

Re: Ta'addud Azwaaj in Islam

<http://www.sunniforum.com/forum/showthread.php?73970-Ta-addud-Azwaaj-in-Islam&p=972891&viewfull=1#post972891>

☞ Originally Posted by **tawbah** ☞

This article makes an emotional argument based on a haughty pretext that the Jahil-Majhul (ignorant, unknown) Blogger follows Shariah and upholds the Sunnah, whilst those in disagreement violate the Shariah and debase the Sunnah.

Let us begin by reminding ourselves that this Blogger is not a scholar in the least. In fact, although this Blogger pretends to be a great Islamic mind, he doesn't even know how to write Jazak Allahu Khayran and is found always writing "Jazakullahu Khairun" - a clear indication of his weakness in basic Arabic comprehension. Yes, this is the Jahil-Majhul Blogger who is now preaching Islam to you. Times of fitnah, indeed - remember the signs? Taking Deen from misguided folk - yep, "MuftiSays" gives a prime blogging space to a Jahil-Majhul.

To proceed, here are some examples of silly "analogies" which the Jahil-Majhul Blogger views to be genius, logical conclusions.

JAHIL-MAJHUL BLOGGER SAYS:

"I don't know what you are talking about but there is no reason to interpret a clear command of Allah (SWT). We are ordered to fast in Ramadhan and no reason for an explanation. We are ordered to marry 1,2,3 or 4 times no explanation is required."

RESPONSE:

Clear command of Allah to "pray Tahajjud" (Surah Bani Israil). Is it just a simple command now? Or can it be explained as all Fuqaha explain: "if you fear missing Fajr Salat then you should leave out Tahajjud"? By your logic, there is no room for "explanation" of this argument.

JAHIL-MAJHUL BLOGGER SAYS:

"What prompted me to add this section to the blog was a talk from a well known Shaykh who narrates the story which he heard from his Shaykh about a circus juggler and narrates his bad experience about polygyny. While he is narrating this anecdote you can hear laughing and giggling crowd in the background."

RESPONSE:

Well done. Pat yourself on the back. You can sleep well tonight. A great service to mankind.

JAHIL-MAJHUL BLOGGER SAYS:

"On one hand is an explicit command of Allah (SWT) and on the other is the experience of a circus juggler being narrated 2nd hand from the pulpit, should I even dignify this with a response?"

RESPONSE:

Dear friends, this is a disgusting attempt to create a scenario of something which doesn't exist. This Jahil-Majhul Fool of Blogger claims the following:

1. There is an explicit command of Allah [doesn't explain which command Jahil-Majhul Blogger is talking about]
2. Then claims it is being opposed by the speaker giving a story of a "circus juggler" [this takes effect by use of the English idiom "on the other [hand]".
3. The result, is for the reader to believe, that this "so-called" Shaykh, has taken some circus-fool over a direct command of Allah. So this directly implies an analogous instance of the following:

(A) "Establish Salah" - Command from Allah (SWT)

(B) My Shaykh told me a story of a circus fool, who said if you pray Salah, you can no longer do tricks.

(C) Therefore, I am telling you to leave Salah, because tricks in the circus are more important.

Anyone, with the slightest drop of decency, would now disregard what this Fool Jahil-Majhul Blogger claims. This is the height of dishonesty, the extreme end of a filthy poisonous lie. This Jahil-Majhul Fool deserves to be whipped for this despicable, cowardly attempt to build an argument out of something that doesn't exist: straw-man? Yes, that shall be the new name, Straw-Man, Fool, Jahil-Majhul Blogger on "MuftiSays" - Allahu Akbar. How long until the "MuftiSays" to him to our Straw Man to take leave?!

STRAW-MAN JAHIL-MAJHUL BLOGGER SAYS:

"Then another anecdote is mentioned and personal experience is narrated where the Shaykh never found anyone happy who has married again! I personally know of Ulamah and Mahaykh within the Silsilah of this Shaykh who are either divorced or unhappy in their current marriage, in fact the Shaykh (HA) has a book in which he writes, "I am compelled to write this due to the prevalence of unhappy marriages and complaints which have reached me". Almost all of us his Khulafa have talks explicitly devoted to problems in marriage!

So what should be done in the light of experiences of the very same Shaykh and his Khulafah, should we abandon marriage all together to avoid the hassle completely? Surely that is the logical outcome which is to decide Islamic issues based on anecdotes and experiences instead of explicitly relying on verses of the Qur'aan and the Sunnah of Sayyidina Rasul-ullah (Sallallahu Alaihe Wassallam)."

RESPONSE

Now this Straw-Man has fallen to the most shocking depth of deception! Ya Allah!

Let us open this up.

-- SUMMARY OF STRAW-MAN JAHIL-MAJHUL BLOGGER'S POINTS

1. Shaykh explains in his experience he has never found anyone happy who has married more than

once

2. Straw-Man Jahil-Majhul Foolish Blogger claims: He knows Ulama and Shaykhs of the same Silsilah who are divorced or unhappy in their marriage to ONE wife.

3. Shaykh and Khulafa talk about how to solve problems in marriage through books and talks.

4. Straw-Man Jahil-Majhul Foolish Blogger claims: Based on the above facts and premises, "Surely [the] logical outcome [is]" to "abandon marriage all together to avoid the hassle completely?".

-- STATING THE OBVIOUS

This foul-mouthed, ill-intending straw-man, has totally lost his straws! Look at what this FOOL is saying, on "MuftiSays" blog (Ya Allah!).

Response: Mr. Genius, point [1] supports the notion that it is difficult to be happy in polygamous marriage.

Point [2] further supports point [1], because if the "Ulama and Shaykhs" that Mr. Genius knows of are finding it difficult to have just one wife, then what of more than one wife!?

Point [3] serves no purpose to the argument whatsoever. It is superfluous; rather, it is there to add spice. What has giving talks and writing books about marital problems got to do with marrying more than once?

The logical outcome of any of the points Mr Genius has mentioned is ABSOLUTELY NOT to abandon marriage altogether. There countless nuances to this matter than a series of binary black and whites, which Mr Genius refuses to comprehend. For example, perhaps the Shaykh is advocating:

(1) Marry once to save yourself from much of the fitnah by assisting in controlling one's desires

(2) Bear the difficulties and problems in a single marriage, rather than multiplying

(3) The first two are a clear playoff as there is no third option to go and fulfill desires with anyone and never get married is there?

(4) Don't marry more than once because the Shaykh, in his experience and understanding, has come to the conclusion that marrying more than once in this day and age leads to (2) above overriding the benefits of (1) - i.e. the "playoff" tips in favour of an undesirable effect which is to cause strain, difficulties and problems in marital life beyond any perceived benefit in controlling one's desires!

-- SUMMARY

Mr. Blogger Straw-Man Jahil-Majhul Genius has ABSOLUTELY distorted what the Shaykh has said. He leaves the reader thinking that the Shaykh advocates not getting married at all, that the Shaykh bases his Deen on anecdotes, that the Ulama and Mashayikh that sit with the Shaykh are a bunch cheerleaders. Ya Allah, what a slander!

FINAL APPEAL

Remember, dear friends, "this matter [of knowledge] is your entire religion, so watch who you take your religion from".

Are you going to listen to a Jahil (IGNORANT) Majhul (UNKNOWN) Straw-Man Blogger who found a little spot on MuftiSays? How long will MuftiSays tolerate this fool? This is an appeal to all readers, and MuftiSays, disregard this Internet-Nobody and take your religion from real scholars. Be wary of the signs of Qiyamah!

There is no time to go through the rest of this blog post. Too many emotional arguments, unrelated events to stir emotional arousal. There is clarity for those who are sincere and seek to look beyond this web of deception and deceit!

RESPONSE FROM THE BLOGGER :

Asslamu Allaikum Wa Rahmatullahi Wa Barakatuh,

Introduction:

A response was posted to my blog on SF to which Maulana directed my attention to and [he had asked if this was the response of Shaykh Mufti A.S. Desai \(HA\)](#) and offered for it to be posted directly underneath my feeble words so people can look at the opinion of a qualified Scholar and place my “opinions” in context. I agree with it 100% because Shaykh Mufti A.S. Desai (HA) is an exemplary Scholar of great courage and fortitude and if he had taken the time to critique what I wrote then first of all I am grateful and secondly it is my duty to inform others of Hazrat’s comments.

Whether those [comments](#) are pertinent and justified are for others to decide. This morning I found a comment on my blog and again I asked the commentator that the comment is being made visible as a “comment” but if it is established to be from Shaykh Mufti A.S. Desai (HA) then it can be displayed with more prominence and no further response has been received.

Someone just highlighted to me that a [Moderator “SeekerOfGuidance “ from SF](#) and good, trustable brother of mine publicly confirmed that these are not the words of Shaykh Mufti A.S. Desai (HA) as follows:

They are definitely not the words of Mufti A. S. Desai.

Just because it's become extremely rare for anyone to take the Deen as 'personally' as Mufti A. S. Desai does, does not mean that anytime someone employs strong language against his opponent it must be Mufti A. S. Desai.

It wouldn't be far-fetched to guess that even brother Tawbah would have found much of Mufti Desai's language too strong for his liking, until his own beloved Shaykh, or the Shaykh he is defending passionately, got attacked.

Based on the confirmation of a Moderator with conviction and knowledge, I will endeavour to respond to a set of “critiques” to the blog, Insha’Allah.

The relationship between me and Shaykh Mufti A.S. Desai (HA) is that of a giant and mosquito with a crippled wing. I have benefitted from Hazrat for many years and discussed with him despite my utter incompetence and ignorance and he has obliged me and tolerated me with good manners and fortitude of a father who is concerned about the Tarbiyah of his child and ignores his stupidity and continues to nurture him and work with him. This is the style of Prophets (to educate those with lesser knowledge and ability) and the legacy of Ulamah of Deoband and Shaykh Mufti A.S. Desai (HA) is no different, an example of our exchanges can be see here on the blog where I have disagreed and kept Hazrat (HA)

informed all along and you can read and judge the matter for yourself by reading the interaction between I, [Mufti Abu Hajira \(HA\)](#) Shaykh Mufti A.S. Desai (HA) and SF Moderator “Meelash”.

The issue was of Academic difference, publicly discussed between more than four people and no sparks flew and no insults were hurled at anyone.

Why is it important to note because none of the people got in the middle and tried to stir the pot of hatred and turn the hearts of the believers against each other. The example of such people and they should be singled out for their behaviour and identified and these are users such as [AkabirofDeoband](#) and Pluto ([here](#) and [here](#)).

My beloved brother Pluto is a extremely talented Tableeghee brother, however my young brother's aspirations are misplaced and he believes that there is a turf war between Tableegh & Tassawuff in which he has been appointed to defend the Tableeghi corner. My beloved AkabirofDeoband believes the other way around that he has been appointed to defend the honour of Ulamah & Mashaykh. Both of them are naive and their actions misplaced, nevertheless their (and everybody else in their camp should be politely, courteously but firmly advised to resist their temptation to create schisms were none exist.

1. There is no attack on Ulamah.

2. There is no attack on Mashaykh.

3. There is no attack on Tableegh.

4. There is no attack on Tassawuff.

5. There is disagreement which is being voiced and dynamics of this disagreement will be made clear in the proceeding parts.

The sooner a person understands it, the quicker their blood pressure will return to normal!

It is the way of Deobandi Ulamah & Mashaykh to resist and desist all calls to create schisms between Tableegh, Tassawuff, Jihad, Darul-ulooms and those who claim to follow the way of Ulamah of Deoband should follow this path. It doesn't mean disagreement can't be aired (read later to know why) but that's all it should be, an Academic disagreement.

Before proceeding further all I ask in fairness and justice is for this response to be displayed on SF as a response.

Name of the Mashaykh/Ulamah being withheld and why?

I neither made the names of Ulamah public nor felt the need for it in accordance to the noble Sunnah of Sayyidina Rasul-ullah (Sallallaho Alaihe Wassallm) and a single example as follows will suffice:

Sayyidina Abu Mas'ud Al-Ansari (RA) narrated that a man came to Allah's Apostle and said, "O Allah's Apostle! By Allah, I fail to attend the morning congregational prayer because so-and-so (i.e., Muadh bin Jabal) prolongs the prayer when he leads us for it." I had never seen the Prophet more furious in giving advice than he was on that day. He then said, "O people! some of you make others dislike (good deeds, i.e. prayers etc). So whoever among you leads the people in prayer, he should shorten it because among them there are the old, the weak and the busy (needy having some jobs to do). [Bukhari]

1. Did Sayyidina Rasul-ullah (Sallallahu Alaihe Wassallm) explicitly highlight and single out every single person who was doing it?

2. Did the Sahaba (RA) go on a “James Bond” style secret service mission to try to investigate and unearth all the “culprits” behind the scene?

All those who want to continue to engage in this “James Bond” style secret service mission of unearthing those being mentioned are responsible for their actions and I am responsible for mine and I haven’t mentioned them, let those who want to speculate, create schisms continue on their path of sin.

I see no need to do so and it doesn’t add or discount anything from the point being raised.

Why highlight this issue? Who are you and more importantly how dare you!

The general command to highlight what is (*personally perceived*) to be incorrect is given in a Hadeeth of Sayyidina Rasul-ullah (Sallallahu Alaihe Wassallam) to the best of their ability:

Sayyidina Ibn Mas'ud (RA) reported that the Messenger of Allah, may Allah bless him and grant him peace,said, "There is no Prophet sent by Allah to a community before me who did not have disciples in his community and companions, who took on his sunna and obeyed his command. Then after them successors followed who said things they did not do and did things they were not ordered to do. All who fought against them with their hands were believers, all who fought against them with their tongues were believers and all who fought against them in their hearts were believers. There is not a mustard-seed's worth of belief beyond that." [Muslim]

There is no hierarchy, clergy or papal system in Islam which prevents and prohibits a “laymen” from questioning what is (*personally perceived*) to be incorrect. From the time of the Sahaba (RA) there are countless stories where laymen corrected Khulafa (rulers) to Ulama and Mashaykh and no rule is ever present to distinguish that Ulama and Mashaykh can’t be corrected.

Denigrating, dishonouring, reviling any Muslim let alone Ulama and Mashaykh is of course a matter of serious concern and if this blog does anything close to that, it should be pointed out.

Secondly (and more importantly) just because it is (*personally perceived*) that a correction needs to be made it doesn’t mean that the person is claiming to be better than the other, when did this become an issue?

1.Did all the laymen who approached Ameerul-Mumineen Sayyidina Umar (RA) with a concern considered themselves better than the Khalifa?

2.Did the rest of the Sahaba (RA) admonished common old (Muslim woman) for raising her concern with Ameerul-Mumineen Sayyidina Umar (RA) ? Did they mock her? Did they say Ah! You think that you are better than Umar (RA), let us demote him as a Khaleefa and put you up there and see how you do the job?

It is because Islam is based on the simple concept that every human is capable of committing sins, tripping up, making mistakes and errors; it’s part of human nature. The following Hadeeth talks about sins and I am talking about mistakes (or errors) and even inadvertent at that!

Sayyidina Rasul-ullah (Sallallahu Alaihe Wassallam) reported, "Every Son of Adam is a Sinner, and the Best of Sinners are those who Repent" [Tirmidhi]

So when a matter is disagreed with someone there is a chance that the original person misunderstood it OR the person being advised may have misunderstood it and there is a chance of either of the scenarios being true.

But the principle of hierarchy or clergy is a concept alien in Islam; disagree with respect, dignity and courtesy and it is perfectly allowed.

Response to Vice-Ameer Brother [Rahmaniyyah](#):

Very strange response!

What is the syntactic difference between something permissible and a “Commands of Allah (SWT)” ? Are they mutually exclusive? How and why? And does it this rule apply to this scenario only or it is uniformly applicable? I will explain with an example about giving charity as mentioned in the Qur’aan:

[2:271] If you make Sadaqat (alms) openly, it is good enough, and if you keep it secret and give it to the needy, it is much better for you, and this will write off part of your sins. Allah is All-Aware of what you do.

Brother Rahmaniyyah gives £10 in his Masjid charity Box, someone asks him why have you done it and he says:

The Jawaz (justification) for me putting the money into the box is because:

- 1.It is permissible
- 2.It is a Hukum of Allah (SWT)
- 3.It is commanded by Allah (SWT)

Anyone reading the example above will clearly see that this is no disparity in any of those, although some of those words are from the writing of our dear and beloved Brother Rahmaniyyah (*not mine*).

The statement, “The article from Muadh has to be the greatest blunder of his internet career” implies a number of things:

- 1.Vice Ameer of Sunniforum knows me
- 2.Vice Ameer of Sunniforum follows my Internet activities with keen interest
- 3.Vice Ameer of Sunniforum has made a subjective judgment call to regard this as my greatest blunder

1 & 2 are critical to the next phase of discussion while there is nothing but a statement regarding the third.

Second Response to Vice-Ameer Brother [Rahmaniyyah](#):

Very strange response!

It's like Shaykh giving counsel that you should go become a doctor instead of an engineer. Both are

Jaaiz in shariah. Quran doesn't have a "hukum" on it.

Becoming a Doctor or Engineer has nothing with Shariah, agreed. This is not the point

Where in the Quran does it command you to marry more than once? Do people really want me to answer that?

Response to Brother [tawbah](#):

Sayyidina Rasul-ullah (Sallallahu Alaihe Wassallam) said, "A believer is not a fault-finder and is not abusive, obscene, or course." [Ahmed]

The readers are free to read the blog here and then read the response of Brother tawbah and decide for themselves as to who has adhered to the Prophetic Sunnah of Sayyidina Rasul-ullah (Sallallahu Alaihe Wassallam) and who has overshot the mark. Remember that you will be held responsible for your words on the day of judgement with Allah (SWT).

Now let's discuss the ancillary issues quickly before moving to the heart of the matter.

One of the first accusation thrown at me is that I am a Jahil (illiterate, ignorant fool) , Ahamdulillah I am the worst out of everyone and if that prevents me from blowing my own trumpet and plastering my credentials all over the Internet then so be it. Alhamdulillah for the company of Ulamah, Mashaykh and knowledgeable ones who continue to show Mercy on this Jahil (illiterate, ignorant fool) and guide him, may Allah (SWT) reward them all the best of success in this world and Jannatul-Firdaus (Ameen) in the hereafter. To counter this argument would be for me boast about my credentials and it is neither Sunnah nor the way of our Ulamah & Mashaykh.

The second accusation thrown at me is Majhul (unknown). I find this accusation strange because:

- 1.I have nearly 10,000 posts on this forum,
- 2.I am part of the team which runs one of the [popular sites on the Internet](#),
- 3.I am available at Muftisays via PM, blog
- 4.I am well known to the Vice-Ameer (as implied by his earlier comments)
- 5.I am well known to many of the Ulamah & Mashaykh on this forum and elsewhere and even many members and easily contactable.

And I am being accused of someone on their 4th post on a forum, you decide for yourself as to who is Majhool but remember that you will be held responsible for your words on the day of judgement with Allah (SWT).

The third accusation thrown at me is my lack of Arabic knowledge (factual) which I request dua for everyone to increase (Ameen) but the demonstration is by displaying my spelling of "Jazakullahu Khairun" in English! Arabic grammar has rules and conventions and there is no set way to demonstrate the state of Rafa or Nas'b by a specific English letter. There is no convention at all, take a good look at any English book with transliteration and you will notice the difference in spellings.

However, there is a point where an error clearly stands out and its blatant and its not about which words a person uses to demonstrate a grammatical state.

Jazakullahu Khairun is pronounced as:

- 1.Jazakullahu (JazakA is joined with Lam of Allah and Alif is omitted and “Hu” is pronounced)
- 2.Khairun is pronounced

The writer claims to break the word down as follows:

- 1.Jazak = First word and no vowel ending
- 2.Allahu = Starting with an Alif and designating it as a second separate word
- 3.Khayran = Third word

Take the spelling claimed by Brother tawbah to any Scholar of Arabic language and ask about Jazakullahu

- 1.When pronounced are “Jazak” + “Allahu” read out as two separate and distinct words? OR
- 2.Jazakullahu is jointly pronounced with skipping the “Alif before Allah” and joining the words without a break in the middle?

The fourth accusation thrown at me is that there is no room for explanation regarding the verses of the Qur’aan. I actually said, “...there is no reason to interpret a clear command of Allah (SWT).We are ordered to fast in Ramadhan and no reason for an explanation. We are ordered to marry 1,2,3 or 4 times no explanation is required”.

These are the verses which I am alluding to:

[2:185] The month of Ramadan is the one in which the Qur’an was revealed as guidance for mankind, and as clear signs that show the right way and distinguish between right and wrong. So those of you who witness the month must fast in it...

It’s clear cut as to what is being said, above.

[4:3] If you fear that you will not do justice to the orphans, then, marry the women you like, in twos, in threes and in fours. But, if you fear that you will not maintain equity, then (keep to) one woman, or bondwomen you own. It will be closer to abstaining from injustice.

It’s clear cut as to what is being said, above.

Now let’s analyse the verse which has been given as an example by the brother to counter my examples above:

[17:79] And during the night, wake up for Salah of tahajjud , an additional prayer for you. It is very likely that your Lord will place you at Praised Station.

It’s also clear cut as to what is being said, above. The brother then claims, “Or can it be explained as all Fuqaha explain: "if you fear missing Fajr Salat then you should leave out Tahajjud"?”

Yes and what is the problem?

- 1.If you are in the fear of missing Fajar then leave out Tahajjud
- 2.If you are in the fear that you won't be able to do justice to more than one wife then abstain

What seem to be the issue?

The fifth accusation thrown at me is about mentioning a Shaykh and then mocking and jesting? What have I done wrong by mentioning that a well known Shaykh says such and such? But the second part of the accusation is against the blatant teachings of the Qur'aan:

[6:10] Even before you (O Prophet,) many messengers were ridiculed. Those who laughed at them were, then, besieged by what they used to ridicule.

The sixth accusation thrown around is in various parts:

1. I have not made it clear which command I am talking about: Blatantly wrong because the text above and accusation above clearly established that I was referring to polygyny and the verse related to it.

2. The negation of the verse of Qur'aan with example from a circus juggler is allowed and valid: In accusation four (4) the brother mentions the statement of Fuqaha (Islamic Scholars) to explain a verse of the Qur'aan, nothing wrong with that at all as he has rightly pointed out. But in this case what is being used against the verse of the Qur'aan and established Sunnah is the example of a circus juggler, that's the point of what is being said.

3. Connection of circus juggler to Salah: Here my dear beloved clearly explains my point better than me! We can't negate a verse of the Qur'aan (of praying in his example) by quoting examples of circus jugglers, extending the principle advocated by him the same rule can be applied that we can't negate polygyny (another verse of the Qur'aan) by examples of circus juggler. I agree that we shouldn't try to negate any verses of the Qur'aan with examples of circus jugglers.

The issue here is laughing and giggling about a verse of Allah (SWT) in connection to an example by a circus juggler and by Allah (SWT) we will detest it whether it is done about the verse pertaining to Salah, menstruation or polygyny.

The seventh accusation thrown around is that the Shaykh is discouraging polygyny by quoting personal anecdotes and examples. This is absolutely true and I stand by that. By publicly claiming that he has NEVER COME ACROSS anyone who is happy with two wives is explicit discouraging of a commandment of Allah (SWT). Nowhere does the Shaykh claim that people will problems should bear it rather he discourages polygyny based on his experience. The argument in the blog is as follows:

- 1.The permission from Allah (SWT) is blatant and clear
- 2.There is no contextualisation from Allah (SWT) that if someone's wife is pretty, young, dutiful and childbearing then this permission is ceased from such a man or he is discouraged from it
- 3.There is no contextualisation from Sayyidina Rasul-ullah (Sallallahu Alaihe Wassallam) that if someone's wife is pretty, young, dutiful and childbearing then this permission is ceased from such a man or he is discouraged from it
- 4.There is no contextualisation in books of Fiqh that if someone's wife is pretty, young, dutiful and

childbearing then this permission is ceased from such a man or he is discouraged from it

Bottom-line is that we all of the above on one hand and the Shaykh (HA)'s experience on the other. Although we have no reason to suspect or doubt (May Allah (SWT) protect us from it(Ameen)) to doubt the experiences of the Shaykh but his life experience is no yardstick for a Muslim and that is the point being mentioned in the blog.

The blog and the entire new (now merged) thread is filled with repeated requests to make Shariah compliant arguments and not circus juggler jokes or personal experiences and to establish them as yardsticks to judge a command of Allah (SWT).

The eighth accusation thrown around is just abuse, foul language and filth to which:

Sayyidina Rasul-ullah (Sallallahu Alaihe Wassallam) said, "A believer is not a fault-finder and is not abusive, obscene, or coarse." [Ahmed]

The ninth accusation thrown around is that Muftisays has allowed me a special platform to which:

1.Blogging is available to [any forum user](#) by default, no special dispensation or permission has been given to me at all.

2.Anyone is welcome to join in and start a [blog against me](#), Insha'Allah

3.Like SF they also have rules and the Ameer is [Shaykh Maulana Yasin \(HA\)](#) who is not related to me, has never met me so just like SF if there is a problem with something please report. unlike SF you have the ability to actually voice your concerns on Muftisays without even registering

4.The blog is read by many Ulamah & Mashaykh including Shaykh Abu Hajira (HA) of SF and a student of Shaykh (Mufti) Taqi Usmani (HA) and both will have no hesitation in picking up the phone or dropping an email and asking me to correct, retract or remove.

The tenth accusation thrown around is this particular blog is nothing but an emotional rant

1.Here is the [blog](#)

2.Here is the response from the [brother](#)

3.And above is my response to it

I guess readers can clearly decide after reading themselves as to who is emotional, Insha'Allah.

The eleventh accusation thrown around is to refrain from reading the material from an unknown from someone with *four (4) posts* on a forum:

1.I have nearly 10,000 posts on this forum,

2.I am part of the team which runs one of the [popular sites on the Internet](#),

3.I am available at Muftisays via PM, blog

4.I am well known to the Vice-Ameer (as implied by his earlier comments)

5. I am well known to many of the Ulama & Mashaykh on this forum and elsewhere and even many members and easily contactable.

6. I guess readers can clearly decide for themselves as to how is unknown.

Why respond?

I have no reason to start an online war between our dear and beloved Deobandi brothers as it is pointless. I also have no reason to counter personal public slander but I wrote this out of sheer sadness!

Sadness that Deoband which once produced Ulama of exceptional capability, its legacy has now been reduced to utter filth, provocation and ad hominem attacks. There is every chance that I am wrong (and very likely) but take the take to:

1. Actually read the [blog](#) what is being said and how it is being said
2. Read the responses by a Syed Scholar in Madina and how he has answered the objections
3. Read how I am being “supposedly” [countered](#)
4. Read how a Scholar from the progeny of Sayyidina Rasul-ullah (Sallallahu Alaihe Wassallam) is being accused of being in cohorts with me (my agent I believe he is being called).

So yes I am concerned, very seriously concerned because I joined this forum years ago to benefit from its Academic discourse and discussions. Take a look at what it has been reduced to!

It is possible that this response doesn't get posted and that will be the decision of Shura to blatantly show one side of the story.

As far as the discussion is concerned we haven't moved an inch forward, please feel free to prove the discouragement of polygyny from Qur'aan, Sunnah, Hadeeth & Qiyas (apart from the obvious). The point of the blog is that EVEN if someone marries someone younger, prettier, virgin merely for physical reasons there is still NOTHING wrong against it in Islamic Shariah. There is no reason to explain for most people but let me elaborate for the sake of our innocent brothers and sisters that NOBODY is proposing to start judging women based on their looks or physicality the criteria in Sunnah is the exact opposite, *just making a point!*