THE SPECTRE OF KUFR AND SATANISM IN SOUTH AFRICAN COURTS

The Majlis
P.O. Box 3393
Port Elizabeth
6056, South Africa

DEFENDING NIFAAQ, KUFR AND SATANISM IN THE KUFAAR COURT

"Verily, We have revealed to you (O Muhammad!) the Kitaab with the Truth so that you may adjudicate between people with that (Shariah) which Allah has shown you. ***Never be a lawyer for the khaa-ineen."*** *(The frauds, deceits and munaafiqeen).*
(An-Nisaa', Aayat 105)

"Do not argue on behalf of those who (in reality) defraud themselves. *Verily, Allah does not love one who is a treacherous sinner."*
(An-Nisaa', Aayat 107)

These verses of the Qur'aan Majeed were revealed to establish justice and to prohibit being a lawyer and a supporter for frauds and deceits. A professed Muslim who in reality was a munaafiq, had accused a Yahudi of theft. The circumstantial evidence indicated that the Yahudi had committed the theft. On the basis of the circumstances Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) had chided the Muslim who had indicated that the theft was committed, not by the Yahudi, but by a 'Muslim'. Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) had rejected him and was on the verge of issuing his verdict against the Yahudi. These Qur'aanic verses were revealed to

exonerate the Yahudi and to expose the Munaafiq who was masquerading as a Muslim.

Even if the culprit is one's close relative, brother, father or son, it is haraam for a lawyer to defend him and to argue on his behalf if he is aware of the guilt of his relative. And there is no greater crime from the Islamic perspective than to be a lawyer for a Munaafiq who strives to undermine the Shariah and demolish Islam.

Recently, a supposedly 'muslim' lawyer, advocate Azhar Bham had appeared in the High Court to argue on behalf of the Fiends of Allah, the so-called 'friends' of the court, viz., the Cross-Worshipper Reverend Abraham Bham and Tony Karan of the Bogus uucsa. These Enemies of Allah, as by this time all Muslims are aware, had brazenly and vigorously campaigned for the Musaajid to be closed and for the daily five Salaat and Jumuah Salaat to be banned in the Musaajid.

These Enemies of Allah had entered the court to support the government in its ban on the Musaajid which they claimed were the worst spreaders of the corona disease, and that the Musaajid should remain closed in order to save lives regardless of the death of such lives having been decreed by Allah Ta'ala as the

Qur'aan states: *"No person will die except at the appointed time with the command of Allah."*

This wayward advocate supporting the glaring Kufr of the Fiends of Allah, made some stupid kufr comments which the tabloid 'muslim news' published under the caption, *The spectre of Muslim self-righteousness in SA courts*. The article, is replete with kufr which reveals the *nifaaq* of the advocate who had argued for the ban on the Musaajid and Salaat. The article does not differentiate between the advocate and the compiler, one Sanglay character. There is no clear demarcation regarding the attribution of the plethora of kufr comments – which comments are Sanglay's and which are Bham's? There is no clarity. Nevertheless, it is assumed that the Sanglay character had based the article almost exclusively on the kufr comments of the Bham chap.

(1) The article alleges: *".....the underlying motive of the applicants in challenging the lockdown regulations in terms of the DMA as either unreasonable or unjustifiable."*

While the 'underlying motive of the applicants' may dishonestly and hypocritically be criticized by the professed 'muslim' advocate or the writer of the article to be 'unreasonable or unjustifiable', true Mu'mineen

know that a Call for opening the Musaajid stems from the bedrock of Imaan. Even the secular constitution and the courts permitted the application. If in the understanding of the court the application was ‘unreasonable or unjustifiable’, the court would have awarded costs against the applicants.

In so far as Islam and Muslims are concerned the motive is to be assessed in terms of the Qur’aan and Sunnah. The sole objective of the applicants was to achieve the opening of the Houses of Allah Azza Wa Jal. While the Enemies of Allah, (included among whom is also this advocate) demonstrated there motive which was to eliminate the Commands of Allah Ta’ala as applicable to the Musaajid and the Ummah, all Muslims understood the sincerity of the motive of the applicants.

Furthermore, sight should not be lost from the fact that the lockdown regulations and the very lockdown itself are grossly unreasonable, unjustifiable, oppressive, tyrannical and grotesque. In their wake came hunger, suffering, crime, police brutality, looting and the devastation of the country’s economy. The tens of thousands of arrests and numerous anti-lockdown court applications, and the several successes in this sphere, loudly vindicate the Application for the opening of the Musaajid despite its unjustifiable and unreasonable

dismissal by the court. It should be remembered that the application of the two Applicants was the first in the series of anti-lockdown applications.

Numerous senior advocates, political parties, and organizations of a variety of kinds have all taken the route to the courts to challenge the oppression of the government – oppression perpetrated under the corona virus cover. This advocate's lips and the tongues of his 'friends' of the court – Fiends of Allah, have become welded, hence no criticism is forthcoming from the lost chap who argued against Islam for the bearers of kufr. The deafening silence of this clique is a voluminous testification for their *nifaaq*. They could discover only the Musaajid of Allah Ta'ala for targeting their insidious attack which is even devoid of legal merit.

While these chaps speak of the motive of the Applicants being unreasonable and unjustifiable, they remain blind to mind-boggling irrationality and unreasonableness of the regulations which constrained a lady to petition the constitutional court for permission to buy clothes for her new-born babe. This was an absolutely mind-boggling application which highlighted the gross irrationality of the satanistic lockdown regulations and the ludicrousness of the western system of kufr justice. Just imagine, that the entity in charge of the lockdown promulgated such a

stupid draconian measure which denies a woman acquiring clothes for her new-born baby, and which necessitated the approach to the highest court in the land.

Even the puerility of the courts, including the constitutional court, was highlighted by this application. The constitutional court, instead of castigating the government for the ludicrity and stupidity of the regulation, berated the lady for having approached the constitutional court first. Although the constitutional court granted the application, it demonstrated appalling puerility and failure of brain-application in its indextrious castigation. The proper course was for the court to have highlighted the ludicrousness and to have ordered the government to dispense of the stupid regulation.

It was indeed silliness at its pinnacle for the constitutional court to have even suggested that the lady should have gone first to the High Court. Just imagine! To the high court to buy essential baby's clothes! This is not a fortuitous display of incongruity. It merely highlights the stupidity and invalidity of man-made laws.

So, this Mr. advocate should open his brains to enable him to discern who and what exactly are being

unreasonable and unjustifiable in the context of the satanic lockdown under cover of the bogus pandemic. While the motive of the Applicants was to acquire the Pleasure of Allah Ta'ala, that of the Fiend of the court and of the advocate was the pleasure of Iblees.

This clique did not step forward to clamour against the opening of the churches, or the opening of the zina film industry, or against the taxi industry and malls which are all the most fertile ground for the 'virus'. They had conveniently forgotten about their simulated objective of altruism of 'saving lives'. While for these crass Munaafiq materialists the other entities are 'essential services', the Fardh Ibaadat is – Nauthubillah! – nonsense, hence their stanistic clamour for the ban.

The campaign against the Musaajid is the hallmark of only Munaafiqeen. The Mashaaikh say: *"A Mu'min in the Musjid is like a fish in the water while a Munaafiq in the Musjid is like a bird in a cage."*

They have glaringly illustrated their aversion for Allah's Ahkaam thereby blatantly exposing their *nifaaq*.

It reality, Allah Ta'ala has entrapped them into becoming 'friends of the court', in order to expose their

nifaaq. The Muslim community has finally seen the unmasking of the Munaafiqeen in our midst.

(2) The chap says:

"....the applicants deemed it fit to challenge this political decision made in the national public interest, and consistent with international practice. They deemed it fit to appropriate constitutional liberties and legislative resources for parochial relief."

This drivel is the effect of *nifaaq*. The government deemed it fit to formulate draconian regulations to oppress and deny constitutional rights. The very constitution which is the great 'god' of the government allowed the action taken by the Applicants.

The recent plethora of anti-lockdown court applications adequately confirm that the political decision which spawned the draconian and oppressive lockdown with its regulations are not in the national public interest. The entire country is now up in arms against the government for the destruction it has wrought to all sectors of the populace with the tyrannical lockdown.

In another application which resulted in the invalidity declaration of the regulations, the judge, quoting the U.S. Attorney-General, said:

"And even a government by the consent of the governed, as in our Constitution, must be limited in its power to act against its people so that there may be no interference with the right to worship,....."

The 'political decision' taken by the government, regardless of its objective, was draconian and pure oppression whose enforceability is possible only by means of a brutal police force and military. The political decision was taken unconstitutionally and is not in the national public interest as the country-wide opposition now testifies. In fact, all over the world Houses of Worship are allowed to operate. South Africa is about the only exception. And, in South Africa, the Bogus uucsa Munaafiqeen for who, lawyer Bham argued in court, are the only supporters of the government in the retention of the ban on the Musaajid.

The so-called 'parochial' relief sought by the applicants is constitutionally and Islamically valid and it is the right of the Applicants which they had lawfully demanded. On the contrary, the government in violation of the constitution adopted a 'paternalistic' approach for achieving its objective by means of unlawful oppression enforced with the brutality of the security apparatus. Describing this improper governmental approach, the High Court said in its judgment in another application:

"This paternalistic approach, rather than a Constitutionally justifiable approach is illustrated further by the following statement of the Director General……."

"The dangers of not following a Constitutional approach in dealing with the COVID-19 pandemic have been highlighted in the judgment of Fabricus J. In his judgment, the learned judge, amongst other things, raised the following question:

"The virus may well be contained……..but what is the point if the result of harsh enforcement measures is famine, an economic wasteland and total loss of freedom, the right to dignity and the security of the person and, overall, the maintenance of the rule of law?"

Quoting another writer, the Judge, to emphasize the imperative importance of human dignity and freedom (which the draconian regulations have ruthlessly expunged), said:

"During a pandemic, government should never lose sight of basic human rights. In fact, it should prioritise their realization and protection of human rights in such a time even more so. In my view, the Bill of Rights has not been given effect to. A pro-human rights lockdown would have perhaps looked much different –

Military officials would have acted more humanely……..The fulfilment of human rights would have been the most important priority to attain."

Said the judge: "I agree with these sentiments. I find that, on an overwhelming number of instances the Minister has not demonstrated that the limitation of the Constitutional rights already mentioned, have been justified in the context of section 36 of the Constitution."

Clearly, the motive of the government and its draconian lockdown regulations are unjustifiable and unreasonable. But the Bham character attributes these deficiencies to the Applicants who had acted lawfully and constitutionally.

The international practice relevant to this bogus pandemic is engineered by conspirators such as Bill Gates who subscribe to the Satanist doctrine of decimating mankind with mass weapons of destruction such as poisonous vaccines. All over the world, people are protesting and demonstrating against the satanic 'international practice', in fact international conspiracy, plotted by the vaccine mob of satanists.

The 'constitutional liberties' and 'legislative resources' appropriated by the Applicants are their constitutional

rights which they have lawfully employed unlike the massive corruptions and scandals involving billions of dollars perpetrated by officials of the government, and about which this advocate chap is mute.

In other applications, the High Courts have roundly and rightly condemned the government, its police and branded the regulations as unconstitutional and invalid. Regardless of the government's intention to appeal, the fact remains that the High Court has declared that the regulations are unlawful. Among these regulations is the satanic regulation which bans Salaat in the Musaajid, and for which ban the Munaafiqeen represented by the Bham character became the 'friends of the court' and the Fiends of Allah Ta'ala.

(3) Making another stupid comment, the advocate says:
"It is the merit of a constitutional democracy that such an application is entertained"

The very entertainment of the Application by this 'constitutional democracy' speaks volumes for the merit of the Application. Even this so-called 'constitutional democracy' which currently has been largely de-democratized, neutralized and rendered academic by an ill-formed dictatorship, has acknowledged the merit of the Application hence its entertainment. It does not befit a lawyer to disgorge

such drivel. His averment is devoid of intelligent substance.

(4) Uttering a blatant LIE, advocate Bham alleges:

"It is a tragedy that a fringe within a religious minority should abuse the legislative organs of the democracy with a futile application."

In this averment the lawyer exhibits his ignorance of the law which is his profession, and his ignorance of the support of the vast majority of the Muslim community for the Applicants. On what basis does he claim that the Applicants represented a 'fringe within a religious minority'. It is necessary for this chap to define the 'fringe' as well as the 'religious minority'.

Without presenting any facts to bolster this stupid claim, the palpability of the bunkum is conspicuous. The Applicants have the support of the large majority of the Muslim Community. Furthermore, if it be assumed that indeed the Applicants constitute the 'fringe in a religious minority', then too the validity, veracity and importance of the Application remain unassailed intellectually, logically, constitutionally and religiously. And, even if it be assumed that the only merit is the religious factor, then too, the Application will be constitutionally valid.

Denial of the rights provided by the constitution to even a 'fringe in a religious minority' is the antithesis of what a supposed democracy stands for. The court had found the application for legalization of dagga made by a fringe group to be constitutionally valid, hence the fringe group now enjoys the right of smoking dagga in public. But this wayward lawyer despite professing to be a Muslim, brands the Qur'aanic demand as 'futile'. While it never dawned on him to oppose the dagga application, he finds it imperative to oppose an Application which seeks to manifest and establish the Command of the Qur'an. His motive for this satanic opposition is not questionable. It is confirmed to be the dictate of the aberration of *nifaaq*.

The stupid notion expressed by the lawyer chap is unintelligent and in conflict with the constitution which he deifies. In fact his deification of the constitutional idol *(taghoot)* is the defecation of intellectual aberration which in Islamic parlance is termed *KUFR*. The religious minority is lauded by the Qur'aan and the Hadith.

If the Application of this so-called 'fringe in the religious minority' is an abuse of the legislative organs', then it highlights the gross deficiency of the 'legislative organs' which were spawned by the constitution of the atheists.

It behoves the Bham character to present a detailed exposition of the divisions and sects of the South African Muslim community and to show just how he had arrived at the stupid conclusion that the Applicants are 'a fringe in a religious minority'. Who is this 'religious minority', and who is the religious majority?

The lawyer chap says:

"It is ironic that civil discourse between the contending views is conducted in the courtroom while in the community, the applicants' religious leadership –who represent a fringe minority – routinely label other ulama who differ from them as hypocrites and with a range of exceedingly offensive epithets."

There irony exists in the convoluted thinking of the modernist lawyer who lacks Imaani understanding. He is bereft of the Knowledge of the Qur'aan and Sunnah, hence he hallucinates the irony. Even a person who is bereft of Islamic Knowledge, but whose Imaan is sound, knows that the acquittal in the secular court by the secular lawyers representing the Applicants will be cloaked with the secular jargon and hues of secularism demanded by courts which in terms of the Shariah have no validity.

The resort to the secular court by the Applicants to request a Shar'i right which is supposed to also be a constitutional right, is a fortuitous expedient imposed on Muslims by an unjust, oppressive, non-Muslim authority. If the court had been accommodative of the Shariah in its true form, then even the religious 'epithets' employed by the religious leadership of the Applicants would also have been 'civil discourse'.

According to the Qur'aan and the Sunnah, the 'epithets and the range of exceedingly offensive epithets' to which the chap takes umbrage, are standard terminology of the Qur'aan and Hadith. Thus, the terms Kuffaar, Munaafiqeen, Fussaaq, Fujjaar, Murtadd, Jaahil, Zindeeq, Mushrikeen, Khanaazeer, Qiradah, Taaghoot, etc., are all integral constituents of the Divine Vocabulary which Allah Ta'ala commanded the Ambiya to employ in the delivery of the Message to characters of the Bogus uucsa type.

These 'epithets' have validity in the Shariah, and they are the effects of the convoluted and corrupt beliefs and acts of the culprits and criminals to whom the designations are awarded. A Munaafiq may not be labelled a Muslim. The signs of a Munaafiq are stated in the Ahaadith. There are principles and rules which govern the validity of these 'epithets'. If these epithets are uncivil with pejorative connotations to westernized

brains of the ilk of Mr. Bham, the religious leadership cannot amend and interpolate the Divine Vocabulary to appease the secular palates of those professed 'muslims' whose satanic mission it is to undermine Islam. In fact, even the lawyer comes within the purview of one or more of the array of Epithets revealed by Allah Azza Wa Jal to Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam).

These 'epithets' are the effects of Shar'i principles, and they have consequences in this earthly abode as well as in the Aakhirah. However, the lawyer fails to understand that his brains are welded within the narrow confines of the straitjacket which was fitted on to his brains by his western masters. The blinkers on his eyes do not permit him to look left or right. Only the path chalked for him by his western academic masters is discernable to him, and that too he views with oblique vision.

Referring to "some fundamental inconsistencies" in the applicants' affidavit, he disgorges some more bunkum, and avers:

"Early in their submission they concede that there is a 'significant diversion of opinion' on the issue. Much later, they submit they are forced to make a 'genuinely burdensome choice' between 'either being true to our faith or respectful of the law'.

It is correct to say that there is a *'diversion'* of opinion, and not a *difference* of opinion. It appears that the chap has employed the term 'diversion' in the context without application of the brains. Diversion in the context means diversion from Siraatul Mustaqeem – diversion from the Haqq of the Qur'aan and Sunnah. While such diversion is kufr, valid difference of opinion has been described by Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) as a *Rahmah* (Mercy). There are prescribed boundaries for valid difference of opinion. But diversion is the inspiration of shaitaan.

The opinions of miscreants such as the Bogus uucsa and Bogus jusa crowd, are diversions. Such opinions are in conflict with the Qur'aan and Sunnah, hence unacceptable. Those who follow in the footsteps of Iblees perpetrate diversion from Siraatul Mustaqeem. They are not guided by the Qur'aan and Sunnah. Elaborating on his bunkum, Mr. Bham says:

"This (i.e. the 'burdensome choice mentioned above - The Majlis) is a false dichotomy. They limit the issue to two options that appear mutually exclusive in order to narrow the argument in their favour. In terms of this reasoning, any Muslim who complies with the lockdown regulations in untrue to his or her faith."

If the compliance is voluntary, then most assuredly such a professed 'Muslim' ceases to be a genuine Muslim. One of the Qur'aanic Epithets will apply to him. Undoubtedly, according to Islam, the issue is limited to two mutually exclusive or repellent options. Hence, it is not permissible to *voluntarily* submit to any haraam lockdown regulation or to any other secular law which conflicts with the Shariah. But, when there is no way of overcoming the oppression of the government, then the Shariah on the basis of its principles permits submission to oppression. There are many such issues which confront Muslims living under the yoke of tyranny of oppressive governments, not only in non-Muslims countries, but in all the lands of Muslims which are today under the helm of kuffaar governments.

Daily, genuine Muslims have to contend with the burdensome choice of opposites – the law of Hell and the Law of Heaven. Thus, in the endeavour to narrow the argument in favour of the Applicants, their attorney was constrained to proffer the burdensome choice argument which has some validity and merit to the court. There is nothing false about this line of argument. For true Muslims there is no third options.

A valid difference of opinion within the confines of the Math-hab of the Muslim, is not a third option. It falls

within the scope of the option which is in diametric conflict with the option of submission to kufr. Such a difference is valid and acceptable. It is not a diversion from the Haqq of Islam. The opinions rejected and denounced by the religious leadership of the Applicants is termed in Islamic parlance *baatil*, *dhalaal, zandaqah* and *kufr*. The argument of the lawyer is devoid of Shar'i substance.

Peddling his bunkum further, the fellow says:

"The logical fallacy is an attempt to obscure the legitimate diversity of views and opinion within the house of Islam."

Since the fellow lacks valid Islamic Ilm, he disgorges whatever his westernized brain dictates. He should define and elaborate these hallucinated 'diversity of views and opinion'. Insha-Allah, we shall then administer the boot for their refutation. Since he has not mentioned the diversity of views and opinions, his attempt to legitimize the diversionary views of the Bogus characters is fallacious. The diversionary views which he has in mind and which the cartel of deviates has trumpeted are illegitimate. Such views and opinions have no validity and no accommodation in Islam. We have responded and refuted to each and every such diversionary view in several publications which are available on our website.

The attempt to obfuscate the issue by painting the diversionary opinion to be a legitimate difference within the confines of the Shariah, is an attempt to obscure the reality of the two mutually repellent options presented by the Applicants.

Without understanding the operation of the principles of the Shariah, the chap avers:

"This, in turn, provides cover for declaration of takfeer – declaring that a fellow Muslim is guilty of not believing in the essential tenets of Islam, and is therefore no longer a Muslim."

The fellow has heard somewhere the term 'takfeer' without understanding the meaning of this concept and the basis of the operation of this injunction of the Shariah. He speaks of 'essential tenets of islam' without having the haziest understanding of such tenets. In all probability, the 'essentials of Islam' in his mind are limited to what is termed the Five Pillars. Besides these fundamentals there are numerous essentials of Islam, the rejection or belittling of which expels one from the fold of Islam. The scope of this treatise precludes such elaboration.

It will suffice to say that *Takfeer* is a valid injunction of Islam. Where and when necessary, it becomes imperative to effect its administration regardless of the chagrin and stupidity of the so-called western intelligentsia who are defective in even the rudimentary masaa-il pertaining to *Istinja*. When it is necessary to excommunicate a man of corrupt beliefs, *Takfeer* will be resorted to in the interest of safeguarding the Imaan of the masses. This is an Islamic provision which may not be relegated to oblivion to suit the whims and fancies of the interfaith mob of murtads and munaafiqs masquerading as Muslims.

Mr. Bham, the lawyer arguing on behalf of Reverend Bham, the Cross-Worshipper, says:

"The applicants rely on the expert opinion of Mufti A. K. Hoosen, whose fatwa on the matter was entered as evidence in the proceedings. The mufti states in his fatwa that he does not agree with the decision of the Al-Azhar, in Egypt, to close mosques as the Al-Azhar is a puppet institution of an oppressive Egyptian regime."

What Mufti A. K. Hoosen commented about Al-Azhar is correct. In fact Al-Azhar is an agent of Iblees. This institution has its own religion which the Applicants and their religious leadership do not accept as Islam. It was therefore downright stupid for anyone to submit the opinion of Al-Azhar to counter the Applicants.

Proffering the views of Azhar is the same as presenting the views of, for example, the Roman Catholic Church in opposition to the Applicants. Al-Azhar has its own religion and the Applicants subscribe to another religion. Regardless of the similarity of names, the Applicants just do not accept Al-Azhar as being Muslim. Qadianis and Shiahs also name their religion 'Islam', while in reality their Religion is a religion of Kufr notwithstanding their recitation of the same Kalimah. Therefore, it was moronic to cite in opposition to the Applicants the views of priests of another religion.

While the Applicants tendered the Fatwa of Mufti A. K. Hoosen and also the Fatwa of the very senior or perhaps most senior Mufti of Bangladesh in support of their Application, they did not solely rely on these Fatwas as implied by the Bham chap. The reliance of the Applicants was predominantly and primarily on their constitutional right as provided by the atheist constitution which even the believers in the great 'god' of the constitution do not uphold. The two Fatwas were of peripheral significance. Just as the Rastafarians claimed their constitutional right for the legality of dagga, and for which they required no expert opinion other than their own views, similarly, the Applicants in terms of the constitution are not reliant on expert opinion and the fatwas of others. They have a set of

beliefs peculiar to themselves. They follow a religion apart from the religion of the Munaafiqeen and Murtaddeen. They do not follow the religion of Sudaisi, Reverend Bham, and the gamut of other *gutha and hufaalah.* Thus, the averment of Advocate Bham is plain drivel devoid of Islamic and constitutional substance.

Then the fellow arguing for the retention of the ban on the Musaajid, averred:

"The mufti is also on record labelling as hypocrites the ulama who support the closure of mosques. Yet, he does not label as hypocrites the despotic Saudi regime that also effectively closed the haramain in Makkah and Madina. His epithets are issued selectively and expediently."

Firstly, for the edification of this fellow who fails to apply his mind objectively and constructively, the Saudi regime is a kuffaar regime, worse than the kuffaar regime of the U.S.A. or of any other non-Muslim country. Secondly, there was no need in the context of the Applicants' case to introduce the Saudi dimension just as there was no need to introduce the kuffaar regime of Pakistan, or the kuffaar regime of France, etc. Fourthly, the valid expedient justified the selective choice. The Applicants dealt with the closure of the Musaajid in South Africa, not the Musaajid in

Saudi Arabia or elsewhere. Hence the need was to fling the epithets at the local agents of Iblees such as the unholy reverend bham and other Munaafiqeen such as Tony Karan, etc.

Fifthly, there is an imperative need for the Mufti to be selective in his administration of the justified Islamic Epithets. It is known that the Fundamental of Hajj and the Sunnah of Umrah have to be discharged in Makkah. There is no substitute for these acts of Ibaadaat. The kuffaar regime saddled in Saudi Arabia will not permit those Muslims who castigate and denigrate it to perform Hajj. Thus in this case discretion is the better part of valour. Circumstances sometimes constrain the adoption of a selective process.

The Bham fellow who, in court, demonstrated a deep-seated aversion for the Musaajid and the Fundamental of Salaat which is inextricably interwoven with the Musaajid, states in the effluvium he discharged:

"The court finds the applicants' acceptance that the lockdown regulations are rational and constitutionally permissible cannot be reconciled with their persistence for exceptions to accommodate their request for permission to attend congregational prayer."

This averment illustrates the total lack of Imaan. He is bereft of even a vestige of Imaan. It is not possible for a genuine Mu'min to demonstrate such insidious feelings for the Musaajid of Allah Ta'ala. A true Mu'min sees no need for the stupid reconciliation mentioned by Bham. A Mu'min readily understands the Imaani logic for the 'persistence' of the Applicants. This logic is incomprehensible to those whose hearts are vacant – denuded of Imaan.

Furthermore, even if the attorney for the Applicants had conceded 'rationality' for the draconian irrational regulations which are in stark violation of the constitution, it does not follow that such concession is the belief of the Applicants. The attorney may have deemed it expedient to present arguments along this line despite the reality of the irrationality of the draconian and unjust regulations which are oppressively shoved down the throats of a population opposed to this oppression. The numerous High Court applications, and even the sharp comments on the High Court regarding the irrationality of the regulations confirm the gross irrationality and draconiality of the oppressive lockdown regulations by means of which the government has trampled on the constitution and human rights of the entire population, and in addition has devastated the economy of the country.

The irrationality of the draconian lockdown regulations is now the clamour of numerous experts and organizations. Senior advocates, lawyers, social organizations, and High Court judges have all joined the chorus of the *irrationality* of the lockdown regulations. In his High Court judgment, the senior Judge Fabricus severely castigated the irrationality of the regulations. He presented a range of irrational regulations from an armoury of ludicrous regulations.

And, what did the government's top scientist, Professor Gray, say about the stupid regulations? She said that these were "sucked from the thumb". It is only the Munaafiqeen who are averse to the Musaajid opening – who are anti-Islam – who see rationality in the devil's handiwork.

Then the Bham attorney chap says:

"What the applicants are effectively seeking is an endorsement for Muslim exceptionalism in a constitutional democracy. The irrationality of this expectation is indisputable."

What is indisputable in terms of the Qur'aan and Sunnah – the Shariah – is the kufr and nifaaq of all those human devils *(Shayaateenul ins)* who have aligned themselves against the opening of the Musaajid. They are the enemies of Islam and the

enemies of Allah Ta'ala, hence they acted as the 'friends' of the court to argue with might and main for the closure of the Musaajid with its concomitant corollary of the abolition of Islam. That is precisely why this chap views the *demand* (not request for permission) for the opening of the Musaajid to be what he describes as 'Muslim exceptionalism'.

If the demand of the Applicants is 'Muslim exceptionalism', then let this fellow understand that the constitution grants such 'exceptionalism' in its principle of freedom of religion. Our religion is not part of the plethora of other *baatil* religions and ideologies which are all figments of satanic hallucination. Islam is an *exceptional* Deen, and it is the incumbent duty of Muslims to demand Muslim *exceptionalism* which is a valid right within the scope of the constitutional imperative of freedom of religion. This *exceptionalism* does not infringe on anyone's rights. On the contrary, its denial is denial of the constitutional right of the Muslim community.

The Qur'aan is our life-breath. Whatever Allah Azza Wa Jal states, is the final Word which nothing and no manmade law can override. Confirming the *exceptionalism* of Islam and of Muslims, the Qur'aan Majeed states:

"Verily, the Deen by Allah is only Islam. Whoever searches for a religion other than Islam, never shall it be accepted of him, and in the Hereafter he will be among the losers (destined for everlasting perdition in Jahannam)."

These verses confirm the *exceptionalism* of Islam. Confirming *Muslim exceptionalism,* the Qur'aan says:

"You (O Mu'mineen!) are the noblest of nations having been created for mankind. You command righteousness and you forbid evil, and you believe in Allah."

The Qur'aan and the Ahaadith make it abundantly clear that this Ummat of Islam, i.e. the true Mu'mineen, are the exclusive repositories of Truth. It is only this Ummah which is on the Haqq – on the Path of Guidance known as Siraatul Mustaqeem. Thus *exceptionalism* is a divinely bestowed attribute to *only* this Ummah of true Believers. This should suffice to debunk the kufr effluvium disgorged by the lawyer whose opprobrious conduct which he displayed with shameful operoseness was indisputably kufr from the Islamic perspective. The only way for being expiated from kufr, the consequence of which is everlasting damnation in the Aakhirah, is sincere Taubah.

Further displaying his aversion for Islam, the lawyer who professes to be a Muslim, says:

"Finally, even after this defeat in the high court, we are left with the bad taste of Muslim self-righteousness. The Applicants project themselves as courageous Muslims whose piety evidently exceeds that of other Muslims who are too weak to fight for their faith."

There is no defeat for true Muslims. Everything, down to the minutest detail related to the most infinitesimal item of creation such as an atom, is under the direct command and control of Allah Azza Wa Jal. Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) and the Sahaabah had also sustained battlefield setbacks. This is the *dunya* which is the arena for the conflict between Haqq and baatil – Truth and falsehood. The conflict is like a seesaw. Miracles are not the norm. Miracles are exceptions to the rule. Here on earth there will be superficial 'defeats' which the true Muslims will have to sustain. If Muslims have to achieve success and victory on all fronts and in every conflict, the very purpose of this transitory sojourn on earth would be defeated. Everlasting success and happiness for the Mu'mineen are in Jannat, not here on earth. If the focus is on Allah Ta'ala, the Muslim understands and accepts that the end result is Allah's decree which is the subject of Divine Wisdom unfathomable to us.

While piety is undoubtedly a vital requisite for the success of Muslims, the idea of piety is furthest from the minds of those who strive in the Path of Allah Ta'ala to uphold His Deen. For the edification of the wayward lawyer, it will be salubrious for him to know that the attitude of the true Mu'min is diametrically opposed to his assertion which is egregious rubbish. As long as a Mu'min does not consciously understand and believe himself to be more contemptible than even a dog, he will be suffering from *kibr*. The 'self-righteousness' slander is a branch of *kibr* in which secular personnel excel, hence suing for defamation is an integral constituent of their westernized hearts.

Our advice for the lawyer is that he should engage in some soul searching. If he does so with sincerity, he will not fail to discern the necrosis of nifaaq in his heart. Life on earth is short-lived. There is still time for expilation.

Salaam on those who follow *Huda (the Guidance of Allah).*