

**THE FITNAH OF  
WOMEN  
TRAVELLING  
WITHOUT  
MAHRAMS**

***RESPONSE TO THE BAATIL FATWA  
OF THE KARONGI MUFTIS***

Published By  
MUJLISUL ULAMA OF SOUTH AFRICA  
P.O.BOX 3393, PORT ELIZABETH,  
6056 ,SOUTH AFRICA

## WOMEN TRAVELLING WITHOUT MAHRAMS

*Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) said: “It is not lawful for a woman who believes in Allah and the Last Day to go on a journey of three days without a mahram.”*

In another Hadith narration a journey of one day is mentioned. Thus a woman who undertakes a journey without a valid Shar’i *Mahram* is akin to a *kaafirah*. Undertaking a journey without a mahram in open defiance of the prohibition declared by Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam), himself, is explicit kufr. The attitude of such a *faasiqah* / *faajirah* testifies to her kufr. Her so-called abaya – mock purdah – deceptively donned to hoodwink others and to deceive herself into the belief of her being a Mu’minah, does not save her from her kufr.

In this era, there is a glut of molvis – evil ones – who aid and abet women in their fisq, fujoor and kufr. These *maajin* muftis who are agents of Iblees, with their haraam zig-zag fatwas in reality abolish the sacred Law of Allah Ta’ala established by explicit Hadith *Nusoos* of the most authentic class.

## A ZIG-ZAG BAATIL FATWA OF THE KORANGI MUFTIS

The muftis of Mr. Taqi Usmani's Darul Uloom in Korangi, Karachi, Pakistan issued the following baatil fatwa regarding a woman travelling without a valid Shar'i Mahram:

سوال: کیا یہ جائز ہے کہ کوئی محرم شخص عورت کو ایئر پورٹ پر چھوڑے، پھر وہ اکیلی جہاز میں رہے، اور پھر Destination (جہاں جہاز اترتا ہے) پر دوسرا محرم اس کو لے جائے۔

جواب: واضح رہے کہ عام حالات میں عورت کے لئے شوہر یا محرم کے بغیر تہا سفر کرنا جائز نہیں ہے، خواہ ہڈ ریڈ ہوائی جہاز ہی کیوں نہ ہو، البتہ اگر شدید مجبوری ہو کہ عورت کے لئے تہا سفر کئے بغیر کوئی چارہ نہ ہو تو ایسی صورت میں نیک خواتین کے ساتھ سفر کرنے کی اجازت ہے بشرطیکہ فتنہ کا اندیشہ نہ ہو اور چونکہ ہوائی جہاز کے ذریعہ سفر میں وقت زیادہ خرچ نہ ہونے کی وجہ سے اس میں فتنہ کا خدشہ کم ہوتا ہے اس لئے صورت مسئلہ میں اگر واقعی شدید مجبوری کی وجہ سے مذکورہ صورت پر عمل کر لیا جائے یعنی ایک طرف سے محرم رشتہ دار نہیں ایئر پورٹ پر چھوڑ دیں اور دوسری طرف سے محرم رشتہ دار ہی ایئر پورٹ سے آکر انہیں لے جائیں نیز جہاز میں ان کے ساتھ نیک خواتین بھی ہوں اور ان کو سفر میں کہیں رات نہ گزارنی پڑے تو اس کی گنجائش معلوم ہوتی ہے۔ (کذا فی التہذیب ۱۳/۵۵۰، ۱۳۹۸، ۲۶) (العرف الشذی للکشمیری: ۳:۳)

### TRANSLATION

**“Question: What, is it permissible for a Mahram person to leave at the airport a woman who will travel alone in the plane, then at her destination another Mahram will receive her?”**

**Answer (by the Korangi muftis):**

Be it clear that in general conditions (*aam haalaat*) it is not permissible for a woman to travel without her husband or a mahram even if the journey is by plane. However, if there is a dire need (*shadeed majboori*) which compels a woman

to travel without a mahram, then in such a case it is permissible for her to travel with a group of pious women on condition that there is no fear of fitnah.

Since the time travelling by plane is not much, the fear of fitnah is minimized. Hence, in the case asked (in the question), if truly the need is dire, then there appears to be scope for this when a mahram leaves her at the airport, and another mahram receives her at the other airport, and furthermore, if there are pious women with her on the plane, and she does not have to pass the night at some place.”

*(End of Korangi's Zig-Zag fatwa)*

## **OUR ANSWER AND COMMENT**

An essential requisite for a Mufti engaged in the duty of *Ifta'* is that he should have Taqwa and be far-sighted. It is not permissible for a moron to be or to act as a mufti irrespective of the academic course of Deeni study he had pursued.

If a mufti lacks a panoptic view of the scenario of the case regarding which a fatwa is sought, then it is not permissible for him to issue a fatwa. Lack of sincerity, worldly and nafsaani motives, inadequate comprehension of the kutub, and lack of panoptic vision induce a mufti to issue zig-zag fatwas. He attempts, albeit abortively, to navigate between

Haqq and Baatil to produce fatwas – liberal fatwas – to assuage the questioners, and this evil has greater applicability if the questioner is wealthy or belongs to the ruling class of scorpions. Little does such a mufti *maajin* understand that in the department of *Ifta'* he is in a veritable spiritual minefield. If the Fear of Allah Ta'ala is not embedded in his heart, he will blow up and destroy his Imaan with his zig-zag and even blatantly baatil corrupt fatwas.

The Korangi Muftis in their averment in aforementioned fatwa, although conceding the impermissibility of a woman travelling without a mahram, resort to their zig-zag shaitaani technique of introducing the element of '*majboori*' (*dire need*) when in reality neither did the questioner raise this issue nor does there exist this element in 99% of the cases of women nowadays travelling alone, without mahrams.

The questioner had posed the simple question: 'Is it halaal to eat pork or consume liquor?' His question is unconditional. He does not seek an answer for a case of *shaded majboori*. He just wants to know whether *khinzeer* and *khamr* are halaal or not. Instead of presenting the simple and unambiguous fatwa of *hurmat* (*being haraam – not permissible*),

the mufti *maajin* resorting to his zig-zag tricks, and displaying blithe disregard for the Shariah, laboriously and without valid reason introduces the *shadeed majboori* (*extremely dire need*) dimension which occasions the fatwa of permissibility.

All Muslims are aware that in cases of dire need, consumption of a little pork or haraam food to save one's life becomes not only permissible, but Waajib. However, the question pertains to normal situations, not to *shadeed majboori* cases as the Korangi Muftis have hallucinated for justifying their zig-zag fatwa of permissibility for a woman to travel without mahram.

Today, droves of women – all lewd – *be-sharam* and *be-hayaa* – travel without mahrams without the slightest vellication of conscience, and in wanton disregard of the severe prohibition. Their travel is not constrained by *shadeed majboori* as the Korangi Muftis subtly adorn the question with in order to fit it with their fatwa of permissibility.

What is this *shadeed majboori* which constrains abolition of the prohibition or diversion from it? These muftis have the duty of expounding exactly what is this ghost of *shadeed majboori* which permits the droves of women to travel without

mahrms. In total disregard of the Shariah's condition of *tafelah* when real need constrains emergence from the home, not for travel, but for attending to real needs within the town, women nowadays, on the basis of zig-zag fatwas of the *maajin* muftis, not only prowl in the public domain, but embark on journeys without the accompaniment of mahrams thereby invoking on themselves the *La'nat* (Curse) of Allah Azza Wa Jal and His Malaaikeh. "*Tafelah*" is the term used by Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam), which means a woman dressed shabbily, like an old hag with even emission of smelly bodily odours. No woman today who takes to the streets or who goes on a journey will ever accept the condition of her being a *tafelah* when emerging from her home. On the contrary, they will be dressed in their best garments, perfumed and painted like prostitutes and set to entrap fussaag and fujjaar. When they emerge, they truly emerge as *Habaailush Shaitaan* (the Traps of the Devil) mentioned by Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam). Nabi-e-Kareem (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) said: "*Woman is aurah. When she emerges (from her home), shaitaan casts surreptitious glances at her (plotting to ambush her and with her to trap males into the commission of zina).*"

The question does not make mention of *shadeed majboori*. A simple answer to a simple question was sought, yet the Korangi muftis went to the inordinate length of zig-zagging between two mutually repellent extremes, viz. Haqq and Baatil, in a stupid attempt to strike a balance between Islamic austerity and western satanic liberality to appease the westernized *zanaadaqah*.

These muftis initiated their fatwa by conceding the impermissibility of women travelling without mahrams. Then by stupid meandering movements, they attempt to manoeuvre through the spiritual minefield. Thus they hallucinate several baseless probabilities which in reality are not to be found, and which are unrelated to the question. Attaching permissibility to the haraam act with a group of pious women is incongruous to say the least.

Firstly, in today's world, there is no 'pious' group of women on a journey. They are all lewd when they undertake a journey without their respective mahrams. These muftis cannot be academically so stupid as not to understand that whether it is one woman or a group of women, it will be haraam for them to travel without mahrams. However, clutching at passing straws in the silly attempt to fabricate 'daleel' for a *daleel-less*, baatil fatwa,

these supposedly Hanafi muqallideen muftis have dug out from the Shaafi' kutub the permissibility of a group of pious elderly women travelling without mahrams. This endeavour by the Korangi muftis is baatil and most unbefitting of Muftis.

Firstly, it is not permissible to extract rulings from other Math-habs without valid cause or real *Majboori*, not hallucinated 'majboori' such as the hallucination of the Korangi muftis. Incorporating into our Math-hab masaa-il from other Math-habs is valid only when there is a real dire need.

There is no dire need – *no shaded majboori* – for women to undertake journeys without mahrams for Umrah or tabligh or visiting, etc.

Secondly, the Shaafi' concession is based on pious elderly women, not young women dressed and adorned to attract and entice fussiaaq and fujjaar. Thirdly, the condition of *tafelah* applies to the Shaafi' concession.

Another extremely silly, deceptive argument proffered by the Korangi muftis is their assumption that much time is not spent when travelling by plane, hence the possibility of fitnah – the fitnah of pre-zina paraphernalia – is minimized. This

assumption is the effect of dwelling in self-deception. What is their concept of ‘fitnah’? Their liberalism has negated the Islamic conception of fitnah from their minds, hence they have so ignorantly entertained the idea of a minimum degree of fitnah on a plane journey. We really fail to understand what their understanding of fitnah is. Furthermore, assuming that there is ‘little fitnah’ on the plane, it does not cancel the Prohibition of travelling without a mahram. The ‘little fitnah’ argument is a shaitani ‘daleel’ which the muftis have simply lapped up with the application of cognitive intelligence. There is no *shadeed majboori* to invoke the Fiqhi principle which legalizes prohibitions.

The noblest ages were the three eras attendant to Rasulallah’s age. Of these three noble ages in which flourished the greatest goodness and virtue the world had ever witnessed, the era of the Sahaabah was the noblest. In their era most of the Pious Wives of Rasulallah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) were alive, and so were all the Pious Sahaabiyah. Yet, the Sahaabah discerned the germination of the seeds of *fitnah* which impelled them to ban these great Ladies of Islam from attending the Musjid for even Salaat, and even whilst they emerged from their homes in the *tafelah*

state. They were prohibited from even the Musjid – the Musjid which was permitted for them by Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam). But today these *maajin* muftis say that it is permissible for a woman to embark of a ten thousand kilometre plane journey without a mahram in glaring opposition to Allah and His Rasool who had likened such a woman to a *kaafirah*.

Then to justify this vile breach, they present the flapdoodle argument of a ‘little fitnah’. Just what is this ‘little fitnah’ which the Shariah is assumed to tolerate for a woman whose entire being according to Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) is *Aurah* , and whose emergence from the home sets into motion satanic conspiracies of zina-fitnah?

The element of *fitnah* which necessitates the strictest observance of Purdah and the prohibition of travelling without a mahram, in its worst form is zina (fornication). The variety of other acts which culminate in zina are all major factors of the Islamic concept of fitnah. Bringing all such fitnah factors within the scope of prohibition, the Qur’aan states: “*Do not approach near to zina.*” Providing the *tafseer* of this *fitnah* concept of the Qur’aan Majeed, Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) explained that the eyes commit zina; the ears

commit zina; the tongue commit zina; the hands commit zina; the feet commit zina, and the mind and the heart commit zina.

At every step of the journey, beginning from home to the destination a thousand or ten thousand kilometres away, a glut of fitnah – fitnah in the meaning of the Qur’aan and hadith – prevails. There is the zina fitnah on the streets, at the airports and on the plane. At the airports it is at its worst. Mingling with kuffaar, fussiaaq and fujjaar is the norm. Lewdness is at its height in these haunts of shaitaan. The lone woman is subjected to this deluge of fitnah and satanism at the airport despite the presence of a mahram. On the plane, without her mahram, it is infinitely worse. She is exposed to kuffaar, fussiaaq and fujjaar males. She has to at times interact with fussiaaq or kuffaar male staff of the plane despite the presence of faasiqaat, faajiraat and kaafiraat staff. Furthermore, this woman travelling alone is bereft of Taqwa. There is nothing to inhibit her from flaunting herself. There is no mahram who can exercise some restraint and inhibition on her.

From the immigration check point right through the entire process of her embarkation, she is without the stupid, *dayyooth* ‘mahram’ who abandoned her

at the airport under cover of the *baatil* fatwa issued by the Karongi muftis. The same haraam scenario is duplicated when she lands at her destination. The airports are veritable cities. She has to mingle, rub shoulders with all and sundry. She is a million times more exposed to *fitnah* – the Islamic idea of *fitnah* – than she would be in a mall in her home city.

The idea of ‘little *fitnah*’ concocted by the Karongi muftis is scandalously and egregiously *baatil*. In fact it is an inspiration urinated into their brains by *shaitaan*. They have stupidly and disingenuously sniffed around for ‘daleels’ to halaalize a major sin – a sin akin to *kufr*, for Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) said that the existence of *Imaan* in Allah and the Last Day does not allow a woman to travel without a mahram.

The other silly ‘daleel’ of the time factor further exhibits the *jahaalat* of the muftis. Regardless if the exposure to *fitnah* is for a short while as contended by the Karongi muftis, it has absolutely no effect on the Prohibition. It remains haraam for a woman to travel without a mahram. The addition of this time factor is a flaccid, in fact baseless, argument in the endeavour to override the Prohibition. It is most unbecoming for muftis to conduct themselves

so irresponsibly as to halaalize a major sin akin to kufr, simply on the basis of assumption.

The Prohibition is not diluted if the journey is not encumbered by ‘much time’. The Prohibition is unconditional. A woman may not travel without a mahram regardless of the time factor. Also, what do they mean by ‘little time’? Utter drivel. What is the ‘time’ concept of these muftis? They claim that since much time is not spent on the journey, the Prohibition is waived. What is the need for this stupidity when the *shadeed majboori* argument is tendered for waiving the Prohibition? If there genuinely exists *shadeed majboori*, no one will deny the concession or the permissibility. But they have to first Islamically prove the existence of *shadeed majboori*.

It is haraam to simply assume *shadeed majboori* when even the one who poses the question does not refer to such a scenario. When there does exist *shadeed majboori*, there is no need for the twaddle of ‘little fitnah’, ‘little time’, group of pious ladies, not having to sleep the night anywhere, etc.

*Shadeed majboori* will automatically override the Prohibition. There will be no need for muftis to issue a fatwa to allow the consumption of a little

pork when *shadeed majboori* genuinely exists. The affected person will act and indulge in the prohibition without any need to refer to muftis.

In their fatwa the Karongi muftis have repeatedly harped on their imaginary *shadeed majboori* basis despite the reality of there being no such dire need mentioned in the question. They therefore had absolutely no need to introduce this falsehood into the question. They hallucinated the *shadeed majboori* only to deceive themselves and mislead others. These are the effects of lack of Fear.

Although the muftis have raised the *shadeed majboori* element for cancelling the Prohibition, they also stupidly attach the condition of “*not having to sleep overnight anywhere*”. When *shadeed majboori* by itself correctly halaalizes the Prohibition, the accretion of the *sleeping overnight* condition is superfluous and drivel. The Fiqhi principle: “*Dhururaat (dire needs) render permissible Mahzuraat (Prohibitions)*”, operates independent of the conditions with which the Karongi muftis have most unacademically encumbered it (i.e. this Principle). For example, in a scenario where a man is permitted to consume a little pork, this Principle applies without restrictions. Thus, regardless of whether the pork is

procured with haraam money or whether it is stolen, etc., the suffering man is allowed to avail himself of the concession in the circumstances in which he finds himself. A mufti may not encumber the permissibility with the condition, for example, of halaal procurement, or any other condition.

Similarly, if *shadeed majboori* genuinely exists, a woman may travel without a mahram, without a jilbaab, without a head scarf, etc. She will not be in need of any mufti's fatwa to avail herself of the permissibility. She only has to consult her heart and conscience in compliance with the command of Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam): "*Seek a fatwa from your heart.*" If she is sincere and a woman of Imaan, then, Insha-Allah, her heart will proffer the correct fatwa, not the type of zig-zag fatwa which the *maajin* muftis of today disgorge sometimes without application of the mind, and at most times, constrained by *nafsaani* and worldly objectives.

A *shadeed majboori* will be the flight of women from human devils in war zones such as Syria, Burma, Kashmir, etc. where they are ravaged by the kuffaar Pigs. Another *shadeed majboori* is the death of the husband along the journey. In fact, the cases of *shadeed majboori* are rare. But for these

liberal muftis influenced by westernism, and for the moron molvis of the Tabligh Jamaat, Nafl Umrah, women's tabligh, visiting relatives, wedding functions, etc. are '*shadeed majboori*'. Their concept of *Dhururat (shadeed majboori)* is compounded stupidity. Since they dwell in confusion, lacking in valid comprehension of the applicability of the juridical (fiqhi) principles, and motivated by *nafsaani* designs, they meander and zig-zag between the extremes of Haqq and Baatil abortively attempting to strike a plausible balance to assuage both the people of Haqq and the people of Baatil. Instead of achieving their ludicrous objective, they stumble into the domain of *kufr* with their zig-zagging.

The Karongi muftis have demonstrated their egregious error on the issue of women travelling without mahrams, with their laborious and confused zig-zagging to fabricate the *baatil* fatwa which does not answer the question. They have unlawfully, in terms of the Shariah, encumbered the question with their imaginary '*shadeed majboori*' element, then on this baseless premises, erroneously fabricated several fictitious stipulations to maul and mutilate the unrestricted *Dhururat* Principle for the production of the obscene fatwa which halaalizes a major sin akin to *kufr*.

The fatwa is obscene because it provides a licence for immorality – for zina. The Qur’aan prohibits every approach to zina, and every stepping stone leading to zina. But the Korangi fatwa opens the door for this immoral *fitnah*.

The confusion of the Karongi muftis on this issue is indeed surprising. Despite having hallucinated the premise of *shadeed majboori*, their ultimate averment is: “*There appears to be scope for it.*” That is, for women travelling without mahrams. If *shadeed majboori* (a real dire need) does exist, the talk of ‘there being scope’ is a stupid excrescent. *Shadeed Majboori (Dire Need – Dhururat)* renders explicit permissibility. The circumspective attitude adopted by the muftis demonstrates their ambivalence, uncertainty and confusion. The Principle evolved from the Qur’aan, itself precludes the zig-zag vacillation of the muftis between the two extremes of Haqq and Baatil. Their understanding of mere *possibility of scope for permissibility when shadeed majboori exists*, testifies to their lack of understanding of the operation of the *Usool*.

In the background of the question asked, is the widespread practice of women nowadays travelling

without mahrams. This practice has become intensified by the kufr decree of the kufr Saudi Najdi regime. The evil Saudi regime has abolished the Shariah, and now permits women to travel without mahrams. The Korangi muftis should have understood that the questioner was seeking a fatwa on the prevalent, widespread practice. He was not asking about any *shadeed majboori* scenario. Without taking into account the factual position, the Korangi muftis with their stupid, baatil fatwa have only assisted to indurate an already-established haraam practice.

### ***OUR ADVICE***

Our advice for the Muftiaan-e-Kiraam of Korangi and elsewhere is to fear Allah Ta'ala; to cultivate some Taqwa; to engage in Muraaqabah-e-Maut and Muraaqaba-e-Qabr; to bear in mind the Hisaab of Qiyaamah; to understand that *Ifta'* is not a joke or a hobby; to realize that the Mufti dangles between Heaven and Hell; to seek only the Pleasure of Allah Ta'ala, not the pleasure of people; not to be influenced by the wealthy and the rulers, and to perpetually engage in Thikrullaah. Only then will Muftis be able to fulfil the obligation which they have imposed on themselves by setting up their Darul Iftas.

When issuing fatwas, Muftis should endeavour to strengthen the bond between people and Allah Ta'ala. They should apply their brains constructively so as to close the avenues for fisq, fujoor, bid'ah and kufr. Nowadays, the shaitaani attitude is to open doors for evil, vice, fisq, fujoor, bid'ah and even kufr on the basis of the shaitaani-hallucinated *fatwa-taqwa* argument. Without applying their minds, the youngster *maajin* 'muftis' who dwell in confusion, seek to emancipate people from the fetters of the Shariah by baselessly introducing the 'fatwa-taqwa' stupidity.

### ***Conclusion***

**It is haraam for women to travel without a valid mahram. Their travelling without a mahram is a *kabeerah* sin which emaciates Imaan, and if this sin is believed to be halaal, it will deracinate Imaan.**