

**A UK CLIQUE OF
JUHHAAL
MOLVIS
IN DENIAL
OF QUR'ANIC
HIJAB**

THE MAJLIS
PO BOX 3393, PORT ELIZABETH
6056, SOUTH AFRICA

INTRODUCTION

“The Munaafiq men and the Munaafiq women are from one another. They command evil (munkar) and forbid virtue (ma’roof).”

(At-Taubah, Aayat 67)

“The kuffaar of Bani Israaeel were cursed by the Tongues of Daawood and Isaa Ibn Maryam because of their transgression. They would not prevent from evil which they perpetrated.

Indeed, vile is it which they perpetrated.”

(Al-Maaidah, 78 & 79)

An anonymous UK based jaahil group of molvis, sheikhs and quack ‘scholars’, styling themselves “Many imams, shuyukh, prominent scholars, and students of knowledge (UK, South Africa, USA and Canada)” has excreted a moronic article in denial of the Hijaab of segregation of the sexes commanded by the Qur’aan and Sunnah.

For such a blasphemous denial, the moron authors have miserably failed to provide even a single Qur’aanic Aayat or a Hadith to bolster the copro satanic opinion excreted by their brains swirling in the urine of Iblees. While the command of Allah Ta’ala is

Amr Bil Ma'roof Nahyi Anil Munkar, this group of miserable agents of Iblees has assumed on themselves the shaitaani practice of *Amr bil Munkar Nahyi Anil Ma'roof* – that is: instead of commanding virtue and prohibiting vice, they do the exact opposite. They promote vice and prevent virtue.

Every Muslim, be he/she an ignoramus, provided that his/her Imaan has not been eroded by the ravages of modernity and westernism, knows and understands that since the very inception of Islam, the Shariah's emphasis has always been on the segregation of men and women. Even those Muslims who are not strict upholders of Hijaab do understand that men and women in Islam are required to be separate and may not mix or even appear in front of one another.

The Qur'aanic and Hadith evidence and the evidence of the fourteen century *Ta-aamul* of the Ummah overwhelmingly refute the copro opinion of the Clique of Juhhaal molvis, sheikhs and crank 'students of knowledge'.

In this era in which the Ummah is swamped in fisq and fujoor, immorality and vice, instead of executing the obligation of *Amr Bil Ma'roof Nahyi Anil Munkar* and proffering *naseehat* to incline Muslims to virtue, these Juhhaal molvis and sheikhs do the opposite. They promote abandonment of Hijaab to an Ummah

which has largely abandoned Hijaab. Muslims all over the world are in the grip of the tentacles of western immorality and nudity. But these agents of Iblees consider it prudent to drive Muslims further into the den of Iblees by promoting acts which are nugatory of the Hijaab commanded by the Qur'aan and Sunnah.

The article of the moron molvis is in entirety bereft of even a single *Daleel* of the Shariah. The article is nothing but the proffering of a copro opinion of 'prominent' molvis and sheikhs who have fallen by the wayside of deviation and picked up by Iblees for harnessing them into his conspiracy of destroying Islam.

The stupid article is based on two stupidities:

- (1) A blatantly baseless opinion unsubstantiated by any daleel of the Shariah.
- (2) A long list of names – names of liberal molvis and sheikhs who have slipped from Siraatul Mustaqeem and joined in the plot of Iblees even if it is unintentionally.

We say unhesitatingly that all those molvis and sheikhs who give talks to a mixed audience of males and females where they are seated alongside one another without a dividing screen, are fussaag regardless of who they happen to be and regardless of

their prominence and status. Iblees has greater prominence than them. Prominence and seniority are discarded when they promote acts which are in flagrant violation of the Shariah.

The criterion is not the names of an abundance of molvis and sheikhs. The Criterion is the Shariah on which all acts and deeds must be incumbently scaled. The Clique of Juhhaal claim preposterously and stupidly that the molvis and sheikhs of our current age should also be followed in the same way as we follow Imaam Abu Hanifah, Imaam Shaafi, etc. Something is drastically amiss with their copro brains corrupted by shaitaani manipulation. Only stupidity and satanically induced insanity constrain these juhala molvis and sheikhs to elevate their copro opinions to the level of the Fataawa of divinely inspired Aimmah Mujtahideen.

It is necessary for Muslims to understand that the whole lot of miserable so-called 'major scholars' who promote intermingling of sexes whether by word or practical deed, are FUSSAAQ. Beware of these *mudhilleen*. Regarding the deviant molvis and sheikhs who misguide the masses, Rasulullah (Sallalalhu alayhi wasallam) said:

"I fear for my Ummah the aimmah mudhilleen."

They are the likes of molvis, sheikhs, imams and moron 'students of knowledge' who promote the abandonment of Hijaab.

RUBBISH

A rubbish article, captioned *Important Statement on Ulama and 'Free' Mixing*, issued by an anonymous clique of so-called *imams, shuyukh, prominent scholars and students of knowledge (UK, South Africa, USA and Canada)* seeks to violate the Shariah's absolutely strict Prohibition of intermingling between the sexes. The moron molvis and sheikhs lack the courage to even state their identities. Whilst their article is fit for assignment to the trash, we deem it appropriate to respond and refute the muck which may confuse the laity.

In their flapdoodle article the juhala molvis say:

"As for when men and women are sat separately under one roof (i.e. in one place/location/hall), without a physical barrier/ screen in between, this is not deemed free mixing per se.....no one can say it is haram."

We say that it is haraam.

This stupid averment illustrates the compound jahaalat of these juhala molvis. Men and women in a hall,

especially without a separating screen, are in actual fact intermingling regardless of them not sitting on the laps of one another. When there is no separating screen, then it is stupid to say that they are seated separately.

The men and women of this age sitting altogether in the same hall are fussaag, fujjaar, faasiqaat and faajiraat. The molvi who addresses this mixed audience is the worst faasiq and faajir. He is absolutely shameless in his flagrant and reckless violation of the Law of Hijab as commanded by the Qur'aan and Sunnah.

Allah Ta'ala commanding the Separating Screen says in the Qur'aan Majeed:

“And when you ask them something, then do so from behind a screen. That is purer for your hearts and their hearts.”

This Aayat in the first instance is directed to the Sahaabah. The females mentioned in the Aayat refer to the Holy Wives of Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam). The *illat (rationale)* for the command of the Screen is stated with clarity in the Aayat. It is to prevent the operation of the disease of lust in the hearts. Thus, Allah Ta'ala says that the Screen is *“purer for your hearts and their hearts.”* They were

the Sahaabah and the noblest ladies of this Ummah, the Holy Wives of Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam).

Despite their exceptional Taqwa and lofty status, the separating Screen was decreed Waajib for them. Now if the danger of lust was present in such noble souls, what should be concluded about the fussaag, fujjaar, faasiqaat and faajiraat who congregate in a hall without any separating screen? Have they excelled the Sahaabah and the Holy Wives in Taqwa? Does the *illat* stated in the Aayat apply to only the Sahaabah, not to the fussaag and fujjaar of this age of fitnah and fasaad? The brains of these molvis are satanically contaminated.

Furthermore, the Qur'aan Majeed states: "*Do not approach NEAR to zina.*" Is this Aayat meaningless? When men and women, especially of this age of immorality, are together in a hall exposed to one another, they will be in violation of this Qur'aanic prohibition. Their lustful gazes are bound to wander and prowl. The lustful gaze is the first factor which brings people 'near' to zina. That is why the Qur'aan Majeed commands '*lowering the gaze*'.

The haraam system of men and women congregating in a hall in flagrant violation of the Qur'aanic

prohibition of separation with a screen, is further in flagrant violation of the Aayat:

“And remain glued in your homes, and make not a display of yourselves such as the exhibition (of the immoral women) of jaahiliyyah.”
(Ahzaab, Aayat 33)

Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) said:

“Women have no share in emergence (from their Homes) except in cases of necessity.”

Female emergence from the home without valid reason is prohibited. Going to a hall to listen to the talk of a shameless faasiq molvi who happens to be a member of the ulama-e-soo', is never a valid reason for emerging from the home. Emerging from the home to go even to the Musjid for Fardh Salaat is not valid and not permissible for females.

The imperative and absolute importance of the separating Screen could be better understood from the fact that even the dead body of a woman shrouded in six sheets has to be screened with a large sheet when being lowered into the grave. When the Screen is absolutely necessary for even the dead female shrouded body who cannot be seen, what should be said about the droves of women fancifully dressed, adorned and perfumed prowling in the streets and

sitting in the same hall in close proximity with fussaag males who are all slaves of their lustful nafs?

Remember and understand well that during the era of Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) when women were allowed to come to the Musjid, they were '*tafilaat*' - shabbily dressed, fully covered from head to feet, without perfume and even perhaps emitting pungent odours. What can be said about today's modernists faasiqaat in the presence of fussaag and fujjaar?

It is absolutely HARAAM for men and women to be under the same roof, in a hall, ***even if there is a separating screen.*** The very first violation is emergence from the home without valid Shar'i reason. Women have to compulsorily remain in their homes. This stupid idea of 'separation' while men and women are seated alongside in the same hall is debunked by Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) who said:

“Woman is Aurah (an object of concealment). When she emerges (from her abode of concealment) Shaitaan lies in ambush for her.”

“Allah curses the one who looks (at females) and the one looked at (the woman who emerges from her home).”

“Beware of mingling with women.”

“Women should not talk with men other than a mahram.”

Understanding the purport of the many Qur'aanic Aayaat and Ahaadith on Hijaab, the Fuqaha have ruled that men should not even make Salaam to women and vice versa.

Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) said:

“A man who casts a gaze at a woman, looks at her garments and discerns her bodily shape, will not smell the fragrance of Jannat.”

The scenario of men and women in the same hall unscreened by a barrier is haraam intermingling. Women are not permitted to be even in the presence of old blind men. *Hadhrat Abdullah Ibn Umme Maktoom (radiyallahu anhu) was an elderly and a blind Sahaabi of Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam). Once when he came to visit Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam), Umme Salmah and Maimunah (radiyallahu anhuma) two wives of Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) said to his wives: “Adopt Hijaab for him” (Withdraw from the place and go into seclusion). Umme Salmah (Radiyallahu anha) said: “O Rasulullah! He is blind and cannot see us”. Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) said:*

“What! Are both of you also blind? Can you not see him?” – (Ahmad , Tirmizi)

Now when Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) had ordered his two Wives who were the noblest of the Ummah's females, to leave the presence of a 90 year old blind man, then what conclusion should we draw about the faasiqaat/faajiraat in the presence of fussaag/fujjaar scoundrels and to crown the evil scenario, a rubbish faasiq/faajir molvi faces the vile crowd to deceive them with some talk couched with 'deeni' terms?

These rubbish men and women and the rubbish molvi speaker are satanic liars for claiming that their carnality is not satanically excited in the crowd of mixed men and women who attend the haraam talk adorned and perfumed. The Qur'aan Majeed states with clarity that the purpose of the Screen is to avoid carnality, hence: *“It is purer for your hearts and their hearts.”*

Close Proximity

The moron anonymous, Zindeeq copro-molvis say: *“Being in close proximity to members of the opposite gender cannot be the sole reason for prohibition.”*

This is another stupid averment tantamount to kufr for it is in denial of the explicit Qur'aanic command to be

far- very far - from the stepping stones of zina. Close proximity between men and women is haraam *per se*. It is to approach “near to zina”. Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) said: “*Woman approaches in the form of shaitaan and recedes (from you) in the form of shaitaan.*” In another Hadith it is mentioned that women are the traps of shaitaan.

“Close proximity’ is the opposite of the Shar’i concept of Hijaab and segregation of the sexes. It is nugatory of the Qur’aan’s command to abstain from ‘close proximity’. Such proximity is explicitly and effectively proscribed by the Aayat which states: “*Do not approach near to zina.*” Iblees is a cunning ustaadh. He ensnares by gradual degrees. He does not suddenly cast or urinates into the brains of a Muslim to indulge in fornication. He paves the pathway for zina, and he leads the person along this path bringing him closer and closer to zina until he ultimately plunges headlong into moral ruin by committing the actual act of zina. Thus, the Qur’aan warns: “*Do not approach near to Zina.*” Close proximity is the most potent device of Iblees to entrap people into the commission of zina.

“Entering /exiting from separate doors”

The zindeeq clique of copro-molvis argue that entrance and exit into the hall from separate doors prevent intermingling. Firstly the juhala fail to

understand or they intentionally pretend not to understand that mere entry/exit from separate doors does not negate the intermingling inside the hall nor outside the hall.

The women arrive all dressed up and perfumed. Their abayas are licenses designed for deception to project an image of piety. But in reality these women are faasiqaat/faajiraat diseased with zina and lesbian tendencies. They come driving vehicles. They park among the males. They walk outside shamelessly in the presence of males. This has been and is being witnessed daily at such Musaajid where they have deceptive shaitaani 'separate' ladies facilities.

Mere entry and exit from separate doors do not negate the intermingling. Not sitting on the laps of men in the hall does not mean that there is no intermingling.

Their very presence together with the fussaaq/fujjaar is intermingling – haraam intermingling.

The male moron

The copro-clique of mudhilleen says: “...*the male speaker is only looking at the men.*” Others are not partners in the stupidity of these juhala suffering from the mental disease called *jahl murakkab* (compound ignorance). Even on the basis of a stupid and silly assumption that the faasiq, moron male speaker does

not look at the women, it does not negate the fact of intermingling taking place in the hall. Also, assuming that the chap does not look at the women, the villain is conscious of the women staring at him throughout his talk of *riya*. This consciousness creates nafsaani and bestial upheavals in the copro-chap. He does not escape nafsaani hallucination in which he fantasizes a variety of copro figments pertaining to the ladies whom he believes are admiring him for his stupid clownish acquittal.

How is it possible for this rubbish male speaker to address females without a screen barrier when the Qur'aan Majeed commanded the illustrious, noble Sahaabah to speak from behind a screen to their Spiritual Mothers, the Azwwaj-e-Mutahharaat of Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam)? These juhala are implying that their 'taqwa' is of a loftier standard than the Taqwa of the Sahaabah, hence while the Sahaabah were in need of a separating screen, these rubbish, jaahil zindeeq, copro-molvis have no need for a concealing screen as commanded by the Qur'aan Majeed.

Examples of alleged intermingling

The clique of copro-molvis says:

"In fact, there are example from the time of the Prophet and his Companions, and the past Muslim communities, where men and women interacted and

sat in the same place. A separate paper will later be presented with relevant proofs and examples, if need be."

We await this 'separate' copro paper with their copro proofs. Insha-Allah, their copro proofs shall be adequately demolished. There are no Shar'i proofs for the current, mingling scenarios of fussaag, fujjaar, faasiqaat and faajiraat. The juhala will proffer some isolated cases which they will submit to their nafsani opinion to extract baseless interpretation in their futile attempt to bolster their haraam copro view of the permissibility of intermingling and for the satanic abrogation of the Screen commanded by the Qur'aan Majeed.

Insha-Allah, an adequate rebuttal shall be forthcoming for their hallucinated 'proofs'

The hallucinated 'original permissibility'

The copro clique of juhala molvis says:

"Despite this, the great *ulamā'* of the subcontinent (*akabir*) abstained from giving a general *fatwa* of permissibility, because they understood that it could open the door for clear *haram* acts (of the first category) and that people would take advantage and end up committing sins. (Following in their footsteps, we also did not want to mention this original permissibility, but were left with no choice due to the recent attack on so many scholars)."

This is blatantly false. Intermingling of men and women is haraam *per se*. There is no contradictory 'original permissibility' fatwa of the Akaabir Ulama. The impermissibility of intermingling is substantiated by numerous *Nusoos* of the Qur'aan and Hadith.

The Aayat prohibiting even "*coming near to zina*", the Aayat pertaining to the Screen and many Ahaadith confirm the original prohibition of intermingling.

Assuming that the prohibition is based on the fear of permissibility opening the door to fitnah and haraam, then it has application in our immoral era of fisq and fujoor to a far greater degree than the fear which existed centuries ago. Thus, there is a greater need today for maintaining the Prohibition and not to stupidly introduce technicalities which lead to the ruin of the morals of the Ummah. Besides this fact, the Prohibition is the *Original Fatwa* of the Shariah, and only fussaaq and juhhaal molvis and moron sheikhs seek to scuttle this sacrosanct Law of the Qur'aan.

The "Recent Attack on the Ulama"

The attack against the 'ulama' who promote intermingling is Waajib. It is part of the obligation of Amr Bil Ma'roof Nahy Anil Munkar. The molvis and sheikhs who promote intermingling with their baseless copro technical arguments are members of the gang of

ulama-e-soo'. It is necessary to condemn these juhhaal who are the primary cause for the destruction of the morals of the Ummah and the erosion of their Imaani inhibition against haraam, fisq and fujoor.

Silence in the face of baatil is the act of a dumb devil. Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) said: "*He who is silent regarding the Haqq is a dumb shaitaan.*" The criticism by the Ulama-e-Haqq does not justify the vindication of *baatil* of which the copro-juhhaal molvis are guilty. Their plot is to unravel the Shariah and to mislead the ignorant and unwary with baseless technicalities taught to them by Iblees which have no valid application. With their *baatil* interpretation they seek to dismantle the Shariah. Much of the laws of the Shariah are structured on sacred *Usool (juridical principles)* derived from the Qur'aan and Sunnah. The 'scholars' who are being criticized are *mudhilleen* and *juhala*.

"Blocking the means"

The Clique of Juhhaal avers:

"Many non-subcontinent scholars, however, do not take this approach of "blocking the means" and have allowed it either verbally or in practice."

Firstly, intermingling of sexes is not a derivative of "*blocking the means*" (*Sadd-e-Tharaai*). It is an

Original Prohibition. Secondly, the approach of “*many non-subcontinent scholars*” is shaitaaniyat. These moron ‘scholars’ are inspired by Iblees. Their shunning of the sacred principle of *Sadde Tharaai*’ is the proof for their shaitaaniyat and jahl.

Such wayward ‘scholars’ who are too stupid to employ the principles of the Shariah when there is an imperative need are agents of Iblees. They must necessarily be criticized, condemned and exposed for the menace they are for the laeity.

Who are they? What are the contexts?

The morons say:

“The subcontinent scholars take the precautions approach and generally avoid such set ups, but because they know that – in-of-itself – it is not *haram*, they, in certain situations/contexts/scenarios, act upon the original permissibility.”

Who are these ‘subcontinent scholars’ acting like chameleons? And, what are the contexts for halaalizing the haraam intermingling of sexes. The juhala should be specific to point out who these scholars are and what are the contexts. Today, even the ‘subcontinent scholars’ have fallen by the wayside of *baatil*. The Fraternity of Ulama-e-Haqq remains a

tiny *Taaifah* whom Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) praised and promises success.

Today the subcontinent is no longer that Bastion of the Haqq which it was during the era of our Akaabir Ulama and Auliya. The subcontinent harbours numerous ulama-e-soo' led by the likes of Mufti Taqi. The views of the ulama-e-soo' do not detract from the validity of the *Ahkaam* of the Shariah. Any 'scholar of the subcontinent' who promotes intermingling also stands to be condemned.

The majority of world's scholars are FUSSAAQ

Grasping at straws, the Clique of Juhhaal ulama-e-soo' says:

"The majority of the world's scholars will not be spared. For example, a large number of Arab scholars do not even take the "blocking the means" route, and have no issue whatsoever with men and women being seated, modestly and separately, under one roof. Take – for example – Syrian scholars; many of them address audiences where men and women are sat without a physical barrier. These are no average scholars; they are top *ulamā'* whose works our young graduates like to quote and benefit from. Recent scholars such as Shaykh Dr Sa'id Ramadan al-Buti, Shaykh Wahba al-Zuhayli (whose book *Al-Fiqh al-Islami wa Adillatuhu* is often referred to), Shaykh Nur al-Din Itr (whose books on hadith sciences are in the library of most scholars), Shaykh Abdul-Razzaq al-Halabi (the great

Hanafi jurist) and many others have taught at Damascus university and other places to mixed audiences, without a physical barrier in between. The renowned Shaykh Muhammad Awwama has on occasions addressed such a mixed audience. Even Shaykh Abdul Fattah Abu Ghudda (whose books almost every serious scholar reads) lectured on occasions to an audience of men and women, without a physical barrier between them. Are all these great *ulamā'* major sinners/*fasiqs*?!"

Yes, all of these 'great ulama' who buffet and mutilate the *Ahkaam* of the Shariah are sinners and faasiqs. We say so unequivocally. They are subservient to the nafs and are bootlickers of modernity and westernism. It matters not that even if those who contravene the Shariah are a world full of scholars of any hue, they will be condemned. We do not elevate scholars to the pedestal of gods as was the practice of Bani Israaeel. In this regard, the Qur'aan Majeed states:

"They appointed their ahbaar and ruhbaan as gods besides Allah..."

Numbers and titles do not awe the People of Haqq. These liberals are not *Daleel* of the Shariah. A view must be substantiated or opposed on the basis of Shar'i dalaa-il, not on the basis of names and numbers. Names and numbers of scholars, and that too, liberals who have fallen by the wayside with their *baatil*, do not abrogate any *hukm* of the Shariah.

Egypt, Morocco and Tunis?

The Juhala Clique of molvis says:

“It is the same in Egypt. Females sit in one corner of the Al-Azhar Mosque and listen to the lecture of the Shaykh. The same occurs in other Muslim countries such as Morocco and Tunisia (a Zaytuna and Al-Qarawiyyin). “

There appears to be something amiss with the thinking of these Juhala molvis. It appears that their nafsaaniyat has produced a degree of mental derangement, hence they stupidly cite Egypt, Morocco and Tunis as *daleel* for their copro idea of permissibility of intermingling of the sexes.

The kufr rulers and governments of these countries have transformed these Muslim lands into Darul Harb and Darul Kufr. Al-Azhar in Egypt and the institutions in Morocco and Tunisia are no longer Islamic bastions of Ilm. They churn out kufr. They are modernists peddling the liberal views of the Yahood and Nasaara. Citing the institutions of these evil states is, to say the very least, laughable. We have absolutely no respect for the evil sheikhs of Al-Azhar and the other institutions of Morocco and Tunisia. They are enemies of Islam and enemies of the Ummah. Their corrupt views are devoid of Shar'i substance. The copro juhhaal are required to present solid dalaal of the Shariah, but which they miserably fail to do.

The stupidity of names – Names are not dalai-il

The Clique of Juhhaal molvis, having no dalaa-il of the Shariah, proffer the following list of characters in an endeavour to awe and browbeat morons like themselves:

“In fact, there is a YouTube video where major Islamic finance scholars (Mufti Taqi Usmani, Shaykh Abdul Sattar Abu Ghudda and Shaykh Nizam Ya’qubi) are on stage, giving lectures at the Al-Qarawiyyin University in Fez (Morocco) in front of a mixed audience, and there is no physical barrier between men and women. In Turkey, the great recent scholar, Shaykh Muhammad Amin Siraj, and his students, have addressed such mixed audiences. The great Mauritanian scholar Shaykh Muhammad Hasan Deddew al-Shanqiti states that free mixing, i.e. casual intermingling is *haram* but men and women just sat under one roof without a barrier is permitted. The late Shaykh Yusuf al-Qaradawi has also emphasized this point, in many of his works. The authors of many books that some of our graduates often read and quote are written by *ulamā’* who have no problem with such (non-free) mixed gatherings. Does that mean, we have been reading the books of major sinners all this time and all the knowledge we gained was from sinners / *fasiqs* and hence not trustworthy?! Major conferences and meetings take place in the Arab world and elsewhere, attended by some of the world’s greatest *ulamā’* and *fuqaha* (and not just social media celebrity scholars/preachers), and also attended by modestly dressed female scholars who sit on one side.”

Yes, most certainly you have been reading the books of major sinners. All those listed by you are FUSSAAQ and FUJJAAR. They have mutilated the *Ahkaam* of the Shariah. In fact, they hover on the precipice of kufr for having halaalized haraam pictures and haraam intermingling of sexes, and for denying the Screen prohibition explicitly stated in the Qur'aan Majeed.

On the Day of Qiyaamah, “*the severest punished*” will be these moron picture-halaalizers who masquerade as Ulama. Thus, this gang of miscreant molvis and sheikhs does not constitute *daleel* of the Shariah. We are not interested in their corrupt copro views which have no validity in the Shariah. They are morons, not Fuqaha. If they happen to be ‘ulama’, they are ulama-e-soo’ whom Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) feared more than Dajjaal. They are *mudhilleen*. They mislead the *awaamun naas* (the laity) with their corrupt nafaani copro ‘fatwas’ bereft of Shar’i basis. They and their likes are the primary cause for the ruin of the Ummah.

The International Fiqh Academy

Proffering another stupid argument, the Clique of deviates states:

The International Islamic Fiqh Academy of Jeddah where the world's top *ulamā'* from all different backgrounds regularly meet, including the longest serving imam in Makka, ShaykhSaleh bin Humaid, sometimes have females present at their meetings, without a barrier. Are all these great *ulamā'* of the world sinners?

Again, this averment is not a daleel of the Shariah. It is a stupid statement of characters bereft of knowledge. Their academic bankruptcy has constrained them to cite this stupid academy which is a conglomeration of liberals and deviates. The so-called 'top ulama' of this entity are top morons. That is why they are able to scuttle the Shariah's prohibitions pertaining to intermingling, pictures, interest, etc. Yes, all of them are great sinners-flagrant sinners – rebellious sinners who dig up the foundations of Islam with their copro views.

Indira Ghandhi and Darul Uloom Deoband

Clutching at straws like a drowning man, the Clique of Juhhaal proffers:

“As for the subcontinent, the former female Indian Prime Minister, Indira Gandhi, was on stage at the Centenary Celebration of Darul Uloom Deoband in 1980 and delivered a speech in the presence of great *ulamā'* such as Hadhrat Mawlana Qari Muhammad Tayyib sahib (RA). Was he and all the *ulamā'* sat on the stage major sinners? The late Hadhrat

Mawlana As'ad Madani (son of Hadhrat Mawlana Hussein Ahmad Madani RA) sat side-by-side to Sonia Gandhi, who wasn't even properly covered, at a major event. His brother, Hadhrat Mawlana Arshad Madani, on occasions gives interviews to females and is seen next to them. Shaykh Abu'lHasan Ali Nadwi, the renowned Indian scholar, has on a few occasions addressed a mixed audience, during his visits to Oxford (UK), where non-Muslim females would also be present. Hadhrat Mufti Muhammad Taqi Usmani has on more than one occasion delivered a lecture to a mixed audience with no barrier in between. Are all these *ulamā'* major sinners and haram-doers who should never be invited and completely shunned?! The above are merely 'some' examples of living and recently deceased scholars; there are many more."

Darul Uloom Deoband's celebration

This is an absolutely moronic argument to bolster the utterly baseless claim of permissibility of intermingling. For negating the contention of Prohibition, Daleel of the Shariah is imperative. The haraam Deoband celebration is not a daleel of the Shariah. Yes, they all are major sinners and fussaag for their dalliance with faasiqaat and faajiraat.

Firstly, the centenary celebration was Haraam. The moron clique of molvis seek to substantiate their baseless idea of permissibility of intermingling on a baseless premises which is haraam. By what stretch of brains, logic and Shar'i daleel is the Deoband

celebration a valid daleel for abrogating a Prohibition stemming from the Qur'aan and Sunnah?

The then authorities of Darul Uloom Deoband had committed a dastardly massive blunder for having arranged that haraam centenary celebration which was bedevilled with a host of haraam factors. The consequence of that haraam celebration was the *Athaab* of Allah Ta'ala which descended on that noble Institution which was a wonderful Bastion of Islam since its inception. Alas! Today, the Janaazah of Ilm has departed from Darul Uloom Deoband. Hence, it may not be cited as proof of the Shariah.

The form of the *Athaab* was the heart-rending split of the Madrasah into two hostile factions, and the filthy Hindu army camping in the Madrasah defiling the sanctity of Darul Hadith, etc. The celebration was haraam, hence the consequences were disastrous.

Maulana Asad Madani

The haraam perpetrated by this Maulana does not override the Qur'an, the Sunnah and the Shariah. If a Maulana or a Hadhrat indulges in zina, does zina become halaal? Is the Maulana's commission of zina a daleel for claiming that zina is no longer prohibited?

Bear in mind, O you moron, jaahil, deviate molvis that the Maulana sitting alongside an improperly dressed

kaafirah woman is an act of zina. This act of zina is now presented as a 'daleel' for the averment that intermingling of the sexes is halaal? Indeed shaitaan has urinated in the brains of these miserable molvis who are unable to distinguish between right and left, jam and faeces.

All the other molvis mentioned above, who had ignored the Shariah's prohibition, are fussaaq regardless of their status in this dunya. The criterion of Haqq is the Shariah, not the misdeeds of prominent molvis. It was the attitude of Bani Israaeel to elevate their priests and saints to the pedestal of godhood whenever the fatwas of their buzrugs appeased their nafs. Today, the very same attitude of the Yahood is being duplicated by the moron molvis.

Yes, they must necessarily be shunned because they have become *mudhilleen* (mis-leaders). They misguide Muslims with their haraam interpretations and misdeeds of fisq.

Mufti Taqi Uthmani

He has rendered himself Islamically *person'a non grata*. He is a liberal who is guilty of multiple major infractions of the Shariah such as halaalizing haraam pictography, capitalist system of riba banking, etc. He drifts the way the wind blows. He participates flagrantly in fisq and fujoor.

Yes, they are Fussaaq!

Presenting another stupid straw, the Juhhaal say:

“As for the West, if we use the premise that “anyone who has ever lectured adult females without a barrier or screen is considered an overt sinner / *fasiq*” then we will be declaring a large number of scholars and imams unreliable. The late Hadhrat Mawlana Yusuf Motala sahib (RA) would encourage his graduates to attend universities, and a few of them graduated and even lectured there. Shaykh Dr Mahmood Chandia (Bolton) and Shaykh Dr Ashraf Muqaddam (Leicester) were both teachers in the Islamic studies department of Manchester and Birmingham Universities respectively. Both are disciples of Hadhrat Motala sahib and delivered lectures to mixed audiences with his guidance. If Hadhrat Mawlana Yusuf Motala sahib was a grave sinner / *fasiq* for encouraging them, then all his students and students of his students and all his institutions become unreliable! Hadhrat Mawlana Bilal sahib (of Bury) is known to entertain females at his Mosque office who come to seek his advice. So many *ulamā'* and imams over the past 15/20 years have been delivering talks at universities to a mixed audience. Notable *ulamā'* who on occasions have delivered a talk or lecture to a mixed audience (without a barrier) include (but not limited to): Shaykh Mawlana Abdur-Rahim Limbada sahib, Shaykh Riyadh ul Haq, Mufti Abdur-Rahman Mangera, Shaykh Sulaiman Moola, Mufti Zubair Bhayat, Shaykh Zahir Mahmood, Mufti Muhammad ibn Adam, Shaykh Hasan Ali, Shaykh Rafiq Sufi, Shaykh Hanif Luharwi, Mufti Husein Kamani, and so many others. The list is endless.”

Yes, they are Fussaaq! The entire 'endless' list of molvis who have indulged and indulge in the haraam act of intermingling are fussaaq. Furthermore all of these miserable moron molvis and juhala sheikhs display their snouts on haraam social media. They are video shayaateen in human form. They are unreliable. They are *mudhilleen*. If all the molvis in the entire world combine to halaalize a prohibition of Allah Ta'ala, the law of the Shariah will not change. We shall say that the whole world full of vile molvis are fussaaq villains.

Some of the characters mentioned are even *zindeeqs*, notably the Moolla and Bhayat miserable mudhilleen characters. The late Motala Sahib had grievously erred with his bootlicking practice. He insulted the Uloom of the Qur'aan by encouraging his students to pursue carrion university education, and in the process opened the door of zina for them in diametric contravention of the Qur'aanic Prohibition: "*Do not come near to zina.*"

These molvis were enamoured by the atheist institutions such as Oxford and Cambridge while we are enamoured by the celestial Institution of *Ghaar-e-Hira* where the Qur'aan Majeed was revealed. We are enamoured by the first Darul Uloom initiated by Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam), namely The Suffah Madrasah. Oxford and Cambridge are major

stepping stones to Jahannam. But the molvis, sheikhs and hadhrats have lost the Path of Jannat, hence they dwell in confusion licking the boots of atheists. That is why they condoned and promoted intermingling and picture-making to enable them to be admired by the faajiraat and faasiqaat of western institutions. Thus, the names of the gamut of molvis and sheikhs cited by the Clique of Juhala molvis are meaningless and devoid of Shar'i substance. It is with emphasis that we are constrained to say: ***Yes, all of them are fussaaq who have betrayed Islam, and in their pernicious process of bootlicking the West, they aided in setting the stage for Dajjaal.***

Never ever are the misdeeds of deviants hujjat (proof)

Pursuing their copro stupidity, the Juhhaal say:

“Objection: Some people say that the action of these scholars is not a proof (*hujjah*) in Islam; what is *haram* is *haram*, even if a major scholar is doing it. This is true in principle, but used in an incorrect way. Indeed, in relation to acts that are clearly and categorically *haram*, the action of no scholar is proof. The act will remain *haram*, even if all the scholars were doing it. If – Allah forbid – the world’s major scholars started drinking alcohol or committing Zina, these two acts will remain *haram* and heinous sins. This is because these acts are clearly unlawful.”

With absolute certitude can it be asserted that the shenanigans of the ‘endless’ list of molvis and sheikhs are haraam. Never ever can their halaalization of haraam be *hujjat (proof)* for the validity of their haraam misdeeds. Pictures, intermingling of sexes, riba and the like are in the same class of Prohibitions such as zina and liquor.

The *hurmat* of intermingling is clear and categorical. There is absolutely no difference in the Prohibition of these evils. It is stupid and satanic to predicate *hurmat* to only “*these two acts (liquor and zina)*”. Since abandonment of Hijaab/intermingling and pictures have become acceptable and respected by the vast majority of this fallen and disgraced Ummah, the moron molvi clique differentiates between the major sin of intermingling and the major sins of zina and alcohol. But this difference will not remain for too long. Due to the desensitization plot of Iblees, soon zina and liquor will become ‘halaal’ by way of the copro interpretation of the characters whose brains are incrementally being deranged by the spell of shaitaan.

While the juhala validly say:

“If – Allah forbid – the world’s major scholars started drinking alcohol or committing Zina, these two acts will remain *haram* and heinous sins. This is because these acts are clearly unlawful.”,

they restrict this truth to only zina and liquor whereas it applies to every one of the numerous Prohibitions of the Shariah. They do agree that if the whole world of 'scholars' proclaim zina to be halaal, it will remain haraam. Thus, in the same vein we unequivocally proclaim that if the whole world of moron juhala molvis and sheikhs, including the 'endless list' of the morons abandon hijab and claim that it is permissible for men and women to be in one hall sitting alongside one another, it will remain haraam.

Directly from the Qur'aan?

The Juhala displaying their jahl say:

"There is no need to follow anyone, not even the Hanafi or Shafi'i Schools or even the sahaba, to know that they are *haram* acts. We take their prohibition directly from the Qur'an and Sunna. However, in issues that are not categorical (*mujtahad fih*) or issues in which there is valid difference of opinion, the statements and practice of the *ulamā'* will undeniably be taken into consideration. Otherwise, anyone can say the practice of Imam Abu Hanifa or such-and-such imam is not proof, because I have read in the Qur'an or Sunna that such-and-such act is unlawful.

In fact, there is an imperative need to follow someone. Minus *Taqleed*, it is impossible to follow Islam correctly. Thus we follow the Sahaabah and the Aimmah Mujtahideen. The claim that for *hurmat* we have to resort directly to the Qur'aan, is *shaitaani*

zukhrufal qaul. It is an adorned snare of Iblees. The Qur'aan and Sunnah cannot be correctly understood and followed without making *Taqleed* of the Sahaabah and Aimmah Mujtahideen. Those who seek to extract rulings directly from the Qur'aan and Hadith and in the process delete the Sahaabah and Aimmah Mujtahideen are Satanists. Regarding such Satanists, Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) said:

“Behold! I have been given the Qur’aan and its Mithl with it (namely Wahi inspired known as Hadith). Behold! Soon will there be an obese (fat) man seated on his couch saying: ‘Take hold of this Qur’aan. Whatever you find in it to be halaal, regard it as halaal, and whatever you find in it to be haraam, regard it as haraam.’”

This is the way in which moron molvis and jaahil sheikhs of this era flout their perceived excellence on the basis of their smattering knowledge. They believe themselves capable of extracting masaa-il directly from the Qur'aan and Hadith. Rejecting the ‘fat’ scoundrel, Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) said:

“Verily, whatever Rasulullah has made haraam is just as Allah has made haraam.”

The issues of hijab/intermingling and pictography are not *mujtahad fih*. These issues are categorically ***haraam*** and preclude interpretation. There is no difference of opinion regarding the segregation of the sexes. The copro opinions of moron 'scholars' of our age are devoid of any Shar'i basis. The contention that men and women in the same hall without an intervening/separating barrier is not intermingling and is not haraam displays cognitive derangement and is the twaddle of irresponsible 'scholars' who believe themselves to be mujtahideen when in reality they peddle the projects of Iblees.

The move to scuttle the fourteen century prohibition of segregation of the sexes by Ibleesi scholars of this age is absolute shaitaniyat. Indeed there is no dearth of *jahaalat* in the ranks of these miserable fussaag scholars who spin events to suit their own corrupt nafsaani narratives, then justify their fisq, fujoor and kufr with their haraam misdeed being a '*mujtahad fih*' subject when in reality it (the Prohibition) is *Mansoos alayh*.

Submitting to the fatwa of the Aimmah Mujtahideen is imperative. It is a colossal deception to expect a similar submission and acceptance to the stercoraceous views of the moron scholars of this age. While the verdicts of the Fuqaha-e-Mutaqaddimeen and the Aimmah Mujtahideen are *Hujjat*, it is

absolutely ridiculous to expect anyone to confer the same acceptability to the opinions of the molvis and sheikhs of this age. Their culture encourages acquiescence and ingratiation to the ideas and practices of the Yahood and Nasaara, and they do so only to advance their nafsaani and worldly objectives. Besides such despicable objectives there is no valid Shar'i reason for these moron 'major scholars' to diverge from the Prohibition, even if they believe it to be for the purpose of "blocking the avenue of haraam".

The statements and opinions of a thousand ulama will be rejected if these are in contravention of the Shariah as is their opinion on the issue of segregation of the sexes. They are conducting themselves with treachery by scuttling the Prohibition even if we assume it to be not prohibited *per se*. A ruling based on the valid *Usool* of the Shariah carries the full force of the Shariah. The issue of *li gharihi* may not be proffered for scuttling the prohibition. The Shariah is not a toy or a football to kick around as these moron 'scholars' of this age are doing. The principle of *Sadde Tharaa'* is not a joke. It may not be adopted and ignored at whim and fancy. Every stupid idea may not be cited as *dharoorah* (*dire need*) for rendering a prohibition halaal.

Justifying and vindicating haraam

Justifying their haraam misdeed of appearing in the presence of females and discarding the Screen commanded by the Qur'aan Majeed, the juhhaal scholars say:

“The fact is that what they caution against in their talks/writings is open/free/casual mixing and intermingling, whilst their practice (which they do not even do it habitually) involves non-free mixing. This also removes the confusion that some people have recently been harbouring: “how can so many major scholars do a *haram* act?” The answer is clear: Their practice is not *haram* in-of-itself; however, they do not promote it or give *fatwa* in its favour due to – as explained above – the fear of opening the doors to clear *haram* acts. However, on occasions, due to a need or due to some reason, they may act on the original and intrinsic permissibility.”

This is palpably false. It is a flapdoodle attempt to vindicate the haraam misdeed of these miserable ‘major scholars’ with flaccid arguments. The idea of ‘non-free mixing’ is a hallucination of the nafs. Men and women in the same hall seated alongside one another without the separating Qur'aanic Screen is not ‘non-free mixing’. It is free intermingling. It is the approach to zina.

This is *Aakhiruz Zamaan*, hence there is no surprise in so many ‘major scholars’ practicing and justifying this haraam act. Haraam is considered ‘halaal’ in this age

by the so-called 'major scholars'. They are major agents of Iblees.

In this era of immorality, obscenity, shamelessness and nudity, there is a greater need to enforce the *Sadde Tharaa'* principle. But these miscreant 'major scholars', instead of having the purity, morality spirituality of the Ummah uppermost in their mind, display flagrant disregard for both the teachings and the spirit of the injunctions of the Deen and the advices of the Qur'aan Majeed and the Sunnah.

Just from whence did they acquire the lewd practice of men and women being together without a separating screen. Furthermore, it should be understood that the presence of women in a hall is haraam even if there is a separating screen. Only morons fail to understand the objectives and purport of the *Nusoos* of the Qur'aan and Sunnah.

A common disease in all these 'major scholars' is their total abstention from *Amr Mil Ma'roof Nahy Anil Munkar*. They simply lack the stamina for commanding virtue and prohibiting evil because they themselves flagrantly indulge in haraam. Their public indulgence in haraam does not permit them to proclaim the Haqq.

When Hadhrat Abu Bakr Siddique (Radhiyallahu anhu) was yearning for Maut, other Sahaabah expressed surprised. Hadhrat Abu Bakr (Radhiyallahu anhu) explained: *“I fear to be in the age when there will be no Amr Bil Ma’roof Nahyi anil Munkar.”* That was more than fourteen centuries ago. It was the noblest of ages. What should we think and say of the current age in which the ‘major scholars’ act like dumb devils. Having cancelled the obligation of Amr Bil Ma’roof they practice *Amr bil Munkar, Nahyi anil Ma’roof*. They condone and promote abrogation of the Prohibitions of the Shariah on their flimsy pretext of ‘need’. But there is absolutely no need for the co-sex audiences - for men and women to be in a hall even if a screen is installed between them. The very first violation of Hijaab is the emergence of females in droves to attend a totally unnecessary talk by some moron jaahil molvi/sheikh.

The categorization of intermingling into free intermingling and non-free intermingling is baatil and satanic. The so-called ‘non-free’ mixing is shaitaan’s ploy to gradually achieve total mixing with the objective being obscenity, immorality and zina. These so-called ‘major scholars’ dwell in deception hence they miserably fail to understand the methodology of shaitaan. Shaitaan achieves his objective by degrees. He acclimatizes people to haraam gradually, step by step, hence the Qur’aan Majeed commands: *Do not*

come near to zina.” Confirming this methodology of Iblees, Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) said:

“He who shuns the doubtful, has saved his Deen and his honour.”

Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) prohibited ‘grazing near to the perimeter’ of another’s property. The proximity will lead to gate and fence-crashing and entry into haraam. The Prohibition is confirmed *per se* by the Qur’aan and Sunnah.

Their corrupt practical ‘fatwa’

In a flaccid attempt to justify the intermingling of the ‘major scholars’, the Juhhaal say:

“Their practice is not haram in-of-itself; however, they do not promote it or give fatwa in its favour due to – as explained above – the fear of opening the doors to clear haram acts.”

Firstly, their practice is Haraam by itself. Secondly they do promote their haraam indulgence by practical example. Thirdly, it is a LIE to claim that they do not verbally promote the evil they indulge in. When attention is drawn to their haraam practice, they react vindictively and baselessly endeavour to substantiate their practice. Fourthly, they practically open the door for clear haraam acts. When the masses see that ‘major scholars’ indulge in mingling with females, then they infer permissibility. Thus, the dumb devil molvis are actively promoting the approach to zina.

Intrinsic permissibility?

The Juhhaal molvis say:

“However, on occasions, due to a need or due to some reason, they may act on the original and intrinsic permissibility.”

The very Prohibition is intrinsic and original. It is not an offshoot of another mas'alah. The act of the ‘major scholars’ is intrinsically and originally haraam. The ‘need’ claimed for justifying the mingling is fictitious. It is the effect of self-induced hallucination. There is absolutely no need for a molvi/sheikh to permit a mixed audience, and that too not separated by the Qur'aanic screen. Let the morons spell out the ‘need’. There is no valid reason for scuttling the Prohibition which they claim is for ‘blocking the avenue leading to haraam’.

The haraam scenarios

The Clique of Jaahil molvis says:

“Moreover, the refuters like to lump all the various situations and scenarios together, and declare everyone as major sinners. The fact is that each event, depending on how it is set up, and depending on the context, is different. The Islamic ruling will also subsequently differ, in terms of harshness and flexibility. Any person with some sort of understanding will realise that there is a difference between the following scenarios:

- a) An event where men and women are sat mixed together, chatting casually and intermingling freely, and even flirting (such as in some “Islamic” concerts),
- b) An event where modestly dressed men and women are sat separately side by side, without a physical barrier,
- c) An event where modestly dressed men and women are sat separately, without a physical barrier, but the women are seated at the rear and far away from the men,
- d) An event where there is a physical barrier between the two genders, but both genders can see the male speaker,
- e) It is a political event attended by many non-Muslims,
- f) The organizers have full power and control over seating arrangements
- g) The organizers do not have any say regarding seating arrangements. At times, at universities, Muslim organisations have no control and power over how the two genders are seated.

Hence, there are so many different facets and nuances in relation to such events, and to lump everything together is nothing but insanity.”

Lumping all the haraam scenarios and situations together is correct and necessary. Since all the scenarios depicted by the Juhhaal are haraam, they have to be conglomerated and the same *Hurmat* ruling slapped on them regardless of any difference there may be in the scenarios.

Whether it is pig faeces or dog faeces or baboon faeces or human faeces, etc., etc., all varieties of faeces are *najis* and *haraam* even if any specific

42

faeces may be palatable or even delicious to any moron suffering from mental derangement as do these juhhaal copro molvis. In view of all the scenarios enumerated by the deviates being haraam, it is only proper to lump them together and to label them haraam.

Let us now deal with each of the faecal scenarios separately to show that each one is faeces and haraam.

“a) An event where men and women are sat mixed together, chatting casually and intermingling freely, and even flirting (such as in some “Islamic” concerts)”

Although the juhhaal and the ‘major scholars’ concede that this scenario is faeces and haraam, they nevertheless do not accept that it is *per se* haraam. Since they claim that there is no proof for the prohibition of men and women being in the same hall without an intervening screen, the *hurmat* in this scenario is secondary, not intrinsic and original. This claim and understanding are the effect of their mental derangement caused by the manipulation of Iblees. This scenario is definitely haraam.

“b) An event where modestly dressed men and women are sat separately side by side, without a physical barrier,”

This scenario is intrinsically Haraam regardless of the 'modest' dress. It is in flagrant violation of the Qur'aanic and Hadith *Nusoos* prohibiting intermingling of any kind whatsoever. The separation is fictitious.

"(c) An event where modestly dressed men and women are sat separately, without a physical barrier, but the women are seated at the rear and far away from the men,"

This scenario too is haraam. In which era of Islam was there ever such a scenario where men and women congregated in the same place? The initial permission for women to perform Salaat in the Musjid was abrogated during the very era of the Sahaabah. Just as it is not valid to say that liquor is halaal on the basis of it being consumed during the early period of Islam, so too is it never permissible to proffer the initial permissibility of women attending the Musjid.

The factors of *hurmat* for this scenario are:

- (1) Women emerging from their homes in flagrant contravention of the Qur'aanic command for them to remain inside their homes.
- (2) The absence of the screen is in flagrant contravention of the Qur'aanic command to have a

screen between men and women if there is a real need for dialogue.

(3) Males and females congregating in the same venue to listen to an unnecessary talk while they are not permitted to be present in even the Musjid for Salaat.

(4) Women of today emerge from their homes, not as *Tafilaat*, but adorned in finery and perfume. Many come driving vehicles.

(5) The mingling outside the hall is terrible. All restraint is discarded. This is daily witnessed at the Musajaad where stupid, haraam so-called ladies facilities have been made available.

“d) An event where there is a physical barrier between the two genders, but both genders can see the male speaker,”

This scenario is likewise haraam. The same factors of prohibition mentioned above are applicable to this scenario as well. The additional aggravating factor of prohibition is that the women can see the male speaker and vice versa. This is in flagrant violation of the Qur'aanic command to lower the gaze and of the Ahadith which prohibit looking at the opposite sex.

“e) It is a political event attended by many non-Muslims,”

This is worse. It further compounds the aforementioned factors of Prohibition and emphasizes the Prohibition. It is haraam for even men to participate in kufr politics. The prohibition for women is substantially greater and has greater emphasis.

Indeed shaitaan has urinated in the brains of these Juhhaal. How can it ever be permissible for Muslim females to attend a kufr political gathering? They are not allowed to attend even the House of Allah Ta'ala for Salaat and Ibaadat. Only copro molvis with diseased brains believe that the major sin of women participating in kufr politics is halaal. Politics – all politics of this era – are the politics of Taaghoot. Yet these juhala proffer this haraam scenario as a mitigating factor for indulging in intermingling of the sexes.

The other haraam factor aggravating the *kabeerah* sin of intermingling, is mingling with kuffaar at the venue of Taaghhooti politics. The jahl of these molvis is indeed shocking and extremely lamentable. Muslim women emerging from their homes and mingling with even kuffaar males at some haraam kufr political gathering appears to be perfectly permissible for these juhhaal molvis. Even ordinary and ignorant Muslims whose Imaan has not suffered the ravages of fisq and fujoor erosion readily understand this Prohibition.

“f) The organizers have full power and control over seating arrangements”

Regardless of the organizers having full power and control or not. It does not alter the *hurmat* status of intermingling. It simply is not permissible for Muslim females to be present at a hall, etc. for listening to a talk even if a screen is erected between the men and women. Their very participation in an event in the public domain is haraam.

“g) The organizers do not have any say regarding seating arrangements. At times, at universities, Muslim organisations have no control and power over how the two genders are seated.

Hence, there are so many different facets and nuances in relation to such events, and to lump everything together is nothing but insanity.”

Assuming that Muslim organizations do have power and control over the seating arrangements, and assuming they do set up a separating screen, then too the *hurmat* remains. Women may not be invited to violate the explicit Prohibition of the Qur'aan.

When they have no power and control, then why do even Muslim males attend such gatherings? What is the need, real need, to attend a gathering where the Shariah will be flagrantly violated? As for universities, these institutions are ‘educational’

brothels. They are dens of evil, vice and immorality. Why do Muslims attend functions and gatherings organized by the university atheist scum? Molvies and sheikhs due to their mental derangement and mental inferiority are adept in the art of bootlicking the Yahood and Nasaara. Therefore, even their universities of vice and kufr are honoured and assigned a pedestal higher than the Darul Uloom where these morons were supposed to gain adequate Ilm to prepare themselves for the meeting with Allah Ta'ala. All these 'facets and nuances' are haraam faeces. Not a single facet disgorged by the Juhhaal has Shar'i validity. All these 'facets and nuances' are *ghutha* - plain rubbish.

CONCLUSION

The Ummah is rotting with fisq, fujoor, bid'ah and kufr. Instead of diverting their effort and energy to combat these evils with *Amr Bil Ma'roof Nahy Anil Munkar*, these miscreant molvis who have selected anonymity deemed it appropriate to vindicate the satanic practice of intermingling, of women emerging in droves from their homes to participate in the public domain despite their awareness that Allah Ta'ala informed Iblees that his traps with which to ensnare people will be women.

Although these juhhaal are well aware that:

- Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) said that the whole body of the female is *Aurah* and
- her place is inside the precincts of her home, and
- the best place for her Salaat is the innermost recess of her home, and
- Shaitaan lies in ambush when a woman emerges, and
- the male should not gaze at even her garments to such a degree that he should not look at even the dead body of a woman shrouded in five sheets and covered by a large sheet when being lowered in the grave, and
- women should not look at even 90 year old blind men, and
- Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) had instructed his two Wives to leave the presence of the aged blind Sahaabi, and
- hot rods will be inserted into the eyes of those who stare with lust at women, and
- Allah Ta'ala says in the Qur'aan Majeed that a screen is purer for the hearts of both the men and women whenever there is a real need for dialogue, and
- the Sahaabah prohibited women from the Musjid, and

- congregational acts of ibaadat such as Jumuah Salaat and Jamaat Salaat have not been imposed on them. They have chosen deliberate blindness to shrug off the deluge of Shar'i evidence which proscribes all the scenarios of intermingling enumerated by the juhhaal.

Their blindness comes within the purview of the Aayat:

“The physical eyes are not blind. But the hearts (spiritual eyes) within the breasts are blind.”

Instead of striving for the *Islaah (reformation)* of Muslims, the Juhhaal molvis add the fuel of more vice to the furnace of vice in which this Ummah is burning itself into destruction. Instead of devising ways of bringing Muslims closer to the Deen and Allah Ta'ala, they promote lewdness, shamelessness, female emergence and free intermingling of the sexes which are all the antithesis of the Ta'leem of the Qur'aan and Sunnah.

THE UK ULAMA-E-SOO

In this era in close proximity to Qiyaamah, fisq, fujoor and deviation are incrementally become the salient features of the ulama-e-soo' of UK. While the world is awash with ulama-e-soo', it appears that the UK

ulama are becoming the vanguard of *Dhalaal* (Deviation).

In this we have published a booklet, *The Dajjaaliyat of the UK Ulama-e-Soo'*. This article is available on our website. It is best to also read the article to gain a better understanding of the deviation of the molvis and sheikhs of the U.K.

Naseehat

Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) said:

“Verily, Allah Ta’ala elevates some people with this Kitaab (the Qur’aan), and He disgraces others with it (the Qur’aan).”

The Ulama-e-Soo' should beware and take lesson. This Qur'aan which they are misinterpreting and buffeting as if it is football will disgrace and ruin them.

THE FISQ OF THE “PROMINENT MAJOR SCHOLARS”

There exists a weird misconception in the minds of numerous of the laeity and in the understanding of almost all of these so-called ‘prominent major scholars’ of this corrupt era in close proximity to Qiyaamah that due to the intagliation of the label of

‘prominence’, the designation of fisq and fujoor does not apply to them.

The understanding stemming from oblique mental vision is that only ordinary people (*awaamun naas*) who indulge flagrantly in acts of fisq and fujoor can be labelled fussiaaq and fujjaar, but not the ‘prominent and major scholars’ who satanically display their snouts on the haraam, immoral social media platforms. This is the molvi-sheikh narrative typically and subtly driven by their claim of being *Warathatul Ambiya* (*The Heirs/Representatives of the Ambiya*). But even a superficial glance at their public lifestyle debunks this misconception and confirms that in reality they are *Warathatush Shayaateen* within the purview of the Qur’aanic Aayat:

“Thus have We appointed for every Nabi shayaateenul ins (jinn devils) and shayaateenul ins (human devils) as enemies who whisper to each other zukhrufal qawl (satanically adorned statements) in order to deceive.”
(*Al-An’aam, Aayat 112*)

These are the ‘prominent major scholars’ regarding whom Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) expressed the fear: *“I fear for my Ummah the aimmah mudhilleen”*, that is the ‘prominent and major scholars’ who manipulate haraam for the production

of 'halaal', who indulge flagrantly in fisq and fujoor and thereby mislead the Ummah.

The 'prominent major scholars' should divest their brains from the idea of the label of fisq and fujoor being exclusively for the *awaamun naas*. We say with emphasis that all those 'prominent major scholars' who exhibit themselves on facebook and the like, and who indulge in haraam videos are fussaag and fujjaar. They are worse than the fussaag and fujjaar of the *awaamun naas*. They should understand that their 'prominence' is the simulacrum of the prominence of Iblees. Whatever they disgorge on these haraam social media platforms is the eructation of *baatil* which they adorn with 'deeni' hues.

*SALAAM ON THOSE WHO FOLLOW THE
HIDAAYAT OF ALLAH TA'ALA.*