



**WOMEN IN MUSAAJID
AND
THE BAATIL OPINION
OF THE
DARUL IFTA OF LEICESTER (U.K.)**

By:
Mujlisul Ulama of South Africa
P.O. Box 3393
Port Elizabeth, 6056
mujlisul.ulama@gmail.com

RESPONSE TO THE CORRUPT 'FATWA'

In a corrupt 'fatwa' of personal opinion bereft of any sound Shar'i dalaa-il, a Molvi Muhammad Ibn Adam of the Leicester (U.K.) Darul Ifta, promoted the fitnah of the imagined 'permissibility' for women to attend the Musjid for Salaat. Commencing his baatil opinion, he avers:

"Generally, the major Fatawa books of the Indian Subcontinent Hanafi jurists (fuqaha) discourage (quite vehemently at times) women from attending and praying in Mosques."

In this opening statement, the Molvi not only displays his extreme short-sightedness and oblique intellectual perception, but demonstrates his *jahl-e-murakkab* (compound ignorance). He displays lamentable ignorance of the Shariah's stance on this issue since the era of the Sahaabah, and his venture to speak on this subject has only exhibited his lack of understanding the principles and rules of Ifta. In brief, his statement, mentioned above, is pure rubbish. It does not behove a man of ilm to disgorge rubbish.

He compounds his rubbish with the abortive attempt to minimize the importance of the Shariah's Prohibition by subtly endeavouring to breed in the minds of readers the notion that the Ban on women's attendance of the Musaaajid is a mere opinion of the Indian Ulama.

We find ourselves in an age about which Hadhrat Abdullah Ibn Mas'ood (radhiyallahu anhu) said while narrating some of the Signs of Qiyaamah, that a great *fitnah* will envelope the Ummah.....

“When your Ulama have disappeared; when your qurraa’ (qaaris) have become abundant; when your Fuqaha are few; when your rulers are in abundance; when your trustworthy are few, when Ilm (of the Deen) will be pursued for motives other than the Deen, and when the dunya will be pursued with deeds of the Aakhirah.”

This Molvi comes within the scope of this Hadith. In attributing the prohibition of women attending the Musjid to the Ulama of the Indian Subcontinent, the mufti *maajin* is emulating the *fussaaq, fujjaar, juhhaal* modernists. These juhhaal perennially claim that the Prohibition is the enactment of the Hanafi Ulama of the Indian Subcontinent. The averment advertises their ignorance – total ignorance – an ignorance of which the *maajin* one-eyed ‘muftis’ with their smattering of knowledge are making taqleed.

If this Molvi was a repository of sound knowledge of the Deen he would not have acquitted himself so stupidly by audaciously attributing the prohibition to the Hanafi Ulama of India and Pakistan. The Fataawa recorded in “major Fatawa Books” which he mentions are not the opinions of the Indo-Pak Ulama. The Fataawa Kutub of the Indian Ulama are merely compilations of the Shariah’s Rulings issued by the Fuqaha of the Khairul Quroon era, and of the Fuqaha-e-Mutaqaddimeen and Muta-akh-khirreen. Not a single one of this glittering galaxy of Aimmah-e-Mujtahideen and Fuqaha was an Aalim from the Indian Subcontinent.

In his attempt to pull wool over the eyes of an unsuspecting, ignorant public, the Molvi merely betrayed his own *jahaalat*. We have published six booklets on the Shariah’s Prohibition of women attending the Musjid. In

these books we have expounded this topic from every angle, and we have refuted every single stupid argument of the modernist ignoramuses and of the cockeyed *maajin* 'muftis' who are described in *Rasmul Mufti* as *Haatibul Lail*, i.e. gatherers of firewood in an intensely dark night. They know not whether their hands are falling on excreta or on a snake.

In the books we have published on this subject we have enumerated the names of many Kutub in which the prohibition is stated, emphasized and explained by the non-Indian Fuqaha many centuries before the Hanafi Darul Uloom Deoband had come into existence. There is no need to duplicate that information in this brief refutation. All six books on this topic are available from us. Whoever is interested, may write for copies.

Thus, the claim the Molvi disgorged is utterly baseless. It is not a prohibition originated by the Hanafi Ulama of India.

Although with a forked tongue he is constrained to concede that "their stance is not based on any cultural values or customs; rather, they are merely reinforcing what the classical Hanafi jurists have stated," his attempt is to water down the rigid stance of the Shariah on the issue of females attending the Masjid, and this he tries to achieve by planting the idea that the primary expounders of this mas'alah are the Ulama of the Indian subcontinent. He has no alternative other than making this concession due to the glaringly conspicuous evidence from the Sahaabah proving the Prohibition.

Disgorging another spurious argument of baseless opinion, the Molvi says:

“However, the understanding of the various classical and contemporary Hanafi Fuqaha is that women in the time of the Messenger of Allah (Allah bless him and give him peace) had the unique opportunity of praying behind the Messenger..... Based on the above, the various classical Hanafi Fuqaha (and also the majority of the contemporary Hanafi Fuqaha of the Subcontinent) state that it is disliked (makruh) for women, whether married or single, to go to the Mosque for congregational prayers.”

Firstly, the Fuqaha do not say that it is ‘disliked’. They say that it is not permissible, and Makrooh in this context means Haraam.

In this stupid averment he again displays his *jahaalat* with his attempt to create the impression that the prohibition is the fatwa of only the Hanafi Fuqaha. But in reality, the Fuqaha of all Four Math-habs have confirmed the ban which Hadhrat Umar (radhiyallahu anhu) had enacted on women attending the Musjid. It is a massive LIE to peddle the claim of the modernist who attribute the prohibition to only the Hanafi Fuqaha. We have explained this issue in our other publications. Suffice here to say that the *maajin mufti’s* claim is baseless. The Fuqaha of all Math-habs are unanimous in holding the view of prohibition.

Although he seeks to abortively minimize the vehemence of the prohibition with the term, ‘disliked’, he says immediately thereafter:

“Imam al-Kasani (Allah have mercy on him) states:

‘It will not be permitted for young women to go to the Mosque for congregational prayers due to the fact that Sayyiduna Umar (Allah be pleased with him) prevented women from doing so. Moreover, women’s going to the Masjid is a cause of mischief (between men and women) and mischief (fitna) is Haram, and that which leads to something Haram will also be unlawful.’ (Bada’i al-Sana’i)

Note: Imaam Kasaani (rahmatullah alayh) was not from the Indian Subcontinent).

The aforementioned statement clearly mentions that it is not permissible for women to attend the Musjid, and that it is haraam based on the *fitnah*.

The Molvi pretends and attempts to disseminate his pretence that while the *fitnah* which was the basis and rationale for the prohibition, was ‘rife’ during the age of the Sahaabah and the Khairul Quroon, it is no longer the case today, hence the ‘context’ which had justified the Prohibition enacted by the Ijma’ of the Sahaabah and upheld by the verdicts of the Fuqaha of all Math-habs in all ages, is no longer applicable. Thus, the supposed non-existence of the earlier ‘context’ in our corrupt age of immorality and vice justifies uplifting or abrogation of the fourteen-century Prohibition of the Shariah.

Expounding his theory of putrid *ghutha*, the Molvi says:

“One should always keep in mind the context in which the Fuqaha were giving such verdicts. Life was very plain and simple. Women in Muslim countries and Islamic societies would normally not emerge out of their homes unless absolutely necessary. The need to emerge out of the house was not like the need we have in today’s

complicated world.....Keeping the context in mind, one can easily understand why the classical Fuqaha gave such verdicts. By allowing women to frequent the Mosques they would be giving women permission to emerge out of their homes- women who would have otherwise not emerged outside.”

This specious argument is both stupid and false. Its falsity is not hidden upon men of understanding and true Ilm. The ‘context’ which the Molvi peddles is false and baseless. The Prohibition did not initiate with the so-called ‘classical’ Fuqaha. The Prohibition was by way of the *Ijma’* of the Sahaabah, and in an age of the greatest piety and nobility – an age, the likes of which we shall never again witness on earth right until the Day of Qiyaamah. It was an age in which still flourished the Azwaaj-e-Mutahharaat (the Holy Wives of Rasulullah – sallallahu alayhi wasallam) – the age in which thousands of pious Sahaabiyah flourished. It was not an age in which fitnah was ‘rife’ as the moron ‘mufti’ seeks to peddle.

Further down the line, i.e. many centuries after the Sahaabah - the Fuqaha-e- Muta-akh-khireen elaborated on the greater prevalence of the fitnah which rushed into the Ummah as a consequence of female emergence – not necessarily for the Musjids. Centuries ago they used to emerge in droves, adorned like prostitutes and exhibiting themselves like prostitutes right within the holy precincts of the Haramain Shareefain. The situation was so horrid that the Shaafi’ Fuqaha opined it was not permissible for women to come to the Haram for even Fardh Tawaaf. Abstention from the evils of female immorality and the resultant mischief created in the ranks of the men, was of

greater importance than the acquisition of the benefits of Tawaaf.

The ‘context’ which the Leicester Molvi tenders is the effect of his hallucination or fabrication. Besides emergence for the Musjid, females emerged for every haraam and unnecessary reason. They polluted the bazaars with their immorality. They soiled the streets and the roads with their presence. They opened up the avenues of zina. And, all of this continued unabated despite the ban on their emergence to attend the Musaaqid having been enacted during the era of the Sahaabah. This Prohibition was totally ignored by the women who emerged from their homes, prowled the streets and roamed in the bazaars. But they observed the ban to attend the Musjid, hence the Musaaqid of Islam throughout the history of Islam had no facilities for women. It is only in this immoral age in which Muslims are emulating the Yahood and Nasaara in every department and aspect of life that they are following the example of the Christian churches, hence they are opening up the last bastions of piety and purity – the Musaaqid – for pollution with zina.

The Molvi’s ‘context’ argument is plain drivel designed to bamboozle the stupid and the unwary.

Furthermore, the Molvi says that since women are today *“all over the market areas, shopping malls, shopping centres, streets and roads, it seems unfair to completely shun them from entering the Mosques.”* This statement further demonstrates the shallowness of his understanding and his extreme short-sightedness.

In his silly opinion it is 'unfair' to prevent women from the Musaaqid, hence they should be permitted. The basis for the permission in his view is the evil and haraam commissions of the women. It should be well understood that the roaming and prowling of women in the malls, hypermarkets, streets and roads are not permissible. Their presence in these public places is a *kabeerah* sin. The *La'nat* of Allah Ta'ala settles on women who roam in these public places. It can therefore never become permissible to allow the *mal-oonaat* (*women on whom is Allah's curse*) admission to the Musaaqid. Those who do allow them are also *mal-oon*.

Presenting another specious argument of *jahaalat*, the Molvi from U.K. states:

"If we were to apply this context to the modern era – where women are all over the market areas, shopping malls, shopping centres, streets and roads – it seems unfair to completely shun them from entering the Mosques, As one scholar of piety and knowledge once said: 'We don't mind women frequenting the most disliked places in the sight of Allah (abghad al-Bilad) which are the bazaars (aswaq), but we have a major problem with women coming to the most beloved of places (ahbabu al-Bilad) in the sight of Allah, which are the Mosques!"

Both the Leicester Molvi and the 'scholar of piety and knowledge' are *juhhaal*. They are ignoramuses on account of the drivel they have disgorged. Who are the people of the Deen who 'don't mind women frequenting the bazaars'? The people who don't mind women frequenting the worst of places are the very same *juhhaal* who are promoting female emergence from the houses to attend the Musaaqid. They are the liberal molvis and the Tablighi

molvis and the crank ‘shaikhs’ of the desolate khaanqas of this era.

Those who prohibit women from the Musaaajid, prohibit them from the bazaars, streets, malls and brothels with even greater emphasis. It is a dastardly LIE for the scholar of supposed piety and knowledge, and a contemptible attempt at deception to convey the vile notion that the Ulama who are maintaining the validity of the Ijmaa-ee Prohibition of the Sahaabah, *“don’t mind women frequenting abghadul bilaad, viz; the aswaaq or bazaars.”*

This is the kind of stupid and false argument proffered by those who are bereft of Shar’i dalaa-il for their fallacies. Those who prohibit females from the Musjid, are more vehement in prohibiting them from frequenting the malls, markets and from roaming in the streets and roads. It is absolutely ludicrous and absurd to imagine that those who prevent women from the holiest places (the Musaaajid), allow them freedom to frequent the worst places (the market places).

Men of piety and knowledge do not fabricate slander as a basis for a fatwa. There is absolutely no worth in the stupid averment of the Leicester Molvi and the scholar of supposed piety and knowledge.

The selfsame context which had warranted the enactment of the prohibition by the Sahaabah, exists today. The only difference is that the context (i.e. the fitnah) has multiplied a thousand fold in today’s age. The fitnah is infinitely worse in this age than what it was during the noblest of ages. The prohibition thus has greater emphasis today

than what it had during the era of the Sahaabah and the Khairul Quroon.

The Molvi without applying his mind advocates permissibility for women to attend the Musjid on the basis of a haraam premiss. He utilizes a haraam basis in his silly attempt to cancel the *Ijma'* of the Sahaabah on the issue of prohibition. Thus he fallaciously says:

“Therefore, when women are allowed to go to the bazaars, markets, shopping malls and other such places (and justifiably in many cases), then it does not seem right to completely shun them from coming to the Mosques.”

This argument is spurious and devoid of Shar’i substance. The very first premiss in this argument is fallacious. Women are NOT allowed by the Shariah to go to the shopping malls and all similar places of lewdness where evil prevails. Their presence at these worst of places is not promoted or permitted by the Shariah. They go to these evil places in defiance of the Shariah and with the co-operation of their *dayyooth* shameless and spineless menfolk who are bereft of any Islamic honour. The evil conduct of the street-women may not be cited as a basis for abrogating the 14 century ban enacted by the Sahaabah.

Pursuing his stupid argument, the Leicester Molvi says:

“Secondly, at times there may be a genuine need for women to go to the Mosques such as when travelling and the prayer time is about to come to an end.”

We have travelled with our womenfolk for decades and so have innumerable Muslims who observe Hijaab. Not once

in all the decades did we experience the need for our females to perform Salaat in a Musjid. When one does not engage in haraam, Allah Ta'ala creates the circumstances for halaal acquittal. Just as the men who are travelling find place for Salaat, so too do the females manage to find places for Salaat. Furthermore, in the vast majority of cases travellers do not perform Salaat in the Musaaajid which are almost always far from the course they are travelling. Furthermore, the 14 century prohibition of the Shariah may not be cancelled for the benefit of a few isolated cases of inconvenience. The context of the fitnah has multiplied manifold.

The miscreant Molvi then avers:

“At times women may need to go to the Mosque to learn sacred knowledge, attend a spiritual gathering and other such matters, hence they may need to pray her Salat in the Mosque.”

It is indeed intellectually demeaning to respond to this stupid averment which the Leicester Molvi has disgorged. When women are prohibited to go to the Musjid for even Fardh Salaat, then to a greater degree will the prohibition apply to any other function. In this age there are adequate and ample ways of acquiring necessary sacred knowledge. Furthermore, most speakers in the Musaaajid do not impart “sacred knowledge”. They talk a lot of drivel camouflaged with Deeni hues.

The Fuqaha have explicitly prohibited women from attending any public lectures of Ilm. They understood these issues better than the moron molvis of this era.

As a consequence of kuffaar modernism and liberalism which many molvis are adopting, most of the Musjids where women attend are being defiled by acts of zina of a variety of kinds. Even the Leicester Molvi is constrained to concede this fact, hence he says:

“At times men and women are seen praying in the Mosque in such an informal and casual manner that the rules of the Shariah are overlooked.. The rules of Hijab are violated and men and women are quite willing to intermingle freely and openly in the Mosque.In some Mosques on the occasion of Eid and other celebrations, women and men dress like they are attending some sort of fashion show, with the women dressed up in all their make up and powerful fragrance.”

This was the scenario which the Sahaabah foresaw 14 centuries ago, and for which the Shariah has enacted the Prohibition which the modernist *maajin* muftis of this age are attempting to scuttle. Despite conceding the immorality accompanying female attendance at the Musaaajid, the Molvi stupidly promotes the idea of permissibility in defiance of the Shariah.

Further conceding the existence of male-female immorality at the Musaaajid where females are permitted, the Molvi says:

“Open and casual intermingling of the sexes is prohibited in Shariah, hence it will not be permitted for women to go to the Mosque in such a context.”

But this is precisely the context which is prevailing at all Musaaajid where women attend. The fitnah can never be

eliminated by allowing women to attend the Musjid. The way of preventing the fitnah is for women to remain at home. They should not emerge from their homes except for activities explicitly permitted by the Shariah. The consequence of violating the limits of the Shariah are evil and immoral.

The “balanced approach” advocated by the Leicester Molvi is a stupid approach. If separate areas for Salaat had to be planned in every Musjid as the Molvi suggests, the Sahaabah would have been the very first to have embarked on this option. However, in the 14 centuries of Islam’s history not a single authority of the Shariah had ever advocated such a stupid measure as this Molvi has suggested. Yet he dubs this stupidity as a “balanced approach”.

The problem of fitnah (immorality) cannot be addressed and eliminated by opening up further avenues of fitnah. The avenue of fitnah has to be closed to eliminate the evil. The mass presence of women in the streets and malls is no justification for defiling the sanctity of the Musaaqid by polluting the minds and gazes of the fussaag which are in abundance nowadays even in the Musaaqid.

It should be understood that banning women from the Musaaqid in the current era is an issue of mere academic import. Practically, the Shariah’s Prohibition no longer has any effect. Despite the Prohibition having existed for fourteen centuries, almost all Musaaqid in the current era have rebelliously thrown open their doors to women. The question presently is not prohibiting women from the Musaaqid. They are already there defiling themselves, defiling the sanctity of the Musaaqid and spinning their

traps of fitnah in which the fussaag are being ensnared. The issue now is only the Law of Allah Ta'ala which has to be maintained intact in its state of pristine purity. And, this is our obligation – to state the Haqq and to din it into the ears of all the deviates and liberal molvis and fake scholars that it is haraam for women to attend the Musjid regardless of their preponderance in the public domain. The avalanches of sins perpetrated by the Ummah should not buffet the Ulama of Haq into silence and concealment of the Haq. The Haq of Allah's Law must be proclaimed without the slightest ambiguity. There should be no forked-tongue stance in the ranks of the Ulama-e-Haq. The Ulama-e-Haq are in fact that Institution which Allah Azza Wa Jal has created to guard and defend His Deen, and about them, Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) said:

“There will ever remain a group of my Ummah who will fight on the Haq. Those who oppose them and those who refrain from aiding them will not be able to harm them. (They will remain steadfast on the Haq) until comes the Command of Allah (i.e. Qiyaamah).”

By creating special areas in the Musaaqid for women, a seal of Shar'i approval, acceptability and respectability will be conferred to a haraam act. Regardless of whether every Musjid in the world opens up its doors for women, it is the obligation of the Ulama-e-Haq to proclaim the Truth, not to adulterate Haqq with baatil, and not to speak with forked tongues as the Leicester Molvi does in his opinion of grievous error. Approval and acceptability may not be conferred to an institution/activity/practice which is haraam in the Shariah regardless of all the hallucinated 'benefits'.

Women who miss their Salaat as a consequence of visiting the malls and roaming in the street cannot be blessed with Musjid facilities. In the first place they are not supposed to be in the malls and bazaars. They should not venture out of their homes at times when there is the fear of missing Salaat. A *Mansoos Hukm* of the Shariah cannot be abrogated for the benefit of accommodating the supposed deeni needs of *faasiqah* and *faahishah* women who prowl around in the malls and streets. Let it be known that all those 'niqaabi' women who roam around in the public domain are included among the *faahishaat* and *faasiqaat*. The Law of Allah Azza Wa Jal does not permit them to defile the Musaaajid with their unholy presence.

Making a mockery of his intelligence, the Leicester Molvi says:

“...extreme care and precaution should be taken of observing the rules of Hijab so that there is no fear of any Fitna. Both brothers and sisters should have separate entrances, and open intermingling of the two genders must be avoided Sisters should also be wary that going to the Mosque should not lead to the non-fulfilment of their other household duties.”

It appears that the Molvi is hallucinating or due to inexperience he dwells in Utopia. It is mind boggling that he fails to understand the simple truth related to the issue of *fitnah*. When during the best age of Khairul Quroon, the Sahaabah abrogated female attendance at the Musjid on the basis of *fitnah*, what is the difficulty in understanding the thousand fold multiplication of the *fitnah*

in this immoral age 14 centuries after Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam)?

Is the Molvi perpetrating deliberate stupidity or trying to bamboozle and hoodwink the masses into understanding that the perfection of Utopia which he is dreaming about can be practically implemented in today's era of total fitnah and fasaad? When the Sahaabah could not achieve what he suggests, who else will have the ability and the authority to implement what he suggests? Look at the situation in the Haram Shareef – in the Mataaf area and in Musjidul Haraam in general. The Molvi is suggesting the abrogation of a fourteen century Shar'i Law on the basis of hallucination. He hallucinates that what he is suggesting is practically achievable.

Without understanding the problem and without applying his mind constructively, the Leicester Molvi has cluttered his article with incongruencies. Despite his motive being the opening up of the already opened Musaaqid for women, he thoughtlessly tenders the following incongruency:

“One should always remember that ‘ends don't justify the means’ hence it is vital that in order to do an act of good one must take means that are sound also. Open and casual intermingling of the sexes is prohibited in Shariah, hence it will not be permitted for women to go to the Mosque in such a context.”

He states the ‘context’ which ushered in the perpetual Prohibition, but fails to understand that this very context exists today in a vastly magnified and intensified form in comparison to what it was during Khairul Quroon. Contradicting the principle of the ends not justifying the

means, he advocates haraam means to address the self-induced haraam problem – a problem created by women themselves – the problem of emergence. He attempts to justify the haraam means for overcoming the ‘ends’. The ‘ends’ in this case is the Salaat of women, and the means are opening up the Musaaajid for females. Opening the Musaaajid for them is a haraam way since it abrogates an explicit *Hukm* of the Shariah. The poor Molvi lacks the intellectual capacity to understand the issue which has tackled.

Further, advertising his ignorance, the Molvi avers:

“On the other hand, we see that some people are quite extreme in preventing women from attending the Mosques that they don’t have a designated place for women to pray.”

If he had applied his mind, he would not have uttered this drivel. Who are these ‘*some people who are quite extreme*’? For his edification it will be salubrious for him to know that the first people who were ‘extreme’ in preventing women from the Musjid were the Sahaabah of Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam). During the best of eras, Ameerul Mu’mineen issued the Ban on women. This Ban was entrenched with the Consensus of the Sahaabah.

Hadhrat Abdullah Ibn Mas’ood (radhiyallahu anhu) who was among the most senior of the Sahaabah, adopted the ‘extreme’ measure of physically standing outside the Musjid chasing away women who attempted to enter. Then we see another very senior Sahaabi, Hadhrat Abdullah Ibn Umar (radhiyallahu anhu) driving women

away from the Musjid by stoning them with pebbles. What degree of ‘extremity’ does the Leicester Molvi assign to these measures of the senior Sahaabah? Why not openly condemn the Sahaabah for the ‘extreme’ measures they had adopted on this issue? Why not openly condemn the senior Shaafi Fuqaha who opined that women should not be allowed to even make Tawaaf of the Baitullah on account of the evil and immorality they had introduced in the Musajjid with their emergence and presence? The Molvi has lost the Path.

***“And it is not on us but to deliver the
Clear Message.”
(Qur’aan)***

“Make incumbent on you (the observance) of my Sunnah and the Sunnah of my rightly guided Khulafa (Abu Bakr, Umar, Uthmaan and Ali – radiyallahu anhum).” “Honour my Ashaab (Companions), for verily they are your noblest, then those after them (the Taabieen); then those after them (TabeTaabieen). Thereafter falsehood will become rampant.”

Shaitaan’s best and most potent trap for misguiding the Ummah is bid’ah – the innovation of acts, customs and practices adorned with an external façade of ‘ibaadat, presented on the basis of ‘deeni’ wisdom and ‘benefit’. One such vile bid’ah which has become entrenched in the community, and which is on the increase is the establishment of ladies Salaat facilities within the Musjid complex.

Deceptive arguments are presented to justify this wide and haraam departure from the Sunnah of Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) and the Sunnah of his Sahaabah, i.e. from the

Shariah of Allah Ta'ala. Almost all Ulama have become the victims of this dangerous plot of shaitaan. Shaitaan having blinded their intellectual perception, they fail to understand that a 'wisdom' and a 'benefit' which abrogate the Sunnah, which wildly depart and diverge from the Sunnah and which are in flagrant violation of the Ijma'(Consensus) of the Sahaabah and the Ummah since the past fourteen centuries, is in fact a plot of shaitaan. It is the type of snare called Talbees-e-Iblees (the deception/confusion of Iblees).

The establishment of women's Salaat facilities alongside/within the Masjid complex is one such act which comes within the purview of Talbees-e-Iblees stratagems. The Ijma' of the Sahaabah and the Ummah had securely and finally banned women from attending the Masjid even in the best of eras, the Khairul Quroon epoch. The perfection of the Deen which the Qur'aan Majeed announces was finalized with the Sunnah and Ijma' of the Sahaabah of Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam).

The argument that women are now on the streets prostituting themselves holds absolutely no validity for the moves to cancel the Sunnah. The wanderings of women in the streets, hypermarkets and malls, their presence in shops, offices and factories working side by side with males and their nocturnal emission from the home to prowl venues of moral villainy can never constitute a basis for changing, mutilating and abrogating any institution of the Shariah.

The solution for the already confirmed khurooj (emergence from the home) of women is not the establishment of institutions which offer them further impetus for entrenchment of their lewdness. The solution is Ta'leem –to educate them.

The duty of the Ulama is like that of the Ambiya whose obligation according to the Qur'aan was: "Upon us is only to deliver the Clear Message (the Shariah)." Effecting changes to the Ahkaam of the Deen on the basis of satanic 'wisdom' is nothing but the dismantling of the Shariah. The Yahood and Nasaara excelled in such stunts, hence today there remains not a semblance of the Shariah of Hadhrat Musaa (alayhis salaam) and Hadhrat Isaa (alayhis salaam).

The grip of shaitaan on the brains of present-day ulama has induced them to totally abandon Amr Bil Ma'roof Nahy Anil Munkar in almost every sphere of the Deen. Instead of educating the females of Islam by propagating the Haqq to them, they (the ulama) are licensing their evil, and conferring legitimacy to their khurooj with the justification of public Salaat facilities for females. These ulama who have lost the direction of Islam and walking blindly in the footsteps of the miscreant ulama of the Yahood and Nasaara, are not confining their misguided fatwas to the permissibility of public Salaat facilities, they have degenerated to even justifying public thikr and lecture programmes for women.

The solution for the rising immorality in the Muslim community is to educate the womenfolk and the menfolk about the demands of Hijaab, and to divest the liberal females who have flit in and out of the home, of the corrupt notion that Hijaab is confined to a deceptive cloak and a niqaab. The first degree of Hijaab— the Fardh degree – as stated in the Qur'aan Majeed is: *qarn fil buyout (to be glued inside the homes)*. The ulama of this age have abrogated this Qur'aanic command to justify the haraam khurooj of women.