Hadhrat Maulana Ashraf Ali Thanwi (Rahmatullah alayh), regarding whose status as a Mujaddid (Mujaddid-e-Millat) there is general agreement amongst the Ulama of Deoband, states in Beheshti Zewar:

“The attendance of women in all types of functions is not permissible (na-jaaiz). Women have become so shameless that they think nothing of emerging from their homes using just any excuse. Whenever they have a desire, they leave the home to visit friends or the sick or to go and congratulate someone on some happy occasion ...

Due to much corruption it is not at all proper for women to emerge from their homes and move around here and there. The only permission they have from the Shariah is to occasionally visit their parents and other mahram relatives. However, as far as the other relatives are concerned, women may visit them once or twice a year.

Other than this, it is not permissible for them to go elsewhere carelessly as has become the practice. Neither should they visit relatives nor participate in

marriage functions nor in functions of sorrow nor visit the sick nor go to wish and congratulate anyone.

In fact, if there happens to be a wedding function then it is not permissible for them to go to even the houses of their mahram relatives. If a woman emerges from her home with the permission of her husband, then he also becomes a sinner just as she is a sinner. Alas! Nowhere is this Law of the Shariah (Hukm) observed. Of greater lament is that people do not even consider female emergence to be sinful. On the contrary, they believe it to be permissible. Ponder! All the corruption in society is the consequence of this practice (of women emerging out of their homes to attend functions and gatherings). It is imperative to abandon this (evil) practice and to repent (Taubah)."

*(End of Hadhrat Thanwi's Lament)*

It is most significant and revealing of the times we are living in that despite the evil of women's Haraam emergence having become infinitely worse since Hazrat Maulana Thanwi's lament above, there now exists an almost total silence on this disease which today has reached pandemic proportions. One can only wonder what the lament, shock and horror of Hazrat Maulana Thanwi and of the other Akaabir Ulama of Deoband would have been if they were able to witness the far more degenerated state of the Muslim women of this era. And what be the shock of the Sahaabah? They would recoil with revulsion.

Of significance too is the fact that despite the deluge of Kuffaar ideologies, including the evil of feminism, engulfing the entire Ummah, the Akaabir of Deoband, almost uniquely, held firmly and rigidly onto this particular aspect of the Deen, as they did also to other teachings of the Deen which had already started becoming *Ghareeb* (strange, forlorn, unpalatable) during their era, precisely in conformity with numerous prophecies of Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) regarding the *Ghurbah* (strangeness, being forlorn and friendless) of the Deen as we approach closer to the last Hour. It is a further sign and testament to their status as a Jama'ah (group) of Mujaddids (Revivers of the original teachings of the Deen) and Muhaqqiqs (Expert Verifiers) whom Allah Ta'aala had tasked with keeping the Sunnah alive - a reality also attested to in detail by unbiased authorities from the Arab lands such as Allamah Kawthari and Shaykh Abdul Fattah Abu Ghuddah.

It is noteworthy that today even many of those who claim to be followers of the Akaabir of Deoband are now employing the very same arguments first used by the modernists and feminists which were refuted in detail by that noble Jama'ah of Mujaddids.

Hazrat Maulana Thanwi's emphatic assertion, "...All the corruption in society is the consequence of this practice (of women's Haraam emergence)" pertains not only to clearly discernible societal evils such as the widespread occurrence of zina, the wholesale neglect

of the household upon which the structure and well-being of society rests, the emergence of generations of dysfunctional children and child-like adults, and innumerable other ills - but it also applies to the epidemic onset of spiritual emptiness, depression, other mental illnesses, and even suicides, which in previous eras used to be exclusively associated with Kuffaar societies.

While the pious woman of the Salaf, and of all eras until these worst of eras, used to readily attain spiritual fulfilment, contentment and tranquillity in the comfort of her own sanctuary, whilst only carrying out her menial home duties and engaging the rest of her time in zikrullah, the modern woman is unable to attain even a semblance of such priceless bestowals from Allah Ta'ala, despite exerting an endless cycle of toil, effort and massive expenditure, involving daily emergence from her home, frequent outings and trips, and even regular Kuffaar-style holidays to the furthest corners of the Earth, as part of an insane pursuit for an elusive mirage of happiness which in reality aggravates her addictions, and is the underlying cause of the numerous mental illnesses she inevitably contracts.

Remember that a natural corollary to Rasulullah's (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) prophecies regarding the end of times is the Ummah falling under the same rut as the Muslims of Banee Israaeel who were condemned in the Qur'an for their Haraam Taqleed of their Shaykhs, Muftis, and Maulanas (Ruhbaan and Ahbaar)

in matters which clearly contradicted the Shariah - a reality that cannot be manifested more vividly than the phenomenon clearly visible today of rulings conveyed by the Fuqaha authentically and consistently throughout the long stretch of 1400 years, and even by the Akaabir Ulama of recent times, only to be suddenly and irrationally deemed to be non-applicable by the scholars of these worst of eras.

May Allah enable us to accept wholeheartedly the pure and pristine teachings of the Deen as conveyed authentically by the Fuqaha, regardless of how difficult and detestable it becomes for our lowly desires to submit.

May Allah Ta'ala enable us to implement such teachings in our daily lives, and thus become eligible for the reward of fifty men from the Sahabah (radhiyallahu anhum) as promised in authentic Ahadith for those who hold fast to the Deen when it has become *Ghareeb* (strange, forlorn, unpalatable).

And finally, may Allah Ta'ala grant us the spiritual strength to propagate such teachings of the Deen and thus contribute to averting the Azaab (punishment) of Allah which currently the Ummah is being subjected to in the form of Kuffaar domination and the imposition of brutal tyrants, which are described in authentic Ahadith to be a direct consequence of forsaking *Amr bil Ma'roof wa Nahy anil Munkar* (enjoining good deeds and prohibiting wrong-doing). Ameen

## **THE ROOT CAUSE OF INTERMINGLING**

The root cause of haraam intermingling is female emergence from the home. Thus the Shariah vehemently and explicitly prohibits female emergence from the precincts of the home.

Allamah Ibnul Hajj al-Maliki, in his Madkhal, whilst emphasizing the rarity of women's emergence as commanded by the Shariah, narrates the following statement of the Salaf-us-Saaliheen:

"A woman has three times of coming out (from her home) in her lifetime: one to the house of her husband when she is handed over to him; one for the death of her parents and one to her grave." (al-Madkhal)

Hadhrat Ibn Umar (radhiyallahu anhu) narrates that Nabi (sallallahu alaihi wasallam) said:

“Women have no share in emerging (from their homes) except in emergencies (i.e. genuine needs defined and explained by the Fuqaha)” (Tabaraani — Mu’jamul Kabeer)

Regarding Rasulullah’s (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) explicit declaration that the woman is Aurah, the first and primary level of concealment is confinement to the home. Hence, in an authentic variant of the above Hadith found in the Musannaf of Abi Shayba, Hazrat

Ibn Mas'ood (radhiyallahu anhu) issues the following emphatic command:

“Keep the women confined (احبسوا) to the home, for indeed the woman is Aurah (must be concealed in entirety). Verily, when a woman emerges from her home, shaytaan surreptitiously pursues her and says to her: “You will not pass by any [man] except that he will be attracted to you.”

Note the verb and command tense used by Hazrat Ibn Mas'ood (radhiyallahu anhu) in this Saheeh narration - literally "imprison" - to emphasize the obligation on the men's part to ensure that their womenfolk remain confined indoors.

The Final Nail in the Prohibition of female emergence and intermingling is the Command of Allah Ta’ala stated in the Qur’aan Majeed:

***“And, remain glued within your homes, and make not a display (of yourselves) such as the exhibition of Jaahiliyyah.***

## ***HOW TO EASILY IDENTIFY A FEMINIST, CHARLATAN SCHOLAR***

Scour through the Ghutha (trash) verbage of feminine, charlatan "Maulanas", "Muftis" and "Shaykhs" who fraudulently claim to follow Rasulullah's (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) teachings authentically and one cannot help but notice that every single command of Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) pertaining to women which does not conform with the Kuffaar cult of life, is vividly conspicuous by its absence.

Chicanery and deceit are qualities that are ingrained in the disposition of all of these feminist deviate "scholars". While they harp on about Rasulullah's (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) command not to prevent women from the Masjids, they all maintain a spectacularly deafening silence on the pre-conditions which Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) himself had set for their attendance.

How many of these feminist deviate scholars expend any effort and how much of their Ghutha (trash) is devoted to exhorting women to emerge only in the state of being "Tafilaat" as explicitly commanded by Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam)? How much of their Ghutha is expended in explaining what "Tafilaat" actually entails according to the experts of the Arabic language i.e. bad-smelling and shabbily, unattractively dressed?

How much of their Ghutha is devoted to emphasizing Rasulullah’s (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) explicit command to women to adhere to the edges of the path, as a result of which the noble female Sahaabiyyaat (radhiyallahu anhumaa) would scrape their outer garments against the walls?

How much of their Ghutha is expended in re-iterating Rasulullah’s (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) explicit declaration that a woman who emerges outside smelling of any form of fragrant scent, is an adulteress whose Salaat is rejected until she performs the Ghushl of Janaabah (ritual purification required after intercourse)?

How much of their Ghutha is disgorged in expounding on the prohibition of men and women being in close proximity even on the roads, leave aside the vicinity of the most sanctified places in the world?

And, how much of their Ghutha is devoted to any of the countless other commands of Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) which are in complete conflict with, and wholly unpalatable to the values of Kufr which lurks in the inner recesses of their hearts?

The deception and misrepresentation of our Deen perpetrated by such charlatan scholars are made even more acutely conspicuous by the fact that all of the aforementioned commands of Rasulullah (sallallahu

alayhi wasallam), and other similar commands pertaining to women, are violated, en masse, to an epidemic degree never before witnessed by the Ummah.

In reality, it is the hidden disdain (Kufr) for these clear commands of Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) which do not accord with their Kufr worldview, which constrains them to seal their lips firmly shut whilst simultaneously being able to whine pathetically, with deafening loudness, about a Fatwa of prohibition which was initiated by none other than those who were the closest to Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam), and who understood and submitted to his teachings the best....

Charlatan, bogus ‘scholars’ always gravitate towards haraam and kufr due to their indulgence in fisq and fujoor which they laboriously but abortively struggle to halaalize. These facebook and immoral media characters are experts in displaying their snouts on these immoral haraam media platforms. Beware of them. They are the dacoits who rob Muslims of their Akhlaaq and Imaan. They pillage and plunder the Shariah with their copro liberal ideas acquired from the western Yahood and Nasaara whom they bootlick.

All of these liberal modernists (especially those who masquerade as molvis and scholars) who fraudulently claim affiliation to our Sunnah Tradition invariably tend to find such tenets which are entrenched

permanently in the Shariah by Ijma’ (consensus), extremely unpalatable.

Moronic and baseless reasonings are generally proffered by these misguided copro liberals in order to circumvent or water down and extinguish these Waajib tenets of the Deen which serve as a vital vanguard to protect the Ummah from satanic infiltration and adulteration of the purity of the Shariah.

In reality, the slogan of “tolerance” and “unity” trumpeted by the liberal molvis are but deceptive canards. Their tolerance is restricted to only their own kind. Their idea of unity precludes unity with the Haqq. They bear the greatest of intolerance to the Haqq. Take the example of shaving the beard and the “tolerance” of such liberals for the view that shaving is “mutilation”, “akin to chopping off one’s penis”, “imitation of the Kuffaar”, “imitation of women”, “a huge transgression of the Shari’ah”, “plucking a few hairs causes one’s Shahaadat to become Mardood”, etc. etc.

While exhibiting extreme tolerance for every conceivable Shaytaniyaat, these fraudsters harbour extreme intolerance for the Haqq. Their hearts are terminally diseased and their brains are putrified. This is because of the Rijs Allah Ta’ala has cast on their brains.

***“Thus, does He (Allah) cast RIJS (FILTH) on those who lack intelligence.” (Qur’aan)***

## THE CLINCHING FACTOR

Allah Ta’ala says in the Qur’aan Majeed:

***“In fact We hurl the Haqq against baatil, crushing out its brains, then it vanishes.”***

***(Al-Ambiya, Aayat 18)***

The satanic screed excreted by the morons who have set themselves up as ‘mujtahids’ is an ill-fated stupid attempt to dismantle and extinguish the Qur’aan’s Law of Hijaab. But, the damnable exercise of these copro morons has not yielded the desired objective of their nafs.

The motive of those who seek to abrogate the Shariah’s Law of Hijaab is nothing but sexual gratification. This is the rationale underlying their sex obsession. In the pursuit of this evil objective, they disgorge real hogwash and pure drivel which make them appear like clowns with all the twaddling with which they trifle with the Deen.

The festering pile of manure which the morons have offered as argument for denying the Shariah’s *ahkaam* pertaining to female face covering and intermingling of the sexes has not succeeded in creating even a crease or a kink in the Shariah’s armoury of formidable *dalaa-il* to substantiate the validity of the Niqaab (Face Cover) and the Hijaab (Screen).

These two issues are Commands of the Qur’aan which override, cancel and abrogate any conflicting argument, Hadith, opinion and interpretation.

Crushing out the brains of all the stupidity excreted by the copro morons, are three Aayats of the Qur’aan:

***(1) “O Nabi! Say to your wives, your daughters and the women of the Mu’mineen that they should draw over them their jilbaabs. That is the least (requirement) so that they be recognized (as respectable and honourable ladies) and not be molested by (evil fussiaaq).” (Al-Ahzaab, Aayat 59)***

This Aayat clinches the argument. This Aayat is the Final Word on the compulsion of face covering for Muslim ladies. It overrides and cancels every hadith and every opinion from which a contrary idea is extravasated by the morons.

***(2) “When you ask them (women) for anything, then ask them from behind a screen. This is purer for your hearts and their hearts.” (Al-Ahzaab, Aayat 53)***

This Aayat nullifies every stupid argument in favour of intermingling of men and women. The separating Screen is Fardh, and nothing can override this Qur’aanic command.

**(3) “And remain (glued) within your homes and make not a display of yourselves such as the exhibition of jaahiliyyah.” (Al-Ahzaab, Aayat 33)**

This Aayat also prohibits women from leaving their homes, other than for real and valid needs. Should need compel emergence, then Aayat 53 and Aayat 59 mentioned above, will apply. It is the death-knell for intermingling.

With these Qur’aanic Verses the junk and flotsam of the morons are effectively demolished and deracinated.

**“In fact We hurl the Haqq against baatil, crushing out its brains, then it vanishes.”  
(Al-Ambiya, Aayat 18)**