



***THE PROHIBITION OF
WOMEN TRAVELLING
WITHOUT MAHRAMS
AND THE ZIGZAG FATWA OF
A GROUP OF MISCREANT
MOLVIS***

By:
Mujlisul Ulama of South Africa
PO Box 3393
Port Elizabeth, 6056, South Africa

***RASULULLAH (SALLALLAHU ALAYHI
WASALLAM) SAID:***

***“IT IS NOT HALAAL FOR A
WOMAN WHO BELIEVES IN
ALLAH AND THE LAST DAY
TO UNDERTAKE A JOURNEY
OF THREE DAYS
EXCEPT WITH A MAHRAM”***

INTRODUCTION

The Shariah's mas'alah pertaining to females undertaking journeys is well-known to all and sundry in the same way as the masaa-il pertaining to Tahaarat and Salaat are known.

It has been known since the inception of Islam that it is haraam for a woman to undertake a journey of three days or more without being accompanied by her husband or some other mahram (father, son, brother etc.). It is among the major sins for a woman to go on a journey without a mahram. The *la'nat* (curse) of Allah Azza Wa Jal settles on her and remains attached to her as long as she has not returned home.

This Prohibition has greater meaning and greater emphasis in this age of *fitnah* – vice and immorality. However, a group of 17 misguided molvis in Pakistan deemed it appropriate to convene a stupid, wasteful, merrymaking conference to decide this simple issue. The agenda of these *mudhilleen* was in reality to extravasate some leeway for the cancellation of the Prohibition, and to open up the gate for the perpetration of this capital haraam act.

Shaitaan has inspired them in this age of *fitnah and fasaad* to provide a free licence to women who are already travelling without mahrams in flagrant and

reckless disregard of Allah's Prohibition. While these women who are already in the public domain acting as they deem best in their lewd interests, these molvis have laboriously, but abortively, endeavoured to justify the evil conduct of the women with their zigzag fatwa.

Instead of resorting to *Amr Bil Ma'roof Nahyi Anil Munkar* (Commanding virtue and prohibiting vice), these liberal molvis intoxicated by western influences, deemed it appropriate to misinterpret the Ahaadith and the Aqwaal of the Fuqaha to extricate the rubbish, zigzag fatwa of permissibility for a *Kabeerah* sin. They have attempted to achieve this stunt by their mismanipulation of the Shar'i principle of *Dhuroorah*, which in a nut shell permits eating of a little pork for a starving person who is unable to find any halaal food.

Alhamdulillah, we have refuted all their *baatil*, insipid and stupid arguments in this treatise. May Allah Ta'ala guide this errant and humiliated Ummah.

MUJLISUL ULAMA OF S.A.

Jumadil Ula 1441 – January 2020

WOMEN TRAVELLING WITHOUT MAHRAMS

A ZIG-ZIG FATWA

In a captious *fatwa* on the question of a woman travelling without a *mahram male*, a conglomerate of 17 Pakistani Molvis, assigning the Shariah to the realm of antiquity, and exhibiting lamentable deficiency in *Ilmi* erudition which is supposed to be an imperative requisite for Muftis, issued a zig-zag *fatwa* on permissibility. The fatwa is reproduced here for better comprehension of our refutation which will follow, Insha-Allah, in this treatise.

THE ZIG-ZAG FATWA

“Today, 4th Rabiul Awwal 1437 (16 December 2015), on the day of Wednesday, there was a sitting (of Molvis) of *Al-Majlisul Ilmi* at Idaarah Ghufraan in Rawalpindi.

In the *Ijlaas (session of molvis)* the issue of a woman travelling without a mahram and the difficulties encountered in this era, were pondered.

After deliberation and thorough examination it was resolved that in normal conditions, a woman should not travel the Shar’i distance without a mahram. However, if there is a dire need (*majboori*) and a mahram is not available, or a mahram is present but due to some *majboori (a valid excuse)* he is unable to travel, then

with the applicability of the undermentioned conditions there is scope for a woman to travel without a mahram:

- 1) The road should be totally safe
- 2) The woman should observe Shar'i Purdah
- 3) Neither should there be the danger of *fitnah* from the woman nor from the other side (i.e. from males).
- 4) Seclusion with a ghair mahram should not occur. The journey should be in group form, or a responsible woman should be with (the other woman travelling without mahram).

If there is danger of *fitnah*, then it will not be permissible for a woman to travel even less than the Shar'i distance.” (*End of the Zig-Zag fatwa*)

Seventeen molvis participated in the production of this flaccid, errant fatwa which only serves to obfuscate the Shar'i principle of *Dire Needs render permissible prohibitions*, and to empower the *Naaqisaatul Aql*, liberals and zindeeqs to take the law of the Shariah into their own defective brains for extravasating *nafsaani* verdicts devoid of Shar'i substance.

The factual existence of the four restrictive stipulations for the permissibility being a near-impossibility in this age of total *fitnah* and *fasaad*, displays the lack of understanding of the conglomerate of molvis and their inability to issue *fatwa* on contemporary issues. Insha-Allah, all the arguments presented in the article of

Idaarah Ghufraan shall be discussed in this treatise to demonstrate the fallacy of this errant, *faux pas fatwa* issued by a conglomerate who has miserably failed to understand the reality of the Satanism of the era in which the Ummah is today floundering and drifting rudderless, and Muslims having lost their Imaani bearings largely due to the *fitnah* of today's Ulama who are glaring signs of Qiyaamah. With diabolical zig-zag *fatwas* they confuse and convolute the brains of the masses, and open wide avenues for the emergence of *fitnah – fisq, fujoor, bid'ah and even zindaqah.*

THE PRINCIPLE OF DHUROORAH

This Shar'i principle based on the Qur'aan and Hadith states:

“Dhuroorah (Dire Need) renders permissible prohibitions.”

This principle is as old as Islam. It is available for practical application when the circumstances permit. For the benefit and edification of the masses for whom this treatise is presented, the example of *pork* will be conducive for understanding the principle and its ramifications.

Everyone is aware that the Qur'aan Majeed permits consumption of a 'little' pork when the *dire need (Dhuroorah)* constrains such an expediency. If a person finds himself in a life-threatening situation due to starvation and the non-availability of halaal or even

mushtabah food of any kind whatsoever, then for consuming a small quantity of pork to save his life, he has no need for a session of 17 muftis to deliberate the issue and to present a fatwa of permissibility. In the circumstances in which this person finds himself, he is his own mufti and has every right to decide whether there is the type of *Dhuroorah* to permit pork for him. Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) said: “*Seek a fatwa from your heart.*”

This is the simple pattern for adoption in all cases of *Dhuroorah*. The principle is sacrosanct and has been available since the inception of Islam.

An *ijlaas* of dozens of muftis enjoying a merrymaking holiday-conference in which large sums of money are squandered in travel, accommodation, gluttony, etc. in western style, is uncalled for and not permissible. These conferences are all the effects of western liberalism. It is a disease which afflicts almost all the ulama of the age.

Dhuroorah affects individuals on a rare basis. The *Dhuroorah* for a woman to travel without a mahram, is even a greater rarity. Prohibitions for halaalizing are to be considered case by case on an individual basis when the occasion develops. While the *Principle* governing the process of *halaalization* operates in all spheres, the act of women travelling without mahrams does not and never requires a universal (*aam*) *fatwa* which could be construed as an abrogation of a Shar’i mas’alah which is

cast in rock, that is, substantiated by authentic *Nusoos* and the *Ijma* ' of the Ummah.

If a woman is trapped in a situation of *Dhuroorah* and needs to know if she may embark on the necessary journey without a mahram, then she can obtain the ruling from a local Aalim, and in the absence of an Aalim, the circumstance of *Dhuroorah* will simply compel her to undertake the journey. She will not be in need of an *ijlaas of 17 muftis*. The *Dire Need* will not permit her to delay or abandon the journey in anticipation of a fatwa which a panel of muftis may issue after several months. These muftis have to firstly converge on a venue, prepare their merrymaking paraphernalia, acquire public funds for their party and meetings of futility to decide an issue for which no decision is required. There is absolutely no need for an *ijlaas of 17 muftis* to decide an issue for which the *fatwa* has been extant since the past 14 centuries. Islam is the final and perfect Divine Code for mankind, hence there is adequate provision in the Shariah to meet any exigency without the need of an *ijlaas of 17 muftis* indulging in a merrymaking conference full of sound and fury signifying nil.

The *fatwa of the ijlaas* is not a decision required for an exigency or for an issue which had not existed in the era of the Salafus Saaliheen. The muftis had gathered merely to play marbles under an extremely thin 'deeni' facade. Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) had

categorically issued his Fatwa of prohibition just as the Qur'aan issues the Fatwa of prohibition regarding pork-eating. The *ijlaas of 17 molvis* has sought to abrogate this Divine Fatwa. Their *fatwa* is akin to a fatwa halaalizing pork by a panel of muftis who have gathered to deliberate whether a man in dire straits of hunger hovering on the verge of death can consume a little pork. Then after some superficial and silly deliberation, they will fabricate a fatwa stating the imperative conditions for the permissibility of consuming a 'little' pork to save the person's life.

Any Aalim, even of mediocre academic expertise in Shar'i Uloom, understands the operation of the *Principle of Dhuroorah*. On understanding the urgency of the woman's need, he will readily advise her of the permissibility. But the reality is that in a scenario of urgent need, the woman will not be interested in any fatwa which some panel of muftis will expectorate long after the expiration of the urgency. Circumstances will compel her to act.

Thus, the consequence of the *faux pas- zigzag fatwa* issued by the molvi *ijlaas* at Idaarah Ghufraan, is nothing other than the presentation of a free licence for droves of Muslim-appearing women who are already travelling without mahrams in blithe disregard of the Shariah's severe proscription.

The laughable *modus operandi* adopted by the conglomerate of 17 molvis for a totally uncalled for fatwa implies the development of an exigency for which there is no answer in the Shariah thus necessitating the ludicrous, wasteful conference of a farcical galaxy of molvis to rubber stamp an issue known to every Muslim. No one requires the fatwa of this conglomerate. The fatwa has been known to all and sundry long, very long before the *ijlaas* published the old hat. They have merely regurgitated a clear mas'alah albeit in a manner which provides much scope for *fitnah*.

Dhuroorah, everyone knows, legalizes prohibitions. The issue is only to determine whether a 'need' is a valid *dhuroorah* which qualifies for the concession. This is essentially a matter between the affected person and Allah Ta'ala. It is a case by case issue. It does not stand in need of a universal fatwa by a panel of muftis converging for a conference for this specific issue. They have indeed acquitted themselves amateurishly.

If the person seeking to avail himself/herself of a Shar'i concession has Taqwa, he/she will be honest and not dwell in self-deception for the sake of committing haraam thereby invoking the *la'nat* and *ghadb* of Allah Azza Wa Jal.

THE FACTUAL POSITION

The reality on the ground today is that women in general are lewd. This applies to even those who are

superficially *deendaar (religious)*. They simply slip in behind the wheel and proceed into the public domain without even the consent of their husbands and even in violation of his prohibition. Women of all walks of life generally travel without mahrams. Drove of tableeghi women, modernists, etc. travel in flagrant violation of the Shariah without mahrams. As far as they are concerned, the Shariah is antique. The severe threat of punishment and warning of the Qur'aan and Hadith have no meaning for them.

These women are not in need of any zigzag fatwa of a panel of 17 zombi muftis to allow them to travel without mahrams. They are already doing so, not by way of availing themselves of the concession due to Shar'i *Dhuroorah*, but in flagrant violation of Allah's prohibition. Now they will merely find justification for their immorality by citing the stupid fatwa of permissibility. They will not be concerned with the conditions, just as the women who today attend the Musjid and other functions are totally uninterested in the stringent terms which had countenanced permissibility during the age of Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam). They only know one thing: *That Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) allowed women to attend the Musjid.* This is the be-all of their corrupt ideology, and it has been indurated by the miscreant molvis of this age who provide haraam licences with their zigzag fatwas which permit women to prowl and roam in the public domain. The concept of

hijaab understood by both the lewd women and the fatwa-issuing molvis is not Shar'i Hijaab. They simply labour in self-deception with their kind of modern 'hijaab'. The stupid so-called 'deendaar' women will argue that many muftis claim permissibility to travel without mahrams. The modernist women of lesbian tendency are not even interested in the fatwa. They are not in need of any fatwa.

The brains of these muftis and molvis are really lamentable. Despite the fisq, fujoor and many other dangers being well magnified, flagrant and prevalent, they pretend the coast is safe for females to emerge without mahrams, venture into public places and even on journeys without mahrams. In fact, in this era of extreme villainy and shaitaaniyyat, the Hadith: '*Journey is a portion of the Fire.*', has greater applicability. Even if a mahram accompanies a woman, a journey should not be undertaken without pressing need.

THE DIFFICULTIES

For their universal fatwa, the group of 17 molvis have imagined *mushkilaat* (*difficulties*) confronting women. The claimed 'difficulties' are mere figments of their imagination. On the basis of hallucination, have these molvis issues their uncalled for fatwa.

What are the *mushkilaat* women are facing today to halaalize travelling without mahrams? Which of their objectives of travel come within the purview of *Shar'i*

Dhuroorah? The whole bunch of molvis has failed to enumerate the *Dhuroori* objectives for which women undertake journeys without mahrams.

Going for tableegh, visiting relatives, attending weddings, studies and the like are not such needs which permit the concession. During the time of Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) a Sahaabi who had left to participate in Jihad had instructed his wife not to emerge from the house during his absence. During his absence her ailing father died. In deference and obedience to the instruction of her husband she did not leave the home to visit her sick father nor did she go to the house when her father died. Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) upheld the veracity of her decision and supplicated for her. Thus, visiting distant relatives in a haraam manner (i.e. without a mahram) is haraam.

When women are confronted by genuine *Dhuroorah* they will not need any fatwa. They will act by force of circumstances and avail themselves of the concession to travel without mahrams. Examples of such exigencies are the scenarios in Syria, Kashmir, Burma, and elsewhere. The mahram may die along the journey. Obviously, the stranded woman will not have to wait for a fatwa of 17 molvis before pursuing the journey back home without a mahram.

If there is a dire need to travel without a mahram, it will apply with rarity and no one will claim that it is

prohibited for her. First the *Dhuroorah* must be established, then the permission will be automatic without the need for a fatwa of 17 or 70 molvis who usually converge at a venue for merrymaking in the name of the Deen.

THE SHARIAH IS NOT ANTIQUE

The mas'alah pertaining to the prohibition of females journeying without mahrams is a simple and straightforward order of the Shariah. It has not become antique as the fatwa of the Idaraarah Ghufraan implies. It is applicable today just as it was applicable 14 centuries ago. It is just as extant as is all rules of Hijaab, of the Faraaidh of Wudhu, and as are all the thousands of the masaa-il of the Shariah. An *ijlaas* of a conglomerate of molvis indulging in merrymaking and squandering large sums of public funds in futile and redundant conferences is not necessary to decide simple issues which a solitary Mufti sitting at home or in his Darul Ifta can answer with a fatwa.

The prohibition is unequivocal. The *Nusoos* categorically prohibit women from travelling without mahrams just as consuming haraam food is prohibited. There is no difference. Now to decide whether a Muslim may consume some haraam food when circumstances compel, or whether a haraam medicine/remedy may be used, a conference of Ulama is not only uncalled for, it is laughable, stupid and satanic squandering of the ni'mat of wealth. If the exigency is dire and urgent, the

person will act automatically without resorting to fishing for fatwas. If the matter lacks urgency and is not pressing, then obviously for the Muslim who is conscious of Allah's Presence, the concession is not available. However, in this latter case, the modernists, munaafiqeen, zindeeqs and the like will cite the stupid fatwa of the miscreant molvis such as the conglomerate of 17. He/she will ignore the conditions (*sharaa-it*), and intransigently claim that numerous muftis say that it is permissible, e.g. permissible for women to travel without mahrams.

For the edification of the molvis, it is imperative to divest their brains from the western-acquired idea on the antiquity of the Shariah. Although they do not verbally proclaim this kufr, the implication of their zigzag fatwas connotes this villainy. This Shariah is immutable. It was completed, finalized and perfected during the very era of Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam). The Fuqaha of the Salafus Saaliheen era have formulated numerous *Usool* from the Qur'aan and Ahaadith to meet every developing contingency and exigency until the Day of Qiyaamah. This Ummah is not in need of molvi/mufti sittings and sessions, ijlaases and conferences in western style to deliberate developing issues. The answers are all present in the Kutub of the Fuqaha. The only requisite is for a Mufti who is adorned with Taqwa. Such a Mufti views the exigency by means of the Noor of Allah Ta'ala Who infuses in his heart the Haqq. Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) said: "*Beware*

of the firaasat of the Mu'min, for he looks with the Noor of Allah."

The system of conferences, reading stupid papers, passing stupid resolutions and ostentious deliberations full of roaring, but signifying nothing, are the paraphernalia of the conferences of the priests of the Nasaara and Yahood who congregate to effect changes to their religions. They interpolate and mutilate their religions. They realize that their scriptures are outdated and have to be assigned to the realm of antiquity, hence they have priest-conferences to plot 'religious' rulings for incorporation into their religions as if such new man-made opinions are the divine truth. These types of conferences had decided the doctrines of Christianity. All their doctrines are 'fatwas' of kufr. The molvis/muftis of this age are following the Yahood and Nasaara by subjecting the Divine Shariah to opinion. Thus, they fabricate fatwas which only serve to further erode the Imaan and ruin the Akhlaaq of the masses.

THOROUGH EXAMINATION

The group of 17 molvis claim to have *thoroughly examined (ghaur, khauz, tamhees)* and pondered the issue. This claim is a ludicrous canard. If they had correctly scrutinized the matter, they would not have presented a zigzag, nonsensical fatwa. The 17 molvis have displayed gross ignorance of the reality on the ground.

While they maintain that the concession applies only if the road is totally safe (*pur aman*), if there is observance of Shar'i purdah, and total absence of fitnah, they appear to be lamentably oblivious of the almost total non-existence of these conditions stipulated for their permissibility fatwa.

Safety of the road

Imagining that the road today is safe whether the journey is by road, sea or air is the effect of moronic hallucination. In the West (U.S.A., U.K. and Europe) thousands of cases of harassment of Muslim women have occurred very recently in the wake of so-called Islamophobia. Muslim women have been harassed, assaulted viciously, insulted and abused in the streets, on planes and in public places where these lewd so-called *hijaabi* females venture. Samples of such harassment negating in entirety the moronic imagination of 'road safety' are presented here for divesting the brains of the molvis.

*** Women viciously assaulted for wearing hijab:**

“Police are appealing for witnesses to a vicious Islamophobic attack in Ealing, West London, last month (August 2019) which left one elderly Muslim woman with broken ribs and another with internal bleeding.....”

*** Teen has hijab pulled off and is pelted with eggs in Dublin:**

“...A Muslim teenager had her hijab pulled off and was pelted with eggs by a group of people in Dublin. The woman and her cousin are also said to have been thrown to the ground and kicked.....”

*** Almost half of Muslims in France harassed:**

“Almost half of Muslims (42 per cent) in France say they have experienced harassment.....60 percent of Muslim women who wear hijab (head scarf) were harassed while the figure was 44 percent for non-headscarf-wearing Muslim women.....”

*** French politician demands woman remove her hijab**

“...A far-right politician demanded that a Muslim mother remove her hijab during a primary school trip to a council building.....”

*** Morocco bans burqas**

“Morocco has banned the import, production and sale of burqas.....”

*** Police stop veiled woman in Italy**

“A woman visiting a post office in Novara, north-western Italy, has been stopped by police for wearing an Islamic veil covering her face...she has to pay a fine of 500 euro.....”

*** Tunisian government attack the veil**

“The Tunisian government has launched a campaign against a return of the Islamic veil. The veil was inspired by sectarianism, foreign to our country, our culture and our traditions, the Foreign Minister said...”

*** The veil a mark of defiance (says the murtad) first ‘muslim’ peer**

“The veil is a mark of separation and defiance against mainstream British culture and should not be used according to Britain’s first Muslim peer.”

*** Detaining Muslims at airports is islamophobia says Cage**

“The detention of Muslims at ports and airports is so disproportionate that the practice has become Islamophobic according to Cage human rights group.....419,000 incidences show the overwhelming use of emergency power was based on religious and racial profiling.”

*** Muslims first victims of far-right extremism in Europe**

“Islamophobic incidents rose across Europe due to the increase of far-right movements.Islamophobic language by high-ranking politicians, most from the right, normalises a dehumanizing and racist language when it comes to the portrayal of Muslims.”

*** Attacks on Muslims**

“Muslims were increasingly becoming victims solely because of their faith, said the report. Around 70 cases of Islamophobic incidents were recorded in Belgium, where 76 per cent of the victims were female, it notes.

In Austria, 540 cases of Islamophobic incidents were recorded in 2018, compared to 309 cases in 2017 – a rise of approximately 74 per cent of anti-Muslim racist acts.

In France, 676 Islamophobic incidents were documented in 2018 against 446 in 2017 with a 52 per cent rise. Among these 676 incidents, 20 involved physical attacks (three per cent), 568 discriminations (84 per cent) and 88 of them involved hate speech (13 per cent). In Germany, there were 678 attacks on German Muslims, including 40 attacks on mosques. Some 1,775 attacks were on refugees, 173 on asylum homes and 95 on aid Workers in Germany, according to the report. In the Netherlands, 91 per cent of a total of 151 incidents of religious discrimination reported to the police was against Muslims. Religiously motivated crime in England and Wales rose by 415 per cent from 2011 to 2018, the report notes.

The Muslims News 29-11-19

Normal conditions (Aam haalaat)

The fatwa of the conglomerate of 17 molvis speaks of ‘normal conditions’ (*aam haalaat*) which are stipulated for the impermissibility of women to travel without

mahrms. What exactly is meant by *aam haalaat*? In the context of the fatwa it obviously means that times of fitnah and danger are the *aam haalaat*, hence the impermissibility to travel without a mahram. In terms of this convoluted logic, it follows that when circumstances are abnormal which implies non-existence of fitnah, then a woman may not travel without a mahram. The incongruency is self-evident.

Regardless of the existence or non-existence of fitnah, and whatever may be this concept of '*aam haalaat*', it is haraam for a woman to travel without a mahram. The Shariah's prohibition is in fact based on the real existence of fitnah, and this aspect will remain for all time, and in fact will deteriorate and become worse with the approach of Qiyaamah. The '*aam haalaat*' which requires the prohibition, exists today to a greater degree. *It* is un-Islamic, silly and stupid to expect or theorize that in our era or in subsequent eras the disappearance of fitnah. The Sahaabah detected in their era which was the noblest era, the development of the kind of *fitnah* which proscribes female emergence from the home necessitating the ban on women attending the Musjid which was the concession during the time of Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam). But these 17 molvis hallucinate something to the contrary, hence they managed the blundering fatwa in this era of supreme *fitnah* when no woman is safe even outside her home, leave alone on a journey without a mahram, and surrounded by hosts of shayaateen, fussaag, fujjaar and

kuffaar on the plane, at the airports and wherever she may tread in the public domain. Added to this mixture of *fitnah*, is the *fitnah* concomitant to the woman herself. She lacks *taqwa*, hence is prepared to travel alone despite '*aam haalaat*'. In the circumstances shaitaan manipulates her fully for the attainment of his perfidious and pernicious objective of sexual perversion. Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) said:

“Woman is aurah (i.e. her entire body). When she emerges (from her home) shaitaan casts his villainous gazes on her. She comes forward in the form of shaitaan, and she moves away in the form of shaitaan.”

From the front and from behind *shaitaaniyat* percolates from her. Allah Ta'ala has made women *habaailush shaitaan (traps of shaitaan)*. Without her mahram on a journey, she constitutes a powerful trap for satanic manipulation.

Allah Ta'ala says in the Qur'aan Majeed:

“The (physical) eyes are not blind. But the eyes within the breasts (spiritual eyes) are blind.”

It is this spiritual blindness which has cast the 17 molvis into their self-imposed deception of imagining that it is all fine and perfect for a woman to travel alone on a plane. Since molvis and muftis of this type find nothing amiss when they travel on planes, they dupe themselves

into the understanding that everything is fine for the woman on the plane journey.

For these western liberalized molvis and muftis with blinded spiritual vision, interacting on the plane with female staff, consuming the impure haraam plane food, standing in the queue next to females waiting their turn to enter the toilet, brushing shoulders with women in the narrow aisles, freely mingling with the opposite sex when alighting from the plane and when sitting in the bus for going to the terminal, then having to endure the villainy and spiritual torture of the mixture at the immigration and customs points, etc., etc. – all of this is acceptable and halaalized by imaginary '*dhuroorah*'.

An example of halaalizing haraam on the basis of warped satanic interpretation and understanding of the principle of *Dhuroorah*, the so-called 'grand mufti' of Pakistan, Mr. Taqi Usmaani, had recently sat face to face with a non-Muslim female journalist who was interviewing him. Every moment of this haraam interaction was most certainly of concupiscence significance to the 'grand mufti' who has become transformed into a grand agent of shaitaan for his dexterity in the manipulation of the principle of *Dhuroorah* for halaalizing clear-cut prohibitions. Shame, *Imaani Ghairat*, the Presence of Allah Ta'ala and the Recording Angels, and the Eyes of the Ummah could not deter the 'grand mufti' from his public act of despicable violation of Allah's Law of Hijaab. Now just

what was the *dhuroorah* for the zina-interview with the young godless Russian faajirah/faahishah? What Shar'i imperative constrained the 'grand mufti' to so callously trample on the Shariah's prohibition so flagrantly in public?

Then we find the *Muhtamim Sahib (Principal)* of Daarul Uloom Deoband shockingly posing with two females alongside him to be photographed. These are *kabeerah* sins which today's grand muftis, allaamahs, molvis, sheikhs and shaitaani 'buzrugs' flagrantly perpetrate in the public. These major sins have become so accepted in view of wide-scale prevalence and rampant indulgence that there no longer remains the need to manipulate the principle of *Dhuroorah* for the attainment of the satanic objective. The degree of desensitization of Imaan has become an adequate halaalizer of fisq and fujoor and of *kabaa-ir*.

These episodes of *fisq* perpetrated by the molvis were public commissions, hence the need to make public reference as a warning to Muslims to be on guard against the shaitaani depredations of the ulama-e-soo' who assail the Imaan and wreck the Akhlaaq of the masses with their liberal ideology.

Basking in self-deception, the 17 molvis have hallucinated that when a woman is bundled alone into a plane by a mahram, then collected by another mahram at the destination, she has been encased in an airtight

box like a parcel in which the contents are safe and sound. This shaitani idea of the woman cast onto the plane being insulated from the deluge of fitnah in the plane and the airport where she will disembark is the effect of immolation of the brains of the molvis who have dastardly mis-manipulated the Shariah's principles to transform haraam into halaal.

Permissibility is occasioned only by dire need (*Dhuroorah*), and this need is not just any need conjectured by just any person. It must be a need accepted by the Shariah. '*Aam haalaat*' which is the necessary requisite for the prohibition according to the 17 molvis exists today to a greater degree than centuries ago when the prohibition was enacted. These molvis have miserably failed to cite a single factor which qualifies for the invocation of the principle of *Dhuroorah* to permit women travelling without mahrams.

Shar'i purdah

The fatwa stipulates observance of Shar'i purdah for the baselessly expectorated permissibility. This is a hallucinatory expectation. Women who venture into the public domain in our era do not observe Shar'i purdah. Even genuine purdah nasheen ladies are unable to observe valid Shar'i purdah in the vile environment polluted with fussaah, fujjaar and kuffaar. At every juncture in the journey purdah is violated.

Firstly almost all women are bereft of purdah of the heart. Their external cloaks are artefacts of tradition, and not adopted as effects of Taqwa. Men and women on journeys are involved in a variety of sins from the beginning of the journey to the end.

The dissertation of the Ghufraan Institute is at pains to paint a picture of safety and comfort for a woman who travels today by plane. *Fitan* and dangers of journeys during bygone times no longer apply to this era according to the Ghufraan Institute molvis. This hallucinated difference eases the Shariah's rigid prohibition in the understanding of the 17 molvis. In their estimation, a woman is safe from sin and fitnah on a plane even if she travels unaccompanied by a mahram. In fact, she becomes embroiled in the *fitnah* of *fisq* and *fujoor* even if a mahram is accompanying her. To a far greater degree is she, herself entrapped in fitnah and also becoming a trap of fitnah for others without a mahram. Even with a mahram she is vulnerable in the public domain, and without a mahram the vulnerability multiplies manifold. It is difficult to comprehend the lack of understanding of the 17 molvis who have fabricated a totally uncalled for fatwa which only gives greater impetus to female lewdness.

No woman today is prepared to emerge from home as *tafilah*. Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) had stipulated the *tafilah* condition for the permissibility to attend even Musjid-e-Nabawi round the corner, but

these molvis proclaim that it is permissible for the adorned woman to travel thousands of miles without a mahram on the basis of some imaginary *majboori*. They have added the stipulation of ‘observing Shar’i purdah’ as a red herring. In fact, it appears that they lack comprehension of the meaning of Shar’i Purdah. In fact, even an old hag is not prepared in this day to emerge from home like a *tafilah* (*an old, smelly hag dressed shabbily*). The emphasis is on adornment and self-expression when emerging from the home, and to be *tafilah* inside the home. The order has been inversed today by shaitaani influences which are promoted by even muftis with their zigzag fatwas of liberalism and corruption.

THE ATTEMPT TO MINIMIZE THE IMPACT OF THE AHAADITH

Although the group of 17 molvis has presented the variety of authentic Ahaadith pertaining to the prohibition of women travelling with mahrams, they have subtly attempted to minimize and dilute the severity of the warning and prohibition. Thus, in their dissertation they say:

“In several Ahaadith the prohibition of a woman travelling without a mahram has been narrated. But, in this regard some difference is found in the words and subject matter of Ahaadith and Riwaayaat. In some is mentioned lengthy travel; in some short travel is

mentioned, and in some narrations the prohibition is general. Also the statements of the Fuqaha in this regard are at variance.

It is obvious that the social life today, especially with regard to travelling and means of communication is vastly different from what it was centuries ago in bygone times.”

With this silly and deceptive preamble the attempt is to dilute the extremely strict and rigid prohibition which will be understood from the Ahaadith which shall be presented further on in this treatise, Insha-Allah.

Further arguing the case for permissibility, the molvis say: *“The present state is that the means of travelling are extremely simple and easy. Unlike bygone times.....The possibility of the type of fitnah of former times has considerably decreased.”*

Brains which have fabricated this conclusion need to be examined for veracity. With the swift advance towards Qiyaamah, how is it possible for molvis to understand a decrease of *fitan* when Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) informed that the rise and increase of great *fitan* will be in such abundance as to resemble a string of beads cut asunder. Just as the beads will scatter helter skelter, so too will be the increase, abundance and occurrence of fitnah in time in proximity to Qiyaamah.

The '*aam haalaat*' which is the basis for the prohibition according to the 17 molvis, exists on a greater scale today, hence the prohibition may not be negated in any way whatsoever. On the contrary, the prohibition should be extended to even a journey of a couple of hours as is mentioned in a Hadith in which Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) said that a woman should not undertake a journey of even one *bareed* (12 miles) without a mahram.

THE RELEVANT AHAADITH

(1) Hadhrat Abdullah Bin Umar (Radhiyallahu anhu) narrated:

“Verily, the Nabi (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) said: ‘A woman should not travel (a journey of) three days except with a mahram.’ (Bukhaari)

“It is not halaal for a woman who believes in Allah and the Last Day to travel a distance of three nights except with a mahram.” (Muslim)

“A woman should not travel (a journey of) two days except with her husband or mahram.” (Saheeh Ibn Khuzaimah)

With regard to a journey less than three days, the conglomerate of 17 says:

“From the apparent text of these narrations it appears that a journey of less than three days and three nights should be permissible for a woman without a mahram.”

This subtle attempt to scuttle the prohibition is negated by the above mentioned Hadith which prohibits even a two day journey as well as Ahaadith mentioning the prohibition even for journeys of a day and of even 12 miles. Besides the Hadith, the ‘*aam haalaat*’ in which *fitnah* is pervasive prohibits women from venturing out of their homes alone even in their neighbourhood. Only morons are blind to the dangers of the times.

Hadhrat Abu Hurairah (Radhiyallahu anhu) narrated that Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) said:

“It is not halaal for a Muslimah to travel a distance of (even) one night except with a close mahram.” (Muslim)

This Hadith reinforces the prohibition of female emergence from their home for even a journey less than three days. In other narrations, also by Hadhrat Abu Hurairah (Radhiyallahu anhu), it appears as follows:

“Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) said: ‘It is not halaal for a woman who believes in Allah and the Last Day to travel the distance of one day except with a mahram.’ (Muslim)

“Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) said: ‘It is not halaal for a woman to travel one day or more than a day except with a mahram.’ (Musnad Ahmad)

“It is not halaal for a woman to travel three (days) except with a mahram.” (Muslim)

“Verily, Rasulallah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) said: ‘A woman should not travel one bareed (12 miles) except with a mahram.’ (Saheeh Ibn Hibbaan)

Hadhrat Abu Saeed Khudri (Radhiyallahu anhu) narrates that Rasulallah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) said:

“A woman should not travel two days except with a mahram.” (Muslim)

“A woman should not travel more than two days except with her husband or mahram.” (Musnad Ahmad)

“A woman should not travel three (days) except with her mahram.” (Muslim)

“A woman should not travel more than three nights except with a mahram.” (Muslim)

“It is not halaal for a woman who believes in Allah and the Last Day to travel three days or more except with her father, son, husband, brother or mahram.” (Muslim)

Hadhrat Ibn Abbaas (Radhiyallahu anhu) narrated:

“The Nabi (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) said: ‘A woman should not travel except with a mahram.’”

The variety of Hadith narrations

The variety of narrations in no way whatsoever detracts from the rigidity of the prohibition. Regarding the statements of Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) the Qur’aan Majeed states: *“He (Muhammad) does not speak of (his) desire. It (i.e. whatever he says) is Wahi revealed to him.”* No one should dwell in any uncertainty regarding the different wordings of these narrations. Every seemingly different view has a valid application. The one narration does not negate nor conflict with the other narrations. On the contrary, these varieties of narrations reinforces and emphasises the prohibition.

But, the conglomerate of 17 molvis has attempted to manipulate the different versions of the Ahaadith together with the technicalities of the views of the Fuqaha of the different Math-habs to eke out permissibility in stark conflict with the express and emphatic prohibition of the *Nusoos*. The prohibition is declared without the least ambiguity in the many Ahaadith on this topic. There is no scope for manoeuvring to produce permissibility.

The issue of permissibility is also a clear-cut, unambiguous ruling of the Shariah based on the Qur'aanic principle of *Dhuroorah*, hence, besides the futility of the uncalled for copious meanderings and wading through the Kutub of the Fuqaha to scavenge for loopholes for expectorating a ruling which is readily available in the Shariah on the basis of the requisite terms and conditions (*Sharaa-it*), the molvis have exhibited their total inability of comprehension of both the *Usool and the Furoo* ' of issues.

It is totally unexpected and ludicrous for men of Ilm – for molvis and muftis – to acquit themselves so amateurishly as demonstrated by the *Idaarah Ghufraan group of 17*. No one has ever argued that it is not permissible for a starving man on the verge of Maut to consume a little pork to save his life. Similarly, no one claims that in a scenario of *Dhuroorah* a woman may not travel without a mahram. However, what the miscreants term as 'dhuroorah' is in reality not *Shar'i Dhuroorah*. Therefore, the fatwa is uncalled for and serves only the inordinate nafsaaani dictates of the fussaag and fujjaar.

To wade through a plethora of Kutub and to obfuscate the issue with a host of technicalities to produce the desired permissibility of consuming pork for the starving man, is not only stupid and incongruent, but

also demands that such muftis be debarred from issuing fatwa.

Once the *Dhroorah* is established, there is no need for a plethora of juridical references and texts to flaunt expertise and perceived academic excellences. There is no need for conferences. There is no need for a lustreless galaxy of molvis to converge on a haunt for a merrymaking function involving huge squandering of money and time wasted in nonsensical and redundant resolutions. This is not the style of the Ahl-e-Ilm of Islam. These molvis are suffering from the disease of liberalism acquired from the West, hence they ridiculously labour to model their Madaaris in emulation of kuffaar secular institutions thereby reducing themselves and their institutions to a mockery, and killing the spirit and ethos of Ilm-e-Deen which sprang from its fountainhead of the *Ghaar-e-Hira*.

The Ahaadith as well as the rulings of the Fuqaha are clear and emphatic on the prohibition of a woman travelling a journey of three days without a mahram. No amount of socialistic dialectics can dent this immutable law of Allah Ta'ala. The different wordings of the Ahaadith are not mutually nugatory. Rather, they are corroborating and reinforcing the Prohibition.

There is no conundrum in the different versions mentioned in the Ahaadith. The three-day limit is cast in

rock and may not be violated regardless of the safety and security of an era and location. Even if the times become as safe as it were during the Khilaafat of Ameerul Mu'mineen Umar Ibn Khattaab (Radhiyallahu anhu) and the khilaafat of Umar Bin Abdul Azeez (Umar, The Second – Rahmatullah alayh), and even if a woman can travel from east to west of a country without the slightest fear of being molested, then too it remains haraam for her to undertake a journey of three days or more without a mahram.

Commensurate with the prevalence of *fitnah*, will the versions of less than three days become applicable. While the three-day law will apply regardless of non-existence of *fitnah*, the lesser number of days (i.e. less than three days) is variable, depending on the circumstances and degree of prevalent *fitnah*. The three-day rule is immutable. It will not be cancelled even if it is completely safe for a woman to travel alone. It is not a variable entity such as the lesser number of days. The scope for the variability of the latter is commensurate with the prevalence of *fitnah*. The very fact that Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) forbade a woman to travel even 12 miles without a mahram adequately illustrates this reality which the 17 molvis of the Ghufraan Institute have failed to recognize due to abstention from cognitive application of the mind.

In the current age of predominance of *fitnah* – *fisq* and *fujoor* – when even males are not safe, when Muslims themselves recklessly and flagrantly violate the Shariah in public, when every rule of Hijaab has been almost expunged, when rape, murder, muggings, when there is intense intermingling even in the Haramain Shareefain, when even mahram males are unqualified by the Shariah to be valid mahrams on a journey, and when crime in general prevails intensively and extensively, it is HARAAM for women to go into any public place even a few metres from their homes without being accompanied by valid Shar’i mahrams.

In these times of extreme *fitnah* when Islam has been accorded the status of a hobby to be adopted partially and defectively, and to be discarded at whim and fancy, ladies who have the Deen at heart, have to incumbently observe the Qur’aanic injunction of ‘*Wa Qarna fi buyootikunna...*’ (*And remain glued inside your homes...*). Obviously, this *naseehat* will be of no concern to the hordes and droves of lewd women who have taken to globe-trotting without mahrams, and who are further emboldened by zigzag fatwas of liberalized molvis and cardboard muftis. Our *naseehat* is directed at those who are genuinely concerned with the Shariah – those who have genuine fear for Allah Ta’ala and the accountability in Qiyaamah. This *naseehat* will, Insha-Allah, find a responsive chord in their hearts, and Allah

Ta'ala grants the *taufeeq* of *amal* to those who are not atheists at heart.

“(O Muhammad!) Give naseehat, for verily, naseehat benefits the Mu'mineen.” (Ath-thaariyaat, Aayat 55)

To issue a universal fatwa on the hallucinatory basis of *dhuroorah* and *majboori*, is satanic inspiration. When a woman is afflicted with a true *Dhuroorah*, she will be constrained to act and travel without a mahram. For this, she does not require any fatwa or licence from any mufti. If circumstances constrain a woman to, for example, flee from the brutality of the kuffaar in the U.S.A. or the U.K. or Syria or Burma, or if she is constrained by any other genuine urgent circumstance, the Shariah's principle of *Dhuroorah* will be automatically availed of. An *aam* fatwa is never required nor is it intelligent for invocation of the exigency of *Dhuroorah*. This is a case by case issue which takes its own course.

What really had prompted the conglomerate of merrymaking molvis to deliberate on a redundant issue? What was the need to organize a futile conference for which journeys were undertaken and considerable money squandered? They have misdirected their efforts and their brains. Our advice to these molvis and to others elsewhere, is to concentrate on the explosion of *fisq*, *fujoor* and *kufir* in the Ummah. The Ummah is

burning, and the conflagration of moral and spiritual destruction has ruined this Ummah. Instead of engaging in *Amr Bil Ma'roof Nahyi anil Munkar* in endeavours to salvage whatever is able of the flotsam (*ghutha*) of this Ummah, the molvis of this age only add to the further destruction of this fallen, humiliated Ummah.

In a world of immorality, vice and perversity of every kind, the obligation of the Ulama is to close the avenues of *fisq* and *fujoor*. Instead of this, they recklessly open with their zigzag fatwas more gaping chasms for deluges of *fitnah*. They issue their zigzag fatwas without any fear for Allah Ta'ala and without mulling over the consequences. Thus, instead of guiding Muslims to *Siraatul Mustaqeem*, they pave the pathway of Jahannam by further widening the already wide chasm between Muslims and Allah Ta'ala.

All the hardships crashing on Muslims fail to jolt these molvis into reality. They remain indurately grounded in wasteful discussions, merrymaking conferences and silly resolutions which are bereft of any utility for the Ummah. Just what was the need for the fatwa granting leeway to women for travelling without mahram?

A futile attempt to seek support

The Ghufraan Institute molvis, in a baseless and futile attempt to extravasate support for their zigzag fatwa,

look askance at the Shaafi' and Maaliki Math-habs. Thus they say in their dissertation:

“According to the Shaafi’iyyah if two or more pious women, and according to some, even one pious woman accompanies a woman, then for purposes of the Fardh Hajj they will be an adequate substitute for a mahram.

According to the Maalikiyyah if a reliable group of men and women is available, and there is also safety from the woman (i.e. no fear of zina-fitnah), then it is incumbent on a woman to go for Hajj without a mahram because in this scenario fitnah is obviated.

However, this rule applies only for the Fardh Hajj. Nafl Hajj as well as journeys for other purposes are also excluded (from the concession) according to these Ulama (Shaafi and Maaliki)

According to the Shaafi’iyyah, Umrah too is Fardh. Therefore if Umrah has devolved as Fardh in terms of the necessary conditions, then as explained above, a woman can travel without a mahram.

Nowadays, the (Hajj) groups consist of different men and women. There is no fear of fitnah, (totally moronic assumption – Mujlisul Ulama), hence according to the Shaafi’iyyah and Maalikiyyah, if Hajj is Fardh on a woman, and if Umrah is Fardh according to the Shaafi’iyyah, then it will be incumbent for the woman to

travel even without a mahram. But the woman will have to make arrangements to ensure that she is not in solitude, etc. with ghair mahrams and she should also ensure that her face is not exposed.”

These hallucinated ‘arrangements’ are impossible in these times of the reign of tumultuous *fitnah* halaalized by the kufr regimes, and by the Muslim masses, and even by the liberal molvis with their zigzag fatwas. It is unbecfitting of Ulama to acquit themselves so amateurishly as this group of Molvis has exhibited in the aforementioned argument.

Firstly, they are supposed to be Hanafis. Secondly, there is no pressing need and no *Shar’i Dhuroorah* for *udool* (*diversion*) from the professed Math-hab to adopt a ruling of another Math-hab. Their citation of the other Math-habs in this context is stupid and not permissible. Thirdly, the concession of the two Math-habs applies to only Fardh Hajj and Fardh Umrah while the zigzag fatwa applies to all sorts of travel. The concession of the other Math-habs is not available for general application. It is not a licence for unnecessary abandonment of the *ahkaam* of the professed Math-hab. Fourthly, the concession is inextricably interwoven with safety from *fitnah*, especially the type of *fitnah* in which humanity (Muslim and non-Muslim) is drowning.

Regarding the impermissibility of adopting a concession due to *fitnah*, the Shaafi'iyyah had even ruled that due to the fitnah prevalent in the Haram Shareef (the fitnah of concupiscence), it is not permissible for women to enter the Haram Shareef for even Tawaaf. The Shaafi Fuqaha had issued this fatwa centuries ago.

The assumption of safety and absence of fitnah, is the hallucination of either morons or molvis who trade the Deen for the dunya. The fitnah prevalent in the Hajj groups goaded on by Shaitaan, is well-known to many who had performed Hajj with the type of groups which the 17 molvis have mentioned. Today, the doors of fitnah have been widely opened by the kuffaar regime in Saudi Arabia. Even foreign prostitutes are brought to ply their satanic trade in the Haram of Makkah.

Compared to the *fitnah* which we have observed some years ago, vice and immorality have multiplied manifold. At every turn is fitnah – fisq and fujoor. Only morons are capable of imagining *no fear of fitnah, and that a woman will not bump into men and rub shoulders with men even whilst making Tawaaf*. Human devils groping females whilst making Tawaaf has been reliably substantiated. There have been incidents of some guards in Musjid Nabawi making zina contact with females right inside the Musjid, then they embark on their zina jaunts, taking the females with them. There are numerous similar fitnah episodes involving women

despite having mahrams with them. These are mahrams of the *dayyooth* class who are not valid Shar'i mahrams for women on a journey. There is absolutely no credibility in this argument tendered by the conglomerate of 17 molvis.

Furthermore, in cases of *Dhuroorah* there will be no need to issue fatwa in terms of the rules of other Math-habs. The *Usool* for such exigencies are available in the Hanafi Math-hab.

Sniffing around to find shreds as evidence for supporting their narrative, the molvis aver:

“According to some Maalikiyyah it is permissible for a woman to undertake non-Waajib, permissible journeys in large caravans in populated areas where there will be no corruption of satr exposure, nor intermingling with ghair mahrams, nor will there be fitnah from either ghair mahrams or from the woman herself. From this it is understood that according to these Ulama, the prohibition hinges on ‘fitnah’...”

They have really descended into the dregs of moronity for presenting this argument which most certainly is not akin to the satanic scenarios encountered today from the very moment one sets out from home even with mahrams.

At a minimum, the utopian scenario which the molvis have presented here exhibits extreme naivety. Where on earth in this age does this utopian scenario of total absence of *fitnah*, of women not exposing themselves, of the absence of intermingling of the sexes in every place in the public domain exists? Their imagination has run havoc with their brains. The situation of supreme Taqwa painted by these molvis for providing a licence to women to travel without mahrams had existed during the Khilaafat of Hadhrat Umar Ibn Khattaab (Radhiyallahu anhu), and for a very brief period of about two years during the Khilaafat of Hadhrat Umar Ibn Abdul Aziz (Rahmatullah alayh).

It is a display of stupidity to attempt justifying females travelling without mahrams on the basis of imaginary scenarios. Furthermore, this view is not even accepted by the Jamhooor Maalikiyyah.

There is no gainsaying in the fact that the Prohibition hinges on *fitnah*. The *fitnah* will always remain. It is an illustration of *jahaalat* to imagine away the *fitnah* of *fisq* and *fujoor* which is incremental by the day as Qiyaamah approaches. The averment of the 17 molvis that if the element of *fitnah* is eliminated, then it will be permissible for women to travel without mahrams is a canard of kufr proportion. Even if the utopian scenario is hallucinated and imagined to be totally free of *fitnah*, then too it will remain haraam for a woman to travel a

journey of three days without a mahram. In view of the immutability of this Shar'i law, it will be maintained with emphasis that regardless of any assessment of safety made by people on the issue of *fitnah*, that the factor of *fitnah* is ever present in a journey of three days irrespective of the existence of the perfect scenario hallucinated by morons.

Since the Shariah of Allah Ta'ala prohibits a journey of three days without a mahram, the element of *fitnah* is of no significance for the sustainment of the Prohibition which will remain intact. The Prohibition may not be abrogated.

This is like the prohibition of pork. The pig is *najis* and *rijs*. It is disease-causing filth. It is detrimental both physically and spiritually because of its inherent filth. If it is imagined that the atheist scientists have succeeded in hygienic pig-farming which eliminates disease, then too pork will always remain haraam regardless of what the moron scientists say.

In presenting the flapdoodle argument of some Maalikiyyah, the group of 17 molvis has demonstrated their lack of perspicacity. This 'daleel' is plain twaddle twiddling with the Divine Prohibition: "*It is not halaal for a woman who believes in Allah and the Last Day to undertake a*

journey of three days without a mahram.” Nothing can abrogate this immutable Law of Allah Ta’ala.

The Safar Zamaani element

In another futile endeavour to dilute and override the Shar’i prohibition, the zigzagging molvis dug out the corpse of an invalid view of *safar zamaani*. In terms of this *baatil* view, the prohibition applies on the basis of the *time factor*, not the distance of three *manzils* (48 miles). The effect of this baseless view is that it is permissible for a woman to travel the entire globe without a mahram as long as the time for the journey is less than three days. Thus, if a woman sets off alone, without a mahram, on a plane journey from country to country, and in the process travels tens of thousands of miles, it will be permissible as long as the journey is accomplished in less than three days.

It is obvious that the 17 miscreant molvis who have assumed upon themselves the satanic task of first diluting, then cancelling the more than 14 century Prohibition, have strayed far, very far from *Siraatul Mustaqeem*. Their intellectual equilibrium has been jarred to debar the perspicacity required for comprehension of Shar’i masaa-il. This *safar zamaani* argument is plain drivel proffered without

fear for Allah Ta'ala. The audacity is indeed egregious.

It did not occur to them that regardless of who the initiator of this view may be, it is rejected by the Hanafi Math-hab of which these 17 molvis are supposed to be muqallideen. All Math-habs reject this view. From whence did this unfortunate conglomerate derive the authority to set aside the immutable 14 Century Law of Allah Ta'ala?

Then this group presenting an utopian caveat says: *"But, for this permissibility the condition is that during her stay there (i.e. at the destination) she should not be in solitude with a ghair mahram nor should it (her stay) entail exposure of her aurah or any other fitnah."*

These molvis should confine their fatwas to issues pertaining to village folk in rural villages. The aforementioned caveat illustrates their total lack of understanding of the colossal *fitnah* concomitant to journeys, especially plane journeys, of this age. If their brains had been functioning with equilibrium never would they have even dreamt of allowing a woman to globe-trot the world without a mahram. They would not have ventured the stupid *safar*

zamaani view. This view has no credibility. It must be dismissed as a total nullity.

A licence for roaming

Again illustrating total ignorance of the prevailing conditions of pervasive *fitnah*, especially for women, the 17 molvis aver that since the 48 mile rule applies from beyond the city's limits, a woman is free to travel alone in a large city even if it entails more than 48 miles.

This a licence for women to venture into the public domain, prowl around the malls, parks, market-places and in all public places where *fitnah* and *fasaad* abounds. The lack of perspicacity of these molvis is shockingly lamentable. Firstly, the issue of a woman roaming within her home-city is unrelated to the question of *safar* which is the subject of this discussion. It is a superfluous introduction providing woman a free licence for indulgence in immorality and *fitnah* of a variety of kinds. There was no need to have introduced this dimension into this subject.

The question of permissibility for a woman venturing out of her home, not for a journey, but for any other purpose locally, is a separate issue unrelated to *safar*. Primarily, the Qur'aanic injunction of '*Wa qarna fi buyooti kunna...*'

(*Remain glued in your homes*), will apply. For different purposes, her emergence is regulated by the rules of Hijaab. It will not be permissible for her to move around even her own neighbourhood in violation of the Hijaab rules even if a mahram is accompanying her or if there is fear of fitnah as is the case nowadays. Thus, she may not leave her house to go to a mall, or to visit relatives, etc. if it entails fitnah. The husband who accompanies her outside the home where fitnah prevails, e.g. a public park, is a *dayyooth*. Allah's *la'nat* settles on him and on her as long as they are outside the home in scenarios of fitnah. There is no blanket permission for women to emerge from the home merely because they will not be embarking on a journey. As mentioned, emerging even with a mahram to go to a mall or a public park is haraam.

Similarly, the molvis blunder and claim that on reaching her destination, she will be free to travel alone from one town to another within the 48 mile limit, if this destination is her *Watn-e-Iqaamat*, i.e. she had made the intention of staying there for 15 days or more. This intention according to the miscreant molvis opens the doors for her to roam around from town to town, place to place, all alone. Their logic is absurd and the effects of it haraam.

Old and young women

In another haraam attempt to dilute the Prohibition and to provide a licence for women to travel without mahrams, the 17 molvis seek to negate the Prohibition with a view of some Maaliki Ulama.

According to this view, very old women are excluded from the prohibition although these molvis also mention that others have refuted this view. So what is the objective for citing this rare, obscure, invalid view? The agenda is to dilute the original Prohibition, hence the introduction of rarities which have no valid substance in the Shariah, hence the miscreant molvis say: *“In this regard, the basis of the difference pertaining to old women of some Maaliki Mashaa-ikh cannot be proclaimed to be weak.”*

This averment is drivel. It is a view in conflict with the ruling of all four Math-habs. The opinion of a small minority of Maaliki Ulama is not the official stance of the Maaliki Math-hab. Its presentation by the 17 molvis to scuttle the Hanafi Math-hab’s fourteen century Mas’alah of Prohibition is satanic.

Justifying this weird opinion, the molvis say: *“It is clear there is little attraction for the mentioned old women. Relative to young women the possibility of*

fitnah is little. Therefore, if sometimes due to a dhuroorat (need) permission is given specifically for an old woman, while young women are prohibited then there is an intelligent basis for this differentiation in the Shariah and in Fiqh.”

This averment is unintelligent. The molvis have only illustrated their jahaalat in this averment blurted out without correct application of the brains. Firstly, in the exigency of *Dhuroorah*, the Prohibition is relaxed for both old and young women. In fact, the young women too will not be in need of any Mufti's fatwa to embark on the journey without mahrams. That is precisely what is currently transpiring in Syria on a mass scale. Hundreds of thousands of refugees are fleeing the murderous and brutal aerial assault of the kuffaar regimes. These women are not in need of the stupid fatwas of molvis of the Idaarah Ghufraan ilk who congregate for a merrymaking conference to deliberate on issues which concern only Madrasah students. The only practical utility of the fatwa of this conglomerate of molvis is the provision of a haraam licence for impious women to travel without mahrams, and to provide justification for the journeys without mahrams of lewd women who undertake holiday journeys without having the slightest care for the Prohibition.

Secondly, while these molvis maintain that relatively speaking the *fitnah* of old women is 'little', they too are unable to negate the *fitnah* in entirety. They have conceded, against their liking, the existence of *fitnah* in even old women. Furthermore, the prohibition is not based on old and young women. It is a straightforward Prohibition. Travelling a journey of 3 days or 2 days or 1 day or even less than one day depending on the circumstances without a mahram is strictly forbidden regardless of the woman being young or old. Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) did not differentiate between old and young women for the application of the Prohibition, and even the Math-habs do not accord validity to this rare and weird opinion.

THE ELEMENT OF FITNAH

The fatwa of the 17 molvis as well as the opinions of permissibility of other Ulama and Fuqaha are all based on the understanding of the absence of *fitnah*. Summing up the basis of the permissibility, the molvis say:

“...if in it there is no kind of fitnah, nor will there be exposure of the aurah in front of ghair mahrams, nor will there be solitude with naa-mahrams, then in principle it will be permissible for a woman to travel without a mahram.”

While we refute the validity of this hallucinatory principle and the conclusion stemming therefrom, we can say with emphasis that it is satanic to presume non-existence of *fitnah* in this era of the reign of vice and immorality. Even some of our senior Ulama have gravely and lamentably erred in having opined that the journey by plane or train is safe. They have erred in concluding that the large number of travellers aboard these vehicles provide security and safety to a woman travelling alone.

Highway robbers boarding trains and long-distance buses, molesting and robbing the passengers are not rare episodes in Pakistan, Bangladesh and elsewhere. In the African states the *fitnah* is even greater. On planes the *fitnah* of concupiscence in the environment of *fisq* and *fujoor* is overwhelming. And even in the Haramain Shareefain this danger is ever present in this age. The same is the state of *fitnah* at the airports, in the transit lounges, in the queues at the check-in counters, etc. The seniors who had believed that plane-travel is without the *fitnah* on which the Prohibition is based, displayed considerable naivety. Their conclusion is simply not valid.

The fatwa of permissibility based on the fiction of safety, and non-existence of *fitnah*, is therefore unacceptable and invalid. None of the views of the various Fuqaha cited by the molvis may be utilized to justify abrogation of the strict Prohibition in our current era. Whoever among the Fuqaha who had held the view of permissibility, hinged it on the total non-existence of *fitnah*. To extend this permissibility to our era in which *fitnah* reigns supreme is deliberate blindness to reality. It is spiritual blindness as mentioned in the Qur'aan Majeed:

“The (physical) eyes are not blind. But the eyes within the breasts are blind.”

On the assumption that the Prohibition pivots strictly on the element of *fitnah*, it will be haraam for women in our age to travel without mahrams even if it is a journey of one day due to the deluge of *fitnah* and other dangers to which they expose themselves.

Although the molvis have laboured considerably to prove the permissibility view, they are constrained by the reality of the Shariah's injunction to aver:

“And, in the cases of fitnah it will not be permissible for a woman to travel without a mahram.”

This is also a zigzag conclusion. The permissibility view has been argued for application to our current era. Plane and train journeys are perfectly safe for women without mahrams according to this corrupt view. Now when it is so according to these molvis, then their aforementioned averment of impermissibility is meaningless and self-contradictory. They zigzag between permissibility and prohibition not knowing whether they are moving forwards or reversing backwards.

As far as the principle and mas'alah are concerned, everyone understands it with clarity, namely, when danger prevails, travel for a woman without mahram is haraam. This mas'alah is not the subject of the discussion. The argument pertains to travel of a woman without mahram by plane and train in the current age. What is the fatwa? Zigzagging and presenting ambiguous views and dubious opinions cluttered with academic details serve no constructive purpose for the guidance of the masses.

If they lack awareness of the conditions prevailing on planes and trains, they should seal their lips and not venture dubious and convoluted fatwas. If they claim that there is no *fitnah* for a woman travelling alone by plane or train, then it is best that they disappear from the scene and become recluses. They should not dabble in

the affairs of the Ummah and misguide the ignorant masses with their own *jahaalaat* and zigzag fatwas.

DHUROORAH

As far as *Dhuroorah* (*dire need*) is concerned, it is an entirely different issue which does not rely on the intellectual gymnastics which the molvis have exhibited in their lengthy dissertation in their abortive attempt to scuttle the Prohibition. It is a simple principle which *dire need* will automatically compel the affected person to adopt. It is a case by case issue and each case will be studied on its merits. The type of journeys which women nowadays undertake without mahrams are not within the purview of *Dhuroorah*, hence are not permissible.

The molvis have presented a few examples which in their opinion are within the confines of *Dhuroorah*. While this is debatable, the fact remains that the permissibility which they have argued is applicable on the basis of *Dhuroorah*. We are agreed on this principle whilst we differ on the classification of the several examples which they believe are *Dhuroorah*. But the underlying basis is that the permissibility is occasioned by *Dhuroorah*. There was absolutely no need for embarking on the wasteful exercise and wasteful conference to hammer out a fatwa for *Dhuroorah* since this principle is not being contested. There was also no

need to present the many Ahaadith and the other stray and even weird opinions for a fatwa of permissibility based on the principle of *Dhuroorah*.

From the examples cited by the 17 molvis. Most are not valid cases of *Dhuroorah* according to the Shariah. The ‘need’ has been hallucinated by these molvis who are victims of western liberalism.

THE CASES OF DHUROORAH

The molvis say in their discussion on setting aside the Prohibition:

“Nowadays, in some cases a woman is confronted with travelling without a mahram. A few examples are mentioned.” The following are the examples which the molvis have classified as cases of *Dhuroorah*:

(1) A woman is married. Her husband is in another country. She has no mahram to accompany her, or a mahram is available but expenses are lacking, or legally the mahram is not allowed to travel to the other country (where the husband is).

Our comment:

This is a case of imaginary *dhuroorah*. For all kinds of situations, people find solutions. They beg and borrow and even pawn and bond their lands and property, and pay haraam interest on loans to enable them to squander huge sums on haraam weddings. If sufficient effort is

made, funds for the journey for the mahram will be forthcoming. The husband in the other country will just have to raise the funds for the mahram's travelling expenses. Other expenditure should be drastically curtailed to make provision for the mahram's travelling expense.

If indeed funds cannot be made available, the wife will have to remain and delay her departure until her husband and other relatives are able to provide the necessary funds. However, at the slightest pretext, the gaze drifts to haraam which is apparently the easy way out of the imaginary imbroglio. The Shar'i casualty is the easiest, hence setting aside or violating the Prohibition is most convenient.

The other factors can also be overcome if there is a sincere effort and if dua is made. If the Deen is the uppermost concern, Allah Ta'ala opens an avenue. However, a trial should be expected. This is the dunya. It is not Jannat. For all worldly exigencies, people find solutions. The imaginary problems mentioned in this first example, can also be overcome with the focus on Allah Ta'ala.

(2) A woman lives with her husband in a country while her parents reside in another country. One of her parents becomes gravely ill and requires aid. No one besides this wife is available to render the service to her parents. Although this woman wishes to go to her parents, her husband is legally not allowed to travel, or he is unable

to obtain leave from his employer, or there will be problems regarding his earnings if he accompanies her, and there is no other mahram.

Our comment:

This is a stupid example flaccidly conjectured by the molvis for their fictitious idea of *Dhuroorah*. If her parent is truly in need of her services, and if there is no one else available to tend to the parent, and if genuinely the law prevents her husband for travelling because his passport has been confiscated due to his involvement in crime, and there is no other mahram available, then the bridge shall be crossed at that time. When such a *Dhuroorah* develops, she may avail herself of the concession. But there is absolutely no valid reason for concocting a zigzag fatwa for universal dissemination. This will be a case concerning one woman. A universal fatwa is uncalled for. The *Dhuroorah* will constrain her to travel without any need for a fatwa.

For the sake of employment, it is not permissible to dump the wife in a crowd of fussiaaq, fujjaar and kuffaar for travelling alone. If the employer refuses to grant permission, then confound the employment. The husband has no option but to travel with his wife. Later he can search for other work. Rizq is pre-ordained. It is not the employer who is the raaziq. Allah Ta'ala is the Sole Raaziq. But when Imaan is extremely deficient,

then a man believes in the *razzaaqiyyat* of his employer/business. This argument is untenable in the Shariah. He has to abandon the employment and travel with his wife. Trials in this dunya are essential corollaries of life. There is no valid *Dhuroorah* in this case to warrant action in conflict with the Prohibition.

(3) A woman lives somewhere with her husband. Her husband dies or he gives her Talaah. Arrangements for her living in that place are difficult or legally she is not allowed to stay there, hence she wishes to go live with her relatives. A mahram is not available to accompany her.

Our comment:

This exigency is also imaginary. In a scenario of this kind, some arrangement will have to be made by her relatives to send a mahram to bring her to her home country. They make all sorts of arrangements at considerable cost of money, and they exhaust all efforts to obtain valid documents for travelling overseas for employment purposes or for haraam weddings, but for abiding by the Law of Allah Ta'ala, they concoct a plethora of excuses to create an imaginary scenario of *Dhuroorah*.

Assuming that this is impossible, then we concede the *Dhuroorah*. She may then travel. But for such rare cases there is no need for a universal fatwa and for convening

a merrymaking conference. The *Dhuroorah* itself will be adequate to compel her to travel, and any local Aalim who is not a moron will proffer the correct advice.

(4) A woman constrained by circumstances is working for her living in accordance with the principles of the Shariah. Her homeplace is at the *safar* distance. Her husband has passed away or she is a divorcee. She has to daily commute to the place of her employment.

Our comment:

The first obligation of the molvis is to educate Muslims regarding their duties and obligations. Never do these molvis educate the masses on major issues of life. They confine their bayaans and talks on *fadhaa-il* and on such issues which are palatable to the juhala. The programmes of *Ta'leem* of the Ulama should include issues of this nature. It is haraam for a woman to leave her home to seek a living.

Providing for a woman is the obligation of the *Asbaat*. Generally in these times, women themselves are desirous of working in the public domain, and the greater part of their earnings is squandered on unnecessary luxuries. Assuming that there is a genuine case of a destitute woman cast into a haraam situation as mentioned in this example, then the principle of *Dhuroorah* will be invoked. But what was the purpose of the uncalled for merrymaking conference? The

mas'alah of *Dhuroorah* is well known. What was there to discuss and hammer out in this regard?

Furthermore, in this example, the woman is already working. She is commuting daily to her workplace. Now what is the need for the zigzag fatwa when this woman in this example is travelling daily without a mahram? She is already in the situation constrained by *Dhuroorah* for which she did not require a fatwa from a galaxy of merrymaking luminaries. Without even the fatwa she does as she feels compelled to do.

(5) A woman lives with her husband. Both husband and wife came to meet their parents or relatives. Circumstances compelled the husband to return alone while his wife wishes to prolong her stay. Afterwards she is unable to find a mahram to accompany her.

Our comment

This example is a classical example of stupid mis-application of the brains. It displays blithe disregard for the Shariah which is taken as a hobby to be buffeted to conform with hallucinated situations and desires.

In this stupid example, the wife had no right to prolong her stay, and the husband had no right of abandoning his wife when he was aware that his wife will have to travel alone in a crowd of fussiaq, fujjaar and kuffaar. Only a

man who lacks in entirety *Imaani ghairat* will be able to stomach casting his wife in such a scenario.

The husband was by the means to travel with his wife to their home country. He was by the means to leave, but he imagines or pretends to be unable to return to accompany her or to arrange for a mahram to bring her. This type of argument is *nafsaani* and inspired by shaitaan. About such putrid justifications, the Qur'aan Majeed states:

“In fact man has insight over his nafs even though he presents excuses.”

The thief in the heart is recognized, but is concealed to satisfy evil motives. This example is not at all a case which justifies the invocation of the principle of *Dhuroorah*.

(6) Some girls for the purpose of acquiring knowledge have to leave home and travel a distance to reach the institution. Some of these girls are from rural villages. They have to travel to the institution outside the villages in bigger towns. All of them are unable to find mahrams.

Our comment

This is another haraam example which never comes within the ambit of *Dhuroorah*. Firstly, it is haraam for these girls to emerge into the public domain in pursuit

of knowledge. If the knowledge refers to secular education, the emergence will be a double sin and a compounded haraam act. If the knowledge refers to Deeni knowledge, then too it is not permissible for girls to travel to institutions. These girls institutions are shaitaani aberrations. The parents of these girls have to make suitable arrangements for basic Deeni Ta'leem at home or in the immediate neighbourhood. This is quite possible, but shaitaan has convoluted the thinking of people and the Satanism is further ingrained in the minds of the juhala by the zigzag fatwas of the *mudhilleen* molvis.

(7) The females of the house wish to undertake a journey for some need. Some of these females have a mahram while others do not have a mahram.

Our comment

Presenting this rubbish example as justification for perpetrating the major haraam sin of women travelling without mahrams testifies to the urination of Iblees into the brains of these molvis who satanically attempt to pass off this rubbish as a case of *Dhuroorah*. There is not a semblance of valid justification for commission of haraam in this case. Those females who have no mahrams have no option other than to remain at home. They may not travel without mahrams.

(8) Sometimes a woman's son may be in another country. The woman undertakes a plane journey to visit her son. The son will receive her at the airport. During the journey this woman will not be in solitude with any ghair mahram nor will her aurah be exposed.

Our comment

This example too is shaitaani concoction. The stupidity should be quite obvious to all sincere Muslims who have Islam at heart. It is haraam for this woman to travel without a mahram. Visiting her son is not a Shar'i *Dhuroorah* which could render halaal a major sin. This example is also satanic rubbish urinated into the brains of the miscreant cartel of *mudhilleen* molvis.

(9) A woman travels from one city to another by means of train or bus. However she cannot find a mahram. Her going is based on need. She will reach her mahram (at the destination) within a few hours. She is safe from being in seclusion with a ghair mahram and from exposing her aurah. Furthermore, due to the group (on the bus / train) the road is safe, hence no *fitnah*.

Our comment

These miserable molvis are among the greatest *fattaan*. They are the creators of *fitnah*. They open avenues for *fitnah* in the name of the Deen. They are agents of Iblees, hence they present stupid, nonsensical and

haraam examples which they seek to pass off as cases of *Dhuroorah*. In this example too, the woman may not travel without a mahram. Since these molvis themselves are embodiments of *fitnah*, they fail to understand *fitnah* in the making of their haraam zigzag fatwas.

The conditions

While these misguided molvis have shoved their flapdoodle examples into the *Dhuroorah* category, they stipulate at the same time the following *sharaa-it (conditions)* for availability of the concession, i.e. for relaxing the Prohibition to allow women to travel without mahrams:

- 1) Observance of full Shar'i purdah
- 2) There should be no *khalwat (seclusion)* with ghair mahrams
- 3) There should be no *kashf-e-aurah (exposure of the aurah)*
- 4) The road of the journey should be totally safe (*pur aman*).

The stipulation of these essential aspects of Hijaab, does not apply to cases of *Dhuroorah*. The aforementioned conditions relate to normal everyday life. Even if a woman is accompanied by her mahram, observance of these conditions remains imperative. If a woman cannot or does not observe these conditions on a journey with a mahram accompanying her, then undertaking the

journey will not be permissible. A mahram whether the husband or another male, who cannot ensure observance of these conditions is not a valid mahram for a journey. It will be haraam for a woman to undertake a journey if the ‘mahram’ is a faasiq or careless about the laws of Hijaab or he remains detached and unconcerned when ghair mahrams mingle or speak with the woman.

The stipulation of the aforementioned requisites as essential conditions for the permissibility of travelling without a mahram is not valid. It is in conflict with the principle of *Dhuroorah*. However, since the scenarios of ‘dhuroorah’ imagined by the 17 molvies are not valid *Dhuroorah* cases in terms of the Shariah, they added the conditions without applying their minds. They failed to realize that these conditions apply to normal times (*aam haalaat*).

The stipulation of these conditions for incumbent observance testifies to the fact that the examples proffered by the miscreant molvis for bolstering their baatil, zigzag fatwa, are not genuine cases of *Dhuroorah*. Therefore, the original Prohibition remains intact

In a case of *Dhuroorah*, the conditions which cannot be observed are relaxed. For example, a woman fleeing from the Hindu savages, or from Assad’s barbarian soldiers, or from the evil Buddhists of Burma and the like, will incumbently travel despite her inability of

complying with the aforementioned imperative conditions of Hijaab. She may also travel in seclusion with a ghair mahram who will smuggle her out from the satanic clutches of the evil, immoral barbarians. There is a general relaxation of the Waajib conditions. Such cases are real and within our knowledge. No one claimed that relaxation of the Prohibition in such genuine cases of *Dhuroorah* is not permissible. Yet, the Idaarah Ghufraan molvis have dishonestly endeavoured to trade the idea that some Ulama do not permit relaxation of the conditions and Prohibition in even cases of *Dhuroorah*. The reality is that the Ulama reject the conception of '*dhuroorah*' spun by the liberal molvis.

THEIR INCONGRUENT STANCE

Concluding their dissertation for providing women a licence to travel without mahrams, the Ghufraan Idaarah molvis say:

“According to the Shariah there is scope for permitting a woman to travel without a mahram while observing several conditions to prevent from fitnah.

1) This permission will apply in cases of majboori (helplessness- compelled by circumstances), and will be limited to specific cases.

Our Comment: The scenario presented here has never been contested by anyone to the best of our knowledge.

Thus, the lengthy, labyrinthal dissertation cluttered with unnecessary academic detail, was uncalled for. As mentioned earlier in this treatise, the Shariah's principle of *Dhuroorah* is not a new accretion. This principle is not the subject of discussion or dispute. The molvis have been arguing in incomprehensible circles setting out to prove what needs not be proved.

In the context of the permissibility on the basis of *Dhuroorah*, the application is on a case by case basis, and this is conceded by the molvis in their first condition, above. Thus there is no contention.

2) *It (the permission) should not be generalized (aam riwaaj).*

Our Comment: That is, the permission granted for a specific case should not have universal application. It is limited to the specific case. This is the obvious effect of a haraam act legalized/halaalized on the basis of the principle of *Dhuroorah*. The permission is restricted to the affected person. However, shaitaan is a cunning ustaadh. The fatwa of permissibility issued by the conglomerate of 17 molvis will be generalized and universalized minus the plethora of conditions with which the permission is fettered.

The liberalist clique which includes moron muftis and molvis, nowadays grants permission for women to attend the Musjid for a variety of programmes. Their

basis is the Ahaadith mentioning this permissibility during the era of Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam). In their initial fatwas of permissibility, in order to deceive themselves and bamboozle the ignorant masses, they do make reference to the conditions for the permissibility. However, the masses are not concerned with the conditions. The permissibility view is ripped out from its context. The conditions are overlooked, and the Musaaqid are then polluted with haraam. The fatwas of the liberal and short-sighted muftis are proffered in vindication.

This very same satanic logic will apply to the fatwa which the 17 molvis have issued. No one will be interested in the conditions. The only attraction will be the permissibility factor. The muftis are either extremely naïve or stupid or satanic in having publicized an uncalled for issue, and in a manner which conveys the idea of the abrogation of the Prohibition. All the conditions will be ignored.

3) The observance of purdah and abstention from kashf-e-aurah (exposure of aurah) should be emphasized on the woman.

Our Comment: This is advice for baboons. Firstly, the Shar'i meaning of Purdah is not even understood. The state of a woman being *tafilah* when *majboori* compels her emergence from the home, is integral to the

Shariah's concept of Purdah. But all women frown on, in fact refute at the peril of their Imaan, the condition of *tafilah* stipulated by Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam).

In total contrast to being *tafilah*, the female traveller on the plane or train or bus will be adorned and perfumed. The very thought of *tafilah* is revolting and disgusting for women of this age. Regardless of what the fatwa says, the woman travelling must necessarily be adorned.

4) *The road must be totally safe (pur aman).*

Our Comment: Perhaps these muftis and molvis are residents of some remote villages in Pakistan. It is glaringly stupid to believe that the road today is 'totally safe' for even a man. Crime and harassment of females are on a terrible increase. If a mufti believes that today the road is '*pur aman*', he only displays his gross jahaalat of reality, or he is egregiously dishonest. The burqah today fits the profile of the terrorist conjectured by the West. Every purdah nasheen woman is today a potential 'terrorist' in the West, hence thousands of Muslim women donning the burqah have been molested and harassed in the U.S., U.K. and Europe. In even Muslim countries such as Tunisia and Morocco, controlled by kuffaar regimes, the burqah is banned, despised and branded as 'uncultural'. These muftis need

to have themselves mentally examined for their shocking lack of perspicacity.

5) There should be no fear of any kind of fitnah from the woman's side.

Our Comment: What is the kind of assumed *fitnah* emanating from the woman which will preclude her from undertaking the journey despite the *dhuroorah* and *majboori*? It is silly to say the least, to expect any of these modernist females whose hearts are bereft of Purdah and who are addicted to prowling in the public domain to be *fitnah-free*.

This condition is furthermore a ludicrous superfluity in the light of the statement of Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam):

“Woman advances (towards one) in the form of shaitaan and moves away in the form of shaitaan.”

“Woman is aurah. When she emerges (into the public domain) shaitaan lies in ambush for her.”

“Women are habaailush shaitaan (the snares of shaitaan).”

Thus this condition is redundant and has no application in a real case of *Dhuroorah*.

6) There should be no probability of the woman being in solitude with a ghair mahram.

Our Comment: It is impossible to enforce this condition. The scope for solitude with a ghair mahram is ubiquitous. We have witnessed such scenarios with our own eyes. Females going into solitude with officials and others. It is a real possibility notwithstanding the presence of numerous passengers on the plane, etc.

About two decades ago, we witnessed two young South African girls being apprehended by the police inside Musjidun Nabawi. They were caught in *khalwat* with two Saudi Musjid guards. That was still an era when the *Amr Bil Ma'roof* police had teeth. These girls were in zaahiri purdah, donning burqaahs and niqaabs. They were in the Musjid on the pretext of Ziyaarat of Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam). The Holy Qabar of our Nabi (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) was in close proximity. These girls performed Namaaz five times a day. They were from a well-respected Deeni family. Their father was present. But he was obviously unable to accompany his daughters into the so-called women's section of the Musjid.

Despite all these factors to impede and negate *khalwat*, they succeeded in being in solitude right inside Musjidun Nabawi. Can a plane full of fussaah, fujjaar and kuffaar, and an airport overrun by such elements offer greater security and safety for a woman than Musjid-e-Nabawi? The molvis should apply their brains

constructively, and also search their souls for clarity on this issue.

In violent rejection of the rubbish of group-travel providing security and safety for women in this era of immorality and vice, we reproduce hereunder a few episodes narrated by Maulana Yunus Patel (Rahmatullah alayh):

Don't trust just anyone.

“... In these days of mischief, and in the light of the cases we are dealing with, if one has a young daughter or daughters – 9 to 12 years of age or even much younger – there should be extreme caution. But we find so many quite laidback and carefree when it comes to their daughters.

They send their daughters alone to the school, Madrasah, college, shopping centres, beaches, fairs, concerts, holidays – here and there – for drives or walks – with male cousins, friends, neighbours or other strangers.

There was one incident where a girl insisted that she wants to marry the neighbour's son, who was not Muslim. The girl's father was enraged, bashed his daughter, and threatened the boy if he pursued his daughter; whereas it was with the father's blessings that his daughter travelled to university with the boy, alone. The father himself said that he made sure that she sat in the backseat of the car.

Apparently the neighbour's son owned a car and being big-hearted gave her a lift daily. So, the father was saving on expenses. (*Shaitaan and wolf-hearted – Mujlisul Ulama*) Where is intelligence?"

“Haji Bhais and Bhens

If it is Haji Bhais and Haji Bhens - then that becomes an even more "respectable" relationship. Many women even remove their “hijaab” and “niqaab” whilst amidst such men during Haj. (*That is because they are lewd, fraud hijaabis. They don an external façade of hijab to deceive themselves, others and Allah Ta’ala. They suffer from prostitute tendencies. The Seat of Purdah is the heart. The cloak is or should be the manifestation of the Purdah of the heart – Purdah which is today entirely lacking. – Mujlisul Ulama*)

The Haj groups today become one big, big (*satantically*) happy family, and many of the women see no need for any kind of purdah, no need for any kind of hijab or any kind of restriction, and they unlock and open all the doors to fitnah. Then we have disaster. In the hotels there in the Haramayn Sharifayn, many men go in and out of the rooms of their friends or family members. Sometimes there is no male person present. It is just the wife or daughter alone in the room. They sit with these ladies or their “Haji bhens” *Shaitaani bhens and shaitaani bhais –Mujlisul Ulama*), and then we are left with these issues. People are thereafter asking questions: Whose child is it? I have a doubt... Who is to be blamed for all of this?

One person mentioned that in the evenings, after Isha, the Haji Bhens and Bhais would get together. They would take their chairs from their rooms, sit together, in the corridor of that floor, and there would be men and women chatting away and merry-making, with even requests from the men for the ladies to sing nazams, and all of this in Madina Sharief. Yet these were ghayr-mahram men. This type of behaviour is totally unacceptable and impermissible.”

“Sins in the Haramayn

I cannot forget a phone-call I received some years back. The person requested for an interpretation of a dream. When he related the dream, I asked him: 'Are you sure you want to hear the interpretation? He replied in the affirmative. I responded that the dream clearly indicates that you committed zina (adultery) in Madina Sharief.

He then acknowledged that he did indeed commit zina. He would visit the room of his cousin, whilst everyone in the family was gone to the Haram Sharief, and one thing led to another... انا لله وانا اليه راجعون To Allah is our complaint.

Whilst the parents are at the Raudha Mubarak conveying Salaam, or whilst they are in Tawaaf or at the Multazam, or in the Hateem, crying in Taubah and dua, some of the children are engaging in major, major sins. To add insult to injury, these crimes are perpetrated in the sacred lands (*and in the most sacred spots – Mujlisul Ulama*). In Makkah Mukarramah, the magnitude of sins is multiplied 100 000 times.

It has even been brought to our attention that many young daughters, left to their 'own devices' – frequenting the shopping centres, are in fact, also flirting and striking up relationships with some of those men in the shops and bazaars, and even in the hotels. Some even have the insolence to make arrangements with their boyfriends, that they too make 'Umrah and Ziyarah' at the same time, so that they can meet there.

These are not fairy tales. They are eye-openers for those who have intelligence.”

(End of Maulana Yunus Patel's narrative)

When the mind and heart are corroded with the libertine western cult, then molvis and muftis disgorge *rijs*. Their fatwas are *ghutha*. Instead of guiding Muslims, they are *mudhilleen* who mislead the masses by paving the path of Jahannam with their zigzag *baatil* fatwas devoid of Shar'i substance. These muftis are obfuscated by their disturbing lack of perspective of reality. We are living in an era in which immorality reigns supreme. This is an age in which immorality is respectable, honourable, cultural and the effect of enlightenment. Even Muslims on a plane will have no qualms and no suspicion about a woman sitting and chatting with a man. It is today the norm. *Khalwat (solitude)* is quite possible in a loaded plane, train and in the transit lounges of airports.

7) *The safar should be in group form or in populated areas.*

Our Comment: Again, this is an illustration of lack of intellectual perspicacity. The immoral crowds of fussaag, fujjaar and kuffaar travelling on planes and trains offer no security and safety. These fussaag and fujjaar are devoid of the slightest interest of the Deeni welfare of the woman travelling without a mahram.

8) The journey should not be more than three days and three nights.

Our Comment: This is a baseless stipulation if the journey is on account of *Dhuroorah*. Even a journey of a year will be permissible without a mahram if circumstances compel the flight of the woman from brutal savages. The 17 molvi chaps have appended this superfluous condition which has no applicability in a state of emergency.

THE SCENARIO IN DHUROORAH

The group of 17 molvis has proffered the aforementioned 7 conditions for the permissibility of a woman to travel without a mahram in a scenario of *Dhuroorah*. Having failed to apply their minds, they failed to understand that all these conditions apply to travel during normal times even whilst accompanied by a mahram.

In a state of emergency, the principle of *Dhuroorah* will apply. Depending on the circumstances, the restrictive

conditions will be relaxed, and fall away. If observance of some of the conditions is possible during the state of emergency, then it will be Waajib. However, if a woman manages to escape from Assad's torture and rape dungeons, it is perfectly permissible for her to flee and travel even with a ghair mahraam, even if he is a smuggler, regardless of the duration of the journey to the Turkish border where sanctuary is available. In this dangerous scenario of *Dhuroorah*, all the conditions are relaxed until such time that these could be instituted. Thus, the conditions which the molvis have expounded for observance in even a state of *Dhuroorah* and *Majboori*, are not applicable. However, since it is clear from the several examples of hallucinated *Majboori* / *Dhuroorah* cases presented by them that the element of *Dhuroorah* is absent, they have incongruently suggested the conditions without which the journey would still be permissible. But in terms of their convoluted understanding, even the *Dhuroorah* scenario has to be encumbered with these conditions.

The Priority of Old women

Another queer averment is their statement: "*In this type of permissibility old women have priority in relation to young women.*"

This is twaddle. There is no priority and preferability in cases of *Dhuroorah*. It is a case by case matter.

Whoever finds herself in such a situation has the full right to avail herself of the concession. The concession arising in the wake of *Dhuroorah* is equally applicable to young and old women. The comparison here is flapdoodle.

Exhibition of stupidity

In their misguided article, the molvis say: “*Nowadays it is obvious that there is no fitnah in plane, train and bus journeys. There is no kashf-e-aurah and no khalwat with ghair mahrams.....hence these modes of travel attain the status of ma'moon qaafilah (safe and secure caravan).....*”

This bunkum has already been answered and refuted earlier. Here it will suffice to say that these molvis have only succeeded in exhibiting their stupidity. They are indeed dwelling in an utopian dreamland if they honestly believe that there is no *fitnah* in these modes of travel. However, we are inclined to believe that their averment stems from spiritual corruption which is the consequence of adoption of the libertine western cult of ‘enlightenment’.

Manifestation of the Truth

After having laboriously, abortively and baselessly argued the case for the rescission of the more than 14 Century Prohibitions of the Shariah, the molvis are constrained to concede:

“....But, because today it is the age of worshipping lust (*shahwat parasti*) and deviation, safety is in confining the permissibility based on the aforementioned conditions, to specific cases of *dhuroorah* (dire need). In this is *salaamati* and *aafiyat* (safety and security), so that as far as possibility the door of *fitnah* is closed.”

After opening the door of *fitnah*, the molvis disgorge this reservation and drivel advice. They concede that our age is the era of *lust* in which *fitan* dominate. Then they illogically speak about confining the permissibility to cases of special *dhuroorah*. Indeed they dwell in a state of confusion, hence the eructation of this specious averment which the Truth has constrained.

Despite conceding the dominance of *lust* (*shahwat parasti*) they stupidly maintain that a woman travelling alone in a crowd of *fussaaq*, *fujjaar* and *kuffaar* who are all worshippers of *shahwat* will be safe.

The talk of confining the concession to special cases of dire need is another incongruent superfluity and deception. In fact, the concession applies to only cases of real *Dhuroorah*. However, since these molvis have lumped hallucinatory cases of need together with real cases of *Dhuroorah*, they are constrained by the reality of the Shariah to say that the concession should be

restricted to specific cases of *Dhuroorah* when this is in fact the mas'alah.

A false criticism

Baselessly criticizing those Ulama who proclaim the Haqq of the Shariah, the miscreant group of 17 molvis say in their article:

“Nowadays, some hadhraat (Ulama) on the basis of the corruption of the time and the immoral lifestyle of women declare haraam every kind of emergence (of women) and journey regardless of the majboori and dhuroorah. They vehemently criticize those who maintain the permissibility on the basis of the conditions. We do not agree with this because to refuse permission in exceptional dhuroori and majboori cases, and to decry (others) in mujtahad fee and furoo-ee masaa-il, and to be fossilized (in thinking) are incompatible with the disposition of the Shariah.”

There is no basis for this criticism. The Ulama who uphold the Shariah and who discharge the obligation of *Amr Bil Ma'roof Nahyi Anil Munkar*, never traverse beyond the limits of the Shariah. These miscreant molvis should cite examples of Ulama who maintain that even in cases of *Dhuroorah* the original conditions and terms are not relaxed. Who are the Ulama who have propounded the view that a woman may not travel without a mahram when dire circumstances compel her

to undertake the journey? Who are the Ulama who claim that a man on the verge of death due to starvation is not allowed to eat a little haraam food to save his life?

The miscreant group of 17 molvis dishonestly accuse the Ulama-e-Haqq who criticize the erroneous definition and understanding of *Dhuroorah* which is the element for the concessions. What the miscreants describe as cases of *Dhuroorah*, are in reality not *Dhuroorah* in terms of the Shariah. The weird conception of *Dhuroorah* of the liberal miscreant molvis opens a wide avenue for *fitnah*. In effect it is the abrogation of the Shariah's Prohibition of women travelling without mahrams.

It is not possible to cancel any Law of the Shariah. The concessions allowed by the Shariah are also sacrosanct, and may not be denied in valid cases of *Dhuroorah*. But interpreting every need to be a Shar'i *Dhuroorah* is satanic inspiration. It is the trap of Iblees who gradually stretches out his tentacles to engulf the Ummah in *fitan*. The desensitization of Imaan of the masses is the consequence of the zigzag fatwas of molvis who lack Taqwa. They utilize the Deen for worldly and nafsani pursuits and goals, hence they interpolate and mutilate the Shariah in their devilish attempt to acquire their worldly objectives.

In the penultimate paragraph of their dissertation, the Truth compels them to say:

“Generally (amm haalaat) it is the law of the Shariah that a woman should not travel without her mahram. In fact, without need she should not emerge from her home.”

This is Allah’s Law which the group of molvis has endeavoured to dilute in order to accommodate the unnecessary travels of women without mahrams. Today, most of the journeys undertaken by women are unnecessary and even haraam. However, to accommodate this satanic trend which is on the rise, the molvis and the liberal muftis are diluting the Shariah, cancelling *ahkaam* and satanically compromising the Deen. Instead of bringing Muslims closer to Allah Ta’ala, their zigzag fatwa shenanigans further widen the chasm between Allah Ta’ala and His servants. This disaster is created in the name of the Deen, and this is among the signs of Qiyaamah.

“...Knowledge (of the Deen) will be acquired for purposes other than the Deen, and the dunya will be pursued with the amal of the Aakhirah.”

Allaamah Anwar Kahsmiri

The 17 molvis have attempted to extract capital for their *baatil* fatwa from some statements of Allaamah Kashmiri (Rahmatullah alayh). Firstly, on the

assumption that the Allaamah’s view is in conflict with the Fatwa of our Math-hab, it shall be set aside. It will be a personal opinion of Allaamah Kashmiri, which may not be proffered in rejection or in dilution of the original stringent Prohibition.

With regard to the different number of days for a journey to be prohibited without a mahram, Allaamah Kashmiri states:

“The Math-hab of Abu Hanifah is that a Hajj journey of three days is forbidden except if she is accompanied by a mahram. If the journey is less than three days, it will be permissible for her to travel.”

Since the venerable Allaamah had to contend with the different number of days – days less than three days for the Prohibition, he opined:

*“The fact in this issue is that the ruling is reliant on (the existence of) fitnah. The matter (for deciding the issue) is left to the person involved in the matter. The stipulation of the number of days does not apply. **This (view) is according to my research of the Math-hab although no one (of our Fuqaha) have explicitly stated this.**”*

Our Fuqaha who were the highest-ranking Authorities of the Shariah, maintained the three-day or more Prohibition *mutlaqan*, i.e. without qualifying it with the factor of *fitnah*. Therefore, even if there is no *fitnah* whatsoever, it will remain haraam for a woman to

undertake a journey of three days without a mahram regardless of her observing all the conditions of Hijaab.

While the ratiocination of Allaamah Kashmiri is valid, the view that it would be permissible for a woman to travel three days without a mahram when there is no fear of *fitnah*, is erroneous. The explicit ruling of the Fuqaha, which is the official stance of the Shariah for more than 14 Centuries, overrides the personal opinion of Allaamah Kashmiri.

As far as her travelling without a mahram if the journey is less than three days, it is accepted that the permissibility is based on safety and no *fitnah*. There is no contention regarding a journey of less than three days in scenarios without *fitnah*. However, if the element of *fitnah* exists in journeys of less than three days, then unanimously the same Prohibition will apply. Thus, there is no support for the 17 molvis in Allaamah Kashmiri's personal opinion. Furthermore, we are not the Muqallideen of Allaamah Kashmiri (Rahmatullah alayh). If any of his personal opinions conflicts with the Math-hab, it shall be incumbently set aside.

Shaikh Yusuf Qardhaawi

The liberal molvis, in their exercise of scavenging for 'daleel', cite Shaikh Yusuf Qardhaawi in the futile attempt to bolster their zigzag fatwa. This Shaikh is a modernist. It will suffice to dismiss his personal corrupt opinions on the basis of his liberal ideology. There is no

need to further dilate on the view of this Shaikh. His liberal views which conflict with the Math-hab are dismissed as invalid.

The Illat of fitnah

Even if it is conceded that the *Illat (rationale)* for the Prohibition is the element of *fitnah* without which the Prohibition will not apply, then too there is not a vestige of doubt in the existence of the *fitnah* in this age of mammoth *fitnah* and *fasaad*. The world is drowning in gigantic floods of *fitnah*. And why will it not be so when we are on the threshold of Qiyaamah?

Misapplication of the Ahaadith

In another abortive attempt to bolster their zigzag fatwa, the Ghufraan Institute molvis cite some Ahaadith from which leeway for permissibility is gleaned. In one such Hadith is mentioned that a woman will be able to travel alone from Madinah to Heerah without having fear for anyone. This fact does not abrogate the Prohibition stated by Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam). It does not cancel out the original mas'alah. It merely indicates the ascendancy of Islam and the prevalence of total peace, safety and security. This state existed during the Khilaafat of Hadhrat Umar (Radhiyallahu anhu). It is stupid to present this Hadith in negation of the express Prohibition stated by our Nabi (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) and recorded in numerous Ahaadith.

They also cite the occasion of the Umrah of Hadhrat Aishah (Radhiyallahu anha) and other ladies during the Khilaafat of Hadhrat Umar (Radhiyallahu anhu). Hadhrat Uthmaan (Radhiyallahu anhu) and Hadhrat Abdur Rahmaan Bin Auf (Radhiyallahu anhu) were appointed to lead these illustrious ladies for Umrah despite them not being mahrams.

The immodest women of our era should not be elevated to the status of Hadhrat Aishah (Radhiyallahu anha) and the other noble Sahaabiyyah. The attempt is absolutely ludicrous. This was an exception to the general rule. It was not the rule. The Aimmah-e-Mujtahideen and the Fuqaha of the *Khairul Quroon* era were well aware of these narrations and similar other Ahaadith, yet the unanimous ruling of the Fuqaha is on Prohibition of journeys of three days without mahrams. This mas'alah is understood and accepted by all and sundry since the inception of Islam. The Prohibition is well-known just as the prohibition of eating pork is known. There is no quandary in this Prohibition.

But the liberal molvis of this age are transforming simple masaa-il into imbroglios thereby confusing the masses and opening avenues of fitnah for the fussiaaq, fujjaar and juhala. Narrations of this kind are assigned to the same category as the Ahaadith permitting women to attend the Musjid which was the practice during the time of Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam).

The Fuqaha were well aware of these narrations, and so were the Sahaabah who witnessed women performing Salaat in the Musjid with the consent of our Nabi (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam). Despite this, women were banned from the Musjid from the time of Hadhrat Umar's khilaafat.

There is no support for the 17 molvis in Ahaadith of this nature. Furthermore, they are not mujtahideen. The *wazeefah* of *Ijtihad* is exclusive with the Aimmah Mujtahideen. These molvis lack even in the methodology of *Ifta'*. Without intending any hyperbole, it will be appropriate to describe today's 'muftis' as *Maajin*. They dwell in the *zulmat* of deception and self-deception. They come within the purview of the Hadith in which Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) said that an age in proximity of Qiyaamah will dawn when the juhala will seek fatwas from other juhala. These juhala, the *maajin muftis* will disgorge zigzag fatwas thereby misleading the masses. All will be astray. They are influenced by the liberal lifestyle of this era of supreme *fitnah*. Their expertise is undoubtedly acknowledged in the sphere of zigzag fatwas.

When the Ulama are bereft of *Taqwa*, their fatwas are designed to soothe the nafs of the masses, especially if the questions emanate from rulers and the wealthy class. The Haqq will always be unpalatable. It is this unpalatable Truth which the muftis of this age dilute

thereby compromising the Deen at the altar of *nafsaaniyat*. They seek the pleasure of the people as well as other worldly and *nafsaani* objectives. Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) said:

“Whoever searches for the pleasure of the people (and in this process) courts the displeasure of Allah, Allah casts him to the people. And, whoever seeks the pleasure of Allah (and in the process courts) the displeasure of Allah, Allah suffices for him for all the problems created (for him) by the people.”

It is absolutely disgusting that a group of molvis who regard themselves as ‘senior’ Ulama, convening a conference which involves squandering of the *Ni’mat* of wealth on travelling expenses and merrymaking feasting, etc., for deliberating a simple mas’alah – a mas’alah as simple as the Prohibition of eating carrion or drinking wine. The Shariah has decided and decreed the ruling for cases of *Dhuroorah* more than fourteen centuries ago when Nubuwwat was finalized and Islam was perfected. But, these miscreant scholars for the sake of appeasing the juhala and also for other *nafsaani* motives deemed it appropriate to churn up a stupid brouhaha with their stupid conference for the production of a zigzag fatwa which only serves to obfuscate the Truth. Their conference in reality was a pantomime where they quibbled and twiddled with the din of their twaddle bereft of Shar’i substance.

The extrapolation of the molvis on the basis of such Ahaadith which are not applicable to the circumstances of our era, is *baatil*. By setting themselves up as mujtahids to decide a simple mas'alah, they extravagated from Haqq to baatil. In the interests of their own Imaan, the Imaan of the Ummah and the safety of the Deen, it is of fundamental importance for Ulama to refrain from truckling in obedience to the rulers and the wealthy. The Mashaaikh said that an Aalim who frequents the wealthy and the rulers is a 'robber'. There are many Ahaadith, not only with dehortative advice, but explicitly warning of the severest punishment for Ulama who mingle and associate with rulers and the wealthy class.

Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) said that in Jahnnam there is a Valley called *Jubbul Huzn (the Pit of Grief)*. The intensity of its heat constrains Jahannam itself to implore Allah Ta'ala for protection four hundred times daily.

Jubbul Huzn, said Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) is for the qaaris and ulama who display their deeds and the worst among them are those who frequent the *umaraa'* (rulers and the wealthy). The general malaise from which Ulama today suffer, is bartering away the Deen to remain in the good books of rulers and the wealthy.

Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) said to Hadhrat Aishah (Radhiyallahu anha): *“If you desire to link up with me (on the Day of Qiyaamah), then content yourself with only so much worldly provision which suffices for (a traveller) on horseback; beware of the company of the wealthy, and do not regard a garment as old (to be discarded) as long as you can patch it.”*

It is not suggested that the molvis renounce their worldly comforts and adopt the extremely austere and rigid methods of *Zuhd* of the Salafus Saaliheen. This is not possible. But, at a minimum it is imperative to walk within the shadow of these Ahaadith and the life-style of the Salafus Saaliheen. The nafs must be expurgated of its evil, and the Goal must be nothing other than the Pleasure of Allah Ta’ala. Only then will the muftis refrain from the disease of zigzag fatwas.