

PROHIBITION OF IKHTILĀT:

A PROTECTIVE

**ISLAMIC CIVILIZATIONAL
BARRIER**



Author: A UK Brother

Published by:

The Majlis

PO Box 3393

Port Elizabeth

6056. South Africa

**THE SHAR'I
PROHIBITION
OF
INTERMINGLING
OF THE SEXES**

PREFACE

The Prohibition of Ikhtilaat: A Protective Islamic Civilisational Barrier is, Alhamdulillah, an excellent, well-researched article prepared by a Brother in UK. He elaborately and convincingly with facts and conclusive evidences refutes the kufr article written by some UK Zindeeq, Yahood-Nasaara Bootlicking molvies who have laboriously and abortively struggled to refute the Shariah's decree of the *Prohibition of Intermingling of the sexes*.

The author has shown that the attempt to abrogate the *Prohibition of Intermingling (Ikhtilaat)*, is not a fortuitous *nafsaani* sprouting of ignorant Muslims who find themselves swirling in the vortex of western immorality. The *struggle* to abolish the *Prohibition* is a vital cog in the satanic machinery to extinguish Islam. The author has, Alhamdulillah, provided adequate proof for this contention.

This pernicious *struggle* of the Yahood and Nasaara has taken into its grasp numerous molvis and sheikhs to execute the satanic plot of dismantling Islam. The chimera of the dollars dangled in front of these bootlickers has induced them to barter away their Imaan and to purchase everlasting damnation in the Aakhirah.

The groundwork for dismantling Islam in this era via the avenue of refuting the validity of the *Prohibition* was prepared by some Egyptian *murtadd* sheikhs, namely, Abduh, Ahmed Lutfi Sayed, Qasim Amin, Taha Husayn, etc. These miserable murtaddeen-munafiqeen were virulently anti-Islam having been thoroughly indoctrinated by their western atheist educational masters in the art of *bootlicking* the Yahood and Nasaara who are the forerunners in the satanic campaign to destroy Islam and the Ummah. They have left no stone unturned in their conspiracy to extinguish Islam. In regard to such scoundrel, Satanists, the Qur'aan Majeed states:

*“O People of Imaan! Do not take as confidants
(bosom friends) those besides yourselves
(Mu'mineen).*

*They leave nothing (no stone unturned) to cause
harm to you. Verily, hatred (for you) has gushed
from their mouths, but what their hearts conceal
is worse. Verily, We have made clear the Aayaat
(Signs) to you, if indeed you have intelligence
(to understand their plots).”
(Aal-e-Imraan, Aayat 118)*

The plot is deep, subtle, cunning and absolutely pernicious. It has undoubtedly reaped considerable

success as is evidenced by the absolutely rotten immoral state of the Ummah today. However, the success is not the effect of the cunning of the kuffaar. The success of the plots of the Yahood and Nasaara is in reality the effect of the *jahaalat (ignorance)* of the masses of the Ummah, and this *jahaalat* of the masses stems from the abandonment of *Amr Bil Ma'roof Nahyi anil Munkar* of the Ulama, as well as from the Ulama having imbibed the villainous attribute of *hubbud dunya (love of the world)*.

Jahaalat is fertile ground for ploughing the seeds of the kuffaar conspiracies. Allah Ta'ala has ordained *Ilm of the Deen compulsory (Fardh)* for all Muslims, male and female. When the Ummah abandoned this *Fardh* command, *Jahaalat* filled the vacuum. Thus, Muslims were easily lured into entrapment of the tentacles of the Satanist kuffaar. Then with their extremely potent weapon of their system of kufr, immoral education they easily indoctrinated Muslims with the venom necessary for the effacement of Imaan.

The consequence of Muslim *jahaalat* was their abandonment of practical Islam, and in its wake came the loss of Muslim political domination which was substituted with the political ascendancy of the western kuffaar as a punishment of Allah Azza Wa Jal. When the western colonial conquerors of the

Muslim lands established their control in the Lands of Islam, they found the fertile ground of Muslim *jahaalat* which enabled them to successfully roll out their conspiracies to dismantle and demolish Islam.

It is essential to understand that kuffaar plots can succeed only if the ground has been made fertile by Muslims themselves. The success of kuffaar plots presupposes Muslim *Jahaalat* with its consequence of abandonment of practical Islam. This is not a mere hypothesis. It is a fact substantiated by the Qur'aan. Allah Ta'ala says:

“If you adopt Sabr and Taqwa, never then will their plots harm you in the least. Verily, Allah encompasses (is fully aware) of what they (the kuffaar) are perpetrating.”
(Aal-e-Imraan, Aayat 120)

“O People of Imaan! Guard yourselves, then he who has strayed will not be able to harm you when you have attained hidaayat.”
(Al-Maaidah, Aayat 105)

Thus, Muslims themselves have cast themselves into the snares of the kuffaar whose plots do not succeed because of their ingenuity –“*never will their plots harm you*”. But when Muslims themselves abandon Sabr and Taqwa, they blindly fall into the traps of the kuffaar.

The Author has indicated the consequence thereby alerting Muslims of the grave dangers of the plots of the Yahood and Nasaara. The villainous gravity of their plots is verified by the Qur'aan Majeed:

“Indeed they conspired their plots whilst their plots are by Allah. Indeed, (the gravity) of their plots is such that it even displaces mountains.”
(Ibraaheem, Aayat 46)

Allah Ta'ala is well aware of their plots the success of which is reliant on his decree for which the determinant is the conduct of Muslims themselves.

We have interspersed the Author's article with our comments which appear in bold in parenthesis.

May Allah Ta'ala munificently reward the Author for the excellent service his article provides for Muslims. He has alerted Muslims of the grave danger of the bootlicking molvis and sheikhs who have bartered away their Imaan and sold their souls to the Yahood and Nasaara for the carrion of the dunya. Their pernicious, satanic objective is to extinguish Islam to fulfil the satanism of the Egyptian murtaddeen such as Abdu, Husayn Taha and their ilk. But they are doomed to failure, for Allah Ta'ala says:

*“Verily We have revealed the THIKR,
and verily, We are its Protectors.”
(Qur’aan)*

Thus the schemed erosion of the Shariah by means of the rat-nibbling of the *Ahkaam* of the Shariah perpetrated by these *shayaateenul ins* (*human devils*) will not succeed. Allah Ta’ala has his ways of guarding His Deen.

THE MAJLIS

INTRODUCTION

Ikhtilāt, or intermingling of the sexes, has been a topic of much discussion in recent weeks. There are those who argue for preserving the Islamic tradition prohibiting *ikhtilāt* as a normative position. Others have attempted to undermine the ruling through a doubt-ridden deconstructionist process, rendering it completely impracticable or enforceable. Others still have proffered support to the second view by arguing that given modernity's socio-political hegemony, which combines the sexes in public spaces, Muslims find themselves in abnormal circumstances unable to maintain the moral ideal. As such, the second view, accommodating this reality, is preferred. For the sake of clarity, I do not uphold the second view and its supporting excuses.

It is not quite clear how social conditions born of Eurocentric modernity thrust upon Muslims result in a conclusion that there is a need to undermine and relax the prohibition of *ikhtilāt*. Unless I am mistaken, human beings still possess sexual desires. The private parts of men and women continue to function. And proximity and frequency of interaction continue to factor in the psychology of attraction. If anything, modernity has hyper-accentuated facets pertaining to sexual desires through anti-God, anti-morality

“revolutions” and the proliferation of preferences in the pursuit of capitalist goals.

It is not quite clear how social conditions born of Eurocentric modernity thrust upon Muslims result in a conclusion that there is a need to undermine and relax the prohibition of *ikhtilāt*.

(The ‘conclusion’ referred to is an inspiration of shaitaan who has convoluted the brains of the jaahil authors. They are zindeeqs bred by Iblees –The Majlis)

The question that we should be asking is: Should Muslims grant flexibility to a destructive organisation of society that has birthed insurmountable problems? Briefly, these problems include, but are certainly not limited to:

1. High divorce rates, with declining rates of marriages.¹
2. Epidemic levels of sexual harassment in the UK predominantly against women.²

¹<https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/birthsdeathsandmarriages/divorce/datasets/divorces>

² <https://theewgroup.com/blog/sexual-harassment-workplace/>

3. An average of 31 violent crimes against women and girls on public transport are reported according to the latest official figures.³
4. Dramatic increases in sexual offences, including rape, across the UK.⁴ There are an average of 24 reports of rape a day in London.⁵ At least 1 in every 12 women will be a victim per year, with the exact number expected to be much higher.⁶
5. Convictions of police officers perpetrating sexual crimes.⁷
6. Epidemic levels of sexual misconduct and violence on NHS premises.⁸
7. According to research by the UK charity Tomorrow's Women, 93% of women do not feel safe being out alone at night, with 82% not feeling safe in bars or clubs.⁹

³ <https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/articles/clyg9mmnewwo>

⁴ <https://www.statista.com/statistics/283100/recorded-rape-offences-in-england-and-wales/>

⁵ <https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/articles/cxr202eee0no>

⁶ <https://news.npcc.police.uk/releases/call-to-action-as-violence-against-women-and-girls-epidemic-deepens-1>

⁷ <https://news.sky.com/story/dozens-of-police-officers-convicted-of-crimes-including-rape-and-sexual-assault-since-sarah-everards-murder-13086063>.
“The number of known criminal officers is ‘just scratching the surface’ due to the difficulties that victims face reporting offences.”

⁸ <https://www.medscape.co.uk/viewarticle/epidemic-sexual-misconduct-and-violence-nhs-premises-2023a1000ass>

⁹ <https://www.itv.com/news/granada/2024-12-03/man-disrupts-tv-interview-about-women-feeling-unsafe-in-public-spaces>

8. Continually increasing levels of STIs.¹⁰

I can go on, but the point is made.

(These problems, crimes and crimes of perversion are not confined to UK. They exist in all countries, South Africa excelling with other countries trailing not far behind. – The Majlis)

Whilst the merging of the sexes has unleashed a torrent of problems, the underlying philosophical currents have failed to produce any convincing guidance on how to constrain them. The #metoo movement demonstrated that liberalism is unable to provide an adequate solution to manage gender relations, fluctuating between non-contact and single-sex spaces¹¹ to complete intermingling of the sexes, with all mechanisms to manage relations falling apart with a bit of liquor and music on Friday and Saturday nights.

Against a backdrop of philosophical, political, and cultural hedonism as well as feminist indoctrination, sadly Muslims too are reaping these bitter fruits of

¹⁰ <https://www.lshtm.ac.uk/newsevents/news/2024/expert-commentsexually-transmitted-infection-rates-increasing>

¹¹ <https://www.itv.com/news/granada/2024-12-03/man-disrupts-tvinterview-about-women-feeling-unsafe-in-public-spaces>

modernity. The consumption of pornography is no longer an aberration. Those familiar with educational settings at all levels will tell you that pre-marital intimacy and obscenities are rife amongst young Muslims. Social media has accentuated all these immoralities. There is a “surge” in divorce rates among Muslims in the UK.¹² And high-profile cases of Imams engaging in sexual misconduct with their female students suggest that Islamic institutions are not immune from degeneracy. *(This picture mirrors the rot all over the world –The Majlis)*

It is well-established that a strong, stable society where modesty and marriage are sanctified and protected is a key pillar enabling broader transformative Islamic efforts. To compromise on the mechanisms that help mitigate moral catastrophes visiting the Ummah is damaging and a case of self-harming.

Like a flood that stresses the banks designed to contain it, the forces of modernity – embodied in its irrational notion of freedom, the unveiling of women, and the mixing of the sexes – bear upon the barriers protecting Muslims. Under such mounting pressure, to

¹² <https://www.versuslaw.co.uk/news/the-rise-of-divorce-in-the-muslimcommunity-unveiling-the-factors-behind-the-increase/>

weaken these defences by eroding the prohibition of *ikhtilāt* would be a grave folly. Surely, the wiser course is to fortify these barriers, reinforcing them against the unseen tide of future threats.

Allah says:¹³

“Surely, those who like that lewdness spreads amongst the believers, for them there is painful punishment in this world and the Hereafter. Allah knows, and you do not know. Had it not been for the grace of Allah upon you, and His mercy, and that Allah is Very-Kind, Very-Merciful (you would have been destroyed). O believers! Do not follow the footsteps of Satan. Whoever follows the footsteps of Satan, (should know that) he orders (one to commit) shameful acts and evil deeds.”

Although the verses pertain to the slander against our Mother Aishah (Radhiyallahu anha), the general meaning stands: debauchery and its diffusion only leads to self-destruction. And leading the believer to such actions is from the strategies of Shaitaan.

Those who pay close attention to the satanic patterns (*khutuwwāt ash-Shaytān*) are familiar with the cyclical nature of the attacks on Islam and the Islamic

¹³ Al-Qur’ān, 24:19-21.

civilisation. As we shall see, chief amongst them is the assault on the traditional prohibition of *ikhtilāt*. Indeed, our enemies know only too well that the intermingling of the sexes is a catalyst to seismic social problems and consequent collective debilitation.

Identifying the most fundamental differentiating factor between the Islamic and modern civilisations the American academic in Middle Eastern and Arab world studies, Miriam Cooke, writes:¹⁴

“Modernity was marked above all by the visibility of women in public places, and the contact established between Europe and Muslim majority countries emphasized to progressive and conservative Muslims alike the role women should play for a society to be considered modern. The veil and gender segregation came under attack as reformists tried to understand why it was that their societies appeared to be so much less developed than those in Europe.”

In other words, a materialist spectre riddled with an inferiority complex overtook a section of Muslims who framed themselves as “reformers” but attacked

¹⁴ Cooke, M. (2013). Feminism in Islam. In: Runehov, A.L.C., Oviedo, L. (eds) Encyclopedia of Sciences and Religions. Springer, Dordrecht. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4020-8265-8_428, p.851.

the Divine configuration laid out for society – the very same layout that changed the world – as the cause of ostensible Muslim decline.

This article will present three key examples, two of which relate to the Islamic world, and the last one to our British context. It will show that today’s arguments against the Islamic practice of sex separation are not new. They have been used in history by a cadre of anti-Islam enemies as part of a systematic process – *khutuwāt ash-Shaytān* – to remove Islam from the Islamic world.

Colonial Egypt and Tāhā Husayn (d. 1973 CE)

The current deformatist themes against traditional Islam can be traced to colonial Egypt, an era and region that is most instructive. It is safe to say that the model of “reform” experimented in colonial Egypt has formed the blueprint to undermine and inhibit the Islamic revival in the rest of the Islamic world.

We begin with the Arab modernist (*zindeeq, murtadd* – *The Majlis*) writer Tāhā Husayn, someone who is widely considered influential in shaping Arab intellectual life.¹⁵

¹⁵ El-Enany, Rasheed. Middle Eastern Studies 36, no. 2 (2000): 199–203. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/4284079>, p.199.

During the 1930s, images surfaced of young men and women sitting together as part of study in front of their teacher Husayn. This created a furore in Egypt. Against this backdrop, Husayn infamously remarked:

“I do not know of any text in the Qurān or Sunnah prohibiting young men and women from coming together for the pursuit of knowledge.”

When some cases of fornication occurred during the opening of the Egyptian National University (later Cairo University), he said nonchalantly: “There must be victims.” Clearly, catastrophic sacrifices must be made in the effort to modernise and europeanise Muslims.¹⁶

Husayn, in collusion with his secular liberal accomplice Ahmed Lutfī al-Sayyed (more on him

¹⁶ See the following article in the Egyptian Arab media outlet Al-Yawm Al-Sabi’:

<https://www.youm7.com/story/2020/5/14/%D8%B3%D8%B9%D9%8A%D8%AF-%D8%A7%D9%84%D8%B4%D8%AD%D8%A7%D8%AA-%D9%8A%D9%83%D8%AA%D8%A8-%D9%85%D8%B9%D8%A7%D8%B1%D9%83-%D8%A7%D9%84%D8%AA%D9%86%D9%88%D9%8A%D8%B1-%D8%AB%D9%84%D8%A7%D8%AB%D9%8A%D8%A9-%D8%B7%D9%87-%D8%AD%D8%B3%D9%8A%D9%86-%D8%B6%D8%AF%D8%A7%D9%84%D8%B8%D9%84%D8%A7%D9%85%D9%8A%D9%8A%D9%86/4774113>, See also Al-Qaḥṭānī, S. Kitāb al-Ikhtilāṭ bayna al-Rijāl wa-al-Nisā’. al-Riyād: Maṭba‘at Safrī, p. 14.

below), conspired to secretly admit girls into the mixed-gender classes at the university. The plan was to impose *ikhtilāt* as a fait accompli, forcing both governmental and social acceptance through its implementation.

These efforts were not met without resistance from the traditional scholars of Al-Azhar and the Muslim Brotherhood.

In 1940, Hasan al-Banna published *The Muslim Woman*, a title that seems to serve as a direct response to Qāsim Amīn's *The New Woman* published a few decades earlier. In this piece, al-Banna warned that "Islam sees in *ikhtilāt* a real danger". He outlined this danger as a loss of honour, corruption of souls, destruction of homes, and effeminacy. To al-Banna, these grave consequences far outweighed any perceived drawbacks of seclusion by a thousand fold.¹⁷

Despite some resistance, the Arab modernists succeeded in normalising unveiling and *ikhtilāt* at the university and in the broader Muslim world. The statements and tactics of Husayn and Lutfī to target women and the prohibition of *ikhtilāt* did not emerge

¹⁷ Banna, H. (1940). "al-Mar'at al-Muslimah" in Kitāb Maqālāt Mawqī' al-Durrar al-Sunnīyah, 1:6.

in a vacuum. As we shall now see, there are several layers of schemes at play, all linking to enemy strategies to undermine Islam and the Islamic world.

Husayn was born during the British occupation. According to his autobiography, Husayn had attended the prestigious Al-Azhar University.¹⁸ He found his *ālīmiyyah* studies boring and “constricting”,¹⁹ and, exhibiting anti-traditional, reformist tendencies would insult and disparage Azhari ulama.²⁰ He was dropped by scholars from the institution.²¹ Notably, the only influence he found solace in was that of Muhammad Abduh – the Freemasonic, neo-Mu’tazili Arab deformer who was supported by Evelyn Baring, 1st Earl of Cromer to destroy traditional Islam and give credence to colonial rule.²²

Pertinently, this influence occurred against a growing political landscape that was calling for the adoption of European, colonial modes of learning and living. To understand the nature of this landscape, we will take a

¹⁸ Hussein, T. (2001). *The Days: His Autobiography in Three Parts*. Cairo: American University in Cairo Press, pp.80-84.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, p.251.

²⁰ *Ibid.*, pp.190-191.

²¹ *Ibid.*, pp.252-257.

²² For more on ‘Abduh, see:

<https://muslimskeptic.com/2022/10/27/Muhammad-abduh-reformer/>

closer look at one of Egypt's earliest feminists, Qāsim Amīn.

Qāsim Amīn

Amongst those Husayn ardently extolled was Qāsim Amīn (d. 1908). In commemorating Abduh's death, Husayn delivered a heartfelt eulogy for both Abduh and Amīn, proclaiming with bold conviction that Egypt was "indebted for her awakening" to them. He praised Abduh for having "revived intellectual freedom" and lauded Amīn for "[renewing] our social liberty."²³

Amīn was a product of French colonial education, having studied law in France at the University of Montpellier and returning infatuated with European civilisation. Alongside a slew of Western liberals, he was strongly influenced by Karl Marx, Charles Darwin, and Fredrich Nietzsche. Deformists Jamal al-Din al-Afghani, and close friends Abduh and Ahmad Lufti al-Sayid also profoundly shaped his view.²⁴

²³ Hussein, T. (2001). *The Days: His Autobiography in Three Parts*. Cairo: American University in Cairo Press, p.383.

²⁴ Amīn, Q. (2000). *The Liberation of Women and The New Woman: Two Documents in the History of Egyptian Feminism*. Cairo: The American University in Cairo Press, pp.xi-xii.

The “Liberation of Women”

Amin targeted the traditional, veiled, non-intermingling women of Egypt as fundamental components of his plan to modernise Egypt. Lamenting how veiling and the prohibition of *ikhtilāt* were historically practised, he said:²⁵

“If we compare our present situation with that of the recent past, we know that a generation ago a woman would have been disgraced had she left her husband’s house or been seen by a stranger. When she went on a trip, all necessary measures were taken for her to travel at night so that no one would see her.”

Muslims often forget the normative position in Muslim societies, and such quotes are helpful to illustrate a snapshot of Islamic civilisational history in this regard.

More pertinently, for Amīn, these practices, and the prohibition of *ikhtilāt* in particular, were the source of Egypt’s “backwardness” and the cause of social problems.²⁶ To remove these obstacles to modernist progress, Amīn set out a reform strategy and set of

²⁵ Ibid., p.36.

²⁶ Ibid., p.xii. p.6. On seclusion as a cause of all problems, see pp.47-51.

arguments that are striking in that they are remarkably similar to today's assault on the prohibition of *ikhtilāt*.

Like 'Abduh's deform strategy to undermine traditional Islam and its scholarship through various sleight-of-hand tactics (highlighted later), Amīn's interventions exhibit a slippery slope. They begin with "reforms" within the framework of the "Qur'ān and Sunnah" and end with full-scale European-style intermixing of the sexes and denigration of traditional Islamic scholars and veiled Muslim women.

Tahrir al-Mara'a or Liberation of Women, published in 1899, was Amīn's first major deform work attacking the veil and the prohibition of *ikhtilāt* purportedly within a religious framework.

In it, he made several dubious arguments condemning the established positions that are fraught with contradictions, demonstrating his thesis-driven approach to *fiqh*.²⁷ For the sake of brevity, it is worth

²⁷ One example is Amīn's treatment of the risk of crimes in relation to the veil, which demonstrates the thesis-driven approach to his selective "fiqh". For example, in arguing that women should remove the veil, he states: "It is a very peculiar and difficult thing to prove the identity of a woman who is present but totally covered from head to foot or concealed behind a curtain or door." He further claims, "For years, both adversaries and judges paid no attention to this issue—they were lenient and allowed a woman to appear before them veiled. She could be a claimant, a defendant, or a witness, and

delineating the general deconstructive strategies he used to undermine the classical rulings on the veil and *ikhtilāt*.

Attacking taqlīd, promoting talfiq

Amin makes a two-pronged advance, undermining taqlīd while promoting talfiq to pick and choose opinions fitting his diagnosis of social practices that have precipitated, in his mind, the decline of the Egyptians: women, their veiling, and seclusion as obstacles to a European-style “progress”.

the judges apparently surrendered to tradition. The danger with this leniency, which I think we cannot tolerate, is quite obvious: there is no positive method by which a veiled person can be identified. This situation lends itself easily to fraud.” Amīn, Q. (2000). *The Liberation of Women and The New Woman: Two Documents in the History of Egyptian Feminism*. Cairo: The American University in Cairo Press, pp.40-41. In other words, there is a harmful risk of fraud where a woman’s identity is not disclosed (incidentally, Islam permits a woman to emerge from concealment and remove her veil for identity purposes where there is a need) and so women cannot be trusted. However, Amīn does not take a risk averse approach to the issue of temptation (which can lead to the crime of illicit sexual activities), instead telling women to just ignore this point: “The fear of temptation, addressed by almost every line written on the subject, is a matter close to the hearts of distrustful men. Women should not concern themselves with it nor ask to know anything about it.” *Ibid.*, p.42. Furthermore, he clearly opposes the classical texts he himself cites as justification to demonstrate that women can unveil their faces, which mention that that “a young woman is forbidden to expose the face for fear of temptation”. *Ibid.*, p.38.

He wrote:²⁸

“[Readers were] asked to avoid limiting themselves to the opinions of a single religious leader whose interpretations are inadequate for the needs of the era through which we are living. They were asked to consider multiple opinions and to investigate thoroughly the changing conditions of society and to compare these conditions with the opinions of the religious leaders. If they happen to find that the opinions of one of the religious leaders have an adverse effect on the legal system, they should replace these opinions with those of other religious leaders who in their theological schools promote ideas that meet the changing needs of society without departing from the general principles of the legal system.”

In short, any views that fit Amīn’s Europeanisation agenda should be considered and the rest ignored, all,

²⁸ Ibid., p.101. Another relevant quote: “Changing legal rulings to reflect changes in customs and the needs of society is not the same as changing Islamic law, but simply a matter of revising the details of the rulings in accordance with the general principles of the law and returning to the spirit of the law. We have the right to choose that which is appropriate and beneficial to us and to our interests. These choices apply to what we eat, what we wear, what we drink, and to all our public and private affairs. The only constraint is that we should not exceed the general boundaries we have discussed.” Ibid., p.104.

of course, within the “general principles” of the Sharīa. (*Amin’s ‘sharia’ of Iblees –The Majlis*)

“General principles”

Elaborating on these principles, he wrote,²⁹

“[Our legal system developed] from branches going back to one root. The Shari‘a includes generalities and general boundaries... These are the general principles that limit our work within the appropriate boundaries. The Quran and the Prophetic tradition are not susceptible to change or exchange. But the rules based on the predominant traditions and procedures are susceptible to change, according to social conditions and historical time frame, so long as such changes do not offend the principles of the Shari‘a.”

Thus, according to the modernist fiqh of Amīn, we can take any view within the purview of principles shorn of the classical rulings that have been developed over centuries by a meticulous system of precedent.

What are these principles?

²⁹ Ibid., p.104.

Amīn injects doubt into the rulings concerning the veil and the prohibition of *ikhtilāṭ* by focusing on the parts of the body that can be shown, such as the hands, feet, and face whilst ignoring the condition of temptation.³⁰ Then, he dismisses the prohibition of *ikhtilāṭ* by restricting the verse of the curtain to the blessed wives of Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) stating that the only forbidden interaction according to hadith is a stranger being alone with a woman and that the Qur’ān impresses on Muslims that the Din is easy.³¹

(This is precisely the stance of the two zindeeq authors of the ghutha article which is an abortive attempt to scuttle the Shariah’s Prohibition of intermingling. They have lapped up the vomit disgorged by the Egyptian murtaddeen bootlickers of the western atheist university professors – The Majlis)

In this model, the veil and the prohibition of *ikhtilāṭ* are mere customs taken from other civilisations. Thus,

³⁰ That is, that for young women, the fear of temptation is present and therefore it would be impermissible to uncover the face. Ibid., pp.38-39.

³¹ “These revelations pertained exclusively in the Prophet’s women and are not applicable to women in general. Thus, this seclusion is not a religious duty required for any other Muslim women.” “The Shari‘a, as we have presented it, does not require women to be secluded. Seclusion is not a constructive activity, and in fact it can be considered harmful.” Ibid., pp.44-45.

covering, excluding the face and hands, and the prohibition of men and women meeting alone are the “principles” he establishes. Astonishingly, this is the core argument made today against *ikhtilāṭ*. And like the arguments made today, any interactions between the sexes within these principles cannot be deemed condemnable.

(These morons in emulation of the Egyptian Satanists have stupidly and subjectively accorded two particular issues –juzwi masaa-il- the status of principles, and on which basis they evolve spurious conclusions to legalize practices leading to zina while all such practices are haraam in terms of the Qur’aanic PRINCIPLE: ‘Do not approach even near to zina.’ – The Majlis)

Delegitimising classical scholars by distancing them from “original Islam”

Of course, recourse to the classical texts and the positions of authoritative scholars would demonstrate the arbitrary (*and flagitious*) nature of the choice of principles and the reductionism required to sustain the argument. Hence, Amīn’s strategy turns to delegitimising classical scholarship and its Azhari proponents.

First, he repackages his liberal, materialist conception of equality as the “original Islam”. Then, he frames the veil and the prohibition of *ikhtilāṭ* as customs. Thus, according to Amīn, “originally women in Islam were granted an equal place in human society” and Islamic law had given “the same rights to women as to men”, even though the Sharīa clearly tailors laws to facilitate sexual differences.³²

Concerning the veil he wrote:³³

“The gauze face-cover and the veil are not part of the Shari‘a, in terms either of piety or of morality. They have been handed down to us from ancient traditions that preceded Islam and have continued to survive.”

And, on the concealment or seclusion of women:³⁴

“The Shari‘a, as we have presented it, does not require women to be secluded. Seclusion is not a constructive activity, and in fact it can be considered harmful.”

³² Ibid., p.8, p.39.

³³ Ibid., p.43.

³⁴ Ibid., p.45.

For Amīn, these practices were heresies – a part of a different religion altogether – that were an obstacle to progress towards “advanced civilisations”, which unveiled women and encouraged men and women to mix:³⁵

“What present-day Muslims (and the majority of their scholars) call Islam is in reality a conglomeration of many ideas, customs, and traditions that have no relationship to the genuine, true, and pure religion. In fact, these contemporary conceptions of Islam are heresies, unprecedented features that have been attached to Islam. Thus it is the medley of beliefs, traditions, and morals that people call religion and consider to be Islam that is in fact the obstacle to progress.”

Having distinguished – in his modernist mind – Islam as practised traditionally during his time and the liberal “original Islam”, and associated the former with failure and decline, he attacked Islamic scholars for sustaining it and making Islam “an object of ridicule”. Aside from Abduh, Islamic scholars had turned away from “other areas of knowledge”, were ignorant and “deceitful”, and “the gap between them

³⁵ Ibid., P.65.

and the genuine religion of Islam” was “tremendous.”³⁶

Furthermore, he stated that the traditional knowledge taught at Al-Azhar – i.e. Islamic theology and jurisprudence – was “useless” unless it was “based on scientific truth” and scientific principles.³⁷

Attacking the notion of tradition

Amīn’s progressivist attack deepens to encompass the notion of tradition more generally, arguing that traditions can be changed and replaced by new ones since they are merely “specific to a historical era” and tied to a nation’s “intellectual state”. Amīn suggested that we should adopt the practices of a more advanced intellectual civilisation (i.e., Europe and the US).³⁸

Laying the foundations for undermining the period of the Salaf, he posited that “Islam had turned the hearts of individuals away from that which their fathers valued and that which the children had inherited”.³⁹ Of course, the parallel is absurd since (a) the logic of progressivism does not withstand rational scrutiny,⁴⁰

³⁶ Ibid., p.65, p.66, p.67.

³⁷ Ibid., p.69-70.

³⁸ Ibid., p.5-8.

³⁹ Ibid., p.69.

⁴⁰ There is a contradiction at the heart of liberal progressivism in that it invokes a lens of history which supports modernity’s notion of progress

and (b) Amīn was turning Muslims towards the children of atheistic secularism.

“Reforms are within the Sharī’a”

Finally, he repeatedly stressed that his “reforms” were “according to Islamic law”, within the “veil’s legal limitations”,⁴¹ and not mere imitation:⁴²

whilst denying the use of history to demonstrate its antithesis. Furthermore, it is self-referential and therefore groundless. Pertinently, the liberal god of progressivism has failed to produce a convincing moral system. Instead, its system of thought has birthed the destruction of nature, mankind, and social structures such as the family on an industrial scale. As we shall see later, the adoption of modernity’s debris in Egypt and Saudi Arabia has only resulted in moral decline. Amīn exemplifies this ideological view of social practice when he invokes American and European female examples as models that demonstrate benefits without a moral decline. *Ibid.*, pp.123-124. The following quote is emblematic of his blind progressivism: “In spite of all this, you will find that Western households are based on firm principles, and we are aware that Western nations are continually progressing. None of the calamities have befallen them that we have been threatened with by our writers and men of jurisprudence, who talk long of the dangers that result from giving women their freedom. We have often heard them state that free association between men and women will lead to the mixing of people, which means the destruction of the nation. “In European countries, men and women interact with one another in all walks of life at all times of the day. Even here, our Christian and Jewish brothers and sisters have recently abandoned the custom of seclusion, and have brought up their women with the freedom of unveiling their faces and associating with men. And how far they are from deterioration and destruction! So let us abandon these fantastic theories, which are worthless in the face of facts.” *Ibid.*, pp.144-145. If only he was alive today to witness the wonderful moral progress Western countries have made!

⁴¹ *Ibid.*, p.34, p.35.

⁴² *Ibid.*, pp.45-46

“I have suggested a change in the use of the veil and a return to its use as identified by the ordinances of the Sharia, because we are attached to Islamic traditions and respect them. I am not in any way requesting this change because we wish to imitate for the sake of imitation of Western nations and their traditions and conditions.”

And:⁴³

“We have proved that every suggested reform concerning women is completely in accordance with the laws and intentions of the Shari‘a.”

It is noteworthy that reformists today repeat the same mantra that their dubious (*haraam and kufr*) proposals are within the “principles and aims of the Sharī‘a”.

The New Woman

In his first work, Amīn framed his strategy to unveil women and thrust them amongst men as being within the bounds of Sharī‘a. However, in his second work, his attack became more virulent, explicitly grounded in a secular liberal and scientific framework.

⁴³ Ibid., p.103.

As such, having deconstructed taqlīd and undermined traditional ulama, Amīn promoted the taqlīd of Herodotus, Rousseau, Karl Marx, Herbert Spencer, John Stuart Mill,⁴⁴ and various Americans and Europeans to extol the virtues of unveiling and *ikhṭilāt*.⁴⁵ (*These atheists were characters specifically created to be fuel for Jahannam. These murtadd Egyptian shaitaani scholars were the bootlickers of these atheists. – The Majlis*)

His tirades became more strident, adopting a tone that would resonate well with anti-Islam neo-conservatives and their deformist agents amongst Muslims today. The key point for readers to understand is how the first book laid the groundwork for the more radical arguments presented in the second.

On Islamic tradition, Amīn questioned whether any part of the Islamic civilisation is the “model of human perfection” since it preceded the discovery of scientific principles.⁴⁶ As such there was nothing to

⁴⁴ Ibid., pp.111-112.

⁴⁵ Ibid., p.166, pp.121-125.

⁴⁶ He wrote: “Since Islamic civilization began and ended before the principles of science were discovered, how can we continue to believe that it was a ‘model of human perfection’? We do not want to belittle our ancestors or detract from their achievements. But at the same time we must not cheat ourselves by imagining that they achieved unsurpassable perfection.” Ibid., p.186.

borrow from Islamic civilisation. He further asserted that early Muslims had not achieved moral perfection:⁴⁷

“People of our age imagine that the early Muslims achieved all the forms of true moral perfection, which is a wrong view, or at least an exaggerated one.”

(By implication this kufr includes Rasulullah – Sallallahu alayhi wasallam. The logical inference is that our Nabi – Sallallahu alayhi wasallam – had not attained moral perfection – Nauthubillaah! – The Majlis)

Consequently, Islamic civilisation “erred in its understanding of the natural disposition of woman or her place in society”. For Amīn, the European civilisation is the “best achievement of human beings”⁴⁸ and tradition should be resisted if it opposes “our will-power and free choice”.⁴⁹

Clearly, the Prophetic age of the “best of generations” was not good enough for the obsequious (*bootlicking*) Amīn. He also reiterated that the “inferior and backward status of Islamic countries in comparison to other countries” is attributed to “the Islamic

⁴⁷ Ibid., P.186.

⁴⁸ Ibid., P.196.

⁴⁹ Ibid., p.184.

scholars,”⁵⁰ who are “ignorant jurisprudents” for defending the veil and the prohibition of *ikhtilāt*.⁵¹ The correct jurisprudence required for Amīn is one where, faced with divergent opinions and changing “social conditions” that reflect a desire for freedom,⁵² we should select the one that aligns with liberalism and freedom:⁵³

“It therefore seems clear that our religion does not support the opinion of those scholars who uphold the more extensive use of the veil. If indeed this issue has two sides, it is acceptable for us to give more weight to the opinion that supports human freedom and the general welfare of our society.”

At this stage of Amīn’s deform path, women covering and veiling was slavery⁵⁴ and “one of the vestiges” of

⁵⁰ Ibid., P.117.

⁵¹ Ibid., P.131.

⁵² Ibid., p.142: “Our social conditions have now completely changed. We have become free, and we love freedom.”

⁵³ Ibid., p.117.

⁵⁴ He wrote: “The woman who must conceal her limbs and the external features of her body—thus hindering her walking, riding, or breathing, and disabling her from looking or talking without difficulty—is a slave, because her enclosure in a piece of fabric that is meant to hide her appearance, and the confinement of her natural human form from the gaze of every man except those of her lord and master, is a form of slavery.” Ibid., p.132. The slavery comment is ironic. His ideal is European, fawning over millions of women intermingling and working amongst men (see for example, Ibid.,

“barbaric behaviour”.⁵⁵ And the prohibition of *ikhtilāt* was effectively a “crime against humanity”,⁵⁶ which Muslims should “shun and abhor”.⁵⁷

Ulama at the time understood that removing such measures would be destructive to Muslims and had expressed this point in their refutations against Amīn and his ilk. Amīn responded that the unveiling and mixing in Europe did not lead to destructive outcomes:⁵⁸

p.125) mainly for men. In his book *The Liberation of Women*, he considered women who do not work an economic burden: “If a woman were led by the hand into the community of the living, if her energy were directed toward active participation in society, and if she were to use her mental and physical abilities, she would produce as much as she consumes, rather than remain as she is now—a burden who lives only through the efforts of others... There is hardly an Egyptian family free of the burdensome expense of supporting a number of needy women unable to work or be self-sufficient. This phenomenon is one of the factors that prevent families from following sound economic principles in planning for their financial needs.” (Ibid., p.13). As such he had a problem with women being at home and not working outside: “The Arab woman was content with her food and barley bread, a cotton gown, and a camel-hair tent. Obtaining and managing these resources did not require extensive knowledge or great skills. The Arab woman lived ignorant of life’s affairs, because her family and her tribe did not need her support in sustaining their domestic or social life. The Arab woman, in fact, was enslaved. She was a commodity included in a man’s possessions through plunder, or through a contract that was more like a deed of purchase than a marriage.” (Ibid., p.152). Only a warped feminist would reconstitute the notion of women working for strange men as “liberation”.

⁵⁵ Ibid., p.134.

⁵⁶ Ibid., p.144.

⁵⁷ Ibid., p.179.

⁵⁸ Ibid., pp.144-145.

“We have often heard them state that free association between men and women will lead to the mixing of people, which means the destruction of the nation. In European countries, men and women interact with one another in all walks of life at all times of the day. Even here, our Christian and Jewish brothers and sisters have recently abandoned the custom of seclusion, and have brought up their women with the freedom of unveiling their faces and associating with men. And how far they are from deterioration and destruction!”

Given the collapse of Western morals and spiralling social problems, his argument has aged like milk.

In any case, the key point to note is the way Amīn’s slippery slope manifests itself. In *The Liberation of Women*, Amīn wanted his readers to believe he was not imitating the West. Yet, all along, the European model of social engagement was his goal.

The Education Trojan horse

For Amīn, like Evelyn Baring, 1st Earl of Cromer and Husayn, (see below), the avenue through which to realise the colonial Europeanisation of Egypt was education. This education would help women “discard the superstitions and myths that presently destroy the

minds of all women”.⁵⁹ Notably, these myths include the value of veiling and sex separation in the hearts of women:⁶⁰

“This early preparation will gradually accustom them to independence and to the belief that chastity is an inner spiritual quality, not the result of a garment which hides the body. They will also become accustomed to interacting with men—whether relatives or strangers—while respecting the limits of the Shari‘a and conforming to accepted moral principles... This preparation will eventually facilitate the integration of women with men.”

(Of the ‘limits of the Shariah to be respected’ and observed, are the Prohibition of intermingling, not looking at the opposite sex, dressing Islamically, females remaining within the home confines, etc. The consequence of the abandonment of these limits is the moral destruction of humanity bringing in its wake a deluge of social evils, mischief and anarchy. Never does such abandonment conform to “accepted moral principles”. – The Majlis)

⁵⁹ Ibid., p.12.

⁶⁰ Ibid., p.61.

Amīn's focus on the young reflects his general strategy to undermine Islam and effect a modernist social transformation. He was interested not so much in engaging traditional ulama but the more amenable educated youth to drive social changes around women.⁶¹ With this education, Amīn believed the social abandonment of removing veiling and acceptance of intermingling would occur gradually.⁶²

Muhammad Abduh (d. 1905)

Tāhā Husayn entered Al-Azhar University at a time when Amīn's attacks on tradition were firmly embedded in the zeitgeist. This background was sharpened for Husayn by Muhammad Abduh's deformatist assault against traditional Azhari ulama and their modes of teaching.⁶³

Abduh's strategy was influenced by the Protestant Reformation,⁶⁴ consisting of, inter alia, the following:⁶⁵

⁶¹ Amīn said: "We are writing to the educated individuals, especially to the young who are our future hope. They will indeed be the generation to have benefited from the exposure to a proper education, enabling them to bring the question of women to the place of concern and consideration it deserves." Ibid., p.116.

⁶² Ibid., p.134.

⁶³ Mahmoudi, A. (2013). *Tāhā Ḥusain's Education: From Al Azhar to the Sorbonne*. Routledge: Oxon, p.19.

⁶⁴ <https://divinity.uchicago.edu/sightings/articles/muslim-luther-andreformation-munim-sirry>

- a. Attacking and undermining taqlīd.
- b. Attacking the traditional scholars who upheld it and bypassing classical scholarly commentaries.
- c. Calling for a “return to the sources”. This meant reducing Islam back to its “principles” based on an understanding of the Qur’ān and Sunnah that is compliant with reason. (*The lopsided, convoluted reason infused into his brains by Iblees urinating in his ears. – The Majlis*) All else was innovations, accretions, and distortions.
- d. Advocating “independent” reasoning to “accommodate” modern ideologies.

Husayn was sold. So profound was the influence that “he came to be considered a follower of Abduh”⁶⁶ declaring “it was Shaykh Muhammad Abduh who gave Egypt its intellectual freedom.” Commenting on Abduh’s lectures promoting these themes, Husayn fondly reminisced:⁶⁷

*“Nothing can efface from my mind the memory
of that voice, the gentleness with which he
recited passages from the Holy Book, the
sincerity of his interpretation, or the strength of*

⁶⁵ Mahmoudi, A. (2013). Ṭāhā Ḥusain’s Education: From Al Azhar to the Sorbonne. Routledge: Oxon, pp.27-29.

⁶⁶ Ibid., p.26.

⁶⁷ Ibid., p.28.

his conviction that nothing he said was in contradiction with the discoveries of modern science, or at variance with the demands of Western civilization.”

This experience deepened Husayn’s dissatisfaction with the traditional Azhari curriculum, which prioritised religious knowledge over modern sciences. It set in motion Husayn’s positivist turn under the auspices of European orientalists (see below), which inverted the prevailing epistemological hierarchy. Over time, this transformation led him to cast aside Islamic knowledge altogether, embracing secular humanism, and ultimately guiding him to heresy.⁶⁸

Husayn’s rebellious feelings were further nurtured by Abduh’s curricular reform efforts, which curtailed and diminished traditional Islamic modes of teaching and

⁶⁸ The secular germs of doubt and philosophical distortion courtesy of French positivism and break with tradition grew into strange conclusions. These included denial of miracles Ibid., p.133), considering the Abrahamic descent of Arabs a myth and legend (Ibid., p.212), relegating religion to the realm of emotions, necessitating a separation of science and religion (Ibid., pp.209-220), and treating religion as a social phenomenon (Ibid., p.212). This also meant a secularised reinterpretation of Islamic history so as to exclude Divine support as the fundamental cause of Muslim victories, although he was unable to articulate what those causes were (see p.124 and pp.210-213). He said, “Don’t talk to me about miracles and events which violate the customary course of things (khawāriq al-‘ādāt). These matters have nothing to do with history or logic and are better relegated to religious disciplines“. Ibid., p.124.

the place of Islam as an identity. Abduh attempted this in two ways. First, he sought to ban the teaching of classical commentaries in the early years by appealing to a direct access to source texts. The second tactic was to introduce broader Trojan horse subjects to discredit traditional Islam and its associated method of teaching.⁶⁹

Amongst these subjects was Arab literature, taught by Abduh's appointee Shaykh Sayyid ibn Alī al-Marsafī (d. 1932).⁷⁰ These classes reinforced the dismissal of commentaries, favouring unrestrained thinking and "unfettered" criticism of primary sources and their associated authoritative commentators. They also lionised pre-Islamic Arabs in place of the Salaf.

Commenting on these lessons, Husayn stated:⁷¹

"The final result of all this was to break the chains of the Azhar once and for all, to arouse utter disgust – as a rule entirely justified, but

⁶⁹ Ibid., pp.20-22.

⁷⁰ 'Abduh had introduced the study of literature as an "educational reform" at Al-Azhar and had appointed Shaykh Marsafī to teach it. Shaykh Marsafī's method dismissed established commentaries to focus directly on the primary sources. El-Enany, Rasheed. Middle Eastern Studies 36, no. 2 (2000): 199–203. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/4284079>, p.199.

⁷¹ Mahmoudi, A. (2013). Ṭāhā Ḥusain's Education: From Al Azhar to the Sorbonne. Routledge: Oxon, p.32.

*not always – with the taste, scholarship,
conversation and general behaviour of the
shaykhs.”*

Explaining how broader subjects were used to undermine traditional Islam and the ulama, Mahmoudi revealingly explains:⁷²

*“The man who was entrusted with teaching
literature played in fact the part of Trojan horse
within the Azhari fortress.”*

Ahmad Lutfī al-Sayyid (d. 1963)

At this point, Husayn was ready to transcend Abduh’s modernism through his introduction to the modernist secular liberal nationalist Ahmad Lutfī al-Sayyid.

Lutfī was the editor-in-chief of the propaganda paper al-Jarida, a mouthpiece and hub for the Egyptian secular liberal nationalist movement.

Outlining Lutfī’s modernist position, Mahmoudi writes:⁷³

*“He calls explicitly for learning from the West,
for taking Europe as a guide. In an article
entitled Taqlīd (“Imitation”), Lutfī would go so*

⁷² Ibid., p.33, p.34.

⁷³ Ibid., pp.44-45.

far as to affirm the need to imitate European civilization.”

In calling for this Egyptianised Europeanism, Lutfī criticised traditional modes of teaching, including Qur’ān memorisation schools, and stipulated that there should be no Islamic codes and doctrines.⁷⁴ Furthermore, the secular Egyptian identity would have to disassociate from its Islamic or Arab affiliation and adopt an “eternal” identity based on European land and history.⁷⁵

Husayn drank from this poisoned anti-Islam modernist well wholesale. To change society, Lutfī’s view was that a liberal-indoctrinated elite intelligentsia had to be fomented that would drive social change and “reform relations within the family”.⁷⁶ With Abduh failing to modernise Al-Azhar,⁷⁷ Lutfī attempted to realise this goal by founding, alongside Qāsim Amīn, the Egyptian National University and becoming its rector.

Lutfī ensured the university propounded his ideals in agreement with Abduh, Amīn, the Freemason Sa’d

⁷⁴ Ibid., p.47, p.45.

⁷⁵ Ibid., p.225, pp.238-239.

⁷⁶ Ibid., p.47.

⁷⁷ Hussein, T. (2001). *The Days: His Autobiography in Three Parts*. Cairo: American University in Cairo Press, p.101.

Zaghlūl⁷⁸ and others: that it was not based on the traditional method of teaching. Furthermore, it should be secular and democratic.⁷⁹ All this had the effect of diminishing Islam in the hearts and minds of students.

To fuel this agenda, the university was staffed with European positivist orientalists (i.e., rejecting metaphysics for a limiting analysis based on empirical evidence and the scientific method across social sciences), who became the masters of Husayn. In effect, these French-schooled “reformers” invited the orientalist subversion of Islam into the Muslim world.

Orientalists

These included the Italian orientalist Carlo Alfonso Nallino (d. 1938), Italian (originally Portuguese Sephardic Jew),⁸⁰ orientalist David Santillana (d. 1931), and French Catholic orientalist and “pioneer of Catholic-Muslim relations” Louis Massignon (d. 1962).

Nallino provided Husayn with a positivist view of history: the idea that all literature reflects social

⁷⁸ See https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Saad_Zaghloul

⁷⁹ Mahmoudi, A. (2013). *Ṭāhā Ḥusain’s Education: From Al Azhar to the Sorbonne*. Routledge: Oxon, p.47.

⁸⁰ <https://www.oxfordbibliographies.com/display/document/obo-9780195390155/obo-9780195390155-0269.xml>

conditions and a particular time. We note this theme today in the way deformatists attempt to “historicise” Islamic scriptures. (*Yes, the Qur’aan and the Sunnah have been assigned to the museum. Islam itself is antique for them. Only its name is maintained on the basis of their Nifaaq. – The Majlis*) He also gave legitimacy to the spurious view that the “decline” in the Islamic world was due to abandoning *ijtihād* and *taqlīd*, reinforcing the hatred of traditional Islam.⁸¹

Santillana promoted the notion that Islam was simply based on “Greek sources”, aligning with the nationalist view that sought to bypass Islamic- Arabic significance. Unsurprisingly, Husayn similarly parroted such views.⁸² Massignon emphasised the study of history in opposition to Arab traditional authorities and modes of history and reinforced Husayn’s positivism and radical criticism.⁸³

In essence, each of them shifted the foundational lens through which Islam and Islamic civilisation were

⁸¹ Mahmoudi, A. (2013). *Ṭāhā Ḥusain’s Education: From Al Azhar to the Sorbonne*. Routledge: Oxon, pp.53-54.

⁸² Husayn took Santillana’s view the Islam’s contributions to knowledge were unoriginal and the Greek philosophy was superior to Islamic philosophy. In other words, he attacked and diminished Islam in an orientalist fashion. See *Ibid.*, p.59 and p.70 fn.138.

⁸³ On the views of the three Orientalists and their impact on Ḥusayn: *Ibid.*, pp.53-63 and pp.225-226.

studied, methodologically excluding Islamic source scriptures as true and recasting them as phenomena explicable solely through physical processes and explanations. This pivot paved the way for a social constructionist assault on the Qur’ān and Sunnah as historical artefacts – man-made documents reflecting specific circumstances of a bygone era.

Nevertheless, Husayn was so infatuated with the French and the modernist way that he went to study in Paris, then Montpellier, and even married his French catholic reader – against his own advice.⁸⁴ He maintained close friendly ties with his orientalist teachers, believing they were men of “pure motives” who were benevolent due to their love of Egypt and the Arabic language.⁸⁵ Husayn could not have been more deluded. *(Because he suffered from a disease of mental derangement termed Takhabbatush Shaitaan. – The Majlis)*

Nallino was a member of the Italian Ministry of Colonies Commission for the Study of Islamic Issues.

⁸⁴ Ḥusayn had stated that it was prohibited to marry European women due to the impact they would have on the culture of the family. Less than seven years later he married a French woman. Hussein, T. (2001). *The Days: His Autobiography in Three Parts*. Cairo: American University in Cairo Press, p.5.

⁸⁵ Mahmoudi, A. (2013). *Ṭāhā Ḥusain’s Education: From Al Azhar to the Sorbonne*. Routledge: Oxon, p.63. p.71, fn.163.

In 1919, he published a study that justified Italian rule over the Islamic judicial system in Libya by weakening the qadi's religious authority, a role that had historically been associated with the Ottoman Caliph.

In other words, it was geared to destroy pan-Islamic unity and facilitate Italy's eventual mission to colonise Libya and turn it into a Catholic imperial outpost.⁸⁶

Santillana also aided colonial efforts against the Sanusi people around the same period. He published a study focused on property rights in post-Ottoman Libya and suggested how the Italian state use its increased influence over local qadis to maintain control over Sanusi properties. Furthermore, it appears Santillana exploited his relationship with Husayn to strengthen the latter's hatred of traditional Ulama. In his autobiography, Husayn recounts an episode in which he and his colonial master visited a class at Al-Azhar.

Instead of simply observing, Husayn chose to engage the Shaykh in a theological debate, despite the latter's desire to proceed with the lesson. As Husayn

⁸⁶ Ryan, E. (2018). Religion as Resistance – Negotiating Authority in Italian Libya. New York: Oxford University Press, pp.102-103.

attempted to interrupt once more, the orientalist gently tapped him on the shoulder. Husayn recalls: “‘Be quiet!’ he whispered in that endearing Tunisian Arabic of his, ‘Be quiet! or he’ll hit you.’” In a tone of sycophantic reverence, Husayn contrasts the “touching kindness” of his colonial master with the Shaykh’s “indignation”.⁸⁷

Massignon, a Franciscan Catholic, was amongst the first to propose the idea that Islam belonged to the “Abrahamic religions”. This perspective shaped the Second Vatican Council’s approach to interfaith dialogue, laying the groundwork for the *Nostra Aetate* document.⁸⁸ As previously established, the notion of dialogue is entwined with the Catholic church’s covert missionary mandate to Christianise the Muslim world. All this reverberates into more contemporary anti-Islam schemes. The Vatican’s present-day role in the theological “interfaith” dimension of the Abraham Accords sham, which aims to neuter Islam, demonstrates its continuing subversive agenda.⁸⁹

⁸⁷ Hussein, T. (2001). *The Days: His Autobiography in Three Parts*. Cairo: American University in Cairo Press, pp.280-281.

⁸⁸ Davies, K., Garfitt, T. (2015). *God’s Mirror: Renewal and Engagement in French Catholic Intellectual Culture in the Mid-Twentieth Century*, New York: Fordham University Press, p.246.

⁸⁹ <https://coolnessofhind.wordpress.com/2024/03/29/post-gaza-plan-partiii/>

This subversive slant can be found in Massignon's adventures in the Muslim world. In 1917, during World War I, Massignon worked for the French Intelligence at the 17th Colonial Division and was assigned to the Sykes-Picot mission – the secret plan between Britain, France and Russia to destroy the Islamic world.⁹⁰ As a supporter of Zionism,⁹¹ he contributed to the deceitful Faisal-Weizmann Agreement,⁹² which gave recognition to a Jewish state in Palestine. He had even met T. E. Lawrence in Cairo in August 1917, with plans formed to post Massignon to the Arab Legion, an Arab force supporting Sharif Husain's revolt against the Ottomans.⁹³

Evelyn Baring, 1st Earl of Cromer

Initially, the British colonisers opposed Abduh and Lurfi's secular university project, fearing it would stir nationalism and thus threaten their colonial authority.

⁹⁰

See https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Faisal%E2%80%93Weizmann_agreement and Davies, K., Garfitt, T. (2015). *God's Mirror: Renewal and Engagement in French Catholic Intellectual Culture in the Mid-Twentieth Century*. New York: Fordham University Press, p.241.

⁹¹ Davies, K., Garfitt, T. (2015). *God's Mirror: Renewal and Engagement in French Catholic Intellectual Culture in the Mid-Twentieth Century*. New York: Fordham University Press, p.247. Apparently, Massignon became anti-Zionist later in life, which matters little given his instrumental involvement in schemes that fractured the Islamic world.

⁹² https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Faisal%E2%80%93Weizmann_agreement

⁹³ See: https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Louis_Massignon.

Yet, significantly, its establishment and goals, manifested in Husayn's anti-Islam secularised cognitive reconfiguration, ultimately aligned with a broader colonial agenda to Europeanise the Egyptian populace.

In Modern Egypt, Evelyn Baring outlined his justification for British colonial rule as necessary for Egypt's modernisation. He asserted that Egyptians were effectively too servile and attached to their tradition to modernise, hence the English were needed to civilise them through reform. Highlighting the "barriers"⁹⁴ between the English and Egyptian "races" i.e., obstacles to Western reform and modernisation, he wrote:⁹⁵

“The differences between Eastern and Western habits of thought constitute a barrier interposed between the Egyptian and the Englishman almost as great as that resulting from differences of religion, ideas of government, and social customs. Indeed, this difference of mental attributes constitutes perhaps the greatest of all barriers.”

⁹⁴ Baring, E. (1916). *Modern Egypt*. New York: The MacMillan Company, p.132.

⁹⁵ *Ibid.*, p.154.

Amongst these “barriers” he identified were the Egyptian steadfastness on Islam,⁹⁶ the legal tradition,⁹⁷ and, pertinent to our discussion, “the inferiority” of women.⁹⁸ Notably, Baring targeted the Muslim woman’s veil and the sex-separated formation of Muslim society as a key obstacle.

Delineating the civilisational difference, Baring said,

“Look now to the consequences which result from the degradation of women in Mohammedan countries. In respect to two points, both of which are of vital importance, there is a radical difference between the position of Moslem women and that of their European sisters. In the first place, the face of the Moslem woman is veiled when she appears in public. She lives a life of seclusion. The face of the European woman is exposed to view in public. The only restraints placed on her movements are those dictated by her own sense of propriety. In the second place, the East is polygamous, the

⁹⁶ “The Egyptian, on the other hand, holds fast to the faith of Islam, that noble monotheism, belief in which takes to a great extent the place of patriotism in Eastern countries, and which serves as a common bond of union to all Moslems from Delhi to Fez, from Stamboul to Zanzibar, as they turn to pray towards the cradle of their creed.” Ibid., pp.134-135.

⁹⁷ Ibid., p.134.

⁹⁸ Ibid., p.134.

West is monogamous.”

Resembling the arguments of Amīn and Abduh, which frame the veil and the prohibition on *ikhtilāṭ* as a custom, Baring also cited a quote asserting that the “seclusion of women” is “in its origin, not Moslem, but simply Oriental”.⁹⁹

Echoing Amīn, Baring deemed Muslim women to be a fundamental barrier to Westernising reform of “Mohammedan countries”. His words on this are worth reproducing in full:¹⁰⁰

“Let any one who is inclined to take a sanguine view of this subject cast, for a moment, all details aside, and consider the general nature of the problem which presents itself for solution. It is nothing less than this, that the new generation of Egyptians has to be persuaded or forced into imbibing the true spirit of Western civilisation... I confine myself, therefore, to arguments derived from facts and subjects which have come under my personal observation, merely observing that both the religion and the social system of Buddhism, and, I believe, of

⁹⁹ Ibid., p.156, fn.2.

¹⁰⁰ Ibid., pp.538-539.

Shintoism, present greater possibilities for the assimilation of exotic secular ideas and forms of government than any which can be claimed for rigid Islamism. Looking then solely to the possibility of reforming those countries which have adopted the faith of Islam, it may be asked whether any one can conceive the existence of true European civilisation on the assumption that the position which women occupy in Europe is abstracted from the general plan? As well can a man blind from his birth be made to conceive the existence of colour. Change the position of women, and one of the main pillars, not only of European civilisation, but at all events of the moral code based on the Christian religion, if not of Christianity itself, falls to the ground. The position of women in Egypt, and in Mohammedan countries generally, is, therefore, a fatal obstacle to the attainment of that elevation of thought and character which should accompany the introduction of European civilisation, if that civilisation is to produce its full measure of beneficial effect.”

Baring presented the Western indoctrination of Egyptians as the solution but pointed out that, of all the religions he has encountered, he had found Islam to be the most resilient against secularism. Women in relation to the Islamic social formation and values in

particular could trigger the collapse of the Western civilising enterprise.

He then presented the solution to this problem¹⁰¹:

“The obvious remedy would appear to be to educate the women.”

According to Baring, Muslims remained sceptical of girls going to schools despite being encouraged through free education. Over time this reluctance was overcome and women became accustomed to gaining education whilst men wanted their wives to have “qualifications other than those which can be secured in the seclusion of the harem¹⁰²”. He further commented that although the Muslim women who gained European education remained “secluded”, he believed that it was possible for them to become more like “Europeanised Egyptian men” who “usually becomes an Agnostic, and often assimilates many of the least worthy portions of European civilisation”¹⁰³:

“Is there any reason why European education should not produce the same effect on the Europeanised Egyptian woman? I know of none. Indeed, in so far as the Agnosticism is

¹⁰¹ Ibid., p.539.

¹⁰² Ibid., p.540.

¹⁰³ Ibid., pp.540-541.

concerned, the woman, on the assumption that her faith is relatively lukewarm, would probably find less difficulty than the man in shaking herself free from the ideas and associations which have surrounded her from her cradle.”

In short, Baring viewed the Europeanization of women’s education as a Trojan horse – an insidious vehicle through which Muslim women would abandon Islamic values as embodied in the veil and the prohibition of *ikhtilāt*¹⁰⁴, ultimately leading them toward disbelief. In this way, he believed, the fundamental barrier to Western colonial dominance would be dismantled.

The Egyptian National University fulfilled this agenda.

The multilayered attack through Tāhā Husayn

Husayn’s statement questioning sex separation as religiously unfounded, coupled with his efforts to institutionalise this shift at the Egyptian National

¹⁰⁴ The reference to the “cradle” in the quote draws from his reliance on Stanley Lane-Pool, who he quotes earlier in his work: “The degradation of women in the East is a canker that begins its destructive work early in childhood, and has eaten into the whole system of Islam.” *Ibid.*, p.134, fn.4. He then proceeds to attack the veil and women’s seclusion as barrier to Europeanisation and modernisation some pages later.

University represented only the visible crest of a multi-layered iceberg. Beneath the surface lay a deep-seated inferiority complex, the treacherous indoctrination of so-called Muslim reformers, and the broader anti-Islam schemes of secular liberals and Orientalist Christian missionaries, all serving the interests of colonial domination.

These layers produced an unwitting agent of Western colonialism – someone who, in a more influential political capacity, continued the assault on tradition. In 1955, three years after his governmental tenure as education minister, Husayn proposed to abolish the *kuttaab* system and the few remaining Azhari institutions. He further advocated for the eradication of Al-Azhar University by subsuming some of its religious subjects into modern education, relegating them to a mere faculty of theology.¹⁰⁵

Yet, despite the simultaneous deconstruction of Islam – beginning with women, veiling, and *ikhṭilāt* – and the adoption of modernisation efforts, Egypt did not reap the promised material prosperity of Europeanisation. The great Islamic nation, once a

¹⁰⁵ Zeghal, M. (1999). Religion and Politics in Egypt: The Ulema of al Azhar, Radical Islam, and the State (1952-94). *International Journal of Middle East Studies*, [online] 31(3), pp.371–399. doi:<https://doi.org/10.2307/176217>, p.376.

bulwark against the formidable Tartar hoards, would later face the humiliation of the Six-Day War in 1967. Since then, it has borne witness to its subjugation as a vassal state for Western-Israeli interests.

Today, it stands impotent, unwilling to lift a finger for its fellow brothers and sisters in Palestine, a mere stone's throw away across the border. The consequences of puncturing the civilisational barriers protecting the social integrity of the ummah also continue to manifest. Social decadence, epitomised by rampant sexual harassment is a significant problem. This trend saw a dangerous flashpoint in 2013 when Egyptians gathered in Tahrir Square to celebrate the ousting of Mohammed Morsi. The events that unfolded starkly illustrated the repercussions of abandoning the prudent rule prohibiting *ikhtilāt*.¹⁰⁶

“On Wednesday night, when Egypt’s army chief announced the forced departure of Mohamed Morsi, the streets around Tahrir Square turned into an all-night carnival. But not everyone there was allowed to celebrate. Among the masses dancing, singing and honking horns, more than 80 women were subjected to mob

¹⁰⁶

<https://www.theguardian.com/world/2013/jul/05/egypt-women-rape-sexual-assault-tahrir-square>

sexual assaults, harassment or rape. In Tahrir Square since Sunday, when protests against Morsi first began, there have been at least 169 counts of sexual mob crime.

“Egypt is full of sexual harassment and people have become desensitised to it – but this is a step up,” said Soraya Bahgat, a women’s rights advocate and co-founder of Tahrir Bodyguard, a group that rescues women from assault. “We’re talking about mob sexual assaults, from stripping women naked and dragging them on the floor – to rape.”

(These are the consequences which the moron zindeeqs are desirous of attaining in the wake of their advocacy of abandoning Hijaab and the Prohibition of Intermingling – The Majlis)

Islam is founded upon timelessly wise principles, values, and rules, all scrutinised and peer-reviewed over centuries by generations of impeccable scholars who can trace their intellectual lineages to Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam). To abandon this tradition is to imperil not only our faith but the very fabric of our civilisation.

(Our Tradition is the Qur’aan and the Sunnah. Its abandonment does not only endanger our faith, it deracinates our Imaan, leaving us as Fuel for Jahannam. – The Majlis)

COLONIAL CONTINUITY

The schemes to target the Islamic civilisation by undermining its barriers of the veil and sex separation outlined in the previous section are not mere history.

The *khutuwwāt ash-Shaytān* (*footsteps and schemes of Iblees*) identified in the colonial era surface as a colonial continuity, reappearing as blueprints to attack Islam. And they often involve the same group of Arab modernists.

Orientalists have played a central role in ensuring the buoyancy of this continuity for several decades. Let us take the example of Tāhā Husayn. Since his demise, Husayn has been promoted as the model, moderate, enlightened Muslim through the translation and circulation of his works. Thus, the late subversive Christian missionary Bishop Kenneth Kragg translated *A Passage to France: The Third Volume of Tāhā Husayn* in 1976. Kragg's mission was for Muslims to "experience Christ" and change their religion¹⁰⁷, and to this end, translated several deformatist works. His PhD was a blueprint to deconstruct and neutralise Islam.

¹⁰⁷ Ghorab, A. (1996). *Subverting Islam: The Role of Orientalist Centres*. Kuala Lumpur: The Open Press, pp.35.36.

Such works are socialised in Orientalist centres, temporarily rebadged as “Islamic studies” programmes in the Muslim world as well as Western universities.

As Dr Ahmad Ghorab explained in the 1990s, the colonial-era Orientalist agenda continued into later decades in the form of “Islamic studies” programmes in the West. These programmes (the Oxford Centre for Islamic Studies in particular) were effectively controlled by Western secularists and Christian missionaries and were funded by the Gulf states such as Saudi Arabia. Western academics presented a façade of “moderate” “interfaith” engagement with Islam, but held hostile views concerning Islam, promoting “women’s liberation” feminism and advocating pro-Israel views on Palestine.¹⁰⁸ As Dr Ghorab laid out, several “Islamic studies” programs were fronts for the CIA and Israeli intelligence.¹⁰⁹

Central to this subversion scheme has been to use Muslim scholars to legitimise these programmes, which were often overseen by the likes of discrete anti-Islam activists like Kragg, John Esposito, and Montgomery Watt.¹¹⁰

¹⁰⁸ Ibid., pp.43-50

¹⁰⁹ Ibid., p.x-xi.

¹¹⁰ Ibid., p.ix, pp.34-38.

One name which Dr Ghorab calls out and is relevant to our topic of *ikhtilāt* is the modernist Yusuf al-Qaradawi. Al-Qaradawi saw his agenda-driven *Wasatiyya* (“moderate”) fiqh methodology as a continuation of the reform efforts ushered in by Jamāl al-Dīn al-Afghānī and his Freemasonic student, Muhammad Abduh.¹¹¹ Thus, unsurprisingly, his view on *al-ikhtilāt* resonates with those of Qāsim Amīn and arguments professed today concerning the matter.

According to al-Qaradawi, the intermingling of men and women is permissible provided they are not alone, they do not gaze at each other with lust, and their engagements are for a “noble purpose”.¹¹² *(This is the same tune which these fake ‘deobandi’ modernist zindeeqs are piping. All of them are in cahoots with the enemies of Islam to destroy Islam, but which goal they will not attain. –The Majlis)*

SAUDI ARABIA

Dr Ghorab’s identification of Saudi authorities as a major actor involved in facilitating Christian missionaries and Western academics in the 1990s was

¹¹¹ <https://www.middleeasteye.net/news/yusuf-qaradawi-scholar-activistegyptian-revolution>

¹¹² <https://www.al-qaradawi.net/node/4298>

both perspicacious and foreboding.¹¹³ It marks a point in history that has a trajectory leading to today's collapse of the Islamic moral standard in the very heart of the Islamic world. *(In fact the collapse and displacement of Islam. The Saudi regime has transformed the Holy Land into a land of kufr. – The Majlis)*

At this point, let us recall the argument put forth by some that, since Muslims are living in abnormal circumstances due to modernity's socio-political hegemony, where mixing in public spaces is the norm, we should effectively accommodate this reality by adopting Islamic views that fit this context.

The Saudi example presents a poignant repudiation of such an argument. In the land of the Haramayn, where the moral ideal was not merely professed but lived and structurally sustained, the West and its liberal agents are now forcing the practices of mixing and unveiling. *(Western Immorality of every kind has become the norm in Arabia which today is under the domination of Murtaddeen / Munaafiqeen masquerading as Muslims. – The Majlis)*

¹¹³ Ghorab, A. *Subverting Islam: The Role of Orientalist Centres*. The Open Press: Kuala Lumpur. 1996. p.ix, p.34-38.

Should they take root and become dominant (as indeed they are), should we “accommodate” modernity in this sacred land by pairing Islam back to arbitrarily selected principles too? If we follow this path, what remains of Islam’s integrity? The Saudi example exposes the absurdity of this accommodationist logic. If such practices are allowed to flourish in Muslim heartlands, the selected principles themselves will be hollowed out.

Indeed, this point is beyond theoretical. The examples of Muhammad Abduh, Qāsim Amīn, Tāhā Husayn, and the Egyptian social experiment demonstrate the systematic erosion of Islam and the industrial scale harm inflicted on Islamic society as we shall now see, this process is unfolding live in the land of Tawhīd.

WAR ON TERROR

The initiation of the *War on Terror* instituted a cold war on Islam. Western states like the US began pressuring the Saudi regime to begin its reform, opening the door for liberals in the region to push for “modernisation”.

According to David Ottoway, King Abdullah had met with President Bush at his ranch in Texas in 2005 to repair the damaged US-Saudi relations stemming from

9/11. Explaining how thousands of young Saudis were sent to the West in a push to “reform”, he writes:¹¹⁴

“Part of their plan called for sending thousands of Saudi high school and college students to the United States for their education. Thus was born the King Abdullah Scholarship Program, through which Saudi Arabia spent \$6 billion annually to send tens of thousands of students to foreign universities, not only in the United States but also in Europe, China, Japan, and Russia. By 2015, there were 125,000 Saudi students enrolled in US universities and colleges, and the total number of Saudis studying abroad, including their guardians, in twenty-three countries had reached 207,000, one-quarter of them women. The vast majority of these students returned to the kingdom tech-savvy and exposed to modern ideas and societies. Of all the reforms Abdullah initiated, the decision to send so many young Saudis abroad was probably the single most consequential to promoting the multiple demands for reforms at home, particularly from women.”

¹¹⁴ Ottaway, D. B. (2021). Mohammed bin Salman: The Icarus of Saudi Arabia? London: Lynne Rienner Publishers, pp.51-52.

KING ABDULLAH'S MIXED UNIVERSITY

As this process of manufacturing the desire for “reform” proceeded, two significant events occurred in 2009. First, King Abdullah purged the traditional (“conservative”) personnel from government agencies (perhaps symbolically) on Valentine’s Day.¹¹⁵ Second, he opened the first mixed-sex university, the King Abdullah University of Science and Technology (KAUST), which was staffed by non-Muslims.¹¹⁶

The university was the first significant step in treading the *khutuwāt ash-Shaytān* to normalising *ikhṭilāt*. A leaked 2009 US diplomatic cable shows the pressure the US was exerting on Saudi to “reform” as well as the importance of KAUST in the Western liberalisation agenda.¹¹⁷

According to the cable, the US Embassy in Riyadh sponsored events featuring two American musicians. The Riyadh Literary Club held the event in Riyadh, inviting Muslim women for the first time. The cable notes that the performance took place before “an unprecedented mixed-gender audience”.

¹¹⁵ <https://www.hrw.org/news/2010/12/15/waiting-reform-riyadh>

¹¹⁶ <https://www.reuters.com/article/lifestyle/saudi-arabia-opens-firstmixed-gender-university-idUSTRE58M65R/>

¹¹⁷ <https://www.theguardian.com/world/2011/may/27/us-pressurisedsaudiois-let-women-drive>

Despite women sitting in screened-off seats, the Americans still found this “remarkable”, since it was the first step towards a complete disintegration of all barriers between the sexes. The cable notes Shura Council member Saad al-Bazei’s statement that “After KAUST, everything is possible”. Meanwhile, videos of young Saudi men and women dancing in the university’s cafeteria surfaced online.¹¹⁸

As all this was taking place, Imams were constrained from critiquing liberals, while the liberal press was allowed to strengthen and promote the burgeoning “reform” agenda.

Critical of the university, Shaykh Sa’d al-Shitri was dismissed despite his support of the monarchy. This was due to a campaign by liberal journalists initiated by then editor-in-chief of the liberal mouthpiece al-Watan, Jamal al-Khashoggi. He attacked the Shaykh for opposing progress and, rather disturbingly, for threatening dissension and accusing the rulers of being stooges of disbelieving foreigners. In other words, al-Khashoggi dangerously framed al-Shitri within a Saudi counter-terror narrative. Turki Abdallah al-Sudayri, the editor-in-chief of al-Riyad reheated

¹¹⁸ https://wikileaks.org/plusd/cables/09RIYADH1532_a.html

Qāsim Amīn’s arguments for *ikhṭilāṭ* and deemed the Shaykh’s view “backward”, “extremist” and one that undermined the monarchy.¹¹⁹

We will return to the counter-terrorism framing in subverting the prohibition of *ikhṭilāṭ* below.

Ahmed bin Qasim al-Ghamdi

Contrasting this treatment is how state and media responded to the self-taught deviant Ahmed bin Qasim al-Ghamdi, someone who had studied at an American university and, at the time of the KAUST debacle, was head of the committee for Commanding Virtue and Preventing Vice (CCVPV) in Makkah. In the spirit of past deformatists, al-Ghamdi declared that *ikhṭilāṭ* was permissible and its prohibition had no basis in Sharī’a.¹²⁰ Despite the outrageous statements expressed in public, al-Ghamdi retained his position, effectively receiving state endorsement for his deformatist rhetoric. His attack, which he claimed was based on Sharī’a and “reason”,¹²¹ mimicked the now familiar satanic pattern of his deformatist antecedents:

¹¹⁹ See, <https://elaph.com/Web/NewsPapers/2009/9/487896.htm>, <https://www.alriyadh.com/462891>.

¹²⁰ <https://www.sauress.com/ajl/11896>

¹²¹ <https://www.sauress.com/ajl/11896>

1. He claimed that there is no clear text forbidding *ikhtilāt* and that it is merely a custom and innovation.
2. He attacked taqlīd and the legitimacy of the Ulama.
3. He argued that the prohibition was a hindrance to progress.

Transporting these colonial-era deformatist arguments into the War on Terror world, he further added that prohibiting *ikhtilāt* was “extremism”.¹²²

Emboldened by the state’s tacit approval and an eager media, the merchant of doubt and confusion took to the liberal media to undermine other aspects of Islam and the CCVPV. Thus, he claimed that the verses of hijab were restricted to the Mothers of the Believers (May Allah be pleased with them).

¹²³In 2014, he appeared on a popular Saudi TV talk show that was broadcast in the UAE. Al-Ghamdi went on air with his wife who appeared unveiled and fully

¹²² Dr. al-Ghamdi (2009). Al-qawl bi-tahrim al-ikhtilāt ifti’at ‘ala al-shari’ wa ibtida’ fi al-din. [online] Okaz. Available at: <https://www.okaz.com.sa/article/302743>. See also: Meijer, R. (2010). Reform in Saudi Arabia: The Gender-Segregation Debate. Middle East Policy, 17(4), pp.80–100. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1475-4967.2010.00464.x>, pp.88-89.

¹²³ <https://www.hespress.com/writers/26187.html>

caked.¹²⁴ He continued his cultural assault by further issuing a ‘fatwa’ allowing women to travel without a male guardian, uncover their faces and arms, and eat alongside men.¹²⁵ Unsurprisingly, he was celebrated in Western media outlets such as the New York Times as a “reformer” advocating for liberal Islam.¹²⁶

The CCVPV was also rendered powerless over time. Its members raised concerns that demonstrate how the erosion of the rulings to “principles” only leads to an erosion of the principles themselves. They highlighted that *ikhtilāt* had rocketed, leading to increased cases of *khalwah* (a secluded meeting of a non-mahram man and woman) and unlawful relationships.

IKHTILĀT AS THE “BATTLEGROUND” BETWEEN TRADITIONALISTS AND DEFORMISTS

Observing these seismic policy shifts, the Western commentariat continued to laud this degeneration. The West also has identified the key “battleground”

¹²⁴ <https://www.npr.org/sections/parallels/2014/12/17/371397185/a-tweeton-womens-veils-followed-by-raging-debate-in-saudi-arabia>

¹²⁵ <https://english.alarabiya.net/articles/2013%2F02%2F27%2F268730>

¹²⁶ <https://www.nytimes.com/2016/07/11/world/middleeast/saudi-arabiaislam-wahhabism-religious-police.html>

between traditional proponents and liberal reformists: the prohibition of *ikhtilāt*.¹²⁷

One frequently cited journal article on *ikhtilāt* was published in 2010 in the *Middle East Policy*. It was authored by a professor in a Dutch university, which was “born out of the Catholic emancipation”¹²⁸. The author declared:¹²⁹

“Ikhtilāt demarcates the battle lines between reformists and conservatives.”

This article was promoted by arch-Islamophobe and Jewish Zionist neocon Daniel Pipes. Writing for the Middle East Forum, he said it “demonstrates how gender mixing (*ikhtilāt* in Arabic) inspires a debate central to the kingdom’s future” before concluding that this “debate deserves our full attention”.¹³⁰

In a 2012 select committee on foreign affairs examining the UK’s relations with Saudi Arabia, a

¹²⁷ <https://www.newyorker.com/magazine/2013/12/23/shopgirls>

¹²⁸ <https://www.ru.nl/en/about-us/history-and-identity/identity>

¹²⁹ <https://www.clingendael.org/sites/default/files/pdfs/20100000-cdsartikel-rmijer.pdf>

¹³⁰ <https://www.meforum.org/saudi-arabia-opening-up>

journalist specialising in the region submitted evidence on women’s rights. She observed:¹³¹

“The battleground is between khulwa (two people of different sexes in closed space together) forbidden by Islam, and ikhtilāt (interaction between members of the opposite sex).”

In 2016, another academic from the same aforementioned Christian-Dutch university conducted research on the subject of *ikhtilāt* at the behest of the Dutch Ministry of Foreign Affairs, in collaboration with the King Faisal Institute for Research and Islamic Studies in Riyadh. The study, which typically favours pro-deform views, tries to demonstrate that the notion of *ikhtilāt* is “ambiguous” on multiple occasions.¹³² The paper also highlights how teachers at universities are “stimulating” *ikhtilāt* through teaching,¹³³ whilst others are using women-only spaces as stepping stones to “dismantling” sex separation, advancing the *ikhtilāt* cause.¹³⁴

131

<https://publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm201213/cmselect/cmffaff/writev/bahrain/sab61.htm>

¹³² <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s11562-015-0350-2>, p.364, p.365, p.366, p.376.

¹³³ *Ibid.*, pp.369-370.

¹³⁴ *Ibid.*, p.371.

MBS'S VISION 2030

Under Abdullah, there were other incremental “reforms” aimed at normalising *ikhtilāt*, but it was when Mohammed bin Salman (MBS) took power that these efforts shifted up a gear. In 2016, driven by the need to diversify the country’s economy through entertainment, MBS established the General Authority for Entertainment as part of his Vision 2030 programme.¹³⁵ To lend the necessary religious legitimacy to his agenda, in 2017, MBS claimed, “We are simply reverting to what we followed – a moderate Islam open to the world and all religions.”¹³⁶

This rhetoric, now familiar in its echoes of figures like Qāsim Amīn and Muhammad Abduh, catalysed *ikhtilāt* and the deconstruction of the remaining vestiges of the Islamic social formation that hindered MBS’s Western entertainment agenda.

In 2016, leading up to MBS’s establishment of the Entertainment Authority, al-Ghamdi proclaimed music to be an art that “refines morals”.¹³⁷ Two years later,

¹³⁵ <https://www.gea.gov.sa/en/>

¹³⁶ <https://www.theguardian.com/world/2017/oct/24/i-will-return-saudi-arabia-moderate-islam-crown-prince>

¹³⁷ <https://www.alwatanvoice.com/arabic/news/2016/06/11/932729.html>

he attacked the abaya¹³⁸ whilst encouraging the celebration of Valentine’s Day.¹³⁹ In promoting such views, he was now supported by more senior government scholars.¹⁴⁰ These views were extensively responded to, but those scholars often ended up imprisoned.¹⁴¹

AL-GHAMDI AND “ISRAEL”

As is usually the case with deformists undermining the civilisational barriers protecting Muslims, al-Ghamdi’s deform efforts occurred under MBS’s broader threat to the Islamic world: normalising with “Israel”.

¹³⁸ <https://english.alarabiya.net/features/2018/03/28/Saudi-cleric-Al-Ghamdi-Abaya-is-not-mandatory-as-per-the-teachings-Islam>

¹³⁹ <https://tribune.com.pk/story/1635465/saudi-cleric-endorses-valentines-day-positive-event-not-linked-religion>

¹⁴⁰ See <https://www.arabnews.com/node/1502966/saudi-arabia,https://www.newarab.com/news/saudi-cleric-claims-music-singing-allowedprophet-Muhammad>

¹⁴¹ For example, see the hadith scholar Shaykh Bader bin Ali al-Otaibi who responded to al-Ghamdi’s arguments and reasserted the classical views on, among other things, the prohibition on ikhtilāṭ: <http://saaid.org/female/0174.htm>. In 2018, he was arrested for criticising Saudi’s ten-year deal bringing WWE wrestling to the region as part of MBS’s Vision 2030 reforms. <https://www.wrestlinginc.com/news/2018/05/ddpthinks-raw-star-is-next-big-thing-639709/> and <https://www.hrw.org/report/2019/11/04/high-cost-change/repression-undersaudi-crown-prince-tarnishes-reforms>.

When one can inject doubt and confusion concerning established Islamic norms, it is not difficult to blur the lines when it comes to “Israel”. And so, with the onset of the Abraham Accords and the Gulf state’s normalisation with “Israel” in 2020, al-Ghamdi issued his full support for MBS, writing a poem eulogising him as a “hero” and a “mujaddid” (renewer).¹⁴²

Two years ago, following the familiar CVE-infused rhetoric similar to UAE’s Abrahamic Family House project (“coexistence” and “constructive dialogue”), al-Ghamdi invited New York-born dual American-Israeli Chabad Rabbi Jacob Yisrael Herzog,¹⁴³ who has proclaimed himself the first chief rabbi of Saudi Arabia.¹⁴⁴

On October 12th 2023, Herzog posted the following message on ‘X’:¹⁴⁵

“Ezra Yachin is a 95-year-old “Israeli” reservist. He was a member of the Lehi or Stern Gang terrorist group, which perpetrated the horrific Deir Yassin massacre and engaged in terrorist attacks against the

¹⁴² <https://x.com/DAhmadq84/status/1300214879278825482>

¹⁴³ <https://chabadinfo.com/infocus/rav-yaakov-herzog-the-rav-of-saudi-arabia-meets-with-senior-cleric/>

¹⁴⁴ <https://cp.allisrael.com/saudi-arabia-chabad-openly-offers-jewishreligious-services-to-jewish-expats>

¹⁴⁵ <https://x.com/RabbiHerzog/status/1712429181231911100>

British. In the Gaza genocide, he called on the Zionist army to “erase the memory of them. Erase them, their families, mothers, and children.” He further called on “every Jew with a weapon” to “go out and kill them” adding, “Let them drop bombs on them and erase them. All the prophecies sent by the Prophets are about to occur.”¹⁴⁶

Since he met with Herzog, al-Ghamdi has appeared on Israeli state-owned Kan 11 TV to discuss the normalisation of ties between the Kingdom and the occupation state¹⁴⁷ and even attacked the authenticity of hadith criticising the past actions of the Children of Israel.¹⁴⁸

***Ikhtilāt* in the counter-extremism framework**

In line with MBS’s “moderate Islam” reform project, MBS inaugurated the neocon-approved, Israeli-aligned Global Center for Combatting Extremist Ideology (*Etidal*) in Riyadh alongside US President Donald Trump and Egyptian President Abdel-Fattah el-Sissi.¹⁴⁹

¹⁴⁶ <https://coolnessofhind.wordpress.com/2023/11/06/the-genocidal-stateof-israel-in-their-own-words/>

¹⁴⁷ <https://www.middleeastmonitor.com/20230816-saudi-arabiaprominent-cleric-talks-to-israeli-tv-about-normalisation/>

¹⁴⁸ <https://www.arabtime.news/latest-news/stars-and-celebrities/21550/>

¹⁴⁹ <https://coolnessofhind.wordpress.com/2021/06/23/the-neocon-war-onterror-cannot-be-understood-without-israel/>

A key initiative of *Etidal* is *Etidal*, a propaganda unit that projects “moderate” messaging and refutes “religious doubts” to counter “extremism” and “violence”.¹⁵⁰ One page identifies the issue of emergence and intermingling of women as a key “doubt” promoted by “extremists”.¹⁵¹

In a two-minute video refuting “doubts” concerning women as promoted by alleged “extremists”, women are displayed unveiled and without a head covering.¹⁵² The narrator explains that it is righteous for women to emerge from their homes and contribute to the country’s economic growth before presenting poor (*absolutely putrid*) theological arguments to justify the mixing of men and women.¹⁵³

¹⁵⁰ <https://tafneed.org/%d9%85%d9%86-%d9%86%d8%ad%d9%86/>

¹⁵¹ <https://tafneed.org/%d8%a3%d8%a8%d8%b1%d8%b2-%d8%a7%d9%84%d8%b4%d8%a8%d9%87%d8%a7%d8%aa-%d8%a7%d9%84%d9%85%d8%aa%d8%af%d8%a7%d9%88%d9%84%d8%a9-%d9%81%d9%8a-%d8%b7%d8%b1%d8%ad-%d8%a7%d9%84%d8%ac%d9%85%d8%a7%d8%b9%d8%a7-2/>

¹⁵² <https://tafneed.org/%d8%a7%d9%84%d8%ac%d9%85%d8%a7%d8%b9%d8%a7%d8%aa-%d8%a7%d9%84%d9%85%d8%aa%d8%b7%d8%b1%d9%81%d8%a9-%d9%88%d8%b4%d8%a8%d9%87%d8%a9-%d8%a7%d9%84%d9%85%d8%b1%d8%a3%d8%a9/>

¹⁵³ A key argument the video promotes is a narration in Bukhari. According to the narration a woman approached the Prophet (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) to seek a legal ruling. The Prophet (sallallahu alayhi wasallam)

The implication of all this is that those who adhere to the traditional view prohibiting *ikhtilāt* are potential terrorists.

The familiar khutuwāt ash-Shaytān

With the barrier that is the prohibition of *ikhtilāt* broken, the floodgates of *fahisha* (*immorality*) have opened. Young men and women rush to the streets celebrating Valentine’s Day, Halloween, and Saudi National Day, only for women to be harassed.¹⁵⁴ Crowds of Muslim men and women attend Western concerts where scantily-clad musicians and gyrating

was riding with Faḍl bin ‘Abbās at the time. The woman and Ibn ‘Abbās exchanged glances at which point the Prophet (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) turned his head away. Far from giving license to intermingling in public places, the hadith is evidence against them. A few points. A) The incident occurred during Hajj explaining the unveiled appearance of the woman. B) The woman was seeking a ruling, not working amongst men or attending concerts and cinemas. C) The action of the Prophet (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) is evidence of establishing separation, even in the case of ad hoc encounters while riding. Explaining the narration Ibn Ḥajar al-‘Asqalānī said: “He [Qāḍī Iyāḍ] then said: ‘Perhaps al-Faḍl did not look in a manner that would be condemned, but the Prophet (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) feared it might lead to that, or it could have been before the command to cover the faces of women was revealed.’ From this, it is taken that men and women are made to separate due to the fear of fitnah (temptation), and it being permissible for unrelated men to speak to a woman and hear her voice at the time of necessity like asking about knowledge (i.e. when there are no other options).” Ibn Ḥajar al-‘Asqalānī, *Fath al-Bārī*, 4:80.

¹⁵⁴

<https://gulfnews.com/world/gulf/saudi/saudi-arabia-many-cases-ofharassment-reported-on-national-day-1.82517445>

singers perform whilst desecrating the Kaba by simulating its appearance on stage.¹⁵⁵ They attend nightclubs where they dance together in close proximity, swaying like zombies through the night. One such club is even situated 650 metres from the Haram in Makkah.¹⁵⁶ Prostitution is rife¹⁵⁷ and AIDs is on the increase.¹⁵⁸

Few amongst those aghast at the modernist aberrations spreading in the land of the two Holiest Sanctuaries would believe that all this could be traced to the undermining of the prohibition of *ikhtilāt*. However, the Saudi “reform” social experiment is a prime example of how the seemingly innocuous effort of promoting a “difference of opinion” on the classical ruling has set off a chain of deconstructionist assaults on other Islamic rulings, ultimately facilitating the Westernised, liberal worldview.

THE UK’S “EXTREMISM” FRAMING

As we saw in the case of Saudi Arabia’s premier counter-extremism body Etidal, the prohibition on

155

<https://www.moroccoworldnews.com/2024/11/366416/controversyrupts-over-stage-display-resembling-kaaba-at-saudi-arabia-show>

¹⁵⁶ https://x.com/RKSA_en/status/1860393260478312531

¹⁵⁷ <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=R6fdwVvH8LM>

¹⁵⁸ https://x.com/RKSA_en/status/1865123051823591895

ikhtilāt has been incorporated into the broader War on Terror framework. Within this counter-terrorism narrative, the practice is not merely backward and illiberal; it is extremist, supposedly leading individuals toward acts of terrorism. Unsurprisingly, given UK's counter terrorism influence on Saudi Arabia, this particular lens has defined the approach of the UK government and media, which have targeted the Islamic practice of sex separation using counter-extremism rhetoric.

Amongst the first calls to remove a barrier between men and women at UK Islamic events was from those who were fully aboard on the key pre-crime pillars of Britain's counter-terrorism strategy known as *Prevent*. In the late 2000s, confused defectors who called themselves "Sufis" whilst fawning over Tariq Ramadan likened the practice to apartheid, denigrating the classical ruling and thus looking down upon our tried and proven heritage.

Over the years, the neoconservatives too have publicly attacked this practice. In 2014, a furore had been triggered by none other than the War on Terror neoconservative hate-mongers from the Student

Rights group,¹⁵⁹ a front organisation for the Zionist-funded and thoroughly bigoted Henry Jackson Society (HJS). The hyperbole was specifically around the practice of sex separation at universities. An Islamic organisation had privately hired university premises for their own religious use and the audience was set to be sex-separated – perfectly within the law and in keeping with the eventual guidance issued by the Equality and Human Rights Commission during the hysteria. Thanks to the frenzy whipped up by the Student Rights group, and HJS’s prized links with the government courtesy of the Islam-hating neocon Michael Gove,¹⁶⁰ then Prime Minister David Cameron “weighed in” into the debate. Gove’s framing of the Muslim practice of sex separation was clear:¹⁶¹

“We should not pander to extremism. Speakers who insist on segregating audiences should not be indulged by educators.”

Sex separation had already been touched by the ever-widening discourse of potential terrorism.

¹⁵⁹ <https://coolnessofhind.wordpress.com/2014/01/06/the-gendersegregation-hyperbole/>

¹⁶⁰ <https://coolnessofhind.wordpress.com/2014/05/23/the-web-ofneoconservatism-threatening-british-values/>

¹⁶¹ http://www.huffingtonpost.co.uk/2013/12/13/gender-segregationuniversities-pandering-extremism-gove_n_4438211.html

Cameron didn't stop at merely preventing speakers from requesting a separated audience. In his neocon-driven adversarialism towards Islam and Muslims, he fanatically went further, wanting a ban on men and women who chose to voluntarily separate themselves from one another.¹⁶²

The arguments, as we examined at the time, were specious, and ironic given they were based on ideas emerging from modernity, which has yet to adequately furnish solutions to basic gender interaction problems.¹⁶³ Nevertheless, policies were changed, and the Islamic view of sex separation was demonised.

The responses from Muslims varied. Some rightly doubled down, whilst others, especially those linked to *Prevent* and the deformation of Islam agenda, rendered it completely un-Islamic. Others of a more “academic” hue adopted a feminist position to bemoan the differential treatment of men and women more generally.

¹⁶² <http://www.theguardian.com/education/2013/dec/13/universities-ukwithdraws-advice-gender-segregation>

¹⁶³ <https://www.vox.com/2018/4/5/17157240/me-too-movement-sexualharassment-aziz-ansari-accusation>

Many, though, missed the fact that this was seen as a civilisational culture war by neocons in power. And this war was not to end there.

Bigoted writers demonised the practice in the media.¹⁶⁴ Jim Fitzpatrick MP who was on the advisory board of the HJS's Student Rights,¹⁶⁵ walked out of a sex-separated Muslim wedding, after which he declared that sex separation was "a sign of increasing radicalisation and was damaging to social cohesion".¹⁶⁶

The sham report by neocon lackey Peter Clarke into the baseless 2014 Trojan Horse hoax affair concerning Muslim educationalists further concretised the view that sex separation is related to "extremism".¹⁶⁷ Later, sex separation amongst governors at an Islamic school was also implied to be contravening British values and therefore "extremist".

¹⁶⁴ <https://coolnessofhind.wordpress.com/2014/02/18/153/>. Direct link to the article mocking sex separation: <https://www.dailymail.co.uk/debate/article-2561686/LITTLEJOHN-Jolly-Jihadi-Boys-Outing-Legoland.html>

¹⁶⁵

https://web.archive.org/web/20140717152755/http://studentrights.org.uk/about_us

¹⁶⁶ <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/religion/6023519/Jim-Fitzpatrick-Government-minister-condemns-traditional-Muslim-wedding.html>

¹⁶⁷

https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/340526/H

In 2021, Paul Stott of the neocon Policy Exchange think-tank compared a “convoy for Palestine” initiative’s catering of women to travel in women-only buses, to racial segregation and described this type of separation between men and women as “Islamist” (i.e., extremist under *Prevent*).¹⁶⁸

In summary, the legacy of Evelyn Baring and his attack on Islam’s civilizational pillars to coerce its liberalisation endures in the empire’s metropole. The difference now, however, lies in the rebranding of this civilising mission by today’s neocons, who cloak their designs in the discourse of “extremism” and “social cohesion”.

CONCLUDING REMARKS

In examining parts of history, be it colonial Egypt or the present-day social engineering in Saudi Arabia and the West, it becomes abundantly clear that the prohibition of *ikhṭilāt* is a vital protective barrier for the Islamic world. A deeper look at this history reveals a recurring and subversive pattern – *khutuwāt ash-Shaytān*, the subtle Satanic steps that open the doors to shameful acts and eventual destruction.

¹⁶⁸ <https://twitter.com/MrPaulStott/status/1402509683852775427>

The objective of modernity is to subsume and efface Islam and identifies Muslim women as a major obstacle to achieving its goal. Through a systematic process, modernity and its agents weaken and destabilise the moral fortifications of Islam, opening doors to a gradual unravelling of its societal structures.

Theologically, this assault consists of the following schemes:

1. Undermining the authority of classical scholarship often by framing them as (“rigid” and “backward”) literalists who fail to use reason.
2. Distancing traditional Ulama from an alleged “original Islam” as practised during the time of Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam).
3. Over-emphasising Islamic “principles” over traditional rulings, or simply dismissing them as customs.
4. Promoting arbitrary adoption of Islamic opinions to fit a preconceived agenda (talfiq).
5. Portraying “reforms” as consistent with the Sharī’a and within its “principles and aims”.

To this list, we should also add the tactic of spinning reforms as anti-colonial or politically sound. Even today, Muslims attempt to separate the twisted views of deformatist *daa'is* because they occasionally voice a tempered criticism of “Israel” or some support other popular political issue. Muslims should remember that figures like Muhammad Abduh, Qāsim Amīn, and Tāhā Husayn were, at various times, seen as anti-colonial. Yet, the damage they inflicted on the Muslim community from within is both profound and well-documented.

These specious schemes are directed at weakening the Muslim’s conviction in the veil and sex separation as Islamic social practice by those schooled by those waging a war against Islam, and who want to quite literally rip off the veils off women and thrust them into the throngs of men. (*As a prelude for the destruction of Islam. – The Majlis*)

“Education” and “noble purposes” are the Trojan horses to justify and normalise *ikhtilāt*. Once the barrier is breached, once the knot of separation is untied, the steady but implacably systematic erasure of Islamic moral, social, cultural, and economic norms starts to take place. Concurrently, they are replaced by Westernised “modernist” forms under the deceptive rhetoric of “reform” and accommodation of “new realities”. The strategy to remove Islam is thus a

gradual one, as Rasuḷullah (Ṣallāḷahu alayhi waṣallam) said:¹⁶⁹

“The bonds of Islam will be undone one by one, and every time a bond is undone, the people will cling to what follows it.”

It is precisely this pattern that deformists like Qāsim Amīn followed. In *The Liberation of Women*, Amīn attacked the veil and the separation of sexes, promoted women’s Western education, and distorted family law on polygamy and divorce through a liberal equality lens. He described his ideas on these topics as “interconnected like the links on a chain”.¹⁷⁰

A similar process has unfolded in the land of Rasuḷullah (Ṣallāḷahu alayhi waṣallam). And the traditional Muslim community in the UK appears to be undergoing this regression. Sadly, it seems our enemies have a stronger grasp of crippling the Islamic society than we do of how to protect them. Those who find themselves seduced by sophistic arguments that legitimate *ikhṭilāt* must reconsider their positions and become cognisant of the *khutuwāt ash-Shayṭān*.

¹⁶⁹ Musnad Aḥmad, 22160.

¹⁷⁰ Amīn, Q. (2000). *The Liberation of Women and The New Woman: Two Documents in the History*

We must know the global and the local designs against the Islamic civilisation – contexts which should factor into our calculations of actualising Islam in our world.

Against the riptide of secularism and modernity, the solution is surely not to “loosen the bonds” to accommodate its social traps and rarefy or remove the proper practice of sex separation, especially in venues that are in our control.

Such self-defeating, short-sighted reasoning ultimately surrenders the Islamic moral framework to the dictates of modernity. To accommodate modernity in this way would not be an act of adaptation; it would be an abdication of responsibility as carriers of the flag of Islam, a surrender to forces that seek to gut Islam and render it a mere shell.

Rather, our task is to strengthen those bonds, to reinforce the support and adoption of the civilisational barriers, which stand firm against a cascade of destruction while safeguarding the beauty and dignity of the Islamic social structure. Islamic organisations and institutions should embody this moral ideal and implement the prohibition on *ikhtilāṭ* to exemplify the Islamic disposition and colouring. Islam is a living religion. As such, Islamic organisations and institutes should provide a microcosmic experience of what the macrocosm of an Islamically founded, healthy, noble

society can and should be. If our experience of Muslims within such a sphere mirrors a society driven by materialism and desires, then what change are we offering for Muslims and indeed for society at large?