

***“BEWARE OF TRIVIALIZING
SINS” (HADITH)***

MAKROOH

**MUJLISUL ULAMA OF S.A.
P.O. Box 3393
Port Elizabeth
6056, South Africa**

THE MEANING OF MAKROOH TAHREEMI

By

Molvi Muhammad Huzaiifah Ibn Aadam

An unfortunate state of affairs today is that most of those carrying around the title of `Ulamaa are in fact either *Juhalaa* (ignoramuses) or *Shayaateen* prowling about in human form. They fall into two categories:

(1) Those who spread *baatil* because they are too stupid to know what is the Haqq. This is the type of Molvi who slept during classes and graduated from whatever Darul Uloom despite not being able to correctly read and understand even a single paragraph of Arabic. As a result, they spread *baatil* beliefs without even realising their folly.

(2) Those who have in fact acquired some "book knowledge". They know very well what the Haqq is, but because they are in fact *Shayaateen* (be it *Shayaateen-ul-Ins* or *Shayaateen-ul-Jinn*), they intentionally conceal the Haqq from people and propagate *baatil* to mislead them from the Path of Allaah Ta`aalaa.

Stating this fact will cause many people to become upset and offended, but the truth remains the truth regardless of who likes or dislikes it.

This brief article deals with an issue regarding which the Ulamaa-e-Soo (or Juhalaa-e-Soo) are blatantly dishonest. It is the issue of *Makrooh Tahreemi* (Prohibited Abomination) and its meaning in the Hanafi Madh-hab.

In order to certify *khinzeer*, *khamr*, *riba* and a host of other Haraam acts and substances, the *Morons of Soo* employ a number of different "Fiqhi Terms" and Arabic terminology to dupe the ignorant masses. Terms such as "*Umoom-e-Balwaa*", "*Mudhaarabah*", "*Mushaarakah*", etc., are bandied about to impress the masses who have no idea of the meanings of these terms. They are impressed by Arabic-sounding terms and assume that whatever the Molvi is saying has to be true.

When asked for the ruling on things that are not permissible in Islaam, they deceptively employ the term "*Makrooh*" in their defective fatwas, translating it as "*disliked*" without giving the questioner any explanation of the Shar`i meaning of *Makrooh Tahreemi*. In fact, they do not specify even if the Makrooh is Tahreemi or Tanzeehi. The term is presented as if there is scope for permissibility.

What the layman understands from the word "*disliked*", is that the *Makrooh* action is permissible, and it is fine to act accordingly although it is better if one abstains, but there is no sin incurred. With this idea these molvis corrupt the juhala, open the door of fitnah for the addiction of sin.

The idea which they are conveying and with which the people are deceived, is not the meaning of *Makrooh Tahreemi*. On account of the grave misconception spawned by the corrupt definition of Makrooh, people, even so-called 'aalims' say: "It is only *Makrooh*, not Haraam." This idea peddled by the juhala molvis is tantamount to kufr. It is *Istikhfaaf* (*regarding something to be insignificant*) with the laws of the Shariah.

In reality, there is no difference between *Haraam* and *Makrooh Tahreemi*. For all practical purposes both are the same. Both mean that the action is prohibited, and that the one who perpetrates it is sinful. The punishment for committing Haraam or Makrooh Tahreemi is the Fire of Jahannam. It is essential to resort to Tawbah.

Many molvis, muftis and shaykhs who are in fact *Jaahils* lauded with titles, read the explanation of *Makrooh Tahreemi* given in the Kutub, but fail to

understand its meaning. The Kutub of Fiqh mention that something prohibited by a *daleel qat`iyy* (evidence of absolute certitude) is termed Haraam, and something prohibited by a *daleel zanni* is termed Makrooh.

These molvis fail to understand what is meant by the difference between the two categories of prohibition. The literal meaning of the word "zanni" is "speculative". Thus, in their *jahaalat (ignorance)*, they adopt the literal meaning thereby believing that Makrooh is something that has no solid evidence to prohibit it. This notion is corrupt, baseless. It is simply based on conjecture.

Despite having studied the Kutub of the Madh-hab, their failure to understand the terminology of the Madh-hab is mind-boggling.

When the Hanafi Madh-hab uses the term "*zanni*", guesswork and opinion are not implied. The proof for the rule/teaching is of a category slightly less than the *daleel qat`iyy* category of evidences. The category known as *daleel qat`iyy* consist of Aayaat of the Qur'aan and Ahaadith-e-Mutawaataarah. This is the highest and most authentic class of Ahaadith. On this type of Hadith is based the *fardhiyat (compulsion)* of the Fardh raka'ts of the daily Salaat, for example.

The term *daleel zanni* applies to such Ahaadeeth which are not of the *qat'iy* category. But never does it mean that laws based on *daleel zanni* are products of opinion for which there is no reliable Qur'aanic or Hadith evidence. Such a notion is absolutely corrupt.

Thus, if something is prohibited, and its prohibition is based on *daleel qat'iy*, then the Hanafi Fuqahaa classify it as *Haraam*. If the prohibition is the effect of *daleel zanni* it is described as Makrooh Tahreemi. But for practical purposes, both mean strictly prohibited, and both are punishable offences. The difference is only academic, not practical.

Thus, when the Ahnaaf use the term *Zanni*, they do not refer to guesswork and speculation. They refer to Ahaadeeth. Something prohibited by Rasoolullaah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) is described by the Ahnaaf with the term "*Makrooh Tahreemi*". Imaam Ibn Aabideen (Rahmatullah alayh) writes in *Raddul Muhtaar alad-Durril Mukhtaar*:

"According to Imaam Muhammad, every Makrooh is Haraam."

In *Al-Kawaashiful Jaliyyah an Mustalahaatil Hanafiyyah*, a Kitaab written on the explanation of the terminologies of the Hanafi Madh-hab, it is mentioned:

"Both (the perpetrator of haraam and makrooh tahreemi) are equal in deserving punishment and criticism."

The Shaykh-ul-Hadeeth of Darul Uloom Deoband, Mufti Saeed Ahmad Palanpuri wrote in his refutation of Maulana Taha Karaan in "*Tresses of Jannat: The Female Hair Issue*"):

"There are many Usool (Principles) for (competency in) Fatwa. It is obligatory on a Mufti to take into consideration such principles (of Ifta). Awareness of such principles is the first obligation of a Mufti. For example in his writings he differentiates between Haraam and Makrooh whereas these terms are technical terminology. If the prohibition of things is substantiated on the basis of the Qur'aan, the Ulama describe it with the term, Haraam, and if the prohibition is substantiated on the basis of Ahaadith, the term Karaahat (being Makrooh) is used. But in Urf this differentiation is not made. The word Haraam is used for Makrooh Tahrimi as well."

Thus, the meaning of *Makrooh Tahreemi* according to the Hanafi Madh-hab is as clear as daylight. As far as the practical adoption of the Rulings of the Shariah goes, there is absolutely no difference between *Makrooh Tahreemi* and *Haraam*. If a person commits

a Haraam act, he has committed a sin, and if he perpetrates a Makrooh Tahreemi act, he has committed a sin. In both cases, he has to make Tawbah or he may be subjected to punishment in the Aakhirah if AllaahTa`aalaa has not forgiven him.

However, the Ulamaa-e-Soo do not explain this reality to the people when issuing a fatwaa. The questioner gains the understanding that Makrooh Tahreemi refers to something that is permissible but that it's just better to abstain.

A very simple, straight-forward question: "If a person commits a Haraam act, he is sinful and may suffer *Athaab*, and if a person commits a 'Makrooh Tahreemi' act, he is sinful and may undergo *Athaab*, so what is the difference?" Both must be equally avoided.

Allah Ta`aalaa knows best

COMMENT BY MUJLISUL ULAMA OF S.A.

Allaamah Abdul Wahhaab Sha'raani, the renowned Shaafi authority of the Shariah, proffering advice to the Ulama, says in his Kitaab, *Tambeehul Mughtarreen*:

“O my friend! Examine yourself in the light of the demand of Amr Bil Ma’roof, Nahy Anil Munkar to ascertain whether you do regard evil to be evil or not, and to ascertain whether you are among those people who are beloved to Allah Ta’ala.

Examine yourself to ascertain if you have aided the Shariat of Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) or are you among those who have abandoned the Shariat. However, you labour under the notion that you are the Representative of Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) because you are calling people towards the Deen.

Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) has appointed the Ulama of the Ummah to be the Trustees of his Shariat after him. However, nowadays (i.e. during the 10th Islamic century) the majority has abandoned the Shariat, leaving it without helpers by means of their words and deeds and by means of silence in the face of evil.

Wa La houla wala quwwata illaa billaahil azeem.”

The Ulama-e-Soo’ in this age and in all ages have always abstained from fulfilling the obligation of *Amr Bil Ma’roof Nahy Anil Munkar*. A vile tendency acquired by them is the notion of an act of the Shariah being “*only Sunnah*’ or “*only Makrooh*”. This ‘*only*’ attitude is termed *Istikhfaaf* in the Shariah. *Istikhfaaf* means to regard something insignificant or unimportant. Adopting the attitude of *Istikhfaaf* for any act of the Shariah even if it is a Mustahab, is kufr.

There is nothing in the Deen which is unimportant or insignificant regardless of the category of its classification. These miscreant molvis and sheikhs have instilled in the ignoramuses the idea of the legitimacy of perpetrating a *Makrooh* act. With this attitude they have rendered a huge disservice to the Ummah. They invite the Wrath of Allah Ta’ala upon themselves and on those who follow in their satanic footsteps.

There are two kinds of Makrooh: *Tanzihi* and *Tahreemi*. While *Tanzihi* refers to such actions which although not sinful if committed

occasionally, they are transformed into *Makrooh Tahreemi* and sins by means of *Israar*, i.e. constant commission.

The miscreant molvis due to their extremely defective knowledge and even greater deficiency of understanding the smattering of their defective knowledge are equating Makrooh Tahreemi with Makrooh Tanzihi. Therefore, they believe and teach the permissibility of the wholesale commission of *haraam* actions.

For example, all sea animals besides fish, are *haraam* for followers of the Hanafi Math-hab. This *haraam* is technically described as *Makrooh Tahreemi*. In order to gratify their lust for consuming crayfish, shrimps and the like, they stupidly and dangerously claim that it is '*only makrooh*'. Yet, they fail to understand that there is Consensus (Ijmaa') of the Ahnaaf on the consequences of both Haraam and Makrooh Tahreemi being the Fire of Jahannam.

An act being technically designated *Makrooh* is not a licence for commission or to feel snug in its perpetration and to believe that it is not sinful.

The kutub of the Ahnaaf are replete with thousands of masaa-il referring to Makrooh acts with the term 'Haraam'. Only moron molvis are ignorant of this fact. In Shaami is mentioned:

“Every Makrooh Tahreemi is Haraam, i.e. like haraam in the consequence being the Fire according to Imaam Muhammad (Rahmatullah alayh).”

“Imaam Muhammad has explicitly said that every Makrooh is Haraam.”

There are innumerable masaa-il which are described by the Fuqaha as haraam despite the fact that the proofs on which they are based are not of the *Qat'i* class of *dalaa-il*. For example, in *Bahrur Raa-iq* is mentioned that for a woman in haidh the recitation of even less than one Aayat is haraam despite there being no *Qat'i daleel* for this. While the kutub describe Qur'aanic recitation by such a woman to be Makrooh, numerous kutub say that it is haraam. This is merely one example out of the thousands of masaa-il in which Makrooh is the same as haraam.

Discussing the practice of mesmerism in *Imdaadul Fataawa*, Hadhrat Maulana Ashraf Ali Thanvi (Rahmatullah alayh) says:

“Regardless of its (initial) permissibility it is in the category of Qabeeh li ghairihi (evil due to other factors), hence prohibited and haraam. This principle is not hidden from the expert of Usool-e-Fiqh.”

(Imdaadul Fataawa, Vol.4, page 74)

It is quite understandable that these Usool are hidden and incomprehensible to moron molvis and maajin muftis.

An act may be initially permissible, hence not prohibited by either the Qur’aan or Hadith. Thus it is *Mubah (permissible)*. Despite its permissibility, the accretion of evil elements renders the permissible act prohibited, and this prohibition is described as *haraam* by the Fuqaha. Only maajin muftis are ignorant of this principle and the methodology of the Fuqaha.

The disease of assigning insignificance to sin was predicted by Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam): *“Soon will you obey Shaitaan in the*

sins which you regard as insignificant.” Today this predicted act is materializing in the corrupt fatwas by the molvis who make *tahqeer* (*regard as insignificant*) of sins with their convoluted conception of Makrooh.

It is also said in the Hadith: “*Beware of trivializing sin.*” The tool for justifying this satanic attitude of *tahqeer-e-zunoob* (*regarding sins being insignificant*) is the misconception pertaining to the meaning of Makrooh.

On the basis of this misconception sins are justified and regarded to be insignificant. This is *Istikhfaaf* which is kufr.

The profession of Ifta’ is not secular. The Mufti should not operate like a lawyer whose objective is this dunya. The Mufti is supposed to guide the servants of Allah and to show them the way to Jannat. He has to strive to close the avenues of sin and strengthen the bond of the Muslim with Allah Ta’ala. But the methods of the muftis of the current age only increases the chasm between people and their Khaaliq.

It is of imperative importance that the Mufti imbues in his fatwa the spirit of Islam to encourage practical implementation of the Sunnah. It is a moron 'mufti', who issues fatwas on the basis of dry technicalities when these open the door of fitnah. The purpose of Fiqhi technicalities is not to distance the questioner from Allah Ta'ala. It is not to encourage in him laxitude and disdain for the Sunnah methods of A'maal.

Nowadays, the muftis appear to be propagating the permissibility of cultivating a lackadaisical attitude towards the Deen whereas the fatwa of the Mufti should serve to bring the questioner closer to the Deen. The Fiqhi technicalities of latitude should be resorted to only after the commission of the deed. It should never be promoted to open avenues for weakening Imaan by diverting the questioner from taqwa.

The attitude of the muftis of today is to embed in the minds and hearts of Muslims indulgence in technical permissibilities regardless of the long term harms to both Imaan and physical health.

Consider for example, the fatwa of alcohol. The muftis who have a loose association with the

Deen, their gaze being deflected from the Path of Taqwa and the spirit which pervades the Qur'aan and the Ahaadith, go to great uncalled for lengths to promote the 'fadhaa-il' of ethanol, and the motive for this type of obduracy and convoluted thinking is plain *nafsaaniyat*. It is calculated to counter those who issue the fatwa of prohibition based on the view of the Jamhoor of our Math-hab and the Ijma' of the other three Math-habs. The nafsaani idea is to show us a point, hence they intransigently peddle the idea of their being 'nothing wrong' with ethanol. They wade through the kutub with the intention of discovering some weird view or an error of a Faqeeh for justifying their convolution.

While the Ummah is grovelling in deluges of fisq and fujoor, and while the Ummah is ablaze with bid'ah and kufr, these muftis with their fossilized brains are lost in technicalities which only adds fuel to the conflagration of fisq, fujoor, bid'ah and kufr in which the Ummah is perishing.

Despite the proven destruction to the health by tobacco, the maajin muftis go out of their way to find, by hook or crook, some justification for legalizing this stinking poison as if it is a staple

food contaminated by *najaasat*, hence the ‘imperative’ need to halaalize the smoking practice of the devil. They will, for example, present as daleel the hookah practice of some Buzrug or doggedly cling to a text of a Faqeeh despite the conspicuous and decisive evidences debunking that view which was centuries ago based on lack of information of the harms of tobacco.

Cancer, as a confirmed consequence of tobacco, is tolerable and acceptable for the Ummah to these muftis, but the Shariah’s principle of *dharar* (*substances causing harm*) as an element of prohibition is unknown to them, yet they proclaim themselves ‘muftis’! In fact, they are like the moron ‘mufti’ who is described as ‘*haatibul lail*’ – a moron who searches for firewood in the bush on an intensely dark night not knowing on what his hands fall, whether on a snake or on faeces.

Rarities and technicalities are not to be promoted for mass consumption. A fatwa based on a technicality is to be restricted to the peculiar circumstances of only the questioner. It may not be peddled for public consumption, for in so

doing, wide avenues are opened for fitnah and fasaad.

Consider the example of *I'aanat alal Ma'siyat (Aiding sin)*. The Qur'aan categorically forbids aiding in sin and transgression. But, muftis lacking in vision and wisdom, suffering from fossilization of the *Aql*, not only issue the fatwa of the permissibility of building a church/temple, but even promote it by presenting the Arabic texts from the kutub to convince the moron questioner who understands neither head nor tail of the quoted *ibaaraat (texts from the kutub of Fiqh)*.

They cite, for example from *Fataawa Hindiyyah*, where it is mentioned that aiding in building a church is 'permissible'. On the basis of this statement, they go crazy with delight to promote all the haraam contracts which Muslim builders enter into with the kuffaar. On this basis they will justify the building of Hindu temples of shirk in Dubai and elsewhere wherein even the ruler of the state and his wife worshipped in accordance of Hindu rituals of shirk.

Whilst they stupidly cling to the aforementioned text like a dog clinging to a bone, they are either

stupidly unaware or conveniently overlook that in the very same kitaab it is mentioned that if a non-Muslim asks the way to the church/temple, then to show him the direction is *kufr*. Just view the great disparity between ‘permissibility’ of building a church / temple, and the mere act of pointing in the direction of the church / temple being *kufr*.

The objective of this brief discussion is not to explain the application of the conflicting masaa-il. This is not the occasion for it. We are merely drawing attention to the *jahaalat* and incompetence of the muftis who are either real *juhala*, or *mudhilleen* (*those who misguide*). They follow in the footsteps of the Ulama of Bani Israaeel whose trademark was rendering haraam into halaal, and vice versa as it served the interests of the donors or the nafs.

The former class consists of morons who have been issued with Ifta certificates despite grossly lacking in even the rudiments of Ifta. The second class of *mudhilleen* are those who have chosen the dunya despite having academic expertise. They are the likes of Mufti Taqi who has fallen into the trap of western liberalism, hence his association with the rulers, capitalist bankers and the like. Such

association has rendered him *persona non grata* from the Shar'i perspective. Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) said:

“The Ulama are the Trustees of the Rusul (the Messengers of Allah) as long as they do not mingle with the sultan (the rulers), and as long as they do not plunge into the dunya.”