

YAWAR BAIG

ANOTHER GHABI CLAMBERING ON THE SHARIAH

By:
THE MAJLIS
P.O. Box 3393,
Port Elizabeth, 6056,
South Africa

THE SUNNAH

Most assuredly, Allah Ta'ala after having imposed the Sunnah lifestyle on us and after issuing dire warnings and threats of the severest consequences for disobedience, did not leave us to dwell and grope in the darkness of *nafsaani* vacillation in the endeavour to discover the Sunnah. The Sunnah is not a concept which is the consequence of our discovery – a stupid discovery developing from the application of man's opinion bogged down and contaminated by a variety of inimical forces. The Sunnah is the lifestyle created by Allah Azza Wa Jal for His *Makhlooq*, and defined meticulously by the practical example of Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) and his noble Sahaabah, hence he declared:

"Honour my Sahaabah, for verily, they are the best of you; then those who followed them (the Taabieen), then those who followed them (Tab-e-Taabieen). Then after them kithb (falsehood and lies, especially modernist lies disgorged by morons) will prevail."

The Qur'aan-e-Hakeem does not deal with modernist fiction. It expounds incumbent facts for us to compulsorily adopt in practical life in the precise way exemplified by Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) and his illustrious Sahaabah. The Sunnah is not a stupid conundrum which has been left for extrapolating concepts of life in kufr evolutionary style in the way the Yahood and Nasaara have mutilated and transmogrified the Shariahs of Nabi Musa (alayhis salaam) and Nabi Isa (alayhis salaam). There is no ambivalence in the Sunnah. The attempt to convey the devilish idea that the Sunnah is a riddle to be solved by the brains of the modernist juhala by way of submitting the Ahaadith to their personal opinion is kufr. Such 'believers' are *zindeeqs*. They seek to scuttle Islam in subtle and cunning ways by retaining the name 'Islam' for the hotch potch of *nafsaaniyat* which is the quotient of their wild conjecturing.

There is no ambiguity and no conundrum in the Sunnah. Allah Ta'ala did not command us to submit to a conundrum or to a concept stricken with ambiguity and darkness, then threaten us with the severest punishment for acts which are in conflict of the Sunnah despite our unawareness of what that Sunnah actually is.

Yawar Baig is another upstart moron in India who hallucinates that he is a 'mujtahid' or the 'mujaddid' of the age. He has vividly demonstrated his *jahl-e-muraqqab* with his stupid blabbering, blustering and block-headed comment on a Fatwa issued by the venerable Mufti of Darul Uloom Deoband on a rape case which happened recently in India. In this case the rapist was the woman's father-in-law.

Before demolishing the stupid 'fatwa' of the *Ghabi* who has audaciously flaunted his *ghabaawat* (*density of brains*), we digress to draw attention to the wisdom of our Fuqaha who have ruled that despite the ties of *mahramiyyat* a man should observe strict Hijaab for his daughter-in-law; a man for his stepmother; a man for his mother-in-law. These people should not freely interact, and the man does not constitute a valid mahram for the woman on a journey. Innumerable instances of sexual misdemeanour happen between persons of this type of family relationship. Great caution is therefore imperative.

The Mufti of Deoband had correctly stated the Shariah's Law, viz., the Nikah of the rapist's son to his daughter has terminated in consequence of the sexual relationship. The Yawar Baig moron, believing himself to be a 'mujtahid', states, in abnegation of this 100% correct Fatwa, that *Hurmat-e-Musaaharah* has not been established in this case in view of the fact that the haraam episode was not consensual sex. According to the moron's understanding, his *jahaalat* dictates that *consensual sex* is an imperative requisite for the establishment of *Hurmat-e-Musaaharah* (*marital prohibition created by marriage*).

Sucking this *ghutha* (*rubbish*) from his thumb, the moron has portrayed his gross ignorance of the Shariah. When zina is perpetrated between a man and his daughter-in-law, she becomes haraam for her husband (the man's son). The marital relationship terminates regardless of the sex being consensual or not. The Shariah has not pivoted the establishment of *hurmat-e-musaaharah* on the condition of consensual context. This Yawar character is unable to distinguish right from left or darkness from light hence he blurted out his rubbish copro-'fatwa'.

This character's stark ignorance is palpably illustrated by the following statement: "*If we take that line of reasoning (i.e. Imaam Abu Hanifah's line of reasoning – The Majlis), then rape would have to be acknowledged as a way of establishing a marital relationship and so any woman who has been raped would automatically become the wife of the rapist without the necessity of the nikah.*"

The brains of this *Ghabi* come clearly within the purview of the Qur'aanic aayat: "*Thus, has He (Allah) cast rijs (filth – najaasat) on (the brains) of those who cannot understand.*" Undoubtedly, Allah Ta'ala has fossilized the brains of this epistasis with the curse of *rijs* which stunts, blunts and extinguishes intellectual vision. By what stretch of rationality and on what Shar'i basis, and in terms of which ruling of any of the Hanafi Fuqaha has the moron based his stupid 'fatwa'. What is the basis for claiming that rape transforms the raped daughter-in-law into a wife for her father-in-law? On which 'line of reasoning' of the Mufti's Fatwa is this stupid and ludicrous averment a consequence?

The establishment of *hurmat-e-musaaharah* has never been a substitute for Nikah. A *hurmat-e-musaaharah* relationship does not 'automatically' transform a woman into a man's wife. How can the consequence of the rape by a man of his daughter-in-law ever be equated to 'nikah' which transforms the raped daughter-in-law into the wife of the rapist? Indeed the brains of this miserable moron has been deranged by the Divine Casting of *Rijs*. A man must indeed be moronic beyond the confines of stupidity to have the shameless audacity of uttering such trash.

The *hukm* of *hurmat-e-musaaharah* gives no rise whatsoever to the rubbish conclusion stated by the *Ghabi*. He should produce the corrupt 'syllogism' with all its elements to prove that such a vile and ludicrous conclusion stems from the reasoning of the Ahnaaf. The consequence of *hurmat-e-musaaharah* is prohibition of marriage to the *Usool* (mother and above) and *Furoo'* (children and below) of the woman with whom an act of sexual misdemeanour as defined by the Shariah has occurred. There is not the slightest narrational or rational indication for the rubbish conclusion which the moron attributes to Hanafi reasoning which he hallucinates as a corollary of the Fatwa issue by the venerable Mufti of Darul Uloom Deoband.

The moron's argument that the raped woman can still live as the wife of her former husband, legalizes adultery. While the Fatwa of the Mufti prohibits adultery which is the logical conclusion of cohabiting with a woman who is no longer lawful for the man, the moron legalizes adultery on the absolutely corrupt basis of the sexual act not having been consentient. There is not a single Faqih in the entire history of Islam from the age of the Sahaabah to this day who has ever tendered that *hurmat-e-musaaharah* comes into existence on the basis of the zina/sexual misdemeanour being consensual. Only a brain deranged by divinely cast *rijs* is capable of excreting such rubbish as the moron has disgorged to advertise his compound ignorance. The act of sexual relationship, consensual or not,

conclusively terminates all husband-wife relationship. Yet the moron advocates that the couple should continue living as 'husband' and 'wife' to produce illegitimate offspring. This is the effect of the *rijs* which Allah Ta'ala has cast on his brains.

The honourable Mufti of Deoband is a Hanafi. The Fatwa is in accord with the Hanafi Math-hab. The *Ghabi* displays aggravated *jahaalat* with his attempt to scuttle the ruling of the Hanafi Math-hab with the view of Imaam Shaafi' (rahmatullah alayh). The Hanafi Mufti is not under any obligation to take cognizance of the Shaafi' view on an issue of this nature. This is not the juncture to elaborate on the *dalaa-il* (evidences) of the two Math-habs. It suffices to say that in the unanimous Ruling of the Hanafi Fuqaha, *hurmat-e-musaaharah* is created when a man indulges in a defined act of sexual misdemeanour with his daughter-in-law, be the act consensual or not.

The moron, flaunting audacious stupidity says: "*So if a man rapes a woman, she does not automatically become his wife...*" Neither the Hanafi Math-hab nor the venerable Mufti of Deoband has said that the raped daughter-in-law has become the wife of the villain father-in-law. This rubbish and stupid averment boggles credulity. Neither did the Mufti contend this rubbish disgorged by the moron, nor does it stem from the Fatwa. The Fatwa only states that *hurmat-e-musaaharah* has been established, and this means that this man can never marry the raped woman's mother or daughter, and that she has become haraam for his son. The Fatwa does not even remotely allude that the raped daughter-in-law has become the wife of the rapists by virtue of the act of rape. It appears that the *Ghabi* lacks understanding of the meaning of the term *hurmat-e-musaaharah*, hence he has made such a gigantic fool of himself with the *ghutha* he has disgorged so audaciously.

Exposing further his gross *jahaalat*, the moron contends: "*I sincerely hope they apply the Shariah punishment in this case which this evil man fully deserves.*" The moron is not even aware of the conditions for the applicability of *Hudood* (prescribed punishments of the Shariah). His stupeficient lack of knowledge/understanding of Shar'i issues demonstrates the stupendous degree of his *jahaalat*. Not a single condition (*shart*) for the administration of "the Shariah punishment" exists for the infliction of *Hadd*, i.e. *Rajm* (Stoning to death) for an adulterer whose adultery is proven on the basis of the evidence ordained by Allah Ta'ala. Neither has any aspect of the Shariah's code of evidence been proffered, nor is India a Shariah state, so how in the name of heaven can the punishment of the

Shariah be meted out? The moron has indeed illustrated his shocking ignorance, yet he sets himself up as a 'mujtahid'. He cannot be termed even a paper 'mujtahid'.

The humbug moron 'mujtahid' contends: "*What should have happened is that the Mufti should have taken cognizance of this ruling (i.e. the Shaafi ruling) and pronounced his ruling based on this opinion of Imaam Ash-Shafa'i. That way the rights of the woman would have been protected to the extent possible and the fairness of the Islamic Shariah would have been clear for the world to see.*"

Firstly, the Hanafi Mufti is under no obligation whatsoever to take cognizance of the Shaafi' view.

Secondly, The gravity of the matter constrains adoption of the view in which there is *Ihtiyaat* (prudence/caution). It is a principle of the Shariah that when the *hukm* oscillates between permissibility and impermissibility – haraam and halaal - impermissibility/haraam takes preference. The *Ihtiyaati* (precautionary) view for Shaafis in this case is the adoption of Imaam Abu Hanifah's view. It is not the other way around. For the Ahnaaf, there is no trepidation in this mas'alah, hence there is no need to react with ambivalence to constrain us to opt for the Shaafi view which is devoid of *Ihtiyaat* and which culminates in the permissibility of the adulterer marrying his illegitimate daughter.

On the contrary, the Shawaafi' should set aside their view to opt for the Hanafi view in which lies precaution, safety from adultery and the breeding of illegitimate offspring.

Thirdly, there are no Shar'i rights of the woman in this case. The ruling is the termination of the Nikah. Her rights are related to the post-Talaaq scenario such as Iddat, etc. The alleged 'rights' here are the effects of the moron's *nafsaani* hallucination. The automatic termination of husband-wife relationship in the wake of the creation of *hurmat-e-musaaharah* as a consequence of the act of sexual misdeamour, extinguishes all marital rights which had hitherto existed.

Fourthly, the inference of the Shariah's 'unfairness' in the valid *hukm* of the development of *hurmat-e-musaaharah* in this case is insolent and contumacious, akin to kufr. The *Ghabi* implies that the Shariah is unfair in its Ruling.

Fifthly, the feelings and opinion of the world of the kuffaar are of absolutely no significance in the pronouncement of the Rulings of the Deen. When proclaiming

the Haqq, cognizance is not taken of the ideas and tastes of morons, fussaag, fujjaar and kuffaar. Thus, the moron's above averment is devoid of substance.

Disgorging more effluent of his *jahaalat*, the *Ghabi*, utters:

"Instead he (the Mufti) took the Hanafi opinion in isolation without paying heed to the spirit of Imaam Abu Haneefa's ruling and the result is that Islamic Shariah has become the laughing stock of the Indian media..."

The imperative need for the followers of a Math-hab is to issue Rulings strictly in accord with their Math-hab. There is absolutely no need for even taking into consideration the views of another Math-hab. This need develops in a case of genuine dire circumstance which is just not the case in this issue. What is the 'spirit' of Imaam Abu Hanifah's ruling which could constrain the Mufti to set aside the Hanafi view to opt for the Shaafi' view? The moron should explain that hallucinatory 'spirit'. There is no nugatory spirit underlying the emphatic ruling of the Hanafi Math-hab in this matter.

The Mushrikeen, idolaters and cow-worshippers of India make a 'laughing stock' of every Law of Allah Ta'ala. The whole of Islam is made a 'laughing stock' by the cow-worshippers. Shall we therefore convolute the *ahkaam* of the Shariah to distort and transmogrify Islam to assuage the palates of the drinkers of cow urine? This type of mushrikeen mockery is highlighted by the Qur'aan Majeed. The Mushrikeen would mock resurrection after death, claiming it to be a fairy tale. Would it have been proper to have abandoned this Aqeedah to appease the mushrikken in the hope of them embracing Islam? Should Islam be abandoned or adorned with kufr to placate the kuffaar?

The moron adds: *"The reluctance to consider the opinions of the other Imaams who we orally claim to follow..."* From whence did he suck this idea? We do not verbally proclaim that we follow the other Imaams. We follow only the Hanafi Math-hab. We are not freelancers nor do we roam aimlessly as do the holy cows of India which enamour the *Ghabi* to the extent that he is prepared to subvert and mutilate the Shariah to gain favour with the Hindus.

Vomiting more *ghutha*, the moron rambles:

"So what is the solution to this and such things in the future? In my opinion the following steps are essential to be taken and taken urgently. First a little preamble. All Sunni Ulama worldwide (including those in India) are agreed that it is acceptable to follow the fiqh of any of the four major Imaams..."

This averment is baseless and misleading. There is no such agreement among the Ulama of the world. There are conditions and principles regulating adoption of a specific view of another Math-hab. This is not a freelancing exercise by means of which the Deen could be submitted to *nafsaani* opinion dictating selection at whim and fancy as the moron proposes. Only in the exigency of *Dhuroorat* is adoption of a view from another Math-hab permissible. Picking and choosing at will and fancy is dalliance with kufr. The Deen may not be trifled with.

The *Ghabi*, presenting a further display of his *jahl* and *ghabaawah* says: "*The differences in practice are acceptable and in any case not major.*" The facts on the ground debunk this stupid averment. There are extremely major differences on many issues of the Mathaahib. Consider this very question which is being discussed. According to Imaam Abu Hanifah (rahmatullah alayh), *hurmat-e-musaahara* is established by zina. According to Imaam Shaafi' (rahmatullah alayh) it is not established. Is this a trivial difference or a major one? According to the Hanafi Math-hab it is not permissible for the muqtadi to recite any Qiraa't. It is haraam. According to the Shaafi' Math-hab, it is Fardh to recite Surah Faatihah after the Imaam in every raka't. In the former view the Salaat is perfectly valid. According to the second view, the Salaat is not valid. Is this a trivial difference?

According to the three Math-habs, the marriage contracted by an adult female is not valid. It is an obligatory requisite for a male to contract the marriage on her behalf. According to the Hanafi Math-hab, the Nikah is valid. Is this a minor or a major difference? In short, there are countless major differences among the Four Math-habs.

The moron proffers the following utterly baseless advice:

".....I have the following suggestion for the All India Muslim Personal Law Board: That the AIMPLB creates a committee of Ulama of all four schools of thought who will examine the rulings of all the four Imaams, on all matters relating to civil law and codify the ones that are most relevant to present times as the Muslim Personal Law Code.....For example the triple Talaaq in one sitting is not permitted in Hanbali (and others) fiqh, This may be taken as the valid opinion for implementation in India."

This suggestion is bunkum and can never be acceptable by the Muslims of India who in vast majority are the followers of the Hanafi Math-hab. The Deen is not the toy of morons. The moron suggests the creation of a fifth math-hab – the math-hab of the nafs. The proposed committee will consist of moron molvies and westernized morons such as the *Ghabi*. Ulama-e-Haqq cannot serve on such a *baatil* committee which will have no validity in terms of the Shariah.

The claim that according to *only* the Hambali Math-hab three Talaqs in a single session are "not permitted", is baseless. This is not permitted according to all Four Math-habs notwithstanding the fact that all three Talaqs are valid, rendering it Talaq Mughallazah which finally and irrevocably terminates the Nikah. The moron is too dense in his sensorium to understand the difference between permissibility and validity. He has perpetrated two stupidities here. (1) He understood impermissibility to mean invalid. In other words, three Talaqs issued in one session are not valid. (2) If he did understand the term correctly, then it is false to claim that it is only according to the Hambali Math-hab that three simultaneous Talaqs in a single sitting are not permissible. This impermissibility is the Ruling of all Four Math-habs.

Further, the contention that according to the Hambali Math-hab three Talaqs in one sitting are not valid, is false. Even according to the Hambali Math-hab three Talaqs given at once are valid regardless of the sin incurred for effecting Talaq in this manner. That the moron is unaware of the ruling of the Hambali Math-hab, yet he choose to attribute the falsehood to the Hambali Math-hab, illustrates his ignorance.

Placing a seal on his *jahaalat*, the moron says: *"This will have another wonderful and most important effect, discouraging differences and divisions between the followers of the four Madhaahib, which are growing among the ignorant India."*

There is nothing wonderful in this stupidity concocted by the moron. Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) said: *"Differences of my Ummah are a blessing."* Differences in the Ummah had existed from the very age of the Sahaabah, and these difference are here to remain solidified in the Ummah until the advent of the Final Hour. The very existence of the Four Math-habs is the strongest evidence for the existence of differences which cannot be wished away, least of all by morons.

Destructive divisions are the products of *jahaalat* (ignorance). The solution for *jahaalat* is education, not transmogrification of the Shariah. The darkness of *jahl* dissipates with the Light of *Ilm*.

The moron advocates that the Ahnaaf should submit to the Shaafi' view and negate the creation of *hurmat-e-musaaharah* in case of zina/sexual misdemeanour. Should the Shaafi' view be adopted, it will follow that the adulterer may marry the daughter he has fathered by zina. This is the Shaafi' ruling. Since *hurmat-e-musaaharah* pertains to ties which are established by only halaal according to the Shaafi' Math-hab, the Shaafi' view is that a man may marry the daughter he has

illegitimately fathered. And, furthermore, the Shaafi' Math-hab maintains this stance even if the woman has been raped. The rapist may marry his illegitimate daughter. The Hanafi view on this issue is the strongest and in it is the highest degree of precaution against adultery and incest. Marital prohibitions created by marriage also come into effect by zina.

One of the Signs of the Approaching Hour is the widespread prevalence of *jahaalat* and compound ignorance. The *Juhala* (*morons*) will be asked to issue 'fatwas'. They will do so. They will be astray and the *juhala* of the masses will be astray too when they accept such corrupt 'fatwas' of the *juhala* '*mujtahids*'. Our sincere advice to the *Ghabi* is to refrain from dabbling in a domain for which he is wholly unqualified. He will render himself a favour to rather go and fly a kite or play marbles. He is undoubtedly a sign of Qiyaamat.

AN INSOLENT SHIAH IS PUNISHED NEVER BEFRIEND A SHIAH!

In Azeemabad (in India) a Sunni and a Shiah were bosom friends. When the Sunni prepared to set off on a journey for Hajj, he went to greet his Shiah friend. The Shiah said: 'I have a request, but lack the courage to say it.' On the insistence of the Sunni, the Shiah friend said: "When you visit the Grave of Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam), then on my behalf deliver the message: 'O Rasulullah! I yearn to visit you, but your two enemies buried alongside you, prevents me.'" This was a reference to Hadhrat Abu Bakr (radhiyallahu anhu) and Hadhrat Umar (radhiyallahu anhu) for whom Shiahs cherish extreme abhorrence.

The Sunni was hesitant, but the Shiah friend said: "Mymessage does not affect you. It is a message from me." The Sunni finally agreed to deliver his friend's message. He made ziyaarat of Rasulullah's Holy Grave but forgot about the message of his Shiah friend. One day before departing from Madinah, he remembered. Mustering up immense courage and with extreme apprehension he went to the Holy Grave and delivered the message of his Shiah friend. After stating the message, so much fear overwhelmed him that he fell down unconscious.

In this state, he saw Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) standing. Hadhrat Abu Bakr Siddique (radhiyallahu anhu) with a Qur'aan in his hand, and was standing on Rasulullah's right side. Hadhrat Umar (radhiyallahu anhu) with a drawn sword in his hand was standing on the left. At a distance was standing the insolent Shiah friend. Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) beckoning to the Sunni said: "Did this person send the message with you?" The Sunni said: 'Yes, O Rasulullah!' Nabi-e-Kareem (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) made a sign to Hadhrat Umar (Radiallahu anhu) who stepped forward and with his sword severed the head of the Shiah. His head rolled and landed in a sewerage gutter. The Sunni woke up in a state of a shock.

When he returned to India, he went to meet his Shiah friend. The Shiah's wife, shedding tears in profusion explained that one day when her husband went to the toilet an enemy suddenly approached and severed his head which he dropped in the nearby sewer. When the Sunni reflected, he realized that the night he saw in his vision the killing of the Shiah was the same day mentioned by the Shiah's wife.

The Majlis

“Voice of Islam”

Presenting the Knowledge of Islam, the Qur’aan and the Sunnah in Pristine Purity.

Presenting the Deen of Islam as propounded and practised by
Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) and
his illustrious Sahaabah (radhiyallahu anhum).

Rates R30.00 (South Africa)

US\$15 (Neighbouring States)

US\$20 (Rest of the world)

Send your subscriptions to:
The Majlis, Subscription Dept.

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