

A BAATIL IDEA OF TOLERATION

Written by Administrator
Tuesday, 16 May 2017 11:54 -

This response is in refutation of an article on 'tolerance', in fact bootlicking, written by some jaahil molvi.

There are many discrepancies in the article captioned: *INTOLERANCE IS SPLITTING US*. Prosperity and peace are the effects of only following the Shariah. Hence, the Qur'aan Majeed says: "Hold on firmly to the

Rope of Allah

and do not split (among yourselves)."

The

Rope of Allah

is the Shariah. Tolerance is valid only on the basis of the Shariah. There is no valid tolerance for anything in conflict with the Shariah. Such tolerance is

mudaahant,

and silence in the face of baatil transforms a man into a 'dumb shaitaan' in the words of Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam).

This dunya is the arena for the conflict between Haqq and baatil. Haqq cannot tolerate baatil. Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) did not show tolerance to baatil. It was his 'intolerance' towards baatil which created the biggest split in the tribes of Arabia. A split for the sake of Allah Ta'ala is an ibaadat of great merit. All Ambiya were sent to create such splits. The attempt of the writer to analogise toleration of haraam and baatil on the basis of toleration of the valid *Ikhti laafaat*

of the Fuiqaha is fallacious. The

Ikhtilaafaat

of the Fuqaha are based on Shar'i dalaal, not on

nafsaaniyat

an opinion devoid of Shar'i substance such as the opinion which legalizes pictography.

Undoubtedly, Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) was "a model of peace, progress and prosperity for the whole humanity"

This humanity includes all the kuffaar. But the peace and prosperity required 'splitting', fighting and even killing (Jihad). The

Sulah-kun

(stupid total peace/compromise on just any basis) is a teaching of satanism.

A BAATIL IDEA OF TOLERATION

Written by Administrator
Tuesday, 16 May 2017 11:54 -

The largeness of the Shariah's road which embraces "different lanes", is a restrictive 'largeness'. It has its limits which may not be transgressed in the pursuit of 'unity' and avoidance of splitting. The Qur'aan Majeed says: *"These are the limits of Allah. Whoever transgresses them, verily he has oppressed his soul."*

Tolerance of valid Fiqhi *Ikhtilaafat* – differences based on Shar'i dalaal – has never been contested by any Aalim of the Deen. But the difference must be based on valid Shar'i dalaail, not personal opinion, and not in conflict with the *Nusoos* of the Shariah.

It appears that the writer of the article is a bootlicker of baatil, hence he advocates a stupid concept of 'tolerance' which is unacceptable to Islam. Even on the Day of the Conquest of Makkah when a universal amnesty and pardon was announced, several people were ordered to be killed. One was killed even whilst hanging on to the *Ghilaaf* of the Ka'bah crying for mercy.

The writer fails to distinguish between valid Fiqhi differences and differences based on *baatil*. The "degree of tolerance of the Sunnah" has not been trampled on as the writer baselessly claims. What has been trampled on is the Shariah itself. The Ahkaam of the Shariah are being mutilated and the foundations of Islam are being dug up by miscreant molvis and sheikhs of baatil. That is what is happening. Tolerating baatil and accommodating those who destroy the Deen are haraam.

What does the writer mean by : *"Everyone is pinpointing the other one in this Ummah."* He should acquit himself with clarity and refrain from ambiguity and riddles. The Ahl-e-Baatil must be pinpointed and criticized. It is Waajib to inform the masses of the villainy of those who mislead the Ummah. Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) himself said: *"Verily, I fear for my Ummah the aimmah mudhilleen."*

A BAATIL IDEA OF TOLERATION

Written by Administrator
Tuesday, 16 May 2017 11:54 -

The analogy of the different postures of the hands during Salaat presented as a grounds for tolerating just any type of difference, is palpably fallacious. Kufr, Bid'ah, fisq and fujoor may not be tolerated simply because the Shariah permits placing the hands differently in Salaat as advocated by the different Math-habs. That is a valid Shar'i differences based on *Nusoos*. But to say, for example, that placing the hands on top of one's head during Salaat should be tolerated, then we shall retort that this propagator is a shaitaan.

The splitting to uphold the Haqq is among the *Maqaasid* of the Deen. Such splitting is the consequence of discharging the obligation of *Amr Bil Ma'roof Nahy anil Munkar*.

It is a splitting which is an act of Ibaadat of high merit. Thus, Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) supplicated:

"May Allah have mercy on Umar. The Haqq has not left a single friend for him."

A logical consequence of proclaiming the Haqq is to attract criticism and intolerance. In reality, the people of baatil are the intolerant ones, not to Ahl-e-Haqq. The People of the Haqq only state the truth of Allah's Deen. Then the people of baatil react with intolerance.

Regarding the advice pertaining to Tablighis reading Fazaail A'maal and/or Muntakhab Hadith, that issue is an internal difference among Tablighis. We are not aware of any Aalim-e-Haqq who has made an issue of this internal Tablighi dispute. It is a matter of policy which the seniors of the Jamaat should settle amongst themselves. The Jamaat people themselves should resolve this difference. It is point of methodology on which we have not commented nor did we read the kitaab, Muntakhab Ahaadith.

The advice that tolerance should be displayed to those who claim that photography of animate objects are permissible should be tolerated, is shaitaani deception. The devil has inspired this writer to advocate acceptance and toleration of Haraam – of a haraam act which is among the major sins and which has been banned by such *Nusoos* which are of the highest degree of authenticity. There is absolutely no scope for tolerating the haraam permissibility view. Those who proclaim permissibility speak with their nafs. They have hitherto miserably failed to present a single Shar'i daleel to bolster their haraam claim. They only present personal opinion with which they satanically attempt to scuttle the *Nusoos* which are of the

A BAATIL IDEA OF TOLERATION

Written by Administrator
Tuesday, 16 May 2017 11:54 -

Mutawwatir category of dalaa-il.

The ulama who maintain that photos are permissible are astray. They have deviated from the Haqq. It is haraam to worship 'ulama' in the way Bani Israaeel had 'worshipped' their ulama who were *mudhilleen*. How is it ever possible to tolerate these miscreant ulama who fail to present Shar'i dalaa-il for their contention?

The writer of baatil toleration says: *"Those ulamas who are very severe against photos should realise that next time don't even give a photo to the embassy for a nafil Hajj or Umrah. There will be no way out but to take the fatwa of those who say it is only a freeze of figures and shadows which is permissible."*

The writer by this statement illustrates his ignorance. Those Ulama who go for Nafil Hajj, even if they present a photo to the embassy, are not in need of the bunkum 'freeze of figures' fatwa of moron 'muftis'. They do not have to accept the stupid 'fatwa' of those who halaalize haraam pictography with the stupid and silly deception of 'freeze of shadows'.

The only thing which the moron can say is that they do not practice what they preach. The weakness of an Aalim is not a daleel in the Shariah. If an Aalim steals or fornicates, he does not have to seek any jaahil's fatwa for regarding his sin to be permissible. He makes Taubah. The same applies to an Aalim who despite proclaiming pictures to be haraam, takes a picture for the purpose of going for Nafil Hajj. There is absolutely no daleel for the moron in this sinful act of the Aalim.

Furthermore, for the edification of the moron writer, he should be told that it is not permissible to perpetrate a haraam act for the sake of a Nafil ibaadat. Umrah and Nafil Hajj are not compulsory. Abstention from haraam photography is Waajib. It is therefore not permissible to go for Umrah and Nafil Hajj if one has to resort to haraam photos. Thus, the Aalim who believes

A BAATIL IDEA OF TOLERATION

Written by Administrator
Tuesday, 16 May 2017 11:54 -

and proclaims pictures of animate objects to be haraam, yet takes a photo for a visa, acknowledges his error. He does not justify his haraam act. He does not halalize what Allah Ta'ala has made haraam. His misdeed is not a daleel for permissibility.

The moron then says: *"Ulamas has given permission the use of figurine coins, newspapers and trade of figurine clothing..."* (He does not even know that Ulama is plural, hence he stupidly say 'ulamas').

This argument further displays the academic bankruptcy of the jaahil. Money is a dire necessity. The permissibility of using money on which appear pictures is based on the principle of *Dhuroorah*. Thus, the permissibility of using such coins is not a basis for declaring pork to be halaal. Pictures will remain haraam when there is no Shar'i *D huroorah*, just as pork will remain haraam despite it becoming temporarily permissible for a starving man to save his life.

Permission to read newspapers, does not legalize haraam pictography. The pictures in newspapers are haraam. If permission to read newspapers is given, it will be based on daleel. But that does not halaalize pictures of animate objects. Selling clothes with pictures of animate objects is not permissible. Those who say that it is permissible are astray and grievous error. There is no toleration to be offered for crass haraam.

Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) did not show tolerance for haraam. The kuffaar find everything of the Deen intolerant. Their boots may not be licked to appease their kufir palates.

He further displays his silliness with the argument of the rise in the divorce rate which he attributes to intolerance. Generally the increase of divorces in Muslim society is due to the kufir culture which they have adopted. The rise in divorce is the consequence of *fisq*, *fujoor* and *jahaalat*, and following the lifestyle of the kuffaar. The lack of toleration in the home for the shortcomings of the spouses has absolutely no relationship with the Shariat's fatwa of the prohibition of pictures of animate objects.

A BAATIL IDEA OF TOLERATION

Written by Administrator

Tuesday, 16 May 2017 11:54 -

The permissibility fatwa is intolerable because it is fraudulent manipulation of the Deen. It is a view which has absolutely no Shar'i basis. It is pure corrupt opinion which cannot be bolstered by a single Shar'i daleel. Just as toleration cannot be proffered for *riba*, *zina*, *khamr*, etc., so too there can be no toleration for the kabeerah sin of pictography. Will acceptance of a fatwa of permissibility for liquor be within the bounds of toleration? Hitherto, we are certain no one has tolerated permissibility of fornication although the time will still come for such toleration and acceptance. But, since the evil of pictures has been eliminated from the hearts, the haraam permissibility view is accepted by the bootlickers of the west.

The moron cites a Hadith pertaining to girls singing with a *daff* in the house of Hadhrat Aishah (Radhiyallahu anha), and Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) not reprimanding them, but permitting it. Firstly, the moron is not a mujtahid. He has no right to extract a Hadith and subject it to his defective interpretation. The Shariah has ruled on the impermissibility of music and the use of the *daff*, and all of this is based on explicit Ahaadith of Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam). This isolated narration may not be cited to abrogate the more than fourteen century law of prohibition. A fatwa of permissibility for music cannot be tolerated on the basis of this Hadith. The moron should study the tafseer of the Hadith and the views of the Fuqaha if he has the ability to effect such study.

This narration cannot be presented as a basis for accepting or even tolerating haraam pictography.

The Qur'aanic exhortation of *hikmah* is not to be understood to mean bootlicking, confusing Haqq with baatil, and concealing the Haqq. *Hikmah* refers to the manner of acquittal – how the message of Haqq is stated and delivered. It never means legalizing haraam and speaking with a forked tongue which leaves people in confusion and doubt.

When Nabi Ibraaheem (Alayhis salaam) said to the mushrikeen that they are his 'enemies' because of their shirk, he was not being in denial of *hikmat* by not tolerating their idols. On the contrary, he took an axe and demolished the idols.

When an illiterate rustic urinated inside the Masjid, Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) spoke tenderly to him. That was *hikmat*. But his *hikmat* did not make urinating in the Masjid

A BAATIL IDEA OF TOLERATION

Written by Administrator

Tuesday, 16 May 2017 11:54 -

halaal. The illiterate man was informed with clarity that it was not permissible to urinate in the Masjid. That was *hikmat*. On the other hand, when Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) observed saliva on the Qiblah wall, his mubaarak face became red with rage and he harshly reprimanded the Sahaabah. That was the *hikmat*

for this occasion. With the kind of brains which the moron displays, it is clear that he does not have even a hazy idea of the meaning of hikmat.

If the opinion of the opposition is legalization of haraam, it shall not be respected nor tolerated. The opposition must be told in their face that they are guilty of kufr by halaalizing a kabeerah sin. The moron says that "we should unite under one banner". The banner which has room for haraam, fisq, fujoor and even kufr, is not for the people of Haqq. It is for those who trade the Deen for a miserable price – for those who pursue the dunya in the name of the Deen and for the bootlickers of the western kuffaar.