

TABLE & CHAIRS AND A CORRUPT FATWA



***“Whoever clings to my Sunnah at
The time of the corruption of my Ummah,
Will receive the reward of a hundred Shuhadaa.”
(Hadith of Rasulullah –Sallallahu alayhi wasallam)***

**PUBLISHED BY:
MUJLISUL ULAMA OF S.A
PO Box 3393
Port Elizabeth, 6056
South Africa**

QUESTION

Mufti Taqi of Darul Uloom Karachi, Pakistan has issued a fatwa saying that eating from tables sitting on chairs is neither forbidden nor in conflict with the Sunnah. He avers that there is no *daleel* for the contention that eating in this manner is contrary to the Sunnah and forbidden.

According to the Mufti, abandonment of only Sunnatul Muakkadah acts could be termed to be contrary to the Sunnah, and such acts are acts of *ibaadat* which Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) had practised with constancy.

He describes eating on the floor in Sunnah style to be Sunnat-e-Aadiyah, adoption of which is not compulsory, and abandonment of which is not sinful nor in conflict with the Sunnah. His argument is that the actions which Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) did not do as *ibaadat*, are called ‘*aadiyah*’, and it is perfectly permissible to abandon such Sunnat acts, and such abandonment is not *Makrooh* and should not be criticized. Hence if any other *mubah* practice/custom is substituted for such Sunnats, then it will not be in conflict with the Sunnah.

According to the Mufti, Rasulullah’s abstention from eating from tables and sitting on chairs for eating, is not a *daleel* for contending that it is contrary to the Sunnah to eat from tables.

This fatwa has bewildered and confused many Muslims who eat according to the Sunnah style and who believe that it is not permissible to sit on chairs for eating from tables. Please enlighten us on this issue.

ANSWER

In the Qur'aan Majeed Allah Ta'ala says:

“Those who devour riba, do not stand except as one who has been driven to madness by the touch of shaitaan.”

Mufti Taqi and the conglomerate of his underling *maajin* muftis of his Darul Uloom who have endorsed his fatwa, have legalized riba and also devour riba. Mufti Taqi is the first deviate mufti from among the Deobandis who had halaalized one of the worst acts of satanism, viz., riba. The bunkum and rubbish opinion which he has issued on the issue of eating food from tables in the style of the western kuffaar whose boots are today being licked with relish by the Ulama-e-Soo' and almost the whole Ummah, is the effect of shaitaani insanity of the type mentioned in the aforementioned Qur'aanic Aayat.

In his insane attempt to justify his madrasah's tables and chair system, and the displacement of the Sunnah, this confused mufti has gone to inordinate lengths to eke out 'perfect permissibility' for his adoption of the western kuffaar system of eating from tables – the system with which he has replaced the 14 century Sunnah way of eating food from the floor in the style of all the Ambiya, all the Sahaabah, all the Auliya and the entire Ummah, of even fussaag and fujjaar. It is only in recent times that Muslims overwhelmed by western culture, are regarding bootlicking and following kuffaar practices right into the “*lizard's hole*” respectable and honourable. They come within the purview of the Qur'aanic stricture:

“What! Do you search for honour from them?”

The *aql* of mufti Taqi has degenerated into a lamentable quagmire of incongruency which precludes him from distinguishing between right and wrong, halaal and haraam, Sunnah and kuffaar customs for which he has a strong inclination. When shaitaan manipulates the *aql* of a scholar, especially a scholar for dollars, he will present even kufr as an act of perfect permissibility.

The strongest *daleel* for the evil of mufti Taqi's haraam view is the abandonment of the more than 14 century Sunnah of Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) and of the entire Ummah. It is a wicked satanic abandonment in favour of the adoption of the custom and way of the enemies of Islam – the western kuffaar who are perpetually conspiring the destruction of Islam. These misguided Karachi muftis have eliminated the Sunnah in favour of the practice of the western kuffaar.

Even on the assumption that the Sunnah style of eating belongs to the Sunnah Aadiyah category, then too, to abandon it for the adoption of a kuffaar way is haraam. The argument presented by mufti Taqi in justification of his displacement of the Sunnah system at his madrasah and replacing it with the kuffaar style tables and chairs is not only flaccid. It is utterly moronic, baseless and unbecoming people who profess to be Heirs of the Ambiya, Ulama, and Shaikhs.

If this Sunnah is supposed to be Sunnah Aadiyah, it does not follow that it may be scuttled or eliminated for the sake of a kuffaar practice. This supposedly Sunnah Aadiyah custom which has been the way of the Ummah for more

than 14 centuries, and which is still the practice of hundreds of millions of Muslims, and of almost all the Deobandi Madaaris, and there are thousands of them, may not be displaced to make way for a kuffaar system which is not *mubah* as the *maajin* muftis of Karachi contend. Far from being *mubah* (permissible) it is *haraam* for Muslims to adopt it at the cost of abandoning the established Sunnah way of Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) even if such practice is labelled Sunnah Aadiyah by the miscreant muftis.

Abandoning the Sunnah and replacing it with a kuffaar custom is a perfect example of *Tashabbuh Bil Kuffaar* on the basis of which all our Akaabir Ulama have declared eating from tables to be *haraam Tashabbuh*. Mufti Taqi's contention that the element of *Tashabbuh* has been eliminated in view of this kuffaar practice having become the norm of all nations, is corrupt, deceptive and baseless. This contention is a blatant lie. He operates a Darul Uloom, and there are thousands of Deobandi Darul Ulooms all over the world. The practice in Darul Uloom Deoband and in almost all other Deobandi Institutions with rare exceptions such as the Karachi madrasah, is eating on the floor in Sunnah style. It is not the norm in our Madaaris all over the world to eat in kuffaar style.

The tables and chairs system has been introduced at mufti Taqi's madrasah, not because it is the norm of the Ummah. It has replaced the centuries old Sunnah way. Mufti Taqi killed the Sunnah, then introduced the kuffaar system. He gave preference to the kuffaar system over the Sunnah system. According to his own admission, the kuffaar

system is more convenient and better than the Sunnah system, hence its adoption and the booting out of Rasulullah's mubaarak system by the very persons who profess to be the standard bearers of Islam. Their claims are hollow and downright hypocritical. They have conspicuously portrayed an attitude of kufr.

It is vile for the mufti to turn a blind eye on the Sunnah way prevailing at all Darul Ulooms, and to justify his haraam displacement of the Sunnah with the kuffaar norm adopted by the juhala masses. It is indeed shockingly lamentable for muftis, supposedly senior, of a well-known Darul Uloom, to accept the way of the *juhala awaam* for abandoning the Sunnah of Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam). While these moron muftis seek to scuttle the Sunnah with their 'aadiyah' technicality, the whole Ummah from the era of Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) has always considered this practice inviolable and Sunnatul Muakkadah. And whatever Fiqhi category the Sunnah may be assigned, it is haraam – it is a major sin to scuttle and abandon it for the sake of adopting a kuffaar system. Preference to a kuffaar system over and above the Islamic/Sunnah system is in fact kufr. Thus, mufti Taqi's haraam displacement of the Sunnah has exceptionally grave consequences for his Imaan.

The argument of eating from tables having become the norm, hence the element of *Tashabbuh* no longer applies, is a deceptive canard. It is grossly misleading in view of the fact that it has been installed only by displacement of the Sunnah. Mufti Taqi and the students at his madrasah

did not find their seniors eating at tables. His entire life passed by observing that all the Ulama – his seniors – and all the students of his father, Hadhrat Mufti Muhammad Shafi (Rahmatullah alayh), the founder of the Darul Uloom which Mufti Taqi is westernizing, eating from the floor. There was no norm of tables and chairs. He has been the very first unfortunate one to kick out the Sunnah to replace it with the kuffaar system.

The Fiqhi categorization by the Fuqaha of the Ahkaam and practices of the Deen are not meant for providing a licence for abandoning the Sunnah on the basis of some technical classification which morons interpret as a permissibility for mutilating and abandoning the practices imparted to the Ummah by Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) and which were staunchly upheld by the Sahaabah and the Auliya and even the masses of every age.

In a very misleading argument to justify the abandonment of the Sunnah by substituting it with the kuffaar system, mufti Taqi says:

“The system of eating from tables has been adopted at Jamia Darul Uloom Karachi because considerable waqf money has to be used for the arrangement to sit on the floor for such a great number of students. Practically it posed numerous problems. Hence the aforementioned system (i.e. the kuffaar system) has been adopted.”

This is a disgraceful acquittal of intellectual insipidity totally unexpected of a senior mufti. The satanic madness

stemming in the wake of the vile process of halaalization of riba and pictures is quite palpable in this stupid argument. Whilst mufti Taqi seeks to pull wool over the eyes of the juhala with the stupidity of wasting waqf money to uplift and clean the dastarkhaans, he conveniently overlooks the tens of millions of dollars he squanders in futile, ostentatious building projects to enhance the false worldly glitter of his little darul uloom empire in total obliviousness of the Qur'aanic stricture: *“Do you construct mansions as if you will be living (in this dunya) forever!”*

It is an insult to intelligence to even entertain the silliness of expending considerable waqf funds to uplift the dastarkhaans (the cloths on which the food is placed).

Whether the cloths are placed on the floor or on the western kuffaar tables, these have to be uplifted and cleaned. And what about the hundreds of thousands of Students eating on the floor in the thousands of Madaaris? These Madaaris are comparatively speaking, poor, lacking in the huge amounts of surplus funds which flow into the coffers of Mufti Taqi's Madrasah. Yet, they very comfortably observe the Sunnah custom of eating on the floor in Rasulullah's style. There are Madrasahs which have thousands of Students, and they observe the Sunnah without the slightest problem.

The problems which mufti Taqi proffers to justify the kuffaar style which he has introduced to displace the Sunnah practice are figments of his hallucination.

All those who have been to Makkah and Madinah during Ramadhaan are aware of the hundreds of thousands of musallis having Iftaar on thousands of dastarkhaans on the floor. Without any problem these cloths are quickly uplifted within a couple of minutes in preparation of Maghrib Salaat. There is absolutely no validity for the bunkum which has been disgorged in justification of the kuffaar practice adopted at Darul Uloom Karachi.

It should be quite clear to unbiased people that the introduction of the western system at the expense of the displacement and killing of the Sunnah system is the satanic effect of western colonization of the brains of the muftis and molvis of the Karachi madrasah. Mufti Taqi's despicable dalliance with the capitalist riba bankers has desensitized his Imaani susceptibilities, and the consequence of this dalliance is the elimination of the Mumin's inhibition to the ways and customs of the kuffaar.

When even senior muftis fall by the wayside, having been deflected from Siraatul Mustaqeem, and incrementally abandoning the Sunnah, then we can understand the implications of the Hadith: *"Then there shall dawn an age when holding on to the Deen will appear like holding on to an ember (a burning coal)."*

In the dastardly attempt to justify the scuttling of the Sunnah, Mufti Taqi seeks to confuse and bog down people in a maze of technicalities to create the idea of perfect permissibility of displacing the permanent Sunnah to make way for a kuffaar style. The issue with which we are

confronted is not the juridical or academic classification of the practice of eating on the floor. Whether it is Sunnatul Muakkadah or Sunnat-e-Aadiyah, is not the issue. The real issue is the displacement of the Sunnah of Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) and substituting it UNNECESSARILY with a kuffaar practice. The adoption of the kuffaar system and giving it preference over the *Mubaarak* way of Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) is undoubtedly *Tashabbuh Bil Kuffaar*. One need not be an Aalim to understand this simple fact. One only needs to follow Rasulullah's command: "*Seek a fatwa from your heart.*" Specifically in relation to the Madrasah, the element of *Tashabbuh* is glaringly visible since the introduction of the kuffaar system entailed the displacement of the Sunnah. It is not a case of the western system being found in the Madrasah by Mufti Taqi, having been introduced decades before he was even born. The reality is that he organized the displacement of the Sunnah to establish the kuffaar system. The *Tashabbuh* is thus confirmed. He has introduced an evil practice. According to the Hadith, the one who initiates an evil practice will have to bear the load of the sins of all those who adopt it.

The argument that eating from tables sitting on chairs has become the norm, hence the element of *Tashabbuh* has been eliminated, is absolutely corrupt. It is totally unexpected of an Aalim of the Deen who has genuine love for the Sunnah and conscious of his obligations to Allah Ta'ala to utter such a corrupt '*daleel*'. Firstly, in so far as the Madaaris are concerned, there is no norm of tables and chairs. To this day the Sunnah of the floor is the sacred

norm. So when Mufti Taqi introduced the kuffaar system of tables and chairs, he did not act in consonance with the 'norm'. There was no norm of tables and chairs in the Madaaris, nor is there such a norm today, except in some liberalized western boot-licking institutions. On the contrary, he perpetrated the act of kufr of displacing the 14 century Mubaarak Sunnah of Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) which was and still is the norm of the Ummah, especially in Deeni institutions and in the homes of the People of the Deen.

Thus, the act of introducing tables and chairs by Mufti Taqi was not merely adopting a norm – a non-existent norm . It was the ignominious and haraam displacement of the Sunnah.

In his corrupt fatwa, Mufti Taqi states: *“Eating from a table is per se (fi-nafsihi) permissible. According to the Shariah it is not prohibited because there is no daleel (for the prohibition). Similarly, eating from tables sitting on chairs is not even contrary to the Sunnah.”*

In addition to this argument having no Shar'i validity, it is baseless and corrupt. *Fi-nafsihi* this practice is prohibited since it is in conflict with the Sunnah. It displaces the Sunnah. It is a preference over and above the Sunnah. It is the custom of the Yahood and Nasaara. It is *Tashabbuh* with them. It is contrary to the more than 14 century practice of the Ummah. It was the custom of Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam), of all the Ambiya (Alayhimus salaam), of the Sahaabah, of the Auliya, of the Ulama and

of the entire Ummah. It is the practice of the *mutakabbireen* (the proud ones).

If these facts are not adequate for the understanding of an Aalim, then there is an imperative need for him to engage in deep introspection for the examination of the health of his Imaan, and to detect and eliminate the disease of emulating the kuffaar.

The averment that the kuffaar system of tables and chairs is not in conflict with the Sunnah because of the idea that it is not a Sunnatul Muakkadah act, is palpably baatil. It is erroneous to assign the Sunnah system of eating to the class known as Sunnat-e-Aadiyah. The Sunnah system is the only system of the Ummah, and it has been such a system since the age of Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam). At no stage in Islam's history was it abandoned and substituted with any kuffaar system. The illustrious authorities of the Shariah have upheld it as the Sunnah and any other system as bid'ah and contrary to the Sunnah.

Furthermore, as mentioned earlier, the issue does not centre around the classification of this Sunnah practice of the Ummah. The issue is the displacement of the 14 century Sunnah of Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) and its substitution with the custom of the Yahood and Nasaara enemies of Islam.

If there had been any system of tables and chairs of the Sunnah, then only would there have been some validity in the claim of it not being contrary to the Sunnah. However,

since the only system of this Ummah has been the Sunnah of the floor, it is utterly baseless to say that the kuffaar system of tables and chairs is not contrary to the Sunnah. The significance and importance of this system confirm that it is a Sunnatul Muakkadah or Sunnatul Huda custom.

Mufti Taqi states that an act which Nabi (Sallallahu Alayhi wasallam) had executed as an ibaadat and which he had adopted with permanency, is Sunnatul Muakkadah, and abandonment of such an act or practising in conflict with it is abominable. He irrationally and without *daleel* excludes from this definition the Sunnah system of eating on the floor. Firstly, *Sunnatul Huda* is not restricted to acts of ibaadat, i.e. acts of ritual ibaadat. In the wider sense, all actions of Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) come within the ambit of ibaadat.

Using the miswaak is an act of ibaadat for which there is considerable thawaab. Its deliberate abandonment is sinful despite its Fiqhi classification of *Istihbaab*, and the Fuqaha have categorically ruled that denial of its Sunnah validity is kufr. Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) has made *muwaazabat* (i.e. practised permanently) on the miswaak, on washing the limbs thrice in Wudhu, on making masah of the whole head, and on many other acts which are all part of the concept of Sunnatul Huda despite their *Istihbaab* classification. Abandonment of these *Mustahab* non-ibaadat acts (i.e. not being ritual acts of ibaadat) for no valid reason, is not permissible. Therefore excluding the Sunnah system from Sunnatul Huda is baseless and corrupt.

The chicanery of employing technicalities, and that too incongruently, does not rescue Mufti Taqi from the predicament he has cast himself into – the vile predicament of substituting the Sunnah of Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) with the system of the Yahood and Nasaara.

Proffering another corrupt contention, Mufti Taqi says: “*If a mubah (permissible) method is adopted, it will not be said that it is in conflict with the Sunnah.*”

The very first premiss, a *mubah tareeq*, is baseless. The kuffaar system is not *mubah*. On the contrary it is *haraam*. It is in conflict with the permanent Sunnah system. It is a displacement of the Sunnah. There is no *mubah* substitute for the Sunnah system of the floor just as there is no *mubah* substitute for the Sunnah system of *Thabah* (slaughtering animals). The Shar’i system of *Thabah* despite not being a ritual act of Ibaadat, cannot be substituted with any other system even if the fundamentals of *Thabah* are fulfilled. It is *baatil* to claim that the Sunnah system of *Thabah* is not among the Sunan Huda. The same argument applies to all Sunnah practices which have been adhered to with constancy from the time of Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam).

Another example is the Islamic system of burial, and carrying the Janaazah. This system may not be abandoned nor is abstention permissible without valid reason despite this system not being a ritual act of ibaadat. But in the wider meaning of the Shar’i concept, it is in fact ‘ibaadat’,

and it cannot be excluded from the Sunan Huda. Substituting this Sunnah system with any other system will be haraam despite the objective of internment underground being achieved by some kuffaar system as well. In brief, all systems of the Sunnah come within the purview of Sunan Huda, hence are Sunnatul Muakkadah, abandonment of which is sinful. The sin is aggravated if the Islamic system is abandoned for the sake of a kuffaar system which is preferred over and above the Sunnah custom. It is for this very reason that Hadhrat Maulana Ashraf Ali Thanvi (Rahmatullah alayh) says that stunning animals prior to slaughter is tantamount to kufr regardless of the fundamentals of *Thabah* being executed.

While arbitrarily attempting to relegate the Sunnah eating system to the *Sunnat-e-Aadiyah* category, Mufti Taqi abortively struggles to bolster his claim with a Hadith. It should be understood that the Fiqhi terms of *Sunnatul Muakkadah*, *Sunan Huda*, *Sunnat-e-Aadiyah*, etc. did not exist during the age of Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) and the Sahaabah. These juridical terms were coined much later. The attempt to substantiate the contention of the system being Sunnat-e-Aadiya with the Hadith of Hadhrat Anas (Radhiyallahu anhu) is therefore baseless and corrupt.

The attitude and practice of the Sahaabah were to give practical expression to every order, practice and method of Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) regardless of the classification of the ahkaam a century or so later.

In fact, the Hadith of Hadhrat Anas (Radhiyallahu anhu) confirms that eating on the floor was the permanent practice of Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam). In presenting this Hadith, Mufti Taqi has in fact negated his corrupt view. In the Hadith, Hadhrat Anas (Radhiyallahu anhu) says: “*Nabi (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) never ate from a table....*” Mufti Taqi cites this Hadith in the attempt to show that abstention of Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) from something does not necessarily mean that *hurmat (prohibition)* is the consequence of such abstention.

It is mentioned in the Hadith of Hadhrat Anas (Radhiyallahu anhu):

“*Nabi (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) never ate from a table nor from small plates nor was bread with fine flour prepared for him..... Qataadah was asked: ‘On what would Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) eat?’ He said: ‘On a dastarkhaan.’ (i.e. on a cloth which was usually of leather).*”

It has not been contended by anyone that every abstention of Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) signifies *hurmat (prohibition)*. For the confirmation of *hurmat* there will be other factors. Rasulullah’s abstention from fine/sifted flour does not signify prohibition because the Sahaabah and the Salafus Saaliheen during the era of *Khairul Quroon* consumed such bread. Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) had abstained from wearing trousers. His permanent garment was the *izaar (lungi)*. Wearing trousers is not prohibited on the basis of this abstention of Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) for the simple

reason that the Sahaabah and the Ummah after them had always worn trousers. There was no stricture from Rasulallah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) or the Sahaabah to indicate *hurmat*.

However, as far as eating on the floor is concerned, it has always been the only custom of Rasulallah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam), the Sahaabah and the Ummah of every era. The virtues of eating on the floor from a dastarkhaan have been stated in the Hadith. The illustrious Ulama of all ages have condemned the kuffaar system labelling it Makrooh Tahreemi and bid'ah. The prohibition is not based solely on abstention by Rasulallah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam). The prohibition of the kuffaar system of eating is not proclaimed solely on the basis of the Hadith of Hadhrat Anas (Radhiyallahu anhu). The variety of *dalaa-il* for substantiating the prohibition is the subject of the discussion in this treatise.

There is no basis and no proof for Mufti Taqi's corrupt view in the Hadith of Hadhrat Anas (Radhiyallahu anhu). Grossly misinterpreting this Hadith, Mufti Taqi says:

“Therefore, even though this method, i.e. eating on the floor from a dastarkhaan is close to the Sunnah, better and a cause for barkat and good fortune, and in normal circumstances it should not be abandoned without valid reason, however, if for some reason this method (of the Sunnah) is omitted and another mubah (permissible) method adopted, then it may not be labelled as makrooh and not permissible. Hence the prevalent custom of tables and chairs is not even makrooh.”

In proffering this weird argument, Mufti Taqi has degenerated from the sublime to the ridiculous. In brief, he has disgorged bunkum. The juxtaposition of this averment with both the *zaahiri* and *baatini* dimensions of the Deen demonstrates the incongruities with which this statement is riddled. Firstly, Mufti Taqi alleges that the method of sitting on the floor and eating from a dastarkhaan in the style of Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) is “*close to the Sunnah*”. Now what is the Sunnah method if this method is “close to the Sunnah”? Is there some other Sunnah method practised by Nabi-e-Kareem (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) and the Sahaabah? If yes, it devolves on Mufti Taqi to present that method.

The reality is that there is no other Sunnah method besides the method of eating from a dastarkhaan on the floor. The allegation of the one and only Sunnah method being “close to the Sunnah” is ludicrous. It is like saying 10 is close to 10, or Makka is close to Makka. It will be proper to say that 9 is close to 10 and Azeeziyah is close to Makkah. Thus, the absurdity of saying that sitting on the floor to eat is “close to the Sunnah” is quite evident.

Secondly, the Mufti Sahib says that the Sunnah method is “*better and a cause for barkat and good fortune*”. Unequivocally it can be said that tables and chairs are bereft of the goodness, blessings and *sa-aadat* (*good fortune*) with which Allah Ta’ala has endowed the system of Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam). Now what will induce a senior Mufti who is the head of a sacred

Darul Uloom established by his august father, Hadhrat Mufti Muhammad Shafi (Rahmatullah alayh), to displace the *Mubaarak* and *Waaajib* Sunnah system and substitute it with the *mal-oon* system of the Yahoood and Nasaara who are avowed enemies of Islam? What induces a senior Aalim to degenerate to this extremely low ebb of bootlicking? To say the least, is it intelligent and valid to eliminate the Sunnah system of the Ummah for replacing it with the system of the kuffaar? Every Muslim who acts according to Rasulullah's command: "*Seek a fatwa from your heart*", will understand the villainy which Mufti Taqi has perpetrated. Instead of defending and preserving the Sunnah, he flagrantly kills the Sunnah and commits the greater crime of defending and justifying the abomination which has been installed at his Darul Uloom.

Being enamoured by the false and satanic glitter of the West, Mufti Taqi deemed it appropriate to spurn the *barakaat* and *sa-aadat* which Allah Ta'ala so munificently offers the Mu'mineen who adopt the Sunnah of Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam).

Thirdly, Mufti Taqi advises: "*in normal circumstances it should not be abandoned without valid reason*". He concedes that omission of the Sunnah should be only in abnormal circumstances. What were the abnormal circumstances prevailing specifically in his Darul Uloom to necessitate and constrain expungement of the Sunnah system?

The only silly reason tendered by him to justify the unholy and kufr displacement of the Sunnah and the introduction of the kuffaar system is the hallucination of considerable money having to be spent to lift the dastarkhaans and effect the necessary cleaning. This reason displays imbecility of thinking, ludicrousness and the total bankruptcy of rational and Shar'i arguments to bolster his indefensible adoption of the kuffaar system which necessitated the eradication of the Sunnah system.

Assuming that there is some validity in the 'considerable cost' stupidity, there is no shortage of funds in the coffers of Darul Uloom Karachi which receives contributions of millions of dollars for even wasteful and unnecessary embellishment. Is it intelligent to assume that the relatively extremely little cost incurred to remunerate servants for clearing the dastarkhaans, will cast the Darul Uloom into financial straits?

If clearing the dastarkhaans entails 'considerable' cost, is the Sunnah so cheap and unimportant to justify withholding this necessary expenditure and to rather discard such an important Sunnah system whose *barkat and sa-aadat* Mufti Taqi concedes? It is satanic niggardliness for a multi-billion dollar institution to refuse paying the pittance to servants for clearing dastarkhaans in the endeavour to uphold and honour the Sunnah system of Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam).

Furthermore, if the niggardliness cannot be overcome due to the attitude of insignificance and disdain (*Istikhfaaf*)

displayed by Mufti Taqi, then it will be salutary for him to visit the Haramain Shareefain during Ramadhaan to learn how thousands of dastarkhaans are cleared in a matter of six or seven minutes – dastarkhaans on which tens of thousands of people have their Iftaar with a big variety of edibles. And, this clearing process does not cost even a dollar.

If clearing the dastarkhaans from the floor entails ‘considerable’ cost as Mufti Taqi wishes people to swallow his myth, does clearing the table cloths from the kuffaar tables and chairs not involve similar cost? Or, are all the table cloths left on the tables allowing the millions of flies to have their own feast on the waste of the left-overs?

If the cost factor has any validity- which of course is a huge LIE – then the students themselves should clear the dastarkhaans. They should appreciate the value and thawaab of engaging in a little menial work as done by the students of other Madaaris who all sit on the floor.

We also advise Mufti Taqi to visit Darul Uloom Deoband, Mazaahirul Uloom in India and other large Madaaris elsewhere to learn how they cope with the Sunnah system.

The truth of the matter is that it is not the cost factor nor any inconvenience whatsoever which constrained the kufri displacement of the Sunnah system and the adoption of the kuffaar system. The determinant for embracing the kuffaar system is inferiority complex which has enamoured the western systems to the ulama of the darul uloom.

Colonized brains – colonized by the West – have induced the commission of the dastardly satanic act of eradicating the Sunnah for the sole objective of substituting it with the system of the Yahood and Nasaara. About these enemies of Islam, Allah Ta’ala states:

“O People of Imaan! Do not take the Yahood and Nasaraa as friends. They are friends amongst themselves. Whoever from among you (Mu’mineen) befriends them, then verily he is of them. Verily, Allah does not guide a transgressing people.”

Numerous Qur’aanic verses and Hadith narrations forbid emulation of the kuffaar. It is not permissible for Muslims to abandon Sunnah systems for the sake of adopting kuffaar practices and customs.

Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) had predicted that the time will dawn when Muslims will follow the Yahood and Nasaara right into the “*lizard’s hole*” in a drunken stupor of emulation, and this process of mental serfdom displayed by most ulama of this era has resulted in the elimination of Islamic and Sunnah systems in an incremental process of the erosion of the *ahkaam* of the Shariah.

It is most lamentable that the pernicious shaitaani process of erosion of the Deen is being spearheaded by muftis from the institutions which are supposed to be the headquarters and bastions of the Sunnah. In this context can the

following prediction of Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) be well understood:

“Soon shall there dawn an age when nothing will remain of Islam but its name. Nothing will remain of the Qur’aan, but its text. The Musaaqid will be ornamental structures bereft of guidance. The Ulama will be the worst of the people under the canopy of the sky. From them will percolate fitnah, and this fitnah will rebound on them”.

This is the predicted fate which has overtaken and overwhelmed Darul Uloom such as the madrasah of Mufti Taqi.

In another puerile attempt to justify the displacement of the Sunnah and the adoption of the kuffaar system, Mufti Taqi abortively argues that one of the reasons why Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) did not use a table for eating, was the unavailability of tables. He argues that since tables were not the prevailing custom, Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) did not use it. He implies by this stupidity that if tables had been available, Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) would have ate from them.

This is another example of degeneration into ludicrousness. The fact that tables are mentioned in the Ahaadith and that this specific Hadith of Hadhrat Anas (Radhiyallahu anhu) negates the use of tables, and for which the reason is palpable, the argument of Mufti Taqi is devoid of Shar’i substance. Although Mufti Taqi cites the two prime reasons proffered by the Mufasssireen for Rasulullah’s abstention from using tables for food, he (Mufti Taqi)

conveniently overrides these reasons with the stupidity of unavailability of tables. He does concede the following facts:

- 1) The actual reason (i.e. for abstention) is that Rasulallah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) for several reasons and wisdoms had adopted a life of zuhd (abstinence), qanaa-at (contentment) and simplicity. For these reasons Rasulallah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) did not use tables.
- 2) The second reason (for abstention) is that frequently the use of tables is motivated by takabbur (pride).

Although it is quite obvious that these were the reasons for not using tables, Mufti Taqi harps on an unsubstantiated opinion. There is no corroboration for this opinion in the Hadith. On the contrary, the first two reasons proffered by the Mufasssireen are confirmed by Rasulallah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) who said: *“I eat like a slave.....”*

He further convolutes this irrational opinion with his averment that since the tables were of copper, they were too cumbersome to handle. Two men were required to lift a table. Ignoring the real rationale for eating on the ground, Mufti Taqi latches on to this ridiculous opinion. Its absurdity is self-evident.

Mufti Taqi argues that the Hadith of Anas (Radhiyallahu anhu) does not confirm prohibition. It has not been contended that the prohibition of eating from tables is reliant on the Hadith of Hadhrat Anas (Radhiyallahu anhu). The Hadith is presented merely to corroborate and add

emphasis to the prohibition of adopting the kuffaar system. In the case of Mufti Taqi's Madrasah, the introduction of the kuffaar system has special notoriety. Its abomination is aggravated by the displacement of the Sunnah system. There was no vacuum to fill for facilitating the eating process of the students. The kuffaar system was brought in to displace the Sunnah system.

Mufti Taqi further argues on the basis of the Hadith of Hadhrat Anas (Radhiyallahu anhu) that just as this Hadith mentions Rasulullah's abstention from tables, so too does it mention his abstention from eating bread of fine flour and eating from small plates. In terms of this convoluted logic, he implies that those who claim tables are haraam/bid'ah/ in conflict with the Sunnah, should likewise prohibit fine flour and eating from plates.

If a jaahil layman argues in this fashion, it will be understandable. But for a senior Mufti to acquit himself so irrationally is unexpected. There are *dalaa-il* for the permissibility of eating bread made of sifted flour and also for small plates. The strongest *daleel* for this permissibility is the irrefutable fact that the Sahaabah, Fuqaha and Auliya did not criticize it even if they abstained from such luxuries because of their *Zuhd (abstinence and austerity)*. On the contrary, the kuffaar system of tables has been criticised and condemned as bid'ah and haraam by innumerable Ulama of all ages.

In another abortive attempt to justify the displacement of the Sunnah system to substitute it with the kuffaar system,

Mufti Taqi mentions the following Hadith, also of Hadhrat Anas (Radhiyallahu anhu):

“Qataadah said: ‘We used to come to Anas Bin Maalik (and according to the narration of Ishaq, the cook of Anas would be standing). In the narration of Daarmi his khwaan (table) was present. One day Anas said: ‘I do not know if Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) had ever seen bread made of sifted flour or a whole roasted goat.’”

On the basis of this narration, Mufti Taqi laboriously argues:

“From this Hadith the use of a khwaan (table), bread of sifted flour and roasted goat by Hadhrat Anas (Radhiyallahu anhu) is confirmed – things which Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) never used in his entire life. It is therefore known that Rasulullah’s abstention from using a table is not a proof for its prohibition or for it being Makrooh.”

It is firstly erroneous to conclude on the basis of this Hadith that Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) had never eaten roasted meat or bread from sifted flour. There are other narrations which confirm that Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) did consume roasted meat. Furthermore, the Sahaabah freely partook of roasted meat and bread from sifted flour. The consumption of these foods was not in emulation of any kuffaar style. There is not a single authority in the history of Islam who had ever hinted that eating roasted meat or bread from sifted flour was reprehensible in the slightest degree. Not even the

noble Sufi Auliya who are famed for their rigorous austerity and abstention from luxuries and comforts had ever hinted that these foods are in conflict with the Sunnah. There never existed the slightest dispute in the history of Islam on these foods.

No one in the history of Islam has ever sought a fatwa on the permissibility of eating roasted meat and bread of sifted flour. It never ever was an issue. But eating from tables, and further aggravating it by sitting on chairs at tables is entirely a different issue. Eating from tables whilst sitting on the ground, i.e. not sitting on chairs in western kuffaar style, is a hotly disputed practice in this belated era in close proximity to Qiyaamah. There is absolutely no doubt that the Sunnah system is to have the food on the floor. The dastarkhaan, food and the eater all have to be on one level on the ground. This is the permanent Sunnah practice of Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam), the Sahaabah, the Taabi-een and the entire Ummah until recent times. In this current era liberals are attempting to scuttle the Culture of the Sunnah by clinging to rarities at the peril of jettisoning their Imaan.

Mufti Taqi states in his article, Issuing Fatwa on the Ruling of another Math-hab: “Imaam al-Awzai’i said: ‘Whoever adopts the rarities of the ulama has left Islam.’ Hafiz al-Dhahabi said: ‘Whoever chases the concessions (i.e. the easiest positions) of the madhabs and the slips of the mujtahids, then indeed his religion has become brittle, as al-Awzaa’i and others said.....he has gathered all evil.”

To bolster the haraam practice of the western kuffaar at the expense of displacing the 14 century Sunnah system, Mufti Taqi is guilty of the crime mentioned by Imaam Auzaa'i (Rahmatullah alayh) and numerous other illustrious authorities of the Deen, and which he himself records in his article. Thus, citing the rarity of the 'table' mentioned in the narration of Hadhrat Anas (Radhiyallahu anhu) brings Mufti Taqi within the purview of the grave stricture stated by Imaam Auzaa'i and numerous other Fuqaha.

In like manner, Mufti Taqi has baselessly attempted to support the displacement of the Sunnah style from his Madrasah with a statement of Imaam Ghazaali who said that raising the food on a *maa-idah* (a raised floor-table) is not prohibited. This citation by Mufti Taqi is baseless because:

- a) Imaam Ghazaali's view on this issue is among the unacceptable rarities which is not supported by the Fuqaha of any age.
- b) It is a view which is in conflict with the Sunnah.
- c) Imaam Ghazaali does not deny the Sunnah system.
- d) Imaam Ghazaali's view does not advocate displacement of the Sunnah for the sake of adoption of the system of the Yahood and Nasaara.
- e) Imaam Ghazaali's view pertains to only the *maa-idah*, NOT to tables and chairs which are the specific practice of the western kuffaar.
- f) The *maa-idah* is not a western-style table which stands high above the ground, making sitting on the floor to eat impossible.

- g) The *maa-idah* precludes the use of chairs. Therefore it necessitates eating whilst sitting on the ground, not on chairs.
- h) There is no resemblance between the *maa-idah* and the western style of the high table and chairs.
- i) Even the use of the *maa-idah* does not cancel the system of sitting on the floor to eat.
- j) Mufti Taqi did not introduce the *maa-idah* style. He displaced the Waajib Sunnah system with the kuffaar system thereby emulating the Yahood and Nasaara right into the “*lizard’s hole*” as predicted by Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam). On this issue he did not even practice on the rarity which one could erroneously hallucinate as a ‘concession’. Furthermore, a rarity or a concession may not be adopted for displacing the Sunnah system. It is a temporary measure necessitated by valid cause. There is no valid reason for having displaced the centuries old Sunnah system from the Madrasah.

Thus, the difference between what Imaam Ghazaali (Rahmatullah alayh) said, and the evil displacement of the Sunnah perpetrated by Mufti Taqi at his Madrasah is like the difference between Jannat and Jahannam.

The attempt to extravagante capital from the Hadith of Hadhrat Jaabir (Radhiyallahu anhu) is baseless just as the attempt to extract support from the Hadith of Hadhrat Anas (Radhiyallahu anhu). Mentioning the Hadith, Mufti Taqi says: “*Salaam Bin Miskeen said: ‘I went to Jaabir Bin Zaid who was eating from a khwaan of khalanj (a type of timber).’*”

It is not necessary that the '*khwaan*' mentioned here was a raised platform such as a small raised floor-table or bench. It is possible that the '*khwaan*' was a timber board placed flat on the ground. And, if it was a slightly raised platform which is also described as *maa-idah*, it never was a high western table necessitating eating by sitting on chairs in western style. Hadhrat Jaabir (Radhiyallahu anhu) sat on the floor eating from the '*khwaan*', and this too is a rarity, not the norm of the Sunnah. There is no basis in this narration for displacing the Sunnah system for the sake of adopting the system of the Yahood and Nasaara.

The use of the term 'table' to describe the *maa-idah* or the *khwaan* is a deception. It seeks to give validity to the western style of sitting on chairs and eating from high tables whereas the *maa-idah/khwaan* necessitated sitting on the floor. The deception is therefore palpable.

It is therefore absolutely baseless to argue tables and chairs on the basis of *maa-idah*, *khwaan*, roasted meat and sifted flour. The presence of a table in the home of Hadhrat Anas (Radhiyallahu anhu) may not be cited as a '*daleel*' for the permissibility of displacing the Islamic/Sunnah system for the kaafir system nor is there any *daleel* for adopting the kuffaar system of tables and chairs in the Hadith of Jaabir (Radhiyallahu anhu) or in the isolated, rare view of Imaam Ghazaali (Rahmatullah alayh) for the reason explained above.

Rasulullah's abstention from using a *khwaan*, contrary to Mufti Taqi's idea, is in fact the basis for the Sunnah system of eating which the Ummah has clung to for the past more than fourteen centuries. This is such an abstention which constitutes a valid daleel, hence the firm adherence of the Ummah to the Sunnah style, and the denunciation of tables and chairs by the Ulama of the Ummah.

Arguing abortively in the attempt to negate the element of *Tashabbuh bil kuffaar*, Mufti Taqi says: "*It is appropriate to clarify here that generally with regard to eating from tables, etc. it is said to be the style of aliens (i.e. kuffaar), hence it is emulating the fussiaaq and kuffaar. However, this was valid when the use of tables, etc. were specific with the Yahood and Nasaara.....*

However, now during our age this practice has become so universal even among Muslims that it is no longer associated specifically with any nation or religion. Therefore, now it cannot be prohibited on the basis of Tashabbuh, moreover, when the intention for using tables, etc. is not to emulate aliens"

The universality of the western practice among the juhala (the ignorant masses) does not justify the displacement of the Sunnah system from a Darul Uloom which is supposed to be a Beacon of the Sunnah. Shaving the beard is a universal practice among Muslims. Standing and urinating has also become universal, hence standing urinals have been installed by the thousand at Arafaat, Mina, etc. to enable the Hujjaaj to relieve themselves in the style of

western donkeys. It does not behove a Darul Uloom to seek guidance and daleel from practices of the *awaamun naas*.

A Darul Uloom has to incumbently act in accordance with Rasulullah's Command:

“Whoever adheres to my Sunnah at the time of the corruption of my Ummah will receive the reward of a hundred shuhadaa’.”

The Ulama are not expected to make taqleed of the *awaamun naas*. If an anti-Sunnah practice has become universal among the ignorant masses, it is not expected of Ulama and of people who love the Sunnah to present such universality of the ignorant masses as *daleel* for the abandonment and displacement of the Sunnah. In the first place, it is the obligation of the Ulama to condemn the introduction of kuffaar practices from the very inception, and not wait for these evil practices to become rampantly prevailing in the Muslim community.

If ‘universality’ is a valid *daleel* for abandoning Islamic practices and Sunnah customs, then the very same fate which the Shariah of Nabi Musaa (Alayhis salaam) and the Shariah of Nabi Isaa (Alayhis salaam) have suffered will befall the Shariah of Muhammadur Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam). ‘Universality’ is a creeping disease. It is a cunning trap of Iblees. With this creature he gradually erodes the Sunnah, desensitizes the Ulama and entrenches the kuffaar systems in the Muslim community at the cost of killing off the Sunnah custom.

Most Ulama today are blind to this evil, creeping disease. To provide justification for their own weakness which constrains them to participate in the kuffaar customs, these Ulama monotonously proffer the corrupt argument of the kuffaar practice having become *aam (universal)*. Such mentality is most lamentable. Even senior Ulama display the lamentable spiritual malady of succumbing to the satanic creature of universality. Then they offer flabby opposition to the kuffaar custom.

The Qur'aan Majeed in praise of the deendaar people (the men of Taqwa) says: "*They do not fear the insults (and criticism) of those who insult.*" We fail to understand the claim of some senior Ulama regarding the universality of anti-Sunnah customs among the Sulaha. These Ulama say that when an initially haraam kuffaar practice becomes universal among the *awaam* and the *Sulaha*, then the element of *tashabbuh* no longer exists.

We do not understand if they have correctly understood the meaning of 'Sulaha' or 'Saaliheen'. The Sulaha do not adopt kuffaar practices. They do not substitute the Sunnah with the customs of the Yahood and Nasaara. One who does so cannot be from among the Sulaha. Whilst an abhorrent custom can become universal among the ignorant masses, it is never acceptable to the Sulaha. Outward appearance is not an adequate qualification for attaining the status of the Saaliheen. Any 'buzrug' who prefers the custom of the kuffaar, and displaces the practice of the Sunnah, cannot be a Saalih.

In these times when Islam has become forlorn and engulfed by the *fitan* of fisq, fujoor, bid'ah and kufr which have become universal among Muslims all over the world, it is extremely moronic, to say the very least, to dig for technicalities in the kutub to further weaken the Sunnah Culture of Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) and the Sahaabah. This is the age when the Darul Uloom has to compulsorily prevail on the Talaba to revive the Sunnah practices which the Ummah has murdered and banished for the sake of adopting kuffaar styles and systems. The massive problem with the Madaaris and the Ulama today is that they have become signs of Qiyaamah. Knowledge is being imparted to gain the dunya. Ilm is pursued for objectives other than the Deen. That is why there is the insistence on liberalizing and modernizing the Madrasah, and in this direction Mufti Taqi has committed the worst crimes.

The objective of a Darul Uloom must be only the Aakhirat, not the dunya. If the objective is to acquire worldly success, another path and profession should be chosen, not Ilm-e-Deen.

Even if an Islamic practice has been abandoned and a kuffaar system has become universal in the Ummah, it remains the obligation of the Ulama to be steadfast in *Amr Bil Ma'roof Nahy Anil Munkar*, and to constantly make the best endeavours to revive and re-introduce the Sunnah. It is satanic to become complacent with a kuffaar system which has displaced the Sunnah. It is this evil

complacency which has made acceptable to the Ulama at large the kuffaar system of slaughter – a system which is horrendous and in conflict with Islam’s system from the very beginning to the end, yet the molvis and sheikhs have becoming so desensitized that they now believe in the ‘superiority’ of the kuffaar system of slaughter which Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) described as *Shareetatush Shaitaan – The Slaughter of the Devil*.

Universality is the consequence of erosion, and erosion of the *ahkaam* and practices of the Sunnah is a gradual process which if not stemmed and halted will ultimately eliminate the entire Deen with its Sunnah Culture. When universal prevalence has displaced a Sunnah system, it devolves on the personnel of the Deen to vehemently combat the disease and to give practical expression to commands of Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) such as the Hadith pertaining to the reward of a hundred martyrs for adhering to Sunnah. However, instead of the Ulama fulfilling their obligation of protecting and reviving the Deen, they are nowadays flowing with the tide of fisq, fujoor, bid’ah and kufr under guise of the creature, ‘universality’ thereby perpetuating the satanic plot of erosion – erosion of the Sunnah and undermining the Deen.

It is unexpected of senior Ulama and Darul Uloom to fall by the wayside of jahaalat and to follow the juhala and the awaamun naas. Furthermore, the displacement of the Sunnah system at Mufti Taqi’s Madrasah and the adoption of the kuffaar system was an act in pure emulation (*Tashabbuh*) of the kuffaar. There was no prevailing

universality within the domain of his Madrasah nor in any other Madrasah of the world affiliated with Deoband. And, if any miscreant madrasah had adopted the kuffaar system, then it was the duty of Mufti Taqi to proffer Naseehat for the reinstatement of the Sunnah system. On the contrary, he boots out the Sunnah from his Madrasah to replace it with the system of the Yahood and Nasaara, then baselessly justifies it with the fallacy of universality.

In reiteration, for better understanding, it should be said that the permissibility of the *khwaan* mentioned in some kutub is not the kuffaar style of eating from high tables sitting at chairs in perfect emulation of the Yahood and Nasaara. The *khwaan* is on the ground and the people sit on the ground to eat, not on chairs. Therefore, the *khwaan/maa-idah* basis cited to justify the current tables and chairs system is a huge deception. Committing this deception, Mufti Taqi, conveniently refrains from mentioning ‘chairs’. In the many times he has mentioned ‘tables’ in his fatwa, he says: ‘*tables, etc.*’ What is this ‘*etc.*’? It refers to chairs, but he has avoided mentioning chairs to make the *Tashabbuh* less conspicuous. This is tantamount to concealment of the Haqq. There is no resemblance between the western table and the *khwaan/maa-idah* mentioned in the Hadith.

If the baseless ‘universality’ argument had to be accorded credence, and on its basis just forget about the massive erosion of the Sunnah Culture, then today in South Africa there would not have been any Muslims donning Sunnah attire and eating their food in Sunnah style. Almost all of

those in South Africa who have an Islamic appearance, eat on the floor, use Miswaak, etc. are ‘converts’ from modernism to the Sunnah. The efforts of the Akaabir Ulama of Deoband who had inspired us, as well as the efforts of the Tabligh Jamaat have, Alhamdulillah, brought about profound changes in our western way of life. If Mufti Taqi’s fallacies had to be adopted, then today Muslims in this country would have sunk further into the quagmire of westernization with its accompaniment of atheism, fisq and fujoor. This is the fate of Muslims in South America as well as in other countries where liberal views such as those promoted by Mufti Taqi have totally displaced all vestiges of the Sunnah to make way for the evil systems of the Yahood and Nasaara. It is indeed lamentable that a Darul Uloom which is supposed to produce Heirs and Representatives of the Ambiya (Alayhimus salaam) has accepted bootlicking of western modernity.

He also quotes from *Tuhfatul Ahwazi* without presenting the translation. The statement says: “*At-Turashti said: ‘Eating on the khwaan has always been the practice of the proudful affluent people and the practice of the arrogant oppressors so that they do not have to bend their heads at the time of eating.’*”

Just as the cross has always been the symbol of shirk and kufr of the Christians, so too has eating from a raised platform (khwaan or a table) been the feature and practice of the proud affluent oppressors. Just as the cross will never become permissible for Muslims on the basis of its universal adoption, so too will western tables and chairs for

eating never be acceptable for Muslims regardless of the element of universality. However, the factual position currently is that eating in western style is not the universal custom of the people who are outwardly of Deeni appearance. They eat on the ground in Rasulullah's style, and even wayward Muslims are incrementally adopting the Sunnah. In such a scenario it is extremely *bad-deeni (irreligious)* and evil to promote the western kuffaar style. The *ta'leem* should be in the direction of re-introducing and reviving the Sunnah.

Mufti Taqi's notion that the introduction of the style of the Yahoood and Nasaara at his Madrasah was for ease and better arrangement implies deficiency in the Sunnah. By implication this idea is kufr. It is an attitude of *ridha bil kufr (being pleased with kufr)* at the expense of denigrating the Sunnah. There can be no better system than any of the practices of the Sunnah. The very same haraam corrupt logic is utilized by the Carrion Clique such as SANHA and the MJC to halaalize carrion meat and chicken products. Since the kuffaar commercial system is designed to facilitate mass production, these unfortunate miserable halaal certificate vendors in pursuit of monetary objectives have not only halaalized the *Shareetatush Shaitaan* system, but believe in its superiority over the Divine System of Allah Azza Wa Jal. It is for this reason that Hadhrat Maulana Ashraf Ali Thanvi (Rahmatullah alayh) said that this attitude regarding the kuffaar slaughtering system is tantamount to kufr.

The displacement of the Sunnah system of eating by the Darul Uloom on the basis of the hallucination of the western system's easier and better arrangement is the effect of an attitude of kufr, for there can be no better and no easier system than the Sunnah.

The element of *Tashabbuh bil kuffaar* remains and this is the precise rationale for the displacement of the Sunnah system by Darul Uloom Karachi and for the introduction of the system of the Yahood and Nasaara. The authorities of this Darul Uloom should hang their heads in shame. Instead of promoting and entrenching the Sunnah, they are complicit in the destruction of the Sunnah.

The objective of the Fuqaha for classifying the Sunnah into *Sunan Huda* and *Sunan Zawaaid* was never for overriding any class of Sunan nor for giving preference to the systems and customs of the Yahood and Nasaara on the flappedoodle basis of hallucinated universality, nor to provide vindication for Molvis who maul, mangle and mutilate the Sunnah to overcome imaginary difficulties.

Furthermore, eating in the Sunnah style is not among the *Sunan Zawaaid* as is being peddled. It is the Sunnah system adopted by the entire Ummah since the age of Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam). It is an integral constituent of Islamic/Sunnah culture which cannot be substituted with a system of the Yahood and Nasaara. If it was as insignificant as today's molvis are peddling, the Ulama of all ages would not have vigorously promoted and defended it.

Abstaining from eating bread of sifted flour is rightly from the *Sunan Zawaaid*. Precisely for this reason, no one has ever imposed on the Ummah the need to abstain from such bread. But eating on the ground is entirely a different matter.

In the adoption of the style of the Yahood and Nasaara all three ways of Sunnah sitting are abandoned. The Sunnah methods of sitting are possible only when seated on the floor to eat. Furthermore, Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) ordered removal of shoes when eating. The technicality of the Fiqhi classification for this command does not detract from the importance and significance of the command. It may not stupidly be averred that removal of shoes when eating was among the Sunan Zawaaidh because this practice was imposed by Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) on the entire Ummah. It was not confined to himself.

The brains of some Ulama are disgustingly retrogressive and afflicted by the calamity of inferiority complex acquired from their colonial masters. Despite conceding the superiority of the Sunnah system, they still maintain baselessly that tables and chairs western style are permissible as a substitute for the Sunnah.

The view that sitting on the ground to eat is '*closer to the Sunnah*', is corrupt. If sitting on the floor is closer to the Sunnah, then with which other system is the comparison intended? Sitting on the floor is the *only* Sunnah. There is

no other system which could be described as ‘close’ to the Sunnah, which could validate the averment of ‘closer’ to the Sunnah. There is in fact only one Sunnah way, and that is to sit on the ground to eat. The western system is in conflict with the Sunnah. Labelling it permissible is a lamentable fallacy. There will be some sense in saying that sitting on the ground and eating from a *khwaan*, not a western table and chair, is ‘closer’ to the Sunnah, but to say that sitting on the ground and eating in the manner Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) ate is closer to the Sunnah, is moronic.

Hadhrat Mufti Muhammad Irshaad, Shaikhul Hadith of Madrasah Riyaadhul Uloom, states in his kitaab, *Shamaail-e-Kubraa*, which was endorsed by Hadhrat Mufti Nizaamuddin Shaamzai (Rahmatullah alayh):

“It is Masnoon for the food to be on a dastarkhwaan placed on the ground. This is close to Tawaadhu’ (humility). The system of aliens (Yahood and Nasaara) has become prevalent in our culture. It is indeed lamentable that its evil and detestability are not even perceived. On the contrary, it (the system of tables and chairs) is regarded as respectable and honourable, especially on wedding occasions. We seek Allah’s protection! *(In fact, even on Darul Uloom jalsah functions, tables and chairs are now in vogue in wedding style. We believe that the forerunner in this evil practice is Mufti Taqi’s Madrasah – Mujlisul Ulama)*. This Makrooh Bid’ah has become the custom.

The People of Imaan should have a vehement aversion for this system. Neither should one adopt this system nor

attend functions where this system (of tables and chairs) is observed because this is the custom of the *Mal-oon and Maghdhoob* nations of the Yahoood and Nasaara.

Nowadays affluent Muslims view as reprehensible to sit on the ground to eat. The system of aliens has substituted the Way of the Sunnah. *Al-Iyaaz Billaah!* To eliminate this evil system today is the equivalent of the reward of a hundred martyrs.

Eating from tables whilst sitting on chairs is Makrooh Tahreemi. Mullah Ali Qaari (Rahmatullah alayh) says that it is the way of the *mutakabbireen* (the proud and arrogant) and bid'ah. In *Kaukabud Durri*, Allaamah Gangohi (Rahmatullah alayh) said that since in our age there is also Tashabbuh with the Nasaaraa, hence it is Makrooh Tahreemi. *(NB The Tashabbuh with Nasaara is an added or and aggravating factor of prohibition. Even if this element is not present, the practice of tables and chairs being in conflict with the Sunnah and the way of the mutakabbireen, remains impermissible. – Mujlisul Ulama)*

Continuing with his exposition, Hadhrat Mufti Irshaad says:

“Waleemah is Sunnah and eating from tables and chairs is bid'ah. If the food is served in accordance with the Sunnah, then the *Masnooniyat* (Sunnah nature) of the Waleemah remains intact. However, if the function consists of makrooh and bid'ah factors, then accepting such an invitation and participating are prohibited. Nowadays in some places the food is consumed whilst standing. This is indeed despicable and prohibited. It is

forbidden to go to such places.” (End of Mufti Irshaad’s discourse)

Shaitaan spreads his snare with extreme cunningness. He erodes Imaani inhibitions to evil and sin by degrees. He gains entry into the fortress of Imaan by concentrating his attack initially on the external guard posts created by Allah Ta’ala for the protection of Imaan. These guard posts are the Mustahabbaat, Sunan Zawaaid and Aadaab which Mufti Taqi and the liberal ulama of this era are rubbishing off as factors of insignificance.

By degrees Shaitaan erodes Imaan. Today they have kicked out the Masnoon system of eating on the ground, and have adopted the impermissible kuffaar system of tables and chairs. Tomorrow, when the requisite degree of desensitization of Imaan has been achieved by the abominable creature of ‘universality’ which is a trap of Iblees, then eating like monkeys standing and prancing will become the style even in the Darul Uloom which have fallen prey to shaitaani inroads.

Some Ulama, awed by the creature of ‘universality’ and western modernity, issue fatwas with forked tongues. Whilst conceding and saying that if the element of *Tashabbuh* is present, then sitting on chairs and eating from tables is Makrooh Tahreemi, but in the absence of *Tashabbuh*, the kuffaar system is permissible. With such fatwas they are rendering Islam and the Ummah a great disservice. The obligation of the Ulama is to strengthen the bond which Muslims have with Allah Ta’ala. This is

possible only by the cultivation of Taqwa. And, minus strict observance of the Sunnah, the acquisition of Taqwa is an impossibility.

Therefore, even if a genuine Mufti, due to lack of insight and Imaani wisdom, believes that the Yahood and Nasaara system without the element of Tashabbuh is permissible, then too his *Imaani Ghairat* should constrain him from issuing a fatwa of permissibility thereby increasing the chasm between the servants and Allah Ta'ala. His obligation is to endeavour to increase the focus on the Aakhirah. Thus, even if he believes that in terms of his dalaa-il, the evil system is permissible, then too, without contradicting his view, he should promote Rasulullah's system and emphasize the utmost importance of observing the Sunnah.

It is intolerable that an Aalim of the Deen presents the flimsy front of *Sunan Zawaaid* to scuttle the Sunnah and to entrench the kuffaar system. Hadhrat Maulana Naeemuddin states in *Rajaal-e-Rashid*:

“Nowadays, following the ways of Europe, eating whilst standing and from tables and chairs is increasingly becoming the custom. If someone professes some Deeni concern, then an arrangement is made to eat from tables whilst sitting on chairs. In reality, both these ways are in conflict with the Sunnat. The objective is nothing but to display wealth and to emulate the people of the West.

For its permissibility, the excuse of need (dhuroorat) is presented whereas there is neither *dhuroorat* nor *majboori*. It is extremely lamentable that even deendaar people and Ulama participate in such functions. Thus, they become cause for permissibility for these functions.

Hadhrat Qaari Saheb never participated in such functions. If sometimes circumstances constrained him to be present, he would ensure that a separate arrangement is made on the ground for him. If such an arrangement could not be made, he would leave the function without eating. He frequently commented: *“If deendaar people and the Ulama abandon going to these functions, then perhaps the masses will become somewhat reformed. But, it is extremely painful to observe that these people (the deendaar ones and the Ulama) participating in these functions. Furthermore, they do not only participate, they present arguments for the permissibility of these functions (where eating is from tables and sitting on chairs).”*

He also mentioned that Shaikhut Tafseer, Hadhrat Maulana Ahmad Ali (Rahmatullah alayh) would never sit at a table to eat.”

Qaadhi Athar Mubaarak Puri (Rahmatullah alayh) narrates about Hadhrat Husain Ahmad Madani (Rahmatullah alayh):

“The captain of the ship had arranged an elaborate feast in honour of Hadhrat Madani. Numerous people had participated. Tables and chairs were beautifully arranged

and laden with food. When Hadhrat Madani went upstairs and saw the arrangement, he said: “I do not eat from tables and chairs.” Immediately on hearing this comment, the captain instructed the workers of the ship to remove the tables and chairs, and to arrange the food on the floor.”

Remember that any act of a senior which is in conflict with the Sunnah, should not be presented as an argument, regardless of his elevated status. The act of the Buzrug may not be presented in negation of or to water down the importance of the Sunnah of Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam). Therefore, Hadhrat Thanvi (Rahmatullah alayh) having sat once in his lifetime at a table with his legs drawn on to the chair, is not a *daleel* for permissibility, nor does it negate the Sunnah in any way whatever. The molvis of today attempt to awe and bamboozle the ignorant and the unwary with such rare acts of senior Ulama.

The effect of the fatwa of Mufti Taqi is entrenchment of the kuffaar system and minimization of the absolute importance and significance of the Sunnah system. Whilst innumerable Muslims from the laity are incrementally coming closer to the Sunnah, the corrupt fatwa of Mufti Taqi presents an obstacle in the revivification of the Sunnah – a revivification for which there is the reward of a hundred shuhadaa’.

We advise the Mufti Sahib to confine the technical discussion of Sunan Huda and Sunan Zawaaid to the Madrasah students. It should be restricted to the academic domain, and not miserably exploited to justify the

displacement of the Sunnah and the introduction of the system of the Yahood and Nasaara.

CONCLUSION

The Deen with all its practices and customs is for practical implementation. These practices and customs constitute the Sunnah of Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam). The classification of the Sunnah into categories is not a licence for omission and abandonment of any act of the Sunnah. Nowadays it has become common in Ulama circles to regard with insignificance such Sunnah practices which have been classified *Sunan Zawaaid*. These Sunnah acts are not superfluous. Notwithstanding the Fiqhi classification, it is incumbent to observe all acts of the Sunnah. Abstention without valid reason is not permissible.

The main charges against Mufti Taqi in this haraam fiasco are:

- **He has displaced the Sunnah system at his Madrasah.**
- **He has substituted the Sunnah system with the kuffaar system.**
- **To justify this travesty, he proffers flapdoodle arguments which have no relationship to the crime he has committed.**
- **Mufti Taqi did not find in his Madrasah tables and chairs to satisfy the hallucination of universality. The Madrasah did not have tables and chairs for eating purposes. The ‘universality’**

pertains to the ignorant masses on the outside. The switch to the kuffaar system was a new process set in motion by Mufti Taqi.

Muslims have two styles of eating. One is sitting on the floor with the food also on the floor on a dastarkhwaan. The other is to sit on chairs at a table. This is the system of the kuffaar whilst the former is the system of Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam). Which system should Muslims adopt? The fatwas of Muftis is not required to understand this issue. Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) said: *“Seek a fatwa from your heart.”*

Casting aside all the technicalities which are baselessly proffered to justify the kuffaar system, one has to only consult one’s conscience for guidance. Is it proper for a Muslim to abandon the system of Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam), and to substitute in its place the system of the Yahood and Nasaara? Look into your heart and seek a fatwa from it.

“And Allah guides whomever He wills.”
(Qur’aan)