


WOMEN IN MUSAAJID AND ISLAM



An article: THE MASAAJID AND MUSLIM WOMEN, written by Maulana/Sheikh Adam Moosa Makda of Zimbabwe, and distributed by the Zimbabwe Islamic Mission has just been brought to our notice. Perusal of the article convinced us of the harm and Imaani damage which the baatil views propounded by the author can cause to unwary Muslims. We have therefore considered it our Islamic duty to prepare this refutation of the baseless and un-Islamic exposition of the question presented by the modernist Maulana/Sheikh .

The Maulana/Sheikh has acted in violation of the Sunnah by having chosen a stand in opposition to the exhortation of Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam). Rasulullah(sallallahu alayhi wasallam) exhorted women to remain indoors and to perform their acts of Ibaadat in the innermost recesses of their homes. In direct contrast, the Maulana/Sheikh has deemed it appropriate and worthy of his position as an Aalim to ignore the wishes and exhortation of Nabi-e-Kareem (sallallahu alayhi wasallam). It has, therefore, become imperative for us to lay bare the facts and dispel the darkness which clouds the baatil opinions of the Maulana/Sheikh, which he sought to administer to the Ummah as facts of the Shariah. But, baatil shall be exposed and demolished by Allah Ta'ala. The Quran Majeed declares:

"In fact, We fling the Haqq against Baatil and it (Haqq) smashes

out its brains. Then, suddenly it (Baatil) perishes. And there is

Wail (Jahannum and destruction) for you on account of what you

***are blabbing."* (Surah Ambiyaa)**

THE MUJLISUL ULAMA OF SOUTH AFRICA

P.O. BOX 3393

PORT ELIZABETH 6056

SOUTH AFRICA

14 SAFAR 1409 26 SEPT. 1988

(Since the author is introduced as an "Aleem" of Nadwatul Ulama of Lucknow and a Sheikh of the Islamic University of Medina, we have described him with, the double title "Maulana/Sheikh". When one graduates at a Deeni Madaaris in India or Pakistan, one is known as a "Maulana", not as an "Aleem". "Aleem" is among the attributes exclusive to Allah Ta'ala).

THE SAHAABAH

The imperative need to follow the Sahaabah of Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) in understanding the Sunnah can never be over-emphasised. The Sahaabah of Nabi-e-Kareem (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) represent the pivot upon which the Wheel of Islam revolves. The Sahaabah are the fundamental basis, the foundations on which the super-structure of the Shariah

has been raised. The Sahaabah cannot be divorced from the Sunnah and vice versa. Without the reports, comments, interpretations and rulings of the Sahaabah it is not possible to understand the Qur'aan and the sacred utterances and practical acts of Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam).

In view of the pivotal and fundamental importance and indispensibility of the Sahaabah in relation to Imaan and Islam, Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) declared:

"Adhere compulsorily to my Sunnah and the Sunnah of my rightly -guided Khulafa."

"My Sahaabah are like the Stars (of Guidance). . . ."

In Muatta Imaam Maalik, the following Hadith appears: *"Verily, Allah Ta'ala gazed into the hearts of His servants and chose Muhammad whom He sent with His Message. Allah then gazed at the hearts of His servants and chose for Muhammad companions. Thus Allah made these Sahaabah of Muhammad the Helpers and the Ministers of the Deen. "*

Just as Allah Ta'ala has created the Sahaabah to be the first helpers and ministers of the Deen so too will He establish them as our leaders on the Day of Qiyaamah. Thus, Rasulullah {sallallahu alayhi wasallam) said: *"On the Day of Oiyaamah my Sahaabah will be raised as Leaders and as Lights for the people of the respec tive lands wherein they had died."*

Beacons of Light and Guidance they were here on earth and beacons of light will they be in the Aakhirah There is no Islam without the Sahaabah. There is no Ummah without them. No man or woman who claims to be an adherent of Islam can ever become indifferent to the Sahaabah. No Muslim can claim independence from these illustrious souls, these men of Imaan and Knowledge who adorned the firmament of Truth and Imaan. There are numerous exhortations and commands of Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) decreeing obedience to the Sahaabah. The few cited above will suffice for this concise refutation of the modernist's view that Islam permits women to participate in congregational acts of Ibaadah in public places.

It will be appropriate here to indicate the status which the Qur'aan-e-Hakeem confers to the Sahaabah. In one aayat, the Qur'aan states: ***"Believe like the people have believed "***.

In the tafseer of this aayat, the authoritative Mufasssireen say that the term, Naas (people) mentioned here refers to the Sahaabah. The high degree of the Imaan of the Sahaabah is declared by implication in this verse. Since they are our guides, the Qur'aan compels us to believe Iike the Sahaabah had believed. Our Imaan and our A'maal (deeds) have necessarily to be in the mould cast by the Sahaabah.

In another aayat, praising the Sahaabah, Allah Ta'ala says: ***"They (the Sahaabah) are the ones who have received guidance." "They (the Sahaabah) are those who have taken precedence and were the first (to accept Islam), among the Muhaajireen and Ansaar, and those who have followed with belief. Allah is well-pleased with them and they are well -pleased with Allah."***

Numerous verses in the Qur'aan Ma jeed extol the virtues and the lofty rank of the Sahaabah. However, this brief refutation of the baatil view regarding the permissibility of women going to

the Masjid propounded by men gone astray, does not require the enumeration of all the Quaraanic aayaat dealing with the Sahaabah and the imperative need for the Ummah to follow them.

THE BAATIL (BASELESS) VIEW

Sheikh/Maulana Adam Moosa Makda of Zimbabwe asserts that it is perfectly permissible for Muslim women to go to the Masjid for Juma' Salaat. In his pamphlet on this question, he presents his baatil view as follows:

"It is clear, therefore, that Muslim women have the undeniable right to attend congregational prayers in a Masjid. Based on this right of the Muslim women to participate in congregational Ibaadat and Taa'leem in a Masjid it becomes essential for every Masjid (Baitullah - The House of Allah) to provide equal but separate facilities for Muslim women to exercise their Islamic duties of IBAADAT and IMPROVING THEIR KNOW LEDGE OF ISLAM."

Let Sheikh/Maulana Makda tell us more about this "undeniable right" supposedly enjoyed by Muslim women. Since when has this supposed right been ordained? Did the Sahaabah have knowledge of this supposed "undeniable right"? Did the Aimmah-e-Mujtahideen have knowledge of this right? Did the Fuqaha of the Khairul Quroon era know of this "right" which Maulana/Sheikh Makda has sought to confer on Muslim women in this belated age of corruption, vice and immorality? If these august personalities and authorities of Islam had acknowledged this contended "undeniable right" of women to attend the Masjid, can the modernist bring forward his Shar'i proof? Without the slightest fear of contradiction we declare that never will anyone be able to prove on the basis of Shar'i evidence that women possess an undeniable right to attend the Masjid for Salaat or Ta'leem. The "undeniable right" which modernists seek to give Shar'i sanction is a figment of their imagination--an imagination belaboured with western influence.

THE SAHAABAH AND THE IMAGINED UNDENIABLE RIGHT OF WOMEN

If women did in fact enjoy any such undeniable right as the modernist contends, the Sahaabah would have been the first to have recognised it. It is inconceivable that the first set of Authorities of Islam, the direct students and disciples of Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) had failed to recognize the supposed right. It is absurd and blasphemous to even entertain the idea that the Sahaabah abrogated or ignored the asserted right inspite of having had knowledge of it Only Shiahs ore capable of piling such slander against the Sahaabah

The rulings and the practical example of the Sahaabah demon strate conclusively that women do not possess any undeniable right to execute acts of Ibaadaat in the Masjid. How can they ever possess such a right and how can men of intelligence ever confer to them such a right when the Qur'aan Majeed commands women: ***"And, remain glued inside your homes"***?

Is Sheikh/ Maulana Makda aware of the Sahaabah's attitude on this question? If he was. we are certain that he would not have ventured to put across such a baseless claim

--a claim which has absolutely no Shar'i sanction. Men of Knowledge should know what they are speaking about. They should be far-sighted. They must be alert and realize the consequences and implications of the statements they make in the name of the Shariah. The Shariah cannot be trifled with. It is not an object to be toyed with. It cannot be submitted to wishful thinking and battered about to eke out confirmation for personal opinion, whims and desires. Let us now see the attitude of the Sahaabah in regard to this right which Maulana/Sheikh Makda has innovated for women of this twentieth century.

Every Muslim knows or should know who Aishah {radhiallahu anha} was. Every Muslim woman who desires to follow the Sunnah of Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) will take cognizance of the ruling of Hadhrat Aishah (radhiallahu anha), the beloved wife of Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) and a great Faqeehah and authority of Islam. After all, there can be no woman living today who can ever hope to have a better understanding of this question than Hadhrat Aishah (radhiallahu anha). Can Maulana/Sheikh Makda claim that he has understood the question of women's Ibaadat congregationally outside the home better than what Hadhrat Aishah (radhiallahu anha) did? What is Aisha's view regarding the contended undeniable right?

In Muatta Imam Maalik the following narration appears: *"Yahya Ibn Saeed narrates from Umrah Binti Abdur Rahman that Aishah (radhiallahu anha) said: 'If Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) had observed that which women have now introduced (i.e. after the demise of Rasulullah), he would most certainly have prevented them from attending the Musjid just as the women of Bani Israeel were prevented.'" Yahya enquired: 'What, were the women of Bani Israeel prevented from the Musaaqid?' Umrah replied. 'Yes.'*

When Ameerul Mu'mineen Hadhrat Umar (radhiallahu anhu) finally enacted the prohibition to prevent women from going to the Musjid, they complained to Aishah (radhiallahu anha). Answering their complaint, Hadhrat Aishah (radhiallahu anha) said: "If Nabi (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) had known what Umar now knows (of the condition of women), he would not have granted you permission to emerge (i.e. to leave your homes and come to the Musjid for Salaat)." (Jaamiur Rumooz)

It is, thus, abundantly clear that Hadhrat Aishah (radhiallahu anha) did not recognize women to have any undeniable right to attend the Musjid. A permissible act restricted by numerous conditions--a permissible act which is discouraged even by the one who grants the permission--can not be interpreted as an undeniable right. If it was an undeniable right, the Sahaabah would have been the very first people who would have recognized the right. If women had enjoyed any such inviolable right as the modernist asserts, the Sahaabah would never have prohibited women from the Musjid. The very fact that such a prohibition was enacted by the Sahaabah—by the most senior Sahaabah—in the very age described as the noblest of ages by Rasulullah {sallallahu alayhi wasallam), is ample refutation of the baatil view propounded by the votaries of female emergence from the home. When the Sahaabah did not recognize the right about which the modernist speaks, then it is clear that the supposed undeniable right of women to attend the Musjid is a mere figment of the Sheikh's or Maulana's imagination. Arabi in his Sharh Tirmizi states:

"Aishah {radhiallahu anha} and Ibn Mas'ud {radhiallahu anhu} are of the opinion that women should be prevented from the Musjids and that they should necessarily cling to the dark corners of their home {when performing Salaat}."

Maulana/Sheikh Makda should not expect the Ummah to accept that he has understood this question better than Hadhrat Aishah (radhiallahu anha) or better than the Fuqaha of Islam. He must not assume that his personal interpretation of the ahadith pertaining to permissibility constitutes a basis for enacting a Shar'i mas'alah. His personal interpretation of the ahadith in question is utterly devoid of substance and can never be tendered for obtaining an abrogation of the rulings of the Sahaabah and Fuqaha. When one sets aside the authority of the Sahaabah, one is bound to drift far far from Seeraatul Mustaqeem. This is precisely what is happening to modernists who present their unbridled and unfounded interpretations in opposition to the interpretations and rulings of the Sahaabah -e -Kiraam. Aatikah (radhiallahu anha), the wife of Hadhrat Umar (radhiallahu anhu), explaining her reason for having discontinued her practice of attending the Musjid said: *"We used to come out when people were yet people."* (LaamiudDuraari)

Hadhrat Aatikah's attitude indicates that the practice of women attending Musjid was discontinued in the early stages of Islam. Amr Shaibaani narrates that he saw Hadhrat Abdullah Bin Mas'ud (radhiallahu anhu) expelling women from the Musjid on the Day of Juma'. (Majmauz Zawaaid). Hadhrat Ibn Mas'ud {radhiallahu anhu} was a top-ranking Sahaabi among those Sahaabah who were considered to be the Ulama. His action of expelling women from the Musjid was directed to achieve the complete discontinuance of the early practice of women visiting the Musjid. His action further refutes the claim that women possess the "undeniable right" to attend the Musjid.

Hadhrat Ibn Umar (radhiallahu anhu) would go to the extent of pelting women with pebbles on Fridays in his effort to prevent them from the Musjid. Hadhrat Umar, Hadhrat Ibn Mas'ud, Hadhrat Ibn Umar, Hadhrat Aishah (radhiallahu annum) and the Sahaabah in general firmly forbade women from the Musjid. How is it possible that these illustrious Sahaabah were unaware of the "undeniable right" of women to attend the Musjid supposed by Sheikh/Maulana Makda? It is abundantly clear from the statements and actions of the Sahaabah that women possess no such right as Sheikh/Maulana Makda imagines.

THE FUQAHA AND THE SUPPOSED UNDENIABLE RIGHT

Let us now study the views and the rulings of the great Faqaha (Jurists of Islam) on this question. These were men who followed the Sahaabah They lived in the Khairul Quroon, having obtained their Deeni Knowledge and training at the hands of the Sahaabah. Surely they possessed a better understanding of Islam and its teachings than all the Sheikhs and Maulanas of this age put together. Surely, they would have known about the existence of this "undeniable right" if it had in fact existed. What was their attitude to women emerging from their homes to attend the Musjid?

In An-Nihaayah it is said;

"Our Fuqaha, base the illegality of women attending the Masjid on the prohibition declared by Hadhrat Umar Ibn Khattaab (radhiallahu anhu). When he detected the mischief (fitnah which women had started to introduce) he forbade their emergence. "

Arabi in his Sharhut Tirmizi says:

"Sufyaan Thauri said: 'It is forbidden for women to emerge from their homes. Ibn Mas'ud (radhiallahuanhu) said that a woman is an object of concealment and when she emerges shaitaan lays in wait (to create fitnah). Imam Abu Hanifah and Ibn Mubarak also stated this ."

"Our Fuqaha have said so (i.e. it is not permissible for women to attend the Masjid) because in their emergence is the danger of fitnah."

Hadhrat Ibrahim Nakhi (rahmatullah alayh) prevented his womenfolk from attending the Masjid. In Nailul Autaar, the following narration appears:

"It (females going for the Eid Salaat) is forbidden. This has been narrated by Tirmizi on the authority of Thauri, Ibn Mubaarak. And, this is the view of Imaani Maalik Abu Yusuf. Ibn Qudaamah narrated it on the authority of Nakhi and Yahya Ibn Saeed Ansaari. "

Among the early Fuqaha there existed difference of opinion on the question of old women attending the Masjid. While some Fuqaha maintained that old women may come to the Masjid for certain Salaat, others averred that they may attend for all Salaats. However, regarding women who are of marriageable age, the ruling of prohibition is emphatic. The following ruling is recorded in Qudoori.

"It is forbidden for women to be present for Jama' (i.e. Salaat in the Masjid) However, old women may come for Fajr, Maghrib and Isha according to Imaani Abu Hanifah. According to Imaani Abu Yusuf and Imaani Muhammad it is permissible for them for all Salaats."

According to Imaani Maalik (rahmatullah alayh), the ahadith indicating permissibility apply to only old women. This is the view held generally by the early Fuqaha of Islam. However, the later Fuqaha expanded on the prohibition to include all women, even old women. In view of the deterioration in the morals of people and the rise of vice, the Fuqaha upheld the total prohibition of women attending the Masjid. Ibn Hajar (rahmatullah alayh) states:

"The summary of the discussion of Nawawi and also of what

Zarkashi has stated in his Ahkaamul Masjid is that when

intermingling with men prevails, whether in the Musjid or in the roads or there exists the danger of mischief because of women's adornment and displays of beauty, then it is forbidden for them to emerge . . . it is incumbent on the Imaam or his representative to prevent women from emerging."

Ibn Humaam (rahmatullah alayh) said:

"The Fuqaha-e-Muta-akh-khireen have stated that the prohibition includes young as well as old women. The prohibition applies to all the Salaats because of the prevalence of mischief."

Who can deny the existence of the worst types of mischief in our age? If anyone chooses to become blind and deny the existence of the evil so predominant in our times, let him peruse the following statement of Hadhrat Allaamah Aini (rahmatullah alayh) who lived in the eighth century of Islam:

"If Aishah(radhiallahu anha) could observe the innovations and evils which the women of this age (i.e. the 8th century) have introduced, her rejection (of women's attendance to the Musjid) would be more vehement. The interval between the time of Aisha's rejection of this practice (of females attending the Musjid) and Rasulullah's (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) demise is very little. The wrongs which the women during the time of Aishah(radhiallahu anha) had introduced were infinitesimal compared to the evils which they have introduced in this time (viz., the 8th century)."

This being the situation in those early days, what can we now say about these times of vice and immorality in which we find ourselves? Or shall we choose deliberate blindness and rhetorically argue away the reality of the age? Modernists assume that they are living in an age of purity, in an age akin to the age of piety of former times, hence they remain blind to the immorality surrounding them. They, therefore, clamour for the Musajjid to have a female attendance as well. But, the Sahaabah and the Fuqaha could not tolerate the practice of female attendance even in the best of ages, yet Sheikh/Maulana Makda seeks to overrule the Fatwa of the Ummah-the Fatwa which has existed in the Ummah for the past fourteen hundred years. He has lost his bearings. The prohibition of female attendance is stated as follows in Muheet:

"The ruling (Fatwa) is prohibition in all Salaats because of the appearance of mischief (fitnah) in this age."

The author of Al-Jauharah states :

"The verdict today is prohibition of women's presence (in the Musjid) for all Salaats because of the prevalence of mischief."

All authoritative Books of Islamic Law state the same view of total prohibition.

"Today, the Fatwa is on Prohibition (of women attending the Musjid)." (Allaamah Aini)

"Today women's emergence (to attend the Musjid) is totally prohibited." (Munazzal)

"The Fatwa today is that it is forbidden for women to attend the Musjid for all Salaats because of the appearance of fitnah." (Kaafi)

"The Fatwa today is the prohibition of female attendance for all Salaats because of the spread of fitnah." (Al-Kifaayah)

The Shaafi view is well stated by Sheikh Sulaiman Bujairmi (rahmatullah alayh) in Tuhfatul Habeeb Ala Sharhil Khateeb:

"Women should not attend (the Musjid) whether they are young or old for Jamaa-at because of the appearance of corruption Today the Fatwa is on total prohibition in all the Salaat."

In the statement, Jamaa -at is included Juma', Eid, Istisqa' and gatherings of lectures, especially the lectures of the juhhaal (ignoramus) who pretend to be Ulama while their motive is lust and the acquisition of the world. The following absolute prohibition is stated in Fataawal Kubra of Ibn Hajar Haitami (rahmatullah alayhi, an authority in the Shaafi Math -hab:

"... the statement of Ghazaali in Ihyaaul Uloom: 'It is obligatory to prohibit women from attending the Musjid for Salaat, for sessions of knowledge and for Thikr when there is the danger of fitnah as a result of them. Verily, Aishah (radhiallahu anha) forbade them. It was then said to her: Verily, Rasulallah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) did not forbid them from Jamaa-at She replied. If Rasulallah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) knew what the women have introduced after him, then most certainly, he would have prevented them.' Agreeing with it is the statement of Ibn Khuzaimah who is among our senior authorities: 'The Salaat of a woman in her home is superior to her Salaat in the Musjid of Rasulallah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam).

.. Now when her Salaat at home is superior then the object which brings her out of her home (to perform Salaat in a Musjid) is either pride or show and this is haraam.'

"There is unanimity regarding the prohibition of women going to the Musjid, Eid Salaat and visiting the graves because of the absence of the conditions of permissibility which had existed during the age of Nabi (sallallahu alayhi wasallam)..... This has been stated by Shaikh Taquiuddin Al Husni and Shaikh Alaauddin Muhammad Al Bukhaari who were two great Imaams

among the Mutaqaddimeen (the early Fuqaha)."

. . . That what these two Shaikhs have stated i.e. the Muftaa Bihi (the view on which the verdict is) in this age is on the prohibition of women's emergence. Only a dense man following

his lowly desires will not accept this, for verily, the rules change with the changing of the times. This is correct in terms of the Math-habs of the Ulama of the Salf and the Khalf." "Hajjatul Islam (Imaam Ghazaali)says in Al-lhya in the chapter dealing on Amr Bil Ma'roof: 'It is obligatory to prohibit women from attending the Musaaajid for Salaat and Thikr when fitnah in regard to them is feared ' In Anwaar it is said: It is waaajib to prohibit women from attending the Musaaajid for Salaat and Thikr when there exists the danger of fitnah.' The evils of their emergence today are established facts. . . . The correct view is that prohibition is absolute and the Fatwa is this (prohibition). This is the summary of our (Shaaf'i) Math-hab" (Fataawa Kubra of Ibn hajar Haitami)

From the discussion in the foregoing pages, the reader will understand that all authorities of Islam from the time of the Sahaabah never accepted women to have any undeniable right of attending the Musaaajid. Far from possessing any such right, the authorities have clarified that it is not permissible for women to even emerge from their homes since the Qur'aan Majeed forbids this. Allah Ta'ala says:

"And, remain inside your homes and do not make a display like the exhibition of the times of jaahiliyyah."

Such displays of jaahiliyyah and the resultant fitnah of immorality are today integral parts of society, Muslim society included. The slight departure from Piety and Hijaab which had commenced even in the very age of the Sahaabah constrained them to prohibit women from coming to the Musjid inspite of them being fully aware that women used to visit the Musjid during the time of Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam). However, since they detected the beginning of the process of corruption and they discerned the gradual abandonment of the very strict conditions which accompanied the original permissibility, the Sahaabah initiated this prohibition. Since Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) has commanded obedience to his Sahaabah and has described the Sunnah of his Sahaabah as his Sunnah, the prohibition enacted by the Sahaabah is in actual fact the Sunnah of Nabi-e -Kareem (sallallahu alayhi

wasallam) --it is the Law of Allah Ta'ala. This prohibition is a divine law which only men rabid with lust or dense in the mind will attempt to violate.

We have come a long long way since the era of the Sahaabah. The type of Hijaab (Purdah) or seclusion and separation between men and women practised by them will be described as madness by modernists of today. The most rigid Hijaab which we can conjecture in our minds in this age cannot compare with that degree of Hijaab which the Sahaabah had considered inadequate. This will emerge from the conditions of the initial permissibility which shall, Insha' Allah, be presented in the ensuing pages. Indeed, modernists and even the

modernist Maulana or Sheikh will shake their heads in disbelief and we dare say, ridicule the exceptionally strict conditions which accompanied the initial permissibility of women attending the Musjid during the time of Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam).

Maulana/Sheikh Makda having misinterpreted the ahadith concerning initial permissibility and

having entirely ignored the Muftaa Bihi (the official verdict) of the Ummah for the past fourteen centuries regarding this practice, audaciously proclaims that separate facilities for women be established in the Musaaajid. Indeed this teaching of the Maulana/Shaikh is obnoxious and baatil. It is a view which cannot be substantiated on any Islamic basis. It is purely the desire and un-Islamic opinion of the propounder of women's so-called liberation and emancipation from the so-called shackles of Hijaab which Allah Ta'ala has ordained for this Ummah.

Does the Maulana/Sheikh understand this question better than the Sahaabah, the Taabieen and the Tab-e-Taabieen who constitute the first and foremost authorities of the Shariah? Did these illustrious Sons of Islam introduce separate facilities in the Musaaajid to accommodate the initial permissibility which was in vogue during the blessed age of Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam)? Did the men whom Rasulullah {sallallahu alayhi wasallam} commanded the Ummah to obey and follow, bring about separate facilities inside the Musaaajid to accommodate the imagined undeniable right conjectured by the Maulana/Sheikh? Did the Sahaabah and the Fuqaha then not understand the value of Ibaadat and ilm for women? What, then was the action adopted by the Sahaabah and the entire Ummah thereafter?

Far from accepting the existence of the imagined "undeniable right" and far from instituting measures to accommodate this supposed right by the creation of separate facilities in Musjids for women, the Sahaabah and the authorities thereafter outrightly prohibited women from the Musaaajid. This was their answer to curb and eliminate the rise of corruption and evil which

was bound to ensue in the wake of entertaining the imagined "undeniable right" of women to visit the Musaaajid. It is, therefore, ludicrous for the Ummah to even entertain the un-Islamic advice tendered by the Maulana/Sheikh

WOMEN'S DUTIES OF IBAADAT AND KNOWLEDGE

Maulana/Sheikh Makda states in his pamphlet of deviation (Dhalaal) that separate facilities should be introduced in the Musaaajid so that women can *"exercise their Islamic right to admission to a Masjid for fulfilling their Islamic duties of Ibaadaat and improving their knowledge of Islam."*

It has already been explained that women have no such right of admission to a Masjid as the Maulana/Sheikh contends. His view is utterly baseless, having no Shar'i basis. He has mentioned women's "Islamic duties of Ibaadaat" in relation to their attendance of the masjid. What are these Islamic duties of Ibaadaat which they have to fulfil inside the Masjid? Can the votary of modernity enumerate these supposed duties of women in relation to the Masjid? The Shariah has not prescribed any acts of Ibaadaat for women for fulfilment in the Masjid. The question of such duties does not apply to women.

Islam does not impose on women Jamaa' Salaat. There is no obligatory Eid Salaat for them. Women are not required to participate in Jamaa' Taraaweeh Salaat nor are they required to execute I'tikaaf in the Masjid. Juma' Salaat is neither compulsory nor Sunnat for them. There is

not a single act of Ibaadat connected with a Musjid which has been imposed on women by the Shariah. When Islam does not impose any Musjid acts of Ibaadaat on women, then the claim of duties relative to the Musjid made by the Maulana/Sheikh is misleading and baatil. What constrains a Muslim to emphasise a course of action which Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) and his Sahaabah discouraged verbally and practically? What motivates a Muslim to take a stance in direct opposition to the exhortation of Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam)? For a short while let us forget about the technical rulings of the Fuqaha, Let us even cast a blind eye at the practical example of the illustrious Sahaabah Let us merely look at Rasulullah's (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) attitude and exhortation regarding the question of women's attendance of the Musjid. What were Rasul - ullah's {sallallahu alayhi wasallam) feelings on this question?

(1) Hadhrat Abdullah Ibn Mas'ud (radhiallahu anhu) narrates that Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) said;

"The Salaat of a woman in her bedroom is better than her Salaat in (another) room (of her house), and her Salaat in the innermost recess of her home is better than her Salaat in her room." (Abu Dawood)

(2) Imaam Ahmad Bin Hambal (rahmatullah alayh) narrates that Umm- e- Salmah (radhiallahu anha) said that Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) said:

"The best Musajjid for women are the dark est corners in their homes." (Umdatur Riaayah)

(3) Baihaqi narrates that Ibn Mas'ud (radhiallahu anhu) said:

"I take oath by the One Being that a woman has never performed a better Salaat than the Salaat she per forms in her room." (Umdatur Riaayah)

(4) Imaam Ahmad Bin Hambal and Tibraam record the Hadith of Umm- e- Humaid Sa'diyah who came to Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) and said:

" O Rasulullah! I love to perform Salaat behind you.' Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) replied: 'I am aware of it. But, your Salaat in the innermost recess of your house is better than Salaat in (other places) of your house....."

On the basis of this Hadith, Ibn Khuzaimah(rahmatullah alayh), a leading

member of the Shaaf'i Fuqaha stated:

"The Salaat of a woman in her room is superior than her Salaat in the Musjid of Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) even if her Salaat there be the equivalent (in quality) of a thousand Salaats performed by males." (Al-Fataawal Kubraa)

(5) Even in the ahadith which record the ini tial permissibility, Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) stated the best course for women. Thus, Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) said:

"Do not prevent your womenfolk from the Musjid, but their homes are best for them." (Sahih Muslim)

The permissibility stated in this Hadith shall, Insha'Allah, be explained later.

From the narrations mentioned above, it will be abundantly clear that Rasulallah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) far from encouraging women to attend the Musjid, exhorted them to perform their Salaat at home. The discouragement from the Musjid was emphasised to the extent that he described the woman's Salaat in her home to be far superior to her Salaat in Musjid- e- Nabwi where the Imaam was none other than Rasulallah (sallallahu alay hi wasallam).

Since the Sahaabah understood Rasulallah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) more than the entire Ummah can ever hope to understand, we observe them (Sahaabah) giving practical expression to the exhortation which Nabi-e -Kareem (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) gene rally gave women in regard to Salaat. In spite of the existence of all the conditions for the permissibility in large measure during the age of the Sahaabah, they, nevertheless, did not go by the initial permissibility which existed during the time of Rasulallah (sallallahu alayhi was allam). On the contrary, they accorded priority to the exhortation of Rasulallah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) --his exhorting women to perform Salaat in their homes. In direct contrast, today we find that Maulana/Sheikh Makda and other modernists actively encourage female attendance of Musaaajid in spite of the total absence of the conditions which accompanied the initial permissibility in the early days of Islam. Can anyone then claim that these modernist devia tes are marching in the spirit of Rasulallah's advices? If they are concerned of the Sunnah of Rasulallah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam), then what constrains them to act in conflict with the wishes of Rasulallah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam). Leaving aside all technical arguments, the love which a Mu'min should have in his heart for Nabie -e -Kareem (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) must necessarily impel him towards obedience and submission to the beloved Sunnah of the beloved Nabi (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) But, we observe the direct opposite in regard to the modernists -modernist sheikhs, modernist maulanas and modernist laymen. In spite of their vociferous slogans of "SUN NAH", they are not at all keen to follow the Sunnah of Rasulallah (sallallahu alayhi wasalla m), hence they fabricate a plethora of technicalities and baatil interpretations to give substance to a practice which was not favoured by Rasulallah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) or his Ashaab. In fact, they move with their times -they move in total conflic t with the exhortation which Rasulallah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) advocated for women.

When Rasulallah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) advocated that the noblest Salaat of women is their Salaat at home, then the fallacy of the claim of women's Islamic duties of Ibaadaat in the Musjid should be apparent for all to see. How can it be asserted that she has a right to fulfil acts of Ibaadat in the Musjid, when Rasulallah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) exhorted the opposite --that she should execute her Ibaa daat in the darkest corner of her home? In view of the fact that women have absolutely no undeniable right" of attending the Musjid and that the venue for the fulfilment of their acts of Ibaadaat is NOT the Musjid, Rasulallah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) did not institute separate facilities for women in the Musjid. Instead of creating or ordering separate facilities for women in the Musjid, Rasulallah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) exhorted the separate facility of their homes. Their homes constitute the separate facilities so absolutely necessary for Muslim women.

It is indeed incomprehensible to hear of a learned man speaking about the fulfilment of women's acts of Ibaadaat in a Musjid. When Islam has not decreed fulfilment of their Ibaadaat in Musjids--when the Musaaajid play absolutely no part in regard to women's Ibaadaat, the claim by the Maulana/Sheikh is shockingly baatil. It is a claim unbecoming of one who raises his stand on the foundation of Knowledge. Let the Maulana/Sheikh who has rendered such a disservice to Islam by his baatil view and claim explain the prohibition which has been in the Ummah for the past fourteen centuries. Let him explain the attitude of the Sahaabah. Let him explain how was it

possible for the Sahaabah and the Fuqaha to have cancelled the supposed undeniable right of women. Let him explain how was it possible for the Sahaabah and the Fuqaha to prohibit women from fulfilling their Islamic duties of Ibaadaat in the Musjid, if indeed their duties did relate to the Musjid. Let him explain the reasons for the Sahaabah and the Fuqaha considering it necessary to prohibit women from the Musjid. Let him explain the practice of the Ummah as it has been transmitted down the centuries from generation to generation. Why does he wish to contradict the Sunnah of the Sahaabah and the course which the Ummah has followed these past fourteen centuries?

It is noteworthy that the Maulana/Sheikh is silent regarding the large volume of Islamic writings explaining the prohibition of women from attending the Musjid. He makes no mention of the rulings of the authorities of Islam. He seeks justification for his baatil opinion by tendering some ahadith in the light of his personal understanding. He behaves as if the history of Islam from the age of the Sahaabah is something to be ignored. His attitude implies that the statements and rulings of the Sahaabah are of no significance, hence he adopts silence in this regard. Isolating the Sahaabah from the Ahadith and discarding their interpretation and understanding are tantamount to scuttling the Ship of Islam. There is no Islam without the Sahaabah. Whoever seeks to interpret the Sunnah by isolating the Sahaabah is clearly plodding the path of dhalaal (deviation) and baatil (falsehood).

THE INITIAL PERMISSION

There is no denying the fact that during the time of Rasulallah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) women were allowed to visit the Musjid for Salaat. However, this permission was accompanied by a number of very strict conditions which are all non-existent in our times. Again, although there was this initial permission, Rasulallah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) discouraged women from availing themselves of this permission. His exhortation that women perform Salaat at home paved the way for the prohibition which came into effect later by the authority of the Sahaabah and the Fuqaha. We shall now proceed to outline the strict measures which accompanied the initial permission.

THE CONDITIONS FOR THE INITIAL PERMISSION

(1) Attractive garments were forbidden. Women who came to the Musjid were not permitted to don fine and attractive clothing. It was declared that they had to dress shabbily and unattractively. Hadhrat Abu Hurairah (radhiallahu anhu) narrates that Rasulallah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) said: "..... *but, they should emerge while they are shabbily dressed.*" (Abu Dawood)

In Ibn Majah it is narrated that once while Rasulallah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) was seated in the Musjid, a woman dressed and adorned in her finery entered and

walked proudly in the Musjid. Rasulallah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) then proclaimed:

"O people! prohibit your women from wearing beautiful garments and from showing off in the Musjid, for verily, Bani Israeel were not cursed until their women started to

wear beautiful garments and show off inside the Musjid."

Ibn Arabi in his Sharh Tirmizi commenting on the type of dress which women should wear according to the Hadith which permits them to come to the Musjid, says:

"When she emerges to go to the Musjid, she should come out dressed in dirty and shabby garb as it has been reported in the Ahadith."

(2) Perfume was forbidden. Women who came to Musjid in the early days were not permitted to apply perfume. In this regard Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) said:

"Any woman who applies perfume and passes by a gathering is like an adultress." (Tirmizi)

"The woman who applies perfume must not be present with us for Isha." (Muatta Imaam Maalik)

Since it is not permissible for women to emerge from the house with perfume applied, be it night or day, the reference to Isha in this Hadith should not be understood to be confined to only Isha Salaat. The word Isha appears in the Hadith in view of the greater danger of mischief and evil during the night time. The Ahadith of Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) clearly brands a woman as immoral for applying perfume and passing by a gathering.

(3) The Jilbaab or outer-covering. When women emerged in those days, they were thoroughly concealed in their jilbaabs which were very large outer garments or sheets of unattractive colour. The sheets were so big that normally two women could be wrapped up in a single jilbaab. The jilbaab was not merely flung over the shoulders. It covered the entire head and the face as well. The jilbaab which the ladies wore during the time of Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) was not a stylish garment with a decorative niqaab (face-veil). It was not designed for beauty as are some of the burqahs of modern times. The jilbaab covered every part of the body, the head and face included. It had to be left slightly open to enable the women to see where they were walking. In other words they had to peep through an opening to see their way. Such garments will not be worn by women of today. About these outer-garments, Hadhrat Aishah (radhiallahu anha) narrates:

"After Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) had made the morning Salaat, the women would return thoroughly wrapped in their sheets. So thoroughly were they wrapped that they could not be distinguished from the darkness (The cloth presumably being black as the darkness)." (Bukhaari)

(4) The women would leave immediately after the Fardh Salaat. The following narration in

Bukhaari explains the practice which was adopted to ensure absolutely no contact with any of the men in the Musjid:

"Hind Bintul Haarith said that Umm-e-Salmah (radhi- allahu anha), the wife of Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam), informed her that during the lifetime of Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) the women would get up after the Salaam of the Fardh Salaat while Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) and the menfolk who made Salaat with him remained seated. After Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) stood up, the men would do likewise."

Commenting on this procedure adopted in the early days, Imaam Zuhri (rahmatullah alayh) states:

"The reason for Rasulullah's delay in rising after the Fardh Salaat was to give the women the opportunity of leaving the Musjid before the men. (This prevented intermingling)."

(5) Intermingling was prohibited even outside the Musjid, in a narration in Abu Dawood, the Sahaabi, Abu Usaid Ansaari (radhi allahu anhu) says that once outside the Musjid men and women had mixed. Nabi (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) then said:

"(O Women!) Move back! Verily, it is not permissible for you to spread in the road. The edges of the road are compulsory on you."

The Sahaabi narrating this Hadith says: *"As a result the women would walk so close to the sides that their clothing would brush against the walls (of the houses)."*

The introduction of these conditions is not possible in this day. After the demise of Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam), even the Sahaabah discerned the difficulty in enforcing the strict or the exceptionally high degree of piety which had prevailed during the presence of Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam). They did not therefore concern themselves with remedial measures. On the contrary, they banned the practice of women coming to the Musjid. Their high degree of Deeni intelligence and insight convinced them that if women are not prevented from the Musajid, the situation will deteriorate to the extent where the Musajid will be no better than the Christian churches. The consequences of females participating in public worship in congregational form are aptly mirrored in the churches. But, today modernists in religious garb are attempting to destroy the atmosphere of piety which still prevails inside the Musajid of the Ummah.

SOME RULINGS OF THE SHARIAH

The following Deeni direction is stated in Musannaf of Ibnul Attaar:

"It is only proper for a woman that she does not emerge from her home, but remains glued to the innermost recess of the house. Verily, her whole body is an object of concealment. It is Waajib to conceal the Aurah (and her entire body is aurah). Regarding women's emergence in the darkness to go to the Musjid, this was in the absence of harm and fitnah as it was during the age of Nabi (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) and the age of certain Sahaabah. Thereafter, emergence was prohibited because of the fitnah which women had introduced such as exhibiting (themselves), application of perfume and their mischief with men. It is only proper for a woman when she emerges from her home (because of necessity) that she does not beautify herself; that she does not apply perfume; that she does not walk in the middle of the path and that her emergence for a valid Shar'i need is not without the consent of her husband. It is only proper for a man to refrain from aiding his wife or any women under his authority with anything from among the acts which facilitates her emergence from her home. . . ." (Al-Fataawal Kubra)

While acknowledging the fact of the initial permissibility of women attending the Musjid, Fataawa Kubra records the following ruling;

"Verily, this (women's emergence from their homes to attend the Musjid) has been forbidden because in their presence (at the Musjid) are haraam evils. Hujjatul Islam (i.e. Imaam Ghazaali) states in the Ihyaa: Rasul ullah (sallallahu alayhi wa sallam) did permit women to attend the Musjid. But, the correct view now is prohibition excepting old women. In fact, the prohibition has become established since the age of the Sahaabah (radhiallahu anhum). Thus, Aishah (radhi allahu anha) said..... and he narrated what had transpired in this regard with her. . . It is obligatory to prohibit women from attending the Musjid for Salaat and gatherings of Thikr when there is the danger of fitnah with them."

"When the fear of fitnah is attendant to their emergence from the home, then it (emergence) is undoubtedly haraam. . . The meaning of fitnah is zina and its introductory acts such as looking at the opposite sex, privacy (with the opposite sex), touching, etc.."

Dirmaani (rahmatullah alayh) says:

"The Hadith: 'Do not prevent the female servants of Allah from the Musjids.', is applicable to night times (i.e. the permission was only for night times). Further more, the permission exists only in the absence of fitnah against women or by women. During the life time of Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) absence of fitnah was dominant."

Allamah Aini (rahmatullah alayh) says; *"During our age mischief and evil are rampant."*

Allamah Aini (rahmatullah alayh) was among the Fuqaha of the eighth century of the Islamic era. The author of Lamiud Duraari asks:

"When this (rampant fitnah and mischief) was the situation during the time of Allamah Aini (rahmatullah alayh) who died in the year 855 Hijri, then what do you think of the present age saturated with vice and fitnah?"

Ibn Hajar (rahmatullah alayh) says:

"The summary of the discussion of Nawawi and Zarkashi is that when intermingling of the sexes

prevails whether in the Masjid or on the roads or there is the danger of mischief because of women's adornment and exhibition of beauty, then it is forbidden for them to come out. . . . It is incumbent on the Imaam or his representative to prevent women from emerging." (Laamiud Duraari)

Hadhrat Hasan Basri (rahmatullah alayh) was asked about a woman who took an oath to the effect that if her husband was released from prison she would, as a measure of thanks unto Allah, perform two raka'ts Salaat in every Musjid of the city of Basra where Salaat is performed in Jamaa'. Hadhrat Hasan Basri (rahmatullah alayh) commented:

"If Umar was here, he would have smashed her head."

Imaam Taimi (rahmatullah alayh) says:

"The Hadith of Aishah (radhiallahu anha) contains the substantiation for the view that it is not proper for women to emerge (from their homes) to attend the Musjids when mischief has come into existence."

Numerous similar statements and rulings of the authorities in the Books of the Shariah proclaim explicitly the prohibition on women attending the Masjid for Salaat or for listening to lectures. Each and every one of these Fuqahaa who spoke on this question was fully cognizant with the initial permission which applied during the age of Rasulullah (sallallahu alay hi

wasallam). Nevertheless, they issued the verdict of prohibition on the basis of the Fatwa of Hadhrat Umar, Hadhrat Aisha and other Sahaabah (radhiallahu annum) as well as on (he grounds of the prevalence of fitnah which undoubtedly did not predominate the scene as we find in our age. In this age of modernity and liberalism, vice, immoral mischief, shamelessness, nudity and public demonstrations of sexual acts have become part of the living "culture". Therefore, by what stretch of Islamic thinking is it conceivable to overturn the

rulings of those august personalities and illustrious authorities of Islam--the Sahaabah and the Aimmah -e -Mujtahi-deen? Maulanas and Sheikhs in this age of immoral revolution, vice and lustful liberalism, with their gross deficiency in every branch of Islamic Knowledge coupled to the total lack of taqwa and abandonment of A'maal-e-Saalihah can never hope to even aspire to attain the lofty pedestal of Uloom and Taqwa of the Sahaabah and the Fuqaha. It is only insolence and gross ignorance (jahl murraqqab) which befuddle the mind of a

man who labours under the colossal delusion of his ability to transgress and ignore the rulings and interpretations of the men appointed by Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) to command the operation of the Shariah.

MAULANA/SHEIKH MAKDA'S ADMISSION

The proofs of the Shariah negating the suggestion of women having the undeniable right to attend the Masjid are so overwhelming that even this Maulana/Sheikh is compelled to concede: *"However, the Noble Prophet (PBUH) did not insist that women should attend the five daily congregational prayers in the MASJID as he insisted to men."*

"In fact, the Noble Prophet (PBUH) strongly advised women to perform their daily Salawaat at home saying that the best place for women to perform their daily prayers is in their innermost apartment of their homes."

He accepts the following two facts which the most modern, anti - Taqleed critic cannot refute:

- (1) That Rasulallah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) did not insist that women attend the Musjid.
- (2) That Rasulallah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) "strongly advised women to perform their Salaat in the innermost apartment of their homes."

After accepting this attitude of Rasulallah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam), why does the Maulana/Sheikh not move in the light and spirit of this Deeni advice which emanated from the Rasool of Allah? Why does he choose an insistence which conflicts with the insistence of Rasulallah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam)? Why does he advise women to act in conflict with the "strong advice" of Rasulallah {sallallahu alayhi wasallam)? Why does he as an Aalim of Deen not continue with the advice and insistence of Rasulallah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam)? An Aalim of Deen will seek to perpetuate the wishes of Rasulallah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam). It does not behove a man of Knowledge, a man who proclaims adherence to the Sunnah to adopt a direction which diverges from the Path established by Rasulallah (sallallahualayhi wasallam) and his Sahaabah.

After having conceded that Rasulallah (sallallahu alayhi was allam) himself strongly advised women to cling to their homes and discharge their Ibaadaat in the inner apartments of their homes, the Maulana/Sheikh's claim of women's "undeniable right" of admission to the Musjid is both superfluous and devoid of any Shar'i substance.

Our advice to the Maulana/Sheikh is: Stand up in your Musjid and publicize Rasulallah's "strong" advice and declare vehemently to your congregation that Nabie -Kareem (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) NEVER insisted that females attend the Musjid. Tell Muslims that since Rasulallah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) strongly advised women to remain at home and

perform their acts of Ibaadaat at home--in the innermost apartments of their homes --you too, strongly advise them to follow and practically adopt this strong advice of Rasulallah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam). Do not befuddle and confuse the issue with your personal opinion and misinterpretations of the Ahadith. Do not advise Muslims to act in conflict with the "strong" advice of Rasulallah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam). Do not advise Muslims to arrange separate facilities for women in the Mosques. Accept the Nabi's strong advice and insist that their separate facilities are the "innermost apartments of their homes" If you are not inclined to retract your baatil opinion, then at least inform your people -inform the Muslims -that although in your opinion women enjoy the "undeniable right" of attending the Musjid, nevertheless, Rasulallah's wish was that they do not exercise their (supposed) "undeniable right" and that they remain at home clinging to their "innermost apartments" inside their homes.

MAULANA/SHEIKH MAKDA AND THE CONDITIONS WHICH ACCOMPANIED THE INITIAL PERMISSION

The Maulana/Sheikh enumerates the "conditions under which Muslim women are permitted to attend congregational prayers in a Masjid". We must observe that the Maulana/Sheikh is extremely naive, to say the least, if he believes that the strict conditions of high Taqwa which

existed during the time of Rasulallah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) are possible and enforceable in this age of nudity--in this age of immorality -in an age when Maulanas and Sheikhs actively encourage women to emerge from their homes in direct violation of the

prohibition stated in the Qur'aan Majeed and in total abandonment of the example of the Sahaabah and the Ummah.

The Maulana's/Sheikh's naivety exceeds all bounds since it is an established Shar'i fact well-known to all and sundry possessing even a smattering of Deeni Knowledge at academic level that even during the time of the Sahaabah when piety reigned supreme, when the ladies were women of Taqwa, observing total Hijaab, the Sahaabah considered it best to prohibit the women from the Musjid. They did not seek to introduce measures to ensure the operation of the conditions.

On the contrary, they banned the practice of women attending the Musjid. If the Sahaabah had realized the impossibility of successfully enforcing all the conditions which attended the initial permission during the time of Rasulallah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam), then what can we say of a Maulana or a Sheikh in this belated century of evil and immorality endeavouring to bring into practice what the Sahaabah could not or did not for some reason of wisdom? He is clutching at straws like a drowning man if he sincerely believes in his naive idea of successfully introducing the conditions which had existed in the time of Nabi-e-Kareem (sallallahu alayhi wasallam). How can it be possible to achieve the successful operation of the stringent conditions of Hijaab and total separation between male and female when there is no control over the activities of people? The attitude of Muslim males and females regarding dress and intermingling of sexes, the free mixing of the sexes on the streets, the preponderance of non-Muslims wandering about and Muslim females mixing with non-Muslims, the modern outlook and the liberalism which has smitten Muslim mentality, the almost total non-existence of Hijaab and the destruction of Hijaab and the destruction of Islamic modesty and the rise of shamelessness in both men and women are all factors which will never permit the rigid conditions to operate.

Let the Maulana/Sheikh first establish such a society in which the high grade of Hijaab and Taqwa in vogue in the time of Rasulallah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam), will reign. When the Maulana/Sheikh can show the existence of such a community of Muslims, then only may he open discussion on the question of reconsidering the prohibition, which the authorities of this

Ummah have enacted many centuries ago. We say-he may since this is a hypothetical case. Assuming that the impossible is achieved, then too, the "strong" advice of Rasulallah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) and the attitude and practical example of the Sahaabah can never be ignored. The Taqwa of those ages of holiness belong to bygone times which will not return until the Day of Oiyaamah. We have long passed the Ouroon -e-Thalaathah (the three noble ages of goodness and virtue) and we are in close proximity to Oiyaamah.

Thus, the Maulana/Sheikh in dreaming about the introduction of the conditions which prevailed during the time of Rasulallah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) and which occasioned the initial permission for women to attend the Musjid, is in fact placing the cart in front of the horse. First create a society or a community of high grade Muttaqeen; first introduce total Islamic culture and first ensure that the women and the men in the community are of a calibre of superior piety, then think about giving da'wah to women to attend the Musjid. In outlining the conditions necessary for women to attend the Musjid, the Maulana/Sheikh commits a serious blunder which

isunforgiveable since he opposes all the Sahaabah and the, Fuqahaa in having propounded his baatil idea. In the type of dress which women require to don when necessity brings them out of the home environment, the Maulana/Sheikh says:

"The Islamic requirement of dress for women leaving their homes must be worn from home; ie. the entire body must be covered with the exception of the face and hand up to the wrist."

Again, he repeats his error in the following statements:

"Hence a plain over-garment or burqah with face only open is recommended for women intending to go to a Masjid."

It is quite apparent that in expounding his personal baatil opinion, the Maulana/Sheikh is tripping over his own feet. He makes the following two claims:

- (1) That women should leave their faces open when outside on the streets since in his view it is permissible for them to parade around the streets with faces exposed.
- (2) That a plain over-garment is merely recommended for women intending to emerge from their homes.

Both claims are baatil and in conflict with the commands of the Shariah. The outer-garment, jilbaab or burqah in the first instance is not "recommended", It is a compulsory command which women have to adhere to when need compels them to leave the home precincts. It is haraam for a woman to emerge from her home without the jilbaab. The Qur'aan Majeed commands:

"O Nabi! Say to your wives, your daughters and the women of the Mu'mineen to hang over themselves their jalaabeeb."

In Islam there is no difference of opinion regarding the compulsion of the jilbaab for women emerging from home on account of necessity The jilbaab/burqah/outer-garment is not merely recommended. It is obligatory. There is no need for us to tender further proofs for the compulsory nature of the jilbaab in view of the facts in this question being as clear as daylight. However, should the Maulana/Sheikh opt for denying the compulsory nature of the jilbaab, then we can always present the Shar'i facts to prove our case and refute baatil from whichever source it emanates.

Secondly, is the contention that the women emerging from their homes should leave their faces uncovered. The Maulana/Sheikh should substantiate his claim by reference to the authorities of the Shariah -the Sahabah and the Fuqaha. We are not requesting him to present the arguments of our illustrious Ulama of India and Pakistan since we are aware of the attempts of certain so-called learned persons to attribute the Shar'i pronouncements of our illustrious Ulama to "Indian" customs. This is a despicable attempt to confuse unwary Muslims and to mislead them and to conceal the truth from them. It is quite easy for them to draw a smokescreen over the true Sunnah, rejecting practices of Rasulu llah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) by attributing these to be the teachings of Indian Ulama. Therefore, the Maulana/Sheikh is requested to furnish his proofs

citing the Sahaabah and the Aimmah -e-Mujtahideen who were all non-Indians. At the same time we must emphasise that when we speak of Shar'i proofs we are not interested in the Maulana's/Sheikh's personal understanding and interpretation of the Our'aanic aayaat. If he cannot content himself with the understanding and interpretations of the Sahaabah and the Fuqahaa, then our rejection of his personal ideas and interpretations should not surprise anyone.

The practice of the ladies during the time of the Sahaabah emphatically demonstrates the compulsory act of covering the face when outside the home. The rulings of the Fuqahaa confirm the importance and the need for women to cover their faces when they have to emerge from the home. We shall here not go into the details of this mas'alah. We have already published a booklet on Islamic Hijaab (Purdah) in which this question has been explained in detail. Those interested may write for a free copy to the **Y.M.M.A., P.O.BOX 5036, BENONI SOUTH 1502, (SOUTH AFRICA)**. It will suffice here to cite the following narrations to dispel the baatil of the Maulana/Sheikh's claim:

Hadhrat Aishah (radhiallahu anha) narrates:

"During the occasion of Hajjatul Wida when people passed near to us, we (the ladies) would draw the jilbaab over the head and face. When they (the people) departed from us, we would open our faces." (Abu Dawood)

Imaam Ghazaali (rahmatullah alayh) states: "Women emerged (from their homes during the time of Rasulullah--sallallahu alayhi wasallam) with niqaabs (face-coverings) on their faces."

(Ihyaaul Uloom)

The following Fatwa is stated in Durrul Mukhtaar: *"Young women are compulsorily prohibited from revealing their faces in the presence of males."*

These are not the pronouncements of the Ulama of India and Pakistan. If the Maulana/Sheikh cares, he may check these facts and verify their authenticity.

THE MAULANA/SHEIKH AND THE SITUATION IN ZIMBABWE

Maulana/Sheikh Makda, in his pamphlet, says:

"You will even find right here in Zimbabwe Muslim women coming from such countries opening their shops during the Jumu'a Prayers (trading during that period is forbidden in Islam) and during 'Idd Prayers while their husbands and sons and brothers go to the Masjid. Needless to say: ISLAM can never be associated with such degradation of women as having no souls to cater for!"

It is the type of propagation advocated by modernists attempting to bring women out of the

home, onto the streets and public places, which have made women objects seemingly without souls. The modernist teaching destroys the natural hayaa (modesty) in Muslim women. When their modesty is displaced, all spirituality abandons them. Let the Maulana/Sheikh by all means castigate the men for putting up the honour and hayaa of their wives and daughters to be plundered by all and sundry. But, let him not make people believe that it is permissible for Muslim women to manage their husbands' shops at times other than Juma'. Just as it is haram for women to be standing and operating the shops of their husbands during Juma' time, so too, is it forbidden for them at all times. The allegation of "no souls to cater for should be addressed to the men who advertise and ruin the Islamic morality of their womenfolk by exposing them to even the Kuffaar. When it is not permissible for women to leave their homes to attend even the Masjid, then to a far greater degree will the prohibition on emergence apply to shops and other worldly places of public gatherings. The teachings of modernist learned men and of modernist ghair muqallid aalims are responsible for the degradation of Muslim women. Such "learned men" have fallen into the trap of shaitaan, a trap which has been set by the tools of westernism.

THE MAULANAS/SHEIKH'S ANTIPATHY FOR THE ULAMA OF INDIA AND PAKISTAN

His comments on the Ulama of India and Pakistan betray his aversion for these august personalities and beacons of Uloom and Taqwa. Although he acquired his Deeni knowledge from the Ulama of India, he exhibits an inner aversion for them. He thus claims:

"It is necessary, in conclusion, to clarify the usually heard -of prohibition of Muslim women in mosques by Ulama from the East (India and Pakistani. Ulama in the Middle-East, Asia Minor, Europe and Africa do not hold that opinion."

Who are the Ulama of the Middle -East and Asia Minor to whom he refers to as supposed authorities? He slops to a ridiculous level by speaking of the "Ulama of Europe". Who are these "Ulama of Europe Does Europe too have Ulama? Is the reference to present modern "ulama" or the Ulama of bygone days? If the Maulana/Sheikh has in mind the modern, suit and tie wearing, clean -shaven faasiq who has obtained some degrees in some ghair-muqallid institution of so-called Islamic learning, then we say to him: We are not interested in the opinions of such misguided people of baatil who labour under the illusion that they are "Ulama". If by the Ulama of the Middle -East, Maulana/Sheikh Makda refers to the great Fuqaha, the Aimmah-e-Mujtahideen --the Ulama -e-Mutaqaddimeen and Muta -akh -khireen, the illustrious Salf and Khalf, then we say that we are on common ground. In that case, let him produce his proofs to bolster his claim that the Ulama of the Middle -East differ with the opinion proclaimed by the Ulama of India and Pakistan on the question of this prohibition which he seeks to negate. We challenge the Maulana/Sheikh to produce the opinions of the true Ulama who had dazzled the firmament of Deeni Knowledge and Taqwa in the Middle East for many many centuries from the time of the Sahaabah.

But, we again remind the Maulana/ Sheikh that we do not accept the freelancing fussaag, the

graduates of ghair muqallid institutions reeling under western influences of liberalism, as ULAMA of the Shariah. Their opinions are meaningless and worthless in so far as the Shariah is concerned. Now let the Maulana/Sheikh substantiate his claim by citing from the Books of the Shariah written by the great and noble Ulama of the Middle East, Let him cite the opinions of the Sahaabah and of the multitude of Middle Eastern Fuqahaa. Let him show us the opinions of those great Ulama of the Middle East differ from the opinion of the Ulama of India and Pakistan on the question of women having to don face-covering when they emerge from their homes. What has been the practice among different Arab societies regarding woman and the niqaab? Can the Maulana/Sheikh enlighten Muslims in this regard? Did the Arab Muslims learn of the niqaab from the Ulama of India and Pakistan?

The Maulana/Sheikh has made mention of the opinion of Ulama regarding the niqaab. Why has he chosen to ignore the opinion of the Ulama regarding the question of women's attendance of the Musjid? If he attaches so much importance to the opinion of the Ulama, will it not be proper for him to attach greater importance to the opinions and verdicts of the Ulama among the Sahaabah, the Taabieen and Tab-e-Taabieen?

THE MAULANA/SHEIKH AND THE MUSAAJID OF INDIA AND PAKISTAN

Maulana/Sheikh Makda moans:

"A grave injustice has been done to Muslim women by builders of Masaajid (Mosques) in India and Pakistan by not providing equal but separate facilities for them in Masaajid built after the Muslim Moghul and Nawa-abi Rule of India. As a result of this unfortunate tendency even up to the present Age, Muslim women in such countries have sadly neglected this basic Islamic requirement of Salaah so much so that the majority of them do not perform their daily prayers having no external encouragement in Masaajid to perform this vital duty to Allah (SWT)."

These remarks are stunning in their puerility. Such childish comments are not expected of men of Knowledge. Let us study the ridiculous remarks more closely. His charge of grave injustice: On which Shar'i basis can one describe the absence of separate facilities for women in a Musjid as an act of "grave injustice" to women? Musjids which lack such facilities are in fact operating in consonance with the spirit of Rasulullah's (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) "strong advice" to women to perform their Salaat in the inner most apartments of their homes. Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) advocated that women perform their Salaat at home; that their Salaat at home is superior to their Salaat performed in even Musjid -e -Nabawi and that the best Musjid for a woman is her home These Musaaqid of India and Pakistan, therefore, have adopted the advice and the wishes of Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam). The Musaaqid of India and Pakistan have chosen to follow the direction issued by the Sahaabah and the Fuqahaa--the great and illustrious Ulama of the Middle East.

Despite the initial permission, did Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) provide separate facilities for women in the Musjid? Did the Sahaabah provide such facilities as Maulana/Sheikh Makda is advocating? When there is no precedent in the Shariah for the provision of separate facilities for women in Musaaqid and when the Shariah does not direct the creation of such facilities, then on what authority does the Maulana/Sheikh allege that an act of "grave injustice" has been committed? On the contrary, the provision of such facilities in Musaaqid constitutes an act of flagrant violation of the direction given by Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) in his advocacy of women's Salaat in the innermost apartments of their homes. The initiation of measures which conflict with the wishes of Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) is in fact an

act of grave injustice rendered to Nabi-e-Kareem (sallallahu alayhi wasallam).

The Maulana/Sheikh seems to be so pre-occupied and obsessed with the attempt to bring women into the Musajid that he fails to realize the spiritual disaster which he is courting by ignoring the wishes and the Sunnah of Rasulallah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) and his Sahaabah. He is the one guilty of the grave act of injustice-injustice to the Shariah.

The Maulana/Sheikh's claim of the neglect of Salaat by women He alleges that the majority of women in India and Pakistan do not perform Salaat because of the lack of separate facilities for women in the Musajid. In the first place, did the Maulana/Sheikh make a survey of the female population of India and Pakistan to entitle him to advance this brazen claim? What are his grounds for this sweeping claim?

Assuming that the majority of women do neglect their Salaat, what is the evidence to substantiate the claim that such neglect is because women are not allowed to attend the Musjid? On what grounds is such supposed neglect of Salaat by women attributed to the lack of Musjid facilities for women? If a woman refuses to perform Salaat in spite of having the knowledge thereof, it is her own misfortune for which the Musajid and their builders cannot be blamed. The Shariah exhorts them to perform their Salaat at home, not in the Musjid. If women are ignorant of this, their male overseers and guardians are to be blamed. Musajid without separate facilities have absolutely no relationship with the neglect of Salaat by women. The Maulana/Sheikh should search for other causes for this neglect. It is downright silly to lay the blame at the doors of the Musajid.

The Maulana/Sheikh speaks about "external encouragement" to induce women to perform Salaat. Such "external encouragement" according to him is the public Musjid. Women are supposed to pick up their inducement to perform Salaat from the outside. But, this is contrary to the Qur'aan which commands internal encouragement in relation to women. The Qur'aan Majeed thus says:

"Save yourselves and your families from the Fire." "O People of Imaani Command your family to perform Salaat. . . ."

It is the obligatory duty of the menfolk of the home to provide the encouragement and the necessary Ta'leem to women so that they understand their duties to Allah Ta'ala. People neglect and abstain from Salaat because of ignorance and spiritual calamities which have overwhelmed them. Women

neglect Salaat not because they are not allowed to go to the Musjid, but because their menfolk--their husbands and fathers --had miserably failed to educate them in this regard. The Maulana/Sheikh should therefore exhort the menfolk to execute their sacred duty of educating their womenfolk in the necessary requirements of the Deen.

THE SO-CALLED HISTORIC ULAMA CONFERENCE

Maulana/Sheikh Makda states :

"This grave injustice and spiritual oppression to Muslim women attracted the attention of great Ulama in the Islamic World resulting in an important and historic Conference held in Meccatul-Mukarramah a few years ago. This Conference decided as a directive to Muslims through out the World that all future Mosques must provide equal but separate facilities for women."

Let the Maulana/Sheikh be told that his conference of Ulama has no Shar'i standing. The "directive" issued by the conference is not, worth the paper on which it was written. Such conferences can be organized by the dozen, and dozens of such worthless directives can be issued. But, baatil remains baatil even if conferences of ulama decide to enact the baatil. Men of true Knowledge have no respect for the nonsensical and baatil "directive" decided on by a conference which lacked Shar'i potency. If there had indeed participated

Ulama in the conference which issued the baatil directive, then those Ulama should hang their heads in shame for having betrayed the Deen. Such Ulama cause the Deen great harm and they are among the causes of the degradation of the Ummah. Such Ulama do not speak from the platform of the Deen. Their personal opinions play havoc with their understanding. Such directives are confounded.

TRADITIONAL TENDENCIES?

Maulana/Sheikh Makda of Zimbabwe attributes the practice of women performing Salaat at home and not in the Masjid, to "traditional tendencies based on tribal, national or sectarian interests". His rhetoric for a supposed learned man in the Deen amazes one. The liberalism of the present age is glaring in his thinking. His words and style of expression drip with the altitudes of the libertine culture of the kuffaar. He has not been able to hold in check his tongue from wagging against the Sunnah of Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam). The type of "traditional tendencies" which inhibit women from emerging from their homes is precisely the propagation of the Sunnah of Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam). The "conservative upbringing" which he denounces is the teaching of the Qur'aan and the Sunnah. The Nusoos (narrations) of the Qur'aan and Hadith are replete with commands to adopt "traditional and conservative tendencies". Female exhibition and emergence are considered among the heinous sins in Islam. The Shariah does not advocate liberalism. The "innermost apartment of the home" stated by Maulana/Sheikh Makda is a conservative tendency exhorted for practical adoption by Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam). Its adoption by successive Muslim generations down the long corridor of Islam's history is part of the "traditionalism" propagated by Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam). We and all Muslims should be proud of such "traditional and conservative tendencies" which are parts of our sacred culture. The donning of garments of unattractive design and shabby form to cover the entire body of the Muslim woman is a teaching of the traditionalism of Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam). The prohibition of the intermingling of sexes is the result of the influence of the "traditional tendencies" espoused by Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam). These are all parts -integral parts -of the culture of a noble Ummah which obtained its "conservative upbringing," from the Sahaa bah of Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam). This is an upbringing of which we as Muslims should be proud. This sacred traditionalism cannot be exchanged for the influences of a libertine and vile way based on western and other kufr interests and cultures.

Every aspect and sphere of the Sunnah is conservative and it is this holy conservatism which influences Muslims who are keen to lead a life under the Umbrella of the Sunnah. Our Qu r'aan is traditional, our Sunnah is traditional, the Sahaabah whom we revere are conservative. In fact, their conservatism was such that once Hadhrat Hasan Basri (rahmatullah alayh), reprimanding his disciples, said:

"If you had to see the Sahaabah, you will brand them as madmen and if they had to see you, they would have branded you as kaafir."

Hadhrt Hasan Basri (rahmatullah alayh) was addressing arch-conservatives great Auliya and Ulama— who were among his muree -deen. He was not speaking to misguided and doomed liberals of our times of corruption.

In having adopted a stand against" traditional ism "and "conservatism", the Maulana/Sheikh has made plain his anti-Sunnah attitude. The traditional tendencies about which he rants are nothing other than the Sunnah of Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) and his illustrious Sahaabah. Sweeping rhetoric will not aid him in any way to prove his claims. He has to furnish Shar'i facts to substantiate his charges and claims which are utterly baseless.

THE LIGHT OF THE QUR'AAN

Maulana/Sheikh advises and exhorts Muslims to be "guided by the Light of the Holy Quran and the Teachings of the Sunnah". We do not know what he has understood by the "Light of the Qur'an". However, Islam teaches us that the "Light of the Qur'an" is to follow and obey Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam). The "Light of the Qur'an" directs the Ummah in the Path of the Sunnah--the Traditional Sunnah of the Sahaabah--the Sunnah of Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam).

Those who understand the meaning of the Light of the Qur'aan will not ignore the exhortations of Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam). Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) exhorted Muslim women to stay at home -to perform their Salaat in the "innermost apartment" of their home. Maulana/Sheikh Makda concedes this indisputable fact. Therefore, those who respect and honour the exhortation of Nabi-e -Kareem (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) are walking by the guiding light of the Qur'aan. In contrast, those who ignore the wishes of Ras ulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) and abandon the traditional practices of the Sahaabah and the Taabieen are walking in the shadow of shaitaan. Their minds and senses are dulled and clogged by nafsaani and shaitaam whisperings and delusions. They have become spiritually delirious, hence they see fit to hurl vile epithets against the Sunnah--the traditional Sunnah--of Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam).

THE CALL FOR "SEPARATE BUT EQUAL" MUSJID FACILITIES FOR WOMEN

Maulana/Sheikh Makda has made a strong call for "equal but separate" facilities inside the Musaa)id for women. It will be pertinent to ask: Who are you following in this call? Which

Sunnah is the Maulana/Sheikh following when he makes such un-Islamic calls? Can he explain how he is acting in the light and spirit of the Qur'aan and Sunnah by making a call which is in conflict with the practical example of Rasulallah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) and the Sahaabah?

The type of equal facilities being called for are not offered by Islam nor were such imagined equal facilities ever part of the Sunnah. It has been explained already that the direction of Rasulallah's (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) Ta'leem indicated and finally led to their Salaat in the home. If there was any merit in the type of equal and separate facilities in Musjids as the Maulana/Sheikh begs for, Rasulallah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) would have been the very first person to have either established such facilities or left an indication for the introduction of such "equal but separate" Musjid facilities. Instead of equal and separate facilities, we have the following Shar'i facts which no modernist can dispute:

(1) Rasulallah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) advising and exhorting women to perform Salaat in the "innermost apartments of their homes" despite his initial permission which allowed them to attend the Musjid.

(2) The Sahaabah ordering the women out of the Musjid and enacting the prohibition.

(3) The Fuqahaa (Jurists) of the Ummah unanimously remaining firm on the prohibition of women attending the Musjid.

Refuting the suggestion of equal Musjid facilities for women, is the following narration of Hadhrat Ibn Mas'ud (radhiallahu anhu), which appears in Tibraani and other Books of the Shariah:

"Rasulallah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) said: *'Assign them (women) to the back just as Allah has assigned them to the back.'*

"Put them behind as Allah Ta'ala has put them behind".

This is the instruction of Islam. The call for equal facilities is therefore baatil and in conflict with the Sunnah.

It is quite clear that the desire to provide equal facilities for women in the Musaaqid is the effect of liberal thinking of the type spawned by western civilization and the other isms of materialism. The slogan of female "equality" and female "emancipation" is quite fashionable in these days of reckless abandonment of religion and transcendental values. But, Muslims -modernized Muslims -because of their double role in life are at a serious disadvantage since they have chosen to tread two divergent paths --the Path of Islam as well as the path of ungodly liberalism. Their mentality has therefore suffered a type of metamorphosis which produces and propagates kufr ideas coated with the hues of Islam. Thus, we have the hybrid idea of "equal but separate facilities for women in Masaajid". The "equal" in this context is the dimension of the kufr base while the "separate" --the outer facade-is the Islamic hue fabricated to conceal the deep-seated influences of the kufr cultures at the feet of which prostrate the modernist Muslim.

Muslims should not allow themselves to be deluded by the deceptive rhetoric of modernist and ghair muqallid maulanans and sheikhs. Such misguided and errant learned men pave the path to Jahannum. They are astray and lead others astray as well. Muslims should reflect! Ponder and analyse the shaitaani calls and ideas of the modernists. Islam is fourteen hundred years old. Our Islamic guidance arises from the Fountain of Nubuwwah. The subordinates and the officers

working in the Department of Nubuwwah under the control and authority of Muhammadur Rasulallah (Sallallahu alayhi was allam) were the illustrious Sahaabah who were in turn the Ustaadh of the Aimmah-e-Mujtahideen. The Deen of Islam was thus transmitted down the centuries in the ranks of the Ummah very reliably and authentically. Therefore, ideas and theories, customs and practices which develop in this belated century and which are at variance with the Shariah are baatil (false and baseless). Muslims should not, therefore, heed such calls.

When Rasulallah (Sallallahu alayhi was allam) and the Sahaabah neither introduced equal nor separate facilities for women in the Musaaajid and when these authorities of Islam never ever attempted to even initiate such a practice, then Muslims should understand that this modernist call is nothing but a ploy of shaitaan to embroil the Ummah in greater degradation and spiritual weakness. The call for opening the Musaaajid to women is a combined shaitaani and nafsani onslaught on the remaining vestiges of piety which Muslims, denuded of their Islamic culture and torn from their Islamic moorings, still enjoy.

All fortresses of piety and holiness in the Ummah have crumbled and fallen to inimical forces manipulating modernized Muslims to wrought the Imaani destruction from within. The Musjid is our last bastion of holiness, which has withstood the onslaught of immoral forces. This has been possible solely because of the foresight of the Sahaabah. If it was not for the foresight and decisive action of the Sahaabah, our Musaaajid would have deteriorated to the level of impiety and evil show as is today prevalent in non-Muslim places of worship. The prohibition on female attendances introduced by the Sahaabah has indeed been a great blessing and an invaluable favour on the Ummah. But, in this age, Muslims themselves have undertaken the satanic work of annihilating the sanctity of the Musjid by pandering to the behests of the lowly nafs. Those who ignore the exhortation of Rasulallah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) and the verdicts of the Sahaabah can never be the sympathisers nor the benefactors of the Ummah.

PARTICIPATION OF WOMEN IN TA'LEEM IN THE MUSAAJID

Maulana/Sheikh Makda advocates the participation of women in Ta'leem in the Musaaajid to gain Islamic education. However, for this claim he has produced no narrational evidence. Neither the Qur'aan nor the Ahadith supports his contention, The Sunnah of Rasulallah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) and the example of the Sahaabah refute the claim of the

Maulana/Sheikh. The following Hadith will adequately demonstrate the fallacy of the claim made by the modernist.

"Abu Saeed Khudri (radhiallahu anhu) said that a woman approached Rasulallah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) and said: The men have monopolised your talks. Therefore, appoint for us (women) a special day from your side so that we may come to you on that day and you can teach us of that knowledge which Allah has taught you.' Rasulallah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) said; 'Gather on a certain day.' Thus the women gathered and Rasulallah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) came to them and taught them from that (knowledge) which Allah had taught him " (Sahih Muslim)

This Hadith appears also in Bukhaari Shareef and other Books of Hadith. In Fathul Baari, this incident is also recorded in a Hadith narrated by Abu Hurairah (radhiallahu anhu). In this narration, Hadhrat Abu Hurairah (radhiallahu anhu) reported that Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) said:

"Your (i.e. the women) appointed place (where you shall gather) is the home of certain lady"

The following facts emerge from this Hadith:

(1) It was not the usual practice for women to attend the Musjid for Ta'leem hence they requested a day to be set aside for them

(2) Women seldom had the opportunity of hearing the talks of Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam).

(3) When Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) accepted their request to lecture to them, he said that he himself would come. While the woman said that they would come to him, he instructed them to gather at a certain place.

(4) Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) did not instruct the women to gather in the Musjid for ta'leem. On the contrary, he ordered

them to gather at the home of a certain lady.

(5) This Ta'leemi gathering was not established as a regular weekly or monthly feature. It was only a one-time affair.

It is noteworthy that in spite of the initial permission for women to attend the Musjid for Salaat, Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) did not invite them to the Musjid for Ta'leem when they made their special request. If it was their undeniable right to attend the Musjid, Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) would have instructed them to gather in the Musjid. This episode amply illustrates that the Musjid is not a place for women.

This episode also clarifies that the standard Islamic method of imparting Deeni Knowledge to women is not in organized public gatherings. They did not obtain their Deeni Ta'leem directly from Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam). Isolated cases are exceptions. The menfolk passed on to their women the knowledge which they acquired from Rasulullah's (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) sacred company.

Throughout the history of Islam, the Sunnah method of educating womenfolk was followed. Never were they projected into the public nor were they accorded equal educational facilities as the modernists are clamouring for. The noble role for which Allah Ta'ala has brought into existence woman precludes her from vieing with males in activities which Allah Ta'ala has not imposed on her. The call for equal Musjid and Ta'leem facilities for women is therefore a great deception and a trap of shaitaan.

The Ahadith also make it abundantly clear that in the initial period when women would attend the Musjid, they would leave immediately after the Fardh Salaat while the men remained seated. Since the females departed from the Musjid immediately upon having made the Salaam of the Salaat, the question of them sitting in the Musjid for Ta'leem does not arise. Hadhrat Umme

Salmah (radhiallahu anha), the wife of Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) said:

"During the lifetime of Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) the women would get up after making the Salaam of the Fardh Salaat while Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) and the men who performed Salaat with him remained seated for some time. After Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) stood up, the men would stand." (Bukhaari Shareef)

The Sunnah of Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) thoroughly rejects the call for women's participation in Ta'leem in the Musjid.

THE ANSWERS TO THE QUESTIONS RAISED BY THE MAULANA /SHEIKH

Maulana/Sheikh Makda concludes his pamphlet of baatil with a number of questions which we shall, Insha' Allah, answer here.

QUESTION 1:

"While less than half of the Muslim Community (in any locality)-male and female -attend the JUMU'A CONGREGATIONAL PRAYERS the other half -female -are either in Offices and Shops or at Home engaged in worldly and mundane matters. Is this Islamic. Will this help in inspiring Islamic consciousness at Home?"

OUR ANSWER:

Maulana/Sheikh you have generalized. By what yardstick have you made this sweeping claim? Have you taken a survey of every locality where Juma' Salaat is performed? We know of localities where 100% of the male population attends Juma' Salaat. Those women who happen to be in the offices and shops are not there only during Juma' Salaat. They are daily in such haraam places because of the misfortune which the ummah has suffered as a result of the baatil preachings of evil "Ul ama" who wean the community away from Traditional Islam-the true Islam of Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi was allam). When the preachings of learned men are un-Islamic the community will necessarily become un-Islamic.

Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) condemned the mis guided "ulama" who lead the Muslim community astray. He branded such "ulama" as the worst of creation under the sky, walking the earth. When the Ulama will realize their duties of Amr Bil Ma'roof, Nahy anil munkar and firmly and clearly propagate the true Sunnah and inform the community of its ills, especially in the field of laxity of morals and the abandonment of Hijaab, then some sense of perception will enter the mind of the Ummah drifting rudderless in the stormy waves of baatil.

While no man in his sane mind will say that women in offices and shops are Islamic, intelligent persons will blame the modernist Maulana and the modernist Sheikh for much of the corruption prevailing in the Muslim community. Under the garb of the Deen explained on the basis of misinterpretations of ahadith and Qur'aanic aayaat, the modernist maulana and sheikh dupes himself and mis leads the community. Under holy pretences and religious rhetoric he impels

women to leave the safety of their home environments. With his warped sense of understanding the modernist maulana and modernist sheikh encourages the Muslim women to remain in public places such as offices and shops. The Musjid is used as a ruse and a smokescreen so that the infiltration of liberalism goes by undetected. But, Allah Ta'ala is the Protector of His Deen, no matter how loudly the modernists may blare their trumpets of baatil. Those who encourage women to come to the Musaaajid are the very culprits responsible for Muslim women's so-called liberation and emancipation from the shackles of the Shariah--the Holy Shackles with which Allah Azza Wa Jal has lettered the movements and actions of the members of this Ummah which has been created for the sole purpose of the aakhirah. Thus, Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) said:

"The world is the prison of the Mu'min and the Jannat of the Kaafir."

The Sunnah fetters of conservatism and traditionalism are the tools and the ways of this Deen of Islam which men of baatil conspire to wreck.

"Will this help in inspiring Islamic consciousness at home?" Ask the Maulana/Shaikh. Yes, the home engagements and activities of a Muslim woman who does not wander the streets, will create a high degree of Deeni consciousness in her. Her "mundane" activities of the home gain for her more thawaab and greater Divine Pleasure than her attendance at the Musjid. Her performance of Salaat at home coupled to her daily duties of a mundane nature are akin to the Jihaad which males wage in the Path of Allah. This is the promise which Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) gave to women who yearned for greater thawaab.

The Muslim woman who remains at home performing her Salaat and engaging in her household work of a mundane nature DURING THE TIME OF JUMA' SALAAT is far superior to the woman who is present in the Musjid for Juma' Salaat. Islam does not call her to Juma'. Islam has imposed on her the Zuhr Salaat which she may fulfil at any time during the duration of Zuhr. Her household duties are her Jihaad. Her quest for her husband's pleasure and comfort is superior for her than the performance of Nafil Salaat and Natl Saum.

Who can contest this claim! Let the Maulana/Sheikh refute it and we shall provide our Shar'i evidence for these claims made by Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi was allam) and which we are echoing. Therefore, the Maulana/Sheikh should not lump a woman's household duties together with the haraam office and shop activities of the "liberated" Muslim woman--liberated from the holy Bonds of the Shariah by the baatil preachings of men of baatil.

QUESTION 2:

"How is it that those who oppose the attendance of their womenfolk in the Masaajid for Ibaadah and Ta'leem allow their women to intermingle with men (most, of them non-Muslims) in offices and shops? How is it that the same "staunch" Muslim men allow their Womenfolk to waste their time before a television set while they pray in the Masaajid? Where is their Islamic duty to their families to attract them to the Worship of ALLAH (SWT) and improving their understanding of ISLAM?"

OUR ANSWER:

The Maulana/Sheikh has mixed up his facts. Those who oppose (the attendance of women in the Musaaajid for (the sake of the Deen -because the Sahaabah opposed it --oppose to a greater degree women's participation in shop and office activities. And, we must add that women are today in the shops and the offices because the Ulama of Baatil — such evil Ulama who have sold their

souls to the world to gain [the miserable benefits of this world— have condoned these haraam activities. On the basis of some lop-sided reasoning and confounded policies of diplomacy and expediency (they maintained silence in the face of the rising tide of evil and abandonment of Hijaab The result is before our eyes. The modernist maulana and the modernist sheikh are to be blamed for this unmoral state, not those who prohibit women from the Musjid, for those who prohibit women from the Musjid, forbid them from the shops and offices as well The Islamic duty of Muslim men does not direct them to commit another wrong to remedy a wrong in which they happen to be indulging. The evil of

watching television cannot be eradicated by encouraging women to attend Juma' Salaat. The cure for the problem is to inform and educate the people about the evil itself. Tell the people that television is haraam. Be steadfast in executing the duty of Amr Bil Ma'roof Nahy anil munkar and abandon the false interpretations of the nafs. This is the answer.

QUESTION 3 :

"On what basis or principles do they object for their womenfolk to join them in the Masaajid for Ibaadat occasionally? (this only in Masaajid which has equal but separate facilities for the Sisters). Are they satisfied that their womenfolk are getting that facility to improve themselves Islamically as they are getting by regularly attending activities in the Masjid?"

OUR ANSWER:

Staunch Muslim men never allow their womenfolk into the presence of males, leave alone non-Muslim males. Staunch Muslim men believe that those men who allow their wives and daughters to serve in shops and work in offices are the DAYYOOOTH (cuckold) whom Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) severely reprimanded. Men who permit the emergence of their women folk from the home environment, be the emergence for the shop, the office or the Musjid, are never staunch Muslims. They lack understanding of Shar'i Hijaab because the Ulama of Baatil mislead and misdirect them. Liberal and modern interpretations are given to the true Sunnah --the true Traditional Ways--of Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam).

The Maulana's/Sheikh's lament about women watching television is misdirected. He should refer this question to those supposed Ulama who have legalized this mother of vice. He should direct this query to the conferences of ulama who themselves indulge in viewing haraam television. The ulama of dhalaal and baatil have encouraged Muslims to become television addicts. The modernist Maulana and the modernist Sheikh are responsible for this lamentable situation in which we find Muslim women squandering their precious time viewing haraam television. The Maulana/Sheikh should educate Muslim men about the evil of television. He should divert some of his energies to eradicate this haraam medium. If Muslim men were guided correctly, the majority would not have introduced television into their homes. But, as a result of learned men falling prey to their lowly desires, television was

legalized and its introduction encouraged by the practical examples of men who are supposed to be the Deeni guides of the community. When Ulama too fall by the wayside and perpetuate an evil institution, they have only themselves to blame for the evil and degraded condition of the community

We can claim with emphasis that they learn almost nothing from the Musajjid in these days. The facility of learning supposedly in the Musajjid exists more in the imagination of the modernist Maulana and the modernist Sheikh. On the other hand, those who observe Shar'i Hijaab for the sake of Allah Ta'ala in obedience to the Sunnah of Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) can be

we are satisfied with the alternate arrangements made at home for the Islamic education and training of the womenfolk. The Sharia envisages the education of its females in the home environment by their mahram males. It, therefore, devolves upon the learned men of Islam to intensively educate Muslim men regarding the imperative need and the obligation to teach Muslim women at home what they have acquired in the Musjid or elsewhere.

Furthermore, the Maulana/Sheikh should know that Rasulullah(sallallahu alayhi wa sallam) appointed a special day for the Ta'leem of women. Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) himself went to teach the womenfolk. Why not adopt this Sunnah? Why oppose the wishes and the exhortation of Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) by ushering women into the Musaaajid? Why follow this crooked path? The women should not be called to the Musjid. Rather, in obedience to the Sunnah, the Aalim should arrange for a private house and

with the minimum amount of publicity and as quietly as possible conduct Ta'leem sessions for the females of a specific neighbourhood. But, ofcourse, there are conditions here too, which have to be fulfilled, e.g. a screen should separate the lecturer from the females. There are other conditions as well, but these are not necessary to be discussed at this stage. The Ta'leem of females cannot be made a public issue. Woman is 'aurah'. This is the verdict of the conservative and traditional Sunnah. Exposing Aurah "brings with it spiritual calamities of disastrous magnitude. Hence, Ibn Mas'ud, the eminent Sahaabi (radhiallahu anhu) said:

"Woman is aurah (an object of concealment). When she emerges, shaitaan lies in ambush"

The emergence of women from their homes is a great weapon and snare of shaitaan. Although Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) has very explicitly warned the Ummah of the type of snare laid by shaitaan, the modernist Maulana and the modernist Sheikh have chosen to remain snug in their delusion--a delusion brought about by their modernistically inclined

misinterpretations of the ahadith and Qur'aanic aayaat. Those who believe in the "Musjid facility" for women's Deeni Ta'leem dwell in deception. The Ummah's females were not educated in Musaaajid. Their Musjid has all along been the home where she obtained her Deeni Ta'leem. The Ulama should therefore strive to revive the original system of woman's education. Men have to be educated. It has to be impressed in their minds that they are responsible for the Deeni Ta'leem of their womenfolk. If the Ulama fail in this task, then

they may forget about impressing women who attend the Musaaajid. There is no goodness and no blessings in inviting women to come out to attend the Musjid.

QUESTION 4:

"Are those who oppose Muslim women from attending the Masaajid not aware of the grave injustice to them regarding their Islamic development? Are they not aware of what is happening to the present generation of our daughters? Are they aware of the number of innocent Muslim sisters who have become 'Idolaters' and Christians or have taken intoxicants and ball-room dancing not to mention their un-Islamic tendencies in dress, entertainment and leisure?"

OUR ANSWER:

We are fully aware of this situation of degradation. But, the Maulana/Sheikh seems to be extremely short-sighted. He is wide off the mark. This deplorable condition of Muslim daughters is not the consequence of them not having attended the Musjid. The cause of these baneful evils should be laid at the door of parents who were encouraged by Ulama who concealed the Truth of Islam. The cause of these vices inherited from the libertine west is the evil of female emergence from the home. Parents have chosen to send their daughters to academic houses of prostitution: secular schools, colleges and universities. They gave their blessings to the wholesale plunder and pillage of their daughters' shame and honour to the forces of immorality which plague the institutions of secular learning. Parents had permitted their daughters to dress immodestly to enable them to blend into the college and university environment. Parents allowed their daughters to attend school parties and dances. Parents perpetrated wholesale zina of the eyes and zina of the ears and the heart collectively with their sons and daughters sitting huddled in the presence of the shaitani screen, the television. Parents permitted and actively encouraged their daughters and their sons to participate in every western evil--in every immoral deed of the libertine cult known as western civilization.

The Maulana/Sheikh now has the temerity to vex his indignation and lay the blame on those who endeavoured to fulfil the Sunnah of Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) and his Sahaabah by giving practical expression to the wishes and exhortation of Nabi-e-Kareem (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) in regard to the prohibition enforced by the Sahaabah. What blatant audacity is this?

Rarely does one find girls who remained at home-girls whose minds were not polluted by the immoral filth gorged and churned out in western colleges and universities -slipping down into the pit of Jahannum with the immoral-burdens described in question number 4. The home is the bastion of the Muslim woman. Her modesty, shame, honour and dignity are all protected at home. Her Imaan is safe. But, modernist Muslims, including the liberal and the ghair muqallid ulama afflicted with the disease of western influences, have opted for casting their children to the kuffaar wolves in colleges and universities so that the enemies of Allah Ta'ala --the enemies of Islam- may pillage all transcendental values of morality which only the Muslim home has to offer--the Muslim home operating under the glare of traditional Sunnah --conservative Sunnah -the Sunnah of Muhammadur Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam). Let the Maulana/Sheikh ponder before he makes such rash statements which have absolutely no basis in reality.

QUESTION 5:

"Be fair and honest to your Islamic conscience and begin helping your womenfolk to be with you in seeking for Islamic happiness and success in life, allow her to attend Masjid activities with you in musjids where separate facilities are provided for her to attend."

OUR ANSWER:

Let the Maulana/Sheikh be honest to his Islamic conscience. Let him reflect and understand the grave injustice which he is causing Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) by his adoption of a

stand in opposition to Rasulallah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam). Let him examine his conscience with sincerity and he will not fail to discern that he is moving in diametric opposition to the Ta'leem and wishes of Rasulallah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) and his Sahaabah. Our womenfolk shall remain at home protected from the vulgarity and barbarity of the streets and devilish characters. Those Muslim men who are truly concerned about the Deen do make adequate arrangements for the Deeni Ta'leem of their womenfolk. They do not require the services of the modern Maulana and the modern Sheikh in this regard. The services offered by modernist learned men are the promptings of Iblees even though such baatil efforts assume Deeni forms. Purdah Nasheen women cannot become part of a system of so called Ta'leem and Ibaadat which operate in violation of the Sunnah of Nabi-e -Kareem (sallallahu alayhi wasallam). Remedy the evils Do not create more evils. Confront the problems with insight. But, then insight does not exist where Taqwa and traditional Sunnah conservative Sunnah are absent. The Firaasat (insight) of the Mu'min is dependent on Taqwa which in turn is not possible of attainment without the Traditional and Conservative Sunnah of Rasulallah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam). Thus, the separate facilities of which the modernists speak are confounded traps of Iblees.

Question number 6 merely mentions some incidents which indicate the presence of women inside the Musjid during the time of Rasulallah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam). Answering the individual incidents mentioned in the Maulana's Sheikh's question 6 will be Superfluous since it was never contended that women were not allowed in the Musjid during the age of

Rasulallah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam). While this fact is accepted, the authorities of the Shariah--the Sahaabah and the Fuqahaa after them have explained the circumstances of the permission as well as the factors for the introduction of the subsequent prohibition. Rasulallah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) has coupled the Sunnah of the Sahaabah to his Sunnah, hence the rulings of the Sahaabah are to be regarded as the Sunnah the following of which Nabi-e -Kareem has made incumbent on Muslims until the Day of Oiyaaamah. It, therefore, serves no purpose for the Maulana/Sheikh to attempt to convince people that because women attended the Musjid in the time of Nabi (sallallahu alayhi wasallam), they too, in this evil age should encourage their womenfolk to invade the Musajjid in opposition to the Sunnah.

THE WOMEN'S STUDY-GROUPS ADVOCATED BY THE MODERNISTS

Maulana/Sheikh Makda, in the same pamphlet, encourages women to organize themselves in to study-groups which are supposed to dissect, analyse and mutilate the meanings of the Qur'aan Majeed in the cauldron of personal opinions of the womenfolk. The Maulana/ Sheikh encourages womenfolk to submit the Qur'aan Shareef to their opinions. This is indeed an invitation to the road of deviation. Women are not only encouraged to come to the Musajjid, but are also exhorted to make a toy of the Qur'aan Majeed.

The type of women's study-groups advocated by the Maulana/ Sheikh are un-Islamic, baatil and fraught with grave dangers to the Imaan of the participants. Rasulallah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) said: *"Whoever speaks about the Qur'an with his opinion should prepare his abode in the Fire."*

Let the Maulana/Sheikh understand that the Qur'aan Majeed is not one of those text books used

in secular schools. The Qur'aan is the WAHI revealed to Muhammadur Rasulallah (sallallahu alayhi was allam) and this Wahi was explained and interpreted by Rasulallah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) under divine inspiration. The Ummah, therefore, does not need the baatil interpretations of unlawful women's or men's Qur'aan study -groups. Let our sisters know that it is not permissible to participate in these un-Islamic study-groups.

IBN MAS'UD (Radhiallahu Anhu) SAID:

“I TAKE OATH BY THE ONE BEING THAT A WOMAN HAS NEVER PERFORMED A SALAAT THAN THE SALAAT SHE PERFORMS IN HER ROOM.....”