

MMB-Questions & Answers

Written by Administrator
Saturday, 16 April 2011 06:51 -

NO. 10

3 Jamaadul Awwal 1432 – 9 April 2011

THE KUFR 'MUSLIM' MARRIAGES BILL

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Q. Why does *The Majlis* say that the Muslim Marriages Bill is kufr?

A. Rejecting, denying, denigrating, mocking, altering, displacing and tampering with any teaching, tenet, principle of Allah's Deen is *KUFR*. Kufr eliminates Imaan and expels the proponent of *kufr* from the fold of Islam. The Bill mutilates many of the laws of the Shariah. What Allah Ta'ala has made halaal, the Bill makes haraam; what Allah Ta'ala has left free and unfettered, the Bill fetters and restricts.

Q. Give some examples of the Bill's kufr?

A. The kufr of the Bill is so glaring that even its diehard proponents and primary supporters such as UUCSA and the NNB Jamiat of Fordsburg have been compelled to publicly admit that some of the *"provisions of the Bill are un-Islamic and in conflict with the Shariah"*. Although they have made this statement, albeit reluctantly, they have to date resolutely refused to define the specific provisions which are *"un-Islamic and in conflict with Islamic law"*. We urge you to write to UUCSA and the NNB Jamiat to ascertain which provisions of the Bill are *"un-Islamic and in conflict with Islamic law"*. They owe the Muslim community the obligation of explaining their statement which has extremely grave implications.

Among the kufr provisions of the Kufr MMB are the following:

* Whereas the Qur'aan unequivocally states that man has a higher rank than woman, the Bill denying this, claims that man and woman have "*equal statuts*".

* Islam permits a man to marry four wives. The Bill prevents a man from exercising this Qur'aanic right, and fetters it with ministerial permission and a host of other conditions, all designed to effectively abolish polygyny.

* The Bill provides for a fine of R20,000 to be imposed on a man who marries a second wife without the permission of the Minister or the court. This is one of the measures designed to curb and eventually abolish polygyny.

* The Bill makes it an offence for under 18 year old adults marrying without first acquiring permission from the non-Muslim minister or the non-Muslim court. Again, halaal is made haraam.

MMB-Questions & Answers

Written by Administrator
Saturday, 16 April 2011 06:51 -

* The Bill gives jurisdiction to non-Muslim judges who are allowed to annul Nikahs and decree Talaq. This is clear kufr. A non-Muslim judge has no jurisdiction, and his decrees pertaining to Faskh, Talaq, etc. are not valid, but the Bill says they are valid.

* The entire Shariah is put at the disposal of the court and the minister for interpretation in terms of the immoral constitution of the country.

These are some of the provisions which are “*un-Islamic and in conflict with Islamic Law*”. The Bill is simply cluttered with provisions which are “*un-Islamic and in conflict with Islamic Law.*”

If you are interested in more detail, we shall forward to you an avalanche of literature on this subject.

Q. Maulana Taha Karaan claims that the *wilaayat* of a non-Muslim judge is also valid. Please explain.

A. It is not for us to explain this kufr claim. The Maulana himself has an obligation to explain. He has grievously erred in advancing a claim which is violently in conflict with the *Ijma'* (Consensus) of all Four Math-habs of Islam. He has cited in substantiation of his claim, a rarity – an extremely obscure view of one Shaafi' Aalim – a view which is *mardood*

(rejected) – a view which has absolutely no status in the Shariah. Insha'Allah, when Allah Ta'ala grants us the taufeeq, a detailed rebuttal of the Maulana Taha's corrupt view will be published.

Q. In a radio talk, Maulana Karaan said: □ *“It was not justifiable to assume that the worse case scenario – as suggested by those opposed to the bill – would automatically ensue if the bill is passed. On the contrary, history shows that the Constitutional Court judges did not opt for radical amendment, even where an act, like the Marriages Act of 1961, was deemed to be discriminatory and unconstitutional, in terms of gays and lesbians.”* What does the Maulana mean by this statement, and is he correct?

A. You should write to Maulana Taha for further explanation. It is with this type of skulduggery that these liberal molvis, sheikhs and molvi-cum sheikhs bamboozle and mislead the ignorant, unwary and unsuspecting masses. With this sophistry and humbug, Maulana Taha Karaan seeks to deflect the minds of the people from the actual kufr contents and implications of the Bill.

Assuming that he is correct in his claim regarding the circumspection of the court judges, it (i.e. assumed attitude of the judges) has absolutely no bearing on the kufr of the Bill. The debate does not pertain to the perceived (or misconceived) circumspection of the court judges. The criticism is directed to the actual provisions of the bill which even the wayward and miscreant proponents of the Bill (i.e. UUCSA, NNB Jamiat and Taha Karaan) have been forced to admit are *“un-Islamic and in conflict with Islamic Law”*. Now after confessing that the Bill is corrupt and un-Islamic, what is the objective for introducing the argument of the circumspection of the court judges? Such circumspection does not alter the kufr of the Bill. In short, Taha has spoken bunkum. But his bunkum is by calculated design. They are madly hoping and labouring to get the Kufr MMB passed because at the end of the MMB rainbow is a pot of gold in the form of R2 million salaries and R20 million golden handshakes. They are bartering Islam down the sewer drain for the rotten monetary carrion of this dunya, and in this insane desire they are not

concerned about their Imaan and Jahannum which is also situated at the end of the MMB rainbow.

Q. According to Maulana Karaan, “the MJC, along with the majority of mainstream ulema have opted to engage on the matter, while the other (group of Ulama) hold the view of total non involvement...” . Please comment.

A. This miscreant should first define ‘mainstream ulema’. He should also explain his conclusion of the ‘majority of ulema’. He should state when exactly he had conducted a referendum to justify his spurious claim. Furthermore, there is no principle of ‘majority’ among the principles of Islamic jurisprudence. UUCSA in reality is a paper organization. If we should delve into the category of this paper body, the paper will be torn to shreds. There is no reality and no viability in UUCSA who is perhaps the ‘maintream ulema’ in the understanding of Taha.

As far as ‘engagement’ is concerned, Taha needs to look up the meaning of the term in a dictionary. While the UUCSA gang has been involved in clandestine engagement, the opponents of the Bill have been engaging the authorities in broad daylight. We do not conduct secret meetings nor do we feed the authorities misinformation nor do we present LIES such as representing the entire Muslim community of the country as UUCSA is guilty of claiming.. ‘Engagement’ is not confined to the objective of passing the bill. Discussing and debating with the government to scrap the bill is also engagement. There are different brands of engagement. We are not under any obligation to follow the UUCSA type of engagement – an engagement which accepts transmogrification of the Shariah. Such kufr is acceptable to Taha and his ilk, not to us – the Mainstream Ulama. From whence did Taha acquire the understanding that we are not engaging? Does opposition to the kufr bill mean that ‘engagement’ is not possible?

Q. With so many un-Islamic and anti-Shariah clauses in the bill, what is the engagement about? Is it to remove the un-Islamic clauses or to make them compliant with the Shariah?

A. The proponents and supporters of the Kufr Bill have a dark, sinister agenda which underlies their 'engagement' process. They are not interested in an endeavour to make the bill Shariah compliant because they are fully aware that it is simply impossible to do so, both from the Shariah and constitutional perspectives. The Shariah and the Constitution of the country are poles apart. They are mutually repellent. There is no meeting point between these two opposite systems of law. The entire satanic 'engagement' process is a last ditch attempt to get the provisions pertaining to the courts reinstated. The government had expunged all the court provisions which the earlier draft bill contained. This has knocked the wind out of the proponents of the bill. They are interested in only the reinstatement of those provisions which in fact come within the purview of the Qur'aanic aayat: *"What, do you believe in part of the Kitaab (Qur'aan) and commit kufr with part of it?"*

Without the court provisions, the monetary hopes and desires of the mercenary proponents of the bill are dashed. Their sole interest is the money which comes along with court 'jobs'. These bill proponents are the most despicable mercenaries who have betrayed Allah Ta'ala, the Rasool and the Ummah. They are the very same crowd who halaalize carrion chickens and meat. Their concern is only money.

IT IS THE OBLIGATION OF EVERY MUSLIM TO DEFEND THE SHARIAH BY STATING HIS/HER OBJECTION TO THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE. WRITE A LETTER OF OBJECTION. DISSOCIATE FROM THE KUFR BILL. ASK THE MINISTER TO SCRAP THE KUFR BILL. SEND YOUR LETTER OF OBJECTION TO:

MMB-Questions & Answers

Written by Administrator
Saturday, 16 April 2011 06:51 -

Mr. T. N. Matibe,

Ministry of Justice & Constitutional Development,

Private Bag X81,

Pretoria 0001.

Fax 086 648 7766;

e-mail: TMatibe@justice.gov.za

MMB-Questions & Answers

Written by Administrator
Saturday, 16 April 2011 06:51 -

**PLEASE FORWARD A COPY OF YOUR LETTER TO US FOR OUR RECORDS.
JAZAAKALLAAH!**

Our contact details:

P. O. Box 3393, Port Elizabeth 6056

Fax 041-451-3566

e-mail: muftis@themajlis.net

MMB-Questions & Answers

Written by Administrator
Saturday, 16 April 2011 06:51 -
