

سَبِيلُ الْمُنْكَرَاتِ  
فِي  
جَمَاعَاتِ الْمُتَكَشِّفَاتِ

The Way Of Evils

In The Groups Of  
Female Expressionists

MUJLISUL ULAMA OF S.A.  
PO BOX 3393  
PORT ELIZABETH  
6056, SOUTH AFRICA

e-mail: [mujlisul.ulama@gmail.com](mailto:mujlisul.ulama@gmail.com)  
website: [themajlis.co.za](http://themajlis.co.za)

### **FEMALE EXPRESSIONISTS**

***Female Expressionists are women who leave the holy precincts of the Home which is the abode which Allah Ta'ala has ordained for Muslim women. Even if they emerge from their homes with burqah/jilbaab (outercloak), they are called expressionists, for in emerging from the home without valid Shar'i reasons they are in emulation of their kuffaar counterparts, for they are then entering into an unnatural sphere which is not the role Allah Ta'ala has ordained for them. Her natural role and her natural sanctuary are the HOME. Thus, according to Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam), woman has no share outside the Home.***

## **Contents**

INTRODUCTION.....	4
‘MASTOORAAT’ – A MISLEADING MISNOMER.....	7
THE FIRST AND HIGHEST STAGE OF WAAJIB HIJAAB ....	9
THE MUFTI SAHIB’S QUR’AANIC DALAA-IL.....	10
THE MUFTI SAHIB’S HADITH DALAA-IL.....	40
WOMEN’S EMERGENCE INTO THE PUBLIC DOMAIN IN TOTAL DEFIANCE OF THE LETTER AND SPIRIT OF ISLAM.....	64
CONCLUSION OF THE MUFTI SAHIB’S QUR’AAN AND HADITH ‘DALAA-IL’ .....	70
THE MUFTI SAHIB’S ‘DALAA-IL’ FROM THE FUQAHA	71
THE STATEMENTS OF THE ULAMA.....	90
THE HADITH IN BUKHAARI SHAREEF .....	103
THE ANALOGY WITH THE MUSJID.....	111
THE AAYAT PROHIBITING KHUROOJ (EMERGENCE) .	114
A CASE ON LIES.....	116
EMERGING FOR NEEDS .....	120
THE PROHIBITION TO ATTEND THE MUSJID.....	122
THE PROOF FOR WOMEN EMERGING FROM HOME...	123
THE GRAVE ERROR OF ‘BENEFITS’ .....	126
THE ORIGINAL FATWA OF DAARUL ULOOM DEOBAND AND MAZAAHIRUL ULOOM OF SAHARANPUR .....	131
A RECENT FATWA OF DAARUL ULOOM DEOBAND.....	136
THE ATTEMPT TO NEUTRALIZE THE FATWA.....	140
MUFTI KIFAYATULLAH’S DETAILED FATWA ON KHUROOJ (EMERGENCE) OF WOMEN FROM THEIR HOMES.....	143
THE PROHIBITION OF WOMEN ATTENDING	

**SABEELUL MUNKARAAT FI  
JAMAA-AATIL MUTAKASH-SHIFAAT**

GATHERINGS AND LECTURES.....	143
THE RULING OF PERMISSIBILITY.....	163
THE MAHRAM FALLACY .....	164
WHAT THE FUQAHAS SAY.....	165
MASTOORAAT OR MAKSHOOFAAT.....	169
THE QUESTION OF WOMEN UNDERTAKING JOURNEYS FOR THE PURPOSES OF MASS TABLEEGH.....	171
COMMENT ON THE VIEW OF HADHRAT MAULANA YUSUF KANDELWI (RAHMATULLAH ALAYH).....	181
HADHRAT MUFTI MAHMOODUL HASAN'S COMMENT TRAVELLING WITH WOMENFOLK FOR HAJJ AND UMRAH.....	184
FATWA ON IMAAM ABU YUSUF'S VIEW – ANOTHER SPURIOUS ARGUMENT .....	187
ANOTHER BASELESS ARGUMENT .....	190
THE CURSE OF RASULULLAH .....	197
(sallallahu alayhi wasallam).....	197
THE ARGUMENT OF THE LESSER EVILS .....	198
MEN AND WOMEN – THE DIFFERENCE IN THEIR PARTICIPATION .....	199
THE HAQ IS CONCEDED .....	202
MORE CONVOLUTED ARGUMENTS.....	204
FEMALE KHUROOJ IS NOT THE SOLUTION .....	205
FEMALES WITHIN THEIR HOMES ARE NOT DEPRIVED OF THE IMMENSE THAWAAB OF TABLIGH AND JIHAD FI SABEELILLAHAH.....	209
THE MUFTI SAHIB'S INJUSTICE.....	209
ULAMA-E-SOO' DESTROYING THE WOMEN OF ISLAM.....	211
OUR COMMENT AND ADVICE .....	214
SUMMARY.....	218

## INTRODUCTION

This publication, *SABEELUL MUNKARAAT FI JAMAA-AATIL MUTAKASH-SHIFAAT* (*The Way of Evils in the Groups of Female Expressionists*), is in response to the book, *Sabeelul Khairaat Fi Jamaa-aatil Mutanaqqibaat* (*The Way of Goodness in the Groups of Females Who don the Veil*) written by a senior Mufti of the Tabligh Jamaat.

The objective of the Mufti Sahib in his book is to prove that it is permissible to encourage women to emerge from their homes for the purpose of undertaking tabligh journeys to distant towns, cities and countries. Although the Mufti Sahib had set himself the task of proving the assumed validity and permissibility of the women's wing of the Tabligh Jamaat, he has hopelessly failed to proffer even one Shar'i *daleel* (*proof*) for his claim.

While the dispute is the permissibility or impermissibility of the women's tabligh jamaat which we have designated *makshoofaat* (*exposed*) *jamaat*, the entire presentation of the Mufti Sahib pertains to arguments to prove the permissibility of women emerging from their homes for their needs of life. The opponents of *makshoofaat jamaat* are not contesting the permissibility of women coming out from their homes to attend to necessities. The argument pertains to the mass women's movement formed by the Tabligh Jamaat and the women's groups organized systematically to undertake journeys.

Since there is not a single *daleel* in the Shariah to bolster the Mufti Sahib's claim, he endeavours in his book to pull wool over the eyes of the unwary and ignorant by presenting the proofs for the permissibility of women emerging for their needs. But this is not the pivot of the dispute. Since all the references cited by him pertain to only emergence of women for their

needs, i.e. emerging locally in their home town, and for Fardh Hajj, his entire book is an exercise in redundancy. He had failed to present Shar'i evidence to justify the ignominious blunder of drawing women out of their homes and sending them on journeys for tabligh.

After failing miserably to present even one viable Shar'i *daleel* to substantiate Shar'i validity for makshoofaat jamaat, the Mufti quotes the lectures and personal views of other Tabligh Jamaat Ulama. All of the votaries of the Tabligh Jamaat without a single exception have only managed to present what they construe as 'benefits' of makshoofaat jamaat. None of them had succeeded in presenting any Shar'i *daleel* which could cloak the makshoofaat jamaat with permissibility. All of them, without exception, have only presented their personal opinions and the assumed 'benefits' of the women undertaking hikes to distant places on tabligh excursions.

The personal opinions of the Ulama are not Shar'i *dalaa-il*, regardless of their seniority. The bias of the Tablighi Muftis has overshadowed their capacity of intellectual independence which is supposed to be an attribute of a Mufti. This bias has unfortunately constrained Hadhrat Mufti Mahmoodul Hasan (rahmatullah alayh) to endeavour to stifle the freedom of the Muftis of Darul Uloom Deoband's Department of Ifta'. Thus, the honourable Mufti Mahmoodul Hasan Sahib himself states:

*"When any query regarding tabligh comes to the Darul Uloom then I personally answer it. I don't give it to any other Mufti because I am unaware what answer will be given."*

This lamentable statement arising from a lamentable attitude is discussed towards the end of this book. By the *fadhl* of Allah Ta'ala, we have responded to all the arguments which are

**SABEELUL MUNKARAAT FI  
JAMAA-AATIL MUTAKASH-SHIFAAT**

conspicuously spurious and sometimes specious, but the hollowness is clearly discerned by those of intelligence.

One salient similarity between the Tabligh Jamaat Ulama and the modernists *zanadiqah* (heretics) is that both groups argue in favour of female expression, emergence and participation in public domain activities. Both groups accept the necessity of Hijaab. The only difference in the Hijaab concepts of the two groups is that while the Tabligh Jamaat believes in the incumbency of the *niquaab* (face veil), the modernists reject the *niquaab*, but do acknowledge the imperative need for the concealment of the entire body. Besides this solitary difference, there is not much practical difference in the two groups which believe in women's so-called 'emancipation' which is the Pathway for Jahannum. Any path which diverts from *Siraatul Mustaqeem*, is the Road to Jahannum. May Allah Ta'ala save us all from this calamity.

**MUJLISUL ULAMA OF SOUTH AFRICA  
15 Sha'baan 1436  
3 June 2015**

## ‘MASTOORAAT’ – A MISLEADING MISNOMER

The Tablighi Jamaat has dubbed its women’s wing of extroverts and self-expressionists, ‘*Mastooraat Jamaat*’. This term is palpably erroneous and misleading for a group which is not *mastoor*. *Mastoor* used for a female refers to a woman who is completely concealed and bashful. In Islamic terminology it refers to a woman who is concealed not only with an outer-cloak, but concealed within the precincts of her home where she is not visible to strangers.

Confirming this conception of the term is the Hadith: “*When a woman emerges (from her home), shaitaan raises his eyes with lust.*” He lies in ambush for her outside her home, and when she emerges, he is in constant pursuit of her, awaiting the opportune moment for spreading his web of fitnah regardless of her jilbaab/burqah. The entire body of a woman, front and back, revealed or concealed, is a tool and trap for shaitaan to spread his fitnah, hence Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) said: “*A woman comes forward in the form of shaitaan, and walks with her back (towards you) in the form of shaitaan.*” Whether man gazes at her, front or back, his lust is incited. It is precisely for this reason that Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) said: “*Women are habaa-ilush shaitaan (the traps of shaitaan).*”

On the occasion of his expulsion from Jannat, shaitaan had supplicated to Allah Ta’ala for tools with which he could ply his trade of deception, fitnah and fasaad on earth. One of his duas was for ‘traps’. Allah Ta’ala granting his supplication, said: “*Women are your traps.*” The trap is set by shaitaan and it begins to operate with the lustful gazes of males, and also of the women whose surreptitious glances from behind the veil while fooling the Tablighi men who have lured them out of the holy



**SABEELUL MUNKARAAT FI  
JAMAA-AATIL MUTAKASH-SHIFAAT**

home precincts, are not hidden from Allah Azza Wa Jal. Then the voice, the movements and the garments of the woman are all the paraphernalia of the shaitaani snare. In fact, close proximity with her is a calamity even if she is with her mahram. Remember that Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) has included in the trap the entire body of woman, front and back whether burqah-clad or unclad. Her strutting is in the form of shaitaan, whether she approaches you or moves away from you with her back towards you. Hence, Nabi-e-Kareem said: *“Allah curses the gazer and the one who is gazed at.”*, i.e. both the man and the woman who is the cause of the lustful gaze, and even if the gaze is at her garments. Furthermore, her gaze from behind the niqaab is not hidden from the Recording Malaaiakah.

The severity of falling into the satanic trap is adequately portrayed in the severe warning of the Hadith. Said Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam): *“Whoever looks at the beauty (mahaasin) of a strange (ghair mahram) woman, hot iron rods will be inserted into his eyes on the Day of Qiyaamah.”* Such are the perils which the Tablighi Jamaat invite with its women’s wing.

Once a woman emerges from her home, she is no longer *mastoor* (hidden from the gaze of all and sundry). Outside her home, she is *makshooof* (exposed). Regardless of the outer-cloak, she is *makshooof* outside her home. She is on public view for the fussaag, fujjaar and kuffaar, and in this immoral era she participates in mingling with fussaag, fujjaar and kuffaar males on her ‘tablighi’ stints and stunts outside her home and far from her home in a cauldron depicted as part of the Fire by Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) who said in this regard: *“Journey is a portion of the Fire.”* There is no true *satr* (concealment) for a woman outside her home, hence she will be a *makshooifah* (exposed entity) outside her home. She will be in gross violation of the command to make herself a genuine

*mastoorah* as mentioned in the Hadith: “*Woman is aurah (an object of total concealment).*”

It is quite lamentable that even Ulama, especially those connected with the Tableeghi Jamaat have failed to understand the Shar’i concept of Hijaab. To them, *the burqah/jilbaab* is the be all of Hijaab. As long as the woman is clad in a jilbaab, be it a haraam designer fake ‘jilbaab’, she is a ‘*mastoorah*’ whether she is mingling with males at the airport, train station, in taxis, on the streets, etc. To understand correctly the Shar’i concept of Hijaab, we advise the Ulama of the Tablighi Jamaat to refer to the Fuqaha.

## **THE FIRST AND HIGHEST STAGE OF WAAJIB HIJAAB**

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

*“And (O Women!) remain (glued) within your homes, and do not make an exhibition (of yourselves) like the displays of the former times of Jaahiliyyah.”*  
(*Ahzaab, Aayat 33*)

Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) said: “*Women have no share in emerging (from their homes) except in cases of need.*”

Stating the *tafseer* of this Aayat, Hadhrat Mufti Muhammad Shafi’ (rahmatullah alayh) says in *Ma-aariful Qur’aan*: “The primary objective by Allah Ta’ala for women is that they should not emerge outside their homes. *Hijaab bil buyout (Hijaab within the homes)* is the objective of the Shariah.....In the Aayat (above), *Qaraar (remaining resolutely) fil buyout* has been decreed Waajib for women. The effect of this command is that emergence for women from their homes is totally

forbidden and haraam.....However, where there is a need, emergence is not prohibited.”

There is no dispute regarding the permissibility of women emerging for their needs – needs which are valid in terms of the Shariah. But, mass women’s tabligh – organizational forms of self-imposed mass tablighi movement is not among the Shar’i needs countenancing female emergence. Thus, the emergence of women for participation in tabligh activity is in violation of the very first category of Hijaab commanded in the Qur’aanic Aayat and in several Ahaadith. It is therefore a misnomer and misleading to dub the emerging women’s groups *mastooraat jamaat*. They are in fact *Makshoofaat Jamaat*.

## **THE MUFTI SAHIB’S QUR’AANIC DALAA-IL**

### **The first daleel**

Arguing in support of *makshoofaat jamaat*, the Tablighi Mufti Sahib cites the following Qur’aanic aayat: “*The Believing men and the Believing women are friends to one another.*” (*At-Taubah, Aayat 71*) Explaining this aayat, he avers: “*In this gracious aayat Allah Ta’ala has mentioned both Mu’min men and women. Thereafter He (Allah Ta’ala) says: “They command virtue and prohibit vice.” From this it is known that Amr Bil Ma’roof Nahyi anil Munkar is the responsibility of also Mu’minaat..*”

Then the Mufti Sahib cites the following from *Tayseerul Kareem* of Shaikh Saadi:

“*i.e. Their males and their females are mutual friends to one another in love, friendship and in help.*”

Then he adds: “*Shaikh Abdul Azeez Bin Baaz says after narrating this aayat: ‘The law of Amr Bil Ma’roof Nahyi Anil Munkar is general, embracing both men and women.’*”

**SABEELUL MUNKARAAT FI  
JAMAA-AATIL MUTAKASH-SHIFAAT**

The Aayat mentions *Amr Bil Ma'roof Nahyi Anil Munkar*. There has never been a dispute regarding the incumbency of this obligation on females. The discussion is not related at all to this issue. The dispute concerns the Makshoofaat Tablighi Jamaat. If a woman is prevented from going to a brothel to propagate the Deen or a man is prevented from going there, it shall not be said that they are being prevented from Amr Bil Ma'roof. If a person prevents someone from reciting the Qur'aan Majeed in a toilet, it may not be stupidly said that he is forbidding Tilaawat. Similarly, when females are forbidden from participating in makshoofaat tabligh journeys, they are not being prevented from executing Amr Bil Ma'roof Nahyi Anil Munkar.

They are only told to fulfil the obligation correctly according to the Shariah, and not to act in conflict with Allah's Law. They are advised to practise this obligation at home to their husbands, children, relatives and friends whom they meet or who come to meet them. When women gather at their home to indulge in gheebat, the lady of the home should immediately fulfil her obligation by resorting to Nahyi Anil Munkar, and to prevent them from indulging in gheebat.

It is clear that the Mufti Sahib has restricted Amr Bil Ma'roof to the specific methodology of the Tabligh Jamaat. This attitude is *ghulu'* which permeates all strata of the Jamaat's membership. Furthermore, whilst the Mufti Sahib has quoted this Aayat in which two duties are imposed on the Ummah, namely, (1) Amr Bil Ma'roof, and (2) Nahyi Anil Munkar, the reality is that the second obligation does not form part of the Tabligh Jamaat's methodology, for its '*hikmat*' demands that the aspect of Nahy *Anil Munkar* be set aside. Nahyi Anil Munkar (prohibiting vice) has been practically abrogated by the Tabligh Jamaat. It is therefore improper for the Tablighi Mufti Sahib to quote in support the Aayat which commands both duties.

**SABEELUL MUNKARAAT FI  
JAMAA-AATIL MUTAKASH-SHIFAAT**

To extravasate permissibility for a mass women's movement in the name of tabligh from this Aayat is a gross misapplication of the mind. Firstly, the Aayat does not in any way whatsoever, permit female emergence, especially in droves in the public. Secondly, the Aayat of general import may not be presented to either curtail or abrogate the *Mansoos Hukm* of Prohibition of female emergence from their homes. Thirdly, in the *tafseer* of the Aayat mentioned by the Tablighi Mufti Sahib, there is absolutely no reference to *khurooj-e-nisaa'* (emergence of women) which is in fact forbidden by *Sareeh Nass* (Explicit Decree) of the Qur'aan and Ahaadith. Fourthly, women helping men, does not refer to outdoor tabligh activity executed en masse by women. The *tafseer* mentions mutual 'love' and 'friendship' between men and women. Obviously this does not mean illicit love and friendship. It refers to lawful love and affection between husband and wife, children and parents, brothers and sisters and the like.

We fail to understand how the Mufti Sahib has managed to extract from this Aayat permissibility for the Tabligh Jamaat's women's mass movement which is totally alien to Islam. Women are "*Aurah*". *Khurooj* negates her "*Aurah*". There is no support whatsoever in this Aayat for Makshoofaat Jamaat. The fundamental error of the votaries of makshoofaat jamaat is that they are ignoring the numerous *Nusoos* prohibiting female emergence and female participation in public activities, and mis-applying Aayaat of general import to curtail or abrogate the explicit rulings of the Shariah stemming from specific *Nusoos* which prohibit emergence of females for such activities which the Shariah has not imposed on them.

The best example is the prohibition of females attending the Musjid – a practice which was allowed during the time of Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam). Another example is prohibition of attending Walimahs which was allowed initially,

but now prohibited due to fitnah of the era. This prohibition is clearly stated by the Fuqaha.

Citing Bin Baaz as substantiation for makshoofaat jamaat is scraping the very bottom of the barrel of intellectual bankruptcy. Bin Baaz was a Salafi, anti-Hanafi, anti-Taqlaad, anti-Tablighi Jamaat. There is no affinity between Bin Baaz and even the male wing of the Tabligh Jamaat. It is indeed surprising that the Mufti Sahib sought to eke out support from a view expressed by Bin Baaz which has absolutely no relationship with the subject under discussion. Shaikh Bin Baaz referred to the general *tafseer* of the Aayat. He merely repeated what all the Mufasssireen stated, viz., Amr Bil Ma'roof Nahyi Anil Munkar applies to both males and females. This is indeed a 'daleel' more apodalic than all the other legless arguments presented in the abortive attempt to substantiate validity for makshoofaat jamaat.

### **The second daleel**

Expounding his second *daleel*, the Mufti Sahib avers:

*"While explaining the good qualities of women at another place (in the Qur'aan), Allah Ta'ala mentions the word 'Saa-ihaat' (Surah Tahreem, Aayat 5). Explaining its meaning, Allaamah Qurtubi (rahmatullah alayh) writes: 'Women who go in the obedience of Allah.'"*

The Mufti Sahib has quoted this meaning from Qurtubi. Then he (the honourable Mufti Sahib) proffering his personal opinion, states:

*"In other words, women who go on journeys in the obedience of Allah Ta'ala. Journeying for Tabligh is in fact a journey for Allah's obedience."*

In citing Qurtubi in this reckless manner, and in the presentation of his baseless personal comment, chicanery has

been committed. This charge shall now be elucidated with copious references from the Tafaaseer Kutub to dispel and nullify what the Mufti Sahib has quoted and opined. The abundance of references may be to the point of monotony. Nevertheless, there is a need to thoroughly debunk the gross and palpable error which has been made in this matter. Therefore, those who become bored with the monotony of repetition, may simply skip this section and proceed with the next discussion pertaining to the refutation of the Mufti Sahib's daleel No.3.

### **(1) Tafseer Qurtubi**

The Mufti Sahib has cited a snippet from page 127, Vol. 18 of *Al-Jaami' li Ahkaamil Qur'aan* of Imaam Qurtubi. The full *Tafseer* of the term, '*Saa-ih*' mentioned in Surah Tahreem, Aayat 5 is as follows:

*“Saa-ih: Fasting women – Ibn Abbaas (radhiyallahu anhu), Hasan and Ibn Jubair said so. Zaid Ibn Aslam, his son Abdur Rahmaan and Yamaan said: ‘Muhaajiraat’ (women who had made Hijrat with Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam). Zaid said: ‘There is no travelling in the Ummah of Muhammad (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) except Hijrat.’ Farraa’ and Qutabi said: ‘A fasting person is named saa-ih (plural saa-ihoon and saa-ih*aat*) because a traveller has no provisions. Verily, he eats from wherever he finds food.’*

*And it has been said: Women who go in the obedience of Allah Azza Wa Jal. The tafseer of it has passed in Surah Taubah.”*

The meaning of *Saa-ih*aat is not women who go en masse on tabligh journeys. The term simply means ‘fasting women’. Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) and the Sahaabah, all said that this word refers to ‘*Fasting Women*’, and this is the first and primary meaning which Qurtubi has mentioned.

However, the Mufti Sahib has intentionally ignored and bypassed the official *tafseer*, and latched on to a dubious meaning from an unknown exponent. A *Weak* view and a view of an unknown author is generally preceded by the term: '*Qeela (It has been said)*'.

This *Weak* '*Qeela*' view appears in the fourth line of the *Tafseer*, after Qurtubi had stated the official and authoritative meaning presented by Hadhrat Ibn Abbaas (radhiyallahu anhu) and other authorities. Furthermore, even the *Weak/Dubious* view has no relationship with emergence of women and mass women's tabligh in the public domain. It does not refer to women undertaking journeys. It only says that it means 'women who go in the obedience of Allah'. Women undertaking journeys for tabligh, especially en masse, was the furthest from the mind of even the unknown one who said: '*Women who go in the obedience of Allah.*' There never was in Islamic history the current spectacle of women going out in droves on journeys for tabligh, not even for Jihad. It was inconceivable for the Sahaabah and the Ummah to have even conceived of this confounded methodology of luring the women of the Ummah out of their homes to undertake journeys when the attitude and *amal* were the exact opposite to the extent of prohibiting even the initial permission of women attending even the Musjid which was not even a stone's throw away from numerous homes of the Sahaabah. Thus the term, '*zaahibaat*' (*women going*') stated by the unknown personality in the '*Qeela*' opinion, if stretched to its furthest conceivable limits as understood by the Sahaabah, would mean women who had to compulsorily undertake the *Hijrat* journey which was *Fardh* in the initial phase of Islam.

Now let us see Imaam Qurtubi's elaboration of this term in his *tafseer* of Surah Taubah. Explaining Aayat 112 of Surah



Taubah in which the masculine gender of *saa-ihaat*, namely *saa-ihoon* is mentioned, Qurtubi states:

*“As-Saa-ihoon, i.e. As-Saa-imoona (Fasting men) – narrated from Ibn Mas’ood, Ibn Abbaas (radhiyallahu anhumaa) and others. And, from this word is Allah’s statement: ‘Saa-ihaat’ in Surah Tahreem. Sufyaan Ibn Uyainah said: ‘Verily, the saa-im (fasting person) has been described as saa-ih (traveller) because he abstains from all pleasures of food, drink and sex.’*

*It has been narrated from Aishah (radhiyallahu anha) that she said: ‘The travelling of this Ummah is siyaam (fasting)’. Tabari has narrated its Chain. And Abu Hurairah (radhiyallahu anhu) has narrated this Marfoo-un from Nabi (sallallahu alayhi wasallam): ‘Verily, he (Nabi –sallallahu alayhi wasallam – said: ‘The journeying of my Ummah is Fasting.’ Az-Zujaaj said: ‘The Math-hab of Hasan (Basri) is that it means those who fast the Fardh (of Ramadhaan).’ It has also been said: ‘Those who are steadfast in fasting.’ (i.e. Observing even the Sunnat fasts).*

*Ata’ said: ‘The Saa-ihoon are the Mujaahidoon.’ Abu Umaamah narrated that a man sought permission from Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) to go on a journey. Then he said: ‘Verily, the journey of my Ummah is Jihad in the Path of Allah.’*

*It has been said that As-Saa-ihoon means Al-Muhaajiroon (those who went on the Hijrat journey).’*

While others have presented their personal opinions, the official *tafseer* of the term given by Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam), the Sahaabah and **all** the authorities of Islam, refers to *Saa-imoona and Saa-imaat (Fasting men and Fasting women)*, nothing else. The interpretation of Mujaahideen and Muhaajireen while correct, is not the official *tafseer* and meaning of the term appearing in the Qur’aan Majeed – the

term from which the attempt is made to extract capital and support for the Tabligh Jamaat's mass women's movement.

## **(2) Tafseer Ibn Katheer**

“Saa-ihaat, i.e. Saa-imaat (Fasting women). Abu Hurairah, Aishah, Ibn Abbaas, Ikrimah, Mujaahid, Saeed Bin Jubair, Ataa', Muhammad Bin Ka'b, Al-Qurzi, Abu Abdur Rahmaan As-Salmi, Abu Maalik, Ibraahim Nakha'i, Hasan (Basri), Qataadah, Dhuhhaak, Rabee' Bin Anas, As-Suddi and others besides them said so. A Marfoo' Hadith has already been mentioned in Surah Baraa-ah (in the tafseer of the word), 'As-Saa-ihoon'. The words of that Marfoo' Hadith are: “The journey of this Ummah is Siyaam (Fasting).”

“Zaid Bin Aslam and his son Abdur Rahmaan said that 'Saa-ihaat' means 'Muhaajiraat' (i.e. women who had made Hijrat).” (Then Ibn Kathir mentions): The first view (i.e. Saa-imaat –Fasting women) is the preferred view.”

The above is Ibn Katheer's *tafseer* of the word in Aayat 5 of Surah Tahreem. The following is his *tafseer* of the term in Aayat 112 of Surah Taubah:

“*As-Saa-ihoon*”: The Wives of Nabi (sallallahu alayhu wasallam) have been similarly described in Allah's statement (in Surah Tahreem), viz., '*Saa-ihaat*, i.e. *Saa-imaat* (*Fasting women*).

*As-Saa-ihoon*: *As-Saa-imoona* (*Fasting men*). So has it been narrated from Saeed Bin Jubair and Al-Aufi from Ibn Abbaas. Ali Bin Talha said, narrating from Ibn Abbaas: 'Whatever Allah mentions in the Qur'aan about *siyaahat* (*travelling*) refers to the *Saa-imoona* (*those who fast*).' And so said Dhuhhaak.

Ibn Jareer said: 'Ahmad Bin Ishaaq narrated to us –Abu Ahmad – Ibraaheem Bin Yazeed -- Waleed Bin Abdullah from Aishah (radhiyallahu anha) that she said: 'The journeying of this Ummah is Siyaam (Fasting).' And so said Mujaahid, Saeed Bin Jubair, Ataa', Abu Abdur Rahmaan As-Sulami, Dhuhhaak

Bin Muzaahim, Sufyaan Bin Uyainah and others besides them. Verily, the meaning of *Saa-ihoon* is *Saa-imoona* (those who fast).’

Hasan Basri said: ‘As-Saa-ihoon mean those who are fasting in Ramadhaan.’ Abu Amr Al-Abdi said: ‘As-Saa-ihoon are the Mu’mineen who are constant in fasting.’ So has it been narrated in a Marfoo’ Hadith.

*(A Marfoo’ Hadith is a narration which links up to Rasulullah – sallallahu alayhi wasallam).*

Ibn Jareer said: ‘Muhammad Bin Abdullah Bin Bazee narrated to me –Hakeem Bin Hizaam – Sulaimaan from Abi Saalih narrated from Abu Hurairah (radhiyallahu anhu) that Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) said: “As-Saa-ihoon: they are As-Saa-imoona (those who fast).” Commenting, Ibn Kathir says: “This Mauqoof Hadith is more authentic.”

‘Yoonus narrates from Ibn Wahab, from Umar Bin Haarith, from Amr Bin Dinaar, from Ubaid Bin Umair who said: ‘The Nabi (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) was asked about (the word) *Saa-ihoon*. Then he said: ‘They are the Saa-imoona (those who fast).’ Ibn Kathir comments: “This Mursal Hadith is *Jayyid* (Excellent), and this is the most authentic view and the most prominent.”

Continuing the *tafseer*, Ibn Katheer says: “A view is also narrated which indicates that *siyaahat* (journeying) is *Jihad*. And, that is the Hadith of Abu Umaamah (radhiyallahu anhu) narrated by Abu Dawood in his Sunan. He said that a man came to Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) and said: ‘O Rasulullah! Permit me to travel (i.e. go touring).’ Then Nabi (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) said: ‘The journeying of my Ummah is Jihad in the Path of Allah.’

‘Ibn Mubaarak narrates from Ibn Lahee’ah who said: ‘Umaarah Bin Ghaziah informed me that *siyaahat* (journeying) was mentioned to Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam). He then said: ‘Allah has substituted that with Jihad in the Path of

Allah and with Takbeer on every elevation.” (*End of Ibn Katheer’s tafseer*)

It should be noted that Rasulullah’s description of this Ummat’s travelling being Jihad is not the *tafseer* of the term *Saa-ihaat* mentioned in Surah Tahreem, or of the word *Saa-ihoon* in Surah Taubah. Regarding the meaning of these two words, there is consensus of the Authorities that it means only *Saa-imaat* and *Saa-imoon* (*Fasting women and Fasting men*). Travelling being Jihad was in answer to a person who had requested permission to go for a tour. Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam), himself, had clarified explicitly the meaning of *Saa-ihaat*. Its meaning in the context of the Aayat is only *Saa-imaat* (*Fasting women*).

### **(3) Tafseer Roohul Bayaan**

Explaining Aayat 5 of Surah Tahreem, *Roohul Bayaan* states: “*Saa-ihaat: Saa-imaat*. The *saa-im* (*fasting person*) is called *saa-ih* (*singular of saa-ihoon*) because he (the traveller) journeys without food during the day, and he continues to abstain (from food) until he finds something to eat. Thus, the *saa-im* has been compared with him since he abstains (from food, etc.) until the arrival of the time of Iftaar....or it (the term in the Aayat) means *Muhaajiraat* from Makkah to Madinah...” (*End of tafseer*)

Again, the actual *tafseer* is confirmed by *Roohul Bayaan* to be ‘*Saa-imaat*’. While *Muhaajiraat* is a valid meaning, it is not the *tafseer* given by Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam). It is merely an opinion to describe the women who had undertaken the compulsory *Hijrat* (*Migration*) from Makkah to Madinah in the initial stage of Islam. But it never means the mass exodus of women from their homes to undertake journeys for conducting tabligh to the world, which is not a duty imposed on them by the Shariah.

In the *tafseer* of this word appearing in Surah Taubah, the following appears in *Tafseer Roohul Bayaan*:

“*As-Saa-ihoon*: Ibn Abbaas (radhiyallahu anhuma) narrated: “Everything mentioned in the Qur’aan about *siyaahat* (journeying) is *siyaam* (fasting).’ It comes in the Hadith: ‘*The journeying of my Ummah is fasting.*’

Several personal opinions such as travelling in search of knowledge and Jihaad are also mentioned. Whilst this too is correct, it is not the official *tafseer* of the term which the Mufti Sahib has mutilated with his opinion. The mutilation is the effect of attempting to ignore the Shariah’s restrictions on female emergence, and to force legality for the mass women’s travelling movement which renders them *makshoofaat*. In the context of the other valid personal opinions, the reference is to only males, not females.

#### **(4) Tafseer Roohul Ma-aani**

Aayat 5, Surah Tahreem:

“*Saa-ihaat*, i.e. *Saa-imaat* (Fasting women) as is narrated by Ibn Abbaas, Abu Hurairah, Qataadah, Dhuhhaak, Hasan, Ibn Jubair, Zaid Bin Aslam and his son Abdur Rahmaan. And, it has been narrated from Nabi (sallallahu alayhi wasallam). The *saa-im* (fasting person) has been named *saa-ih* (a traveller) because he is without provision (along the journey), and he eats from wherever (and whenever) food is available.”

People in these times of opulence may wonder about a person travelling without provisions. Centuries ago, during the early stage of Islam, numerous people would journey on foot, and most on camels. They would travel in this manner from country to country taking many months to arrive at their destination. They don’t carry provisions for months on their backs and

mounts. They content themselves with food wherever and whenever available.

Continuing the *tafseer*, Allaamah Aalusi says in his *Roohul Ma-aani*: “Zaid Bin Aslam and Yamaan said that it refers to *Muhaajiraat*. Ibn Zaid said: ‘In Islam there is no journey except *Hijrat*.’”

Zaid Bin Aslam clarifies here that the *Muhaajiraat* refer to the women who had undertaken the Migration which was compulsory in the beginning of Islam. They migrated from Makkah to Madinah on the orders of Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam). Again, the *Muhaajiraat* meaning does not and cannot override the *tafseer* of *Saa-imaat* given by Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam). Nevertheless, it is a correct opinion which has absolutely no relationship with the mass emergence of women to undertake journeys for tabligh – journeys which the Shariah does not impose on them. Rather, on the contrary prohibits them from emerging from their homes. The *Hijrat* referred to was extremely restricted and a temporary development.

Presenting the *tafseer* of this word mentioned in Aayat 112 of Surah Taubah, Allaamah Aalusi says:

“*As-Saa-ihoon*, i.e. *As-Saa-imoona* (*Fasting men*). Ibn Mardawaih narrated from Ibn Mas’ood and Abu Hurairah (radhiyallahu anhum) that Nabi (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) was asked about this word. Then he replied as mentioned (i.e. *Saa-imoona*). This is the view of the illustrious Sahaabah and Taabi-een. And it has been narrated by Aishah (radhiyallahu anha): “The journeying of this Ummah is fasting.”

**(5) Tafseer Abi Sa-ood**

In the *tafseer* of Aayat 5 of Surah Tahreem, Qadhil Qudhaat Imaam Abu Sa-ood Al-Imaadi, says:

*“Saa-ihaat: i.e. Saa-imaat (Fasting women).”*

In the *tafseer* of Aayat 112 of Surah Taubah, he says:

*“As-Saa-ihoon, i.e. As-Saa-imoona because Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) said: ‘The journey of my Ummah is fasting.’ .....It has been said that they are those who journey in Jihad and in the quest of knowledge.”*

**(6) Tafseer Tabari**

“Allah’s statement, *Saa-ihaat*, i.e. He says: ‘*Saa-imaat (Fasting women)*’. The people of Ta’weel (Interpretation) differed regarding the meaning of *Saa-ihaat*. Some said its meaning is *Saa-imaat*. They are:

\* Muhammad Bin Sa’d said: ‘My father narrated to me from his uncle from his father, and he from his father narrating from Ibn Abbaas, Allah’s statement, ‘*Saa-ihaat*’, i.e. *Saa-imaat*.

\* Bishr from Yazeed from Sa-eed from Qataadah who said that Allah’s statement, *Saa-ihaat* means *Saa-imaat*.

\* Ibn Abdul A’la from Ibn Thaur from Ma’mar from Qataadah that he said: ‘*Saa-ihaat means Saa-imaat*.

\* Husain from Abu Muaaz from Ubaid from Dhuhhaak who said that Allah’s statement, *Saa-ihaat means Saa-imaat*. ”

Others say that *As-Saa-ihaat means Al-Muhaajiraat*. They are:

**SABEELUL MUNKARAAT FI  
JAMAA-AATIL MUTAKASH-SHIFAAT**

\* Ishaq Bin Abi Israaeel from Abdul Azeez Bin Muhammad Ad-Daarwadi from Zaid Bin Aslam who said '*As-Saa-ihaaat means Al-Muhaajiraat.*

\* Yoonus from Ibn Wahab from Zaid said about Allah's statement, *Saa-ihaaat*, that it is *Muhaajiraat*. *Neither in the Qur'aan nor in the Ummah of Muhammad (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) is there any journey except (the journey of) Hijrat, and this is what Allah Ta'ala means (with the statement) 'As-Saa-ihoon'.*

In the *tafseer* of Aayat 112 of Surah Taubah, Tabari states:

*'As-Saai-hoon:* They are *As-Saa-imoona* as it has been narrated by Muhammad Bin Isaa Damighaani and Ibn Wakee'. They both said: 'Sufyaan narrated from Amr from Ubaid Bin Umair from Yoonus who narrated from Ibn Wahab from Amr Bin Harth from Amr from Ubaid Bin Umair. He said: 'Nabi (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) was asked about *As-Saa-iheen*. *He said: 'They are the As-Saa-imoona (those who fast).*'

'Muhammad Bin Abdullah Bin Bazee' said: Hakeem Bin Hizaam narrated from Sulaimaan from Abu Saalih from Abu Hurairah who said: 'Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) said to me that *As-Saai-hoon, they are As-Saa-imoona (those who fast).*'

'Ibn Bashaar narrated from Abdur Rahmaan from Sufyaan from Aasim from Zarr from Abdullah who said: '*As-Saa-ihoon are As-Saa-imoona.*'

'Yahya narrated from Sufyaan from Aasim from Zarr from Abdullah similarly.'



**SABEELUL MUNKARAAT FI  
JAMAA-AATIL MUTAKASH-SHIFAAT**

‘Muhammad Bin Umaarah Al-Asadi from Ubaidullah from Shaibaan from Abu Ishaq from Abu Abdur Rahmaan who said: ‘Journey means Fasting.’

‘Abu Kuraib narrated from Ibn Atiyyah from Israaeel from Ash-ath from Saeed Bin Jubair from Ibn Abbaas who said: ‘As-Saa-ihoon are As-Saa-imoona.’

‘Ibn Wakee’ narrated from his father, and he from his father from Israaeel Bin Ash-ath from Saeed Bin Jubair from Ibn Abbaas who said: ‘*As-Saa-ihoon are As-Saa-imoona.*’

‘Al-Himaani narrates from Israaeel from Ash-ath from Saeed Bin Jubair who said: ‘As-Saa-ihoon are As-Saa-imoona.’

‘Ahmad Bin Ishaq from Abu Ahmad from Israaeel from Ash-ath Bin Abi Sha’thaa from Saeed Bin Jubair from Ibn Abbaas similarly.’

‘Ibn Wakee’ from his father from Sufyaan from Aasim from Zarr from Abdullah similarly.’

‘Abu Ishaq narrated from Abdur Rahmaan: ‘As-Saa-ihoon, they are As-Saa-imoona.’

‘Muhammad Ibn Sa’d from his father from his uncle from Ibn Abbaas: ‘*As-Saa-ihoon – The meaning of it is As-saa-imoona.*’

‘Ibn Wakee’ from Ubaidullah from Israaeel from Ibn Abi Najeel from Mujaahid who said: ‘*As-Saa-ihoon – they are As-Saa-imoona.*’

‘Abu Huzaifah from Shibli from Ibn Abi Najeel from Mujaahid who said: ‘*As-Saa-ihoon are As-Saa-imoona*’

**SABEELUL MUNKARAAT FI  
JAMAA-AATIL MUTAKASH-SHIFAAT**

‘Abdullah from Muaawiyah from Ali from Ibn Abbaas who said: *‘Whatever Allah has mentioned in the Qur’aan of siyaahat refers to Fasting.’*

‘Al-Mas’oodi from Abu Sinaan from Ibn Abi Huzail from Abu Amr Al-Abdi who said: *‘As-Saa-ihoon are those of the Mu’mineen who are constant in fasting.’*

‘Ibn Humaid from Hakkaam from Tha’lab Bin Suhail from Hasan who said: *‘As-Saa-ihoon are As-Saa-imoona.’*

‘Qaasim narrated from Husain from Mansoor Bin Haaroona from Abu Ishaq Al-Fazaari from Abu Raja’ from Hasan who said: *‘As-Saa-ihoon are As-Saa-imoona.’*

‘Ibn Wakee’ narrated from Abu Khaalid from Juwaibir from Dhuhhaak: *‘As-Saa-ihoon are As-Saa-imoona.’*

‘Abu Usaamah narrated from Juwaibir from Dhuhhaak who said: *“Everything in the Qur’aan concerning As-Saa-ihoon refers to As-Saa-imoona.”*

‘Al-Muthni narrated from Amr Bin Aun from Hushaim from Juwaibir from Dhuhhaak that *As-Saa-ihoon are As-Saa-imoona.*”

‘Husain Bin Faraj narrated from Muaaz from Ubaid from Dhuhhaak who said about Allah’s statement, *‘As-Saa-ihoon’,* that they are *As-Saa-imeen.*” (those who fast).

‘Ibn Wakee’ narrated from Ibn Numair and Ya’la and Abu Usaamah from Abdul Malik from Ata’ who said: *“As-Saa-ihoon are As-Saa-imoona.”*

‘Ibn Uyainah said: “*When a person abstains from food, drink and sex, then he is ‘As-Saaiah (a traveller).*”

‘Bishr narrated from Yazeed from Saeed from Qataadah that *As-Saa-ihoon are people who fast for Allah.*”

‘Ahmad Bin Ishaaq narrated from Abu Ahmad from Ibraaheem Bin Yazeed from Waleed Bin Abdullah that Aishah (radhiyallahu anha) said: “*The journey of this Ummah is fasting.*”  
(*End of Tabari’s tafseer*)

Noteworthy is the emphasis which Tabari places on this issue to substantiate the meaning of *Saa-imaat (Fasting women)* for the term *Saa-ihaat*, the word whose meaning the Mufti Sahib has aborted by concealing the *tafseer* given by Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam), the Sahaabah, and the Taabi-een. Tabari has recorded a numerous variety of Chains of Narration for confirming the authenticity of the reported *tafseer*. The word simply does not refer to women who emerge from their homes in droves for tabligh.

#### **(7) Tafseer Bahrul Uloom (Samarqandi)**

“*Saa-ihaat means Saa-imaat (Fasting women).*”

#### **(8) Tafseer Mazhari**

“*Saa-ihaat are Saa-imaat (Fasting women).*”

#### **(9) Tafseer Ma-aariful Qur’aan**

In his *tafseer* of the term ‘*As-Saa-ihoon*’, Mufti Muhammad Shafi’ states:

“According to the Jamhoor Mufasssireen, the meaning of *As-Saa-ihoon* is *Saa-imoona (those who fast)*. This word is derived from the term *siyaahat*. Before Islam, in the Deen of the

Nasaara, *siyaahat* (to undertake journeys for dissociation from the world) was regarded as an *ibaadat*. Man would renounce his home and hearth and devote himself to *ibaadat* (in the wilderness and caves). This is called *Rahbaaniyat* (monasticism) which Islam has prohibited. Then (Islam) substituted Fasting for it. The objective of *siyaahat* is renunciation of the world. Fasting is such an act which entails renunciation of worldly pleasures for a specific time even whilst living in one's home."

### **(10) Tafseer Baidhaawi**

"*Saa-ihaat*: i.e. *Saa-imaat* (Fasting Women). The *Saa-im* (Fasting person) has been called *Saa-ih* (singular) because he commences the day without food.....

"*As-Saa-imoona*: i.e. *As-Saa-imoona* because Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) said: "*The siyaahah (journey) of my Ummah is Saum (to fast)...*"

On this basis in some narrations Jihaad has also been described as *siyaahat*. In a Saheeh narration recorded by Ibn Maajah, Haakim and Baihaqi, Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) said: "*The siyaahat (journeying) of my Ummah is Jihad in the Path of Allah.*"

Hadhrat Abdullah Ibn Abbaas (radhiyallahu anhu) said that wherever the word *saa-ihleen* is mentioned in the Qur'aan its meaning is *saa-imeen* (those who fast). Hadhrat Ikrimah said that it refers to the one journeying in the quest of Ilm (Knowledge of the Deen)." (End of Tafseer Ma-aariful Qur'aan)

All the Tafaaseer Kutub categorically state the same meaning for the term '*Saa-ihaat*'. It means only '*Saa-imaat*' (Fasting women), and nothing else. It is a monstrous error to ignore the *Tafseer* presented by Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam), the Sahaabah and the illustrious Taabi-een Mufasssireen. The Mufti Sahib has committed abortion with this word by:

(a) Ignoring the official *tafseer*.

- (b) Creating confusion by a false attribution to Imaam Qurtubi. Imaam Qurtubi's view is exactly the view of the Jamhoor. Despite Imaam Qurtubi having explicitly stated that the term means '*Fasting women*', the Mufti Sahib bypassed it and abortively extracted an unknown person's opinion which Imaam Qurtubi had mentioned halfway in his *tafseer* of the word.

Another fact of importance is that the meaning of *muhaajiraat* (*migrating women*) is an opinion which does not clash with nor negates the *tafseer* given by Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam). It is a minority opinion which does not condone the Tabligh Jamaat's mass makshoofaat movement. There is no relationship with Hijrat which is forced on women by circumstances and the voluntary violation of the prohibition to emerge and of the rules of Hijaab by women who resort to globe-trotting in the style of men. Hijrat is a calamity which forces people to migrate. People fleeing from war torn regions, and from lands of persecution where the honour of women is plundered, have no option other than to migrate. Thus, tableegh is not like *Hijrat*.

In the fourteen century history of Islam, never were women ushered out of their homes to undertake journeys for the sake of tableegh. It is simply unnatural for women to conduct themselves like males. It is in total negation of the ethos and teachings of the Shariah.

In the Hadith the mention of *siyaahat* being Jihad in the Path of Allah, does not relate at all to the *tafseer* of the word *Saa-ihaat* in Aayat 5 of Surah Tahreem, nor is it the *tafseer* of *Saa-ihoon* mentioned in Aayat 112 of Surah Taubah. Hadhrat Ibn Abbaas (radhiyallahu anhu) clarified that in the Qur'aan the term is used only for *Saa-imoon* (*those who fast*). The very tiny minority view of *siyaahat* referring to Jihad in the Path of

Allah was said by Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) in response to a man who wanted to go touring. Thus, Nabi-e-Kareem (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) said that the *siyaahat* of his Ummah is Jihaad fi Sabeelillaah. It was not stated as the *tafseer* of the word, *Saa-ihoon*, mentioned in the Qur'aan in Aayat 112 of Surah Taubah.

It should now be abundantly clear that there is Consensus (Ijma') on the fact that *Saa-ihaat* – the word in Aayat 5 of Surah Tahreem, which the Tablighi Mufti Sahib had aborted – has only one meaning, viz. *Saa-imaat* (*Fasting women*). The *tafseer* proffered by Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) clinches the argument and seals the *Ijma'*. The minority who said: *Muhaajiraat*, simply added a dimension to the actual meaning of the word. They did not present their opinion in negation of the *tafseer* of Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam). It is inconceivable that any authority of the Shariah would dare to negate Rasulullah's *tafseer* with his personal opinion unsubstantiated by *Nass-e-Qat'i*. The meaning of '*Fasting women*' has attained *Tawaatur* status.

### **The third daleel**

The third argument of the Mufti Sahib is another apodal which comports with the Mufti Sahib's methodology of argumentation which consists of the presentation of Aayaat and Ahaadith of general import, unrelated to the subject of dispute. This eristic method is unbefitting those in the quest of Truth. The attempt to extravasate substantiation from unrelated Qur'aanic Aayaat and Ahaadith to bolster one's view is a baseless hermeneutical exercise. In simple terms it is *ta'weel baatil*.

Presenting his third daleel, the Mufti Sahib cites the Qur'aanic aayat:

**SABEELUL MUNKARAAT FI  
JAMAA-AATIL MUTAKASH-SHIFAAT**

*“Say, this is my path. I call towards Allah with baseerat – I and those who follow me. Glory unto Allah! I am not from the mushrikeen.”*

In the Name of Allah Ta’ala we ask: ‘What relationship is there between this Aayat and the mass women’s tablighi movement which requires gross violation of Allah’s laws of Hijaab? There is not the remotest support for the makshoofaat jamaat in this Aayat.

The Mufti sahib avers: “In the tafseer of this Aayat, the Mufasssireen say that it includes every person who has Imaan on Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam). That is: Whoever has Imaan on me and acknowledges whatever I have brought also calls towards Allah Ta’ala.” (Tafseerul Khaazin and similarly in Jalaalain and Tafseer Mazhari)

“From the facts derived from this aayat, one is that it is the responsibility of every person who believes in Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) to call towards Allah.” (Aisarut Tafaaseer of Al-Jazaairi). Qaadhi Thanauallah Panipati says in Tafseer Mazhari that Kalbi and Ibn Zaid said that it is incumbent on those who follow Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) to call people (give da’wat) of the way that Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) had given da’wat.

Hadhrat Mufti Muhammad Shafi’ said that *“Whoever follows me”* is general and includes every person who is engaged in delivering to people the da’wat of the Rasool (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) until the Day of Qiyaamah.” (End of the Mufti’s dissertation.)

The hollowness of this argument should not be hidden to men of intelligence. Women calling to Allah Ta’ala is not in dispute. The specific methodology of the Tablighi Jamaat pertaining to

makshoofaat jamaat is the disputed issue. The Mufti Sahib, like all Tablighi Ulama, has assumed that *da'wat ilallaah* is confined to the specific methodology of the Tabligh Jamaat. This idea is *ghulu'* – haraam extremism – bigotry. If a woman engages in *da'wat* in some other form without emerging from her home, and without going on hikes, it may not be inferred that she is not executing the decree of *da'wat ilallaah* which is incumbent on her. The contention that it is incumbent on women to emerge in droves from their homes to execute the duty of *da'wat* is a despicable canard.

It is not permissible for women to engage in *da'wat ilallaah* in ways which are proscribed by the Shariah. The very first Shar'i proscription applicable to makshoofaat jamaat is the emergence of women from their homes. Insha-Allah, the list of their violations shall be presented further on in this discussion.

A woman who teaches her children at home; who gives naseehat to her husband, relatives, friends who visit her, and a woman who teaches children of the neighbourhood the elementary syllabus of the Deen, are engaging in *da'wat ilallaah* – the *da'wat* stated in the Aayat cited by the Mufti Sahib. However, he has not correctly applied his mind in his abortive attempt to extravasate some straws to clutch on to support makshoofaat jamaat.

The Holy Wives of Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) had fulfilled the requisite of this Aayat par excellence whilst remaining glued to their homes. They did not venture out of their homes in droves in makshoofaat jamaat fashion of the Tablighi Jamaat. Can the Mufti Sahib claim that the Sahaabiyaat had failed in their obligation of *da'wat ilallaah* because they had remained within their homes, and had not ventured out for tabligh? There is not a single incident of a Sahaabiyah (female) having left the home to engage in tabligh,



**SABEELUL MUNKARAAT FI  
JAMAA-AATIL MUTAKASH-SHIFAAT**

makshoofaat jamaat style. Did all of them fail in their obligation? The Mufti Sahib has in fact failed to understand what exactly is the obligation which the Shariah imposes on females in the sphere of da'wat. The consequence of the mind fitted in the straitjacket of Tablighi Jamaat mentality is bigotry –*ghulu'*. And *ghulu'* is to exceed the bounds of Allah Ta'ala. The Qur'aan states:

*“These are the limits of Allah. Whoever transgresses the limits of Allah, verily he has oppressed his soul.”*

The mentality portrayed by the Tabligh Jamaat is that any one outside the Jamaat's methodology is doomed, and that he/she fails in the obligation of Da'wat and Amr Bil Ma'roof Nahy Anil Munkar whereas the very first ones to fail are the Tablighi members who, not only have practically abnegated *Nahyi Anil Munkar*, but compromise with baatil in the attempt to swell their numbers. While the Mufti Sahib generalizes and mutilates Qur'aanic Aayaat and Ahaadith for support although these *Nusoos* have no relationship with the makshoofaat jamaat, there are Aayaat and Ahaadith which explicitly condemn and make haraam compromise with baatil. A prime example of such haraam compromise is the Tablighi Molvi Tariq Jameel.

The concept of Tabligh propounded by the Ulama of the Tabligh Jamaat is their specific methodology of *Da'wat*. Neither are they aware of any other method nor do they accept any other method of Tabligh to be valid. On the contrary, wherever *Da'wat and Tabligh* are mentioned in the Qur'aan, Hadith and the Kutub of Islam, the reference is to Calling to Allah Ta'ala in general. The Tabligh espoused by Islam embraces all lawful methods of propagating the Deen. In fact, for almost thirteen and a half centuries, the specific method of the Tabligh Jamaat was unknown. It is an entirely new system which is permissible for males on condition that *ghulu'* is not

perpetrated. But for women, it is never permissible, that is, the *siyaahat (journeying) amal*.

So, the Qur'aanic Aayaat quoted by the Tablighi Mufti Sahib embrace in the first instance, the Tabligh methods of the Sahaabah and the Sahaabiyaat. All subsequent methods initiated are secondary and are the effects of circumstances. Provided that the new method does not clash with the Shariah, it will be valid. If the new method is bolstered with *ta'weel baatil*, the method will likewise be baatil and haraam. Examples of haraam methods are propagating the Deen by television, photography, video, in mixed gatherings of males and females, interfaith satanism, compromise with baatil (Tariq Jameel methodology condoned by the Tabligh Jamaat), the *Ghulu'* method of the Tabligh Jamaat, and the Makshoofaat Jamaat. All such methods are the effects of *Baatil Ta'weel*. They are *Baatil* because their respective propounders are extremely short-sighted, and most of them are followers of vain desire (*ahwaa*). They abrogate Shar'i prohibitions on the basis of hallucinated benefits to commit a host of violations of the Shariah in the process of instituting their pet methodology.

The *Da'wat* in the Qur'aanic Aayaat cited by the Tablighi Mufti Sahib is *aam (general)*. It has no relationship with the specific new methodology of the Tablighi Jamaat, which was introduced only in this belated century in close proximity to Qiyaamah. We reiterate that no one prohibits women from *Da'wat*. It was never contended that women are excluded from the *aam* predication of the relevant Aayaat commanding *Da'wat*. The dispute pertains to the specific makshufaat methodology introduced by the Tabligh Jamaat.

In his third 'daleel' the Mufti Sahib quoted from Mufti Muhammad Shafi's *Ma-aariful Qur'aan*, very selectively. However, even the selectively cited statements do not provide

any support for makshoofaat jamaat. Mufti Shafi like all the other Ulama of all times merely said that *Da'wat* and *Amr Bil Ma'roof Nahyi Anil Munkar* apply to both men and women. The issue of makshoofaat jamaat is furthest from their minds. Whilst the Tablighi Mufti Sahib cites selectively statements which have no relationship with makshoofaat jamaat, he very conveniently ignores the following statements of Mufti Shafi' which appear in the very same discussion from which he quotes selectively.

In *Ma-ariful Qur'aan*, in the *tafseer* of the Aayaat pertaining to Hijaab, Mufti Shafi' states:

\* “ In Jaami Tirmizi is the Hadith of Hadhrat Abdullah Ibn Mas'ood (radhiyallahu anhu) in which he says that Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) said: “*When a woman emerges (from her house), shaitaan glances surreptitiously at her..*” That is, he makes her a cause for spreading immorality among Muslims”

\* “ Ibn Jareer and Ibn Hibbaan have also narrated in this Hadith the words: ‘*A woman is the closest to Allah when she is concealed within the innermost recess of her home.*’ In this Hadith too is the *shahaadat* (testimony) that the actual (rule) for women is to remain within their homes, and not to emerge outside. (Occasions of necessity are excluded).

\* “In a Hadith Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) said: ‘*Women have no share in emerging (from their homes) except when (circumstances) force (them).*’

\* “Hadhrat Ali (Karramallahu Wajhah) narrated that once when I was in Rasulullah's presence, he asked his Sahaabah: ‘*What is best for a woman?*’ The Sahaabah were silent. I went home, I posed this same question to Faatimah (radhiyallahu

anha). She responded: *'Neither should they look at men nor should men look at them.'* I narrated this response to Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam). He commented: *'She spoke the truth. Verily, she is part of me.'*"

\* "During the episode of *Ifq*, Hadhrat Aishah (radhiyallahu anha) was left behind in the wilderness. This was because the purdah of the Holy Wives of Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) was not confined to burqah and chaadar (jilbaab). Even on the journey they would remain inside their *houdaj* (a small cabin). The cabin with the woman would be loaded on to the camel. During this episode the servants were under the impression that Hadhrat Aishah (radhiyallahu anha) was inside the cabin, hence they lifted it on top of the camel. But in reality she had gone to answer the call of nature. Thus the caravan departed under the impression that she was inside her *houdaj*. This episode also strongly testifies that according to Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) and the Holy Wives the concept of Shar'i Hijab requires women to remain within their houses even on the journey. They should not appear in front of men. Now when there is such emphasis on Hijaab even during a journey, then the emphasis on it will be much more when they are at home."

*(End of Mufti Shafi's dissertation)*

The Mufti Sahib ignores all of this explanation cited by Mufti Muhammad Shafi' – Ahaadith which explicitly prohibit women from emerging from their homes without valid Shar'i justification. Women's mass tabligh by way of undertaking journeys is never among the necessities condoned by the Shariah for permitting women to leave their homes. The Mufti Sahib conveniently turns a blind eye to Mufti Shafi's explicit statement that *"Actual and true Hijaab is Hijaab fil Buyoot, i.e. to remain within the homes. The makshoofaat jamaat is in violent conflict with all the Qur'aanic and Hadith Nusoos*

prohibiting them from emerging from their homes. The emergence is aggravated by the new, lewd form it has assumed under the auspices of the Tabligh Jamaat, and that is mass and organized exodus - women deserting their husbands and families in droves, going for hikes, tours and drives while labouring under the convoluted idea of them serving the Deen.

This third ‘daleel’ of the honourable Mufti Sahib is likewise corrupt, baseless and does not even have a specious veneer to succeed in deception. The Aayat simply does not have the remotest relationship with the unlawful makshoofaat jamaat.

### **The fourth daleel**

In another ludicrous attempt clutching at straws, the Mufti Sahib says: “Similarly, Amr Bil Ma’roof Nahyi Anil Munkar and Da’wat ilallaah which are in the Nusoos are *aam* (general), including both men and women.” Then he quotes the Qur’aanic Aayat: “*And, whose statement is better than the one who calls to Allah and practises righteousness, and who says: ‘Verily, I am of the Muslimeen.’*”

Astoundingly, the Mufti Sahib does not know what he is saying here. There is not even a vestige of relationship between this Aayat and makshoofaat jamaat. No one has disputed the goodness and virtue of calling to the Path of Allah Ta’ala. No one excluded females from such Calling. But *Da’wat ilallaah* for women is not outside their homes. Their *Da’wat* precludes journeys. This Aayat does not provide any support whatsoever for the emergence of women in droves from their homes for undertaking journeys for propagating the Deen. There is not a single precedent in Islamic history for this lamentable methodology of the Tabligh Jamaat relative to its women’s wing.

The Aayat only informs us of the significance of Da'wat. While it applies to both men and women, the Da'wat has to be incumbently executed within the *hudood (confines)* of the Shariah. If the limits are transgressed, then such 'da'wat' and 'tabligh' are confounded.

No one has ever denied that Amr Bil Ma'roof Nahyi Anil Munkar is applicable to women as well. Salaat is Fardh for both men and women. However, they have their own ways of performing Salaat. Similar is it with Tabligh and Da'wat.

While the Tabligh Jamaat abstains from Nahyi Anil Munkar subject to its 'hikmat' policy which condones compromise with baatil, others outside the Tabligh Jamaat practise both dimensions, i.e. Amr Bil Ma'roof and Nahyi Anil Munkar.

Women have to fulfil this obligation within the confines of their homes, or in their neighbourhood in unostentatious ways, without attracting any outside attention. This argument of the Mufti Sahib is not a daleel. It is plain drivel devoid of any support whatsoever for makshoofaat jamaat.

### **The fifth daleel**

Once again presenting a ridiculously spurious argument, the Mufti Sahib cites the Qur'aanic Aayat: - 34 of Surah Ahzaab:

*“And remember the Aayaat of Allah and the talks of wisdom which are being recited to you in your homes.”* In the tafseer of this gracious Aayat, the Qaadhi of Baghdad, Allaamah Aalusi (rahmatullah alayh) says that in this Aayat the Holy Wives have been commanded to deliver the laws of Allah to people., and that they should lecture to people by way of wa'z and naseehat.”

This is utterly baseless. The term *wa'z* in the Urdu language refers to a public lecture. The speaker addresses a public crowd.

**SABEELUL MUNKARAAT FI  
JAMAA-AATIL MUTAKASH-SHIFAAT**

The Aayat gives no such command to the Holy Wives of Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam). If public lecturing and globe-trotting were commanded by this Aayat, the Azwaaj-e-Mutaharaat would have been the first to have complied. But they remained glued within their home. The command is simply for them to remember Allah's favour on them. And this Favour refers to Wahi having been revealed in the home of Hadhrat Aishah (radhiyallahu anha). This remembrance according to the opinion of the Ulama – there is not a single Hadith to corroborate the opinion of the Mufti Sahib – is for them to practise the teachings of the Qur'aan and Sunnah, and to teach it to others as well.

Whilst this opinion is valid, the Mufti's interpolation of the Urdu term, *wa'z*, with its meaning is baseless, and is not mentioned in the Aayat nor in the opinions proffered by the early Ulama. The Arabic term means plain naseehat, and in relation to the Pious Wives of Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) it means teaching from their homes those who come to them for naseehat. Whilst this was the methodology of the Holy Wives, the method of the makshuftaat jamaat is the exact opposite. The Holy Wives remained at home while people came to them for naseehat which they would impart from behind a screen within their homes. On the other hand, the women of the makshuftaat jamaat, leave their homes, undertake journeys in immoral conditions, and go to people. Yet, the Mufti Sahib has the temerity to cite this Aayat in support of the makshuftaat jamaat.

Never did the Holy Wives leave their homes for purposes of *wa'z* and naseehat to others. It is a vile deception to create this fallacious impression.

The sum total of the Mufti's Qur'aanic 'dalaa-il' consists of the aforementioned five Aayaat of the Qur'aan Majeed. Not a

single one of these Verses has the remotest connection with makshoofaat jamaat. These Aayaat mention *Amr Bil Ma'roof and Nahyi Anil Munkar* without specifying any method of propagation. Methodology is an evolutionary process. With changing circumstances, methods can and do change. However, every method has to be examined on the Standard of the Shariah. If a method is in violation of any teaching, precept or principle of the Shariah, it will be haraam to adopt it.

It is indeed weird for a Mufti to cite Qur'aanic Verses and Ahaadith of a general import to justify or support a specific methodology which did not exist in the Ummah for thirteen centuries right from the inception of Islam. The new method has to be incumbently evaluated in the light of the Shariah. Relevant to makshoofaat jamaat, a host of Shar'i violations are committed. This women's mass movement and travelling around the world are in flagrant violation of the Qur'aanic command for them to remain within the holy and safe precincts of their homes. This prohibition has greater force during the present times of fitnah and fasaad. Added to this is the abject weakness and deficiency of Imaan. Aggravating the scenario further, is the desensitization of the hearts relative to lewdness, immorality and immodesty of this era.

No longer are Muslims appalled when they observe female immodesty and female nudity. In fact, it has become a norm for Muslim women clad in stylish, fake and deceptive 'burqah' with pieces of rags on their faces exposing their eyes to simply slip out of the house, jump behind the wheel of a car and speed off to engage in some tabligh programme or attend a bayaan or thikr programme of a miscreant 'shaikh' who himself dwells in deception, lacking in the understanding of Tasawwuf.

The fact is that the Qur'aanic Aayaat only command *Amr Bil Ma'roof, Nahyi Anil Munkar and Da'wat*. The methodology for



the execution of these obligations is not specified. Any method in conflict with the Shariah has to be discarded regardless of the real or hallucinated benefits. Furthermore, as far as the Tabligh Jamaat is concerned, they have abandoned/abrogated *Nahyi Anil Munkar*. All the Qur'aanic arguments of the Mufti Sahib are extraordinarily spurious and utterly baseless, lacking entirely in academic worth.

## **THE MUFTI SAHIB'S HADITH DALAA-IL**

The Mufti Sahib of the Tabligh Jamaat has presented a package of 12 Ahaadith as his 'dalaa-il' in substantiation of makshoofaat jamaat. All of his arguments on the basis of the Ahaadith are just as legless and baseless as the arguments he had raised on the basis of the Qur'aanic Aayaat. Let us now examine each one of the 12 Ahaadith.

### **Hadith No.1**

The Mufti Sahib says:

“Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) said: *“Whoever among you sees evil, he should change it with his hand. If he is unable, then with his tongue, and if he is unable (with even his tongue), then with his heart. And, that (with the heart) is the weakest of Imaan.”*

The Mufti Sahib has presented this Hadith without comment. He contented himself with only the translation. This Hadith deals with only *munkar* (evil/vice/sin/transgression). The first and highest stage of the command is the utilization of force to eliminate the vice. The second stage is naseehat, and the third (the weakest) stage is to detest the evil in the heart.

**SABEELUL MUNKARAAT FI  
JAMAA-AATIL MUTAKASH-SHIFAAT**

This Hadith has no affinity with the Tabligh Jamaat. We fail to understand why the Mufti Sahib has even bothered to cite this Hadith when the Tabligh Jamaat does not engage in the prevention of *munkar*, neither with the hand nor with the tongue. As for the heart, we shall adopt silence. Only Allah Ta'ala is aware of what lurks within the innermost recesses of the hearts.

There is not a ghost of support for makshoofaat jamaat in this Hadith nor for even the men's wing of the Tabligh Jamaat. Their speciality is limited *Amr Bil Ma'roof* which is also good and rewardable provided the limits of Allah are not breached.

Furthermore, no one prevents women from engaging in changing *munkar*. In fact it is Waajib on them to attend to the deluge of *munkaraat* which they find in their homes perpetrated by their children, sisters, husbands, etc. Their territory of operation is the home ground, not the public domain. To change/eliminate evil, females are not permitted by the Shariah to wield *laathis (sticks)*, move in droves in the streets, invading brothels and taking the prostitutes hostage as the female's *Amr Bil Ma'roof Nahyi Anil Munkar Jamaat* of the Lal Musjid Girls' Madrasah had done a few years ago, and which led to the killing of the Maulana in charge and the closure and demolition of the Madrasah by the kaafir government of Pakistan. In the name of *Amr Bil Ma'roof*, these females eliminated all their *haya*. Their concept of *hijaab* was restricted to the *burqah*. The Tabligh Jamaat's makshoofaat jamaat is of similar ilk. The very first casualty they suffer is abandonment of their natural *haya (shame and modesty)*.

Roaming in the public domain necessarily eliminates *haya* and substitutes it with audacity. Most of these makshoofaat women excel in audacity. Examples shall be presented later in this

kitaab, Insha-Allah. It suffices here to say that this Hadith does not have the remotest connection with makshoofaat jamaat. It is not even a straw to clutch.

## **Hadith No.2**

“It is narrated from Nabi (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) that he said: *“Whoever commands virtue and prohibits vice, he is the Khalifah of Allah on earth, the Khalifah of the Rasool and the Khalifah of Allah’s Kitaab”*.

This Hadith only states the significance of those who practise the duty of *Amr Bil Ma’roof Nahyi Anil Munkar*. Firstly, it does not specify any particular method for discharging this obligation. Secondly, it does not condone the execution of this obligation in ways in conflict with the Shariah. Thirdly, there is absolutely not the remotest suggestion in this Hadith for permissibility of makshoofaat jamaat. Fourthly, it embraces all lawful methods adopted for this objective. Fifthly, the Tabligh Jamaat is in conflict with this Hadith for having abandoned *Nahyi Anil Munkar*.

Women have a wide scope for practising *Amr Bil Ma’roof Nahyi Anil Munkar* within the home precincts. That is the area Allah Ta’ala has designated for them. Since no one has ever excluded females from the obligation of *Amr Bil Ma’roof Nahyi Anil Munkar*, the Mufti’s wandering off at a wide tangent with a grammatical issue in the Hadith is ludicrously futile.

## **Hadith No.3**

The Mufti Sahib quoting another Hadith, says: “The Nabi (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) said: *“When people see an unlawful act, and if they do not endeavour to prevent it, then it is not far that Allah Ta’ala will overtake them with his universal (umoomi) punishment.”*

Stating his ‘tafseer’ of the Hadith, the Mufti Sahib says: *“In this Hadith is the word, ‘an-naas’ (people) which includes both male and female.”*

It should be quite obvious that the Mufti Sahib is blissfully unaware of the question in dispute. His every argument is an ingemination of the same monotonous theme, namely the Aayaat and Ahaadith include both men and women. Since this fact is not contended, there is no dispute in this regard. The dispute from his angle should be the innovated method of makshoofaat jamaat. We are not saying that women should seal their lips and abstain from *Amr Bil Ma’roof Nahyi Anil Munkar*. We are saying that they should not prowl outside their homes; that they should not undertake journeys for executing the Tabligh Jamaat’s specific method of tabligh which is designed for only males. It is therefore a ridiculous superfluity for the Mufti Sahib to monotonously repeat the same futile theme. He has miserably failed to proffer even one cogent *daleel* for justifying the makshoofaat jamaat. Thus, in this Hadith too, there is not a vestige of support for the makshoofaat jamaat.

#### **Hadith No.4**

The Mufti Sahib says: “On the occasion of the Farewell Hajj, females were also present with Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam). He said: *“Listen attentively. Those present should deliver the message to those who are absent.”*

This order too is general for all those who were present, for men and women...This instruction includes both men and women.”

Again, the Mufti Sahib has repeated his drivel. No one has claimed that women should not impart to others what they know of the Deen. The issue is not what the Mufti Sahib attempts to portray. The issue is makshoofaat jamaat. This

Hadith as well as other similar narrations are applicable to someone who perhaps claims that women are precluded from offering naseehat to others. Since this is not the issue, the Mufti Sahib's argument is fallacious.

## **Hadith No.5**

The Mufti Sahib says: "For the purpose of Jihad with the sword, the Sahaabiyaat and the Holy Wives would emerge in abundance according to the Ahaadith. Hence, by way of *Dalaalatun Nass* the emergence of women for Jihad with the tongue, i.e. Tabligh, will be valid to a greater degree."

It is the Mufti Sahib's contention that when women were permitted to participate in Jihad where there was the danger of death and enslavement, then to a greater degree will it be permissible for them to emerge and participate in tabligh in which these dangers are non-existent. He extracts this conclusion on the basis of the Fiqhi principle of *Dalaalatun Nass*. However, this principle may not be availed in conflict with *Nusoos*. It may not be employed to cancel any *Hukm* of the Shariah. Utilization of this principle is conditional on compliance with the Shariah, not in conflict with the Shariah. Thus to claim that women's participation in the specific Tablighi Jamaat methodology has greater significance than their participation in Jihad is downright stupid. There is no *Dalaalat* here for justifying their emergence on a mass scale to undertake journeys in droves for participation in an act which the Shariah does not impose on them, and the achievement of which is reliant on haraam, namely, violating the Qur'aan's and the Sunnah's prohibition for women to emerge without valid Shar'i reason.

Tabligh is as old as Islam. It was the primary mission of the Ambiya (alayhimus salaam). Women were in greater need of

**SABEELUL MUNKARAAT FI  
JAMAA-AATIL MUTAKASH-SHIFAAT**

knowledge about Islam in the very early epoch of Islam when tribes and nations entered the fold of Islam. But, never did Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) or the Sahaabah or the Taabi-een or the Ummah right until recent times despatch regiments/battalions and groups of women to go on journeys to the distant countries, towns and villages to teach the ignorant Muslim women who had just entered the fold of Islam.

The obligation of teaching the womenfolk was fundamentally the Fardh duty of their husbands and mahram menfolk who had accomplished this task. The Tabligh Jamaat which flaunts the objective of the Sunnah should educate their male members to educate their females at home. If these men can engage in da'wat outside their homes to strangers and to those in distant countries, what prevents them from making *amal* inside their homes to their womenfolk on the Fardh command of Allah Ta'ala announced in the Qur'aan Majeed:

*“O People of Imaan! Save yourselves and your families from the Fire, the fuel of which is people and stones.....”*

Why don't the men of the Tabligh Jamaat practise in terms of this Command of Allah Ta'ala? The primary da'wat of even men is at home. The outsiders are of secondary importance. The Ummah consists of family units. If each father/husband follows Rasulullah's teaching:

*“Every one of you is a shepherd, and every one will be questioned about his flock.”*

Then there shall be a transformed Ummah of pious men and women, obedient to Allah and His Rasool. But while the house is ablaze, the father/husband is outside trying to extinguish someone else's fire. This is manifest *jahaalat*. The thawaab for attending to the family is double the reward of service to outsiders. Nepotism is an ibaadat of high merit in Islam.

The Mufti Sahib should apply the principle of *Dalaalatun Nass* to establish the prohibition of female emergence, and not

misapply his mind so despicably to use this principle to produce an effect which abrogates the explicit Law of Prohibition. The correct utilization of this principle would be to argue that despite the permissibility of women attending the Musjid for Salaat during the time of Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam), the Sahaabah banned this practice although it was yet a time of great *khair*, and it was the age of the Sahaabah. Hence, to a greater degree will it be prohibited for women to undertake journeys to distant places in these times flooded with evil, immorality, vice and just every sin one can imagine. In this scenario it will be correct to say that *the maskoot is aula than the mantooq*.

As far as women travelling nowadays is concerned, the dangers compared to the dangers in Jihad in the early days, are substantially more evil and destructive. The handful of women who had joined their husbands in Jihad, despite the dangers of war, were not in any haraam, immoral situations. They were fully in Hijaab and even in a *houdaj (small cabin)*. They did not travel in taxis, buses and planes where women mix with fussaag, fujjaar and kuffaar males. They did not wait at taxi ranks and bus and train stations among crowds and menageries of the worst specimens of humanity. They were not examined by male immigration officials. They did not have to pass through customs and other checkpoints manned by fussaag and kuffaar males. They did not have to take haraam photos for passports and visas.

In the Jihad scenario, they were totally shielded from all and sundry, from even other Sahaabah. Rasulullah's statement: "*Journey is a portion of the Fire*", has the greatest application in this age in which immorality and vice preponderates. Brains whose equilibrium has been jarred into some degrees of derangement, will not understand the villainy of journeys today, not only for women, but also for men. The very same fate of

immorality which women have to undergo in journeys, is the lot of even men – of such men who do understand the meaning of Islam. We say with emphasis, that the brains of the vast majority of Ulama of this age are deranged as a consequence of spiritual desensitization. The immorality around them has taken its toll on their *Aql*. Male and female mingling and interaction has become a standardized norm, acceptable and respectable to even the Ulama and the moron ‘shaikhs’ of fake tasawwuf who undertake journeys to increase their circle of mureeds, to dole out their cheap wares of appointing ‘khalifahs’, and to gain materially and monetarily from their stupid mureeds who are taught the art of saint-worship, singing songs and making gheebat. This is the be all of ‘tasawwuf’ of the era.

The Tablighi Mufti Sahib will bestow a favour unto himself, if he again makes *mutaa-la-ah* of the principle of *Dalaalatun Nass*. After a thorough and correct application of *Aql*, Insha-Allah, he will not fail to see the haze lifting. He will then understand that makshoofaat jamaat should be argued on the basis of the *prohibition of female emergence to attend the Musjid*. This is the manner of the Qiyaas of the Fuqaha. The emergence was banned by the Sahaabah during the best of ages with the best of humanity living, and in the best and holiest of cities, viz, Madinah Munawwarah. Thus by way of *Dalaalatun Nass* the prohibition of women undertaking journeys for Tabligh should be prohibited *bi darja-e-aula (to a greater degree)*.

Most certainly, the Mufti Sahib has not applied his mind. In addition, his research of the Ahaadith is deficient. Firstly, logic which conflicts with the Shariah is putrid and rubbish, and should be discarded. Logic may not be resorted to in conflict with any teaching of the Shariah.



**SABEELUL MUNKARAAT FI  
JAMAA-AATIL MUTAKASH-SHIFAAT**

Females used to emerge from their homes and perform Salaat in the Musjid freely during the era of Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam). Despite this initial permission, the Sahaabah forbade them and banned them from attending the Musjid after the demise of Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam). It was still the best of ages, the Age of the Sahaabah and the women were Sahaabiyaat. Despite this, they were banned from attending the Musjid.

The Sahaabah did not argue against Hadhrat Umar (radhiyallahu anhu), saying that women were permitted by Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) to perform Salaat in the Musjid. Nor did they argue in the convoluted manner of the Mufti Sahib. They did not say that women used to emerge and participate in Jihad despite the dangers pointed out by the Mufti Sahib, and that there were no such dangers in them attending the Musjid, hence they should not be prevented. On the contrary, all the Sahaabah accepted the decree of Hadhrat Umar (radhiyallahu anhu) and submitted. Hadhrat Aishah (radhiyallahu anha) upheld the ban with considerable emphasis.

Furthermore, the participation of women in Jihad was not for the purpose of wielding the sword. They had participated in a very unorganized manner without even the permission of Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam). Some simply accompanied their husbands.

Women were discouraged and even prohibited by Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) from participating in Jihad. They were not encouraged nor lured out of their homes by tablighi jamaat propagandists. No *tashkeel* of females was made. They were not formed into groups, and battalions/regiments, etc. to wage Jihad in battle array. They were insignificant entities, hardly noticeable, for they were concealed in tents and

**SABEELUL MUNKARAAT FI  
JAMAA-AATIL MUTAKASH-SHIFAAT**

remained in the extreme background. A very few, a mere handful – would accompany their husbands.

When Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) took along one of the Azwaaje Mutahharaat in Jihad, she was completely concealed in a cabin (*houdaj*) which was mounted on a camel. These cabins were specially used for Purdah Nasheen ladies who had to travel when the need arose. But the Hijaab was complete. From the example of Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam), it will be manifest that even in Jihad which has a superior status (i.e. Fardhe Kifaayah) than the specific *mubah* (*permissible*) tablighi activity of the Tablighi Jamaat, Hijaab was observed as far as was possible, and the Hijaab was not of the deficient hijaab of this age.

The Ahaadith make it clear that women never participated in Jihad in any organized form. There was no 'ladies regiment', 'ladies battalion' or 'ladies jamaat' operating 'side by side' with males. The presence of women in the Jihad campaigns paled into insignificance by virtue of their negligible number, unofficial, rare and unorganized participation.

Even if women participated in Jihad campaigns it cannot be cited as justification for the 'ladies jamaat' operating under the auspices of today's Tablighi Jamaat just as permissibility for Musjid attendance may not be extravasated on the basis of the permissibility which had existed during the age of Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam). As has been stated earlier, Fardh Kifayah Jihad and Mubah specific tablighi activity of the Tablighi Jamaat are two different duties. The Ahkaam of both differ. The one cannot be argued on the premises of the other. Tabligh is not something new. It existed since the time of Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam). In fact, it was the mission of Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) and of all the Ambiya (alayhimus salaam). There is no need to prove the

significance and importance of Tabligh on the basis of Jihad Aayaat and Ahaadith as is the penchant of the Tabligh Jamaat. It is a branch of Ibaadat on itself, having its own rules and regulations independent of Jihad. It is, therefore, erroneous to justify 'ladies jamaat' activity on the basis of women having participated in a quiet role, unostensibly in the Jihad campaigns of Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam). Their engagement in actual fighting activity with the kuffaar was in the course of events, and extremely rare. But their participation was extremely insignificant. Isolated episodes of participation do not represent a general rule.

Despite the great importance of Jihad, Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) did not encourage ladies to participate. In the same way they are not encouraged to perform Salaat in Jamaat, even if they are only women at home. The following Hadith indicates Rasulullah's (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) actual attitude to the question of women emerging from their homes even to participate in the Fardh Kifayah obligation of Jihad.

“Hadhrat Umme Kabshah (radhiyallahu anha) says;  
'A woman of the tribe of Usrah Bani Qudha-ah requested Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam):

'O Rasulullah! Do you permit me to participate in that army?'  
Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) refused permission. The lady said: 'O Rasulullah my intention is not Jihad. My motive is to tend to the wounded and sick and give them water to drink'.

Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) replied:

'If it was not for the fear of women's participation in Jihad becoming Sunnat and people saying (in future) that a certain woman (Sahaabi) went in Jihad, I would have given you permission. But, you remain behind." **(Hikayatus Sahabah, Vol. 3)**

This Hadith is also found in many Hadith kutub. Herein is a salubrious lesson for the Mufti Sahib. The Hadith is narrated in *Hikaayatus Sahaabah*, which is a kitaab in the Tablighi Jamaat's *nisaab (syllabus)*. Rasulullah's reason is a clear message for the Mufti Sahib and those who think like him. We wonder what his stance is about Rasulullah's refusal.

### **The refusal**

This Hadith portrays: (1) Rasulullah's (sallallahu alayhi wasallam), express refusal to women's participation in Jihad even in a secondary capacity, and (2), the reason for the refusal. The reason for Rasulullah's (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) refusal is given by Nabi (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) himself as the fear that women's participation in Jihad will be interpreted as a Sunnat whereas it is not a Sunnat. Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) did not wish his Ummah to cite women's participation in Jihad campaigns during the age of Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) as being a standard Sunnat practice, hence he refused permission and immediately furnished the reason for the refusal, viz., "THE FEAR THAT WOMEN'S PARTICIPATION IN JIHAD WILL BECOME TO BE ACCEPTED AS A SUNNAT".

Now since Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) himself negates women's emergence from the home to participate in the superior Ibaadat of Jihad, it will be highly improper and in total conflict of the purport and spirit of Rasulullah's (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) teaching for us in this age to assign 'ladies jamaat' activity a higher rank (or even an equal status) than Jihad, by claiming that it is Sunnat for ladies to participate in the Tablighi Jamaat 'ladies programmes.

Tabligh in group form has never been ordained for ladies.  
*"Heed the lesson, O People of Intelligence!"*

In a morbid attempt to neutralize the explicit prohibition issued by Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam), the Tablighi Mufti Sahib argues away the prohibition by claiming:

*“Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) did not grant permission to Ummah Kabshah (radhiyallahu anha) to participate in Jihad for three reasons:*

- (1) So that it is not regarded to be Sunnah.*
- (2) So that it is not made a normal practice (habit) for all women to pursue.*
- (3) So that it does not become known that Muhammad (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) is recruiting women for Jihad.”*

Indeed, this interpretation is the limit of spuriousness, to say the least. Although Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) categorically stated the reason for prohibiting Umm-e-Kabshah (radhiyallahu anha) from participating in Jihad, the Mufti Sahib clings to a weird interpretation to skirt the prohibition or to in fact, negate it.

In fact, in terms of the very interpretation presented by the Tablighi Mufti Sahib, makshoofaat jamaat has been forbidden by Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam). His attempt to dismiss the explicit prohibition of Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) is weird because he (the Mufti Sahib) shoots himself in the foot by acknowledging that the reason for the prohibition is to negate the future idea of women’s *khurooj* for Jihad being Sunnah. This negation was in fact intended for the Tablighi Jamaat and other groups who would be embarking on the ‘emancipation’ of women by luring them out of their homes in diametric conflict with the Shariah’s command for them to remain ‘glued’ to their homes, and ‘unglue’ themselves only for occasions explicitly permitted by Allah’s Law.

**SABEELUL MUNKARAAT FI  
JAMAA-AATIL MUTAKASH-SHIFAAT**

Since the Tablighi Mufti Sahib has selected only Jihad narrations to justify the mass women's movement, he should submit to this prohibition ordered by Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam), and not act in conflict with it

Covertly the Tabligh Jamaat peddles the notion that its specific methodology of tabligh is *Fardh-e-Ain*, and this applies to females as well in the conception of the Jamaat. Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) categorically negating the Sunnah of female participation in Jihad, ordered the Lady to remain at home. Now when this was Rasulullah's command for the lady, the Tablighi Jamaat is in flagrant conflict with the Divine Prohibition with its weird insistence for women to open the doors of their homes and to come out in droves into a weird world of fitnah and fasaad to engage in an act which Allah and His Rasool never ever envisaged for women.

Then the other reason which the Tablighi Mufti Sahib himself proffers for the prohibition commanded by Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) is the fear of women emerging *en masse* to participate in Jihad. While the Mufti Sahib states this fact, he has to apply his mind to what he has said. He concedes himself that in terms of Rasulullah's prohibition, women should not make *khurooj en masse*, yet the Tablighi Jamaat very irrationally and in conflict with this reason makes *tashkeel* for women to emerge *en masse* for participation in tabligh activity in distant places which necessitates the undertaking of journeys.

The Mufti Sahib also attempted vainly to eke out support from the statements of some Fuqaha who said that it is permissible for a woman to participate in Jihad with the permission of her husband, and of course, this entails the accompaniment of her husband as well. But this is absolutely no support for the mass makshoofaat jamaat movement.

Firstly, this statement of some Fuqaha cannot and does not override the explicit prohibition of Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam). The statement merely refers to isolated cases, not to mass women's *khurooj* for an activity never imposed on them by the Shariah, for according to Allah's Law, women's *khurooj* is transformed by shaitaan into a trap of fitnah and fasaad. Where is the isolated case of a woman accompanied by her husband unostensibly and where is the mass emergence of women on an organized, systematic and ostentatious basis? The difference is like that between Jannat and Jahannam. By what stretch of intelligent reasoning and by what stretch of Shar'i logic can the mass makshoofaat jamaat movement be argued on the basis of a single woman accompanying her husband without the least bit of ostentation?

Secondly, the Mufti Sahib has acknowledged that according to Haafiz Ibn Hajar, the narration of Umm-e-Kabshah (radhiyallahu anha) is *Naasikh* ,i.e. it abrogates the earlier Hadith in which permissibility was granted for participation. Be this as it may. The fact remains that even the cases of permission are isolated and the permission is in almost all cases implied, not expressly given. That is, Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) did not consciously promote women's participation in Jihad nor did he recruit women nor did he in any way whatsoever encourage them to make *khurooj* for Jihad, leave alone *khurooj* for tabligh which never ever featured among the Sahaabiyaat.

Thirdly, there is no daleel in the isolated cases of female participation in Jihad for a basis on which to structure permissibility of the mass makshoofaat jamaat movement of this era.

Fourthly, the Tablighi Mufti Sahib has miserably failed to cite even one incident of woman's *khurooj* for tabligh. Every

narration he has cited pertains directly to Jihad which is the activity in which the Tabligh Jamaat is not involved. The emphasis which the Mufti Sahib places on Jihad narrations for extravasating proof for an errant methodology conveys the impression to an unacquainted person that the Tabligh Jamaat is in the forefront of Jihad, i.e. Shar'i Jihaad – Jihad in the battlefield against the kuffaar. But there is nothing of this sort.

Fifthly, the only thing the Fuqaha have mentioned is that it is permissible for a husband to take his wife with him in Jihad. They did not venture beyond this to establish a basis for a mass female's movement outside the homes to be created in an era rife with fitnah and fasaad. They merely implied that just as it is permissible for a husband to take his wife for Hajj or for any other valid, permissible activity, so too, is it permissible for him to take his wife with him in Jihad. Thus, it will be permissible for a man to take his wife unostentatiously to a private home to teach other females or to act as a midwife, or to give ghusl to the mayyit or to visit her relatives. But there is no daleel in this type of *khurooj* for the mass makshoofaat movement of the Tabligh Jamaat. The Mufti Sahib's citation of several cases of females participating in Jihad is thus a redundant exercise. He has laboured in futility.

Tabligh is as old as the Institution of the Ambiya (alayhimus salaam). Women in every era were in need of Deeni Ta'leem. But never ever since the commencement of the Institution of Ambiya was this obligation thrust by the Shariah on to females. Therefore, the makshoofaat jamaat is a severe, unnatural aberration with extremely harmful consequences in the long term.

These consequences are already coming home to roost in the form of female audacity, insubordination to husbands, *ghuloo'* in their idea of tabligh and prowling outside the homes thereby



exposing themselves to great danger. An account of female deviation appears towards the end of this treatise. The Mufti Sahib should bear in mind that Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) said that women are '*Habaailush Shaitaan*'. Sanctifying their mass *khurooj* is to play with fire and to walk right into the ambush prepared by shaitaan.

The only 'daleel' – baseless argument – tendered by the Tablighi Mufti Sahib is the legless 'daleel' of 'benefits'. But pork, liquor and gambling too have benefits.

Acquisition of Islamic knowledge and the specific tabligh activity of the Tablighi Jamaat should not be confused. Acquisition of necessary Islamic knowledge is Fardh upon every Muslim, male and female. But, this should not be interpreted as the specific tabligh activity of the Tabligh Jamaat, for this specific tabligh activity is neither Fardh Ain nor Fardh Kifayah nor Sunnat nor Mustahab. It is *mubah* (permissible), and it will remain *mubah* as long as the limits of the Shariah are not breached. There are a variety of ways for acquiring Islamic knowledge. It is absolute contumacy and deviation to pursue Islamic knowledge in ways which are in flagrant violation of the Shariah as is the way of makshoofaat jamaat.

Aishah Binti Talhah (radhiyallahu anhumaa) narrates that Hadhrat Aishah (radhiyallahu anha), Ummul Mu'mineen, said: "*I sought permission from Nabi (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) (to participate) in Jihad. Then he said: 'The Jihad of you women is Hajj.'*" (Bukhaari).

The analogy of women having participated in Jihad as a basis for makshoofaat jamaat is *qiyaas-e-faasid*. The analogy is corrupt, baseless and fallacious and unexpected of men of Ilm.

## **Hadith No.6**

The Mufti Sahib avers: “Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) had ordered *haaidhah* (*menstruating*) women to attend the Eidgah. It is an accepted fact that they do not perform Salaat. It is therefore known that their presence was to gain ta’leem from Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam).....”

This is another classical example of the Mufti Sahib’s misapplication of mind. He has made this statement without reflecting. We are not aware of the *maslak* of the Mufti Sahib. Although ostentatiously he appears to be a Hanafi, we cannot vouch for it. Surely, the Mufti Sahib is aware or should be aware of the total ban on women attending the Musjid and Eidgah enacted by the Sahaabah. All our Fuqaha in all ages have decreed it impermissible for women to attend the Musjid and the Eidgah. Women having attended the Eidgah during the time of Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) is in the same category as female attendance of the Musjid. Both acts were prohibited by the Sahaabah. To cite an abrogated deed as proof is self-imposed intransigence. The desire is not to gain the Haqq. The objective of such convoluted argumentation is merely to gain victory over the adversary.

Furthermore, Imaam Tahaawi and other Fuqaha have explained that women were ordered to attend the Eidgah in the initial stage of Islam because the Muslims were few in number. To impress the mushrikeen with the number of Muslims, the womenfolk were ordered to attend.

It is ludicrous for a muqallid Mufti to proffer as his daleel an *amal* which has been prohibited by the Sahaabah and the Math-hab. Furthermore, the women who had attended the Eidgah prior to the prohibition did not go on any journey nor were they subjected to the host of haraam acts which are concomitant with all journeys of this age. It was a small, compact society

living in primitive surroundings. The fact remains that women were not formed into jamaats and despatched on journeys to make da'wat and tabligh to the ignorant female population. If there was any goodness in female jamaats, most assuredly, it would have been ordained by Wahi, and Rasulullah (sallahu alayhi wasallam) and the Sahaabah would have been the first to have instituted it.

It is indeed gross self-imposed intransigence to ignore the host of *Nusoos*, both general and explicit regarding the prohibition of women attending the Musjid and Eidgah, and to trumpet the initial permissibility. In addition to this incongruent presentation of argument, women attending the Eidgah once or twice a year is not an act on which to base the mass makshoofaat jamaat with all its attendant evils. In his Eidgah argument, the Mufti Sahib is arguing exactly in the same way as the modernist females who have embarked on the venture of establishing Eidgahs for men and women. Just as they are justifying their Eidgah movement with the Hadith cited by the Mufti Sahib, so too is he justifying haraam makshoofaat jamaat with this Hadith. The legalizers of makshoofaat jamaat and the modernists who are advocating female emergence have become birds of a feather.

### **Hadith No.7**

The Mufti Sahib says: “Umm-e-Shareek (radhiyallahu anha) was among the Sahaabiyaat (female Sahaabi). She had presented herself in marriage to Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam). After accepting Islam she would silently (that is secretly) go to the houses of the women of the Quraish and engage in da'wat of Islam. On account of this, the people of Makkah severely persecuted her.”

Although the Mufti Sahib acknowledges the deficiency in the *Sanad* of this Hadith, he nevertheless presents it as proof. We

shall accept the ‘authenticity’ of the Hadith despite the *kalaam* in its sanad.

What relationship is there between a solitary woman acting all on her own in secret without ostentation, and the Tablighi Jamaat’s makshufaat wing? Was this lone lady operating in stealth a member of a public makshoofaat jamaat? Did she make the *tashkeel* of other women to come out to go on journeys? Did Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) and the Sahaabah organize women’s jamaats to follow in the footsteps of Umm-e-Shareek (radhiyallahu anha)? The difference between her silent, secret, lone activity and makshoofaat jamaat is like the difference between Jannat and Jahannam. This ‘daleel’ is absolute twaddle.

### **Hadith No.8**

The Mufti Sahib says: “Hadhrat Umm-e-Hakeem Bint Haarith, the wife of Hadhrat Ikrimah Bin Abu Jahl had entered the fold of Islam on the Day of the Conquest of Makkah. Her husband had fled to Yemen. She then left Makkah and journed to Yemen where she gave the da’wat of Islam to her husband. He accepted Islam, and returned to Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam).”

The Mufti Sahib merely presented this hadith without structuring any daleel on it. He imagined that the journey of the lady to Yemen was the factor common to her journey and the journeys of makshoofaat jamaat, hence the latter is permissible. Such a corrupt and legless ‘daleel’ evokes mirth. No person who views the issues intelligently will understand that makshoofaat jamaat is permissible, simply because a lone lady had gone in pursuit of her husband who had taken flight in fear of being put to death. She did not take a jamaat of woman to make da’wat to other women. Her journey was her own

decision to bring back her husband. But his return to Makkah was dependent on him embracing Islam.

This miserable ‘daleel’ is so palpably spurious and baseless that even the Mufti Sahib contented himself with a mere citation of the Hadith without tendering a word of comment. In other words, he had unnecessarily and wastefully darkened a page.

### **Hadith No.9**

Advancing another spurious figment in the abortive bid to bolster makshoofaat jamaat, the honourable Mufti Sahib says: “Hadhrat Umm-e-Sulaim (radhiyallahu anha) had presented Islam to Hadhrat Abu Talha (radhiyallahu anhu) when he had intended to marry her.”

Again, unable to overtly present any argument on the basis of this Hadith for bolstering makshoofaat jamaat, the Mufti Sahib simply bypasses the Hadith after quoting it. It mentions not a word in argument to indicate how on earth this narration supports makshoofaat jamaat. Any woman is free to propagate the Deen to any man who proposes to marry her. This has absolutely not even a remote relationship with droves of women undertaking journeys to distant places to execute a deed which the Shariah does not impose on them, but which is proscribed for them in terms of explicit *Nusoos* and the spirit of Islam as applicable to females whom Allah Azza Wa Jal has created for the home role only. Her job is not outside the home. What the Tablighi Jamaat has devised for women is unnatural, and the consequences of operating in conflict with Allah’s natural laws are disastrous. The effect of western female ‘emancipation’ are becoming increasingly manifest of makshoofaat jamaat women and on the type of ‘aalimah’ women who attend girls madrasahs which are likewise unnatural institutions which breed *fitnah* and *fasaad*. The products of both makshoofaat jamaat and girls madrasahs are

legions of *be-haya be-sharam* (immodest and shameless) women.

Here (in this Hadith) a kaafir man proposes to a Muslim lady. She stipulates for her acceptance of his proposal his conversion to Islam. No one has forbidden this. But, this is not a daleel for rendering makshoofaat jamaat valid. It is downright silly and stupid to present this Hadith in the context of our topic of dispute.

### **Hadith No.10**

The Mufti Sahib alleges: “A very great objective for coming out in Tabligh is the acquisition of Knowledge of the Deen in order to give practical implementation to it. What is shown and taught practically becomes more grounded in the heart. It is mentioned in abundance in the Ahaadith that the females would come to Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) to ask about masaa-il. Now when it is permissible to go without a mahram in the city to query about masaa-il, then there is scope to go out of the city with a mahram.”

Then Mufti Sahib quotes another Hadith in his No.10, as follows:

“Hadhrat Aishah (radhiyallahu anha) said that the mother of Hadhrat Muaawiyah (radhiyallahu anha), Hindah (radhiyallahu anha) once came to Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) and asked: ‘Abu Sufyaan (radhiyallahu anhu) – her husband – is very cautious in spending. May I take from his money something?’ Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) said: ‘Yes. As much as is sufficient for you and your sons.’”

For a better understanding of the mas’alah, we present the correct translation: “*Is there any sin on me if I take from his wealth secretly?*’ Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) said:

*‘You and your son may take what is sufficient for you with ma’roof.’*

This mas’alah is unrelated to our subject of discussion, nevertheless this digression is necessary to clarify the mas’alah which could be misunderstood from the Mufti’s incomplete paraphrasing of the Hadith.

In the context, *ma’roof* here means: equitably, fairness. A woman is allowed to take from the money of her niggardly husband without his permission only what is actually sufficient for her basic needs, not what she feels is sufficient for herself. She may not take without permission to buy an extra dress, etc. She has to take with *ma’roof* – for bare necessities.

Since this Hadith offers not the slightest basis for supporting makshoofaat jamaat, the honourable Mufti Sahib makes no attempt to extravasate proof from this it. He contents himself with only citation of the Hadith.

Both narrations listed under No.10 provide no sanctuary for the Mufti Sahib’s view. There is no connection between a local, resident woman asking Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) a mas’alah, and the globe-trotting women of makshoofaat jamaat who travel in groups to distant places, traversing immoral zones infested with fussaag, fujjaar and kuffaar.

The Mufti Sahib presents a putrid, ridiculous analogy in the attempt to eke out permissibility for makshoofaat jamaat. He says that when a woman can go to someone’s home in the same town/city without a mahram to query a mas’alah, then she may undertake a journey with a mahram to query a mas’alah in any distant place. The argument is fallacious. Firstly, it is permissible for a woman to travel with her husband or mahram.

**SABEELUL MUNKARAAT FI  
JAMAA-AATIL MUTAKASH-SHIFAAT**

This is not being disputed. What is being disputed is makshoofaat jamaat.

Secondly, the woman in the hypothetical example travels with her husband to learn, not to make tabligh. The *amal of makshoofaat jamaat* is purportedly *da'wat and tabligh*. Their objective is to teach others. Therefore, they deliver talks. They act as teachers. The example of the Sahaabiyyah therefore does not constitute a basis for makshoofaat jamaat, for these Sahaabiyyah went to Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) who was just round the corner, to learn about masaa-il. The permissibility of this is not contested.

Furthermore, times have changed for the worse. No longer is it permissible for women to go anywhere even in the same city without a mahram. Their honour is in danger of being pillaged by the kuffaar. Several cases of such pillage of honour had been reported recently in Europe and the U.K. Just the other day, a burqah-clad woman was accosted by a couple of kuffaar louts at a bus stop in a U.K. city. She was without a mahram. This unfortunate lady must have had a licence to roam in the city without a mahram from the Tabligh Jamaat or a misguided 'shaikh' or she may have been an 'aalimah'. The Mufti Sahib in his argument endorses this permissibility, that is, for a woman to roam around the city without a mahram.

This most unfortunate sister was dragged into the nearby bush by the kuffaar louts. Her honour was ravaged brutally, and she was left severely injured and may possibly remain in a state of mental shock for the rest of her life. Who bears the primary blame for this unfortunate lady's brutal assault and pillaging of her honour? It is the Mufti Sahib, his likes, the miserable crank shaikhs of fake tasawwuf and the miserable madrasahs producing quack 'aalimahs' who must take the blame for the ruin of this sister. They are the devils who encourage women to



roam in the cities without mahrams. They are the shayaateen who grant Muslim sisters the licence to travel in public transport unaccompanied by mahram. These juhala molvis and shaikhs have read in the kitaab that a woman requires a mahram when she goes on a journey. Their calcified *Aql* does not allow them to look beyond their noses. From the mas'alah requiring a mahram when on a journey, these *Maajin* muftis have inferred total permissibility for a woman to wander around and to be raped without a mahram in the city. They all are devils in human form. They are too stupid and dense in the brains to take into account the changing circumstances and the vicissitudes of life. It is haraam for Maajin muftis with fossilized brains to dabble in the department of fatwa.

## **WOMEN'S EMERGENCE INTO THE PUBLIC DOMAIN IN TOTAL DEFIANCE OF THE LETTER AND SPIRIT OF ISLAM**

It is indeed lamentable and surprising that the Tablighi Mufti as well as all the Tablighi Molvis in general lack the intellectual and Imaani discernment to understand Islam's emphasis on women's home role. Emergence of women for any purpose whatsoever is in conflict with the letter and spirit of the Shariah, hence only needs specified by the Shariah are valid reasons for emergence. In Ibnul Haaj's Madkhal it is mentioned:

*“For a woman there are three occasions for emergence in her lifetime: (1) For the home of her husband when she is handed over to him (i.e. when she has married). (2) Emergence on the occasion of the death of her parents. (3) Emergence for (her being assigned) to her grave (i.e. when she dies).”*

In this nutshell have the Salafus Saaliheen encapsulated the

spirit of Islam regarding Hijaab for women. But for those who advocate the ‘emancipation’ of women, the sagacious advices of the senior Salafus Saaliheen are meaningless.

During the noblest of ages wherein flourished the noblest of the Ummah – the Sahaabah – the very senior ranking Sahaabi, Hadhrat Abdullah Ibn Mas’ood (radhiyallahu anhu) said:

*“Keep women within the homes, for verily women are aurah (objects of concealment). Verily, when a woman emerges from her home, shaitaan casts surreptitious looks at her and says to her: ‘You will not pass by any person (any man) but he will be attracted by you.’”*

*(Musannaf Ibn Abi Shaibah)*

What should we now infer from groups of women travelling together with groups of men dwelling in the deception of them being in Purdah whilst they are all together in close proximity in the taxi, train, plane, etc.?

Hadhrat Anas (radhiyallahu anhu) said: *“The women came to Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) and said: “O Rasulullah, the men have surpassed us with virtue and in Jihad in the Path of Allah, for we have no (such) deed by which we can acquire the deed of the Mujaahideen in Allah’s Path.” Then Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) said: “Whoever among you **stays within her home** will obtain the virtue of the Mujaahid in the Path of Allah.” (Musnad Al-Bazzaz)*

Thus, her staying glued inside her home is the equivalent of the Mujahid in the Path of Allah, and infinitely more meritorious than males going in Tabligh.

Drawing women out of their homes under the pretext of Tabligh is truly a shaitaani deception. It is to cast the women into the

tentacles of Iblees. It is to aid Iblees in his nefarious profession of using women as traps. In the words of Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam), women are *Habaailush shaitaan (the snares of shaitaan)*.

Even the Tabligh Ulama displaying lack of *faqaahat (Deeni Wisdom)* have become Signs of Qiyaamah. Hadhrat Abdullah Ibn Mas'ood (radhiyallahu anhu) for whom the Tablighi Ulama and the Khaanqah Molvis display a muted dislike, said to the people:

*“How will you be when you are enveloped by such a fitnah that the elderly ones will become senile, and the young will become old, and people will regard that fitnah to be Sunnah. If anything from it (the fitnah) is omitted, they will say that a Sunnat has been discarded.” The people said: ‘When will that be?’ He replied:*

*‘When your Ulama (i.e. the genuine Ulama – the Ulama-e-Haqq) will have gone (departed from this world), and your qaaris have become abundant, and your Fuqaha have become few, and your rulers (the civil service) have become numerous, and your trustworthy have become few, and the dunya will be pursued with deeds of the Aakhirah, and Knowledge (of the Deen) will be acquired for motives other than the Deen.’*

The Tablighi Molvis have no affinity with Hadhrat Abdullah Ibn Mas'ood (radhiyallahu anhu) because of his vehement opposition to women emerging from the homes. The deviate ‘shaikhs’ of this era’s khaanqas have no liking for this senior Sahaabi because of his vehement opposition to their bid’ah halqah thikr sessions in the Musaajid.

All of these shaikhs and molvis lack *faqaahat*, hence they accord priority to their conception of benefit. They override the Shariah with their personal opinion. One of the types of *fitnah* mentioned by Hadhrat Ibn Mas'ood (radhiyallahu anhu) is the

*fitnah* of women's tabligh groups travelling and behaving like males when they take to the road.

Among the *fitan* (plural of *fitnah*) which will be regarded as 'sunnat', mentioned by Hadhrat Ibn Mas'ood (radhiyallahu anhu), is the Tabligh Jamaat's women's wing. In fact, the emphasis accorded to this deviated practice implies that it is near to Fardh, hence anyone who opposes or dissociates from this women's bid'ah is regarded as anti-Sunnah. This is precisely what the Hadith means in the statement: *"When anything of the fitnah is omitted, it will be said that a Sunnat has been discarded."*

It is indeed mind boggling to observe the lack of Deeni intelligence in the shaikhs and molvis of the Tabligh Jamaat. They are oblivious and blind to the dangers to which they are exposing the womenfolk by drawing them into the outside domain. We have already made reference to the niquaab-wearing woman who was brutally ravaged and pillaged by kuffaar louts while she was standing at a bus station in the U.K. In another tragic episode in the wake of women embarking on 'humanitarian' activity to aid the suffering poor, two Muslim women who were on the aid convoy to Palestine were brutally raped by 'Muslims' in Libya. They had brought this calamity upon themselves by violating Allah's command for them to remain indoors. Reporting the tragedy, *Al-Jazeera* said:

*"Two British nationals of Pakistani origin have been subjected to a brutal gang rape in Libya's eastern city of Benghazi, their father has said. Awadh al-Barassi said on his Facebook page that the women – part of a humanitarian convoy destined for Gaza, the Palestinian coastal enclave under an Israeli blockade – were "brutally raped" in front of him. Barassi called the crime a "horrible act".*

*He said he had been to see the two victims in Benghazi on*

*Thursday, and that the family was “in a very bad psychological state”. The AFP news agency said the two women, accompanied by their father, were with the Gaza convoy when it was blocked from leaving Libya and entering Egypt. The three decided to return to Benghazi accompanied by two more Britons, with the aim of getting a flight home. But when they arrived in Libya’s second city they were abducted by five unidentified men.”*

Such fates await females who venture into shaitaani domains in flagrant violation of Allah’s command for them to remain resolutely within the holy confines of their homes. Whether the women enter into the outside world for humanitarian work or Tabligh work or any other work, they become the prey of barbarians who have sunk to levels lower than animals. Despite being aware of such vile and brutal fates befalling women in public, the Tablighi Molvis show no sagacity whatsoever. With far-fetched baseless interpretation they argue away the Shariah’s prohibitions, Rasulullah’s statements, the letter and spirit of Islam for legalizing the emergence of women for activities which the Shariah does not impose on them.

### **Hadith No.11**

Another apodal. The honourable Mufti Sahib states: “Hadhrat Zainab (radhiyallahu anha), the wife of Hadhrat Abdullah Ibn Mas’ood (radhiyallahu anhuma) had asked Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) the mas’alah pertaining to Sadqah to one’s husband and children.”

In this baseless, insipid ‘daleel’, the Mufti Sahib does not even present the translation of the lengthy Arabic Hadith he has cited. He only gives the couple of lines reproduced above. He makes no comment and does not even attempt to hammer out from the Hadith some support for the makshoofaat jamaat. This

testifies for the hopelessness of his case. The answer to this preposterous ‘daleel’ is the same as appearing in our comment on Hadith No.10, above.

### **Hadith No.12**

The Mufti Sahib of the Tabligh Jamaat says: “A woman presenting da’wat to her community. Imaam Bukhaari has narrated a lengthy riwaayat in the section on Tayammum. The summary of it is: The Sahaabah had gone in search of water. They found water by a woman. The water which the Sahaabah obtained from her, was presented to Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam). It is narrated in the same Hadith that afterwards when the Sahaabah attacked nearby villages, they would bypass the village of the woman. The woman was thus impressed with Islam, and she presented Islam to her people. Her people accepted Islam enthusiastically.”

This is the mirage of a hallucinated ‘daleel’ to justify makshoofaat jamaat. What is the relationship between the forcible capture of a kaafirah woman by the Sahaabah? The Sahaabah were on a Jihad campaign. During their search for water, they alighted on the kaafirah with a container of water. They ordered her to accompany them. She was presented to Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) with the water. By way of Mu’jizah, the water sufficed for the entire army of Sahaabah, and for even taking ghusl. But, the water in the container remained full. In fact, at the end of using the water, the container was fuller than it was when she was captured.

The lady understood that this man was a true Nabi. She was set free with gifts of food. On reaching her village she explained the wonderful incident and ultimately, i.e. after a few days, invited her people to accept Islam. Is this grounds for makshoofaat jamaat? Did the kaafirah constitute a makshoofaat jamaat during her state of kufr whilst she was in the bush

filling her container with water? When finally she and her people accepted Islam, was it the consequence of a makshoofaat jamaat coming to them from outside? This ‘daleel’ is pure drivel unexpected of a man of learning.

## **CONCLUSION OF THE MUFTI SAHIB’S QUR’AAN AND HADITH ‘DALAA-IL’**

At this juncture in his book, the Mufti Sahib’s stock of Qur’aan and Hadith arguments terminates. He presented in his book five Aayaat of the Qur’aan Majeed and 12 Ahaadith. Not a single one of these verses and narrations has the remotest relationship to makshoofaat jamaat. Instead of presenting viable basis for makshoofaat jamaat, the Mufti Sahib has vividly demonstrated total academic bankruptcy. He did not present even a one-legged argument. His case is legless. There is no merit in what he has argued on the basis of the Qur’aan and Hadith.

Far from the Qur’aan and Ahaadith supporting even remotely makshoofaat jamaat, these *Nusoos* categorically prohibit women emerging unnecessarily even individually, leave alone emergence in droves to participate in activity in the public domain and become involved in many haraam acts in the process of executing a type of tabligh which the Shariah neither imposes on them nor expects of them. In fact, makshoofaat jamaat journeying to engage in tabligh is nugatory of the natural role Allah Ta’ala has created for women. Throughout the history of Islam, there was never a single episode of female group Deeni activity even in their towns of residence. Whatever tabligh, da’wat and ta’leem women engaged in was in the privacy of their homes. They never went out of their homes. Ladies would come to them for

ta'leem, and even Ulama would come to genuine Aalimah ladies and acquire Ahaadith, etc. from them from behind proper Shar'i screens. But this is not makshoofaat jamaat.

The Mufti Sahib, after presenting his Qur'aan and Ahaadith, embarked on his venture of fabricating spurious and baseless 'dalaail' which he laboured to extravasate from the statements of the Fuqaha.

## **THE MUFTI SAHIB'S 'DALAA-IL' FROM THE FUQAHA**

### **First daleel**

The Mufti Sahib says: "When an arrangement cannot be made at home to teach a woman, then the Fuqaha have permitted her to emerge from the house (to acquire knowledge elsewhere)."

The Mufti Sahib quoted the following from *Haashiyatut Tahtaawi alad Durriil Mukhtaar*:

"It is mentioned in *Al-Bahr*: When a woman intends to emerge (from the house to attend) a gathering of Knowledge without the consent of her husband, then this is not permissible for her. However, if she is confronted with a (Deeni) problem (e.g. a haidh issue), and if the husband asks an Aalim and informs her, then it is not permissible for her to emerge from the house. If he refuses to ask (an Alim) then it is permissible for her to emerge without the consent of the husband.

If she is not confronted with a (Deeni) problem, but she intends to go to a gathering of Knowledge to learn some masaa-il of Wudhu and Salaat, then if the husband is aware of the masaa-il and he informs her thereof, then he is entitled to prevent her from emerging. However, if he is not aware of the masaa-il, then it is better that he grants her permission (to



emerge) occasionally. But if he does not allow her, then there is no sin on him, and it will then not be permissible for her to emerge.”

On the basis of this explanation, the Mufti Sahib extracts the following conclusion:

“From this it is known that a woman can go to a gathering of knowledge with the permission of her husband. If the husband or a mahram himself accompanies her then there is no reason for objection.”

The incongruity of the Mufti Sahib’s reasoning is truly lamentable. What the Fuqaha have ruled in the aforementioned exposition has no relationship with droves of women emerging from their homes and undertaking journeys for the purpose of tabligh – teaching others, and not seeking awareness pertaining to such knowledge which is incumbent. What has been stated in the aforementioned passage from *Raddul Muhtaar* is something other than makshoofaat jamaat.

The husband granting his wife permission to participate in a gathering of knowledge, does not refer to her going on a journey. It refers to a place around the corner or in the same street where she lives. The discussion does not take into consideration emerging from the home to go on a journey. The scenario in makshoofaat jamaat is substantially different. It is not permissible for the husband to subject his wife to a host of Shar’i violations for the sake of undertaking a journey to teach other ladies in a different town/city/village.

Then, it is manifest ignorance to take droves of women from one town to another town to learn basic masaa-il pertaining to Imaan, Tahaarat and Salaat. In fact, almost **ALL** the women who participate in makshoofaat jamaat are aware of all the *Dhuroori (necessary/incumbent)* masaa-il for their daily acts of

ibaadat, etc. If they are so stupid and unfortunate that they are ignorant of the basic masaa-il, then the Tabligh Jamaat who very ostentatiously portrays great concern for the Ummah, should make arrangements for a knowledgeable lady to teach the jaahilah females the necessary masaa-il in their home environment. They should not be lured to go on journeys.

The reality is that the Mufti Sahib is trying to pull wool over the eyes of the ignorant and unwary public with his specious and fallacious arguments. The objective of the Tabligh Jamaat is more with its specific methodology than to impart the knowledge of the masaa-il. Their objective demands globe-trotting as a waajib obligation. In fact they believe it to be *Fardh-e-Ayn*. The more the merrier. They just want to take out droves on journeys to display how widely they have ramified and how many lands they have travelled to. Their aim is portrayal of their travelling tablighi exploits. If they are genuinely concerned about the ignorance in the ranks of the females, then instead of taking groups of women on journeys, wasting huge sums of money and in the process damaging their *haya*, and perpetrating many violations of the Shariah, they should arrange for just one lady to teach in each neighbourhood in an unostentatious manner.

There is nothing, absolutely nothing, in the abovementioned Fiqhi text which condones makshoofaat jamaat.

## **Second daleel**

The Mufti Sahib says: “Muhaqqiq Ibnul Humaam states in *Fathul Qadeer*: “Where we have permitted for a woman emergence (from her home), it will only be permissible on condition that she does not adorn herself, and that her form (beauty) is changed (made to look shabby) so that males are not attracted to look at her nor incline to her, for Allah Ta’ala

says: “*And do not make a display (of yourselves) like the exhibition of Jahiliyyah of former times.*”

The Mufti Sahib has only cited this passage without commenting. This statement merely supports the case of his adversaries. The makshoofaat jamaat ladies never emerge in the state of *taghyeer-e-hai'ah*. They do not travel with shabby and ugly burqahs. Never will they agree to emerge with shabby dress and change themselves to appear like old, ‘smelly’ (*tafilaat*) hags. Anyone who claims that they do, is a confounded LIAR. They still emerge attractively and the Hadith stating that a woman from the front and the back is in the form of shaitaan, fully applies here as well.

Furthermore, shabby dress is not the only requisite for permission. The Mufti Sahib and all Tablighi molvis are silent about the many other Shari’ violations committed when the women go on journeys. When the Sahaabah had discerned fitnah in the women during their noble and pious era, constraining them to prohibit women from the Musaajid, how can one be so stupid to maintain that there is no fitnah in this immoral age of fitnah and fasaad, hence it is permissible for women to undertake journeys to embark on tabligh which is not incumbent on them –i.e. tabligh in other towns and communities?

The Mufti Sahib, himself enumerates in his kitaab 12 conditions for the permissibility of women emerging. Enumerating these conditions, he says:

- (1) The permission of the chief of the house (husband/father/brother).
- (2) Adherence to purdah according to the Shariah.

**SABEELUL MUNKARAAT FI  
JAMAA-AATIL MUTAKASH-SHIFAAT**

- (3) To abstain from customary adornment. (*Abstention from all sorts of adornment is haraam outside the home, not only 'customary', whatever that may mean. – Mujlisul Ulama*)
- (4) Not to apply perfume while walking on the road. (*Perfume is haraam even at home when about to emerge out of the home. Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) described a woman who applies perfume when she is about to leave the home and walk in the public, as an 'adulteress' – Mujlisul Ulama* )
- (5) There should be no intermingling of men and women.
- (6) There should be Purdah arrangement at the place where the women will be staying.
- (7) The journey should be with a Shar'i mahram.
- (8) Absence of fitnah.
- (9) To arrange to learn and teach the Deen and to have its concern.
- (10) The menfolk of the house where the women will be staying should stay with the men of the Jamaat in the Musjid.

If the above mentioned conditions cannot be fulfilled, then women should not emerge.

During the very first era of Islam, the Sahaabah had decided that these conditions cannot be fulfilled, even in that noblest of all ages, hence they enacted the prohibition and prevented women from attending the Musjid. Either one chooses deliberate blindness and denies the existence of fitnah and fasaad of the current immoral age, or one must indeed be extremely dense in the brains to fail to see and understand the existence of fitnah and fasaad.

Just the other day, very recently, a burqah-clad female standing at a bus stop in Leeds, in the U.K., was dragged by a group of kuffaar louts to a nearby bush, savagely raped and brutally assaulted. The whole incident was caught on cctv, parts of

which was broadcast on television news and channels. The sisters head was smashed with a brick around 20 times and she was left to die Who bears the primary blame for the pillaging and plundering of the honour and body of this burqah-clad Muslim woman? The vile girls madrasahs, the devil , crank ‘sheikhs’ of fake tasawwuf and the mufti maajins of the Tabligh Jamaat who have granted women a blanket licence to roam the street without a mahram as long as it is not beyond 48 miles. Those supposed worldly ‘scholars’ who have destroyed the *haya* of women, and who have brainwashed the women of deficient intelligence to believe that a burqah is the be-all of Hijab, are responsible for what had happened to the burqah-clad lady. The whole lot of these moron ‘scholars’ and crank ‘sheikhs’ of fake tasawwuf, and the stupid molvis of girls’ madrasahs must acknowledge responsibility for the pillaging and plundering of the honour of the Muslim woman.

It is too stupid to believe that the conditions enumerated by the Mufti Sahib are observed by women and do exist when they emerge into the public. No matter what the Mufti Sahib tries to explain, the reality is that women of makshoofaat jamaat are generally *be-baak*, *be-sharam* (*audacious and shameless*). The Mufti Sahib is speaking about theory whilst the facts of the ground are in abnegation of the theory he hallucinates.

Some months ago when we went to our Musjid in Malabar, Port Elizabeth for Asr Salaat, we were surprised to find almost all the parking bays taken. This was abnormal. It crossed our mind that we must have arrived late, hence all the cars. However, our surprise was soon transformed into disgust. We parked on the street. As we walked to the Musjid, the conundrum of the cars was solved. From the house a few metres from the Musjid, emerged some burqah-clad women who leisurely strolled to the parking bays. They slipped into the driving seats of the cars and sped off shamelessly. They had absolutely no shame and

**SABEELUL MUNKARAAT FI  
JAMAA-AATIL MUTAKASH-SHIFAAT**

no inhibition for the men who were walking past them to get to the Musjid. They had no idea of the distress they had caused the musallis by having usurped the parking bays in their haraam manner and the embarrassment they had caused.

These women were conducting a makshoofaat jamaat programme in the house. When this same shaitaaniyat occurred the second time, we remonstrated with the owner of the house about the shamelessness of the Tabligh Jamaat's women, and insisted that they conduct their programmes at a house far from the Musjid. Fortunately, he complied and saved us the torture of crossing paths with shameless makshoofaat jamaat women outside the Musjid.

Whilst we had addressed the problem, the same fitnah prevails on a bigger scale in numerous places, and it is condoned, especially where the Imaam of the Musjid happens to be a Tablighi or a miscreant liberal who are eager to have the womenfolk in close proximity.

The fitnah commences the very moment the women emerge from their home to go on a makshufaat jamaat travel excursion. They are never dressed in the type of large shabby jilbaab described in the Hadith. There is no one to enforce the rules and to ensure that they do not apply perfume. Then they have to go by vehicle, whether it be public transport or private transport. The driver is a ghair mahram. They will be seated with him.

If the journey is planned for another country, the fitnah multiplies manifold. They have to take haraam photos for a *mubah* exercise. They have to go into the public – into the lewd market places to get their photos taken. They have to mingle with all and sundry in the streets. Then they have to visit the fussaag and kuffaar at the various embassies to apply

**SABEELUL MUNKARAAT FI  
JAMAA-AATIL MUTAKASH-SHIFAAT**

for visas. Then comes the great calamity of the airports where they are constrained to mix freely with fussaag, fujjaar and kuffaar males and kuffaar women. They have to stand in long queues at the immigration and customs check counters; interact with male officials; sit in transit lounges with all and sundry; listen to the music and watch the television. In the transit lounge, if any of these burqah-clad ladies wishes to answer the call of nature, she must run the gauntlet of males all over the show.

Inside the plane, the calamities are repeated. There is no hijab in the plane, and no Salaat facilities. Salaat has to be performed haphazardly. We have seen in planes, the ladies and the men standing in long queues, especially in the morning, lining up to enter the toilet. It is indeed a shameless scenario. Men and women standing close together. A man stands at the toilet's door, and your wife, O Tablighi Brother, opens the door to emerge from the toilet with the faasiq/kaafir looking her in the face and brushing past her. This is the type of 'hijab' which is tolerable to the makshoofaat jamaat ladies and the founders and organizers of the makshoofaat jamaat. They must hang their heads in shame. They are a *be-ghairat* lot of *dayyooth* men, lacking in honour, hence all these haraam indignities inflicted on their womenfolk are tolerable to them.

Then, when they land, the same process described above is re-enacted. In short, they indulge in sin from the time they leave home until the time they return back into the sanctuary of the home. Their 'tabligh' activities in these conditions do not atone for their acts of flagrant transgression which are the consequences of having violated Allah's Command: "*And, remain resolutely (firmly/glued) in your homes.....*"

Another example of the immoral consequences of makshoofaat jamaat ladies travelling on tabligh excursions, is a group of

**SABEELUL MUNKARAAT FI  
JAMAA-AATIL MUTAKASH-SHIFAAT**

three couples – three husband and wives who travelled for tabligh activity. They travelled by train. A sleeper compartment for six was booked for this shameless group. The three women slept in the three bunks on one side, while facing them half a metre away on the other side, were the three men in their sleeping bunks. Just imagine this immoral scenario. Three women and three men sleeping together at such close quarters that each one can hear the other breathing. And, what happens during the night when a female wants to answer the call of nature. She has to clamber down from the top bunk with the men observing her from all angles – shaitaan in front and shaitaan at the back according to the Hadith.

There is no hijab at the train toilets. All Toms, Dicks and Harrys go to the same toilet and bump into the burqah lady in the extremely narrow train foyers. And if the burqah aunt is a fat lady, physical brushing against the kaafir man in the foyer is incumbent. It is just one hell of immorality, throughout the journey. The train stations are real portions of Jahannam. But the Mufti Sahib has chosen to remain deliberately blind to all the fitnah and fasaad which engulf the womenfolk on the journey.

What has happened to the *Aql* of the Mufti Sahib and the Ulama of the Tablighi Jamaat? Has the *Aql* become so calcified that they are unable to comprehend the rationale in the ban which the Sahaabah had placed on women during *Khairul Quroon* to prevent them from attending the Musjid? Is this action of the Sahaabah driven for these Muftis and Molvis of today? They speak much of the Sahaabah, but totally ignore this exceptionally important Law of Prohibition enacted by Hadhrat Umar (radhiyallahu anhu) and upheld by all the Sahaabah and the Fuqaha of the Ummah in every age.



The general law may not be cancelled or ignored on the basis of some exceptions such as women having accompanied their husbands in Jihad. While the Mufti Sahib cites the exceptions, he conveniently ignores what Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) said and ruled about women and Jihad. Then he astoundingly ignores all the *Nusoos* pertaining to Hijaab, the first stage being *Hijaab fil buyoot* (*Hijab by remaining inside the homes.*).

The Mufti Sahib has a penchant for selective citation of the views of the Fuqaha and for ignoring the context and circumstances to which the views are applicable. Insha-Allah, this issue will be elaborated later in this discussion.

### **Third daleel**

The Mufti Sahib quoting, says: “And, if permission is granted for her to emerge (to go) to a gathering of wa’z (lecture/bayaan) which is devoid of bid’ah, then there is nothing wrong with it.”

Although the Mufti Sahib quoted the Arabic text from Fataawa Hindiyyah, he neither translated the Arabic text nor ventured any comment. What type of atrocious ‘daleel’ is this to cite in support of makshoofaat jamaat? The permission for women to attend gatherings of Ilm existed in an era free of fitnah. But that era does not exist today. The directive in this regard has to be incumbently taken from the Sahaabah who had prohibited women even during the noblest of ages.

The factor of ‘bid’ah’ mentioned in Fataawa Hindiyyah embraces all elements of evil. The fitnah of immorality which is the primary factor of prohibition comes within the scope of the term. Only one who denies the reality of the fitnah of this age or one intensely dim and dense in the mind can claim that the fitnah which constrained the Sahaabah to ban women from the Musaajid, and also the Fuqaha of all Math-habs to

categorically proclaim the prohibition, be it for Salaat or Ilmi gatherings, no longer exists today.

In view of the large scale fitnah and fasaad of the age, it is haraam for a husband to permit his wife to go on makshoofaat jamaat excursions and also to the Musaaqid to listen to lectures of wayward and miscreant molvis who are competing with the Tabligh Jamaat for capturing the attention of the females.

### **Fourth daleel**

The Mufti Sahib, says: “ Consider the text of Imaam Fakhruddin Qaadhi Khaan: *‘It is permissible for the husband to permit her to emerge, and he will not be sinful by granting permission. Among this, is emergence for visiting her parents....Similar is it if she gives ghusl to the dead (women), and to attend gatherings of Ilm.’*” Then the Mufti Sahib quotes the very same ‘daleel’ mentioned in his first argument (First Daleel) which has already been answered.

The statement from Qaadhi Khaan does not support makshoofaat jamaat. It does not at all relate to women in droves emerging from their homes and issuing forth into the world of fitnah and fasaad, with almost all the conditions for the initial permissibility missing. Qaadhi Khaan does not say that making *tashkeel* to lure women out of the homes is permissible. Never had there existed any women’s movement in Islamic history. The mas’alah stated in Qaadhi Khaan applies to individual women emerging from the home for reasons permitted by the Shariah.

There is no dispute regarding the permissibility of a woman going to give ghusl to a deceased woman or a midwife or a woman who visits her parents or to attend to any valid need permitted by the Shariah. But attending the Musjid and gatherings of knowledge is not among the incumbent needs of

women. Going on journey in groups for tabligh is abhorrent in terms of the Shariah. Just keep in mind the ban enacted by the Sahaabah, and the haze which shaitaan churns up in the mind will dissipate. It is this shaitaani haze which blurs the intellectual vision of molvis and muftis who see goodness in female emergence, expression and participation in activities in the public arena. The ‘permission’ in Qaadhi Khaan presented as ‘proof’ for makshoofaat jamaat is putrid and utterly baseless.

### **Fifth daleel**

The Mufti Sahib citing another ‘daleel’ from his armoury of spurious ‘dalaa-il’ states:

“Allaamah Aini (rahmatullah alayh) writes in *Umdatul Qaari* that there is permission for women to emerge from the home for their needs on condition that they fully observe Purdah.” Then presenting the translation of Allaamah Aini’s statement, the Mufti Sahib writes:

“Allaamah Aini says that besides the Azwaaj-e-Mutahharaat, there is no difference of opinion regarding the emergence of other women for their lawful matters at the time of need. Yes, it is necessary to observe the following conditions:

- (1) Dishevelled appearance.
- (2) Simple and coarse garments
- (3) Not being perfumed and fragrant
- (4) All parts of the body to be fully covered
- (5) Not exhibiting any beauty
- (6) Not raising her voice.”

Emergence of women for their needs has never been contested by anyone. The Mufti Sahib persistently and monotonously barks up the wrong tree. Women coming out of their homes, individually, not on an organized basis in groups, for attending to needs permitted by the Shariah is unlike makshoofaat jamaat. Women undertaking journies for non-essential purposes and for tabligh which the Shariah does not impose on them cannot

be analogized on the basis of individual women allowed to attend to their needs in the town where they live. There is no relationship between the two acts.

Furthermore, the abovementioned conditions enumerated by the Mufti Sahib applies to even women who have to come out of the house to attend to needs in the town of their residence. However, these stringent conditions are not observed by women nowadays, and there is greater violation of these conditions on a journey. In this age women will not agree to emerge with old, shabby and dirty garments. Their ‘burqaahs’ too are mostly stylish abayas which are a far cry from the jilbaab ordained by the Shariah. They are addicted to a variety of perfumes, sprays, deodorants, etc. These substances are compulsorily applied just prior to leaving the home precincts.

The translation of condition No.3 is not a faithful rendition. The Mufti Sahib, possibly for fear of criticism from the modernist juhhaal, has not correctly translated condition No.3. This condition is stated by Allaamah Aini as: *‘tafilatur riyaah’* which means the *emission of a bad odour – smelly – letting off a pungent/noxious odour like a skunk*. For fear of modernist criticism, the Mufti Sahib resorted to fanciful and whimsical interpretation, hence he translates the term as, *“Not being perfumed and fragrant.”* This is not the correct translation. The lady when emerging should be ‘smelly’, emitting a noxious odour which acts as a repellent for males. How she will accomplish this feat, is not the subject of our discussion.

Since the Mufti Sahib selected to interpret and not translate the statement regarding the emission of a bad, repelling odour, he should not have cited Allaamah Aini’s statement. There is no woman today who will be amenable to the idea of emerging in a smelly state, emitting a repellent to drive away the fussaaq, fujjaar and kuffaar. There is not a shred of support for

makshoofaat jamaat in Allaamah Aini's statement. It should also be understood that the 'smelly' issue is not Allaamah Aini's personal opinion. It is an explicit command of Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) on which there exists *Ijma'* of all authorities of all Math-habs.

Regurgitating the same issue stated above, the Mufti Sahib, citing Ibn Battaal, says:

"Ibn Battaal says elsewhere: *"In this Hadith is proof that women may emerge for all needs which are permissible for them such as visiting parents, close relatives and for other needs."*

There is nothing new in this statement. We have explained it repeatedly, and have disposed of the spurious 'daleel' which the Mufti Sahib abortively attempts to construct on its basis. This statement too has no bearing on makshoofaat jamaat undertaking journies for tabligh to other communities in distant places, which is not among their needs.

### **Sixth daleel**

The Mufti Sahib says: "In *Ahkaamul Qur'aan* which was prepared under the supervision of Hadhrat Maulana Ashraf Ali Thanvi (rahmatullah alayh), Maulana Zafar Ahmad Uthmaani (rahmatullah alayh) says: "Tabligh is incumbent and necessary also on women as it is on men because in regard to the laws of the Deen, women are the equals of men except if there is a *Daleel Mukhassis*. There is no such *Daleel Mukhassis* relative to *da'wat and tabligh*. Therefore women too should engage in *da'wat* among themselves. However, because of the corruption of the times, they should not give *da'wat* to men."

Quoting from *Ahkaamul Qur'aan*, the Mufti Sahib translates the relevant passage as follows:

"The author of *Ar-Roo'h* said: 'It is also deducted from this aayat that it is not Waajib for the mastooraat to come out for

tabligh and ilm because women are not included in the address (directed to) men. But the Saheeh (correct version) is that women regarding the Ahkaam are the equals of men and they compare with them. Whatever is incumbent on men is also Waajib and incumbent on women except if there is some daleel for excluding (them), and here it (such an excluding daleel) is missing. Thus, it is Waajib for women to engage in tabligh among themselves to one another.

“Yes, it is appropriate to say that it is not incumbent on women to engage in ta’leem and tabligh for men ***because women have been commanded to remain within the homes and to observe purdah for men.*** (Emphasis ours –Mujlisul Ulama). Hence, this is something which is understandable. It is also confirmed that Hadhrat Aishah and others among the Azwaaj-e-Muttahhaaraat used to give *dars* of Hadith to men from behind a screen. ***If it was not for the corruption of the times and the inclination of people towards mischief, and if people did not hasten to fitnah and fasaad,*** we would say that just like men, tableegh and proclaiming knowledge are Waajib and incumbent on women also. ***But, we lay our complaint to Allah Ta’ala. The condition of the people has become extremely corrupt. They are involved in futilities and evils, hence have become oblivious (ghaafil) and fallen into deception. Knowledge is in reality by Allah Azza Shaanuhu.”*** --Our emphasis – *Mujlisul Ulama (End of the Mufti’s citation)*

This entire *ibaaarat (text)* from *Ahkaamul Qur’aan* negates and demolishes the case which the Mufti Sahib has attempted to construct for the permissibility of makshoofaat jamaat. There is not a single statement in this *ibaaarat* to support makshoofaat jamaat. Above we have mentioned the 10 conditions which the Mufti Sahib had presented for the permissibility of women emerging, and also the conditions stated by Allaamah Aini. Among the imperative conditions for permissibility to emerge

is safety from fitnah and fasaad. It should not be a time of corruption. Although the Sahaabah had decided this issue fourteen centuries ago by banning the women from the Musjid on the basis of fitnah, this fact is repeated and emphasized by Mufti Zafar Ahmad Uthmaani in *Ahkaamul Qur'aan*, and the Mufti Sahib of the Tabligh Jamaat has not applied his mind in reproducing it here.

The mufti Sahib, while quoting from *Ahkaamul Qur'aan*, has not reflected, and the reason for this is that his attitude in his argumentation on the makshoofaat jamaat issue is intransigently eristic. That is, he is not interested in the truth or in the quest for the Haqq on this issue. He is bent on achieving victory over the adversary to prove the hallucinated permissibility for makshoofaat jamaat by hook or by crook. We shall now enumerate the facts in the above *Ibaarat* which refute the Mufti Sahib's case.

**First:** There is nothing in the text to support women's emergence for going on tabligh journeys. The emergence refers to emergence in their places of residence, not for journeys.

**Second:** The tabligh which women have to engage in is within their homes, hence it is stated explicitly:

***because women have been commanded to remain within the homes and to observe purdah for men.*** Mufti Zafar Ahmad Uthmaani mentions very clearly that the tabligh of women among themselves should be in their home. This fact decisively negates the tabligh-journeys undertaken by makshoofaat jamaat.

**Third:** The text mentions a valid *Istidlaal*, viz., that tabligh is not Waajib on women. If the Waajib stance is 'saheeh' according to some Ulama, the 'not Waajib' view is saheeh according to other Ulama. Regardless of this difference, in terms of both views, the issue does not concern women on journeys for tabligh.

**Fourth:** The *dars* conducted by the Azwaaj-e-Mutahharaat was within their homes from behind a screen. They did not undertake journeys nor did they operate conventional and systematically operated madrasahs. There is absolutely no relationship between the ta'leem (not da'wat) of the Holy Wives inside their homes, and the da'wat and tabligh journeys organized by makshoofaat jamaat.

**Fifth:** The fitnah and fasaad of the times are explicitly stated in *Ahkaamul Qur'aan*. Thus, Mufti Zafar Ahmad Uthmaani states: *"If it was not for the corruption of the times and the inclination of people towards mischief, and if people did not hasten to fitnah and fasaad,..... The condition of the people has become extremely corrupt. They are involved in futilities and evils, hence have become oblivious (ghaafil) and fallen into deception. Knowledge is in reality by Allah Azza Shaanuhu."* These statements emphatically negate the permissibility stated by the Tablighi Mufti – a permissibility to emerge in town on the basis of his enumeration of the ten conditions, and that stated by Allaamah Aini in his enumeration.

Above all, Mufti Zafar Ahmad Uthmaani did not touch on the topic of makshoofaat jamaat which did not even exist in his time. He was discussing women's tabligh *per se*. The mention of Hadhrat Maulana Ashraf Ali Thanvi's name in this context is plain chicanery. His very strict views regarding Hijaab are well-known. He was in fact opposed to the establishment of even girls' madrasahs.

On the basis of the view that Ta'leem is Waajib on women, it applies within the home environment, not journeys. Regarding the *Mukhassis* (the factor excluding some from a command), the Shariah itself is the *Mukhassis*. While it allows males to go on Jihad and Tabligh journeys regardless of the fitnah and fasaad of the times, it (the Shariah) prohibits female emergence even



in their home towns during the times of corruption, hence it is not permissible for them to attend the Musjid next to their homes.

The Qur'aanic Aayat: “*And remain glued in your homes...*” is a *Mukhassis*. The era of fitnah is a *Mukhassis*. The fitnah created by women themselves is a *Mukhassis*. The prohibition imposed on them by the Sahaabah is a *Mukhassis*. The example of the Azwaaj-e-Mutahharaat teaching from within their homes is a *Mukhassis* to exclude women from the permissibility of undertaking journeys for tabligh. Woman's *takhleeq* (natural disposition) created for her by Allah Ta'ala is a *Mukhassis*. Rasulullah's statement: “*Women is Aurah*” is a *Mukhassis*. Her duties to her husband and children are a *Mukhassis*. There are many factors which exclude women from undertaking journeys of tabligh. That is: All these *Mukhassisaat* effectively prevent women from emerging from the home to go on tabligh excursions to other towns and countries.

The *Wujoob* of Tabligh on women is applicable to them within their homes and to their flock (children and husband), and to those close relatives and friends with whom they come into contact within the course of their daily activities. And, the very first *Wujoob* in their field of tabligh when they meet other women is to proffer naseehat to abstain from *gheebat*, for this vice is their speciality.

### **Seventh daleel**

In his seventh ‘daleel’, the Mufti Sahib says: “Just as it is incumbent on a man to acquire sufficient knowledge, so too is it incumbent on a woman.” The Mufti Sahib has indeed wasted ink, paper and time with this baseless ‘daleel’. In the two pages he wrote on this topic, he mentioned only two facts: (1) Just as adequate knowledge is incumbent on a male, so too is it incumbent on a female. (2) The term *Muslimah* does not appear

**SABEELUL MUNKARAAT FI  
JAMAA-AATIL MUTAKASH-SHIFAAT**

in the Hadith, nevertheless, woman comes within the purview of the term *Muslim* in the Hadith which states: “*The quest of knowledge is compulsory on every Muslim.*” He mentions not a word of support for makshoofaat jamaat in his seventh ‘daleel’.

It was never contended that necessary Deeni Knowledge is not incumbent on women. The discussion is not about Knowledge for women. The subject in dispute is makshoofaat jamaat, and the Hadith does not refer remotely to women undertaking journeys to teach other women in other countries and towns.

There is adequate scope within the home and neighbourhood environment for women to learn the *Dhuroori (Necessary) Masaa-il* for their daily needs. In addition to ladies teaching, an abundant of literature written in simple language, and many reliable kitaabs, e.g. Beheshti Zewer, Ta’leemuddeen, Ta’leemul Islam, Kitaabul Imaan, Kitaabut Tahaarat, Kitaabus Salaat, Kitaabus Saum, etc., in English and other languages are easily available. Furthermore, the best method is for the menfolk of the house to teach their female subordinates. Just as the Tabligh Jamaat exhorts its male members to go out into the world for tableegh to others, so too, or to an even greater degree, should it exhort the menfolk to engage in tabligh and ta’leem of their womenfolk at home. While most men of the Tabligh Jamaat are eager to travel and give da’wat to others, they have no patience with their wives and children, thus neglecting them. Yet the Qur’aan commands: “*O People of Imaan! Save yourselves and your families from the Fire....*”

At this juncture – at the end of his seventh spurious Fiqhi ‘daleel’, the Mufti Sahib turns to the statements of Ulama of recent times.

## **THE STATEMENTS OF THE ULAMA**

Let us now examine the statements of the Ulama cited by the Tablighi Mufti Sahib. The Mufti Sahib quotes several contemporary Ulama who have permitted women's participation in makshoofaat jamaat. However, their fataawa are ambiguous, fork-tongued, personal opinion, and in denial of the reality on the ground.

### **Mufti Mahmoodul Hasan's Fatwa**

Mufti Mahmoodul Hasan's fatwa consists of two parts. The first part is a valid Shar'i fatwa while the second part is pure personal opinion unbacked by even a single Shar'i basis.

#### **Part One of his fatwa**

In part one of the fatwa Mufti Mahmoodul Hasan states: "The best is for a woman to remain within her home. If she is in need of Deeni masaa-il, she should learn these from her husband, father, brother, etc (i.e. mahram males or females). If she can read, she should consult the kitaabs. *(Nowadays, all these facilities are available abundantly – Mujlisul Ulama)*. If books are not available or if she does not understand the books, then her husband, father, etc. should consult with an Aalim and then inform her.

She herself should not go outside nor even write to anyone a letter (even regarding masaa-il) when there is the fear of fitnah." *(The fear of fitnah in emergence is a certitude nowadays, but Hadhrat Mufti Sahib prohibits even the pursuit of knowledge by letter. – Mujlisul Ulama)*

The above is the actual and true naseehat for women. This part of the fatwa is structured on sound Qur'aanic and Hadith proofs, and this has been the Fatwa since the time of the Sahaabah, and

it is the Fatwa which all the Fuqaha of all the Math-habs upheld throughout the history of Islam. However, after having presented this valid Shar'i Fatwa and Naseehat, Mufti Mahmoodul Hasan, lapses into ambiguity with spurious arguments. He has vacillated between two extremes. In his genuine Fatwa he prohibits even letter-writing. A woman may not even write to an Aalim regarding Deeni masaa-il.

From this valid 'extreme' which in fact is the sound Shar'i stance, he veers into the errant extreme of liberalism which he structures on his personal opinion bereft of Shar'i dalaa-il.

### **Part two of his 'fatwa', i.e. personal opinion**

Thus he says:

"But, lack of Deen and lack of knowledge is rampant among Muslims. Even among thousands perhaps only one or two persons may be found who are grounded in Ilm and Amal. Or who are concerned with Ilm and Amal. Therefore there is a need for universal (aam) dissemination of knowledge. There should also be enthusiasm to learn the Deen. Further, the Deen is not confined to a few masaa-il.

"Participation in Ijtimas (of the Tablighi Jamaat) enhances Deeni enthusiasm, the effect of which benefits others. It also creates the concern for improving the home environment., and increases knowledge. Imaan is strengthened. Listening to the way of life of Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) creates a zeal in the heart for reformation.

"Keeping in mind these benefits, if they (women) go with purdah and if there is no fitnah, then without valid reason they should not be prevented from participation. On the contrary, the husband or some mahram should accompany the woman."  
*(End of Mufti Mahmoodul Hasan's fatwa)*

**SABEELUL MUNKARAAT FI  
JAMAA-AATIL MUTAKASH-SHIFAAT**

This advice of Mufti Mahmoodul Hasan is in direct contradiction of the reality of the Shariah which he mentioned in the beginning of his Fatwa (as above). The benefits which he has mentioned are also spurious, just as spurious as his advice regarding participation. If Mufti Mahmoodul Hasan Sahib had reflected and if he had kept in mind the Ban enacted by the Sahaabah and the rationale for the Ban, he would not have acquitted himself with such ambiguity.

The conditions for permissibility of women emerging are completely missing. Fitnah and fasaad are rife outside. It is therefore plain hallucinating to believe that in today's evil age there is no fitnah outside, hence women are free to globe-trot.

The claim that in thousands only one or two men are aware of the necessary Deeni masaa-il is baseless in our setting. Yes, it exists in regions where jahl reign supreme despite huge Darul Uloom being a few hours away from the regions of Jahaalat such as in India and Pakistan. While the Ulama there encourage even women to globe-trot for tabligh, they make no attempt to go to the remote villages just a couple of hours from cities like Karachi where there is a glut of Darul Uloom all teaching Ilm for the sake of the dunya, not for the Aakhirat, hence they totally neglect the Waajib Tabligh which they are supposed to discharge in places such as Baluchistan, Thar Desert, Sind and elsewhere which are headquarters of Ignorance. But, they find it proper to exhort women to get out from their homes and undertake journeys.

They have their priorities all convoluted and they do not understand that the country is ablaze because of the corruption of the Ulama and the Deeni institutions such as the khaanqahs and Tabligh Jamaat of this day.

We are under no Shar'i obligation to accept and submit to the personal opinion of any Aalim or Buzrug or Hadhrat regardless of his seniority and Knowledge. The standard is always the Shariah. The errors of the Ulama are cited as 'daleel' by zindeeqs and men who are deficient in the grasp of Ilm. Allaamah Sha'raani (rahmatullah alayh) of the 9<sup>th</sup> Islamic century said: *"Whoever clings to the errors of the Ulama (for daleel), verily, he has made his exit from Islam."*

The scenario painted by Mufti Mahmoodul Hasan Sahib does not apply in the South African context. It does not apply to Muslim women in western countries. In these countries, women have more than adequate secular knowledge. They read and are well-read. Deeni kitaabs in English are plentifully available. There is no dearth of contact with English-speaking Ulama with whom they do communicate by letter. The e-mail era has immensely simplified the process for acquiring Knowledge of the Deen. These women, in large numbers – in droves – drive vehicles – a haraam practice which the crank sheikhs of fake tasawwuf, the crank molvis of the ulama-e-soo' category and the ulama of the Tabligh Jamaat not only condone, but encourage. Consequently, they simply slip in behind the wheel, regardless of the disapproval of the husband, and speed off to the bayaan or thikr session of their quack 'sheikhs' or to the Tablighi Jamaat programme.

We are aware of the complaints of the husbands. So, the rosy picture painted by the Tablighi Jamaat Muftis regarding the imagined benefits of female participation and undertaking journeys is a lot of hogwash hallucinated to soothe their conscience which is rudely jarred by the Dalaa-il of Prohibition which stare them starkly in the face.

With all their ballyhoo of imagined 'dalaa-il' which are pure personal opinion unsubstantiated by Shar'i evidence, the

honourable Muftis struggle to overwhelm their conscience which must most certainly be sending haemorrhaging shock-waves through their hearts for overriding the fourteen century BAN and IJMA' enacted by the Sahaabah during the noblest of Islamic Ages.

Part two of Mufti Mahmoodul Hasan's statement is devoid of Shar'i substance, hence dismissed.

### **Fatwa of Mufti Fareed of Darul Uloom Haqqaaniyah**

His fatwa too consists of two parts as explained above. In the first part he states:

*“Is it permissible for women to emerge (and participate) in Tabligh Jamaat? The Ulama have differed in this issue. Some say that it is not permissible just as it is not permissible for them to emerge for attending the Musaaqid whether the husband permits or not. This (prohibition) is because they do not observe the conditions such as abstention from perfume, garments of adornment, abstention from mixing with males when entering and emerging (from the Musjid), etc. And, this is quite clear. **And on this view is the Fatwa.**”*

The second part of his fatwa contains imaginary benefits similar to the first one mentioned above. The worst imagination is the hallucination that the *sharaa-it (conditions)* for permissibility which had existed only during the brief era of Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) are to be found today, hence the 'permissibility' has been re-introduced in abrogation of the 14 Century BAN enacted by the Ijma' of the Sahaabah. While this attitude is expected of the zindeeq modernists, it is totally unacceptable from senior Ulama.

No one should be awed and buffeted into acceptance of the personal opinions of the Ulama – opinions which are starkly in

conflict with the Shariah, for the Qur'aan Majeed reprimanding Bani Israaeel for their Hadhrat-Worship, says:

*“They (the Bani Israaeel Muslim Ummah of the time) take their scholars and their saints as arbaab (gods) besides Allah, (and they take also as their god) Maseeh the son of Maryam.”*

We are not supposed to be of this ilk. It is stupid and contumacy to believe that this age of fitnah and fasaad in proximity with Qiyaamah is holier than the age of the Sahaabah and the Taabi-een. With this, the second part of Mufti Fareed's fatwa is also dismissed as baseless.

In another fatwa of Mufti Muhammad Fareed, it appears as follows:

**“Q.** What do the Muftis of the Shariah say in terms of the Shariah regarding the emergence of women from their homes for tableegh? Is it permissible or not?

**A.** In this age, the reformatory process (Islaahi Nizaam) in the homes of the masses, in fact even the homes of the Khawaas (Ulama) is tantamount to non-existence. Therefore, in this age, for the purpose of reformation and acquiring knowledge if women emerge whilst observing the conditions and the rules, it will be a recommended act.”

The Hadith of Imaam Bukhaari in his Saheeh indicates this”

The Hadith in Bukhaari Shareef does not remotely refer to women going out of the homes and undertaking journeys for tabligh. The ladies had requested Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) to appoint a day for them when they could listen to naseehat from him. Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) instructed them to be at a certain house on a certain day. He went on that day to the house and offered the womenfolk naseehat.



Far from having a relationship with women undertaking journeys and becoming muballighaat (preachers) in other cities and countries, they were ordered to gather at a home in their immediate neighbourhood. Then Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) went to the house and delivered a bayaan. This is the Sunnah method of ta'leem for females. An elderly Aalim, not one of those facebook, moron faasiq molvis who deliver talks to impress and attract the women, should give bayaans to the womenfolk of the neighbourhood. He should be behind a screen, and his wife or a mahram lady should also be with him to act as a guard against nafsaaniyat and shaitaaniyat. The Sunnah is not to lure the women out from the homes and send them on tabligh hikes to other cities and countries.

Mufti Fareed Muhammad has erred conspicuously by citing a totally unrelated Hadith as his support for makshoofaat jamaat.

### **Mufti Taqi Uthmaani**

The following is the fatwa of of Mufti Taqi Uthmaani presented by the Mufti Sahib of the Tabligh Jamaat:

“The actual/original order for women is to remain in their homes. They should not venture out of their homes without dire need because in the emergence of women is the fear of fitnah. Hence, the noble Fuqaha have prohibited women from emerging from their homes without need. However, for the sake of necessities of the Deen, e.g. to learn the masaa-il Salaat, Saum, etc. they may emerge .

**But there is no need whatsoever for women to emerge outside for the purpose of tabligh.** Since this is the age of fitnah with irreligiosity increasing, especially among women this has increased much, there is scope for them to occasionally participate in tabligh if they observe the following conditions:

- The permission of the husband or the head of the house.

**SABEELUL MUNKARAAT FI  
JAMAA-AATIL MUTAKASH-SHIFAAT**

- The husband/mahram should accompany her.
- Complete Shar'i purdah.
- Emerging without adornment and perfume.
- Complete purdah arrangement at the house where the women will be staying without any male interference.
- During ta'leem the voice of the woman should not be heard by ghair mahrams.
- The rights of their children and relatives should not be violated.
- Tabligh in general should not be proclaimed Fardh on women.
- Women who remain at home (i.e. they do not participate in makshoofaat jamaat activities- *Mujlisul Ulama of S.A*) should not be despised nor regarded to be inferior (in any way).
- They should not mention unsubstantiated issues during ta'leem."

*(End of Mufti Taqi's fatwa)*

The contradiction in Mufti Taqi's fatwa is conspicuous. In the first part he states the stance of the Shariah, and he emphatically negates emergence of women for tabligh, hence he states:

**"But there is no need whatsoever for women to emerge outside for the purpose of tabligh."**

Despite Mufti Taqi Sahib being a liberal, he has adopted a very cautious stance regarding the delicate issue of women emerging in droves from their homes. In fact he has added some conditions which even the Fuqaha have not stipulated. What clinches the issue and confirms the impermissibility is the fact that these conditions are not being observed, and that this is the age of the worst fitnah in history. The element of fitnah is inescapable regardless of what today's muftis say and what argument they present in the abortive bid to justify

makshoofaat jamaat. Ending off his fatwa, Mufti Taqi Uthmaani says:

**“If the women do not observe these conditions, then it will not be permissible for them to go for even tabligh.”**

Fourteen centuries ago, the Sahaabah had decided that these conditions cannot be and will not be observed, hence they enacted the BAN on the emergence of women for even Salaat in the Musjid. What would be the attitude of the Sahaabah if they had seen the fitnah of this age, and the corruption which occurs along journeys, and the lewd state of the women – of even the so-called burqah women?

Remember that the Sahaabah had prohibited women from the Musjid when the women were of the calibre of the Holy Wives of Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam), and when Taqwa and Purdah were observed stringently by the Sahaabiyaat. It is just lamentable that the Muftis of this age seek to override the Sahaabah. They fail miserably in understanding the wisdom and far-sightedness of the Sahaabah and the Fuqaha.

The Mufti Sahib has presented the views of a number of other contemporary Ulama of Tabligh Jamaat persuasion. They have added nothing to the aforementioned spurious ‘dalaal’ which we have refuted. The same monotonous theme of ‘benefits’ has been piped. Some of them have presented some baseless criticism of those who are opposed to makshoofaat jamaat. We shall now respond to such criticism which is devoid of reality and truth.

(1) One Mufti Sahib states:

“The objector is ready to object, but he does not apply his life and wealth for the service of the Deen. For example, they say that the Tabligh Jamaat does not engage in *Nahyi Anil Munkar*. But if it is said to them: “Do something for the reformation of

the Ummah. Contribute life and wealth in the work of Islaah. Engage in Amr Bil Ma'roof and also in Nahyi Anil Munkar", then they place their hands on their ears. They themselves are not prepared to do anything (for the Deen). It costs nothing to merely talk (and object), hence they deem talking to be service to the Deen."

Yes, talking and objecting are services for the Deen. Amr Bil Ma'roof, Nahyi Anil Munkar consists of talking. This statement of the Mufti is plain drivel, if not worse. Those who are objecting here are, by the fadhl of Allah Ta'ala, engaging in Amr Bil Ma'roof, Nahyi Anil Munkar, devoting their lives, time and wealth in the Path of Allah. By Allah's fadhl, they have made their lives Waqf for the Deen. We do not know to which Ulama the Mufti has directed his criticism.

The Mufti and the Tabligh Jamaat members should not be misled by Takabbur and Ujub. The Mufti's attitude smacks of arrogance and pride. They should not labour under the false impression that it is only Tabligh Jamaat people who are spending wealth and giving time for the Deen when they spend on their journeys and camp food. They rarely, if ever, spend on others. Every person of the Tabligh Jamaat spends on himself, not on others.

On the contrary, Allah Ta'ala has endowed innumerable non-Tablighis to spend large sums of their wealth on a regular basis for the upliftment of the variety of Deeni Projects. The Deen is not confined to Tabligh Jamaat activity. We warn these Ulama to beware of Ujub and Takabbur. Do not despise those who are not globe-trotting with you. There are many of Allah's servants who render great and wonderful service to the Deen silently without Tabligh Jamaat style ostentation and fanfare. They spend with the right hand that which the left hand knows not. Pride will cause your fall and obliteration.

The Mufti who has made the above criticism should have reflected and ascertained whether his criticism is factual or simply emotional. Blurting out drivel is unbecoming of a senior Mufti. His criticism smacks of pride.

(2) Another Mufti offers the following criticism:

“Today hundreds of thousands of women roam around in the market places. But, no one lifts a pen to prevent them. However, when women emerge with their mahrams, observing all the conditions and limits of the Shariah for executing Deeni work, then books are written about them...”

This poor Mufti has also disgorged an emotional outburst without applying his Aql correctly. Who is the Aalim who has criticized makshoofaat jamaat but has failed to lift his pen regarding women roaming and parading in the malls and streets? This Mufti has spoken rubbish. He too blurts out drivel without ascertaining the factual position or stance of those who criticize female emergence. The claim which he has made is a blatant LIE. By the fadhl of Allah Ta’ala those who criticize makshoofaat jamaat are more vociferous in their criticism of the women who roam in the market-place and malls. In fact, they criticize women who go for even Nafl Umrah. In fact, they have labelled the mall-roaming women as prostitutes, while they have spared the makshoofaat women from this epithet. We do not know which jungle the Mufti Sahib inhabits to have reached his stupid conclusion. He must learn to control his nafs, then his tongue will not utter rubbish. It is improper for a Mufti to make a fool of himself with falsehood. Alhamdulillah thumma Alhamdulillah! Those who are criticizing makshoofaat jamaat are constantly writing and criticizing and offering naseehat to women who roam the streets, who attend schools and universities, who establish women’s organizations, etc.

**SABEELUL MUNKARAAT FI  
JAMAA-AATIL MUTAKASH-SHIFAAT**

Hadhrat Maulana Ashraf Ali Thanvi (rahmatullah alayh) said: *“Silence for an Aalim is zeenat (beauty), and for a jaahil, a purdah (veil concealing his jahl).”* If the Mufti Sahib who has made the aforementioned stupid and false comment lacks the ability to speak factually, then it is best that he seeks refuge in silence.

One very important fact which escapes the legalizers of makshoofaat jamaat is that emergence from the home regardless of the purpose, corrodes and ultimately destroys the *hayaa* of women. The remedy for the jahaalat of the women is that the Tabligh jamaat and these Muftis who rely on women should exhort the menfolk to fulfil the obligation which the Qur’aan imposes on them. Apply the same concern in this regard, that is, men should teach their womenfolk, just as you apply pressure on men to engage in tabligh to others. Make it your priority to convince your members to make tabligh, da’wat and tabligh first to their womenfolk at home. Then there will be no need for makshoofaat jamaat.

This Mufti Sahib (not the one who is the author of the book we are refuting) who disgorged the aforementioned drivel, is constrained to end off his erroneous fatwa by saying: *“...on condition that they observe all the conditions.”* Yet he lacks the understanding to comprehend that these conditions are grossly violated when women go on journeys.

There is no conundrum regarding the age of fitnah. Hadhrat Umar (radhiyallahu anhu) in particular, and the Sahaabah in general, and thereafter the Illustrious Fuqaha of the Khairul Quroon have relieved us of the responsibility of deciding the factor of fitnah of the times for the *hukm* of prohibition. Now when these great and illustrious Authorities of the Khairul Quroon had established that the *Illat (rationale)* for prohibiting emergence of women to attend the Musjid in even their era of

piety, is the fitnah of the age, then by what stretch of Imaani logic, Fiqhi rationale and demand of plain Aql can the Muftis of this current age proclaim that the conditions for permissibility are being observed? Their reasoning, to say the very least, is bereft of goodness.

(3) Another Tablighi Molvi/Mufti presenting a stupid argument, says: “The Ulama and pious people together with their womenfolk undertake optional Haj and Umra trips travelling with planes, trains, buses, etc. in the presence of many strange (ghair mahram) men, yet no problem is perceived therein. Thus no problem should arise with regards to ladies jamaats as well since its manifest benefits are apparent.”

At least he has conceded, albeit without thinking, that the ladies have to mingle with many strange men on journeys. The travelling women are always in the eyes of these strange fussaag, fujjaar and kuffaar males.

It is unexpected of a Mufti to descend to the level of an *aami* (*a layman*) when substantiating an act for which a Shar’i fatwa is required. The *Asl* (*First premiss*) in his analogical reasoning (*qiyaas*), namely, the pious ones undertaking Nafl Haj and Umrah with their wives, on the basis of which he extracts a ruling for makshoofaat jamaat, itself is the subject of query. It too is a *Fara’* (*the Second premiss*) for which a Shar’i ruling is required. A new development which is in need of a Shar’i *hukm*, is reliant on an *Asl* which has an unambiguous Shar’i ruling. Thus, the very first premiss in his *qiyaas* is *faasid* (*corrupt and baseless*). It, itself, needs a Shar’i ruling. It cannot be cited as a basis for permissibility of makshoofaat jamaat.

If the act of the Ulama going on Nafl Haj and Umrah with their womenfolk is subjected to Shar’i scrutiny, it will be found on the basis of the *Nusoos* that in this era of extreme fitnah and

total chaos in the Haramain Shareefain, it is NOT permissible for women to go for Nafl Hajj and Umrah regardless of being accompanied by their mahaarim. The fitnah of the age totally precludes them. Both the wife and the husband are sinful in the circumstances. It is not permissible for them to go for Nafl Hajj and Umrah in the prevailing scenario of fitnah and fasaad.

*“It is not permissible for him (the husband) to grant her permission (to emerge) for such issues, e.g. visiting ajaaneeb (non-relatives), and visiting the sick (among ajaaneeb), waleemah and similar other matters (such as Nafl Hajj, Umrah, tabligh and the like –Mujlisul Ulama). If he permits her to emerge, then both are sinful.” -Majmooun Nawaazil*  
This is the standard fatwa of all the Fuqaha.

Now on the basis of this first premiss of the Tablighi Mufti, it is not permissible for makshoofaat jamaat to undertake tabligh journeys. An act cannot be argued on the basis of a haraam practice. The Mufti’s argument is dismissed. It is absolutely unsound and not worthy of academic refutation although we have acted with a degree of intellectual debasement by answering this drivel argument.

## **THE HADITH IN BUKHAARI SHAREEF**

Let us take a closer look at the Hadith in Bukhaari Shareef which the Mufti baselessly cites in support of makshoofaat jamaat. Imaam Bukhaari records the Hadith as follows:

*“The women said to Nabi (sallallahu alayhi wasallam): ‘The menfolk have monopolised (your time and have deprived) us. Therefore fix for us a day from yourself. Then he promised them a day when he would meet with them. Then (on the*



*appointed day) he advised them (gave them naseehat) and instructed them.”*

The salient facts in this Hadith are:

- (1) The women requested Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) to address them and give them a bayaan.
- (2) Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) did not intentionally make *tashkeel* of the women, neither for local ta’leem nor for journeys. It was on their request that he gave them a talk.
- (3) The women did not go out of the town on a tableegh mission to teach others. They remained within the town.
- (4) The women gathered at a house.
- (5) Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) went to the house and delivered his bayaan.

There is no relationship between this act of Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) and the practice of sending groups of women out of the town on tabligh missions. So, this is the Sunnah method of imparting ta’leem to women. Why does the Tabligh Jamaat not adopt this Sunnah method initiated by Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam)? Why do the Muftis not promote this actual Sunnah way of instructing the women? No one has spoken in opposition to this Masnoon method.

Instead of calling women in droves out of their homes and sending them to distant places in emulation of the males, why do the Tablighi Jamaat elders not appoint elderly and experienced muballigheen to give regular bayaans to the ladies within the precincts of their neighbourhood? This Sunnah system will obviate journeys for women. It will ensure that the Qur’aan’s command is not violated. It will be in accord with the method of the Sahaabah.

The problem is that this Sunnah method is devoid of sound and fury, fanfare, fun, ostentation, hiking and travelling, hence the Tabligh Jamaat derives no pleasure in this silent Masnoon method. They should examine their intentions, do some serious soul-searching, and abandon their way of violating the Shariah with their convoluted logic of ‘benefits’ with which they abrogate explicit *Ahkaam* of the Shariah.

### **A Fatal Error**

The Muftis of this age have blundered into a grave error in the same way the modernist zindeeqs have. Instead of taking their directive from the Sahaabah and the Fuqaha of the Math-hab, they resort directly to the Hadith and make a mess of their corrupt ‘ijtihad’. They should rather declare their abandonment of Taqleed of the Math-hab, then we shall know in which category of ‘salafi’ism they should be lumped and dumped. It is contumacious for a Muqallid Mufti to extract Ahaadith which were all in front of the Sahaabah and Aimmah-e-Mujtahideen, then to formulate their noxious ‘fatwas’ of the nafs in conflict with the Fataawa of the Sahaabah and Fuqaha of the Khairul Quroon. These Muftis expect Muslims to make their taqleed, whilst they cunningly renege from the superior Taqleed of the Aimmah-e-Mujtahideen. Precisely for this reason do they present Hadith narrations to abrogate the rulings of the Sahaabah and Fuqaha.

It is stupid to cite the Ahaadith which mention women’s attendance of the Musjid during the age of Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam), women’s participation in Jihad and narrations which inform us of the ta’leem which Sahaabiyaat had imparted to others. All of these Ahaadith are not new discoveries. These Ahaadith do not even remotely hint at women undertaking journeys for tabligh. The Sahaabah and Fuqaha were fully aware of these Ahaadith. We have already answered the spurious ‘dalaal’ raised on the basis of

these Ahaadith. Here we need only mention, that the Muftis of this age have absolutely no right to cite such narrations in the bid to cancel the 14 century Prohibition enacted by the Sahaabah. In so doing, they befool themselves, befuddle and mislead the masses, and open the modernist, zindeeq avenue for abandonment of Taqleed. They are guilty of the very same haraam exercises in which the modernist *zanaadaqah* indulge in their kufr attempt of abrogating the Ahkaam of the Shariah as transmitted down the centuries to us from the Sahaabah. This is a fatal error which digs up the foundations of Islam. There is no scope for '*ijtihaadi*' joyrides.

## **Performance of Hajj**

Without applying his mind constructively, one of the Muftis cited by the author of the book states:

“Fulfilment of Hajj too is not possible without coming out of the home. Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) had permitted a woman to perform Hajj-e-Badl. Hajj-e-Badl is neither Fardh nor Waajib nor Sunnat. In fact it is something which is *mubah* (just permissible). Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) had permitted a woman to do this *mubah* act.”

Firstly, the Mufti is not a Mujtahid. He has no right to submit the Hadith to his deficient '*ijtihad*'. Ijtihad is the *wazeefah* of the Aimmah-e-Mujtahideen. That era has passed more than a thousand years ago. Ijtihad is not the function of today's muqallid Muftis. Secondly, the Sahaabah and Fuqaha were fully aware of this Hadith and many other similar narrations, but they did not argue in the manner of today's Muftis. Despite this Hadith, they proceeded to ban females from emerging.

Thirdly, just as women attending the Musjid was permissible during Rasulullah's time, so too was the performance of Hajj-e-Badl for them. It was an era of total peace and safety. The

woman did not have to undergo the immoral persecution of today's mode of travel in which she has to rub shoulders with fussaag, fujjaar and kuffaar at every turn outside the home. Today it is not permissible for a woman to undertake a Hajj-e-Badl journey nor a Nafl Umrah journey.

In fact, due to the extreme state of immorality of the times – both men and women - the Shaafi' Fuqaha hundreds of years ago had decreed that it is not permissible for women to perform Tawaaf and Sa-ee regardless of it being Fardh Tawaaf. This is not the juncture to discuss the mas'alah. The issue here is the extreme to which the Shaafi' Fuqaha had gone to prohibit females from emerging from their homes for even Fardh Tawaaf.

In a lengthy, very detailed Fatwa in *Al-Fataawal Kubra* of Ibn Hajar Al-Haitami, it is mentioned:

“.....Of the worst evils perpetrated by the ignorant masses during tawaaf is the crowding of the men with their wives with faces exposed.....And, also from among the evils is what the women of Makkah and others do when they intend to make tawaaf and enter the Musjid such as adornment, application of perfume thereby distracting the people, and attracting attention to them, and other acts of corruption. ....Thus, if you reflect, you will find the prohibition to be explicit even from tawaaf when they perpetrate acts leading to fitnah. What has been explained earlier supports this.....Some of the Muta-akhkhireen said: ‘Of the bid’ah which happen during the month of Ramadhaan is the sleeping of women in the Musjid and their entry with the men. This is such a haraam which no one can tolerate for the women of the Muslimeen except one who is bereft of honour. How is it possible for anyone to tolerate this for his wife? How can it not be Waajib to forbid her?.....And how can it be said that it is permissible for her to emerge?

**SABEELUL MUNKARAAT FI  
JAMAA-AATIL MUTAKASH-SHIFAAT**

“And of the haraam acts is their mingling with the men in the Musjid and the road when there is fear of fitnah. Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) said: “Touching a pig soiled in mud is better than a man’s shoulders touching a woman who is not halaal for him.” (Narrated by Tabaraani).

If you say: ‘How can it be waajib to prohibit women in a situation of fitnah, from attending even the Musjid of Makkah when it is her intention to perform Tawaaf which they cannot perform in their homes, and whilst sometimes Tawaaf is Fardh upon them?’ I say: ‘Because repelling corruption has priority over the acquisition of benefit.....’ *(The Fiqhi arguments pertaining to the Fardh Tawaaf from which women are prevented in terms of the Shaafi’ Math-hab, are not the concern of our discussion pertaining to makshoofaat jamaat. This mas’alah has been mentioned to only show the seriousness with which the Fuqaha view the emergence of women during times of fitnah and fasaad.)*

“It is narrated from At-Tartooshi of the Maalikiyyah and Abu Shaamah from us (i.e. Shaafis) that both had criticized this (emergence of women), and they emphasized it, and that it is fusooq.....If you say: ‘Do you say that it is forbidden for women to emerge to go to the Musajjid, Mawaaid (Eidgahs), visiting the graves besides the Qabr of Nabi (sallallahu alayhi wasallam)?’ I say: ‘How can I not say so when there is consensus on this (prohibition) because of the non-existence of the conditions of permissibility which were found during the era of Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam)?’ Verily, this has been narrated from the two Shaikhs of the Mutaqaddimeen, who were Imaams, men of Zuhd and Wara’, namely, Shaikh Taqiuddin Al-Hisni and our Shaikh Alaauddin Muhammad Bin Muhammad Ibn Muhammad An-Najjaari –May Allah have mercy on them. What they have said is adequate for one who abandons his desire. Some people think that the view of

Tahreem (i.e. it is haraam for women to emerge) and the claim of consensus on prohibition is in conflict with the Math-hab (i.e. Shaafi' Math-hab). But it is not so. From what I shall explain from the Kutub of the Math-hab, etc., the intention of these two Shaikhs will be clear, and it will be clear that there is no difference of opinion in what they have said. Those who oppose them, do so because of lack of such information of which they were aware. What these two Imaams had said is that in this age the Mufta Bihi (the Official Ruling is the prohibition of women emerging). No one will hesitate (to accept) this except a moron (*ghabi*) who follows his base desires, for verily the laws change with the change of the people of the times.. This is the correct view in terms of the Math-habs of the Ulama from the Salaf and the Khalaf .....

Imaam Tahaawi said: 'The order for women to emerge (on Eid Days to attend the Eidgah) was in the beginning of Islam for impressing the enemy with the number of Muslims.' In the Sharh of Ibn Daqeequl Eed it appears: 'That (emergence) was at a time when Islam was little (i.e. its followers were few). Therefore there was a need to emphasize the emergence of the women in Hijaab.' It is mentioned in the Musannaf of Ibnul Attaar: 'It is only appropriate for a woman not to emerge from her home. On the contrary, she should resolutely remain in the innermost recess of her home, for verily, the whole of her is Aurah, and it is Waajib to conceal the Aurah. Regarding emergence to go to the Musjid in the darkness at a time when there is no fitnah and harm, that was permissible during the time of Nabi (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) and for a brief time during the age of some Sahaabah. Then this was prohibited because of the fitnah, exhibition and perfume introduced by the women, as well as their fitnah with the men.' .....

Imaam Ghazaali said: It is Waajib to prohibit women from attending the Musaajid for Salaat and gatherings of thikr when there is fear of fitnah.....'

(Al-Haitami concluding the lengthy discussion says): “These are the statements of the Ulama regarding the difference in the ruling by virtue of the change of times. These aforementioned Ulama are the Jamhoor Ulama among the Mujtahideen and the Imaams of the Muttageen and the Saalih Fuqaha who are experts. Therefore accepting their rulings is Waajib, for verily, they are the Standards of the Ummah. What they have chosen for us is better than what we choose for ourselves. Whoever opposes them is a follower of his vain desires.....When fitnah is the consequence, then it (emergence) is haraam without doubt.....When any haraam act is related to it, then Tahreem is absolute. A Faqeeh will not hesitate in this.....The correct view is Tahreem with emphasis and the Fatwa is on it. This is the summary of our (Shaafi’) Math-hab.” (*End of Ibn Hajr Al-Haitami’s Fatwa*)

The above are some extracts from the very lengthy discussion of Ibn Hajr Al-Haitami. Only a *ghabi* (*moron*) will claim that the fitnah of the men and women which was the basis for the prohibition during the age of the Sahaabah and at the time when Ibn Hajar stated the above, has dissipated, and that this immoral age of the 20<sup>th</sup> century in close proximity to Qiyaamah is devoid of the fitnah. It is quite apparent that the Muftis who permit women in this age to emerge on the understanding that all the conditions of permissibility are being observed, lack proper understanding of the situation prevailing during journeys and outside the home for women, or if they are aware, they have been completely desensitized by the vicissitudes of the age and their abundance of *Ikhtilaat ma-al anaam* (*association with the masses*).

## **THE ANALOGY WITH THE MUSJID**

One of the Muftis who is a votary of makshoofaat jamaat says: “The emergence of women for tabligh should not be analogized with their emergence for Salaat in the Musjid because there is the fear of fitnah over there as a consequence of mixing with males. Whereas fitnah in the Tablighi Jamaat is not possible.”

This Mufti sahib does not understand what he is talking. The mixing with men when women undertake journeys begins from the very time when they emerge from their homes and sit in the company of ghair mahram drivers. As far as we know none of the makshoofaat jamaat women fly through the air miraculously to reach their destinations. They travel by vehicle, train, plane, bus, taxi - all types of public transport. They are constrained to mingle with males –fussaaq, fujjaar and kuffaar in the streets, at the bus stations, taxi ranks, train stations, airports, in transit lounges, and the entire process of mingling is repeated when they arrive at their destination. One of the Tablighi Muftis whom we have refuted earlier in this discussion, has conceded this intermingling. Each time they move to a different location, the fitnah of exposure and mingling is repeated.

Then they have to stand in queues together with men at immigration counters, custom check points, etc. Then the shamelessness is worsened inside the plane, train, taxi, etc. These Muftis pretend that there is nothing of this sort of haraam mingling taking place. According to them the be-all of Hijaab is the face cloth and the abaya. In short, they are involved in sin from the time they leave home until their return back into the sanctuary of their homes.



**SABEELUL MUNKARAAT FI  
JAMAA-AATIL MUTAKASH-SHIFAAT**

Another very important effect of makshoofaat jamaat ladies, like ‘aalimah’ (jaahilah) women of girls madrasahs, is that they lose their natural haya. They become audacious. One jaahilah, so-called ‘ameerah’ of a makshoofaat jamaat, in anger wrote to us that the tabligh of the Tablighi Jamaat is superior to the Jihad of the Sahaabah. This type of attitude is not rare. It is a norm with these women. Furthermore, the Muftis of the Tablighi Jamaat are unaware of the gheebat sessions in which these women are involved. We have received complaints from time to time from women who had participated in makshoofaat jamaat, but who became disgusted with the conduct of the women.

Although a woman is accompanied by her husband, sight should not be lost of the mode of the travelling. It is not one couple that undertakes the journey. A group of women together with a group of mahrams travel together. All the men and women are together. If five couples are together, they remain so throughout the journey. From behind their veils, these women stare at the husbands of the other women in their group. Even if these women are hallucinated to be saints, then too they are the owners of an evil nafs. Which women are greater and more pious than the Azwaaj-e-Mutahharaat? Despite their piety and lofty status, the Qur’aan commands the Holy Wives of Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) to be behind a screen when the need arises for any Sahaabi to speak to them. The jilbaab was not deemed adequate hijab for a Sahaabi conversing with one of the Wives of Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam). There had to be a separating screen to divert the gaze from falling on even the garments of the female. Thus the Qur’aan states: *“And, when you ask them something, do so from behind a screen.”* What is the reason for this? The Qur’aan mentioning the reason, states: *“This is purer for your hearts and their hearts.”*

**SABEELUL MUNKARAAT FI  
JAMAA-AATIL MUTAKASH-SHIFAAT**

Now when there is the fear of fitnah in the hearts of the Sahaabah and even the hearts of the Azwaaj-e-Mutahharaat, then in which category should we dump the women of makshoofaat jamaat? Yet, they all travel together in group form, men and women, sitting together at close quarters, and sleeping together at close quarters if they are on a train. And, in the plane they have to cross the path of men on the way to the toilet and even stare men in the face when they open the toilet door with a male waiting to enter. And when disembarking from the plane, the fitnah is magnified in the rush in the narrow passage of the plane, and this fitnah worsens in the airport bus in which the passengers are loaded pell-mell. We think that something is drastically amiss with the thinking of these honourable Muftis who are votaries of makshoofaat jamaat.

It is necessary to extend the prohibition from the Musjid issue to the makshoofaat jamaat. The *qiyaas ma-al faariq* claim of the Mufti Sahib is bunkum, and the claim that fitnah with the Tabligh Jamaat is not at all possible is greater bunkum. The implication is that fitnah with the Sahaabah Jamaat during the Khairul Quroon while a reality is not possible in this immoral age with the Tabligh Jamaat.

Genuine purdah is not taught by the Tabligh Jamaat. They don't understand what the soul of Purdah is. They do not know what is the seat of Purdah. It is for this reason that numerous Tablighis go on tabligh jamaat journeys, stranding their wives without any mahram to attend to them. Some even leave their wives to take care of their shops. Meanwhile in their absence, some of these women strike up illicit affairs or zina relationships. The minds of the Tablighi elders are in a straitjacket, blocked and calcified, unable to understand and see the dangers they have created with their makshoofaat jamaat and with their condonation of men leaving their wives without mahrams.

## THE AAYAT PROHIBITING KHUROOJ (EMERGENCE)

Regarding this Aayat, the Mufti Sahib, not the author of the book, but another votary of makshoofaat jamaat, says that it is not correct to make *Istidlaal* (to deduct and formulate) prohibition on the basis of the Qur'aanic aayat: “*And remain resolutely within your homes...*” because the prohibition, according to him, is restricted with: “*And, do not make a display like the jahiliyyah of former times.*” If the prohibition is not restricted with this condition, then it follows that under no circumstances will it be permissible for a woman to emerge from her home whereas it is clear from the *Nusoos* that women are allowed to come out of their homes for needs.

The argument of the Mufti Sahib is not valid because the command to remain indoors was revealed in the first instance for the Azwaaj-e-Mutahharaat. The aforementioned Aayat addresses specifically the Holy Wives of Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam). There is certitude that when the Azwaaj-e-Mutahharaat used to come out from their homes for Salaat and any other needs, they never made a jahiliyyah display of themselves. Despite them observing all conditions of permissibility, they were still commanded to remain within their homes. And above all, even though the Sahaabiyaat during Hadhrat Umar's time were not making exhibitions of jaahiliyyah when they would emerge to go to the Musjid, he and the Sahaabah banned them from the Musjid. Whatever change in the conduct of the pious ladies Hadhrat Umar (radhiyallahu anhu) and Hadhrat Aishah (radhiyallahu anha) had observed, was never *tabarruj-e-jaahiliyyah ula* (exhibition of the times of ignorance).

Despite this reality, the farsightedness of the Sahaabah constrained them to enact the prohibition primarily for the benefit of posterity – for the Ummah in later times of fitnah and fasaad.

The Sahaabah and the Fuqaha of former and later times, did not argue baselessly as the Mufti Sahib argues. As for the *Nusoos* to which he refers, the simple answer is that no one denies the validity of women's emergence for their valid needs on condition that the restrictions and stipulations are observed. But, women undertaking journeys for tabligh which the Shariah does not impose on them, is not among the needs which constrain their emergence. Furthermore, if a woman emerges for her needs in the style of *jaahiliyyah*, then such emergence will be haraam regardless of the need. Thus the Fuqaha have ruled that it is no longer permissible for women to attend even walimah function although this too was permissible during the early days of Islam.

As time progresses and moves further from the Age of Nubuwwat, the logical culmination of *khurooj-e-nisaa'* (emergence of women) is *tabarruj-e-jaahiliyya ula*, and this evil is precisely what is afflicting the Ummah today and what has afflicted it soon after the passing of Khairul Quroon, in fact even during the later part of Khairul Quroon.

The prohibition to emerge is not pivoted on displays of *jaahiliyyah*. Women may not emerge unnecessarily into the public domain even if they are correctly clad and observing the necessary conditions for the permissibility to emerge. The permission applies only to needs allowed by the *Nusoos*. Tabligh journeys for women are not among their needs permitted by the Shariah.

The Mufti Sahib has not applied his mind, hence his error. If *khurooj* was at all times permissible without *tabarruj-e-jaahiliyyah*, it will follow that women are permitted to leave home and wander around at will as long as they do not perpetrate *tabarruj-e-jaahiliyyah*. The statement regarding *tabarruj-e-jaahiliyyah* is an independent command. When women are constrained by valid circumstance to leave home, they should not practise *tabarruj*. Absence of *tabarruj* is not a licence for unnecessary emergence, and journeys for tabligh as far as women are concerned, are not among the needs, nor does the Shariah impose on them this obligation which the Tabligh Jamaat has ordained for them 14 centuries after Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam). There is no merit in this argument of the Mufti Sahib.

## **A CASE ON LIES**

The total academic bankruptcy of the votaries of makshoofaat jamaat has constrained one of their Muftis to resort to even lies to bolster the case in support of women's jamaats. Thus, this Mufti after a lecture devoid of Shar'i dalaa-il, and confined to only assumed benefits, says: "In short, female madaaris and the Tablighi Jamaat have proven to be very effective and beneficial. This (lecture) is a summary from the Fataawa of the Akaabir (Senior Ulama) such as Hadhrat Mufti Mahmood Hasan Gangohi, Mufti Shafi Sahib, Maulana Ashraf Ali Thanvi, Mufti Abdur Raheem Lajpuri and Mufti Abdur Rashid Ludhyanwi."

The inclusion of Hadhrat Maulana Ashraf Ali Thanvi (rahmatullah alayh) in this list is a blatant lie. It is despicable chicanery employed by the Tabligh Mufti. He has falsely and deceptively attempted to convey the impression that Hadhrat

**SABEELUL MUNKARAAT FI  
JAMAA-AATIL MUTAKASH-SHIFAAT**

Thanvi was in favour of makshoofaat jamaat and girls madrasahs. This idea is a brazen lie peddled by the Mufti. Hadhrat Thanvi was never a promoter of girls madrasahs and to a greater extent not an advocate of makshoofaat jamaat.

The Mufti also peddles the lie that Hadhrat Maulana Masihullah (rahmatullah alayh) was a promoter of makshoofaat jamaat. This is a vile lie. How is it possible for Hadhrat Masihullah to have been an advocate of makshoofaat jamaat and girls madrasahs, when Tablighis revile Hadhrat Masihullah as an opponent of the Tabligh Jamaat? We, the students and mureeds of Hadhrat Masihullah (rahmatullah alayh) are more aware of Hadhrat's stance pertaining to the Tabligh Jamaat as a whole. In fact, Hadhrat Masihullah was averse to even male students of the Madaaris participating in Tabligh Jamaat activities. His stance was that the Tabligh Jamaat was for the *awaam* (masses). Hence, when the Tabligh Jamaat groups would come to Jalalabad and stay over at the Madrasah's Musjid, Hadhrat would advise them: "Stay here, but give your bayaan in the bazaar Musjid". The students were engaged in the Deen the whole day, hence Hadhrat was not in favour of the Tabligh Jamaat interrupting their studies with their bayaan. It is indeed most despicable for the Tablighi Mufti to falsely and deceptively cite the name of Hadhrat Masihullah in his book promoting makshoofaat jamaat.

The women attending Hadhrat Masihullah's bayaan every Friday were not part of any makshoofaat jamaat. They were not organized groups of women undertaking journeys. They came to listen to the bayaan of an Aalim and in so doing were following the Sunnah tareeqah which the Tablighi Mufti Sahib mentions in his book. He had quoted the Hadith of Bukhaari Shareef regarding a day set aside by Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) to deliver a bayaan to the ladies. So, Hadhrat

Masihullah's bayaan was in emulation of this Sunnah. It was not in emulation of the Tabligh Jamaat's makshoofaat jamaat.

Hadhrat Maulana Ashraf Ali Thanvi's stance of girls madrasahs is well known. He was opposed to the establishment of such institutions. In the first part of Beheshti Zewer, 105 years ago when the fitnah of females and males had not reached current proportions, he states:

“..... From this discussion, two corruptive factors are apparent which are widely prevalent nowadays. The first is the establishment of girls schools and public madrasahs. Episodes and experience have shown that due to the conglomeration of girls from a variety of backgrounds, different families and dispositions, such elements accumulate here (at the madrasahs and girls schools) which have a detrimental effect on their character, and this companionship in most cases leads to the ruin of chastity. And this happens even if the Muallimah (teacher) is a Muslim lady, and the girls come to the madrasah in *dolis* ( a purdah cabin in which a woman is concealed, and which is carried by labourers), and even if they stay at a place of purdah (at the madrasah). ..... The safest method for (teaching) girls is the way which has come down from bygone times. Two or four girls (i.e. a few) should assemble in their close neighbourhood and be taught by a lady. If possible if such a lady (muallimah) is found who does not accept a salary, then there will be more barkat and benefit in her teaching. However, if such a teacher is not available, then because of the need, a paid teacher will also be appropriate. Where a female is not available, the man in the house should teach his females.”

Then Hadhrat Thanvi goes on to explain the very same method explained by the Fuqaha. This method does not tolerate girls madrasahs nor makshoofaat jamaat. It is therefore most dishonourable, to say the least, for the Tablighi Mufti to

besmirch Hadhrat Maulana Ashraf Ali Thanvi's name with lies. Since they are bereft of Shar'i dalaa-il for their case, they resort to fabrication of falsehood to bolster what cannot be supported with Shar'i proofs. From the aforementioned statement of Hadhrat Maulana Ashraf Ali Thanvi, the following facts are conspicuous:

- (a) Hadhrat Thanvi was opposed to girls madrasahs regardless of purdah arrangements.
- (b) Although the girls madrasahs did not involve females undertaking journeys, Hadhrat Thanvi was nevertheless opposed to such institutions because these institutions corrupt their moral character and destroy their haya.
- (c) The assembling of females in an institution is unhealthy.
- (b) Females should acquire Deeni knowledge by the method which has come down from the era of the Salafus Saaliheen which is explained by the Fuqaha.

Further elaborating the disadvantages of girls madrasahs, Hadhrat Maulana Ashraf Ali Thanvi (rahmatullah alayh) says:

“Nowadays educating females by way of girls madrasahs is a fatal poison. I do not like female madrasahs even if it is administrated under the supervision of an Aalim. I say on the basis of experience, never never embark on it. If you ignore what I am saying, you will later regret. Leave schools and madrasahs (i.e. girls madrasahs). Keep females at home for ta'leem.

*Shurafa'* (noble people) never preferred girls madrasahs for their girls. In the towns, generally the girls are literate. But all of them had been taught at home. At home there is no harm whatsoever for the girls.....I am totally unable to understand the establishment of Maktabas (Madrasahs) for girls as is systematically established for boys. The abundance of incidents (of moral turpitude) occurring in these institutions



convince one that the condition of these makhtabs (for females) is not good.....”

“The matter of educating girls is very problematic. However, we have observed that wherever there are madrasahs for girls, the consequence is certainly corruption (mafaasid). Acts of immodesty occur (at these madrasahs). Many such incidents happen.” *(End of Hadhrat Thanvi’s bayaan and opinion)*

Since this is the stance of Hadhrat Thanvi regarding girls madrasahs, it is dishonest and dishonourable for the Muftis to cite him in a manner to deceptively convey the idea that he supported female emergence for education.

## **EMERGING FOR NEEDS**

In another abortive attempt to justify makshoofaat jamaat, the Mufti Sahib presents as proof the permission to emerge for Hajj. Thus he cites Allaamah Aalusi who says in the tafseer of the Aayat commanding women to remain inside their homes, “This does not negate their emergence for Hajj or for a Deeni *maslihat* with purdah and without display.”

This statement of Allaamah Aalusi should not be viewed in isolation of the conditions of permissibility for emergence. Hajj and the like are exceptions permitted by the Shariah. However, if the Hajj is Nafl, then in the present age of fitnah and fasaad it will not be permissible for women to go for Nafl Hajj and Umrah just as it is not permissible for them to attend the Musjid and functions such as Walimah despite the Sunniyat of the latter.

Earlier Ibn Hajar Al-Haitami’s lengthy fatwa was cited in which the Shaafi Fuqaha even stated prohibition of women performing even the Fardh Tawaaf due to the then prevalent

fitnah of women in the Haram Shareef. Today in the Haram Shareef, there prevails total chaos with the men and women standing in the same saffs and even in the rows in front. Multitudes of women in Haram are without niqaab and dressed gaudily. But the Tablighi Ulama remain deliberately blind to all this fitnah.

Secondly, Allaamah Aalusi's statement does not refer to women undertaking journeys for tabligh except where the Shariah has granted explicit permission such as Fardh Hajj. The sagacious advice of Hadhrat Maulana Ashraf Thanvi in this regard should not be ignored. He said that ignoring his advice will lead to regret.

No one had at any stage contended that women are not allowed to emerge for their needs, be it worldly needs or Shar'i needs. The Mufti Sahib has tried to confuse the issues for lack of dalaa-il to prove his case in favour of makshoofaat jamaat. Throughout his book, he confuses makshoofaat jamaat journeys with the permission to emerge within the town limits, or more better, the neighbourhood limits, for the acquisition of necessary knowledge. Our charge is directed at makshoofaat jamaat tabligh journeys, not normal, permissible, impromptu emergence in proximity of their homes. The thrust of the criticism is directed at makshoofaat jamaat, not at what Allaamah Aalusi and other Ulama say about such emergence which is explicitly permitted by the Shariah.

Whatever the Mufti Sahib and the votaries of makshoofaat jamaat proffer in justification of female emergence for tabligh journeys is fallacious and the exceptions to the general rule of prohibition are an erroneous basis for extending the permissibility to females going on tabligh journeys. Since the permissibility to emerge for needs is not contested, the more

than half of the book constitutes a superfluous and a redundant exercise.

The makshoofaat jamaat journeys are not among the Shar'i needs for permission to be granted to emerge, And, even if we accept to sink into stupidity momentarily and accept that it is among the needs, then it shall be said that due to the extreme state of fitnah and fasaad of both women and men in this immoral era, the conditions for emergence are absent, hence even Nafl Hajj, Umrah, Walimah and the Musjid are not permissible for women.

### **The prohibition to attend the Musjid**

The Mufti Sahib also attempts to minimize the effect of the prohibition to attend the Musjid. He emphasizes that the actual reason for the ban was Rasulullah's encouragement for women to perform Salaat at home. This interpretation is fallacious. If it had any merit, Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) would have firmly prohibited women from the Musjid whilst he was alive.

Furthermore, the Sahaabah, especially Hadhrat Aishah (radhiyallahu anha) and all the Fuqaha of all the Math-habs throughout the history of Islam emphasized the aspect of fitnah for the prohibition, not the fact of woman's Salaat being superior in her home. Women were prohibited from the Musjid because of *fitnah*, and they were prohibited from emerging from their home by virtue of the Qur'aanic Aayat ordering *qaraar fil buyout* except for such needs which are upheld by the Shariah as valid. But females going on excursions to other cities and countries are not valid Shar'i needs regardless of the purpose being tabligh.

The consequence of the pursuit of *fadhielat* by performing Salaat at home is not prohibition to attend the Musjid. The Mufti's argument is insipid and baseless.

## **THE PROOF FOR WOMEN EMERGING FROM HOME**

The Mufti sahib embarks on another irrelevant exercise by presenting proof for the emergence of women to visit other females at their homes, e.g. for *ta'ziyat (condolence)*, etc. The Mufti Sahib is barking up the wrong tree. This issue is not being contested or denied. There is therefore no need for producing evidence to substantiate an issue which is not the subject of the discussion and dispute. The issue is women going on journey for tabligh. A woman going discreetly next door or a few doors away, well covered with an extra-outsize jilbaab which could comfortably enshroud two women, to visit or to ask something or do something, is not a mass women's liberation movement going from city to city, town to town and country to country in an age of massive fitnah and fasaad, and getting involved in contact with fussaag, fujjaar and kuffaar males at various stages of the journey. The thinking of the Tablighi votaries is indeed lamentable. They are extremely short-sighted to labour to undo what the Sahaabah and the Fuqaha of Khairul Qurooon and even thereafter had enforced.

An extremely stupid argument which evokes mirth is the Mufti Sahib's '*daleel*' that the womenfolk would emerge to answer the call of nature. What does he expect of them? While the Mufti Sahib answers the call of nature right inside his house, and numerous people in this age soil and contaminate their home environment with toilets right inside their bedrooms, even the modern molvis, answer the call inside their bedrooms

**SABEELUL MUNKARAAT FI  
JAMAA-AATIL MUTAKASH-SHIFAAT**

in toilets called ensuites, the people fourteen centuries ago incumbently answered the call of nature in the nearby bush at a distance from their homes. This dire need was a valid Shar'i need for *khurooj* of the women from their homes. The puerility of this 'daleel' is a mockery unexpected of a Mufti. How can a man of intelligence and Ilm argue permissibility of makshoofaat jamaat journeys on the basis of emergence for answering the call of nature?

All the examples of women emerging from their homes during the time of Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) tendered by the Mufti Sahib have no relationship whatsoever with makshoofaat jamaat journeys. There is a difference of heaven and earth between the two. The vilest assumption made by the Tablighi Ulama is that there is no fitnah and fasaad in our times, hence women may go on tabligh journeys. There is no answer for such self-induced intransigence and gross *jahaalat*.

Their mentality is indeed weird. While they list the conditions of permissibility, they fool themselves with the hallucination that these conditions are being observed when in fact there is no way of overcoming the element of fitnah and female exposure and mingling with all and sundry at various stages when undertaking journeys. They intentionally befool themselves with imagination because all of the Tablighi molvis and muftis have undertaken journeys. They are aware of the fitnah at airports, bus stations, train stations, inside the planes and trains and in general at almost every stage of the journey. But to them their specific methodology of tabligh overrides the *Nusooos* of prohibition. In this attitude have they transgressed the limits of Allah Ta'ala. In the words of the Qur'aan Majeed: *"These are the limits of Allah. Whoever transgresses the limits of Allah, verily he has oppressed his soul."*

**SABEELUL MUNKARAAT FI  
JAMAA-AATIL MUTAKASH-SHIFAAT**

*Ghuloo' (haraam extremism)* has become an outstanding feature of the Tabligh Jamaat. The entire Ummah -- all those who do not participate in Tabligh Jamaat activities, are in their opinion doomed to Jahannam. All other departments of Da'wat and Tabligh besides their specific method are futile and worthy of abandonment in their understanding.

The Fuqaha whom the Mufti Sahib quotes in a vain bid to bolster the makshoofaat jamaat case, and who have permitted women to emerge for a variety of needs on condition that the host of stringent conditions are observed, have issued this ruling for emergence within the town, not for the purpose of journeys for tabligh. To base makshoofaat jamaat journeys on this permission is fallacious.

The Mufti Sahib seeks to extravasate capital for his view from Fiqhi texts such as: *"If the husband permits her to emerge (from the home) to attend a gathering of knowledge which is devoid of bid'ah, then there is nothing wrong with this."* This type of 'daleel' is spurious and baseless. It does not support makshoofaat jamaat. It does not support the creation of a mass women's movement to fan out into the world, and even in the very same town from which they hail.

The permission stated by the Fuqaha applies to unostentatious, small gatherings of women in a nearby house. It does not entail travelling with public transport or undertaking journeys to other towns and countries. It is a quiet gathering without makshoofaat jamaat fanfare. In such a setting, the conditions stipulated by the Shariah can be observed. Never can these conditions be observed on a journey in this age of total fitnah and fasaad. There is therefore absolutely no sanction for makshoofaat jamaat tabligh journeys in any of the kutub of the Shariah. There is not a single Faqeeh in the entire history of

Islam who has countenanced what the Tabligh Jamaat is perpetrating regarding its makshoofaat jamaat.

Furthermore, the same Fuqaha who permit the unostentatious, silent and clandestine gatherings of women in the locality, vigorously condemn and prohibit the emergence of women to attend the Musjid and public gatherings of knowledge, thikr, etc. Insha-Allah, their statements and Fatawaa appear further on in this discussion.

The greater part of the Mufti Sahib's book consists of regurgitations. The same theme is piped over and over by different Ulama of the Tabligh Jamaat. He has presented not even one valid daleel to justify makshoofaat jamaat journeys. There is not a single precedent in the entire history of Islam of women going out on journeys for tabligh.

## **THE GRAVE ERROR OF 'BENEFITS'**

A reflective perusal of the Mufti Sahib's book will convince the unbiased searcher of the Haq that not a single cogent *Naqli* (*narrational*), Shar'i *daleel* has been proffered to substantiate the claimed permissibility for makshoofaat jamaat journeys and also for the mass, ostentatious women's movement with the emphasis on *khurooj minal buyout* (*emergence from the homes*) which is in diametric conflict with all the *Nusoos* of the Qur'aan and Ahaadith dealing with the subject of Hijaab.

The entire book of the Mufti Sahib consists of only one article which has been repeated over and over by a variety of Tablighi Ulama, some seniors, some juniors and contemporaries. Whatever the one has presented, the other one has ingeminated. And the accumulative conclusion is only one, namely, '*the benefits*' of makshoofaat jamaat.

**SABEELUL MUNKARAAT FI  
JAMAA-AATIL MUTAKASH-SHIFAAT**

Assuming that the ‘benefits’ are factual, then too, it is haraam to pursue and acquire benefits in conflict with the Shariah’s prohibitions. We are not under Shar’i obligation to acquire benefits by hook or by crook in violation of the Shariah’s laws. We are under obligation to obey the laws. That there are benefits in all things, whether halaal or haraam, is undeniable. However, when the benefits are overshadowed and outweighed by the evils and harms, then that act/deed/institution will be haraam.

Acknowledging the benefits of liquor and gambling, the Qur’aan Majeed says: *“They ask you (O Muhammad!) about liquor and gambling. Say (to them, O Muhammad!): ‘In both are great sin, and many benefits for man. However, their sin is worse than their benefits.’”*

Regardless of any benefits which the Tabligh Jamaat believes to be in makshoofaat jamaat, its harms, especially audacity of women, damaging and ruining their haya, mingling in a world of fussaag, fujjaar and kuffaar, etc., outweigh the benefits. And, assuming that the benefits are indeed more than the harms, then too, the mass women’s movement moving around from place to place is just not permissible since it is in violation of all the *Nusoos* of the Shariah as well as in conflict with Islam’s spirit, and nugatory of the natural role for which Allah Ta’ala has created females. Makshoofaat Jamaat masculinizes or defeminizes women.

Even should it be conceded that there are indeed benefits in makshoofaat jamaat, the argument may not be employed to scuttle the Shariah’s law pertaining to Hijaab – total Hijaab, not a veneer of hijab as practised by the *mutakash-shifaat* (women who expose themselves outside the home).



Consider the episode of a man who visited a brothel where he indulged in zina with a non-Muslim prostitute who then fell in love with the Muslim man. She converted to Islam. Both sincerely resorted to Taubah and led a life of Taqwa. From her offspring came such pious children who later became Ulama and Auliya.

Now in terms of the Tabligh Jamaat's logic of 'benefits', it should be permissible for Muslim males to become embroiled with non-Muslim prostitutes with the intention of da'wat and gaining the wonderful benefit of the children who will perhaps becoming pious Muslims.

A buzrug had secured the Taubah of a prostitute in similar circumstances. But his example is not for adoption on the basis of the 'benefits'. Hadhrat Khidhr (alayhis salaam) killed an innocent na-baaligh boy because of future benefit for his parents. But his example may not be adopted for the simple reason that the Shariah does not permit haraam acts on the basis of the acquisition of 'benefits'. Thus, the 'benefits' argument is shallow-minded bunkum.

Shaitaan is a cunning ustaadh. He lures into his den of vice with deeds masked under a veneer of altruism. By degrees he desensitizes the Mu'min's inhibition to evil. The erosion of Imaani inhibition caused by shaitaan is a subtle and silent creeping cancer which deteriorates without initial detection. Some decades ago there were no Hanafi Musjids in South Africa with faasiqah (ladies) facilities. But today, almost every Musjid has created such vile facilities. The evil of female exhibition - *Jaahiliyyah Ula* – is now an established fact in almost all the Musaajid. In fact, shaitaani molvis masquerading as Ulama, are encouraging the lewd females to drive to the Musaajid to listen to their corrupt bayaans in supposedly

**SABEELUL MUNKARAAT FI  
JAMAA-AATIL MUTAKASH-SHIFAAT**

‘separate ladies facilities’. We reproduce here a letter which a Brother wrote of 15<sup>th</sup> May 2015:

“Assalamualaikum

I recently attended a nikah at the masjid and was shocked at the fitna that was taking place. I am emailing to ask if you can write a letter to the imam, which I can drop off in the hope of him changing his ways.

There were always ladies facilities at this masjid, what is new is that now the ladies section is all along the left side of the masjid right to the front, with wooden stacking doors inbetween the men and the women. These doors have many holes inbetween so it doesn't fulfil it's purpose of a pardah screen.

What was shocking, was that one entire section of these doors, about 5 metres long, in the front left of the masjid, was opened completely. The ladies that came for the salah and nikah were standing there looking at the khutbah etc. Obviously right next to men.

A video camera was placed there on a tripod also by one of the ladies. Whilst the khutbah was on, flashes from cameras were coming from the same side.

The imam was making jokes, talking to them and looking at the ladies side many times, told the ladies to switch the lights ON on their side for reasons we don't understand and which would make the little ‘pardah’ a total mockery.

The nikah was of a Shafee to a Hanafi and the khutbah and nikah was done as a 'mix' between the two madhabs according to the imam. As the nikah parties signed etc and throughout the nikah, cameras were flashing and even whilst the dua was on as well. I hurriedly left the gathering.

What happened after, was very distressing. Some of my family who had not left immediately say that some men went into the ladies side, hugging the bride etc. The bride and groom posed with each other and everyone took photos of them. Free intermingling was taking place. So many commands of Allah being totally trampled on and violated shamelessly, right inside the masjid! And with full support by the faasiq imam.

**SABEELUL MUNKARAAT FI  
JAMAA-AATIL MUTAKASH-SHIFAAT**

The imam thereafter also attended the wedding function, where Allah knows best what sins took place. There was no pardah inbetween men and women, where the imam gave a talk. etc. as well. All this in the name of Islam.” (*End of letter*)

Such immorality was unimaginable in even the bid’ati Hanafi Musjids a couple of decades ago. For the molvis masquerading as Ulama, the scenario described in the letter is a non-issue. They and even the Ulama who promote female attendance at the Musaajid will shrug off the lament in the letter as if it is of no significance. That is because their hearts are desensitized. They can no longer differentiate between vice and virtue in terms of the Shariah and Islamic morality.

This is not a rare case. The norm at all Musaajid attended by women is fitnah which is now accepted and not regarded as fitnah. Furthermore, almost all of these women who attend the Musaajid are members of makshoofaat jamaat. They are bereft of haya – *be-sharam*, *be-baak*, and their menfolk are *be-ghairat dayyoos* (dishonourable cuckolds).

The existence of viable separate facilities for ladies is a haraam myth – a vile canard propagated by buffoon molvis and imams of the Musaajid. The same villainy perpetrated by the fussaag molvis is the disease of those who conduct girls madrasahs, and the Tabligh Jamaat is hard on their heels in emulation. They all are blind to the evil consequences of *the emergence* of women from their homes to participate in public activities, be these of a Deeni nature. And, the ‘burqah’ is merely a smokescreen to justify the haraam shenanigans of the women and men who have discarded Shar’i Hijaab. The burqah is not the be-all of Hijaab.

## **THE ORIGINAL FATWA OF DAARUL ULOOM DEOBAND AND MAZAAHIRUL ULOOM OF SAHARANPUR**

The **Original Fatwa of Prohibition** on the question of makshoofaat jamaat was issued by the very Senior Muftis of Daarul Uloom Deoband and Mazaahirul Uloom 65 years ago. We reproduce the Original Fatwa and its translation:

### **MAKSHUFAAT (LADIES) TABLIGH JAMAAT**

**FROM THE ARCHIVES OF THE HEADQUARTERS – DAARUL  
ULOOM DEOBAND ---- CONSENSUS OF PAST AND PRESENT  
MUFTIS OF THE HEADQUARTERS – ENDORSED BY  
MAZAAHIRUL ULOOM**

### **TRANSLATION OF THE QUESTION AND THE FATWA**

**Question: What is the fatwa of the Ulama and the Muftis of the Deen on the issue of women going on Tableegh journeys accompanied by their mahrams? Is it permissible?**

**(Question asked by Haafiz Abdur Raheem, Musjid Kotawali, Dehli, India - 17 Safar 1371)**

**This question was sent to Darul Ifta of Deoband Darul Uloom 61 years ago.**

**ANSWER BY HADHRAT MUFTI SAYYID MEHDI HASAN, THE CHIEF MUFTI OF DAARUL ULOOM DEOBAND.**

**Hadhrat Mufti Sayyid Mehdi Hasan (rahmatullah alayh) was the Ustaadh of Hadhrat Maulana Masihullah (rahmatullah alayh), Hadhrat Mufti Mahmoodul Hasan Gangohi (rahmatullah) and of many other senior Ulama.**

**Responding to the question, the Honourable Chief Mufti wrote:**

**“Women would not travel for tableegh during the age of Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) nor during the time of the Sahaabah (radhiyallahu anhum) nor during the time of the Taabieen (rahmatullah alayhim). Neither did Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) nor the Sahaabah instruct women to embark on journeys for the purpose of tableegh nor did they send women on tableegh journeys. It is thus established that it is not permissible for women to travel for the purpose of tableegh.**

**During the era of Khairul Quroon (the first three ages of Islam), if a woman required information (in a Deeni issue), she would approach the Holy Wives (of Rasulullah – sallallahu alayhi wasallam) or the wives of the Sahaabah.**

**Tableegh during that period was the responsibility imposed on men. Females through the medium of Purdah would learn the laws of the Deen. It was the function of men to educate their womenfolk regarding the ahkaam of the Deen. Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) and the Sahaabah would travel for the purpose of tableegh and jihad. Generally they would not take women along.**

**When this was the state during that age of virtue, then how can it be permissible in this age of vice and mischief for women to travel for the purpose of tableegh even if accompanied by their mahrams. The question: How will tableegh be made to females?, is not valid. Their menfolk should make tableegh to them and teach them the ahkaam of the Deen.**

**The menfolk themselves should acquire knowledge of the Deen from others who know. They should undertake journies to learn and to teach the Deen. If women in general embark on tableegh journies, the doors of fitnah will open up. This state (of fitnah and evil) is today being observed. And, Allah knows best.**

**Signed:**

- (1) Mufti Sayyid Mehdi Hasan (The Chief Mufti of Daarul Uloom Deoband) 25 Safar 1371**
- (2) Mufti Saeed Ahmad (The Chief Mufti of Mazaahirul Uloom, Saharanpur**
- (3) Mufti Abdul Lateef (Chief Superintendant, Mazaahirul Uloom, Saharanpur**
- (4) Mufti Habeebur Rahmaan (Daarul Uloom Deoband) 23 Rabiul Awwal 1432**

This original Fatwa of Daarul Uloom Deoband issued by very senior Ulama, overrides the fatwa of Mufti Mahmoodul Hasan and also all the personal opinions of today's Tablighi Jamaat Ulama. This original Fatwa is in line with the Fataawa of all the Fuqaha of all the Math-habs. The personal opinions of the votaries of the Tabligh Jamaat lack in Shar'i daleel, hence have no status when compared to the Fatwa of their seniors.

بسم الله الرحمن الرحيم

کیا فرماتے ہیں علماء کرام مفتیان عظام مندرجہ ذیل مسئلہ کے بارے میں؟  
(۱) مستورات اپنے اپنے شوہروں کے ساتھ یا بچہ خرموں کے ساتھ تبلیغی جماعت میں جاتی ہیں باقاعدہ شرعی دائرہ حدود میں رہتے ہوئے مکمل حجاب و پردہ کے ساتھ مرد پر طریقہ کے مطابق عورتوں کا جماعت میں جانا کیا ہے؟ مرد پر طریقہ عوامیہ ہے کہ پیش کی بھی عورتیں جماعت میں جاتی ہیں ان سب عورتوں کے اپنے اپنے خرم ساتھ میں ہوتے ہیں اور باقاعدہ مکمل پردہ کے ساتھ چلتے ہیں، عورتوں کے ٹھہرنے، اور طعام کا انتظام کسی باپردہ گھریں ہوتا ہے۔ جہاں کسی بھی مرد کی آمد و رفت پر مکمل پابندی ہوتی ہے، اور مرد و حضرات محلہ کی مسجد وغیرہ میں عورتوں سے بالکل الگ ٹھہرتے ہیں اور مستورات عورتوں کی تبلیغ کرتی ہیں اور مرد مردوں کی تبلیغ کرتے ہیں، تو کیا ایسی صورت جائز ہے؟ اپنا جائز ہے؟ اس کے علاوہ اگر کوئی صورت ناجائز یا جواز کی ہو تو وہ بھی برائے کرم مفصل تحریر فرما دیجئے، اور جناب بالکل صاف صاف اور مدلل باقاعدہ حوالہ جات کے ساتھ عنایت فرما دیجئے، انتہائی مہربانی ہوگی، والسلام

الحاضر عبدالقیوم قاسمی

مہتمم مدرسہ دارالعلوم سیہ فرمائی مظفرنگر

بسم الله الرحمن الرحيم

الجواب وانشاء اللہ تعالیٰ۔ اللہ نے مردوں کو مکلف بنایا ہے کہ وہ دین کے احکام کی کراچی عورتوں کو سکھائیں کلکٹم راعی وکلکٹم مسسٹول غن ز عینہ (بخاری) عورتوں کو دعوت تبلیغ کا مکلف نہیں بنایا ہے۔ ان کو دعوت تبلیغ، امامت، خلافت سے مستثنیٰ رکھا ہے۔ انھیں اپنے گھر میں رہنے اور پردہ میں رہنے کا حکم دیا ہے وَ قَرْنَ فِي بُيُوتِكُنَّ (القرآن) انھیں صرف ضرورت اور مجبوری میں گھروں سے نکلنے کی اجازت دی گئی ہے۔ عن ابن عمر عن النبی ﷺ لَيْسَ لِلنِّسَاءِ فِي الْخُرُوجِ نَصِيبٌ إِلَّا مُضْطَرَةً (رواہ الطبرانی فی المعجم الکبیر) فتوں کا دور ہے فتوں کی وجہ سے عورتوں کو فرض نماز کیلئے اپنے محلہ کی مسجد میں آنے سے خواہ مخوم کے ساتھ آئیں۔ صحابہ کے مشورہ سے حضرت عمر فاروق کے عہد خلافت میں روک دیا گیا۔ تو جہاں تبلیغ میں نکلنے کے لئے جو ایک امر مستحب ہے کیونکہ اجازت ہو سکتی ہے جبکہ عہد صحابہ کے مقابلہ میں اس دور میں بہت زیادہ فتوں کا شیعہ ہے اور بخاری شریف کی اس حدیث کی بار بار تفسیر دیا گیا، عن عائشة قَالَتْ لَوْ أَدْرَكَ رَسُولُ اللَّهِ ﷺ مَا أَخَذَتْ النِّسَاءُ لِمَنْعَتِهِنَّ الْمَسْجِدَ كَمَا مَنَعَتْ نِسَاءَ بَنِي إِسْرَافِيلَ فَقُلْتُ أَوْ مَنَعْتِهِنَّ؟ قُلْتُ نَعَمْ (بخاری ص ۱۲۰) غیر اقرآن میں عورتوں کو دین کی دعوت تبلیغ کیلئے بھیجے گی کوئی نظیر نہیں ملتی جبکہ اس زمانے میں زیادہ ضرورت تھی کیونکہ اسلام میں اکثر مرد اور عورتیں داخل ہو رہی تھیں۔ بانی تبلیغ حضرت مولانا محمد الیاس اس کام کیلئے مفتی اعظم حضرت مولانا محمد کھلیہ اللہ کے پاس تین مرتبہ تشریف لگئے اور ان سے عورتوں کی جماعت بھیجے کی اجازت چاہی۔ حضرت مفتی صاحب نے تینوں مرتبہ انھیں منع فرمایا اے حضرت مولانا محمد الیاس نے بھی عورتوں کی جماعت نہیں بھیجی، ان کے صاحبزادے حضرت جی جعفری حضرت مولانا محمد یوسف صاحب نے بھی کبھی عورتوں کی جماعت نہیں بھیجی، عورتوں کو اپنی بستی میں ہی کسی کے مکان میں ہفتہ واری ایک یا دو اجتماع کر لینا چاہئے اس میں دینی مذاکرہ کر لیا کریں۔ اس سے کافی دیداری کا داخل پیدا ہوگا۔ ہمارے اسلام کا یہی طریقہ رہا ہے۔ عورتوں کو باہر اور دور دراز جانے سے احتیاط کرنا چاہئے۔ خرم کے ہوتے ہوئے بھی غیر خرموں کے ساتھ سفر ہوتا ہے۔ مثلاً وہ عورتوں کی ایک جماعت اپنے اپنے خرم کیساتھ نکلتی ہے تو ہر عورت کا ایک ایک خرم ہوتا ہے اور باقی آدمی غیر خرم ہوتے ہیں جن کیساتھ وہ جاتی ہیں۔ یہ بے احتیاطی ہے، غیر خرم کیساتھ سفر کرنے کی احادیث میں ممانعت آئی ہے الاکل لاسراة تو من باللہ والیوم الآخر تسافر مسیریة یوم ولیلۃ الا مع ذی محرم علیہا (مسلم) فقط والاسراة لم حب الوطن

عنا اللہ عن مفتی دارالعلوم دیوبند

کرم خرم ۱۳۳۲ھ

مفتی دارالعلوم دیوبند  
سیہ فرمائی مظفرنگر



(۱۵۷/د)

سوال: کیا فرماتے ہیں علمائے دین و مفتیان شرع متین مسئلہ ذیل میں کہ کیا عورتوں کا تبلیغ کے لیے سفر کرنا حرم کے درمست ہے؟

المفتی:

حافظ عبدالرحیم سید کوٹھہ والی صدر بازار دہلی

۱۳۷۱/۲/۱۷ھ

(۱۰۹/د)

بسم اللہ الرحمن الرحیم

الجواب: آنحضرت ﷺ اور صحابہ کرام رضی اللہ عنہم اور تابعین رحمہم اللہ کے زمانہ میں تبلیغ کے لیے عورتیں سفر نہ کرتی تھیں، اور نہ آپ ﷺ نے اور نہ صحابہ نے تبلیغ کے لیے عورتوں کو سفر کرنے کا حکم فرمایا نہ خود تبلیغ کے لیے سفر میں روانہ کیا، اس عمل سے ثابت ہے کہ عورتوں کو تبلیغ کے لیے سفر کرنا جائز نہیں، خیر القرون کے زمانہ میں اگر کسی عورت کو کسی مسئلہ کی ضرورت ہوتی تھی، تو آنحضرت ﷺ یا ازواج مطہرات یا صحابہ کی بیویوں سے آکر دریافت کر لیتی تھیں، تبلیغ مردوں کے ذمے اُس زمانے میں مقرر تھی، اور عورتیں پردہ کے ذریعہ سے احکام کو معلوم کر کے دین کی باتیں سیکھتی تھیں، مردوں کا کام یہ تھا کہ وہ اپنی عورتوں کو دین سے واقف کرائیں آنحضرت ﷺ اور صحابہ کرام تبلیغ کے لیے سفر کرتے تھے، جہاد میں جاتے تھے، لیکن عام طور پر سب عورتوں کو اپنے ساتھ نہ لے جاتے تھے۔

جب اُس خیر کے زمانے میں یہ صورت حال رہی ہے، تو اس شر اور فتنوں کے زمانے میں عورتوں کو تبلیغ کے لیے سفر کرنا، اگرچہ حرم کے ساتھ ہی کیوں نہ ہو کیوں کر جائز ہو سکتا ہے؟ یہ خیال کہ عورتوں کو کس طرح تبلیغ ہوگی؟ اس بنا پر صحیح نہیں کہ ان کے مرد ان کو تبلیغ کریں، اور دین کے احکام ان کو سکھائیں، اور خود مرد دین کی باتیں دوسرے واقف کاروں سے سیکھیں یا سیکھنے اور سکھانے کے لیے سفر کریں، ورنہ عام طور پر عورتوں کا تبلیغ کے لیے سفر کرنا فتنے کے دروازوں کا کھول دینا ہے، جو آج دنیا پر نظر ڈالنے سے مشاہد بھی ہے فقط واللہ تعالیٰ اعلم

سید مہدی حسن غفرلہ

(صدر مفتی دارالعلوم دیوبند)

۱۳۷۱/۲/۲۵ھ

الجواب صحیح: سید احمد غفرلہ (مفتی اعظم مظاہر علوم سہارنپور)

الجواب صحیح: عبداللطیف (ناظم اعلیٰ مظاہر علوم سہارنپور)

نوٹ: ان دونوں حضرات کی تصدیق مظاہر علوم سہارنپور کے دارالافتاء کے ریکارڈ میں محفوظ ہے۔

(مفتی) حبیب الرحمن عفا اللہ عنہ

۱۳۳۲/۳/۲۳ھ

نقل من اصل  
۲۸  
۱۳۷۱





## A RECENT FATWA OF DAARUL ULOOM DEOBAND

### THE LADIES TABLIGH JAMAAT

#### **Question**

Ladies go for Tabligh Jamaat work with their husbands or with their mahrams. What is the ruling of women going out in customary Jamaat work fully observing hijaab and purdah and remaining within the proper Shar'i confines and limits? The customary practice germane to Ladies Jamaat is that all those women going out in Jamaat have their mahrams with them and they travel observing fully the Shar'i Code of Purdah.

Arrangements for the lodging and meals for these women are made at a home of Purdah where no male is allowed to visit at all. The males (accompanying the Ladies Jamaat) stay over at the local Musjid or elsewhere completely away from the ladies. The ladies engage in tabligh to women and the males to men.

Is this scenario permissible or not? If there is some other way of permissibility or if it is impermissible then kindly elaborate. Please provide a clear, detailed and authoritative response with references. It will be much appreciated. (Abdul Qayyoom Qasmi, Principal Darul Uloom Maseehiyyah, Farmani, Muzaffar Nagar)

**Answer (Wabillaahit Taufeeq):**

Allah Ta'ala has made obligatory upon males to learn the Ahkaam of the Deen and teach it to their females.

***“All of you are shepherds and all of you shall be questioned about his flock.” (Bukhari)***

Women have not been tasked with Da'wah and Tabligh. They have been excluded from Da'wah, Tabligh, Imaamat and Khilaafat. They have been instructed to remain in their homes and in Purdah.

***“And remain firmly in your homes.” (Qur’aan)***

Women have only been granted permission to emerge from their homes at times of need and in emergencies. It is reported from Hadhrat Ibn Umar (radhiyallahu anhu) that Nabi (sallallahu alaihi wasallam) said:

***“Women have no share in emerging (from their homes) except in emergencies.” (Tabaraani—Mu’jamul Kabeer)***

This age is full of *fitnah*. On account of the preponderance of *Fitnah*, women were debarred from coming to the Musjid of the locality even with their mahrams during the Khilaafat of Hadhrat Umar (radhiyallahu anhu) upon the mutual consultation of the Sahaabah. Thus, how can it be permissible for them (ladies) to go out in Tabligh Jamaat work, which is a *mustahab* act, when in

this age *fitnah* is pandemic in our societies? They had been debarred (from the Masaajid) on the basis of this Hadith which is reported in Bukhari Shareef: “Hadhrat Aishah (radhiyallahu anha) said:

*‘Had Rasulullah (Sallallahu alaihi wasallam) witnessed what women have introduced he would have banned them from the Musjid just as the women of Bani Isra’eel were banned.’ ‘Were they really banned,’ the narrator asked? ‘Yes, they were,” Hadhrat Aishah replied. (Bukhari, 1/120)*

There is no precedent in the *Khairul Quroon* of women being dispatched on Da’wah and Tabligh, whereas the need during that time was greater in view of the large number of men and women entering the fold of Islam.

The founder of the Tabligh Jamaat, Hadhrat Maulana Ilyaas Sahib went to Mufti A’zam Hadhrat Maulana Kifaayatullah Sahib on three occasions for this purpose; of seeking permission to send women on Tabligh missions. On all three occasions Hadhrat Mufti Sahib forbade him. Hence Hadhrat Maulana Ilyaas Sahib never sent women out in Jamaat. Likewise, his son, Hazratji – Hadhrat Moulana Muhammad Yusuf Sahib – never organized women’s Jamaats.

Women should confine their activities to meeting once or twice weekly at a home in the locality having Deeni Ta’leem. This will be efficacious in

inculcating Deeni fervour. This was the time-honoured Tareeqah of our *Aslaaf* (Predecessors).

Women should be cautious in leaving the town and journeying to far-off places. In spite of the presence of mahrams there are ghair mahrams also present on the journey. For example, a group of ten women set off on journey with their respective mahrams. Now in this scenario each woman has one mahram with the remaining nine men travelling along being ghair mahrams. This is lack of caution. The Ahaadith have prohibited travelling with ghair mahrams.

And Allah knows best.

**Habeebur Rahmaan (Afallahu anhu)**

**Mufti, Darul Uloom Deoband**

**Zainul Islam Qasmi**

**Deputy Mufti, Darul Uloom Deoband**

## **THE ATTEMPT TO NEUTRALIZE THE FATWA**

In response to Hadhrat Mufti Kifaayatullah's three-time veto of makshoofaat jamaat (mentioned in the aforementioned Fatwa of Daarul Uloom Deoband), the Tablighi Mufti Sahib states in his book:

*“Hadhrat Mufti Sahib had prohibited travelling (for women) without mahrams because Mufti Sahib himself had permitted women to emerge from their homes for Ta'leem.”*

This is the Tablighi Mufti's first response. His claim is a false assumption. His interpretation is baseless. The question posed to Mufti Kifayatullah by Maulana Ilyas was not about women travelling without mahrams. Maulana Ilyas did not seek permission for sending out women on journeys without their mahrams. This assumption made by the Tablighi Mufti is preposterous.

The assumption of the Mufti Sahib implies that Maulana Ilyas was seeking a fatwa to override the need for a mahram to accompany a woman on a journey. Such a belief is kufr. It is in rejection of a mas'alah substantiated by *Nass-e-Qat'i*, and on which there is not the slightest difference of opinion. It is most unbecoming of the Mufti Sahib to have fabricated such a vile assumption whereby he demoted Maulana Ilyas to an ignorant layman seeking a fatwa of permissibility for women to travel without mahrams.

The Mufti Sahib's second response which is another fallacious assumption is:

*“Assuming that Mufti Sahib (i.e. Mufti Kifayatullah) did not give permission, then in this mas'alah he is ma'zoor.”*

The Tablighi Mufti Sahib has uttered a vile calumny against such a great Mufti as Mufti Kifayatullah Sahib (rahmatullah alayh). In fact, the Tablighi Mufti, displays gross ineptitude in his arguments in his book in support of makshoofaat jamaat. This confirms that he is a *ma'zoor*. The *ma'zoor* epithet implies that Hadhrat Mufti Kifayatullah did not understand the issue and did not know what he was talking when he vetoed Maulana Ilyas's idea of makshoofaat jamaat.

It should be borne in mind that Hadhrat Mufti Kifayatullah was one of the greatest Ulama of the Indian sub-continent. He was not a *maajin* mufti such as the glut of 'muftis' roaming around today. Maulana Ilyas must assuredly have elaborated in detail his makshoofaat jamaat plan, and this he did on three different occasions, to meet with a rebuff on each attempt. Mufti Kifayatullah must have studied the plan carefully, and only after giving the matter considerable and deep thought, issued his Fatwa of prohibition which was entirely in conformity with the Shariah while the request of Maulana Ilyas was in conflict with both the letter and the spirit of the Shariah. Thus, to say that Mufti Kifayatullah was *ma'zoor* thereby implying that he lacked the expertise and ability for issuing his Fatwa against the proposed makshoofaat jamaat, is bunkum disgorged with contumacy by the Tablighi Mufti Sahib.

Continuing his second response, the Tablighi Mufti avers:

*"He was ma'zoor because at that time the formation of the mastooraat jamaat had not yet been inaugurated. When, afterwards the jamaat was formed and the benefits came to the fore, then many Muftis bestowed permission..."*

The issue here is Mufti Kifayatullah, not the "many other Muftis". The fact remains that Hadhrat Mufti Kifayatullah had refused permission on three occasions after Maulana Ilyas had most assuredly explained his plan elaborately with much

**SABEELUL MUNKARAAT FI  
JAMAA-AATIL MUTAKASH-SHIFAAT**

insistence. The contention that this great Mufti was *ma'zoor* because the makshoofaat jamaat had not yet been born is nonsense. A Shar'i ruling for a venture is sought prior to embarkation. The horse is put in front of the cart, not vice versa.

It is imperative to obtain a Shar'i ruling prior to embarking on a venture to ascertain whether it is permissible or not. A venture is not first put into operation, and a fatwa for its permissibility is only then sought. The determination of permissibility or impermissibility is not achieved on the basis of benefits. The basis is the principles and teachings of the Shariah. The entire emphasis of the Tablighi Ulama is on the 'benefits', not on the principles of the Shariah. There are benefits in everything. It is this 'benefit' hallucination to which the shaitaani television molvis cling for permissibility.

The Muftis of Daarul Uloom Deoband have confirmed that Maulana Ilyas was turned down thrice by Mufti Kifayatullah in regard to the makshoofaat jamaat issue. The matter was never for women to go on journeys without mahrams as the Tablighi Mufti Sahib ludicrously contends.

The responses of the Tablighi Mufti Sahib are devoid of Shar'i substance, and in no way whatever could be deemed valid for overriding the veto of Mufti Kifayatullah.

## MUFTI KIFAYATULLAH'S DETAILED FATWA ON *KHUROOJ* (EMERGENCE) OF WOMEN FROM THEIR HOMES.

### The Prohibition of Women Attending Gatherings and Lectures

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

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

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

### Answer to Question 1

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

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

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



*This claim is baseless and designed to confuse and mislead. That there is consensus of the Fuqaha on the prohibition of women attending public lectures, is stated by many Ulama. In this regard, Mufti Kifayatullah says:*

“The Ulama have ruled by **consensus** that it is Makrooh-e-Tahreemi for women to attend Salaat in Jamaa’at, and from this, every intelligent person will understand that since this is the ruling regarding the Compulsory gatherings (Jamaa’at Salaat) then **there is no way that gatherings of lectures, etc can ever be permissible.**”

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

*The categorizing of the Fuqaha into two groups on this issue by the Tablighi Mufti is chicanery. All the Fuqaha unanimously state that it is haraam for women to emerge into the public adorned and perfumed. There is no ikhtilaaf on this issue. It is not a group of the Fuqaha who is of this view. There is not a single Faqeeh who maintained that it is permissible for a woman to emerge for her need dressed in her finery, perfumed and adorned.*

*Similarly, there is not a single Faqeeh who said that a woman may not emerge for her needs despite observing the conditions and limits of the Shariah. Since this is not the issue, the Tablighi Mufti is trying to pull wool over the eyes of the public by baselessly categorizing the Fuqaha into two groups. The simple consensus of the Fuqaha is on the prohibition of women*

*attending the Musjid for any and all purposes which include lectures since such emergence was never among their needs.*

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

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

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

*This is precisely what we are saying. But the Mufti Sahib is presenting it in a manner to confuse and to create the impression that the Fuqaha who permit Khurooj, do so for purposes of lectures and Salaat. But this is blatantly false. We have earlier mentioned that **all** the Fuqaha permit Khurooj for Shar'i needs. Thus, the Fuqaha who permit Khurooj do not permit it for lectures and Salaat. The impression traded by the Tablighi Mufti Sahib is that some Fuqaha had at one time prohibited women from attending public lectures, and at another time permitted them. This idea is false and deceptive.*

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

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

*husband' never transcends the Right of the Shariah. The Fuqaha unanimously state that even the husband will be sinful if he permits the khurooj of his wife in times and ways of fitnah. The husband has no right to permit his wife or to accompany his wife into the world of fitnah and fasaad for a purpose which the Shariah does not impose on women.*

*The prohibition of the Fuqaha on which exists consensus is unrelated to the husband's right. The husband has the right to prohibit his wife from emerging for even a perfectly halaal purpose, and it is obligatory on her to obey him despite violation of her right. For any violation, Allah Ta'ala will hold the husband responsible, but the wife has to obey as long as her obedience does not clash with the Shariah. The prohibition pivots on the fitnah and fasaad of the times – the fitnah of men, the fitnah of women, and the fitnah in the public domain. All of this is unrelated to the right of the husband.*

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

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

Continuing with his Fatwa, Mufti Kifayatullah says:

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

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

The narrator of this Hadeeth further states,

“I asked Hadhrat Umrah (radhiyallaahu ‘anhaa) if they (women of Banee Israaeel) were prevented from attending the Masaajid..?”

She replied, “Yes.”

(Bukhaari)

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

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

“The ‘Ulamaa have stated that the women during the lifetime of Rasulullaah (Sallallaahu ‘Alayhi Wasallam) used to attend ‘Eid Salaat because that was an era wherein there was goodness and blessings and there was no fear of Fitnah. However, in these times a woman is most certainly not allowed to attend. It is for this reason that Hadhrat Aishah (radhiyallaahu anha) said that ‘had Nabee (Sallallaahu ‘Alayhi Wasallam) seen the condition

of the women of today he would most surely have prevented them from attending the Masjid, just as the women of Banee Israaeel were prevented.'

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

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

Allaamah Aini (rahmatullaahi 'alayh) states in another place in his kitaab, "Umdatul Qaari",

"The ruling of our companions is that which the author of Bada'i (name of kitaab) has stated - whereupon there is a consensus of opinion that a woman cannot attend 'Eid or Jumu'ah Salaat — in fact she is prohibited from attending any/all Salaat. This ruling is based on the Aayat of the Qur-aan (regarding women) – '*And remain steadfast (glued) to your homes.*' The emergence of women from their homes is a cause of Fitnah."

(Aini and Bada'i Page 275, Vol 1)

It is further stated in Bada'i,

"Women are not allowed to attend Salaat with Jamaa'at —the proof is in that narration of Hadhrat 'Umar (radhiyallaahu 'anhu) wherein he prohibited women from emerging from their homes.

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

(Bada’i page 157, Vol 1)

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

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

(Fataawaa Aalamgiri Page 93, Vol 1)

It is said in the Kitaab, Bada’i,

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

(Bada’i, Page 258, Vol 1)

From the foregoing texts, it is ascertained that for women to attend the five daily Salaat, ‘Eid- Salaat and Jumu’ah Salaat is Makrooh-e-Tahreemi and their emergence from their homes is a means of Fitnah. This prohibition was sanctioned by Hadhrat Umar, Hadhrat ‘Aaeeshah, ‘Urwah bin Zubair, Qaasim, Yahyaa bin Sa’eed Ansaari (radhiyallaahu ‘anhum), Imaam Maalik and Imaam Abu Yusuf (rahmatullaahi ‘alayhim). The ‘Ulama have reached a consensus of opinion on this matter (that women should not leave their homes). This is clear from the texts of Aini and Bada’i.

Notwithstanding the fact that during the era of Nabee (Sallallaahu ‘Alayhi Wasallam) women used to attend the five daily Salaat (in the Masjid) and the ‘Eid and Jumu’ah Salaats,

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

Firstly, nowadays most lecture gatherings are such that, let alone women, it is not even permissible for men to attend them, because most speakers/lecturers who are regarded as Molvis, have scanned through a couple of Islaamic reference books and have become orators. Then in their lectures, besides a few stories, some half-true narrations and fabricated tales, there is nothing else. It is not permissible for anyone to attend these types of lectures.

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

**SABEELUL MUNKARAAT FI  
JAMAA-AATIL MUTAKASH-SHIFAAT**

*(This prohibition of listening to the lectures of ‘molvis’ and ‘shaikhs’ masquerading as Ulama, applies to a greater degree to the ‘molvis’, muftis’ and shaikhs’ who appear on the immoral media such as facebook, television and radio stations of shaitaan. And, remember that all so-called ‘Islamic’ radio stations, are haraam appendages of Iblees. There is no exception. It is not permissible to listen to the talks of these scoundrels pretending to be men of the Deen. They corrupt the Imaan and ruin the Akhlaaq of the masses.—Mujlisul Ulama of S.A.)*

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

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

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

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



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

(Bahrur Ra’iq Page 380)

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

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

It is reported from Imaam Abu Haneefah (rahmatullaahi alayh) that it is permissible for old ladies to attend Fajr, Maghrib and Eshaa Salaats. Saahibain (Imaam Abu Yusuf and Imaam Muhammad) and the other 3 Imaams (Maalik, Shaaf’i and Ibn Hambal) (rahmatullaahi ‘alayhim) say old ladies can attend all Salaats. However, the ruling of these times is that old and young women are all prohibited from attending Salaat in Jamaa’at. And the author is also of the opinion that Jumu’ah, ‘Eid and Istisqaah Salaats and **Lecture gatherings are all included in this prohibition**, specifically those lectures of persons posing as ‘Ulama whose object is to satisfy their desires and to earn worldly benefits.” --*Such as the facebook, television and radio scoundrels who are shaitaan-incarnate – Mujlisul Ulama*

(Aini Sharah Kanz, Page 39)

It is stated in “Durrul Mukhtaar”,

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

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

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

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

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

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

From this and preceding texts, it is clearly ascertained that **emergence of women from their homes, and their participation in the Jamaa’at is a sure cause of Fitnah, and**

**the ruling of prohibition is for the prevention of this Fitnah.** The visiting of graves, ‘Eid, Jumu’ah and Istisqaa Salaats and **Lectures** are all included within the ambit of this prohibition.

It is established that young women, whether they emerge adorned or ordinarily clad, in all instances, their emergence (from their homes) is not permissible. And even though there appears to be a concession in some narrations for the emergence of old women for Fajr, Maghrib and Eshaa Salaats, on condition that they are not adorned in any way, the final ruling (Muftaa Bihi) on this matter is that even they (old ladies) are not allowed to emerge from their homes. This is clearly proven from the texts of Allaamah Aini’s (rahmatullaahi ‘alayh) Sharah-e-Kanz and Durrul Mukhtaar.

If the Lecture gatherings include poems (nazams) which appeal to the passions of people, then the ruling regarding the attendance of women at these gatherings is not such that any knowledgeable person will have any doubt or hesitation regarding it (i.e. its prohibition). Hadhrat Anas (radhiyallaahu ‘anhu) has reported that Nabee (Sallallaahu Alayhi Wasallam) had a caravan leader (one who leads/drives the camels by singing to them); his name was Anjasha and he had a beautiful voice. Nabee (Sallallaahu ‘Alayhi Wasallam) said to him: *“Hold on (i.e. sing softly); do not break the glass.”* Hadhrat Qataadah (radhiyallaahu anhu) said that by “glass” Nabee (Sallallaahu Alayhi Wasallam) meant the (fragility of) women. (Mishkaat, Page 410)

Maulana Shaykh ‘Abdul Haqq Dehlwi (rahmatullaahi ‘alayh) explains this Hadeeth saying,  
“Nabee (Sallallaahu Alayhi Wasallam) gave Anjasha the order to lower his voice, because Nabee (Sallallaahu ‘Alayhi Wasallam) feared that the hearts of the women (accompanying them) would be affected (by this voice), thereby giving rise to a

Fitnah, since the will-power of women is weak and their hearts are easily influenced by such things.”(Lam'aat, also in Footnote of Mishkaat)

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

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

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

### **Answer to Question 2**

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

The reply is: **That the very emergence of women from their homes is in itself impermissible.** And in this emergence, due to there being a possibility of Fitnah, most Fuqahaa (Islaamic

Jurists) have given the ruling of **absolute impermissibility**..... Also, the Fuqahaa have given the ruling of impermissibility for women to attend Salaats with Jamaa'at, **Lectures**, Jumu'ah and 'Eid Salaat, because this leads to Fasaad (immorality/mischief). This is clearly ascertained from the above mentioned Ahaadeeth. (*Mufti Kifayatullah does not here mean that it is prohibited for women to emerge for even such needs allowed by the Shariah – Mujlisul Ulama*)

.....And in the narration of Hadhrat Aishah (radhiyallaahu anhaa) the words ما أحدث النساء 9i.e. the actions which women have created), also emphasise this point.

Also in the narration (Abu Dawood, Page 84, Vol 1) فيتخذنه دخل (i.e. they will falsify/corrupt the matter) the object is this, that if women are permitted to emerge from their homes, then they will use this as an excuse; and from behind this cover they will fulfil all their desires. If this possibility was not considered by the Fuqahaa, the matter would be quite simple to solve. They would have ruled that in the Masaajid a separate arrangement should be made (with Purdah) for women. The Fuqahaa would not have prohibited the attendance of women from the Masaajid and **Lecture** gatherings. But no Faqeeh (Islaamic Jurist) has written this alternative (of separate ladies facilities) in any kitaab, viz., to provide separate accommodation for women in the Masaajid or allow them to attend the Jamaa'at Salaat. (*'Separate' ladies facilities' is a gigantic farce. It is a trap of immoral scoundrel ulama-e-soo' to lure women out of their homes, and to impress them with stupid flamboyance which the buffoon molvis and shaikhs display in their talks specifically designed to attract the attention of the ladies. – Mujlisul Ulama*)

It is conspicuously evident that they (Fuqahaa) have understood that the **emergence of women is the vehicle of Fasaad (moral**

**corruption**), and have thus **prohibited the emergence from the home**. And for this reason most Fuqahaa have in their texts, at this juncture, used the word “**Khurooj**” (emergence) to explain this Mas-alah.

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

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

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

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

Reflect, once again on the Hadeeth reported in “Bahrur Ra’iq”, which we have mentioned earlier, wherein Nabee (Sallallaahu ‘Alayhi Wasallam) said that a woman’s Salaat is best which is read in the innermost corner of her house compared to her Salaat in her courtyard, and that Salaat read in her courtyard is better than Salaat in the Masjid. Why is this.?

Only for this reason, that a woman in her home, with the best concealment and peace of mind, to whatever degree further she remains (concealed), that much further is she from Fitnah. It is for this reason that Nabee (Sallallaahu ‘Alayhi Wasallam) said, “their (women’s) homes are best for them.”

Hence, it is established that the **emergence of women from their homes is a cause of Fitnah**. It is for this reason that to make **Purdah arrangements at Lecture gatherings is of no**

**benefit, and there will be no effect by it being made permissible.** Otherwise it will then become incumbent to make separate arrangements in the Masaajid, for women to attend the Salaat and join in the Jamaa'at (congregation), and permission will have to be granted for this as well, as a matter of priority. But this is not established from any kitaab.

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

Even if we accept that the purdah facilities at Lecture gatherings are such that they prevent the gazes of strange men falling on women, then the possibility of women's gazes falling on strange men is certainly not removed in such instances. The women from behind the purdah peep at and observe all the people at the gathering. And this 'sickness' is common amongst women of today; probably two to four women in a generation are exceptions to this rule. In fact, this estimate may also be too high. Hence this avenue of Fitnah is not in any way removed if separate accommodation is arranged for women at Lectures.

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

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

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

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

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

(Majaalisul Abraar, Page 563)

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



first possibility is removed -- because the **primary and principal cause (of Fitnah) is the emergence from the homes.**

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

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

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

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

And if we consider the intentions of the speaker, that by allowing women he would be benefiting more in that his desires of accumulating more wealth (i.e. by donations, fees, etc.) will be more speedily achieved, (*and that the females would be emotionally attracted to him* – Mujlisul Ulama), then

this would be another reason to add to those already outlined above. All of this emphasize the impermissibility of women attending Lecture gatherings.

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

### **Answer to Question 3**

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

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

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

The rulings of the jurists follow hereunder:

“The husband has this right to prevent his wife from attending gatherings of Knowledge, unless such an occasion arises (where she needs a ruling (Mas-alah) and her husband does not obtain it for her (i.e. If the need is immediate and the husband is neither available nor does he make an effort to ask an ‘Aalim), then under such circumstances she may leave the house to enquire from a learned person.” (Raddul Mukhtaar, Page 683, Vol 2)

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

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

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

(Majaalisul Abraar, Page 563)

Hence, from the foregoing, this much is established that the husband holds the right to prevent his wife from attending Lecture gatherings, since it is NOT PERMISSIBLE for a

woman to attend Lecture gatherings etc. in the first place, and it is his OBLIGATORY DUTY to prevent her from impermissible and undesirable acts. (Allaah Knows Best) - *(End of Mufti Kifayatullah's Fatwa)*

## **THE RULING OF PERMISSIBILITY**

At this juncture it is necessary to clarify that the former ruling of permissibility to emerge when the husband is unable to present to his wife the Shar'i answer for an urgent Shar'i need, no longer applies. In the present age it is not permissible for a woman to emerge into the immoral outside environment even for a necessary Shar'i mas'alah because of the ready availability of ways and means of ascertaining the fact right within the home.

The internet, e-mail, sms, telephone and books are all available to all women living in our times in our type of environment. Yes, the permissibility will still apply to women living in primitive surroundings, e.g. remote villages, the jungle, wilderness, the desert, and inaccessible places.

We can testify on the basis of personal experience that innumerable women acquire from us Shar'i rulings via the aforementioned means. In fact, whilst they are in Makkah for Umrah/Hajj, many women and men contact us by e-mail for urgent Hajj/Umrah masaa-il which require immediate response. Thus, the permissibility mentioned by the Fuqaha stands abrogated in the view of the elimination of the need (dhuroorat) on which the permissibility was originally based.

From the aforementioned detailed exposition presented by Mufti Kifayatullah, the fallacy of the arguments of the Tabligh Jamaat votaries will be quite apparent. The emphasis of all the

Fuqaha is on *Khurooj-e-Nisaa' minal buyout* (emergence of women from their homes) without valid Shar'i need. And, tabligh around the world is never a valid Shar'i need for women.

The Mufti of the Tabligh Jamaat is at pains in his endeavour to show that *Khurooj* is not the issue. But this is palpably erroneous since all the Fuqaha among the Sahaabah, Taabi-een and thereafter have always made *khurooj* the primary and pivotal basis for involvement in the *fitnah* stemming from *Habaa-ilush Shaitaan* (*the Traps of Shaitaan*).

## **THE MAHRAM FALLACY**

The claim that the women are with their mahrams when undertaking tabligh journeys is a farce, presented with a superficial veneer of deception. Consider four couples travelling together in a single Kombi-type vehicle. It is fallacious to dub this group a mastoorat jamaat. It is a group of mixed sexes recklessly put together without understanding or thinking about the consequences.

In this inter-mixed group of eight persons consisting of four males and four females, each woman is together with three ghair mahram males, and likewise is it with the men. They are all seated at close quarters in the same vehicle. They converse and look. They stop at places, go to the toilets at petrol stations, where the women have to run the gauntlet, passing through crowds of fussaag, fujjaar and kuffaar of all varieties and hues to reach the female section of the toilets which are adjacent to the men's toilets.

When a mixed group of men and women travel together, it presents a recipe for fitnah. In fact, the fitnah is far greater than

the fitnah of a husband and a wife travelling in a public bus where all are strangers to them. Comparatively speaking, in the bus the couple is secluded to themselves, whilst in the vehicle the four couples are travelling, an attitude of camaraderie is cultivated. A nafsani intimacy develops, and be it in the slightest degree such as in the mind or heart, it is the zina of the heart. It is a vile seed planted in the heart by shaitaan, and it will germinate.

From behind the burqah veils, these women view the men to whom they are attracted, especially if they find some deficiency in their own husbands. They watch the movements and actions of their male compatriots with an eagerness, and the men too act in a manner to subtly impress the females next to them. If some moron does not understand this simple nafsani psychology, then he should get lost.

All of this borders on zina of the mind, and which is 100% zina of at least the eyes. Whilst the organizers of these makshooftaat jamaat have the ability to befool themselves and to believe that they are *Fi-Sabeelil Khairaat*, the reality is otherwise. They are in fact *Fi Sabeelil Munkaraat*. People of intelligence are not deceived.

## **WHAT THE FUQAHA SAY**

(1) “Today the Fatwa is on prohibition (Makrooh Tahrimi) of women attending for every Salaat because of the appearance of corruption. Since it is prohibited for them to attend the Musjid for Salaat, then to **a greater degree is it Makrooh for them to attend lectures, especially the lectures of these juhhaal (ignoramus)** who pretend to be Ulama. So have the Mashaaikh said. If they had to observe what we are observing in our present age of the displays of women when attending

lectures, then they (the Mashaaikh) would have vehemently condemned it.” (*Sharhun Nuqaayah*)

(2) "The Fatwa today is the prohibition of female attendance for all Salaats because of the spread of fitnah." (*Al-Kifaayah*)

(3) “Sheikh Sulaiman Bujairmi (rahmatullah alayh) says in *Tuhfatul Habeeb Ala Sharhil Khateeb*:

"Women should not attend (the Musjid) whether they are young or old for Jamaa-at because of the appearance of corruption. . . . Today the Fatwa is on total prohibition in all the Salaat."

In the statement, Jamaa-at, is included Juma', Eid, Istisqa' and gatherings of lectures, especially the lectures of the *juhhaal* (ignoramus) who pretend to be Ulama while their motive is lust and the acquisition of the world.

(4) The following absolute prohibition is stated in *Fataawal Kubra* of Ibn Hajar Haitami (rahmatullah alayh), an authority in the Shaafi Mathhab:

“. . the statement of Ghazaali in Ihyaaul Uloom: ‘It is obligatory to prohibit women from attending the Musjid for Salaat, for **sessions of knowledge and for Thikr** when there is the danger of *fitnah* as a result of them. Verily, Aishah (radhiallahu anha) forbade them. It was then said to her: Verily, Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) did not forbid them from Jamaa-at. She replied: If Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) knew what the women have introduced after him, then most certainly, he would have prevented them.’

Agreeing with it is the statement of Ibn Khuzaimah who is among our senior authorities:

‘The Salaat of a woman in her home is superior to her Salaat in the Musjid of Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam). . . Now when her Salaat at home is superior then the object which

brings her out of her home (to perform Salaat in a Musjid) is either pride or show and this is haraam'.

"There is unanimity regarding the prohibition of women going to the Musjid, Eid Salaat and visiting the graves because of the absence of the conditions of permissibility which had existed during the age of Nabi (sallallahu alayhi wasallam). . . . This has been stated by Shaikh Taqiuddin Al Husni and Shaikh Alauddin Muhammad Al Bukhaari who were two great Imaams among the Mutaqaddimeen (the early Fuqaha)."

. . . . That what these two Shaikhs have said, i.e. the Muftaa Bihi (the view on which the verdict is) in this age is on the prohibition of women's emergence. **Only a dense man following his lowly desires will not accept this**, for verily, the rules change with the changing of the times. This is correct in terms of the Math-habs of the Ulama of the Salaf and the Khalaf."

"Hujjatul Islam (Imaam Ghazaali) says in *Al-Ihya* in the chapter dealing on Amr Bil Ma'roof:

'It is obligatory to prohibit women from attending the Musaajid for Salaat and Thikr when fitnah in regard to them is feared.'

In Anwaar it is said: It is waajib to prohibit women from attending the Musaajid for Salaat and Thikr when there exists the danger of fitnah.'

The evils of their emergence today are established facts. . . . The correct view is that prohibition is absolute and the Fatwa is this (prohibition). This is the summary of our (Shaafi'i) Math-hab".

(Fataawa Kubra of Ibn Hajar Haitami)

From the discussion in the foregoing pages, the reader will understand that all authorities of Islam from the time of the Sahaabah never accepted that women have an undeniable right of attending the Musaajid. Far from possessing any such right, the authorities have clarified that it is not permissible for



**SABEELUL MUNKARAAT FI  
JAMAA-AATIL MUTAKASH-SHIFAAT**

women to even emerge from their homes since the Qur'aan Majeed forbids this. Allah Ta'ala says:

“And, remain inside your homes and do not make a display like the exhibition of the times of jaahiliyyah.”

Such displays of jaahiliyyah and the resultant fitnah of immorality are today integral parts of society, Muslim society included. The slight departure from Piety and Hijaab which had commenced even in the very age of the Sahaabah constrained them to prohibit women from coming to the Musjid inspite of them being fully aware that women used to visit the Musjid during the time of Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam). However, since they detected the beginning of the process of corruption and they discerned the gradual abandonment of the very strict conditions which accompanied the original permissibility, the Sahaabah initiated this prohibition.

Since Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) has commanded obedience to his Sahaabah and has described the Sunnah of his Sahaabah as his Sunnah, the prohibition enacted by the Sahaabah is in actual fact the Sunnah of Nabi-e-Kareem (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) -- it is the Law of Allah Ta'ala. This prohibition is a divine law which only men rabid with lust or dense in the mind will attempt to violate.

## MASTOORAAT OR MAKSHOOFAAT

An earlier article in refutation of *makshoofaat jamaat*, is reproduced here. It is a summary of the entire discussion pertaining to this issue:

The term ‘*mastooraat*’ is a misnomer in relation to female tableeghi groups. The apt designation for such female groups is *makshoofaat* which means females who are exposed or revealed or on display.

The mere donning of an outer cloak does not make a woman *mastoor* (concealed, hidden from the public gaze). At the outset, we must clarify that the term *makshoofaat* in this context is not being used with a pejorative connotation nor in an objurgatory sense, nor do we imply sarcasm. We are merely saying that a spade is a spade. It is wrong to say that a spade is a spoon.

The erroneous appellation appropriated for female-khurooj groups is due to a misunderstanding of the meaning of *mastoor* in the Shar’i sense. As far as the Shariah is concerned, *Mastooraat* are such women who are totally and completely hidden from the public gaze. A woman who emerges into the public even with burqah is no longer *mastooraah*. On the contrary, she becomes *makshoofah* (exposed).

The Satr of a person is called such because it is totally hidden, hence it is *mastoor*. Whilst a portion of the human body will be validly *mastoor* if covered by garments, the woman in relation to Hijaab will not be *mastooraah* with only garments if she emerges into the public. The term is of relative significance. Different things are *mastoor* in different ways.

Narrating a Hadith, Hadhrat Abdullah Ibn Mas'ood (radhiyallahu anhu) said that when a woman 'emerges from her home, then shaitaan casts surreptitious gazes at her'. Whilst inside her home, she was validly *Mastoor*, protected from the gazes of the shayaateen. Once outside the home precincts, she becomes *makshoof* for the devils prowling around. There are two types of shayaateen: shayaateenul jinn (jinn devils) and shayaateenul ins (human devils). Outside her home, despite her burqah she becomes *makshoof* (exposed) to both categories of devils. Although the degree of exposure of a burqah-clad lady outside her home is greater to the jinn devils, the fact remains that she is exposed (*makshoof*) to even the human devils.

When Hadhrat Saudah (radhiyallahu anha) had emerged at night to answer the call of nature, she was fully covered with a jilbaab which could comfortably conceal two women. Nevertheless, from the size of her body, Hadhrat Umar (radhiyallahu anhu) recognized who she was. The cloak was not adequate for qualifying her for the designation of *mastoorah*.

The fact that a woman is recognized as a woman from even her outer-garment negates the *mastooraat* designation. Explaining the concept of *mastoor*, Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) said: "*Women have no share in khurooj (from their homes), except in cases of need.*" They have no share in emergence. Emergence transforms the *mastoorah* into a *makshoofah*.

Furthermore, the Qur'aan Majeed in commanding: "*Remain resolutely in your homes...*" explains the meaning of *mastoorah* who is one who remains resolutely within the home. Hadhrat Maulana Ashraf Ali Thanvi (rahmatullah alayh) explaining the first category of Hijaab which makes woman a *mastoorah*, said: "*The normal general rule of Hijaab is total seclusion. In this category the woman has to necessarily remain within the home*

*environment and expose nothing of herself, not even her garments.” Thus, she is not allowed to emerge from the home for any activity which the Shariah has neither imposed on her nor described it as a *haajat* (need).*

Confirming that the meaning of *mastoor* is total concealment, Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) described woman as *Aurah*, i.e., she has to be concealed in entirety from the gazes of *ghair mahaarim*. Since the women of the Tableegh Jamaat are out of their homes, on the streets, and in all public places where *fussaaq*, *fujjaar* and *kuffaar* abound, the appropriate appellation for them is *makshoofaat jamaat*.

## **THE QUESTION OF WOMEN UNDERTAKING JOURNEYS FOR THE PURPOSES OF MASS TABLEEGH**

### **Question**

Please study this fatwa (which I am sending) of Hadhrat Mufti Mahmoodul Hasan (rahmatullah alayh) on the issue of women going on Tableegh journeys. I have read your book explaining that Ladies Tableegh Jamaat is not permissible. However, the Ulama associated with the Tableegh Jamaat hold the view of permissibility. Please comment on the Fatwa.

### **Answer**

After perusing the fatwa of permissibility issued by Hadhrat Mufti Mahmoodul Hasan (rahmatullah alayh) on the question of females undertaking journeys for purposes of tableegh, we comment as follows:

With respect to the Honourable Mufti Sahib (rahmatullah alayh), we have to say that his fatwa is pure *raai* (personal opinion) unsubstantiated by any Shar'i *daleel* (proof). For a

fatwa to enjoy the force of the Shariah, *dalaa-il* of the Shariah are imperative.

The Shariah is not the product of personal opinion. The recent Fatwas issued by the senior Ulama of Darul Uloom Deoband, which prohibit female tableegh jamaat are of Shar'i worth and significance in view of the Shar'i evidences which the Honourable Muftis have provided for their fatwa. The same cannot be said of the fatwa of Hadhrat Mufti Mahmoodul Hasan (rahmatullah alayh) for want of Shar'i dalaa-il.

The other Muftis who have endorsed the fatwa have simply endorsed a personal opinion. The number of Muftis endorsing a personal opinion does not add Shar'i lustre or force to the fatwa. In fact, it is improper to even describe a personal opinion as a fatwa.

The Honourable Mufti Mahmoodul Hasan Sahib says in his fatwa:

“The objective of the Tablighi Jamaat is to learn and strengthen our deen and encourage others to do the same. Towards the propagation of this ambition, long arduous journeys too are undertaken. Just how men are in need of learning and strengthening their deen, on the same token, women too are in need of it. Generally the facilities are not accommodated for in the houses. Thus travelling to places as far as London accompanied by a mahram, taking into cognizance all the boundaries of the Shariat and without stepping on the rights of anyone, would be allowed in the Shariat.”

This is the honourable Mufti's opinion. However, it is bereft of Shar'i proofs. It therefore lacks Shar'i force. Not only does it lack Shar'i force, it is also in conflict with the clear *Nusoo*s of the Shariah as encapsulated in the Qur'an, Sunnah and the 14

century *Ta-aamul* of the Ummah. Let us now examine the ingredients in the aforementioned opinion.

(a) The pursuit of the objective is permissible in only ways and means which are valid and permissible in the Shariah. Regardless of how beneficial a methodology may appear for the propagation of the Deen, if it is in conflict with the Shariah, it will be haraam to adopt it. On the basis of this principle, television, photography, videos and the like are haraam for utilization in the propagation of the Deen no matter how ‘great’ the benefit may appear to those in whose opinion such methods are permissible.

Similarly, regardless of the benefits which some Muftis discern in females undertaking journeys for the sake of tableegh, the method is in conflict with the Shariah, hence it is not permissible for women to globe-trot even with their mahrams for the sake of tableegh. Tableegh to the masses is not a Waajib duty for females, nor is it Mustahab, hence it is extremely short-sighted to draw them out of the homes, exposing them to the public and subjecting them to arduous journeys in which it is in this era IMPOSSIBLE to observe Shar’i Purdah (Hijaab).

Purdah is not restricted to the cloak and the face-veil. These items of dress are simply a dimension of Purdah. The primary Purdah for women in terms of the Qur’aan, Sunnah and Ijma’ of the Ummah, is confinement within the holy precincts of the home.

Whilst the Honourable Mufti Sahib has explicitly stipulated for the permissibility the condition: *“taking into cognizance all the boundaries of the Shariat and without stepping on the rights of anyone”*, he has overlooked the irrefutable fact that in our time it is impossible to abide by these conditions, and NO ONE abides thereby. Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) said:

*‘Safar (journey) is a portion of the Fire.’*

A journey should not be undertaken unnecessarily. Since tableegh to the masses is not Waajib for females, it is not permissible to emerge from their houses, exposing themselves to all and sundry – to fussaaq, fujjaar and kuffaar – in flagrant violation of the Qur’aanic prohibition:

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

Emerging from the home, be it with abaya (a semi-jilbaab) and niqaab, for something which is not Waajib, is not permissible for women, for in so doing they will come within the scope of the Qur’aanic proscription. Needs which justify emergence for women are such acts specified by the Shariah.

How is it possible for women venturing to far off places necessitating public transport, to abide by Shar’i Purdah? They mingle with fussaaq, fujjaar and kuffaar males and females in overcrowded airports, airport buses, planes, etc. They have to stand in long queues for passport checking, luggage checking, custom checking, and subjected to fussaaq, fujjaar and kuffaar males checking and viewing them. It is not always that females are available to examine, view and check the burqah ladies. In fact in Saudi Arabia male immigration louts order women to open their faces to enable checking.

They have to line-up together with males in the same lines. They sit in airport lounges crowded with the most immoral elements of the world. In the planes, they line-up in the queues to visit the toilets. We have observed Muslim ladies standing immediately behind men and vice versa in the toilet queues. We have seen with our own eyes, a Muslim lady coming out of the plane toilet while a male is right in front of the queue staring at

her. Is this hijab? What has happened to the haya of the burqah-bibis and the brains of the Tablighi Molvis?

There is a total breakdown of Hijaab nowadays on journeys. The Tablighi brothers who maintain that their womenfolk along the journey are in ‘purdah’ are guilty of a massive canard. They dwell in self-deception. There is no true Purdah for women who mingle with all and sundry at airports, in the planes, in public transport, etc. The idea that the burqah/abaya and the veil are the be-all of Hijaab is a delusion and has cultivated in the minds of Muslims a totally inaccurate concept of Hijaab.

In addition to the abandonment of Hijaab is the disruption of Salaat, and the consumption of the haraam and mushtabah food of the airways served by the hands of *faajiraat* and *kaafiraat*. But these violations no longer have significant meaning to even those who purport vociferously that they are in the ‘Path of Allah’.

(b) The virtues and importance of propagating the Deen are not denied. The method adopted for this objective is rejected since it is in conflict with the Shariah. The Sahaabah were well aware of the virtues and importance of propagating the Deen. In fact, during their era such propagation was imperative. It was the first age of Islam and the Deen had to be compulsorily spread and taken to the non-Muslim people of the world. Yet, they did not deem it necessary to initiate a mass women’s movement to propagate the Deen to the non-Muslim females who also were in need of the Deen just as their menfolk were in need. But, nowhere in the 14 century long history of Islam was a women’s mass movement created.

The isolated cases of females accompanying their husbands, not on tableegh missions, but on first degree Jihad campaigns, may not be cited as a basis for the current women’s movement



which the Tableegh Jamaat has created in conflict with the Shariah. In fact, there are Nusoos to confirm Rasulullah's opposition to even the isolated cases of females going with their husbands in Jihad. Once when he saw a woman with her husband on a Jihad campaign, he reprimanded her. When one of his wives sought permission for participation in Jihad, Nabi-e-Kareem (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) said that women's Jihad is Hajj.

There was a greater need to teach women in the early days because all who came to Islam were non-Muslims. But, the method devised by the Sahaabah was for the menfolk to teach their women.

This is the original and the only system of the Sunnah for the ta'leem of females.

In an insipid attempt to negate this original method of the Sahaabah – a method which has endured in the Ummah for almost fourteen centuries – the Tablighi Mufti Sahib alleges in his book:

*“If the man is responsible for the house, then the woman too is responsible. Now when the man along with his household responsibilities also bears the responsibility of tableegh, then why would the woman not bear the responsibility of tableegh?”*

Indeed this is an extremely stupid argument. It appears that the Tablighi Mufti Sahib has joined the gender equality mob, hence he knows not how to apply his mind. In presenting this foolish and weird argument he has demeaned his intelligence and demoted his status. Is he not aware that despite the woman having domestic responsibilities the responsibility of maintenance of the home is not her obligation. So why should outside tableegh to the world at large be her responsibility when the Shariah has not made this her obligation just as it has not made maintenance of the family her duty.

Is the Mufti Sahib not aware that the Qur'aan says about women: "*And for men there is a rank above them (women).*" ? And, does he not know that the Qur'aan Majeed states: "*Men are the rulers of women....*" ? This very same Aayat states that Allah Ta'ala has given men *fadhielat* over women. Is he then not aware of this fact?

He has indeed degenerated to an extremely low intellectual ebb in his attempt to force an equality between the responsibilities of men and women. The responsibility of tableegh to the world is NOT the responsibility of women because Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) said that "woman is *aurah*". She has to be compulsorily concealed from the gazes of men as far as is possible. The responsibility of tableegh outside the home is not her responsibility because it is she, not the man, who gives birth to children, and who has to tend to the children. It is she who has to clean the house and prepare the food and do the other many duties which are associated with woman's role. Tabligh to the world is not her responsibility as it is the man's because it is she who is the subject of *haidh*, not the man. This argument of the Mufti Sahib is absolutely ludicrous.

Furthermore, did Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) and the Sahaabah not know that tableegh to the world at large is supposed to be the obligation of also women whom he has ordered to remain indoors at all times? Why did the Sahaabah not form Jamaats of women and push them out of the homes into the public to engage in tableegh at a time when women were more in need of basic Deeni ta'leem than the present day? The Mufti Sahib has spoken weird drivel.

(c) "The same token" mentioned in the aforementioned opinion existed even during the time of the Sahaabah as well, and it existed in every age. The argument that the 'facilities' for ta'leem 'are not accommodated for in the houses' is incorrect.

**SABEELUL MUNKARAAT FI  
JAMAA-AATIL MUTAKASH-SHIFAAT**

What prevents all the men who participate in tableegh jamaat activities, from teaching their womenfolk? Why have the Tableegh Jamaat departed from the age-old Sunnah methodology (Tareeqah) of Ta’leem for women? Why does the Jamaat not also concentrate on the ‘home facilities’ to which Mufti Mahmoodul Hasan refers?

A man spends years in Tableegh activities, travelling around the country and the globe, but he is unable to teach his womenfolk! In fact, he is unwilling, and his unwillingness stems from lack of understanding the objectives and priorities of Tableegh, or he simply does not derive ‘fun’ and pleasure teaching his wife and children. But he engages with enthusiasm in making tableegh to others whilst the Qur’aan imposes on the man as a prior obligation tableegh to his family.

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

“O People of Imaan! Save yourselves and your families from the Fire.”

The method of saving is Ta’leem and Tarbiyat – teaching the Shariah and moral training.

Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) said: “Every one of you is a shepherd, and every one of you will be questioned about his (or her) flock.” It is the Waajib obligation of the males in the house to impart Ta’leem to their womenfolk. But, not only do they grossly neglect their homes, they are not even aware of their obligation since this issue does not feature in the syllabus of the Tableegh Jamaat. It is hideously corrupt thinking to expect women from another locality or another country to come and teach the womenfolk who are the responsibility of their husbands and fathers.

What exactly is meant by the lack of accommodation in the houses? This is extremely ambiguous, in fact baseless. The men have to create the necessary ‘accommodation for the necessary facilities’ in their houses. The Tableegh Jamaat should highlight this accommodation feature to its members and impress on them the imperative importance of cultivating the accommodation in their houses. If the menfolk are able to create the ‘accommodation’ for males outside their homes, why can they not create it in their own respective homes for their beloved ones?

In which way did this ‘accommodation’ exist in the houses during the time of the Sahaabah and during the Khairul Quroon era? There is the Waajib need to revive that method which had been imparted to the Ummah by the Sahaabah, but which method the Ummah has today abandoned. It therefore, devolves on those who purport to be in the Path of the Sunnah to revive the Sunnah, and not fabricate a new method which in addition to being bereft of Islamic spirit and ethos, is in conflict with the Nusooos of the Shariah.

It is not possible “to take into cognizance all the boundaries of the Shariat” when women emerge from their homes, especially for participation in a mass movement. When women emerge from their homes, the Hadith tells us that shaitaan lies in ambush for her. He will most assuredly manipulate her for spreading fitnah. Women’s mass movements are the innovations of the western kuffaar. There is great wisdom underlying the designation *Habaailush Shaitaan (the Traps of Shaitaan)*. To save the Ummah from these traps, the Shariah has introduced the system of Hijaab which consists of numerous rules and regulations, violation of which opens up the doors of fitnah.

The boundaries of the Shariat in this context are not restricted to wearing the cloak (and that too, defective cloaks) and the face-cloth. The very first boundary of the Shariat which the women violate, and which violation is granted acceptability and respectability by short-sighted Muftis, is emergence from the home to participate in mass activity which Islam has not imposed on them in any degree whatsoever. Their Tableegh is confined to their flock – their children at home.

(d) Entrusting children to the grandmother while the mother departs on a tableegh mission in a distant country for which she has not been created, is abhorrent in the extreme. She abandons the Amaanat entrusted to her by Allah Ta’ala. This advice is indeed short-sighted to say the least. Allah Ta’ala has bestowed the Amaanat of children to the mother, not to the grandmother. The grandmother is an emergency option. It is hideously abnormal for the mother to abandon her little children and embark on globe-trotting to engage in tableegh to others.

This advice is in diametric conflict with the Hadith: *“Every one of you will be questioned regarding your flock.”* It is indeed cruel for a mother to abandon her little children and to dwell in the deception that she has discharged her maternal obligation by casting her flock to their grandmother or to some other relative or friend. There is a vast difference between a mother and a grandmother.

Furthermore, her abandonment of her flock is more reprehensible in view of tableegh to the masses not being her obligation. The Shariah does not call on her to embroil herself in a mass women’s movement for conducting mass tableegh. But the Shariah demands that she tends to her home Amaanat.

We respectfully say that the Honourable Muftis have grievously erred in their personal opinion for which they lack any Shar’i substantiation.

## **COMMENT ON THE VIEW OF HADHRAT MAULANA YUSUF KANDELWI (RAHMATULLAH ALAYH)**

In expressing his view on female participation in mass tableegh which requires undertaking of journeys, Hadhrat (rahmatullah alayh) said:

*“The delicateness of this work with regards to women increases considerably. Women should never be brought to open gatherings when there is a possibility of no observance of purdah. Instead, a day should be stipulated when the women from nearby homes gather at a concealed place within their area to do ta’leem.*

*It should begin by men informing their womenfolk of what they hear in the Ijtimas, da’wat, ta’leem, etc. In this way, Insha-Allah, their mind-set will begin to form in a short span of time.”*

This much is perfectly correct. There is no objection to this. However, the reality is that the gatherings of the ladies are not held at concealed places. The concealed place is the exception while the public place has become the norm. This is the natural consequence of any mass women’s activity and of emergence from the home.

In Durban at one large Musjid, when bayaans take place, women converge in droves, driving cars shamelessly. They shamelessly take up the parking lots allocated for the musallis of the Musjid. Ulama have explained to us that they have to lower their gaze in shame for the women protruding from their vehicles. They think nothing of pulling up their vehicles next to males. They strut to the women’s section regardless of the staring eyes of the males whose purity of heart becomes

contaminated by the arrival of these shameless women clad in mock burqaahs.

At the main Musjid in Malabar Port Elizabeth, the ladies jamaat sometimes have their programme at a house directly opposite the Musjid's main entrance. They commence their programme during the afternoon. They fill the Musjid's parking space with their vehicles and shamelessly strut to the opposite house. When musallis arrive for Asr Salaat, some of the cars of the ladies are still blocking the parking spaces. Without any vestige of haya (shame) they jaywalk into the parking space and concerned males have to retreat into Purdah whilst these *be-sharam* (shameless), *be-haya* (immodest) tableeghi aunts stroll to their cars. Regardless of the *takleef* (inconvenience/distress) they cause the musallis, it is of no concern to them. They labour under the hallucination of having accomplished a great feat by shamelessly leaving their homes, shamelessly parking their vehicles in the Musjid's parking lot and shamelessly returning to retrieve their vehicles in full view of the arriving musallis.

Thus, the talk of 'concealed places' and observance of Purdah by women who destroy their modesty with frequent emergence and participation in group activities, be it tabligh, are devoid of substance, are uttered for self-deception and to soothe the conscience, and to convey the idea that everything is in order when in reality, the basis is corrupt. Allah Ta'ala has moulded woman for the home-role, not for the street-role.

Hadhrat Maulana Yusuf Kandelwi's advice that tabligh should be initiated by men at home, imparting ta'leem to them, is the only correct and Sunnah method. The accretion of the mass women's movement is a bid'ah fraught with dangerous moral consequences which will yet be seen in the future.

However, the advice of sending out women's jamaats on journeys is most certainly baatil. It is a huge error. Even great Ulama err. The criterion is always the Shariah which is the product of the Qur'aan, Sunnah and Ijma' of the Ummah. Women's tabligh jamaat is in conflict with all three Sources of the Shariah. The 'fatwa' of permissibility does not proffer even a single Shar'i daleel. Taqleed of unsubstantiated *raai* (opinion) is not valid.

## **HADHRAT MUFTI MAHMOODUL HASAN'S COMMENT**

Hadhrat Mahmoodul Hasan (rahmatullah alayh) is reported to have said: *"When any query regarding tabligh comes to the Darul Uloom then I personally answer it. I don't give it to any other mufti because I am unaware what answer would be given."*

Indeed this attitude is highly erroneous and disturbing. It is expected that the Muftis staffing the Ifta Department of Darul Uloom Deoband are highly qualified and accomplished Ulama who have all the qualifications to issue fataawa on the basis of the principles of the Shariah. The statement of Hadhrat Mufti Mahmoodul Hasan, if correctly narrated, registers a vote of no-confidence in the Ifta' Department of Darul Uloom. This is manifestly unjust and incorrect.

In view of his bias for the specific methodology of the Tabligh Jamaat, his fatwas cannot enjoy genuine credibility because on his own admission, he will answer the istifta' (question) with a preconceived bias which constrains him to refute the istifta' even before having studied the contents. Since other Muftis of the Ifta' Department will subject the istifta' to the scrutiny of Shar'i dalaa-il, they are better poised to present a fatwa unadulterated with bias.



## TRAVELLING WITH WOMENFOLK FOR HAJJ AND UMRAH

Another spurious argument tendered in favour of women's tableegh jamaat journeys is:

*“The Ulama and pious people together with their womenfolk undertake optional Hajj and Umrah trips travelling with planes, trains, buses, etc. in the presence of many strange men, yet no problem is perceived therein. Thus no problem should arise with regards to ladies Jamaats as well since its manifest benefits are apparent.”*

This argument is invalid for several reasons:

(i) The primary premises (*maqees alayh*) in this syllogism is itself corrupt and in need of a Shar'i ruling. It is not a principle nor an absolute Shar'i permissibility. It is therefore improper to seek a ruling for ladies tabligh journeys on the basis of this corrupt primary premises. It simply lacks the viability for being the *Maqees Alayh*.

(ii) What is the Shar'i basis and dalaa-il for claiming that optional Hajj and Umrah are permissible for women in the current scenario of fitnah and fasaad? There is no valid Shar'i basis for claiming permissibility for these female journeys in these times of immorality and fitnah.

(iii) The averment that “*no problem is perceived*” with these optional Umrah journeys, is arbitrary and incorrect. On the contrary, we maintain the same attitude and state the same ruling for women going for optional Hajj and Umrah in the current era of fitnah.

In a futile and puerile attempt to refute this contention, the Tablighi Mufti Sahib says: “*Our seniors used to undertake journeys with their womenfolk for Nafl Hajj.*” He cites as his

‘daleel’ Mufti Muhammad Shafi’ (rahmatullah alayh). In the understanding of the Tablighi Mufti Sahib, the Nafl Hajj which Mufti Shafi Sahib and others had undertaken with their womenfolk many decades ago, constitutes *daleel-e-qat’i* for claiming permissibility for this prohibition.

It is indeed unbefitting of a Mufti to labour so hopelessly and to clutch at straws to substantiate his claim without providing a single Shar’i daleel. The practice of Hadhrat Mufti Shafi (rahmatullah alayh) and of other seniors does not constitute a daleel in the Shariah. The Tablighi Mufti Sahib should learn to acquit himself on the basis of the *Dalaa-il* of the Shariah. Those who say that it is not permissible in this age for women to go for Nafl Hajj and Umrah even with their mahrams, base the prohibition on Shar’i dalaa-il while the Tablighi Mufti Sahib can only cite the action of another Mufti. But we are not the muqallideen of our seniors in every action and practice. We are the Muqallideen of the Fuqaha, and that too, of the Fuqaha-e-Mutaqaddimeen of the Ahnaaf. Mufti Muhammad Shafi’s personal action is not a Shar’i daleel. The argument of the Tablighi Mufti Sahib is bereft of Shar’i and intelligent substance.

Following the errors and citing the errors of seniors as ‘daleel’ is a sign of deviation (*Dhalaal*). Allaamah Abdul Wahhaab Sha’raani (rahmatullah alayh) of the 9<sup>th</sup> Islamic century said: “*He who grabs hold of the obscurities of the Ulama, verily, he has made his exit from Islam.*” The errors of seniors should be set aside or a suitable interpretation should be provided. Their errors should not be presented as daleel, for such an attitude was the attribute of the Bani Israa-eel whom the Qur’aan reprimands as follows: “*They took their scholars and their saints as arbaab (gods) besides Allaah.....*” Alhamdulillah, we are not of such ilk.

(iv) What the Ulama and pious people of this age are doing is not necessarily permissible nor does it constitute Shar'i daleel. Numerous Ulama are embroiled in flagrant acts of fisq and fujoor. The personal deeds and misdeeds of the Ulama and pious people do not constitute Shar'i daleel, and may not be cited as such, especially in the present age of laxity and indifference towards the Shariah displayed by even the Ulama and pious people.

Hadhrat Aishah (radhiyallahu anha) narrated that Allah Ta'ala sent Wahi to Nabi Yusha' (alayhis salaam) that He would soon be destroying the 60,000 inhabitants of a certain city. Among these inhabitants were 20,000 Auliya whose A'maal (righteous deeds) were as the deeds of the Ambiya. Extremely perplexed, Nabi Yusha' (alayhis salaam) supplicated to Allah Ta'ala: "O Allah! That you will destroy the disobedient ones is understandable. But why will You destroy even the Auliya?"

Allah Ta'ala revealed to Nabi Yusha' (alayhis salaam) that these Pious Men became complacent with the evil of the masses. They became so desensitized as a consequence of mingling and fraternizing with the transgressors that the villainy of their misdeeds departed from their hearts. As a result of this attitude, they abstained from *Amr Bil Ma'roof Nahy Anil Munkar*, hence the punishment has become halaal for them as well. This is the disease and rot in which most Ulama of this age grovel.

Therefore, understand well, that the deeds of the Ulama and the pious people, especially of this corrupt era should not be presented as daleel for any activity which is in need of a Shar'i ruling. We are aware of Ulama and Muftis who visit the beachfronts with their womenfolk during the kuffaar holiday seasons. They savour their nafs and gratify their bestial lusts by feasting their eyes on the mobs of bikini-clad faajiraat and kaafiraat. Neither these Ulama nor their womenfolk any longer

possess any haya. What type of a wife is the woman who can tolerate to be with her molvi/mufti husband at the beachfront where naked women parade in profusion and the eyes are drowned in corruption? *Wala houla.....*

The Honourable Muftis should present solid Shar'i dalaa-il. The deeds of the Ulama and pious people of the time are not among such proofs of the Shariah. In short, it is not permissible in this age for women to go for Nafl Hajj and Umrah. It is not permissible to commit haraam for the sake of acquiring a Nafl act.

## **FATWA ON IMAAM ABU YUSUF'S VIEW – ANOTHER SPURIOUS ARGUMENT**

Some Molvi Sahib annotating the fatwa of Mufti Mahmoodul Hasan (rahmatullah alayh) wrote: *“In our Fiqah, the fatwa is given on the view of Imaam Abu Yusuf (rahmatullah alayh) on matters pertaining to Qadha and Waqf, not on the view of Imaam A'zam Abu Hanifah (rahmatullah alayh) despite him being the Ustaadh. Mufti Mahmood Gangohi and Mufti Muhammad Yusuf Ludhyanwi are Tableeghi members.. ...”*

(The annotation is incomplete on the fatwa copy sent to us.) Nevertheless, the purport of this comment is to convey the idea that just as the fatwa on Qadha and Waqf matters is generally given on the view of Imaam Abu Yusuf, so too the fatwa on Tablighi issues should be the fatwa of the Tablighi Molvis.

The puerility of this averment evokes mirth. The Molvi Sahib who has made this comment has failed to understand the issue pertaining to Imaam Abu Yusuf (rahmatullah alayh). Fatwa on his view applies to issues in which he had greater knowledge. For example, a Mufti who has expertise in the capitalist system

of banking, shares, trade and commerce, is in a better position to issue fatwa than his Ustaadh who lacks such knowledge. His fatwa will not run counter to *Mansoos Ahkaam* as do the fatwas of the Tablighi Molvis.

Consider the example of Hadhrat Maulana Ashraf Ali Thanvi (rahmatullah alayh). His knowledge supersedes the combined knowledge of all the Ulama of our day. Nevertheless, there were many new developments of which he lacked expertise, hence he could not issue fatwa on such questions. Hadhrat Maulana Masihullah (rahmatullah alayh) explained to us that when the question of shares was posed to Hadhrat Thanvi, he consulted with a trader in Saharanpur. The poor trader explained what he thought shares are. His explanation conveyed to Hadhrat Thanvi that shares were a valid Shirkat (Partnership) venture. Thus, on the basis of this misconception, Hadhrat Thanvi (rahmatullah alayh) said that shares are permissible.

However, when Hadhrat Masihullah (rahmatullah alayh) studied the explanation which we had prepared, he was 100% in agreement with our view of *hurmat*, that shares are haraam. In fact, when Hadhrat Mufti Mahmoodul Hasan (rahmatullah alayh) read our explanation, he too issued an unambiguous fatwa of impermissibility. But, the compilers of *Fataawa Mahmoodiyah*, deemed it appropriate to perpetrate *Kitmaanul Haqq* (Concealment of the Truth) by conveniently either destroying that fatwa or placing it in the archives where no one will come to know of it. In their clouded opinion it was appropriate not to include this particular Fatwa of Hadhrat Mahmoodul Hasan (rahmatullah alayh) in *Fataawa Mahmoodiyah*. Anyone interested in the Fatwa, may write to us.

But as far as the Tablighi Molvis are concerned, their fatwas on their own activities are clouded with bias and short-sightedness,

hence it is preposterous to contend that other Ulama who possess greater insight and are unbiased and look at things objectively in the light of the Shariah, and who are aware of all the ins and outs, advantages and disadvantages of the Jamaat, lack the ability for issuing fatwa on Tablighi issues. If the Tableeghi Molvis find any flaw in our views, they should pinpoint our errors. It serves no good purpose to merely harp monotonously on the benefits of the women's mass tabligh jamaat without answering the Shar'i dalaa-il which are proffered for the prohibition.

It is quite palpable that in view of the females jamaat promoters lacking Shar'i dalaa-il coupled to their inability to respond to the Shar'i dalaa-il the opposition proffers, they resort to side-stepping and ignoring the dalaa-il which impugn their stance. A refutation is valid only if it also counters and rebuts rationally with dalaa-il the arguments of the adversary. An article which skirts and ignores the dalaa-il of the adversary is not a valid refutation. It is simply an essay stating the views of the writer.

There are benefits in everything, even in eating pork, consuming liquor and gambling. But such benefits cannot be cited for repealing and cancelling any Shar'i hukm. What the Tablighi Jamaat Molvis are guilty of is abrogation of *Mansoos Ahkaam*, and this is haraam and intolerable. Such *qiyaas* which is in conflict of *Nass-e-Shar'i* is not valid. It is *mardood*.

The view of a senior Mufti minus Shar'i dalaa-il is essentially *raai* – his personal opinion which carries no Shar'i weight. It may not be imposed as a Shar'i Hukm. It is essential to understand that a Fatwa is in fact the Law of Allah Azza Wa Jal. It is not personal opinion. There is absolutely no resemblance between women's emergence for undertaking journeys in the midst of fitnah and fasaad for tabligh activities which are not

Waajib for them, and the Qadha and Waqf issues which Imaam Abu Yusuf (rahmatullah alayh) had to rule on.

During the era of Khairul Quroon, the issues of Qadha and Waqf were in the evolutionary stage which comported with the Shar'i concept of Ijtihad which was then in vogue. Qadha and Waqf related to an evolving Shar'i corpus of Ahkaam which was in the formative stage. But all of the Fatwas of Imaam Abu Yusuf (rahmatullah alayh) were structured on the Shar'i Usool evolved by Imaam Abu Hanifah (rahmatullah alayh) on the basis of the Qur'aan and Ahaadith.

It is simply an issue of new developments with which Imaam Abu Yusuf had to deal with, hence precedence is given to his rulings. But, by this time, every mediocre Molvi is also fully acquainted with every iota pertaining to the Tabligh Jamaat. There is nothing new today in the Jamaat. On the contrary, whilst the Jamaat may be on the incline quantitatively speaking, in Shar'i terms it is actually on the decline, qualitatively. The manifest sign for this fact is the *ghulu'* which has set into the Jamaat at all levels.

In the rulings of Imaam Abu Yusuf there were no factors of *hurmat*. On the other hand, journeys of females are accompanied by a number of exceptionally evil, haraam factors. A Mufti who fails to see and understand these glaring *Asbaab-e-Hurmat* should desist from issuing fatwa on this specific issue of females undertaking journeys.

## **ANOTHER BASELESS ARGUMENT**

Another baseless argument tendered for the permissibility of women's tabligh journeys is the Hadith: "*Verily, you (women) have been granted permission to emerge (from your homes) for your needs.*"

On the basis of this Hadith the Tablighi Molvis contend that it is permissible for women to undertake journeys through the minefields of fitnah and immorality to execute tasks which the Shariah has not at all imposed on them. Tabligh to the masses in distant places which necessitate journeys is definitely not among *haajatikunna* (your needs) mentioned in the aforementioned Hadith.

The circumstance which evoked the aforementioned permission to emerge for needs, was the need to answer the call of nature. In those days, there were no toilets inside the homes. Even females, were constrained to go to remote spots to relieve themselves. The law of Hijaab created a dilemma due to misunderstanding, hence Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) explained to his wife, Hadhrat Saudah (radhiyallahu anha) that since answering the call of nature is a dire need, emerging from the house to fulfil this *haajat* is permissible. Whilst ‘needs’ are general despite the specific circumstance, it is preposterous to claim that tabligh by women to the masses is among their needs. This is not a *haajat* which permits them to leave their homes and expose themselves to all and sundry.

Regarding the Mufti Sahib’s toilet ‘daleel’, he says:

*“Some people say that during the era of Nubuwwat women had permission to emerge only for answering the call of nature because there were no toilets in the homes.”*

After making this silly statement, he proceeds to provide proof for the emergence of women for reasons other than the call of nature. Some people sometimes descend from the sublime to the ridiculous. However, since the Mufti Sahib’s entire book is devoid of sublimity, we can only say that in his toilet argument he has degenerated from one level of ridiculousness to another level of ludicrousness.



Who is the moron who has ever claimed that during the time of Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) women were allowed to come out of their homes ONLY to answer the call of nature and for no other reason whatsoever? It is clear that the Mufti Sahib has trumped up this silly concoction simply to darken a page or two in order to increase the size of his book. How can anyone be so stupid as to claim what the Mufti Sahib is saying regarding his toilet daleel, when everyone is aware that women would freely attend the Musjid during the time of Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam)? But their emergence for Jamaat Salaat is never a basis for makshoofaat jamaat, for the Sahaabah had nipped the fitnah in the bud by banning women from the Musjid.

Even Nafl Hajj for women during the times of peace and absence of fitnah, was frowned on. It is abnormal for women to embark on a journey for even Nafl Umrah. One Mufti Sahib conditions the permissibility with: *“Provided there is no fear of fitnah.”* One has to be either a moron or a deliberate liar to contend that this age in which we happen to be is without fitnah, and that there is no fitnah along the journey for women.

All the Fuqaha of the early times as well as all our Akaabir Ulama of recent times prohibit women from attending even Walimah feasts on the basis of the presence of fitnah. They are not permitted to go to the Musjid because of the element of fitnah. Yet, the Tablighi Molvis wish everyone to blindly believe that there is no fitnah for women in the journeys they undertake for a task which the Shariah had never envisaged for them.

Another act which they abortively force into the scope of ‘needs’ is the exceptional presence of a couple of ladies in Jihad campaigns during the age of Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam). The logic which brings such female participation in

**SABEELUL MUNKARAAT FI  
JAMAA-AATIL MUTAKASH-SHIFAAT**

Jihad within the scope of *Haajat* is indeed pathetically baseless and lamentable. Neither were females called to participate in Jihad nor were they granted permission. There was no *tashkeel* to enlist women in Jihad.

Clutching at a straw to answer this contention of *tashkeel* (*recruiting*), the Tablighi Mufti Sahib says in his book: *“If during the age of Nubuwwat there had been recruiting (tashkeel) of women for Jihad, then most of the women would have emerged (to participate). In Jihad there is the great danger of most women being taken prisoners and dishonoured. Also women did not go in Jihad to fight.....Since fighting was not the objective, what was the need for tashkeel?”*

Firstly, Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) expressly refused permission to a woman who wanted to go in Jihad, not for fighting, but to tend to the wounded. Yet, Nabi-e-Kareem (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) refused on the basis that his permission would be cited by posterity as daleel for women’s *khurooj* and participation to be Sunnah.

This express prohibition of Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) may not be overruled by the rationale presented by the Tablighi Mufti Sahib.

Secondly, the rationale presented by the Tablighi Mufti Sahib is his personal idea which is not a basis for permitting women’s organized mass *khurooj* and undertaking journeys in conflict with the mass of Shar’i dalaal pertaining to Hijaab, Aurah and the natural role of women.

Thirdly, Rasulullah’s express prohibition is the LAW, not the *amal* of some Sahaabiyaat who accompanied their husbands on disorganized and informal basis.

**SABEELUL MUNKARAAT FI  
JAMAA-AATIL MUTAKASH-SHIFAAT**

Fourthly, neither Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) nor the Sahaabah after him had at any time organized even a handful of ladies to participate in Jihad only for tending to the wounded. Such an arrangement never formed part of Jihad since *khurooj* of women for such purposes which do not constitute *haajat* in Shar'i terms is alien to Islam. No *tashkeel* of women for nursing activities in Jihad was ever made.

Fifthly, the Tablighi Mufti Sahib should desist from citing Jihadi issues as daleel for the specific methodology of the Tablighi Jamaat. Jihad is not within the purview of Tabligh Jamaat activities. Whilst we are not saying that the Tabligh Jamaat is in error for not engaging in Jihad activity, we state unequivocally that they are in grievous error for citing Qur'aanic Aayaat and Ahaadith pertaining to Jihad to substantiate their specific methodology.

Sixthly, it is absolutely ridiculous to present the occasional, disorganized participation of a handful of Sahaabiyaat in Jihad as a basis for the mass organized, systematic exodus of females from their homes to globe-trot for the sake of tabligh to the world at large. This methodology comports with the western concept of the emancipation of women. The Tabligh Jamaat has adopted this western concept to create a women's lib. movement in the name of the Deen.

Seventhly, *tashkeel* (*recruiting*) of women was never ever made in Islamic history for the simple reason that woman's place is the home. Her Tabligh is at home. Her responsibility is at home. Her flock is her children and husband. Outside the home, they become *habaa-ilush shaitaan* (traps of shaitaan), hence they have been banned from the Musaa'jid, from lectures, from walimah functions, etc. because their *khurooj* entails fitnah and fasaad.

Some husbands on their own accord took with them their wives. There was no mass organized *khurooj* of females to participate in Jihad in the manner of the mass *khurooj* of women in this era for tabligh journeys.

There was no female brigade or nursing group to accompany the mujaahideen. The impression created by the promoters of female *khurooj* is extremely deceptive. Instead of permission, Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) reprimanded them and expressly forbade women from participating in Jihad. The following Hadith knocks out the bottom of the women in jihad argument and is in fact the last nail in the coffin of the spurious arguments of the promoters of women's *khurooj*.

Hadhrat Umme Kabshah (radhiyallahu anha) narrated: “A woman of the tribe of Israh Bani Qudha-ah requested Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam): ‘O Rasulullah! Do you permit me to participate in that army?’ Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) refused to grant her permission. The woman then said: ‘O Rasulullah! My intention is not Jihad. My motive is to tend to the wounded and sick and give them water to drink.’ Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) responded: “If it was not for the fear of women's participation in Jihad becoming a Sunnat, and people (in the future) saying that a certain female (Sahaabiyah) went in Jihad, I would have given you permission. But, you remain behind (at home).”

How can Ulama be so dishonest to deliberately cast a blind eye on this explicit command of Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) prohibiting women from participating in Jihad? With what conscience do they contend that Jihad is among the ‘needs’ for which Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) granted females permission to emerge from their homes? For hallucinated ‘benefits’ they brazenly and blatantly deny the explicit prohibition on female *khurooj* and participation in Jihad

announced by Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam). Indeed, it is not an exaggeration to say that the argument of Jihad for women to justify Tabligh journeys for them, is satanically inspired, hence it has become so simple to ignore the unambiguous prohibition.

Hadhrat Aishah (radhiyallahu anha) narrates: “I sought permission from Nabi (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) (for participating) in Jihad. Then he said: ‘The Jihad of you women is Hajj.’”

On another occasion, Hadhrat Aishah (radhiyallahu anha), again seeking permission, said to Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam): “Why should we (women) not wage Jihad with you, for verily I do not see in the Qur’aan any act superior to Jihad?” Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) said: ‘Verily, for you (women) the best Jihad is Hajj of Baitullah-Hajj-e-Mabroor.’”

The Tabligh Jamaat has a penchant to apply the Qur’aanic aayaat and Ahaadith which deal specifically with Jihad, to their specific Tabligh methodology. However, it is improper to be baselessly selective and ignore certain Jihad verses and adopt others on the basis of which capital can be extracted for the specific methodology of the Tabligh Jamaat.

In terms of the Tabligh Jamaat penchant mentioned above, honesty demands that Rasulullah’s proscription of female participation in Jihad should likewise be applied to female participation in Tabligh journeys.

It is furthermore, incongruent to present the isolated cases of female participation in Jihad to scuttle the teaching and spirit of the Qur’aan and Sunnah on the issue of female *khurooj* and participation in Jihad and Tabligh journeys. Rasulullah’s categorical statements of prohibition may not be rescinded or

abrogated by the isolated examples of women in Jihad. There was no organized women's jihad jamaat as there is an organized mass ladies tabligh jamaat in this age.

## **THE CURSE OF RASULULLAH**

(sallallahu alayhi wasallam)

Females who emulate males have been cursed by Allah Ta'ala and Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam). Regardless of the area of the emulation, be it in deeds of virtue, imitation of males is haraam. Even their Salaat is distinct from the Salaat of males.

In this regard, Hadhrat Ibn Abbaas (radhiyallahu anhu) narrates that Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) said: "Allah has cursed men who emulate women, and women who emulate men.' A woman equipped with a bow around her neck passed by Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam). He said: *'Allah curses those women who emulate men and those men who emulate women.'*

This Hadith strongly prohibits female participation in Jihad, and the prohibition is logically and in terms of the Tabligh Jamaat penchant extended to Tabligh. Even to bear arms in the way men do is forbidden for them. By the same token, tabligh in the style of men is forbidden for women. *Khurooj* and *Safar* are exclusive for men. Women have no share in these male activities. Their *khurooj* is permissible only for genuine need. Their needs are specified by the Shariah. Undertaking journeys for the sake of tabligh to the masses is not among their needs, hence not permissible.

The *Nusoos* prohibiting women from *khurooj* even for ibaadat and jihad are numerous. It is baseless and not permissible to ignore them on the basis of the ‘benefits’ perceived nowadays in their *khurooj* and *safar*.

## **THE ARGUMENT OF THE LESSER EVILS**

Presenting the argument of *Ahwanul Baliyatain* (*Lesser of the two evils*), the Tablighi Mufti Sahib insipidly states:

*“Some Muftis have said that Khurooj (of women) is the lesser misfortune. They did not say that it is not permissible. The meaning of ahwanul baliyatain is this that khurooj is a misfortune, but it is better than jahaalat (ignorance). When on the tree of khurooj the fruits of ilm and amal blossom, then misfortune will become a bounty....”*

The radio shaitaan, the television and the facebook molvis, and all deviated modernists utilize the very same stupid argument to justify their haraam perpetrations. A haraam method may not be pursued to gain knowledge or for the purpose of tabligh. It appears that the Tablighi Mufti Sahib does not understand the operation of the principle of the ‘lesser evils’.

The Mufti Sahib has attempted to justify female journeys for tabligh on the basis of the Fiqhi principle of *Ahwanul Baliyatain* (the lesser of the two evils). This argument too is spurious. This principle applies only when there is no third lawful alternative. When all lawful options are closed, and one is faced with two evils from which escape is impossible, only then may this principle be invoked. If a starving man is able to find somewhere some halaal food, he may not invoke the principle of the lesser evils to consume haraam meat or pork.

The basics of the Deen can be acquired from numerous simple books, and from females in the immediate locality, and also from their husbands and fathers. If women are willing to learn, they can arrange in their locality to be taught. It is therefore not permissible for them to perpetrate the haraam acts of unnecessary *khurooj* and *safar* on the basis of the principle of the lesser of the two evils.

There is a variety of ways for women to acquire the elementary teachings of the Deen. One simple method is for the Tablighi Jamaat men to teach their womenfolk. Another method is the Tabligh Jamaat to organize the ladies of the immediate neighbourhood to have ta'leem amongst themselves. A third method is for the Tabligh Jamaat to ask a local Tablighi Molvi to adopt the Sunnah method and have occasional talks for women in an unostensible and private manner.

There is no imperative need for women to undertake journeys to learn and teach others in other cities, towns and countries. The Mufti Sahib is befuddling himself and fooling others with his spurious 'lesser evil' argument. There are lawful ways of curing the jahaalat of women. The Tablighi Molvis only need to open their eyes and cudgel their brains and they will then be able to employ halaal methodology to educate the womenfolk.

## **MEN AND WOMEN – THE DIFFERENCE IN THEIR PARTICIPATION**

The Mufti Sahib, arguing in favour of women's tabligh journeys, says:

*“It is also important to note that when Hadhrat Moulana Ilyas Saheb Rahmatullah, commenced this noble work of Tabligh, there were reservations from some Muftis who did not understand and see the work of Tabligh from within. As the*



**SABEELUL MUNKARAAT FI  
JAMAA-AATIL MUTAKASH-SHIFAAT**

*effort of Tabligh became widespread and Ulama and Muftis observed the work closely and from within, they supported the work including the Mastooraat Jamaat. ”*

The initial hesitation of the Ulama regarding the Tabligh Jamaat is standard attitude and procedure in the Department of Ifta'. This caution was not restricted to issues pertaining to the Tabligh Jamaat. It applies to every new development. The Tabligh Jamaat was a totally new development whose methodology has no precedent in Islamic history. The hesitation and caution were therefore simply necessary. A variety of factors has to be investigated and ascertained before a fatwa could be issued.

This initial caution cannot be extended to makshoofaat jamaat. There is no need to infiltrate the makshoofaat jamaat to ascertain its position and reality. Regardless of the perceived benefits, its reality and nature are in conflict with the Shariah, hence numerous Ulama are opposed to it. The opposition to the makshoofaat jamaat is not the effect of remaining 'without' nor is there a need to participate and journey with one's wife to ascertain what the makshoofaat jamaat is. There is no conundrum in the makshoofaat jamaat. It is a development simply in conflict with the Shariah whereas there was no conflict with the Shariah in the males wing of the Tabligh Jamaat.

Whilst some *ghulu'* has now crept into the Tabligh Jamaat in this age, it did not exist in the early days of the Jamaat. All movements veer from the Haqq with the passage of time. It is essential that the elders of the Tabligh Jamaat take stock, assess the situation and ensure that the Jamaat does not veer rudderless widely off the mark of Siraatul Mustaqeem.

It will indeed be a sad day when bid'ah takes over the Jamaat. Bid'ah is the natural consequence of *ghulu'*. Everything has

limits. The Qur'aan states: "*These are the limits of Allah. Whoever transgresses the limits, verily he has oppressed his own soul.*" The enemies of the Haqq, especially the Barelwi Qabar Pujaaris, are praying for the deflection and demise of the Tabligh Jamaat. The Jamaat will be ignoring the sagacious advice and admonition of the Ulama-e-Haqq at the peril of self-immolation.

We are not the enemies of the Tabligh Jamaat. We are of the same spiritual and academic roots. We are in conformity with the Jamaat's methodology. But we emphatically reject the idea that the methodology of the Jamaat is the sole and exclusive method of Tabligh. The Jamaat's method is one of the *Mubah* (permissible) methods of Tabligh which is a multifaceted institution of Islam.

Extremists in the Jamaat should divest themselves of the haraam attitude that the Tabligh Jamaat methodology is *Fardh-e-Ain* and that only its method is the valid method of Tabligh.

Baatil accretions must necessarily be weeded out. If not, these attitudes of bid'ah will throttle the Haqq from the Jamaat. This lamentable fate has happened to all institutions of the Haqq in Islamic history. The Jamaat is no exception. The elders must be careful. They must keep this huge Ship of Tabligh on course – on Siraatul Mustaqeem. Whilst it is undoubtedly, a huge Ship of the Haqq, it is definitely not the Ship of Nooh (alayhis salaam) as the extremists in the Jamaat are projecting, implying thereby that all those Ulama and non-Ulama who are not participating in Tabligh Jamaat activities are kaafirs doomed to everlasting perdition in the Aakhirah. This is the clear implication of not being in the Ship of Hadhrat Nabi Nooh (alayhis salaam). Thus, the comparison with Hadhrat Nooh's Ship is palpably false and an example of the *ghulu'* which is choking the Jamaat.

In the perpetration of crass *ghulu'*, one senior of the Jamaat, Taariq Jameel is outstanding. He holds some decidedly weird views which are even bizarre and Imaan-threatening. If Allah Ta'ala grants us the taufeeq, we shall discuss some of his baatil for the guidance of the Ummah. This is our obligation. This is part of the *Amr Bil Ma'roof Nahy Anil Munkar* obligation which the Shariah imposes on us. It is our desire and Dua that the Jamaat remains on course. For securing this, it is imperative to arrest the *ghulu'* and bid'ah and weed it out.

## **THE HAQ IS CONCEDED**

Despite arguing in favour of female's *khurooj* to participate in Tabligh journeys, the Mufti Sahib says:

*“When this was the condition in the era of the Sahaabah that due to fitnah women were prohibited from attending the salaah in the masjid, then one can well imagine the need for not allowing women to participate in the congregational prayer in this time and age, where the fitnah is rampant and widespread everywhere to such an extent that controlling the fitnah is impossible.”*

The reasoning of the Mufti Sahib is most pathetic. He concedes the preponderance of fitnah in women's *khurooj* just to attend the Masjid which is the holiest of places, and which is in close proximity to their homes. He furthermore acknowledges the impossibility of controlling the fire of fitnah which has engulfed the whole world. Yet, he sees no fitnah in women undertaking journeys to distant places for tabligh to the masses which is not their function – which the Shariah has not imposed on them.

In a vain and abortive attempt to neutralize the severity of the prohibition which he himself stated in the aforementioned statement, he flabbily avers:

*“As far as the second type of need is concerned, just as it was permissible in that era, it is permitted in this time and age provided there is no fear of fitnah.”*

The Mufti Sahib dwells in bewilderment, not knowing which way to turn, hence his self-contradiction. It has already been explained earlier that what has been imagined as ‘need’ to justify female emergence and undertaking journeys, is absolutely not a need in terms of the Shariah. It is a despicable falsehood to peddle the baatil that women were permitted to participate in Jihad. Furthermore, Tabligh to the masses and undertaking journeys to do tabligh are not at all among the Shar’i needs of women. Their imperative need is to stay within the confines of their holy homes.

Despite his weak attempt to justify female *khurooj*, the Mufti Sahib is constrained to say: *“provided there is no fear of fitnah”*. Now which Muslim in his sane senses can honestly claim that this era is devoid of the fear of fitnah? The fitnah which constrained the Sahaabah to prohibit even the very pious Sahaabiyah from attending the Musaajid has multiplied a thousand fold. To acknowledge the widespread fitnah, the *“controlling of which is impossible”* in this era according to the Mufti Saheb, and to condition the female’s *khurooj* with absence of fitnah, then to say that it is permissible for them in this age to undertake tabligh journeys, is to speak with a forked tongue. The stunt to proclaim permissibility defies credulity.

The *“unimaginable maladies and uncontrollable ailments which have spread in the ummah”* mentioned by the Mufti Sahib cannot be remedied by acting in conflict with the Shariah – by encouraging women to participate in a mass female’s movement. The solution is to revert to the original Sunnah system of educating womenfolk within the precincts of their homes. This is the obligation of the menfolk who are in Tabligh.

Their prior Tabligh is for their families. But the problem is that the men have no patience with their wives and children. They are prepared to globe-trot and spend ages away from home making ‘tabligh’ to others whilst they think nothing of neglecting Tabligh to their families. This speaks much for the corruption of their intentions.

Brandishing the aim and the goal of the Tabligh Jamaat to justify a method which is inherently fraught with grave moral consequences for the entire Ummah, does not justify the abrogation of an explicit law of Islam, namely, the prohibition of female emergence for activities not imposed on them by the Shariah. The noble end does not justify a haraam methodology.

## **MORE CONVOLUTED ARGUMENTS**

The Mufti Sahib also argues:

*“The Ulama of the Tableegh Jamaat have analysed that when the Shariah has granted women permission to leave their homes for a physical need, such as to acquire medical treatment or be hospitalized, then why would they not be allowed to leave their homes to acquire their Imaani need through attending madrasahs and mastoorat (sic!) jama’at?”*

They are not allowed for the simple reason that Allah Ta’ala has prohibited the latter while permitting the former.

It is massive deception to utilize personal logic to deny and cancel any law of the Shariah. The Sahaabah and the Aimmah Mujtahideen were better poised to have understood this imagined mystery. Despite this, they prohibited females from the Musjid in that golden era when fitnah was practically nil. For the protection of posterity, the Sahaabah enacted the ban on female’s *khurooj*.

In the 14 centuries of Islam's history, the Tabligh Jamaat has been the first to innovate the evil of female *khurooj* on a mass scale. It appears that the Hadith in which Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) mentioned that the reason for his refusal to grant the woman permission to participate in Jihad was the fear that such *khurooj* would be interpreted to be Sunnah, was directed to the Tabligh Jamaat. It is only the Tabligh Jamaat which has flagrantly violated this express prohibition of Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam), and they utilize personal logic and whim to deny what Nabi-e-Kareem (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) had proclaimed regarding women's *khurooj*. In fact, their attitude and conduct testify that they have given female *khurooj* the status of *Wujoob* (compulsion). The interpretation which is employed to skirt the explicit prohibition is *ta'weel-e-baatil* (baseless interpretation).

The reasons proffered for ignoring what Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) said, and what the Sahaabah had ordered are the effects of fanciful imagination.

## **FEMALE KHUROOJ IS NOT THE SOLUTION**

The Mufti Sahib in his promotion of *khurooj-e-nisaa* (emergence of women from their homes) laments: *"However, due to the sad and unfortunate plight of the ummah witnessed across the globe, where a decline and degeneration of Deeni morals and values are seen in women, to the extent that they are openly seen frequenting the shopping centers and bazaars, halls and malls, occupying positions in shops and offices, driving about freely, going for morning walks and jogs in groups, taking part in national and international sports and even the Olympics, attending schools and universities, getting involved with or marrying non Muslims, being influenced by anti Islamic beliefs and ideologies e.g. Darwin's theory etc. and*

**SABEELUL MUNKARAAT FI  
JAMAA-AATIL MUTAKASH-SHIFAAT**

*are also seen intermingling and interacting with the opposite sex without any sense of shame and modesty. Due to this sad and unfortunate plight, the need was perceived to use some other Halaal alternative which may perhaps not be the ideal but a means to acquire the ideal - a means through which a woman can once again come onto the path of the Sunnah and find her true place in her home and observe complete purdah. Hence the 'Ulama have thought of ways (through girls madrasahs and Mastooraat Jama'at) to reform and rectify the unimaginable maladies and uncontrollable ailments which have spread in the ummah."*

This sad and lamentable plight of the Ummah's females painted by the Mufti Sahib is supposedly the basis for the justification to promote a mass movement of women undertaking journeys. If the Mufti Sahib makes an honest appraisal of the droves of women in the makshoofaat jamaats, he will find extremely few women who were former factory girls, shop girls, street girls, university girls, participants in Olympics, jogging girls, sportsgirls, etc,etc. Females involved in these lewd outdoor occupations and professions continue with their haraam professions. Hardly any of these females are captured by the Tabligh Jamaat.

Even the daughters of Tablighi brothers and of even Molvis are attending universities. The females of fathers who are staunch Jamaat workers are on the streets and brushing shoulders with all and sundry. A man goes for 4 months believing himself to be in the Path of Allah whilst his wife manages the business and interacts with ghair mahram males and prowls around the streets. The females who are attracted to the Tabligh Jamaat are those who are from so-called respectable homes. They are not factory and shop workers. They are females who are generally in their homes although not in full purdah. These are the

women who are encouraged to leave their homes and undertake tabligh journeys.

Girls working in factories, in shops and the public sector are not targeted. Seldom will such females join the makshoofaat jamaat. The immoral condition of females is not set to improve. It will deteriorate further as we approach Qiyaamah. The downward plunge in the abyss of immorality cannot be arrested. All the predictions of Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) have to necessarily materialize.

The solution is only to propagate the Sunnah methodology and to leave the end result to Allah Ta'ala. The analysis of the Tablighi Molvis is baseless. Methods in conflict with the Sunnah and Shariah are doomed to failure, and the consequences of such methods are always disastrous. Currently the public sector females are beyond the reach of the makshoofaat jamaats.

If it is possible to organize bayaans for the 'emancipated' females, there is no need for women from other countries to undertake journeys for this purpose. There are many women locally who could arrange for bayaans at someone's home in a very unostensible manner to advise and teach the females. There is no need to organize the females to go out in jamaats. Ulama and other knowledgeable women should organize bayaan programmes for the lost females. What is the need for a mass movement? What is the need to create a specific public mould for women's tabligh? Why adopt the male tabligh model for women?

Whilst makshoofaat jamaats are being justified by using the public sector girls as a smokescreen, hardly any of them (i.e. the factory, shop and university females) join these female jamaats. Mostly women who are generally in the homes are the



members of the makshoofaat jamaats undertaking journeys to distant places.

The claim by the Mufti Sahib that most of the women in the makshoofaat jamaats “*are from the underprivileged class*” is incorrect. The Tabligh Jamaat is not too active in the underprivileged areas whether for males or females. They operate more in privileged areas.

Whatever the case may be, and whatever benefits are imagined, the bottom line is that methods which contravene the Shariah are not permissible and should not be employed. The work should be executed in compliance with the Shariah, and the result be left to Allah Ta’ala. The Qur’aan Majeed tells Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) that he has not been appointed a guard over people nor can he grant hidaayat to people. His duty is only to deliver the Message of the Deen. This was the function of all the Ambiya: “*On us is nothing but to deliver the clear message.*” (Qur’aan) Hidaayat cannot be rammed down the throats of people.

Those who innovate new methods in conflict with the Shariah are desirous to supersede the Ambiya (alayhimus salaam). They believe that the inability to gain recruits is failure. Their emphasis is on their effort and on quantity whereas the sincere Muballigh’s focus is on Allah’s Ridha’, hence he does not act in conflict with the Ahkaam of the Shariah. This is an important lesson which the Tabligh Jamaat of our time should learn.

Allah Ta’ala has created females for the home, not for outdoor activities, be these Deeni activities. Female *khurooj* is unnatural and haraam. Tabligh activities for women in the manner of the makshoofaat jamaats and by undertaking journeys are not permissible.

## **FEMALES WITHIN THEIR HOMES ARE NOT DEPRIVED OF THE IMMENSE THAWAAB OF TABLIGH AND JIHAD FI SABEELILLA AH**

Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) said:

\*“Whoever of you (women) who remains at home, verily, she will acquire the amal (with its rewards) of the Mujaahid in the Path of Allah.”

\* “Your Jihad is Hajj.” That is the performance of the Fardh Hajj.

\* A woman who adopts patience when her husband marries again, will attain the thawaab and rank of Shahaadat. Thus she is not deprived of the thawaab of Tabligh whilst remaining within the precincts of her sacred home.

## **THE MUFTI SAHIB’S INJUSTICE**

At the very inception of his book, the Mufti Sahib had destroyed his entire argument by perpetrating gross injustice which is tantamount to *kitmaanul haq (concealing the truth)* and chicanery. He began his so-called Qur’aanic proofs with a palpable falsehood by wilfully misinterpreting the Qur’aanic term, *saa-ihaat*, to convey the notion that the Qur’aan Majeed promotes women’s emergence from their homes to undertake journeys.

He has miserably failed to present the official/authoritative tafseer of this word. Not once did he mention the tafseer of the term given by Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam), the Sahaabah and all the Mufasssireen. Then, he committed double chicanery by falsely attributing his personal pet ‘tafseer’ to Imaam Qurtubi when in fact Imaam Qurtubi did not interpret the word to mean what the Tablighi Mufti Sahib conveyed. The

**SABEELUL MUNKARAAT FI  
JAMAA-AATIL MUTAKASH-SHIFAAT**

Mufti Sahib deliberately skirted the tafseer of Imaam Qurtubi, and from the centre of the explanation proffered by Imaam Qurtubi, the Mufti Sahib extracted the view of some unknown person. While Imaam Qurtubi had mentioned this view of someone else, he did not attribute it to himself. His view is clearly stated after the very word of the Qur'aan in the very first line of his tafseer of the word.

We have cited ten Kutub of Tafaaseer to show the consensus of all Authorities, beginning from Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam), - consensus on the meaning of the term, *saa-ihaat*. In the context of the Aayat it means nothing but *Saa-imaat* (*Fasting Women*).

The palpable dishonesty of which the Tablighi Mufti Sahib is guilty testifies that he is not interested to establish the Haqq. His mission is to establish the makshoofaat jamaat by hook or by crook. Precisely for this reason has he made an attempt, albeit abortive, to convolute the meaning of the Qur'aanic word to create capital for the makshoofaat jamaat. It is indeed surprising that the Mufti Sahib had run away with the idea that such chicanery would go by undetected.

On the basis of just this one grave crime, it will be proper to strike down his whole book as an exercise in baatil. Although his book is cluttered with baatil arguments which provide no proof for the supposed validity of makshoofaat jamaat, there is really no need to traverse beyond his very first false argument to scuttle the female jamaat of the Tablighi Jamaat.

## **ULAMA-E-SOO' DESTROYING THE WOMEN OF ISLAM**

A very concerned sister from England writes;  
Assalamu alaykum

I am living in Birmingham, UK. I find myself in a dilemma and very concerned with what the future holds. Despite this being a city with a very big Muslim population, I feel there is no barakah, no sense of tranquillity and serenity. Rather I sense that something terrible is on the way. The reason is: I see sisters do something with sincere intentions but with haraam means because they genuinely trust the 'scholars' (scholars for dollars – boot-lickers and boot-leggers –The Majlis) whom they believe are real scholars. Things are very confusing because in this city, and in the UK, there are no scholars talking out against the ulama-e-soo and the Haraam rulings being given by 'scholars' to sincere sisters and brothers who are mostly ignorant and will follow naively.

These ulama-e-soo' are doing their own 'ijtihad' by saying that times have changed so the ruling should be changed too. Many sisters follow and are direct students of these ulama-e-soo', because there do not seem to be any alternative scholars to go to, and no other scholars are highlighting errors and warning the people. So sincere people who are new to Islam or newly practicing on the deen will naturally trust these ulama-s-soo'.

To give an example, a sister wanted to raise money for her Alimi institute that's forever eating the money of it's students and other people. The naive sister who is still really ignorant even though she is in the 4th year of alimah course (Jaahilah course – The Majlis) in that institute, recently took part in a marathon which entails wearing tight clothes, free mixing, running out in the open, etc. I have advised this sister

previously myself but it fell on the deaf ears. Why should the sister listen to a layperson like myself when she has so many ‘great’ and ‘knowledgeable’ scholars (Juhala predicted by Rasulullah –sallallahu alayhi wasallam – The Majlis) to take rulings from?

I know people have informed the Alimi institute a while ago about the bad behaviour of many of their female-students who are now in the higher years of the Alimi course and about to become the next generation of ‘Alimahs’ (Jaahilahs will lead other jaahilahs. Signs of Qiyaamah -The Majlis) from whom people will take rulings. Not only this institute but many other institutes seem to be producing the same type of ‘Alimahs’ with really bad adab and akhlaaq, and following the wrong rulings of their scholars.

There is no emphasis at all on Tasawwuf and Taqwa. And maybe they're not completely to blame for not putting emphasis on Tasawwuf because the people of Tasawwuf in Birmingham do weird stuff, like constantly over-praising their shaykh, saying 'shaykh did this', or 'shaykh had this for breakfast', or 'shaykh dreamt something today' and so on, and becoming more and more similar to the tasawwuf cults of the Barelwis. So these new ‘Alimahs’ along with their teachers think that such Tasawwuf is more of a problem and no longer necessary.

One example of a wrong ruling that the Ulama of these institutes give to their students is that for ‘special’ circumstances a group of sisters can travel more than 48 miles as long as there is one mahram of one of the sisters in the group. Some of my close relatives and friends follow this ruling and it looks like any Aalim can decide when these ‘special’ circumstances apply. But I was even more shocked to learn that this ruling is not a new ruling. The senior Ulama of the big madrasahs in this country issued this ruling many years ago,

when girls madrasahs started. In order that girls can be transported from their homes to these madrasahs, the senior ulama said that one mahram in the van or coach is sufficient. They also said that this is a very ‘special’ ruling and should not be publicised.

I request The Majlis to comment on this ruling of senior ulama of the UK who are very big and famous ‘buzurgs’, and regarded as ‘Walis’ of Allah. (Genuine Ulama and Walis do not issue haraam twaddle as ‘fatwas’. – The Majlis) Who can decide when to apply these ‘special circumstances’? Now it looks like any group of Aalims and buzurgs can decide when these ‘special’ circumstances apply so that women can travel over 48 miles in a group. And then other Aalimahs take further advantage of this ruling by deciding that they can decide themselves when these ‘special’ circumstances apply such as going sight-seeing to ‘appreciate’ the wonders of Allah, and even coming home extremely late at night.

This state of affairs exists even though the situation in this country is getting worse and worse in terms of safety. Just recently a sister wearing a hijab who was waiting at a bus stop was dragged to a nearby bush, violently assaulted, dishonoured terribly and left to die.

I see sisters who are sincerely practising and new to Islam but are extremely naive and confused. How do I convince them not to follow the ‘ulama-e-soo’ and instead stick to the original fiqh rulings like those in Beheshti Zewar? When I give such advice, these sisters don't listen, and I ask myself why should these sisters even listen to me? What qualification do I have compared to the big mufti titles of their teachers who quote even bigger muftis and buzurgs to justify their rulings.

I wanted to ask, as these things are becoming more apparent in our community, I am worried that Allah's athaab is on its way due to these sins and lack of taqwa in the community – the same athaab that is currently ravaging Syria, Palestine, Egypt, China, Burma, in fact most of the Muslims around the world. What is a layperson to do? Should I email the relevant ulamas and explain what they and their Alimahs are doing is affecting the community? Should I warn people of these ulama as there is no other ulama reprimanding them and tell them not to attend their classes?

My heart is in despair. I am crying because people have started to use the religion to fulfil their desires and what they want to believe to be the deen. Basically deen is being used for dunya with even sincere but ignorant people being dragged in. It hurts me that they are upsetting Allah. Allah has put it in my heart to email you regarding this, and seek advice on what can I do. Sometimes its difficult, and I wish to do hijrah to South Africa because it seems there might still be true scholars there. Here in Birmingham things are just going worse and worse, and it is affecting so many families who I know personally, and I am afraid of Allah's athaab coming.

As sisters who are struggling with holding onto deen, who can not find good company in this day and age. What advice do you have for them? Jazak'Allahkhayr for reading this.  
(End of the Sister's lament).

## **OUR COMMENT AND ADVICE**

Sister, South Africa is not much better than the rotten state of U.K. where you are living. This is the era of the increase of the ulama-e-soo'. Just as in the U.K., there is a glut of these worldly 'scholars' – scholars for dollars' – evil molvis and sheikhs in South Africa. There is really no place to migrate to.

Remain where you are and do for the Deen and for yourself whatever you are able to, and leave the end result to Allah Ta'ala.

As long as you are concerned and do what Allah Ta'ala wants you to do, you will be saved from His Athaab, Insha-Allah, when it settles on the community. You may write to the 'scholars' and ulama-e-soo' to discharge the obligation of Amr Bil Ma'roof Nahyi Anil Munkar.

Tampering with the Shariah and legalizing what Allah Ta'ala has made haraam is tantamount to kufr. Those 'scholars' who have claimed that it is permissible for a group of women to travel with a ghair mahram male as long as he is accompanied by a mahramah (female), are zindeeqs. They are following in the footsteps of the ulama-e-soo' of Bani Israaeel whose profession it had become to tamper with and alter the Tauraah and the Shariah of Nabi Musa (alayhis salaam). These ulama-e-soo' are embarking on the same mission initiated by the ulama-e-soo' of Bani Israaeel. They are astray and they mislead others. They are juhalah who deceive and misguide the juhalah among the masses.

The so-called 'special circumstances' hallucinated by these scoundrel 'scholars' is a typical example of Talbeesul Iblees (Deception of the Devil). With this absolutely ludicrous argument the ulama-e-soo' deem it appropriate to tamper and mutilate the crystal clear command of the Shariah regarding the prohibition of females travelling without their male mahrams. Anyhow, we have to reconcile ourselves with the predictions of Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam). Fulfilment of predictions is a sign of the truth of Nubuwwat. Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) had predicted the present degenerate state of the 'scholars', hence he said: "Verily, I fear for my Ummah the Aimmah Mudhilleen." They are the



‘scholars for dollars’ – the ‘scholars of deviation – the ‘scholars’ who are astray and lead others astray as well. They prowl the world today in search of nafsaani gratification and securing worldly goals in the name of the Deen. Stating this fact, Hadhrat Abdullah Ibn Mas’ood (radhiyallahu anhu) mentioning some of the signs of Qiyaamah, said: “The dunya will be pursued with the amal of the Aakhirah.” Deeds which are exclusively for the Hereafter, will be presented as a front to entrap people for the sake of monetary purposes and other base nafsaani motives.

Regarding these ulama-e-soo’ Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) said:

“There will dawn a time when nothing will remain of Islam but its name. Nothing will remain of the Qur’aan but its text. The Musajjid will be beautifully adorned structures, but devoid of guidance. The worst of the people under the canopy of the sky will be their ulama. From them will emanate fitnah and the fitnah will rebound on them.”

Rasulullah’s predictions are materializing right in front of our eyes. These ulama-e-soo’ to whom you have referred are running amok with the Deen all over the world, not only in the U.K. They are vermin eating away the foundations of Islam. But Allah Ta’ala has His Own plans to thwart these vile shayaateen in human form. There will always be the group of Haqq to proclaim the pristine pure Deen and the Sunnah of Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam).

These villains masquerading as Ulama and Shaikhs of Tasawwuf should hang their heads in shame and disgrace for tampering and mutilating the Ahkaam of the Shariah. Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) said that it is not halaal for a woman who believes in Allah and the Last Day to undertake a journey without her mahram. But these human

**SABEELUL MUNKARAAT FI  
JAMAA-AATIL MUTAKASH-SHIFAAT**

shayaateen seek to override this Law of the Shariah with their copro-opinion. It is haraam for women to travel without their male mahrams. The one male who is a mahram for one woman is never ever the mahram of the other women. By what stretch of Shar'i logic and intelligence did these villain 'scholars' override what Allah Ta'ala and His Rasool (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) had decreed?

The blame for the ravaging and plundering of the sister's honour by the kuffaar louts must be borne by these evil 'scholars' who issue vulgar and stupid 'fatwas' of the nafs granting women a licence to roam around without mahrams. Nowadays, it is not permissible for a woman to be out of her home on the streets without a mahram even within the precincts of the town. This is an age of extreme fitnah and fasaad. Just look what has happened to the sister at the bus station. She had no right to be at the bus stop. She violated Allah's Law on the basis of the haraam 'fatwas' of the zindeeq 'scholars', hence her honour was plundered and pillaged and she was seriously assaulted.

It is indeed shocking that a girl pursuing Deeni studies participates in a kuffaar marathon, dressed like a prostitute, running in the open in the mix with men and women of all varieties of kufr, fisq and fujoor. These ignoramuses are supposed to be 'aalimahs'. They are nothing but the worst type of jaahilahs. They and their teachers are all ignoramuses – moron miscreants who deceive and mislead Muslims.

These girls madrasahs and makshoofaat (ladies) tablighi jamaats are curses which destroy the hayaa and morality of females. They rip out the veil of Imaani haya from the hearts of the women who are lured out of their homes with thier chimera of 'deen'. It is all a ploy of shaitaan. It is the devil's trap to ruin the nation of Islam. The consequence of mass emergence of women from their homes is only fitnah and fasaad. This fitnah

**SABEELUL MUNKARAAT FI  
JAMAA-AATIL MUTAKASH-SHIFAAT**

is being enacted in the name of Islam by the ulama-e-soo' who hoodwink the masses with their deceitful talk presented in deeni hues. What you have said about Allah's Athaab is correct. There does overhang the Muslim nation the dark clouds of Divine Chastisement. The extent of the fitnah and immorality – fisq and fujoor – in the community has gone far beyond the limits.

Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) said that in the human body there is a lump of flesh. If it is healthy, the entire body is healthy. If it is diseased, then the entire body becomes diseased. That lump is the heart. The Heart of the Ummah is the Ulama. But the ulama are today corrupt – rotten to the core. Thus, we see the masses too are corrupt – rotten to the core. The kuffaar may not be blamed for the humiliation and oppression which have become our lot. Muslims are deserving of these calamities. They are divinely imposed on us via the kuffaar servants of Allah Ta'ala.

Hitherto, Allah Ta'ala has given us just a taste of chastisement as a warning and an eye-opener so that we heed and turn back to obedience. He states in the Qur'aan Majeed:

*“Fasaad has appeared in the ocean and the land because of the deeds which people have perpetrated so that He (Allah) gives them a taste of some of the deeds they have earned, for perhaps they will return (to obedience).”*

## **SUMMARY**

The Tabligh Jamaat's women's jamaat is not a mastoorat jamaat.

***“And (O Women!) remain (glued)  
within your homes, and do not make  
an exhibition (of yourselves) like the  
displays of the former times of  
Jaahiliyyah.”  
(Ahzaab, Aayat 33)***

***Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi  
wasallam) said: “Women have no  
share in emerging (from their homes)  
except in cases of need.”***