PO Box 3393,
Port Elizabeth, 6056
South Africa

Email: muftis@themajlis.co.za
The Majlis

15 Rajab 1444 – 6 February 2023

MAULANA AZMI'S FITNAH OF DISPLAYING DIRTY LINEN IN PUBLIC

Seeking our comment on the recent statement issued by Maulana Fazlur Rahmaan Azmi, the Ustaadh of Hadith at Darul Uloom Azaadville, some Ulama query:

"The Shaikhul Hadith of Azaadville Darul Uloom, Maulana Fazlur Rahmaan Azmi has now published a lengthy statement which is attached, in which he criticizes Maulana Abdul Hameed Sahib, the Principal of the Darul Uloom. His statement has created much controversy, misgiving and confusion. Please make a perusal of his statement and provide us with your comments to guide those cast into confusion. One thing we can say for certainty is that instead of clearing up any issue, Maulana Fazlur Rahmaan has only added to the considerable confusion existing in the relationship between Wifaaqul Uloom and the Fordsburg Jamiat. The public is now more confused as to Haqq and Baatil. Who is on Haqq and who is on baatil?"

(End of Query)

OUR COMMENT

Subhaanallaah! Maulana Azmi has been affected or influenced by the method of acquittal of *The Majlis* although he may not realize it.

While Maulana Azmi and innumerable others have perennially criticized *The Majlis* for what they dub *'name-calling',* here we find Maulana Azmi supposedly a reserved conservative, resorting to our *tareeqah.* Indeed *The Majlis* has exercised an irresistible influence on him, hence adoption of our methodology of 'name calling' – Subhaanallaah! Thus, instead of concentrating on whatever grouse, grumble and grievance he has with Wifaaqul Ulama of whom he is a member or was a member, he disembarked from his pedestal to label this Ulama-e-Haq body with the derisive title, *"Shiqaaqul Ulaama".* It is unintelligent for the pot to call the kettle black.

This very epithet, unexpected of the Ustaadh who has taught Hadith for more than three decades, reveals the bitterness which he has harboured in his heart. Thus the springboard for his public outpouring of personal grievance is a malicious heart which has become, due to emotional wounds, incapable of rational acquittal which is an imperative requisite for fairness and justice.

Maulana Azmi's emotional outburst consists of two issues:

(1) Personal grievance against Wifaaqul Ulama in general, and in particular against Maulana Abdul Hameed Sahib.
(2) Looking askance at the public at large for support.

He has mentioned no reasons for his grievance against Wifaaqul Ulama. He has singled out only Maulana Abdul Hamid.

His essay is a narrative of self-vindication bereft of Amr Bil Ma'roof Nahy Anil Munkar. It is devoid of this vital Act since the motive underlying his public statement is quite evidently the desire to exonerate himself of any blame, imaginary or real, and this is extremely disturbing to emanate from a senior Ustaadh of Hadith.

He is also guilty of biting the hand which has fed him for almost 40 years. After all, his Rizq was tied up with Darul Uloom Azaadvile where he had remained so long teaching Hadith whilst cherishing grudges in his heart for the Principal. The right thing for a Man of the Deen who had supposedly dedicated himself to the noble Service of Hadith, to have done in view of the many grievances he has now adumbrated in the public forum, was to have honourably resigned from the Madrasah, and to go his way without resorting to fitnah as he is currently perpetrating.

This regretful action of Maulana Azmi is not at all motivated by any Deeni consideration. His public acquittal is in fact displaying his dirty linen. Thus, he has cast himself from the lofty pedestal which he has occupied for more than three decades, and has degenerated to the level of a grimalkin. There is no goodness and no Deeni substance in the grievances which he had deemed appropriate to spill into the public. He was supposed to adopt silence on these personal issues and resign from the Madrasdah if he believed his position had become untenable.

While he and his supporters speak much about our senior Ulama, they all fail to take cognizance from the fact that our Akaabireen did not resort to such dirty tactics to which Maulana Azmi has descended in his pernicious attempt to paint Maulana Abdul Hamid unfavourably.

As for the criticism against *The Majlis* made by him and his supporters of the anonymous *'Markazi Wifaaqul Ulama Transvaal',* it has always been our stance NEVER to react and not to respond to personal criticism. Our obligation is only *Amr Bil Ma'roof Nahy Anil Munkar.* It is most despicable to respond to personal criticism even it may be slanderous. Therefore, we shall offer no defence. We shall bypass the puerility of our critics and stay on course, which is to attend strictly to Deeni issues which affect the masses.

Let us now attend to the enumerated grievances of Maulana Azmi Sahib.

(1) The alleged "bad treatment" against you is no concern of the general public. It is a purely personal issue. Your plea for sympathy is most unbefitting an Ustaadh who has engaged himself in Hadith for 38 years. Self-pity stems from *ujub* and *kibr*.

(2) That Maulana Abdul Hameed was a student of Maulana Jeena is not an issue for public airing. His criticism of Maulana Jeena cannot be adjudicated by the masses. You had no right to degenerate to this level to disgorge your enmity for Maulana Abdul Hamid. This is not a matter pertaining to guidance for the public. What is your motive for having stooped to this degenerate level in which there is no benefit for anyone? It is pure mischief.

(3) Your Muhtamin is fully justified for being 'angry with anyone who is teaching at the Jamiat'. He has valid reason for such anger which in reality is *Bugdh Fillaah.* Such anger is for the sake of Allah Ta'ala. The so-called Jamiat (i.e. the NNB of Fordsburg) is an agent of Iblees. It has made the Qur'aan Majeed subservient to secular education. Just imagine, to study the Qur'aan and Hadith, the prospective student must be in possession of a donkey, kaafir secular matric certificate. While this evil of the NNB jamiat is tolerable to Maulana Azmi, he cannot find a valid interpretation for the 'anger' of Maulana Abdul Hamid.

If Maulana Abdul Hameed has started speaking ill of Maulana Jeena, then Maulana Azmi should know that he (i.e. Maulana Azmi) is guilty of *gheebat*. Maulana Abdul Hamid has his reasons for his stance. But Maulana Azmi has no right to embark on a programme of *gheebat*. The issue is a personal one. It does not concern the public whose sympathy Maulana Azmi is courting. If he reflects, he will understand that he has made *gheebat* of Maulana Abdul Hamid.

(4) Your past letter to the NNB jamiat, despite its correctness, does not atone for the *gheebat* you have made of Maulana Abdul Hameed nor for publicly presenting your personal ugly issues to the public. You did not render anyone other than yourself a favour with that letter. You need not crow about it. Whilst you had written that letter, you maintained a dalliance with the *mudhilleen* who are agents of Iblees.

(5) Your intended participation in the Bukhari jalsah of the *mudhilleen* was an egregious error, to say the least. Your arguments in your defence on this score are insipid and utterly baseless. It is haraam to consort with those who flagrantly indulge in haraam, fisq and fujoor and that too, in the name of Islam.

If your desired participation had Shar'i merit and if you were on the Haqq, you would not have withdrawn. Your withdrawal itself indicates the error of participation. A man of the Haqq does not abandon the Haqq merely because of the criticism of some people.

(6) You say: *"When I returned from my Brazil trip, I noticed displeasure from people."* Whose pleasure are you courting? The pleasure of Allah Ta'ala or the pleasure of the people? As an Ustaadh of Hadith, you are surely well-acquainted with the Hadith:

"He who searches for the Pleasure of Allah despite displeasing the people, Allah suffices for him regarding the problems/difficulties people create. And, he who searches for the pleasure of the people despite displeasing Allah, Allah casts him to the people."

What type of Imaan induces a Man to abandon what he believes to be rectitude merely because some people voice displeasure? Your argument is bereft of merit.

(7) There is no merit in your decision mentioned in your item No.7. It is simply twiddle.

(8) and (9) The argument you presented to Muhtamim Sahib to bolster your ill-fated participation in the jalsah of the *mudhilleen* has absolutely no Shar'i merit. The analogy of your

cancelled participation with the order of Hadhrat Uthmaan (Radhiyallahu anhu) is palpably fallacious.

The Sahaabah did seek guidance from Hadhrat Uthmaan (Radhiyallahu anhu), the then Khhalifah who was besieged by the rebels. Undoubtedly, Hadhrat Uthmaan (Radhiyallahu anhu) did order them to continue performing Salaat in Musjid Nabawi behind the Imaam appointed by the rebels. Now what is the common denominator between the two episodes, viz., the order of Hadhrat Uthmaan (Radhiyallahu anhu) and participation in the jalsah of the *mudhilleen*?

The validity of Salaat behind a faasiq is an accepted Mas'alah of the Ahlus Sunnah Wal Jama'ah. It poses absolutely no danger to anyone's Imaan. It does not confer validity to the rebellion. All the Sahaabah were 100% convinced of the villainy of the rebels. Jamaat Salaat in the Musjid is a Waajib requisite of the Shariah. Since when did the jalsah of the *mudhilleen* attain the status of Wujoob to constrain participation? Jamaat Salaat is the Jalsah of Allah Ta'ala. This Jalsah may not be abandoned on account of the fisq of the Imaam.

Your participation in a jalsah organized by such persons who promote fisq, fujoor and even kufr – by those who worship under crosses in churches – by those who promote the kufr interfaith shaitaaniyat, will most surely be understood by numerous laymen to be a vindication of these deviates. The jalsah itself minus the deviants, is also bid'ah. Participation in jalsahs is not a Waajib command of the Shariah to be placed on par with jamaat Salaat.

Surely, you are aware of the Hadith which mentions that he who is present in the gathering of deviates is one of them. His very presence boosts their confidence in the evil of their perpetrations.

Are you not aware of the Hadith which mentions the command of Allah Ta'ala to Jibraeel (Alayhis salaam) to destroy a certain city despite the presence of a confirmed Buzrug/Wali who had never sinned? Hadhrat Jibraeel (Alayhis salaam) in a quandary, enquired from Allah Ta'ala. He was then instructed: *"Destroy him along with the city, for the colour of his face did not change when evil was being committed."*

Are you not aware of the Hadith narrated by Hadhrat Aishah (Radhiyallahu anha) in which narrated that a city of 60,000 was destroyed by Allah Ta'ala. 40,000 of the 60,000 were fussaaq and fujjaar, and 20,000 were such pious persons (Buzrugs) whose A'maal were like the A'maal of the Ambiya. The Nabi of the era was perplexed and supplicated to Allah Ta'ala for clarification. The destruction of the fussaaq/fujjaar was understandable. But what was the error of the Buzrugs? Allah Ta'ala sent Wahi that they freely mingled, associated, socialised and fraternized with the flagrant fussaaq/fujjaar, hence they qualified for His Athaab.

There are many similar episodes debunking the fallacy of Maulana Azmi, which he proffers to justify his intended participation in the jalsah of the deviates. It is surprising that he fails to discern the harm to the Deen his participation would have caused.

Performing Salaat behind a faasiq in no way whatsoever harms the Deen. That is why we perform Salaat even behind Qabar Pujaaris despite their vile and haraam indulgence in bid'ah and baatil. While our Akaabireen have criticized the Ahl-e-Bid'ah, they ruled that Salaat is valid behind them although one should not intentionally go to their Musaajid without valid

reason. This fatwa of our Akaabireen is justified by the order of Hadhrat Uthmaan (Radhiyallahu anhu). It is a *daleel* favouring us, not Maulana Azmi's egregiously erroneous desire to attend the jalsah of the *mudhilleen* thereby boosting their image which in turn will constitute a cause for fitnah. The unwary and ignorant will gain the idea that everything is fine and valid with these deviates. If not, a man of the Haqq would not grace their functions.

The Fardh Salaat with its Waajib jamaat in the Musjid may not be abandoned on account of the fisq of the Imaam. There is no such demand of the Shariah for participation in the functions of the fussaaq and fujjaar. In fact, the deviates of the NNB jamiat are worse than fussaaq/fujjaar. They pose a grave danger to the Aqeedah of Muslims. Thus, you have no 'proof' for your desired participation. Your 'proof' is cognitive dissonance devoid of Shar'i merit.

Then you say that regarding your baseless 'proof': *"Muhtamim Saheb did not acknowledge this proof, nor give any answer to it, as is always his habit."*

While Muhtamim Sahib had maintained silence, it does not necessarily mean that he had no answer for the baseless 'proof' Maulana Azmi had proffered. His response would have led to possibly a heated argument. Maulana Azmi was emotionally disturbed. When a man is under emotional influence, it is futile to reason with him. Furthermore, even if it be accepted that Muhtamim Sahib was unable to demolish your proof, it does not follow that your stance for participation was correct. Your error was palpable and conspicuously *baatil*. That is why numerous Muslims, Ulama and laymen had written to us to query the rationale and validity of your participation in a function of such deviates who have made the Qur'aan Majeed subservient to kufr education.

(10) Maulana Azmi says in his lament No.10:
"Because of this, I stopped meeting with many such people – out of fear that if they regard such a statement to be true, then their faces must not become distorted because of me."

Indeed, Maulana Azmi has acquitted himself with utmost puerility in having made this observation of drivel. The 'such people' refers to the deviates of the NNB jamiat with whom he has allegedly 'stopped meeting'. It appears that he did not understand the purport of Maulana Abdul Hameed's comment pertaining to the distortion of faces and hearts – transformation into apes and pigs. Maulana Azmi relates this comment to the NNB's deviates whereas the warning was directed to himself, not to the deviates.

What Maulana Abdul Hameed meant is that the effect of association with the people of baatil, the deviates, is the distortion of the faces and the hearts. Thus, the *naseehat* was for Maulana Azmi that if he persists in associating, socializing and fraternizing with the deviates, then his own face and heart are in the danger of 'distortion'. He obviously missed the point.

Association with deviates produces a disastrous spiritual effect on the heart. It creates *zulmat* and it qualifies the Buzrug for Athaab. This is evidenced by the Qur'aan and Ahaadith which are not unknown to Maulana Azmi.

(11) The 'sadness' mentioned by Maulana Azmi applies to himself. It is indeed sad that despite teaching Hadith for more than three decades and despite being aware of the Athaab which comes in the wake of socializing and fraternizing with the flagrant transgressors, he still deems

it appropriate to grace their functions and exchange niceties with them thereby casting the *awaam* into confusion. Thus, instead of being a *Haadi*, he becomes a *Mudhil*.

It is of utmost importance for the Muqtada to exercise extreme care and caution so that the ordinary folk are not cast into confusion and deviation as a result of the zigzag attitude and corrupt fatwas of the Ulama who are in emulation of the ulama and buzrugs of Bani Israaeel. The Qur'aan Majeed states that they were cursed by the "tongues of Daawood and Isaa" (Alayhimas salaam). The faces of some of Bani Israaeel were disfigured into apes and pigs. Maulana Azmi is aware of this terrible calamity. There is no need to be affronted when *naseehat* is provided. Instead of heeding the naseehat, he acquits himself like a grimalkin seeking public sympathy by airing private issues.

(12) What he was told in the office was correct. If an Ustaadh has no compatibility with the *Ihtimaam*, then he should honourably resign and take leave without creating *fitnah* and spreading mischief with the aid of students who may be supporting him.

His argument: *"I was called here",* is devoid of substance. Yes, you were called to teach, not to interfere in the *Ihtimaam*, not to sew dissension with your incompatibility.

His intransigence reflected in his statement: *"Do as you wish."*, is unbefitting of a senior Ustaadh of Hadith. It was for him to have resigned when the Muhtamim clarified the issue, viz., *"You can go from here."* Now when your presence became untenable, what constrained you to remain and to silently engage in fitnah by creating a support base for yourself from the student population? What was the intention for joining the Madrasah to teach Hadith? If it was purely for the *Ridha'* of Allah Ta'ala, then your *Ajr* is assured. If there was contamination in the niyyat, then the consequence will be fitnah in the Madrasah.

Your argument: *"I am here for the students",* has no merit. You may not be there for the students in conflict with the consent and happiness of the Muhtamim. Since your presence at the Madrasah was no longer welcome, your obligation was to leave with honour. However, you degenerated to the deplorable ebb of harbouring enmity for the Muhtamim for so many years. Now, the preponderance of vapours of malice *(hiqd/bughdh)* has constrained you to advertise your dirty linen in public. There is no semblance of *naseehat* and Deen in your lamentable outpouring.

(13) We cannot comment on this point since you have not elaborated the alleged "extremes" of the Muhtamim.

(14) This number portrays the paucity of intelligence of Maulana Azmi. He says:
"A Da'ee meets with everyone, whether that person is a drunkard, a gambler, Deobandi, Barelwi, Salafi. I am a Da-ee. Why would meeting the Jamiat for a short while result in faces being distorted."

We shall, Insha-Allah, edify you in this regard. You have an extremely narrow understanding of the meaning of 'da'ee'. Your narrow understanding stems from Tablighi Jamaat concepts. According to the Tablighis, only they are Daa-ees. All others are flotsam and jetsam for the Tablighis. That is why today they stand with daggers busy slitting the throats of their adversaries in the Jamaat. You have the Raiwandis and the Sadists. Both are trapped in their

ghulu. Both believe that only their specific methodology of 'tabligh' qualifies one to be a daa-ee. This is the mentality of Maulana Azmi.

From whence did you, Maulana sahib, glean the idea that only you are a daa-ee and others who are not aligned to the Tabligh jamaat, but who are engaged in their own institutions of Da'wat and Tabligh are not Daa-ees? Understand well that Islam has several Departments of Da'wat and Tabligh. The Tablighi Jamaat to which you have allegiance is an extremely latecomer on the scene. Furthermore it has recklessly deviated from Siraatul Mustaqeem, hence the Raiwandis and Sadists are facing one another with daggers drawn. Tabligh is not confined to your concept of tabligh.

Also understand well that your self-portrayal as a 'daa-ee' is the effect of *ujub* and *kibr*. You are a plain nothing – a nothing which all of us are. You are an epistasis, and so are we all. It is purely by the *fadhl* and *karam* of Allah Ta'ala that He is extracting some Deeni service from you and from us. It is an honour He has bestowed to us despicable infosoria – the great honour of serving His Deen. Therefore, do not permit the insobriety of the nafs to bloat your brains with the idea that you are a wonderful 'daa-ee'. You are nothing – absolutely nothing.

Attending to the Islaah of 'drunkards, gamblers, Barelwis and Salafis' is not exclusively your domain. All others, especially the Mashaaikh of Tasawwuf, always attended to such people – incorrigible sinners and deviates. This is not the preserve of the Tabligh Jamaat. Every sincere Aalim is a Da-ee in his own right. No sincere *Naasih* turns away 'drunkards and gamblers'. However, this never means going into the pub and into the brothel. But when these sinners come to us, our doors are always open. This is not an issue to crow about as Maulana Azmi is so childishly and stupidly acquitting himself.

Muhtamim Sahib, to the best of our knowledge, never prevented you from proffering naseehat to 'drunkards and gamblers'. Yes, what he may have said is that it does not befit you to go into the pub and into the casino. The Muhtamim does not debar you from being a Daa-ee. He debars you from elevating the haraam, deviate, mudhil, munaafiq agents of Iblees, the NNB jamiat to the pedestal of honour thereby causing mischief and confusion among the masses.

You are speaking a mammoth LIE with your Tablighi monotony, namely: *"Bani Israaeel left the work of da'wat of Deen for a long period, and as such they went astray."* Maulana Azmi you are a confounded LIAR in disgorging this falsehood. Why were some of the Bani Israaeel disfigured and transformed into apes and pigs? Why was Bani Israaeel cursed by Nabi Daawood (Alayhis salaam) and Nabi Isaa (Alayhis salaam)? If you do not know, then refer to the Qur'aan Majeed:

"Those of Bani Israaeel who committed kufr were cursed by the tongues of Daawood and Isaa Ibn Maryam. That is because they transgressed and used to go beyond the limits (with sin and ghulu' as does the current Tablighi Jamaat)."

(A-Maaidah, Aayat 78)

And what was their transgression? Allah Ta'ala informs us:

"They abstained from prohibiting munkar (evil) they used to perpetrate."

(Al-Maaidah, Aayat 79)

They had abandoned *Amr Bil Ma'roof Nahy Anil Munkar.* This is a Waajib obligation which the Tabligh Jamaat and its 'daa-ees' have abandoned. Thus, they come within the purview of the aforementioned two Qur'aanic Verses. Maulana Azmi your da'wat and tableegh are confined to appeasing the *nafsaaniyat* of deviates. Since your methodology is structured on dubious and baatil ideas, you are constrained to dilute the Shariah to lick the boots of professional modernists with the mistaken idea of winning them over to your Jamaat, not to the Sunnah and the Deen. Thus, abandoning Amr Bil Ma'roof Nahy Anil Munkar has been excised and abandoned totally by your Jamaat. This is the reason for the destruction of Bani Israaeel, not what you hallucinate.

The Qur'aan Majeed further informs us of the bootlicking attitude of daa-ees of your calibre:

"You will see many of them (such as you and your partner in jahl-e-muraqqab, Tariq Jameel), befriending the kuffaar (in our current context ,especially the Shiahs of today). Indeed vile is it which they have sent forth for themselves, i.e. the Wrath of Allah on them and in the Athaab shall they dwell forever."

(Al-Maaidah, Aayat 80)

"Say: 'Should I inform you of a worst punishment? (It is) the one whom Allah has cursed and on whom is His Wrath and from among them He transformed into apes and pigs whilst they worshipped Taaghoot (Iblees). They are the ones who are the vilest and the most deviated from the Straight Path."

(Al-Maaidah, Aayat 6)

They were transformed into apes and swines because they worshipped the calf and elevated Isaa (Alayhis salaam) to the pedestal of godhood. This punishment was for their *ghulu' fid deen.* It was not the consequence of having left Tablighi style 'da'wat'.

And they were punished and destroyed because they transgressed the sanctity of the Sabbath. Thus the Qur'aan Majeed says:

"You are certainly aware of those who transgressed the Sabbath (Holy Saturday). Therefore, We said to them: "Become disgraceful (and despised) apes!"

According to Hadhrat Abdullah Bin Abbaas (Radhiyallahu anhu), the young transgressors were transformed into monkeys and the elders into swines.

Nowhere is it mentioned that Bani Israaeel was punished and destroyed because of 'having left da'wat and tabligh for a long period' as Maulana Azmi falsely alleges. He has sucked this stupidity from his thumb, true to Tabligh Jamaat ideology.

Maulana Azmi has conveniently turned a blind eye to the Aayat: *"Beware of such a punishment which will not be exclusive to the sinners among you."* It will overtake the buzrugs and the molvis also because they had abandoned Amr Bil Ma'roof Nahy Anil Munkar, not because of abstention from Tabligh Jamaat style appeasement and condonation of haraam and baatil on the basis of their dubious and baatil wisdom and diplomacy. Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) said:

"Proclaim the Haqq even though it be bitter." But the Tablighis abhor this 'bitterness' which comes in the wake of Amr Bil Ma'roof Nahy Anil Munkar Sunnah style, not Tablighi Jamaat style.

What does the Hadith say about that great Buzrug who had not disobeyed Allah for 'even a wink of the eye', according to Jibraeel (Alayhis salaam)? Maulana Azmi the 'shaikhul hadith' of Darul Uloom Azaadville where he engaged in the Dars of Hadith for 38 years should know well that Allah Ta'ala had commanded the destruction of this great Aabid as well because the expression on his face did not even change when observing evil, and this was because he had socialized and fraternized with the 'drunkards and gamblers' to the degree that he became insensitive of Allah's abhorrence for sin and evil.

Much can be expounded and elaborated in refutation of the drivel stated by Maulana Azmi on this 'drunkard-gambler' issue. At this juncture, it will suffice to reiterate that Muhtamim Sahib did not debar you from proffering naseehat to 'drunkards and gamblers'. He was seeking to open your mind and eyes to make you understand that association with deviates of the likes of the NNB jamiat was dangerous for the Imaan of the *awaam*. That is all.

Just for the further edification of Maulana Azmi we narrate here an episode cited by Hadhrat Maulana Ashraf Ali Thanvi (Rahmatullah alayh). A Bid'ati peer was about to enter the village where a prominent Aalim lived. When the Aalim was informed, he decided to go and meet the Shaikh. After all, this Bid'ati was unlike the other deviates. He had some Deen in him. As the Aalim who was also a Buzrug got up to go meet the Bid'ati, he received *Ilhaam: 'Do not go.'* He sat down. But again he felt that there was nothing wrong in mere musaafah and meeting the Bid'ati Buzrug. Therefore, he got up, but again came the Divine Warning via *Ilhaam*: *"Do not go."* He sat down. Then for the third time, setting aside the *Ilhaam* which everyone knows is not a Hujjat of the Shariah, he got up and took a few steps. As he exited from his house, he slipped, fell and broke his leg. Then he understood the reality of the evil and danger of going specifically to meet and fraternize with the Bid'ati. This is the *tareeqah* of Maulana Azmi. This is his *baatil tareeqah* which poses a grave danger for the Imaan of the unwary and ignorant.

Maulana Azmi in his baseless argument No. 15 says: *"Hazrat Shah Hakeem Akhtar Saheb said that we must keep good thoughts (Husn e Zann) about people, not bad thoughts (Soo e Zann) because there is no chance of being taken to task by Allah Ta'ala in this case on Husn e Zann."*

There is no need to present Hakim Akhtar Sahib in support of this claim. The Hadith and the Qur'aan, and the Ta'leem of all our Akaabireen of the Salf and Khalf propagate this theme. But, this issue of *zann* is not applicable to the context of this dispute. What *husn-e-zann* should we entertain of a Muslim who walks around the Hindu firegod in a marriage ceremony? Should we make *ta'weel* and say that he is merely warming himself while making *tawaaf* of the Hindu god and chanting Hindu prayers and making offerings to the Taaghoot?

What *husne-zann* should we make of an Agent of Iblees who sits under twelve crosses in a church flanked by kuffaar priests and engaging in prayers? What *husne zann* should we make when we see a deviate promoting kufr interfaith? What *husn-e-zann* should we make when we see a molvi flagrantly indulging in fisq and fujoor and then justifying his indulgence with *ta'weel baatil?*

What *husne zann* should we make when molvis halaalize haraam pictography?

What *husne zann* should we make when the molvis close the Musaajid, suspend Jumuah Salaat, abolish Jamaat Salaat in the Musjid, etc., etc.? What *husne zann* should we make when molvis shove into the first saff kuffaar politicians wallowing in kufr and janaabat, then telling them to engage in mock 'salaat'? The list of their villainy is quite lengthy. Never is *husne zann* valid nor permissible for flagrant kufr, fisq and fujoor.

On the contrary the *husn e zann* of Maulana Azmi calls for the shuddering of the Arsh of Allah Ta'ala, for his style of *husn e zann* demands that flagrant fussaaq and even kuffaar be honoured.

(16) No. 16 is merely a stupidity of a grimalkin. It requires no intelligent response.

(17) Maulana Azmi states:

"Mufti Motara and I asked Muhtamim Saheb if he considers Ml Ebrahim Bham to be Kaafir? No direct answer was given, but the answer was around "he did this, he did that etc., and there are some people that regard him as Kaafir."

Why did you in the first place have to ask Muhtamim Sahib this stupid question? What was your evil motive? Even *The Majlis* despite levelling the charge of kufr at a man desists from *Takfeer.* Pointing out his kufr and making takfeer of him are two separate issues. When a man is informed of his kufr, there is no imperative need for *takfeer*. He is reminded and jolted with the charge of kufr against him. The purpose is for him to repent and to abandon his kufr.

As far as the Reverend Bham character is concerned, the flagrant kufr in which he indulged demands the *hukm* of *Takfeer*. Muhtamim Sahib did not err for not giving an explicit answer. *Takfeer* is not an issue to trifle with. Perhaps he is not as convinced as us regarding the kufr of this Bham Iblees, hence he proffered no explicit answer to the question so stupidly asked by Maulana Azmi.

Furthermore, if Maulana Abdul Hameed had to say that the chap is not a kaafir (as he, i.e. Maulana Abdul Hameed) may be believing, he would with his answer be diluting the gravity of Bham's deviation *(dhalaal and gumraahi),* hence he acquitted himself with justifiable ambiguity. But the stupid question of Maulana Azmi was motivated by the desire for fitnah.

(18) Uttering an egregious stupidity which illustrates the degree of senility to which he has degenerated, Maulana Azmi says:

"Even if, hypothetically speaking, he is a Kaafir, then do Muslims across the world not deal with Kuffar in their daily interactions?"

Dealing with the rank and file kuffaar poses no threat to anyone's Imaan. Dealing with kuffaar in daily interaction has no relationship to the Aqeedah of Muslims. But the kufr, fisq and fujoor of molvis who are considered to be leaders in the community are disastrous for the Imaan and Akhlaaq of the *awaam*. Muslims do not acquire their Aqeedah and Akhlaaq from the world full of kuffaar. They acquire the Deen from their Ulama. Now when an Aalim becomes a *murtad* or a *mudhil*, what Deen is the man in the street expected to acquire from him? Is Maulana Azmi unaware that the instruction is to be careful about the person from whom Deen is acquired?

The interaction with the kuffaar in general in matters pertaining to trade, commerce and the like is not the same as interaction with a rascal who masquerades as an Aamil, but teaches kufr, fisq and fujoor. It is not the same as the justification of sin and evil of a molvi/mufti. Something serious is amiss in the thinking of Maulana Azmi. It is this lapse in the *Aql* which has constrained him to display his dirty linen in the public.

(19) Maulana Azmi argues that his intention for wanting to attend the jalsah of the deviates was because he wanted to publicly talk about photography, appearing on TV and intermingling in the muslim schools.

This baseless argument is to soothe his nafs, nothing more. Was this the only platform available to him for proclaiming the Haqq regarding the three sinful issues? Was association with the deviates the only platform from which the three sins could be criticized?

His attendance would have diluted whatever he said regarding these three sins which have gained pandemic status. Assuming that his naseehat would have been heeded, the fact remains that his attendance would have been misconstrued. He would have had to honour the deviates thereby causing the Arsh of Allah Ta'ala to shudder. After the talk he would have had to socialize and make merry and laughter with them whilst eating meals, etc. The effect of his naseehat on the three issues would have been completely effaced. But his merrymaking with the deviates would leave an indelible mark on the participants and audience. This argument of Maulana Azmi is devoid of Shar'i substance.

The advice of Hadhrat Maulana Rashid Ahmed Gangohi for Hadhrat Maulana Ashraf Ali Thanvi (Rahmatullah alayh) to abandon his participation in the jalasah of the Bid'atis, should be salubrious for Maulana Azmi. Most assuredly he is aware of this episode in which Hadhrat Thanvi (Rahmatullah alayh) had realized his error of participation. Therefore, he heeded the instruction of Hadhrat Gangohi and henceforth abandoned his participation in their jalsahs.

(20) In this number, Maulana Azmi again moans like a grimalkin. His comment here is nonsense and does not warrant intelligent response. However, it must be said that the offer of the NNB jamiat betrays his close friendship with the deviates.

(21) Again displaying dirty linen in the public. It merely illustrates your *ujub* and *kibr*. It also asks for sympathy and exhibits your attitude of self-pity. There is no other intelligent response for this drivel.

(22) More grimalkin talk devoid of Shar'i substance and designed for public sympathy. It is also another example of displaying dirty linen in public.

In his penultimate statement Maulaan Azmi issues a WARNING. This warning in reality is a call to students to embark on fitnah. Maulana Azmi has become a *mufsid*. Allah Ta'ala warns the mufsideen:

"Do not spread mischief in the land."

With his display of dirty linen in public, the motive is only to churn up *fitnah* and *fasaad*. Whatever grouse and grievance he has aired in his stupid outpour is a private issue between himself and Maulana Abdul Hamid. It does not concern the public at large.

Due to his dissatisfaction and incompatibility with Maulana Abdul Hameed, he was supposed to have endeavoured to iron out the differences in privacy. If this was not possible then the only option Maulana Azmi has was to honourably resign. He was then supposed to give the Talaba good *naseehat* to obey their Asaatizah and the *Ihtimaam*. But calling on students to embark on agitation is pure fitnah.

While the issue is between Maulana Azmi and Maulana Abdul Hameed, he (Azmi Sahib) has unjustly dragged the whole organization (Wifaaqul Ulama) into the mud puddle he has created. His grouse, grumble and grievance developed over a period of several decades when Wifaaqul Ulama was not even in existence. His agenda for dragging in Wifaaqul Ulama is palpably clear. He is out to appease the NNB jamiat who is now chuckling with joy and mirth over the discomfort Azmi Sahib has created for Wifaaqul Ulama.

It is our dua that Allah Ta'ala guides Azmi Sahib. May he realize the colossal blunder he has made and the resultant fitnah of which he is the author.

Markazi Wifaaqul Ulama Transvaal

At the conclusion of Maulana Azmi's deplorable lament, some anonymous entity dubbing itself, *Markazi Wifaaqul Ulama Transvaal*, has added some silly comments which are insipid and devoid of Shar'i substance. There is no need to respond to the drivel of this deviate group.

"Fitnah is worse than qatal."
(Qur'aan)