

Women and Musājid

THE TRASH OF THE CHARLATAN 'SCHOLARS'

By A U.K Student

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

INTRODUCTION

The monotonous clamour of the juhala modernist moron so-called 'scholars' regarding their hallucinated permission for women to attend the Musaa'jid, reveals an effeminate tendency displayed by male sexual perverts. They are of the type of mix-up gender or transgender creatures who were exiled to the outskirts of Madinah by Rasulullah (Sallallahu Alayhi Wasallam).

The abnormal gender mix-up partially deranges the mental equilibrium hence their obsession with women. The mental disequilibrium of these juhala womanish 'scholars' is conspicuously displayed in the silly and trash arguments which they stupidly extravagate from Ahaadith which they ludicrously mutilate for fabricating their opinion of permissibility.

Added to their deplorable jahaalat (ignorance) is the Satanism which Shaitaan urinates into their disturbed brains. Thus, their arguments are compounded stupidity which make them a laughing stock of clowns. Regarding these clown 'scholars', the Qur'aan Majeed says:

“Among people is he who disputes in (the laws of) Allah without knowledge, and he follows every rebellious Shaitaan.”

(Al- Hajj, Aayat 3)

In reality these 'scholars' of perversion are Satanists, and only Satanistically inclined morons incline to Satanists.

Mujlisul Ulama of South Africa

WOMEN, MOSQUES, EIDGAH, AND THE DECEPTION OF FEMINIST CHARLATAN SCHOLARS

In recent days a whole glut of feminist deviate “scholars” have come crawling out of some hellish hole somewhere, clamouring for women to attend the Eidgah and Musjids. These charlatans masquerading as scholars quote Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) and the Fuqaha (jurists) extremely selectively and with a great deal of dishonesty.

In due course, as and when time permits, we shall, insha-Allah, expose and refute all their acts of deception and chicanery, and their complete misrepresentation of the teachings of Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) which they filter through the lens of Kuffaar norms and values to which they (the feminist deviates) are pathetically enslaved.

In the meantime, for the benefit of sincere seekers of truth who may have been swayed into a state of confusion by the toxic but enticing Ghutha (trash) vomited out in unison by these feminine deviates, we release this brief notice to apprise the Ummah of the Haqq and to shed some light on the position of a few of the Fuqaha who are quoted deceptively by these charlatans masquerading as scholars.

We emphasize categorically that according to the command of Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam), the Sahabah (radhiyallahu anhum), and ALL the Fuqaha of Ummah, even including the few names selectively and deceptively quoted by these feminist charlatans, ALL women today must be barred from the Masjids. This is the only valid ruling of the Shariah on this issue.

And this ruling applies to an infinitely greater degree in this worst of eras in which both women and men fail in the most absolute manner in fulfilling the whole host of essential and non-negotiable pre-conditions set by Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) himself.

Amongst the scholars parroted by these feminists, Ibn Hazm features prominently. Ibn Hazm's fatwa on women's attendance at the Masjids is a Shaadh (anomalous, isolated and erroneous) view which has been ignored, dismissed and rejected by the Fuqaha throughout the ages. It is based on a grave slip of enormous magnitude which we shall expound on in detail in future insha-Allah.

The feminist charlatan scholars whose satanic methodology amounts simply to scouring through our tradition in order to excavate what accords closest to the norms and values of their Kuffaar masters, have naturally pounced on this Shaadh fatwa. One notorious feminist Guru, Akram Nadwi, has even gone as far as translating and publishing it as a book for the "benefit" (i.e. damnation) of the masses. We intend soon to lay bare the acts of blatant distortion (Tahreef) and chicanery of this "Shaykh ul-Hadith" regarding whom there is Ijma' (agreement) amongst the feminine charlatan "scholars" on his scholarship, standing and integrity.

Despite the isolated and erroneous status of Ibn Hazm's position on this issue, we shall demonstrate in detail that even according to him, ALL women today must be barred from the Masjids. For now, we list four aspects of Ibn Hazm's position which the feminist fraudsters who cite him seek to conceal:

1) Ibn Hazm narrates the authentic Hadith in which Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) commanded: *“Do not prevent the female servants of Allah from the masjids of Allah, and they must not emerge EXCEPT that they are Tafilaat.”* The clear implication from Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) is that they must be prevented if they are not *“Tafilaat”*.

What is *“Tafilaat”*? Ibn Hazm proceeds to accurately define *“Tafilaat”*, in accordance with the classical experts of the Arabic language, as *“foul-smelling and clothing”*. Since all feminists harbour a natural disdain (also known as Kufr) for any teaching of Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) that conflicts with their preferred *“Deen”*, feminism, the dishonest fraudster, Akram Nadwi, has endeavoured his best to conceal this definition of *“Tafilaat”* in his so-called *“translation”*.

2) Ibn Hazm expressly indicates that it is FARD (obligatory) to prevent from attending the Masjid any woman who does not meet this vital pre-condition of *“Tafilaat”* set by none other than Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam).

3) Ibn Hazm regards as authentic the sanad (chain) of the Hadith recorded in the Sunan of Abu Dawud which explicitly establishes the superiority of the prayer of a woman in the private chamber of her private room in her home, over her prayer in the Masjid. His momentous slip consists of somehow and inexplicably managing to invert the wording of the Hadith which appears to be the root-cause of his misunderstanding, i.e. he somehow managed to misread the Hadith as stating the exact opposite of what it actually states.

4) Ibn Hazm then proceeds to shoot himself and the feminists of this age in the feet by categorically declaring that if a woman's prayer in her home is indeed really superior, then it must be HARAAM for a woman to attend the Masjid. He provides cogent reasons for this assertion and then emphasizes the fact that no other possibility exists. We point out here that according to the Ijma' of the whole Ummah, according to Ibn Hazm's inadvertent admission mentioned in point number 3 above, and even according to many of the feminist charlatan scholars of this age, a woman's prayer in her home is indeed superior to her prayer in the Masjid.

Thus, according to Ibn Hazm's own rationale for which he provides cogent reasons, a woman's attendance at the Masjid is Haraam.

From the points above, all of which will be substantiated in detail in the future, the deceit and dishonesty of the feminist deviates who parrot the name of Ibn Hazm repetitively can be discerned. There is no consolation nor succour for these charlatans even in a Shaadh view which is unique in its anomalous and erroneous nature.

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

Scour through the Ghutha (trash) verbage of these feminists who fraudulently claim to follow Rasulallah's (sallallahu alayhi

wasallam) teachings authentically and one cannot help but notice that every single command of Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) pertaining to women which does not conform with the Kuffaar cult of life, is vividly conspicuous by its absence.

How many of these feminist deviate scholars expend any effort and how much of their Ghutha (trash) is devoted to exhorting women to emerge only in the state of being “Tafilaat” as explicitly commanded by Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam)? How much of their Ghutha is expended in explaining what “Tafilaat” actually entails according to the experts of the Arabic language? How much of their Ghutha is devoted to emphasizing Rasulullah’s (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) explicit command to women to adhere to the edges of the path, as a result of which the noble female Sahaabiyyaat (radhiyallahu anhunna) would scrape their outer garments against the walls? How much of their Ghutha is expended in re-iterating Rasulullah’s (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) explicit declaration that a woman who emerges outside smelling of any form of fragrant scent, is an adulteress whose Salaat is rejected until she performs the Ghusl of Janaabah (ritual purification required after intercourse)? How much of their Ghutha is disgorged in expounding on the prohibition of men and women being in close proximity even on the roads, leave aside the vicinity of the most sanctified places in the world? How much of their Ghutha is used to clarify the fact that the noble Sahaabiyyaat (female companions) would generally attend the mosques in intense darkness, wrapped up in entirety in their worn-out and tattered outer garments, with none being able to recognise the other, and that they would flee from the mosque immediately after Salaat while the male Sahabah (radhiyallahu anhum) would remain seated until all trace of the generally elderly women had vanished?

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

The deception and misrepresentation of our Deen perpetrated by such charlatan scholars are made even more acutely conspicuous by the fact that all of the aforementioned commands of Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam), and other similar commands pertaining to women, are violated, en masse, to an epidemic degree never before witnessed by the Ummah.

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

In vivid contrast to the Ghutha disgorged in chorus by these feminist deviates, the books of the Fuqaha are faithful to Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) and replete with all of the aforementioned commands, much of which would naturally be unpalatable today, as indicated by Rasulullah's (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) prophecy that the true Deen will eventually become Ghareeb (lone, isolated, forlorn).

Amongst the very first pre-condition which was violated, en masse, which constrained the Sahabah (radhiyallahu anhum) to initiate a prohibition, was the requirement of women being

“Tafilaat”. Hadhrat Aishah (radhiyallahu anha) makes this very clear in the following authentic narration:

“Aishah said that Rasulallah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) said “Do not prevent the female servants of Allah from the Masjids of Allah, but they must emerge Tafilaat.” Then Aishah said: “Had he (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) seen their condition today, he would have prevented them.” (Musnad Ahmad ibn Hambal)

In addition, the women had gradually ceased to arrive at and depart from the mosque in the stealthily discreet manner in which the noble Sahaabiyyaat used to do so. In another version of this narration, Hadhrat Aishah’s (radhiyallahu anha) statement regarding this particular aspect is recorded:

“Were Rasulallah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) to see from the women what we are seeing (i.e. violating the pre-conditions for emergence), he would most assuredly have prevented them just as the women of Bani Israaeel were prevented. And, I used to see us praying Fajr with Rasulallah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) in our cloaks, and we would depart (swiftly) and none of us would recognise the other.” (Musnad Abee Ya’laa)

Both of the authentic narrations above are also corroborated by versions in Saheeh Bukhari and Muslim and many other collections of Hadith.

The great Mujtahid Imam, Abu Ja’far al-Tahawi, expounded in detail on the real and actual prohibition enacted by the Sahabah (radhiyallahu anhum) referred to by Hadhrat Aishah (radhiyallahu anha).

He explains that the “illat” (cause) of this Fatwa of prohibition i.e. widespread violation of pre-conditions set by Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam), would naturally become more acute as we move further away from the blessed era of Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam):

“Aishah said this about Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) regarding women only after knowing that he only allowed them in the masjids due to the absence of a condition that occurred within them later. Since that was so in the time of Aishah, they would be even further from what they were in the time of Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) after her.” (Ahkaam ul-Qur’an)

Similar statements exhorting a complete prohibition based on the Hadith of Hadhrat Aishah (radhiyallahu anha) have been made by the early Mujtahids such as Imam al-Qaffal, Imam al-Saydalani, Imam al-Juwayni, Imam al-Ghazali, Qadhi Husayn, and countless other Fuqaha. Refer to the article *“Eidgah and Feminism”*, easily available online, where the quotes of the aforementioned Mujtahideen and of many other Fuqaha will be added regularly.

Leaving no doubt whatsoever that Hadhrat Aishah’s (radhiyallahu anha) statement refers to an actual implementation by the Sahabah (radhiyallahu anhum), the following authentic narration describes the expulsion of women from the Masjid by one of the most senior Sahabah, Hadhrat Abdullah ibn Mas’ood (radhiyallahu anhu), who is described in authentic Hadeeths to be the most knowledgeable of the Qur’an amongst the Sahabah, the one closest in conduct and character to Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam), and the one regarding whose teachings Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) explicitly instructed to “hold fast” to:

“I saw Ibn Mas’ood throw small pebbles at women expelling them from the masjid on the Day of Jumu’ah.” [Musannaf Abi Shayba – Saheeh]

In another version of this narration it states that Hadhrat Ibn Mas’ood (radhiyallahu anhu) would call out while throwing the small pebbles: *“your Salah in your houses is better!”*

After describing what the women of Bani Israeel introduced which resulted in their permanent expulsion from the Masjid, Hadhat Abdullah Ibn Mas’ood (radhiyallahu anhu) issues the following explicit command to the Sahabah (radhiyallahu anhum) and Tabi’een of his era:

“Keep them out from where Allah had expelled them from.” [Tabaraani – Saheeh]

The narrations above are most significant and vividly portray the eventual and final attitude of the Sahabah (radhiyallahu anhum) towards women’s attendance at the Masjid, which was demanded by the failure of both men and women to abide by the numerous commands of Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) set as necessary prerequisites for permission for women’s attendance at the Masjids.

This final attitude of the Sahabah (radhiyallahu anhum) was carried over to the subsequent generations as evident in the Fatwas of the Imams of Salaf-us-Saaliheen. For example, the following is the explicit Fatwa of Imam Abu Hanifah, Imam Abu Yusuf and Imam Muhammad ash-Shaybani (rahmatullahi alayhim) – the three Absolute Mujtahids upon whom the Hanafi Madh-hab is based – declaring the impermissibility (Tahreem) of women going to the Eidgah:

“I [Muhammad ash-Shaybani] said: “What is your opinion on women, is it binding on them to come out for the two Eids?” He [Abu Hanifah] said: “There used to be concession (rukhsa) for them in that. But today, I consider that Makrooh (Tahreemi) for them.” (al-Asl)

Similarly, Imam Ahmad ibn Hambal who narrates in his own Musnad many of the narrations commanding men not to prevent women from attending the Masjids, implies with the following categorical declaration that the men and women of his era were no longer meeting the pre-conditions for attendance set by Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam), hence the women have naturally become a source of fitnah:

“I heard my father (i.e. Imam Ahmad ibn Hambal) being asked regarding women’s emergence to the Eid prayers. He replied: ‘No, I disapprove (Tahreem) of it in this age of ours, because they (women) are a fitnah’” [Masaa-il Ahmad ibn Hambal – compiled and transmitted authentically by the son of Imam Ahmad ibn Hambal]

In the context of his statement that women are fitnah, the prohibition is self-evidently of the highest degree.

For support, Hadhrat Ahmad ibn Hambal (rahmatullahi alayhi) quotes, with an authentic chain, the following factual observation of one of the great students of the Sahabah (radhiyallahu anhum), Hadhrat Matar al-Warraaq (d. 129) (rahmatullahi alayh), proving conclusively that it was none other than Rasulullah’s (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) closest companions who understood his teachings the best, who had initiated this prohibition:

“Indeed the women used to come to the same gathering as men’s. However, as for now (i.e. the Tabi’een era), verily, a single finger from the fingers of a woman casts (a man) into fitnah (i.e. stirs lust/temptation).” [Ahkaam-un-Nisaa]

The narration above is an authentic and definitive eye-witness testimony that even during the era of the Sahabah (radhiyallahu anhum) circumstances had changed drastically enough to demand a suspension of the initial concession granted by Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) which he himself (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) made wholly dependent on the fulfilment of a whole host of stringent pre-conditions which are designed perfectly to eliminate any chance of fitnah and fasaad, amongst which one of the biggest dangers was that of free-mixing, both enroute and at the Masjid.

The fraudulent so-called Hambalis of this era, both the Salafi and fraudulent “Sufi” varieties, who cite some latter-day Hambali authorities which contradict this explicit Fatwa of Imam Ahmad ibn Hambal issued during the most blessed of eras, seek to conceal the fact that even according to the teachings of these latter-day Hambali authorities, no group of women exists today to whom their fatwas of permissibility could apply. Imam al-Buhooti, for example, defines the pre-condition of “Tafilaat” as, *“When her smell becomes pungent as a result of leaving out applying fragrance or applying oil.”*, and Allamah Qudamah includes as a prerequisite the wearing of old, worn and tattered garments (al-bizlah).

Those feminists who have yet to reject the authenticity of all the Hadeeths and the verses of the Qur’an, go to ridiculous lengths in explaining away the statement of Hadhrat Aishah (radhiyallahu anha).

They latch onto the anomalous position of Ibn Hazm who came up with the ridiculously far-fetched theory that Hadhrat Aishah (radhiyallahu anha) was only speaking hypothetically and that she did not actually prohibit the women from attending the Masjid. Amongst the reasons Ibn Hazm uses to substantiate this weird and outrageous claim is the fact – so he claims – that Hadhrat Aishah (radhiyallahu anha) did not specify what the women had innovated. Apart from the obvious fallacy of that rationale, the narrations of Hadhrat Aishah (radhiyallahu anha) cited above indicating the failure of women to emerge “Tafilaat” and discreetly enough, thoroughly debunk Ibn Hazm’s basis for his far-fetched theory.

Like Imam al-Tahawi, the Fuqaha of all Madh-habs have understood Hadhrat Aishah’s statement to be in reference to a real and actual prohibition enacted by the Sahabah (radhiyallahu anhum). The actions of Hadhrat Abdullah ibn Mas’ood cited above were real. The eye-witness testimony of Hadhrat Matar al-Warraaq is real. The fatwas of Imam Ahmad ibn Hambal, Imam Abu Hanifah, Imam Abu Yusuf, Imam Muhammad, Imam Sufyan ath-Thawri, and ALL the Imams of the Salaf-us-Saaliheen are an irrefutable proof that circumstances were altering drastically, and the women were no longer meeting the prerequisites for attendance stipulated by Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam), thus demanding the fulfilment of the command of Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) which eventually culminated in the complete prohibition of all women from the Masjids.

Why do these feminist charlatans even bother with the likes of Ibn Hazm or Ibn Hajar al-Asqalani when even much of their teachings on this issue would be regarded as misogynistic according to the libertine cult of the West to which these charlatans have fully submitted (tasleem)?

Why do these charlatans even bother trawling through our vast tradition, dismissing and mocking the rulings of the Fuqaha on the way, and searching desperately for an anomalous scrap or two that conform closest with the values of Kufr embedded in their hearts, and even then having to distort and mutilate those scraps? Why do they not come out into the open and declare loudly and clearly, *“This is my own personal Deen, and that is the Deen of the Fuqaha and the Salaf-us-Saaliheen.”*?

The obvious answer is that even these charlatans realise that a great proportion of their market, the masses to whom these charlatans are fully dependent on for money and adulation, still possess the belief that the true Deen is somehow tied to the Salaf-us-Saaliheen and the great Fuqaha of the past, hence the need for them (i.e. the feminists) to scavenge like hungry dogs for the anomalous and erroneous slips of the scholars.

Consider the example of one lost specimen of the Naaqisatul Aql (deficient in intellect) species from South Africa who deemed it fit to write an open letter to the Ulama, protesting her own disqualification and the disqualification of the rest of her kind, from attending the Masjid.

Although her letter does carry a great deal of stench with it, we can confidently claim that this shameless woman fails miserably in meeting the vital condition of “Tafilaat”, accurately defined as “foul-smelling” by her own authority whom she refers to, Ibn Hazm. We can safely assume that she walks openly and often in the middle of the path unnecessarily, in violation of Rasulullah’s (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) explicit command. We can safely assume that she fails miserably in fulfilling the condition of wearing “al-bizlah” – old, tattered and worn out garments – which is listed amongst many other prerequisites for attendance

at the Masjid, by Allamah Ibn Qudamah whom she refers to as an authority on this issue.

We are confident she fails in fulfilling the requirement of being “mutaghayyaratur reeh” – possessing a gone-off, altered for the worse smell – which is listed approvingly amongst the pre-conditions by Haafiz Ibn Hajar al-Asqalani whom she refers to.

According to ALL the authorities whom she herself cites, she qualifies with flying colours for a complete prohibition from the Masjid – a lifetime ban and possibly an eternal one if she fails to repent and make amends immediately. We console her, however, by stating that she is not unique. Her state of complete disqualification from attending the Masjid is shared by all the women of the world, and have been for many a century. The Fatwas of permissibility of the Fuqaha which she refers to deceptively are addressed exclusively to a group of women who are completely non-existent today.

In her foul-smelling letter (tafilat), riddled with ridiculous blunders, more likely stemming from an abnormally intense Naqs (deficiency) of her Aql (intellect) rather than a deliberate attempt at distortion, she insinuates that there exists an ikhtilaaf or contradiction between the Sahabah (radhiyallahu anhum) enacting the prohibition, and between certain Fatwas of the Salaf and reports of women’s attendance, such as the presence of Hadhrat Aatikah bint Zayd (radhiyallahu anha) in the Masjid at the time of the murder of her husband, Hadhrat Umar (radhiyallahu anhu), when in reality there is no contradiction.

It is evident that the prohibition enacted by the Sahabah (radhiyallahu anhum) was implemented in stages.

Initially the Shawwaab (non-elderly women) were prohibited, who obviously would, by human nature, have been the first to violate the pre-conditions set by Rasulallah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam), and also be the first to be involved in the violation of the numerous commands addressed to the men.

In this regard, The Hambali authority, Allamah Ibn Hubayrah, states in his book on Ijma' (consensus):

“They (the Fuqaha of ALL four Madh-habs) are in agreement that it is reprehensible for Shawwaab (non-elderly women) to attend the congregational prayers of men.” (Al-Ijma’)

Imam Al-Kasani, the Hanafi authority states:

“They (the Fuqaha) are all agreed that there is no concession for Shawwab (non-elderly woman) to emerge for Jumu’ah, the two Eids, and anything from the (congregational) prayers.” (Badaa-i us-Sanaa-i)

On the other hand, the Ajaa-iz (women of great grandma age) during the age of the Salaf-us-Saaliheen had not yet degenerated to the degree which demanded the same ruling of prohibition that was applied with respect to the Shawaab (non-elderly women). The Ajaa-iz, in general, would still only emerge as commanded by Rasulallah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) in the state of being *“Tafilaat”* – smelling only of body odour as a result of not having applied any perfume, scented lotions, soaps, deodorant, cosmetics, and the like (*ghair mutatayyibaat*), to combat the odour which the body naturally emits. The Ajaa-iz, in general, would still emerge covered entirely in baggy, coarse, old and tattered garments.

They would still emerge only in the intense darkness of Fajr and Isha times during which none would recognise the other. They would still adhere to the edges of the paths and take routes that were the most isolated. They would still lower their gazes, never daring to sneak a glance at any Granddaddies who they might happen to pass by on an isolated chance encounter, nor would any Great Granddaddy attempt to sneak a glance at the dark tattered-garmented shadows scurrying on the peripheries.

And, the Ajaa-iz, along with the Granddaddies would still adhere largely to all the other measures instituted by Rasulallah (sallallahu alayhis salaam) which were designed perfectly to prevent free-mixing to and from the Masjids, and eliminate any chance of fitnah.

Is there even the slightest resemblance between the pious elderly women of that age and the women and men of this worst of eras in which every single prerequisite for women's attendance at the Masjids, instituted by none other than Rasulallah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) himself, is violated intentionally and with intransigent pre-meditation, en masse and at the behest of the Ulama-e-Soo', to a degree never before witnessed in the entire history of this Ummah? The author of the open letter and the rest of the feminist charlatan "scholars" are most contumacious if they are able to hallucinate that their womenfolk are anything like the Great Grandmas of the Salaf-us-Saaliheen.

Since the majority of the Ajaa-iz were still abiding by the prerequisites for attendance at the Masjids, especially during Fajr and Isha times, they still qualified for coming under the purview of the Hadith:

“Do not prevent the female servants of Allah from the masjids of Allah, and they must not emerge except that they are Tafilaat.”

The narrations in Bukhari mention specifically that Hadhrat Aatikah (radhiyallahu anha) would only emerge as *“Tafilat”* in the intense darkness of Fajr and Isha times. In Uyoon al-Akhbaar of Ibn Qutaybah it is recorded that she was already well-advanced in age (*“khalaa min sinnihaa”*) when she married Hadhrat Zubayr (radhiyallahu anhu) very soon after the martyrdom of Hadhrat Umar (radhiyallahu anhu).

Evidently then, she was an elderly woman of impeccable Taqwa (piety) and Wara’ (scrupulousness) who fulfilled perfectly all the prerequisite conditions for attending the Masjid.

Yet, despite qualifying for attendance at the Masjid in a manner no (non-sahabi) woman would thereafter match, it is noteworthy that the Ghairah (an honourable, protective type of jealousy) of Hadhrat Umar (radhiyallahu anhu), and the Ghairah of her husband after his martyrdom, Hadhrat Zubayr (radhiyallahu anhu), constrained both of them to exhibit much reluctance in permitting Hadhrat Aatikah (radhiyallahu anha) to attend the Masjid. The narration in Bukhari specifically mentions the Ghairah of Hadhrat Umar (radhiyallahu anhu) in this matter. Hadhrat Zubayr’s (radhiyallahu anhu) Ghairah compelled him to take the radical step of hiding incognito in ambush and slapping his wife in the dark on her way to the Masjid, on which she promptly returned back home vowing never to go to Masjid again, citing the reason that the people had become corrupt.

Where are the men today with the Ghairah of Hadhrat Umar (radhiyallahu anhu) and Hadhrat Zubayr (radhiyallahu anhu)?

While the Ghairah of these noble Sahabah (radhiyallahu anhum) manifested itself so vividly at an elderly wife of perfect piety attending the most sacred and safest of places during the most blessed of eras, fulfilling all the necessary prerequisites for attendance perfectly, with no chance of any strange man seeing her, nor her seeing any strange man, the cuckolds (Dayooth) of today feel not even the slightest pang of discomfort in their dead hearts while sending their wives in tight, colourful and fragrant “jilbaabs” daily to rub shoulders with strange men at the markets which Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) branded as the “worst places on Earth”, to drop off and collect the children at the Kuffaar and so-called “Islamic” schools, to “man” their shops and businesses serving strange men face to face, and to every other place where the rules of the Shariah which are perfectly designed to prevent fitnah, are violated terribly and inexcusably. Unfortunate circumstances constrained by genuine Shariah-based necessities (Darooraat), which might, on occasion, be unavoidable in Daarul Kufr (e.g. hospitalizations), should never eliminate Ghairah and the natural Imaani pain registered in the heart of the believer when unable to take remedial action, which Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) described as a sign of the “weakest of Imaan”. In reality, no Imaan remains in the heart which fails to trigger the slightest pang of discomfort and distress when the divine Shariah is being violated.

While the narration of Hadhrat Aatikah bint Zayd (radhiyallahu anha) attending the Masjid, and the narrations of other elderly “Tafilaat” cited in a selectively half-baked manner by the feminist fraudsters, poses absolutely no problem for us, they backfire flatly in the faces of these charlatans, and reveal the *Nafsaaniyaat* – base desires fully submitted to Kuffaar values – that is the core foundational basis of their entire “Deen”.

On what other basis do these feminist Charlatans have the audacity to even cite Hadhrat Aatikah's (radhiyallahu anha) presence at the Masjid at the time of the martyrdom of her husband (radhiyallahu anhu), leave aside using it as a Mustadal (proof), when this has reached us only in the form of a *Munqati'* (disconnected) narration, while the authenticity of every other authentic Hadith confirmed and accepted by the entire Ummah, but unpalatable to the Kuffaar, is assaulted on the slightest whimsical basis? On what other basis do these fraudsters reject the fully-connected and authentic narration of Hadhrat Aishah (radhiyallahu anha) as it has been understood by the entire Ummah?

On what other basis do those fraudsters who concede the authenticity of the narration of Hadhrat Aishah (radhiyallahu anha) dismiss the understanding of the galaxy of Mujtahideen and Fuqaha of the entire Ummah regarding it, and proceed instead to scavenge like hungry dogs for an anomalous scrap or two such as the one dropped by Ibn Hazm which Ibn Hajar al-Asqalani merely regurgitated? On what other basis do these dishonest fraudsters who pounce on the anomalous couple of scraps left for them by Ibn Hazm and Ibn Hajar al-Asqalani, then proceed to ignore, dismiss, and even commit blatant Tahreef (distortion) of the rest of the teachings of these two scholars, such as the prohibition of women emerging EXCEPT as "*Tafilaat*" which Ibn Hazm defines aptly as "*foul-smelling and clothing*"? On what basis do these feminist fraudsters ignore the fully-connected and authentic narration of one of the most senior Sahabah (radhiyallahu anhu), Hadhrat Abdullah ibn Mas'ood (radhiyallahu anhu), expelling the women from the Masjid and instructing the Sahabah (radhiyallahu anhum) and Tabi'een to "*Keep them out from where Allah had expelled them from*"?

And, on what basis do these quacks ignore and suppress the facts evident from the very narrations that they cite, such as the fact that Hadhrat Aatikah (radhiyallahu anha) was an elderly woman (al-Ajooz) of impeccable piety who would only attend the Masjid as “*tafilat*”, during times of intense darkness, fulfilling all the other necessary pre-conditions for attendance set by Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) with absolute perfection, and yet, still, the greatest of men on Earth at the time displayed so much disinclination and Ghairah towards her attendance?

In a similar manner, the fatwas of permissibility of some Shafi’i Fuqaha which are cited deceptively by the feminists today refer exclusively to age-old women (al-Ajooz) who no longer possess any desire for men, and whose faces ridden with crinkles and wrinkles serve as a sufficient deterrent for Great Granddaddies. Imam Nawawi (rahmatullah alayh), for example, who is quoted often by the fraudulent part-time “Hanafis” of this era, explicitly states that his Fatwa of permissibility is directed exclusively to al-Ajooz (women of great grandma age) who fulfil all the necessary conditions including wearing “*al-bizlah*” – old, worn-out, and tattered garments, and in the complete absence of fitnah, the greatest of which is the widespread violation of measures which Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) himself had instituted to prevent any mixing whatsoever between men and women, to and from the Masjids.

Perhaps during Imam Nawawi’s era there still existed a few pockets in the Ummah, in which the great grandmas were still emerging “*Tafilaat*”, and both the men and women living in those isolated pockets were still able to fulfil all the other stringent pre-conditions set by Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) including those designed perfectly to prevent any free-mixing whatsoever

enroute, to which Imam Nawawi's fatwa may have borne some relevance.

However, the later Shafi'i Fuqaha, on realising such women no longer existed even amongst the Great Grandmas, and that even amongst the Great Granddaddies there was a sharp increase in the number of perverts, categorically declared a complete blanket prohibition.

The Shafi'i authority, Allamah Taqi ud-Deen al-Hisni states that only a *Ghabi* (a moron suffering from extreme density of brains) would fail to understand the applicability of Hadhrat Aishah's (radhiyallahu anha) explicit Fatwa for an age in which the pre-conditions for women's attendance are violated to an infinitely greater degree than the relatively more minor violations that had occurred during the era of Hadhrat Aishah's (radhiyallahu anha):

"In our time, there should be absolute certainty of it being Haraam for non-elderly women and those of stature to emerge because of the prevalence of corruption. Although the Hadeeth of Umm Atiyyah supports emergence, but the condition that was there in the early generations has disappeared...It has been authentically transmitted from Aishah that she said, "If Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) had to see what women have introduced, he would most certainly prohibit them from the Masjid just as the women of Bani Israaeel were prohibited.' This then is the Fatwa of Ummul Mu'mineen in the best of ages. Then what should be (the fatwa) in this corrupt time of ours?....And this (difference of opinion regarding women's attendance) applied to that (early) age. But during this era of ours, not a single Muslim will hesitate to prohibit women except a Ghabi (an ignoramus/moron whose brains are dense) who lacks understanding of the deeper wisdom of the Shariah..."

The correct ruling is resolutely Tahreem (i.e. it is haraam for women to attend the Masjid). And the Fatwa is according to it.” (Kifaayat ul-Akhyaar)

We add to the above statement that not only a Ghabi (an extremely dense and damaged brain cell) would issue a Fatwa of permissibility in this worst of eras, but also a particularly evil specimen from the satanic species known as the Aimmah Mudhilleen (scholars who will drag countless people with them into the depths of Jahannum) would issue such a Fatwa designed for a non-existent group of women, extinct long long ago, by which the doors are opened for countless women to transgress the Ijma' of ALL the Fuqaha of the Ummah including even the likes of Ibn Hazm, that minus the fulfilment of a whole host of stringent pre-conditions set by Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) himself, women must be barred from attending the Masjid.

The famous verifier of the Maliki Madh-hab of the 8th century, Allamah Khaleel ibn Ishaq al-Jundi, in the very same section in which he lists a few of those stringent and non-negotiable pre-conditions, states:

“In our time, (complete) prohibition is stipulated, and Allah knows best. This is proven by the famous statement of Aishah (radhiyallahu anha)...” (al-Tawdeeh)

Evidently, he realised that the fulfilment of such conditions were an insurmountable task for the Muslims of his age, and had been for many centuries.

We end with the comments of Allamah Ibn Hajar al-Haythami, the famous verifier of the Shafi'i Madh-hab from the 10th century AH. After quoting approvingly Allamah Taqi ud-Deen al-Hisni's Fatwa cited above, he declares that this had been agreed upon by Ijma' (consensus):

“How can I not say this (i.e. that it is Haraam for all women to attend the Masjids, Eidgah and graveyard) when this has become agreed-upon due to the absence of the condition of the permissibility of coming out in his time (sallallahu alayhi wasallam), ...Those who made these pronouncements (i.e. Fatwas of prohibition) are the majority of the Ulama from the (early) mujtahids and the proficient Imams and the righteous Fuqaha, who are the experts, so it is necessary to accept their statements, as they are the guides of the ummah, and their choice for us is better than our preference for ourselves, and whoever opposes them is following his base desire..At the time of the prevalence of Haraam acts, the correct view is absolute Haraam, and a Faqeeh does not hesitate in this (i.e. in issuing the Fatwa of Haraam)” (Al-Fataawal Fiqhiyatul Kubra)”

This elucidation and clarification of the position of Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam), the Sahabah (radhiyallahu anhum) and the Fuqaha should suffice for now in establishing the Haqq on this issue, and also in exposing the deception and fraud of the feminist charlatan “scholars” of this age whom Shaytaan has delegated the task of dragging innumerable people with them into the depths of Jahannum.