

***"O PEOPLE OF IMAAN!
VERILY, THE MUSHRIKON ARE
NAJIS. THEREFORE THEY SHOULD
NOT COME NEAR TO MUSJIDUL
HARAAM AFTER THIS YEAR."
(AT-TAUBAH, AAYAT 28)***

INVITING NON-MUSLIMS INTO THE MUSJID

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

INTRODUCTION

Is it permissible to invite non-Muslims into the Musjid?

The disingenuous narratives of the moron muftis (*maajin* muftis) of our time have cast into confusion the laymen and even sincere molvis who are not grounded in the Ilm of the Deen.

There are two types of *maajin* muftis. For the edification of readers, a *maajin mufti* in terms of the Shariah is a thick-skulled, stupid, shameless so-called ‘mufti’ who lacks in adequate *Ilm*, who gropes in the darkness of his nafs, and who is bereft of Taqwa. In a true Islamic state such a brainless impudent character will be estopped from issuing fatwa, and if he persists, he will be flogged and imprisoned. It is just unfortunate that nowadays the trend is *mass production*. Darul Iftas staffed by *maajin* muftis have mushroomed, and along with it misguidance has spread and ruined Akhlaaq and Imaan of the masses.

The one kind of moron (*maajin*) mufti is sincere, but is not grounded in *Ilm*. His knowledge of the Deen at the higher level is pathetic. Nowadays the Madaaris produce almost exclusively *maajin* muftis. Most of them are of the second category, namely devils in human form (*shayaateenul ins*). In the description of Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam), they have the hearts of wolves. They are driven by either *hubb-e-jah* (love for name/fame) or by *hubb-e-maal* (love for wealth), or by both.

The first kind of moron mufti is cast into bewilderment and confusion when the second kind of moron mufti tears

Fiqhi *ibaaraat* (texts from the kutub of Fiqh) out of their context and without understanding the circumstances and scenarios for the application of the texts, then structures his fatwa of *jahl* on its basis. Thus he casts the *awaamun nass* (the general public) into confusion with his smattering of knowledge anchored to the dictates of his nafs.

The first kind of moron mufti despite his sincerity becomes the victim of the *jahaalat and nafsaaniyat* of the second kind of *maajin* mufti. His (i.e. the first kind of moron mufti's) superficial knowledge does not permit him to see beyond the confines of his nose. He is unable to distinguish between right and left, hence he is entrapped by the stupid fatwas of moron muftis of the second kind.

However, if the moron mufti of the first kind has cultivated Taqwa, then by virtue of his purified *Baatin* he will be able to understand and even spiritually feel the incongruency and *butlaan* of the stupid fatwa of the moron mufti of the second kind. The purified heart of the Mu'min becomes a guide, hence Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) commanded us: "*Seek a fatwa from your heart.*" But a heart enshrouded and darkened with *zulmat* (*spiritual darkness*) is incapable of traversing beyond the confines of his villainous nafs.

The issue under discussion is not merely the simple act of a non-Muslim entering the Musjid or being allowed into the Musjid for a valid Shar'i reason. A host of evils is attached to today's practice of inviting non-Muslims into

the Masjid. Thus, the issue is *Inviting non-Muslims into the Masjid*. It is not simply about *a non-Muslim entering the Masjid*.

An important Fiqhi principle to remember is that any permissibility which leads to haraam, also becomes haraam.

By Allah's *fadhl* we have explained in detail in this brief treatise the Shariah's prohibition which will, Insha-Allah, be readily absorbed by the sincere seekers of the Haqq.

Mujlisul Ulama of S.A.
1440 / 2019

INVITING NON-MUSLIMS INTO THE MUSJID

Any Mufti who claims that inviting the kuffaar into the Musjid or allowing non-Muslim tourists, men and women lewdly clad, into the Musjid, or inviting them into the Musjid to sing hymns of kufr and shirk in praise of their god of shirk, and then justifies his fatwa of permissibility on the basis of the texts stated by the Hanafi Fuqaha, is a moron. He is what is known as a *mufti maajin*. He is stupid and need to be estopped. It is not permissible for such a moron to be in the department of Ifta’.

A Mufti requires brains adorned with taqwa to understand an issue. The circumstances and scenario have to be understood and taken into account. The consequences of the fatwa must be understood. A Mufti needs to be far sighted and not tear out of the Kutub just any text for justifying a practice which leads to corruption and threatens the Akhlaaq and even the Imaan of the *awaamun naas*.

The scenario with which we are confronted is not something insignificant such as the need for a electrician, and only a non-Muslim is available to attend to the Musjid’s electricity, or only a non-Muslim is available to attend to some work in the Musjid. The scenario we are confronted with threatens Akhlaaq and Imaan. Consider the following scenarios:

- (1) Muslims inviting Christians into the Musjid to sing religious songs of kufr and shirk.
- (2) Muslims allowing droves of non-Muslim tourists into the Musjid. Men and women are dressed lewdly. They walk around and sit in the Musjid while musallis are engaging in Salaat, and while other musallis sit ogling the scantily dressed females.
- (3) Muslims inviting the Christian priest to deliver a Christian sermon inside the Musjid. The priest criticizes the Qur'aan, denigrates Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) and Islam right inside the Musjid where he dins the ears of the Muslims with his sermon of kufr. Then the priest distributes his kufr literature to the musallis inside the Musjid. Not a word of protest escapes the lips of even a single musalli.
- (4) Muslims inviting the kuffaar into the Musjid for interfaith dialogue. Kufr and shirk ideologies are propagated inside the Musjid.
- (5) Muslims inviting non-Muslim politicians into the Musjid to deliver the pre-Jumuah lecture. The musallis have to sit. Listen and digest the shaitaaniiyat which the politicians din into their ears on this mubaarak occasion, and all of this spiritual filth takes place inside the Musjid at the behest of the devilish 'Muslim' management of the Musjid.
- (6) Worse is still to follow in the wake of the stupid fatwas issued by the maajin muftis. According to the Hadith, cross-worship will be taking place inside the Musjid.

Apart from the *janaabat* – spiritual and physical – of the non-Muslims, are the aforementioned acts of kufr, shirk

and fisq permissible inside a Musjid? Are these acts permissible in any Muslim home? Are these acts permissible in the street? Brains are not a requisite for the comprehension of this issue. Only healthy Imaan is necessary. Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) said: *“Seek a fatwa from your heart.”*

There is no need for sniffing unrelated texts from the Kutub of the Fuqaha to justify activities which are explicitly and emphatically declared haraam by the Shariah. Perpetration of evil in a Musjid is an added dimension of aggravation. It defiles the sanctity of the Musjid and corrupts the Imaan and Akhlaaq of Muslims.

A STUPID ARGUMENT

The claim to justify the corruption made by morons is: *In the time of Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) kuffaar were allowed in the Musjid*, is baseless. This cannot justify the commission of the host of evils which is occurring nowadays in the Musjid as a consequence of allowing non-Muslims entry. The following instances more than adequately debunk this stupid argument.

Women in the Musjid

During the time of Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam), and during the khilaafat of Hadhrat Abu Bakr (Radhiyallahu anhu) as well as during the initial period of the khilaafat of Hadhrat Umar (Radhiyallahu anhu) women were allowed to come to the Musjid to perform Salaat. Despite this initial explicit permissibility of Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam), the Sahaabah and the Fuqaha prohibited women from the Musjid.

Now what should be concluded from the prohibition by the Sahaabah and the Fuqaha of the Ummah of all Math-habs of a practice which Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) himself had permitted?

If pure, holy Muslim females of the calibre of Sahaabiyaat could be prohibited from the Musaajid, then on what basis do the moron molvis aver that kaafiraat women and kuffaar men wallowing in janaabat and kufr cannot be prevented from the Musaajid, especially when they constitute a threat to the sanctity of the Musjid and the Imaan of Muslims?

Urine as medicine

Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) had prescribed camel's urine for the treatment of members of a tribe. Is it today permissible to prescribe urine and najaasat in general as medicine? People of brains will understand that Rasulullah's statement: *"Allah has not created the cure of my ummah in things which have been made haraam for them."*, and other Shar'i dalaa-il take precedence over the initial prescription of urine. It does not follow that because it was permitted by Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam), it constitutes a universal law for all time to drink camel's urine, and by analogy even human urine for medical treatment.

It is baseless to claim that camel's urine is permissible and pure because it was prescribed by Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam).

Aqeeqah

According to Imaam Abu Hanifah (Rahmatullah alayh), Aqeeqah is an abrogated issue. Only Qur'baani is valid. Qur'baani cancelled out Aqeeqah. However, this Fatwa of Imaam Abu Hanifah (Rahmatullah alayh) has been set aside, and the Ahnaaf have adopted the same ruling of the other three Math-habs. Setting aside Imaam Abu Hanifah's view regarding Aqeeqah, and concurring with the view of the other three Math-habs do not create any insoluble problem. A haraam is not committed in this adoption. But setting aside the view of prohibition of kuffaar's entry into the Musjid of the three Math-habs whose case is vindicated by the Qur'aanic verses and Ahaadith, results in a huge haraam problem, viz. allowing people of janaabat and kufr into the Musjid. While the moron muftis do not contradict the three Math-habs on the Aqeeqah and women in Musjid issues, they thoughtlessly and stupidly ignore the view of the three Math-habs and the other dalaa-il which substantiate the prohibition.

The Six Fasts of Shawwaal

According to Imaam Abu Hanifah, the six fasts of Shawwaal are bid'ah. This view is in conflict with the view of our other Fuaqaha and of the three Math-habs. But in this matter, the Hanafi Fuqaha have set aside Imaam Abu Hanifah's view and have concurred with the view of the three Math-habs. No one objects to this. But a clamour of stupidities is raised by the moron muftis on the issue of kuffaar being prevented from entering the Musaajid to engage in the fisq, fujoor and kufr explained earlier. They should invite the kuffaar to commit fisq and

fujoor in their homes, not in the Musaajid. The homes of these moron muftis are more fitting for immorality, not the Musaajid.

Women of the Ahl-e-Kitaab

The Qur'aan Majeed explicitly permits marriage to women of the Ahle Kitaab (of the Yahood and Nasaara). Even all the Fuqaha of all Math-habs proclaim this permissibility. However, all our Akaabir Ulama have issued fatwa that in the current era it is no longer permissible to marry Christian and Jewish women as long as they do not embrace Islam. Even these stupid maajin muftis have not objected and cannot object. It may not be argued that our Akaabir have erred because the Hanafi Math-hab does permit marriage to the women of the Ahl-e-Kitaab.

When Hadhrat Umar (Radhiyallahu anhu) was informed that Hadhrat Huzaifah (Radhiyallahu anhu) whom he had appointed the governor of a province had married a Jewess, he ordered him to immediately divorce her. Hadhrat Umar (Radhiyallahu anhu) added that he was not making haraam what Allah had made halaal in the Qur'aan, but he was ordering Hadhrat Huzaifah (Radhiyallahu anhu) to divorce the woman forthwith. It is moronic and only morons will argue that Hadhrat Umar (Radhiyallahu anhu) had acted in conflict with the Qur'aan. All authorities of all Math-habs accept the ruling of Hadhrat Umar (Radhiyallahu anhu). Circumstances constrained him to prohibit a permissibility which threatened to develop into evil and haraam.

It is not surprising that these maajin muftis are unaware of the principle of the prohibition of a permissibility if it leads to haraam.

Mafqooduz zauj

According to the Hanafi Math-hab, when a husband goes missing and cannot be traced even after years, the wife has to spend her entire life waiting. Her Nikah cannot be annulled. But, in recent times, our Akaabir Ulama have issued the fatwa in accordance with the Maaliki Math-hab. She has to wait four years.

The moron muftis should now cling to the Hanafi fatwa just as they are clinging to the Hanafi Math-hab for allowing fisq, fujoor and kufr to be perpetrated in the Musjid. The reality is that the Hanafi Math-hab DOES NOT allow kuffaar into the Musjid for commission of immorality and kufr. This prohibition should be reinforced with the views of the other three Math-habs, and any contrary opinion should imperatively be discarded. In fact, not even Muslims are permitted to desanctify the Musjid as these shaitaani qawwaals are doing nowadays.

On the basis of Shar'i principles of the Hanafi Math-hab, the Maaliki view has been incorporated into our Math-hab. There are *Usool* which regulate the issuance of Fatwa. But the moron muftis are too stupid and too much embroiled with the nafs to understand these *Usool*.

The non-Muslim delegations

During the time of Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam), the non-Muslim delegations allowed into the Musjid did not perform any of the haraam stunts and clowning activities which are displayed by non-Muslims called to the Musaaajid by such Muslims whose Imaan dangles by a thread. The non-Muslims who were allowed into the Musjid in Rasulullah's era came in submission, with respect and without causing the slightest defilement to the Musjid or to its ethos.

The Najraani delegation

The morons are fond of citing the Christian delegation of Najraan. There is absolutely no resemblance between the scenario of today's kuffaar entry and the Najraani delegation. A molvi, Mumtazul Haq, had very recently invited a Christian priest to deliver a kufr sermon in the Musjid where he (Mumtaz) is the Imaam. In refutation of this appallingly haraam act which the deviate imam abortively struggled to justify on the basis of the Najraani delegation being allowed in the Musjid by Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam), we had issued the following refutation based on the information provided by Muslims in the U.K:

On the previous occasion, he said the Qur'aan is "*mixed up*". This condemner of the Qur'aan, who spoke of his "*growing friendship*" with Imaam Mumtaz (*the Agent of Iblees –The Majlis*) despite their differences and whom Imaam Mumtaz (*Shaitaanul Ins – The Majlis*) called on us to treat with respect as he was our guest, also put up a theatrical performance of kufr on the musallah where the

Janaazah Salaah of Muslims is read, spreading his hands out from time to time to conjure images of “*Jesus on the cross*”, and warned Muslims not to fall for “*false messiahs*”, in what appeared to be an indirect but slanderous reference to our Rasul, peace be upon him. The Imaam (*the Imaam of shayaateenul ins wal jinn – The Majlis*) and some others justify this kufr by pointing out that the “*inter-faith dialogue*” is an opportunity to win over Christians, that they are “closest” to us compared to people of other faiths and it was not in breach of Shariah as the Christians of Najran had also been hosted in Masjid e Nabawi for a “debate and discussion”.

(Our comment:

The justification for kufr propagation by a kaafir priest right inside the Masjid, is termed in the Qur’aan Majeed: ‘Zukhrufil Qawl’ – satanically adorned words designed to deceive and entrap stupid Muslims into shaitaan’s snare of kufr.

Never ever can non-Muslims be won over to Islam with kufr? How is this ever possible when this so-called ‘dialogue’ blasphemes the Qur’aan and Rasulullah – Sallallahu alayhi wasallam? How is it ever possible to bring Christians close to Islam when Islam is portrayed as a false religion by their priest? Furthermore, the vile criticism of Islam was designed for Muslim consumption. The stage was set by the Murtad ‘sheikh’ for bringing Muslims close to Christianity. The argument of bringing the Christians closer to Islam, is satanically moronic, and comes within the scope of the Qur’aanic Aayat:

“Never will the Yahood and Nasaaraa be pleased with you except if you follow their religion. Say: ‘Verily, the guidance of Allah is the only guidance. And, if you follow their vain desires after Knowledge has come to you, then Allah will not be for you a friend nor a helper.’”
(Baqarah, Aayat 121)

Continuation of the letter:

“I am among those musallees who remain unconvinced, holding the view that if a Shia cannot stand in the mosque’s parking bay to “slander” the Sahaaba then there is no way a pastor can stand on its musallas and condemn the Qur’aan Majid as “mixed up” and “meaningless”. For me, this is nothing but a case of the Imaam pandering to the pastor and surrendering the musalla for the preaching of pure kufr to Muslim adults and children who, unlike the Sahaaba, know very little about the Qur’aan, bible or other scriptures. This is why the pastor got their attention when he said that many Muslims do not even know the meaning of the word Torah and he will tell them.

(Our comment: Even the Sahaabah who knew much of the Qur’aan and who were the devotees of Islam, were prohibited by Rasulullah –Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) - from reading the Tauraah. Once when Hadhrat Umar – Radhiyallahu anhu – was reading the Tauraah, our Nabi –Sallallahu alayhi wasallam – severely reprimanded him. There is absolutely no need for any Muslim to know the meaning of the word ‘Tauraah’. It was a stupid shaitaani red herring cast by the kaafir priest to

bamboozle stupid Muslims whom this Mumtazul Baatil Murtad Agent of Iblees had lured into the Trap of Kufr.

Our salvation is reliant solely on believing in the fundamentals of Islam, not in the nonsense of knowing the meaning of the Tauraah. The propagation of kufr inside a Musjid by a kaafir priest criticizing and demeaning the Qur’aan Majeed and Rasulullah – Sallallahu alayhi wasallam – is absolutely mind boggling for a Muslim. Wallaah! There are no words in the dictionary and no expletives in the gutter language of hoodlums strong enough to criticize this Agent of Iblees.)

The letter continues:

The da’awah/call to kufr continued after the official “dialogue”, as the Christian missionaries, now fed biryani, seized the opportunity to preach to Muslims on a one-to-one basis rather than just making chit-chat. This, in the very Mosque where Imaam Mumtaz (*Imaam of the shayaateen –Mumtazul Kufr- The Majlis*) has frequently lamented that Muslims in London are becoming murtads because of the “cunningness” of Christian missionaries. But some ulama may feel that, given the rise in Islamophobia in the UK, what Imam Mumtaz is now doing with the pastor is right, while Moulana Tariq Jameel’s conciliatory approach towards the “Sahaaba-slandering” Shias remains wrong as they are, in fact, “traitors” and “kaafirs” worse than Christian missionaries who slander the Qur’aan. I await clarity. Jazakallah, Wassalaam. (*End of the Brother’s letter*)

OUR COMMENT

Any molvi who proffers any justification for this act of supreme *shaitaaniyat and kufr* which this *murtad, shaitaanul ins*, had organized for the Musjid, joins his rank into the lowest level of the dregs of Jahannam.

It is shockingly surprising that the Ulama in the UK have become so spineless that their tongues and lips have become welded into satanic silence. All of them without exception are of the ‘Dumb Devil’ ilk stated by Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam): *“He who remains silent regarding the Haqq is Shaitaan Akhras (a dumb devil).”*

It is accepted that the U.K. government following in the footsteps of the communist regime of the now extinct Soviet Union, has enacted draconian anti-Islam laws which are designed for eliminating Islam in the U.K. The objective of these laws despite not specifically mentioning Islam to be the target, is the very same plot of the abolition of religion which the Soviet communists had brutally enforced in the Muslim countries in Central Asia.

However, despite the evil anti-Islam laws, there remains scope for proclaiming the Haqq without adopting our strident tone. Also, to the best of our knowledge, hitherto there is no law compelling Muslims to invite kuffaar priests into the Musaajid to disgorge kufr and to compound their kufr with vile denigration of the Qur’aan, our Nabi (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) and our Qur’aan. How was it possible for Muslims to sit and

devour ‘biryani’ with such enemies of Islam? How was it possible to engage in merrymaking with the kaafir priest and his kuffaar entourage? The kaafir priest had even utilized the merrymaking moments for dinning the ears of Muslims with his preaching of shirk and kufr.

Hadhrat Sufyaan Thauri (Rahmatullah alayh) said about 13 centuries ago:

“A crevice (for the entry of baatil into the Ummah) has opened up, but now the opening is so massive that an ocean of baatil is flooding through. Who can now prevent it?”

This was the lament of one of Islam’s greatest Authorities in all fields of Shar’i Uloom more than 13 centuries ago. The incremental expansion of kufr from even the Musaajid is satanism which is here to stay. Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) has predicted it, and his predictions are signs of the Truth of Nubuwwat. This development of shaitaanīyat and kufr initiated by molvis right inside the Musjid is a sure sign of the imminence of the Hour of Qiyaamah.

The argument of *Najraan* – of the Christian delegation to Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) – on the basis of which this shaitaani Mudhil, Mumtaazud Devil, abortively seeks to justify his act of blatant and brazen kufr perpetrated in a place which is supposed to be among the holiest bastions of the Deen, is absolutely satanic and putrid. This argument is bereft of the slightest vestige of credulity. It is Ibleesi twaddle with which the Murtad is attempting to bamboozle the juhala Muslims

who sat through the kufr propagation soiling and polluting their hearts with the kufr which the priest dinned into their ears.

It will be salubrious if the Murtad Mudhil elaborates on the Najraani episode. But never will he be able to present the truth of this anecdote. To dispel the baatil and falsehood which the Murtad attempted to spin in his bid to pull wool over the eyes of the ignorant and unwary, we present here some aspects pertaining to the Christian delegation which had visited Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam).

When the delegation reached Madinah Munawwarah, its members removed their travel dress and donned their gaudily adorned garments and golden rings. According to their proudful style, their long cloaks dragged on the ground as they walked. In this state of pomp and show they came to Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) and greeted him. Our Nabi (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) did not respond to their greeting.

They endeavoured the whole day to engage Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) in conversation, but he rebuffed them. He did not speak with them. Then they set out in search of Hadhrat Uthmaan (Radhiyallahu anhu) and Hadhrat Abdur Rahmaan Bin Auf (Radhiyallahu anhum). They were acquainted with these two senior Sahaabah. After they located the two, the Christians said:

“O Uthmaan! O Abdur Rahmaan! Your Nabi had written a letter to us. We have come to respond to his letter. We came and greeted, but he refused to respond to

our greeting. We endeavoured the entire day to speak to him, but he avoided us. What is your advice? Do you advise that we should return?"

Both these Sahaabah sought the advice of Hadhrat Ali (Radhiyallahu anhu) who said: *"They should remove their gaudy garments and their golden rings, and don their travel dress, then go to Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam)."*

This advice was heeded. The delegation acted accordingly. Then when they came into the presence of Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) and greeted, he returned their greeting. Then Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) said:

"I take an oath by That Being Who has sent me with the Truth! They (i.e. the delegation) had come to me the first time with the adornment of Iblees...." Then Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) engaged them in discussion. Before the delegation had arrived, Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) had issued the following ultimatum to them:

"Accept Islam, and you will be granted safety.....I am calling you away from the worship of slaves to the worship of Allah Ta'ala. I call you away from the friendship of slaves to the Friendship of Allah. If you refuse (to accept this demand), then payment of Jizyah will be incumbent on you. If you refuse (even payment of Jizyah), then take notice of war. Was-salaam"

Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) had also informed them:

“Three things impede you from accepting Islam: Worshipping the cross; devouring the flesh of swines, and believing that Isaa (Alayhis salaam) is the son of Allah.”

Regarding the delegation of Najraan, the Qur’aan Majeed states:

“The Truth is from your Rabb (O Muhammad!). Therefore, do not be among those who doubt. Whoever disputes with you in this matter (of the Haqq) after Knowledge (by Wahi) has come to you, then say: ‘Come! Let us call our sons and your sons, our wives and your wives, ourselves and yourselves, then we shall supplicate sincerely (and earnestly) invoking the La’nat (Curse) of Allah on the liars.’” (Aal-e-Imraan, 59 and 60)

This was the challenge which Allah Ta’ala commanded Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) to issue to the Najraani Christians. The delegation had asked Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) why he was speaking ill of ‘their person’... Upon this Allah Ta’ala revealed the aforementioned Aayat of *Mubaahalalah*. However, the Christians were scared, hence refused to take up the challenge.

Far, very far from any bootlicking and listening to any sermon of kufr from the Najraani delegation, Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) imposed on them an annual Jizyah tax of 2,000 suits of garments in the month of

Rajab. Thereafter, Nabi-e-Kareem (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) told them that if they had engaged him in the *Mubaahalah* to invoke the *La'nat* of Allah Azza Wa Jal, the entire Christian population of Najraan would have been destroyed. All of them would have been transformed into apes and swines, and the entire region would have been consumed by a raging fire. Thereafter, not even birds would perch on the trees of Najraan.

This then is the story of the Najraani delegation which the Murtad Mudhil and all other munaafiq bootlickers and modernists cite to justify kuffaar presence in the Musaajid. Is there any semblance of bootlicking by Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) in this episode? Did Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) obfuscate the Haqq and allow the Christians to insult the Qur'aan and Islam, and to din the ears of Muslims with such kufr and blasphemy which insult the Deen, the Qur'aan and the Nabi? Did Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) invite the Najraanis to propagate their kufr and shirk in the Musjid?

By putridly and stupidly mentioning the Najraani delegation, this Murtad and all other mudhilleen molvis and modernists hoodwink the ignorant masses into the satanic understanding that the Najraani delegation was in a dominant position and had dictated to Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) and the Muslimeen. In addition to there being not the slightest vestige of bootlicking, Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) acquitted himself with belligerency. He refused to greet them. He refused to speak to them the entire day when

they arrived. They were constrained to disrobe and don their old, dirty travel garments. They were issued the Mubaahalalah challenge with the consequences of being transformed into apes and pigs, and finally an annual tax was imposed on them under threat of Jihad.

Is there any resemblance between the anecdote of Najraan and the bootlicking kufr ceremony of the kaafir priest inside the Musjid at the invitation of the Murtad, Mudhil Agent of Iblees? Every Muslim can now quite easily understand the farce and fallacy of the Najraani analogy drawn by the jaahil murtad sheikhush shaitaan to justify the sermon of kufr inside the Musjid.

“O People of Imaan! If you follow the kuffaar, they will (only) turn you on your heels (to renege and become murtads), then you will become losers (in this dunya and in the Aakhirat).”

(Aal-e-Imraan, Aayat 149)

“But in fact, He (Allah) is your Friend, and He is the best of friends.” (Aal-e-Imraan, Aayat 150)

“Verily, those who have believed (had become Muslims), then they committed kufr, then again they believed, then again committed kufr, then they increased the kufr (as this Agent of Iblees has done), Allah will not forgive them nor will He guide them to the (Straight) Path.”

(An-Nisaa', Aayat 137)

“Convey to the munaafiqeen (such as the kuffaar bootlickers) the tidings that most certainly for them there

is a Painful Chastisement. They (the munaafiqeen) are those who take as friends the kaafireen (just as the mumtazul baatil character has perpetrated) besides the Mu'mineen. What! Are they searching for honour from them (from the kaafireen)? (Know!) that verily all honour belongs to Allah.” (An-Nisaa’, 138 and 139)

May Allah Ta’ala protect our Imaan and may He keep us steadfast on *Siraatul Mustaqeem* and take our Souls at the end of this earthly sojourn with our Imaan intact. *“Imaan is suspended between fear and hope.”* No one knows what the morrow holds for him. Just reflect! Meditate on the abyss of kufr into which the Imaam of this UK Musjid has plunged into. It is indeed fearful. We seek Allah’s Protection from the evil of our nafs and the snares of Iblees. *“Salaam on those who follow Allah’s Guidance.” (End of our earlier refutation)*

The salient facts regarding the Christian Najraani delegation are:

- (a) On their arrival, Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam), did not even respond to their greeting because of their proudful dress attire.
- (b) Despite the delegation endeavouring to engage Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) in discussion the entire day, Nabi (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) rebuffed them.
- (c) Hadhrat Uthmaan (Radhiyallahu anhu) advised the Christians to change their dress and remove their rings of gold. It was only after they complied that our Nabi (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) agreed to speak to them.

- (d) Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam), banishing all forms of dubious ‘hikmat’ (stupid wisdom), said to them that the first time they had approached him was with “*the adornment of Iblees*”.
- (e) Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) issued an ultimatum of Jihad or Jizyah to the Najraanis. He abjured them and warned them of their kufr worship.
- (f) Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) denounced the worship of the cross, pork and their belief of Nabi Isaa (Alayhis salam) being the son of Allah.
- (g) The Qur’aan Majeed announced the Challenge of the Curse (La’nat) which the Christians declined.

It is not generally known that the Yahood and Nasaara of the era of Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) strictly observed two acts: Ghushl-e-Janaabat and consuming halaal *zabeehah* meat. That is why their *zabeehah* was made halaal for us. Thus their *zabeehah* is permitted for Muslims. However, in our current era, the meat of the Yahood and Nasaara is no longer permissible in view of the fact that they do not practise their original *zabeehah* rites. The Jewish kosher is not valid halaal for us. We cannot even trust any Muslim halaal-certifying agency.

Despite the Qur’aan declaring the permissibility of the meat of the Ahl-e-Kitaab, all our Akaabir Ulama have issued fatwa of *hurmat (prohibition)* regarding the meat of these people in our time. No one accuses them of being in violation of the Hanafi Math-hab. The fatwa of prohibition is based on principles of the Hanafi Math-hab. Firstly, there is no Shar’i incumbency to indulge in a

permissibility. Secondly, if factors of prohibition accompany the initial permissibility, the fatwa of *hurmat* will apply. But morons do not understand these issues.

When Hadhrat Umar (Radhiyallahu anhu) was on the journey to take possession of the City of Jerusalem, he passed by a village where lived a Christian bishop. When the bishop learnt of the passing by of Ameerul Mu'mineen Hadhrat Umar (Radhiyallahu anhu), he presented himself and invited Hadhrat Umar for meals at his home. Hadhrat Umar (Radhiyallahu anhu), presenting some excuse for declining, asked the bishop to bring the food to him. He would eat it. The bishop brought the food and Hadhrat Umar (Radhiyallahu anhu) ate of it. Since he had no doubt regarding the *hillat* (*being halaal*) of the food in view of the strict observance of halaal rules by the Ahl-e-Kitaab of the early ages, Hadhrat Umar (Radhiyallahu anhu) consumed the food.

Later he explained that the reason for not going to the bishop's home was that it was a common practice for the Nasaara to have pictures of their Christ hanging on the walls, and Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) forbade Muslims from entering homes, etc. wherein pictures were displayed.

But today in this age of total corruption, immorality and atheism we may not consume the meat of Jews and Christians, justifying our action with the Qur'aanic Aayat and the Ahaadith which confirm the permissibility of eating their meat. This prohibition is based on principles

of our Math-hab, and of all Math-habs. But moron muftis dwell in nafsaaani deception.

When the Nasaara were in the Musjid, they performed their Salaat facing Baitul maqdis. This further confirms that they were in the state of Tahaarat which was an essential condition for the validity of their ritual acts of Ibaadat which their Ambiya (Alayhimus salaam) had imparted to them. Even to this day, the ritual of ablution for prayers is to be found in their corrupted bible texts.

The Banu Thaqeef delegation

This delegation consisting of mushrikeen is also cited by the morons to vindicate their inviting kuffaar into the Musaajid. This delegation was not invited into the Musjid. According to one narration, Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) had arranged a tent for them near to the Musjid. A narration also mentions that the tent was pitched right at the back of the Musjid.

Even if it be accepted that they were inside the Musjid, it was the initial period of Islam, and these delegations of the Mushrikeen had presented themselves to Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) with the genuine desire to learn and embrace Islam. Thus, we find that almost all of them accepted Islam. There was no bootlicking the kuffaar and allowing them to preach kufr and shirk to Muslims in the Musjid, nor were lewdly dressed kuffaar women accompanying the delegations. In fact, even the males of the Najraani delegation were rebuffed on account of their gaudy apparel and gold rings. There was no haraam interfaith dialogue.

After staying a few days, they embraced Islam. But the priests and politicians invited into the Musaajid by moron Muslims endeavour to propagate their kufr and baatil ideologies to Muslims, and they furthermore defile the sanctity of the Musaajid.

The Delegation of Kindah

When this delegation came to Madinah, Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam), after presenting islam to them, asked: “*Do you accept Islam?*” They responded: “*Yes, O Rasulallah!*” Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) said: “*Then why have you cast silken shawls around you?*” The members of the delegation immediately removed their shawls and tore them to pieces. Thus, there was no bootlicking. It was pure da’wat with Islam in the dominant position. It was not a farcical show for a busload of tourists for whom the Musjid is simply an item on the itinerary for sight-seeing. There was no paraphernalia of fisq and fujoor which are concomitant with these tours.

There is absolutely no *daleel* for the bootlicking morons in the stay of the Najraani delegation in the Musjid. The Najraani’s were Nasaara who adhered to the ghusl-e-janaabat mas’alah. Rasulullah’s initial treatment towards them highlights their grossly inferior status. The da’wat which Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) directed towards them was robust, crisp and demanding. They settled for their *asaaghireen* (*gross inferiority*) status which the Qur’aan imposes of the payers of Jizyah.

“Fight them until they pay the Jizyah with their own hands whilst they are in humiliation.”

(At-Taubah, Aayat 29)

Relative to the incoming delegations, Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) and the Muslims were in a commanding position. They were not humiliated bootlickers as we are today.

A decrepit daleel

Citing from the kutub, the following daleel is presented to justify today's perfidious act of inviting the kuffaar into the Musjid:

“Al-Qurtubi said in his Kitaab, Al-Jaamiu li Ahkaamil Qur'aan:

‘Abu Hanifah and his companions said: The Yahood and Nasaara should not be prevented from entering Musjidul Haraam except the mushrikoon and the people of idols.’

The decrepitude of this averment is borne out by the contradiction which stems from excluding the mushrikeen and idolaters from the permission. On what basis should the mushrikeen / idol-worshippers be prevented from entering the Musaajid when the very same basis which permits the Yahood and Nasaara from entering the Musjid is common to the mushrikeen as well? In fact, perhaps only one Christian delegation, the Najraanis, came to Madinah whilst a number of Arab delegations of mushrikeen and idol-worshippers were housed in the Musjid by Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam). For allowing the Yahood and the Nasaara, the *daleel* of the kuffaar *Wufood* (delegations) is of

fundamental importance. The legalizers invariably quote the Ahaadith pertaining to the kuffaar *Wufood*, but conveniently overlook Rasulullah's active command to ban people of *janaabat* from entering the Musjid. They also turn a blind eye to the Qur'aanic prohibition.

Then the legalizers further weaken, in fact scuttle their case by baselessly creating a division in the permission by claiming permissibility for only the Yahood and Nasaara thereby prohibiting the mushrikoon/idolaters despite the fact that almost all the Ahaadith pertaining to permission relate to the Mushrikoon. The tribe of Banu Thaqeefah was the worst regarding idolatry. Their great idol-god was *Laat*. Yet a tent was set up for this delegation in the Musjid, and according to another narration, just outside the Musjid. Nevertheless, accepting that they were housed inside the Musjid, the irrefutable fact is that they were idol-worshippers. It is therefore incongruent and baseless to exclude the mushrikeen from the permission.

It appears that Imaam Qurtubi (Rahmatullah alayh) had attributed this decrepit argument to Imaam Abu Hanifah and his Ashaab on account of some misunderstanding, or perhaps an error has been committed by someone in the Kitaab. Such errors are frequent occurrences. Even in the illustrious Kitaab, *Hidaayah* there is the serious error of the permissibility of *mu'tah* attributed to Imaam Maalik (Rahmatullah alayh). Either it was an interpolation or a genuine error due to some misunderstanding. Thus, there is the incumbent need to examine the dalaa-il, and to imperatively take into consideration the prevailing

circumstances and scenarios before issuing a fatwa. But this exercise is not within the domain of the brains of *maajin* muftis.

It could be argued that the rationale for Imaam Abu Hanifah distinguishing between the Ahl-e-Kitaab and the Mushrikeen, permitting the former and prohibiting the latter, was his awareness of the staunch adherence of the Ahl-e-Kitaab to ghusl-e-janaabat whereas the mushrikeen had no such ritual in their religion of idol-worship. But this rationale too can be debunked by the fact that Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) had allowed the *Wufood* of the Mushrikeen entry into the Musjid.

What then can be a logical explanation for distinguishing between the Ahl-e-Kitaab and the Mushrikeen regarding the question of entry into the Musjid? It may be proffered that allowing the mushrikeen into the Musjid was among the *khusoosiyat* (*specialities*) of Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam). It was permitted by Wahi for him. Islam was in its nascent stage, and there existed the imperative need to subdue the entire Arab nation so that not a single mushrik or even a single Kitaabi remains. Hence, even during his Maradhul Maut our Nabi (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) issued the order: “*Expel the Yahood and Nasaara from Jazeeratul Arab.*”

When their presence became intolerable in the entire Arabian Peninsula, how is it possible to accept their presence inside the Musajaad? It is exceptionally puerile and short-sighted to employ fiqhi technicalities to legalize, not only the entry of kuffaar into the Musajaad,

but to permit them to execute their fisq, fujoor and kufr inside the Musaajid and to sing hymns of shirk, and to give lectures of even their baatil ideologies inside the Musaajid. What has happened to the brains of these moron muftis? They are specimens who come within the purview of the Qur'aanic Aayat:

“Thus, does Allah cast rijis (filth) on those who lack aql (who fail to employ their brains correctly).”

They are those in whose ears and hearts shaitaan urinates and even excretes.

The fatwa of prohibition

There is no rational and no Shar'i reason for anyone in this era to fault or to reject the fatwa of prohibition – prohibiting kuffaar entry into the Musaajid. When in the noblest time of the three noblest eras (*Khairul Quroon*) – the era in which flourished thousands of Sahaabah during the Khilaafat of Hadhrat Umar (Radhiyallahu anhu), the most pious Women of the Ummah, including the Noble Wives of Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam), were prevented from the Musaajid despite their rigid Hijaab, sublime Tahaarat and Taqwa, then there can be no Shar'i reason whatsoever for allowing into the Musaajid kuffaar wallowing in janaabat and kufr, seeking to promote their agendas of kufr.

Haafiz Ibn Hajar (Rahmatullah alayh) said that it is only a *ghabi* (moron with fossilized brains) who propagates permissibility for women to come to the Musjid. Those who proclaim permissibility for non-Muslims to enter the Musaajid in this time in close proximity to Qiyaamah – a time in which kufr, fisq and fujoor predominate

everywhere – an age in which the Ummah is grovelling and bootlicking the kuffaar in utter humiliation – an age when Muslims have become complacent with the kufr culture of the West and with even their religions and ideologies of kufr, are greater *ghabis* than those mentioned by Haafiz Ibn Hajr (Rahmatullah alayh). Their *ghabaawat* is shockingly lamentable.

Hadhrat Aishah (Radhiyallahu anha) said that if Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) had seen the acts innovated by women, he would have banned them from the Musaajid just as the women of Bani Israaeel were prohibited. She was speaking of the noblest time of the three Noblest Eras. We follow her Sunnah and say as she had said. When Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) had allowed the kuffaar entry into the Musjid it was another age with other circumstances which are widely divergent from the state in which we find ourselves today so far from the Age of Nubuwwat.

Muslims should constructively employ their brains to understand the issue. If Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) was today in our midst, would he have allowed Christians priests and kuffaar politicians and droves of fujjaar, faajiraat and kuffaar into the Musjid to propagate their agendas thus overshadowing the Da'wat for which Allah Azza Wa Jal had despatched him to earth? Would the Khulafa-e-Rashideen have tolerated this utter humiliation and bootlicking on which permission to enter the Musjid is based? Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) said: “*Seek a fatwa from your heart*”. This is advice for the sincere seekers of the

Truth. Do not seek guidance from moron muftis and liberal molvis whose objective is the fulfilment of the dictates of the nafs.

The permissibility view of the Ahnaaf is valid in a scenario as was prevailing during the age of Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam). The condition of *saaghireen* of the non-Muslims who were allowed into the Musjid by Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) must necessarily encumber the permissibility. The condition (*shart*) may not be separated from the permissibility view. Minus the condition, the permissibility is invalid.

For example, if it be assumed temporarily, that today women should be allowed in the Musaajid on the basis of the permission of Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam), and because that was the standard practice in the age of our Nabi (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) and also in the initial time of Khilaafat-e-Raashidah, but all the conditions (*sharaa-it*) for the initial permissibility are ignored, then we believe that even moron muftis will differ and say that it is haraam for women to come to the Musjid, adorned, perfumed, gaudily and lewdly dressed. But since the situation which prevailed during the age of Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) is non-existent and devoid of reality, the fatwa of prohibition remains intact. In exactly the same way, the condition of the kuffaar during Rasulullah's era is no longer found today. Hence, it is never permissible to promote permissibility for non-Muslims to enter the Musjid.

The prohibition applicable to Muslims in *janaabat* will have greater emphasis in so far as non-Muslims are concerned. Their *janaabat* is both physical and spiritual.

The reaction of the Sahaabah

When Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) allowed the Bunu Thaqeef delegation into the Musjid, the Sahaabah expressing surprise said: “*O Rasulullah! They are a nation of filth.*” What had constrained the Sahaabah to be surprised over the permission of allowing the idolaters into the Musjid? Their surprise indicates that it was understood, and it was the practice that people of *anjaas* may not enter the Musjid. This surprise leads to the conclusion that an exception was made for Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) for the purpose of the *Wufood*.

It may not be argued that today it is permissible to arrest and execute criminals inside Musjidul Haraam because on the occasion of the Conquest of Makkah, Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) had ordered the execution of several persons right in the haram, and even whilst one man was holding on to the *ghilaaf* (cloth) of the Ka’bah pleading for mercy. His pleas were ignored and he was executed. Even some females were executed.

This action of our Nabi (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) does not constitute a basis for the abrogation of the original mas’alah of prohibition. Criminals may not be arrested and executed in Musjidul Haraam. What had transpired on the occasion of *Fath-e-Makkah* was a special concession for Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam).

The muftis need to operate their brains with rectitude, but such operation is not possible without Taqwa which creates *baseerat*.

Similarly, the permission for kuffaar to enter the Musjid granted by Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) may not be extended to the evil scenarios of our time. The objectives as well as the circumstances are vastly at variance, in fact divergent.

Shah Abdul Aziz's Fatwa

Once when Hadhrat Shah Abdul Aziz (Rahmatullah alayh) was giving a bayaan to his mureeds and some Ulama, two persons from the public entered and sought a fatwa. The one said: *"Today my friend drank water which was the left-over of an Englishman. What is the fatwa?"* Hadhrat Shah Sahib adopting a very sombre attitude said that since this issue was extremely delicate, it will take time to search for the fatwa. He told them to return for the fatwa after a couple of days. The audience consisting of Ulama, was surprised. The fatwa according to the Shariah is simple. If the kaafir's mouth was paak (taahir), the water remains paak, hence there was no concern. If his mouth was impure due to liquor or haraam food, then obviously the water was impure. Why did Shah Sahib adopt this strange strategy? But no one had the courage to question him.

On the appointed day, the two chaps came for their fatwa. Shah Sahib said: *"The fatwa is Tajdeed-e-Imaan (i.e. renewal of Imaan. By implication he had become a murtadd); Tajdeed-e-Nikah (renewal of his marriage)."* Shah Sahib furthermore prescribed some penances to be

performed as an expiation (kaffarah) for having drunk the water which had touched the lips of the Englishman. The two persons being sincere, were satisfied. They left and observed the prescription and the penalty.

When the surprised Ulama questioned Hadhrat Shah Sahibm, he responded: *“By this measure, I have saved their Imaan.”*

Muftis should reflect, apply their minds and not acquit themselves like morons enslaved to the nafs. The objective of fatwa is not to ruin the morals of Muslims and to open the avenue for fisq, fujoor, bid’ah and kufr. A Mufti should be far-sighted. He should be able to fathom the one who poses a question and not pander to the vagaries of people. But bootlicking has become an ingrained disease in the Ulama of today, in even the sincere ones, hence they all are in line for Allah’s Athaab. About them, the Qur’aan Majeed says:

“Beware of such a punishment which will overtake not only the transgressors among you.” It will overtake and utterly destroy even the molvis and the buzroogs who excelled in bootlicking and accommodating baatil.

The Akaabir Ulama did not argue that according to the Hanafi Math-hab as well as the other three Math-habs, there is no basis for the Fatwa of Shah Sahib. They did not aver stupidly that according to all four Math-habs, drinking the water of a non-Muslim was not kufr, hence the fatwa was baseless. Shah Sahib was not a moron as are the glut of today’s muftis who are depicted in the Kutub as persons gathering firewood in the bush in an

intensely dark night. They do not know if their hands are falling on snakes or faeces.

The stupidity of these molvis and muftis is shocking. Their myopic gaze is on the entry into the Musjid of the non-Muslims during the age of Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) while they are totally blind to the fisq, fujoor and kufr which the invited kuffaar perpetrate in the Musaajid nowadays.

Maulana Ashraf Ali Thanvi's Fatwa

Responding to a question pertaining to allowing non-Muslims entry into the Musajid, Hadhrat Maulana Ashraf Ali Thanvi (Rahmatullah alayh) said:

“....There is no need to enter into a discussion regarding bodies and souls of mushriks being najis or not. Generally the bodies of minors are najis. Now when it is haraam to allow even Muslim children into the Musjid, then how can permission be given to the kuffaar to enter the Musaajid. Besides the certitude of their najaasat there are also other factors of prohibition for allowing them into the Musaajid. Predominance of Najaasat on them is quite obvious, especially after they relieve themselves in the toilet. They do not adhere to tahaarat in this respect.....

(Imdaadul Fataawa, Vol.2)

All factors and circumstances have to be compulsorily taken into consideration when issuing a fatwa. It is not permissible to lapse into stupidity by simply tearing out of Hadith and Fiqh kutub narrations to justify and

legalize practices which are haraam and accompanied by evils. It is ludicrous for a mufti to ignore the haraam activities which accompany kuffaar entry into the Musaajid and to justify their entry with the Ahaadith which pertain to the entry of non-Muslims during the era of Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam). The mufti should open his eyes and brains to look at the whole picture.

The fundamental issue confronting us in this age is not the mere entry of non-Muslims. It is the *fisq*, *fujoor* and *kufr* which accompany such entry. This danger and evil did not exist during the age of Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam). There is no *daleel* whatsoever- not a single one – for permitting non-Muslims entry into the Musaajid in this age. The entry of the kuffaar *Wufood* is not at all an argument for bolstering the baseless permissibility view.

Among the Fuqaha of all Math-habs, there is considerable difference of opinion regarding the entry of a *junubi* non-Muslim. Despite the narrations of the *kuffaar wufood*, there is no unanimity on the permissibility view. Furthermore, the weak, decrepit permissibility view applies only if there are no accompanying haraam factors. There is no Faqeeh who has ever permitted kuffaar shenanigans inside the Musjid.

THE SAHAABAH'S ATTITUDE

Despite the uncertainty and conflicts in the views of the Ulama on this issue, there appears to be complete unanimity of the Sahaabah on the fact that it is not

permissible for a *junubi* (one in the state of *janaabat*) to enter the Musaaajid.

Hadhrat Abu Musa Al-Ash'ari (Radhiyallahu anhu) came to Hadhrat Umar (Radhiyallahu anhu) with his scribe. The writing of the scribe was very pleasing to Hadhrat Umar (Radhiyallahu anhu). Not being aware of the status of the scribe, Hadhrat Umar (Radhiyallahu anhu) said to Hadhrat Abu Musa Al-Ash'ari (Radhiyallahu anhu) to request his scribe to read *"for us"* (i.e. *for the Sahaabah*) a letter which was inside the Musjid. This letter had come from Shaam. Hadhrat Ash'ari said: *"He cannot enter the Musjid."* Surprised, Hadhrat Umar asked: *"Why –is he a junubi?"* Hadhrat Al-Ash'ari said: *"No, he is a Nasraani (a Christian)."* Then Hadhrat Umar severely reprimanded him, and slapped him (i.e. Abu Musa Al-Ash'ari) on the thigh.

Narrating this incident, Imaam Al-Baihqi (Rahmatullah alayh) states in *As-Sunanul Kubra*:

"Abu Musa (Radhiyallahu anhu) had a Nasraani kaatib (scribe). Umar (Radhiyallahu anhu) was pleased with the writing of the kaatib, hence he commented: 'Verily he (the kaatib) is an expert.' Then Umar said: 'Verily, we have a letter in the Musjid which has come from Shaam. Call him (the scribe) to read it.'

Abu Musa (Radhiyallahu anhu) said: 'He is unable to enter the Musjid.' Then Umar (Radhiyallahu anhu) exclaimed: 'What! Is he a junubi?' Abu Musa said: 'No, but he is a Nasraani.' Then Umar (Radhiyallahu anhu) rebuked him (Abu Musa) and struck him on his

thigh, and ordered: ‘Dismiss him!’ Then he (Hadhrat Umar) recited (the Qur’aanic Aayat): ‘O People of Imaan! Do not take the Yahood and Nasaara as friends. They are friends to one other. Whoever among you (Muslims) befriends them is of them. Verily, Allah does not guide people who are zaalimeen.’ (Al-Maaidah, Aayat 51)

Abu Musa (Radhiyallahu anhu) said: ‘By Allah! I have not befriended him. He only writes.’ Hadhrat Umar (Radhiyallahu anhu) said: ‘Could you not find from the People of Islam anyone to write for you? Do not bring them near, for Allah has distanced them. Do not trust them, for Allah has attributed treachery to them. Do not honour them after Allah has humiliated them. Therefore dismiss him.’”

It is most significant for this discussion and for the edification of the *maajin* muftis who mislead Muslims with their fatwas of *jahl*, that Hadhrat Abu Musa Al-Ash’ari (Radhiyallahu anhu), a very senior Sahaabah, believed that it was not permissible for his Christian scribe to enter the Musjid. This was despite the scribe not being a *junubi* as his response to Hadhrat Umar’s question confirms. It was the practice of the Aghl-e-Kitaab in that age to make ghusl-e-janaabat. Thus, Hadhrat Umar, thinking that the scribe was a Muslim, had asked in surprise: “*Is he a junubi?*”

The fact that the scribe was a Nasraani was sufficient for the prohibition of his entry into the Musjid, and this is despite Abu Musa’s awareness of the mushrik

delegations being allowed in the Musjid by Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam).

The mere fact of the scribe being a *Nasraani* was also a factor of proscription, hence Abu Musa (Radhiyallahu anhu), responded: *'He is a Nasraani.'* This emphasized the prohibition. In other words, kuffaar are not allowed in the Musjid. Hadhrat Umar (Radhiyallahu anhu) recited the Qur'aanic Verse on reprimanding and striking Hadhrat Abu Musa (Radhiyallahu anhu). This verse prohibits friendship with those whom Allah Ta'ala rejects. Therefore, the scribe was dismissed.

It is mentioned in *Ash-Sharhul Kabeer* by Ibn Qudaamah Al-Maqdisi that Umme Ghuraab narrated: ***“Ali (Radhiyallahu anhu) while on the Mimbar saw a Majoosi (Fire-Worshipper) inside the Musjid. Then he dismounted (from the Mimbar), beat the Majoosi and expelled him from the Doors of Kindah.”***

Attempting to reconcile Hadhrat Ali's action with the permission granted to the mushrikeen delegations by Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam), Ibn Qudaamah (Rahmatullah alayh), incongruently mentions that the delegation from Taa-if was allowed into the Musjid prior to them having accepted Islam. Therefore, according to Ibn Qudaamah, the correct version is that the kuffaar are allowed inside the Musjid with the permission of the Muslims. It must be stressed that this permission will apply only if there are no accompanying bootlicking factors of corruption.

However, this rationale is decrepit, in fact baseless. There is nothing in the episode of the beating and expulsion of the Majoosi by Hadhrat Ali (Radhiyallahu anhu) to substantiate the inference that the non-Muslim was inside the Musjid without the consent of the Muslims. In fact, the contrary is more probable. The Majoosi was in the Musjid to most probably listen to the bayaan. Furthermore, Hadhrat Ali (Radhiyallahu anhu) did not question the Majoosi. He beat and expelled the Fire-Worshipper. The sole ground for Hadhrat Ali's action was that the non-Muslim had no right to be inside the Musjid. Thus, the permissibility view stated by Ibn Qudaamah on behalf of the Hambali Math-hab, is illogical.

Hadhrat Abu Musa Al-Ash'ari, Hadhrat Umar and Hadhrat Ali (Radhiyallahu anhum) were unanimous in their stance of prohibiting non-Muslims from the Musaajid. This indicates the view of all the Sahaabah. The two factors of prohibition are the *najaasat of janaabat* and the *najaasat of kufr*, the latter being the greater one.

Ibn Qudaamah also mentioning the view of prohibition states:

"In this regard there is another view: 'There is no permission for them (the kuffaar) to enter the Musjid under any circumstances because Abu Musa came to Umar with a written record of his accounts..... Umar said: 'Call the one who had written it to read it.' Abu Musa said: 'He cannot not enter the Musjid.' Umar said: 'Why can he not enter the Musjid?' Abu Musa said:

‘He is a Nasraani.’ Then Umar rebuked him (Abu Musa).’

Further commenting, Ibn Qudaamah says: ***“This is Ittifaaq (unanimity) among them (the Fuqaha who prohibit kuffaar), that he (the kaafir) cannot enter the Musjid. In this (narration) is the daleel for the prominence (of this view) among them. The rationale for it (for the prohibition) according to them is that the impurity of haidh, janaabat and nifaas prevents being in the Musjid. To a greater degree does the impurity of shirk (prevent entry into the Musjid).”***

While according to Ibn Qudaamah, the ‘correct’ or ‘most correct’ view is the permissibility one, according to other Fuqaha, it is the prohibition view which is most correct hence they have adopted it.

In *Sharh Muntahil Iraadaat*, this mas’alah is explained as follows:

“It is not permissible for a kaafir to enter the Musjid even with the permission of a Muslim, for verily, Abu Musa... *(the narration of the Nasraani scribe)*. This indicates on their unanimity (*Ittifaaq*) that the kuffaar may not enter the Musjid because the impurity of haidh and janaabat prevent being in the Musjid. Thus, the impurity of kufr is more emphasized. Regarding the delegation of Thaqeef permitted by Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam), it was the probability of there being a need.”

This dire need has already been discussed earlier. In the Kitaab, *Haashiyah tur Raudhil Murabba' Sharh Zaadil Mustaqni'*:

“It is not permissible for a kaafir to enter a Musjid even if a Muslim permits him, because Abu Musa (Radhiyallahu anhu) came to Umar (Radhiyallahu anhu) with a scribe... (the same incident narrated above)...then Umar rebuked him, and because Ali (Radhiyallahu anhu) whilst on the mimbar saw a Majoosi (in the Musjid). Then he alighted from the mimbar, beat and expelled the Majoosi. This is the daleel on their Ittifaaq (unanimity) on the fact that the Kuffaar may not enter the Musajjid. And, also because the hadth (impurity) of janaabat and haidh prevents (entry into the Musjid). Thus, shirk applies to a greater degree (i.e. to a greater degree is it prohibited for mushrikeen to enter the Musjid).

Maalik and Ahmad said: ‘It is not permissible for them under any circumstances to enter the Musajjid.... And the Jamhoor are of the view of prohibition.’”

In *Al-Mausooatul Fiqhiyyah* it is mentioned: “According to the *Maalikiyyah* the kaafir shall be prevented from entering the Musjid even if a Muslim permits such entry. This (prohibition) applies when there is no need for artisans (builders and the like), and the Musjid is in need of this....

This view of the *Maalikiyyah* is a narration (also) according to the *Hanaabilah*. Ibn Qudaamah said: ‘It is not permissible for them under any circumstances to enter the Musjid.’”

THE HANAFI LATITUDE

The apparent laxity of the Hanafi Math-hab on this issue is not a licence for the perpetration of *fisq*, *fujoor* and *kufr* of the *kuffaar* in the *Musaajid* on the invitation of moron *molvis*, stupid *sheikhs* and the *zanaadaqah* of this era. The permission of the *Ahnaaf* based on the permission granted to the *mushrik Wufood* is a *fiqhi* technicality which has absolutely no validity for the *haraam* justification which the moron *ulama-e-soo'* of our age proffer for their bootlicking attitude which has brought about the desanctifying of the *Musaajid* with the acts of *fisq*, *fujoor* and *kufr* inside the *Musaajid*.

Instead of adopting the straightforward and simple *mas'alah* of prohibition based on the *najaasat of janaabat and the rijs of kufr and shirk*, the *mudhilleen* *molvis* and moron *sheikhs* resort to silly, legless labyrinthal arguments to justify misdeeds which are among the *kabaa-ir* sins and even *kufr*. Crooked and stupid arguments stem from the crookedness of the brains and corruption of the hearts.

If the issue was as simple as these deviates posit, namely, *kuffaar* today are permitted entry to the *Musjid* on the basis of the permission granted to the *mushrik* delegations by *Rasulullah* (*Sallallahu alayhi wasallam*), then there would not have existed the plethora of differences, trepidation and even confusion among the *Fuqaha* on this issue. Regardless of the initial permission which applied to an exceptional circumstance, the spectre of *janaabat and kufr/shirk* looms ominously in front of the *Fuqaha*. It is this spectre which has constrained the

weak and even incongruent interpretations and attempts of reconciliation.

But, as far as we are concerned in this era in close proximity to Qiyaamah, we are not in need of basing the prohibition on the primary factors of prohibition, namely, *janaabat and shirk*. The real issue with which the Ummah is today saddled in this regard, is the evil which is committed inside the Musjid by non-Muslims at the invitation of moron molvis and stupid sheikhs. The fatwa of *hurmat* for the *fitnah* and *fasaad* is not reliant of the factors of *janaabt and kufr*. Even if Muslims perpetrate such haraam villainy of *fisq, fujoor* and *kufr* in the Musaajid, they too have to be compulsorily prevented.

In this era of boundless *fitnah* and *fasaad* the Imaan of the vast majority of the Ummah dangles on a thread. Imaan has been extinguished from the hearts of billions of Muslims of this era. This disastrous state is being exacerbated by the haraam, stupid fatwas of *mudhilleen maaqjin* muftis. The evil of hugging and embracing kuffaar has led to interfaith dialogue (i.e. acceptance of *kufr, shirk* and *atheism*) in Musjids. The Imaan of the ignorant masses – Imaan already emaciated to the point of extinction – is further threatened by this wholesale haraam shaitaani embrace of kuffaar inside the Musaajid which are supposed to be our bastions of Ibaadat for cultivating Taqwa.

The Usool of the Shariah indicate and confirm prohibition. If the morons are so desirous of introducing kuffaar to the Musaajid on the basis of the *Wufood*

Ahaadith, then it devolves on them to create the very same scenario which had prevailed in the time of Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) when he allowed the mushrikeen into the Musjid to submit to Islam and to embrace Islam. It was the prelude to the expulsion of every single kaafir from Jazeeratul Arab. These mudhilleen molvis are like the Yahood about whom Allah Ta'ala castigatingly says:

“They are great listers of falsehood and devourers of haraam.”
(Al-Maaidah, Aayat 42)

There is absolutely no permission in the Hanafi Math-hab nor in any other Math-hab for the haraam scenarios and villainous perpetrations with which the Musajjid are today being desanctified, and the Imaan of the *awaamun naas* ruined.

From the Hadith of Abu Musa (Radhiyallahu anhu), two facts emerge: (1) The Christian was not in the state of janaabat since it was their religious obligation to be in the state of Tahaarat. (2) He was not allowed into the Musjid because he was a Christian. Hadhrat Al-Ash'ari (Radhiyallahu anhu), Hadhrat Umar (Radhiyallahu anhu) and the other Sahaabah were fully aware of the kuffaar delegations who were allowed into the Musjid by Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam), but despite this awareness, they did not deem it permissible to allow the Christian scribe to enter the Musjid although he was not in the state of janaabat. This episode should be adequate for those seeking the truth.

The Weakness of the Arguments

The arguments for bolstering the permissibility view, i.e. junubi non-Muslim entry into the Masjid minus the other factors, are also confusing and decrepit. There is considerable *ikhtilaaf* among the Fuqaha of all Math-habs on the question of permitting junubi non-Muslims into the Masjid despite acknowledging that such non-Muslims were allowed in the Masjid by Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam). The issue of their *janaabat* and *najaasat* looms in the background, hence the doubt and uncertainty in the views of the Fuqaha and Ulama.

If the issue was clear and simple on the basis of non-Muslims having been allowed to enter the Masjid during the era of Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam), there would not have been the considerable *ikhtilaaf* among the Fuqaha.

There is no difference of the Math-habs on the prohibition of a junubi entering the Masjid. Even one without wudhu may not enter the Masjid. Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) said:

“Close the doors (of the Masjid for the junubi), for verily I do not make it halaal for a junubi nor for a haaidhah.”

While the Hanafi Fuqaha do say that the *Zimmis* (non-Muslim citizens of the Islamic state) may enter the Masjid, Imaam Shaafi’ says that it is not permissible for them to enter Masjidul Haraam in particular. According to Imaam Maalik (Rahmatullah alayh), the Qur’aanic Aayat describes the Mushrikeen as ‘*najis*’, and since it is

Waajib to protect the Musaajid from *najis*, they should not be allowed in the Musaajid. The Hanafi daleel is the *Wufood* of the kuffaar having been allowed into the Musjid. We have already discussed this issue at length in the foregoing pages.

Further, Imaam Maalik (Rahmatullah alayh) says that it is not permissible for the kuffaar to enter any Musjid. The prohibition is not restricted to Musjidul Haraam because the kuffaar do not make ghusl-e-janaabat. The junubi has to be prevented from the Musjid. The rationale of *najaasat and janaabat* applies to all Musaajid. This is the Maaliki *daleel*. In terms of the most authentic narration, Imaam Ahmad Bin Hambal (Rahmatullah alayh) concurs with Imaam Maalik. Nevertheless, the existence of a contrary view indicates the uncertainty.

Once Hadhrat Ali (Radhiyallahu anhu) whilst on the mimbar saw a Majusi (Fire-Worshipper) inside the Musjid. He alighted from the mimbar, beat the Majusi and expelled him from the Musjid.

One Shaafi' view is that if the non-Muslim is in the state of janaabat, he will be prevented from the Musjid. In *Al-Majmoo'* it is mentioned:

"There are two views (in the Shaafi' Math-hab) if he (the non-Muslim) is in the state of janaabat, the One view is that he will be prohibited being inside because when a Muslim junubi is prevented, then preventing a mushrik junubi will apply to a greater degree."

According to the other Shaafi view, the mushrik junubi may enter. In *Rawdhatut Taalibeen* it also appears:

“If he (the non-Muslim) seeks permission to sleep and eat (in the Musjid), he shall not be given permission.”

This view is neutralized by the fact that the mushrikeen of Thaqeef slept and ate inside the Musjid. On what basis has the Shaafi’ Fuqaha made this distinction? While we do not reject the validity of this view, we mention it to show that circumstances dictate changes in the rules and even in occurrences which took place during the time of Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam).

It is also said in *Rawdhatut Taalibeen*:

“If he seeks permission to listen to the Qur’aan or to Ilm, he shall be permitted hoping that he will accept Islam. (However) all of this is when he is not in the state of janaabat.”

However, in another view of the Shaafi Fuqaha, he shall not be prevented. But *“the non-Muslim female in haidh shall be prohibited just as a Muslim female is prevented. Similarly, children and the insane will be prevented from entering the Musjid.”*

No distinction is made between a non-Muslim female in haidh and a Muslim female. Both are prohibited on the grounds of impurity. This should be applied equally to non-Muslim males as well. Their impurity of janaabat is the same. This ruling highlights the discrepancy.

In Fataawa Mahmudiyyah of Mufti Mahmudul Hasan (Rahmatullah alayh), the following question and answer appear:

Q. If a non-Muslim man or woman enters the Musjid and it is not known if he/she is *paak* (clean/pure), will entry be permissible?

A. As long as there is no awareness of them being *napaak* (impure), and also if there is no other harm or corruption, then it will be permissible.

In this fatwa, the venerable Mufti Sahib basis the permissibility on them being *paak*. It logically follows that according to him they are not *paak* and if their entry results in corruption, then it will not be permissible to allow them in the Musjid. This argument is decrepit. In terms of the popular argument which is tendered for permissibility, viz. the entry of the kuffaar delegations during the time of Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam), the mushrikeen were all *naapaak* (impure – in the state of *janaabat*). So, on what basis did the honourable Mufti create a distinction?

While the *mafsadah* (corruption) he mentions is a valid reason, the reason of impurity is untenable because the Ahaadith is proffered as the basis for permission. These Ahaadith confirm the *najaasat* of the mushrikeen. Despite this, our senior Muftis maintain that if the impure state of the kuffaar is known, they may not be permitted entry.

Regarding awareness of their condition, it is self-deceptive to feign that the state of *janaabat* of the kuffaar,

all kuffaar whether Christians, Jews, Hindus or of any brand, of this era is unknown. There is 100% certitude that they are in the state of janaabat. Furthermore, they are soiled with faeces. It is not their practice to cleanse themselves in the toilet with water. Hadhrat Maulana Ashraf Ali Thanvi (Rahmatullah alayh) has made mention of this fact.

The following is another question and answer in *Fataawa Mahmudiyyah*:

Q. How is it to invite non-Muslims to attend a Nikah inside the Musjid. May they be brought into the Musjid?

A. No, they should not. (*End of the Mufti's answer*)

Now why should the non-Muslims not be allowed to attend a Nikah of their friends or Muslim relatives when the Muftis claim permissibility on the basis of the Hadith? The fatwas and arguments to bolster these fatwas are all incongruent.

The following question and answer appear in *Fataawa Daarul Uloom Deoband*:

Q. If a kaafir comes into the Musjid with the intention of listening to the lecture, what should be done?

A. If a kaafir comes to the Musjid clean and with **ghusl**, then he should not be prevented. (*End of the Mufti's answer*)

Thus it is quite obvious that according to our Akaabir Ulama, a non-Muslim in the state of janaabat may not be allowed into the Musjid. This fatwa is clearly in conflict with the initial permission during the time of Rasulullah

(Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) when the mushrik kuffaar delegations were allowed into the Musjid. In reality, there is no conflict. The times and circumstances have changed. It is to be viewed in the same light as the prohibition for Muslim women to come to the Musjid for Salaat, which was a practice permitted during the era of Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam).

The reason why the *maajin* muftis fail to understand circumstances and the *fitnah* of these times is because of spiritual blindness. Describing such blindness, the Qur'aan Majeed says:

“Verily, the (physical) eyes are not blind, but the hearts within the breasts are blind.” (Al-Hajj, Aayat 47)

The *Ijma'* of the Sahaabah and the Fuqaha of all Four Math-habs on the prohibition of females attending the Musjid despite the permissibility during the age of Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) and during the era of Hadhrat Abu Bakr's khilaafate, and during the initial period of Hadhrat Umar's khilaafat should more than adequately open up the blind eyes of the heart and defossilize the incorrigibility of the brains to understand why in this era of *fitnah*, *fasaad*, *fisq*, *fujoor* and *kufr*, non-Muslims should not be permitted entry into the Musajjid, especially when such permission entails even *kufr* inside the Musjid. There can be no conundrum for the sincere seekers of the Haqq in this prohibition. How is it possible for a Mu'min of healthy Imaan even if he is not an Aalim, to accept that it can be permissible for a kaafir priest to propagate Christianity to the musallis inside the Musjid? How can any Muslim who is not a

zindeeq or a *munaafiq*, ever accept that it can ever be permissible for kuffaar to sing songs of *shirk* inside the Musjid? How is it possible to accept that it can be permissible to allow droves of kuffaar tourists, men and women lewdly dressed to saunter into the Musjid and sit in the Musjid with fussaag/fujjaar Muslim males staring lasciviously at the women?

How can all these vile acts of fisq, fujoor and kufr ever be justified on the basis of the non-Muslim delegations allowed into the Musjid by Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam)? All the tribes whom the delegations represented entered into the fold of Islam and were instrumental in carrying the Torch of Islam to the shores of the Atlantic in the West, and to the Walls of China in the East.

These delegations did not enter the Musjid to propagate their kufr and shirk. They came in subservience while Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) and the Sahaabah were in a position of dominance. There was no bootlicking, and Muslims were not seeking aid and refuge with the kuffaar. The entire Arabia by Allah's command had to be brought under Islamic domination. The delegations constituted a vital step in this direction. All kuffaar had to be compulsorily expelled from the Arabian peninsula. Not the slightest semblance of bootlicking by the Muslims accompanied the entry of the *Wufood* into the Musjid.

A SIGNIFICANT QUERY OF THE SAHAABAH

When Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) allowed the mushrikeen delegation of Banu Thaqeefah into the Musjid, the Sahaabah expressed surprise and commented on the *najaasat* (*janaabat*) of the mushrikeen. This surprise confirms that people of *janaabat* were not permitted inside the Musjid. If this was not the case, the surprise of the Sahaabah would have been meaningless.

That our Nabi (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) acted contrary to the rule, further confirms that it was an exceptional case for which he had Allah's permission, and that it was not the norm or the permanent rule for all time. It is precisely on these grounds that our Akaabir Ulama stipulate that the entry of the kuffaar must be conditioned with *tahaarat*, i.e. they must take ghusl first.

Some muftis, even senior ones, due to some personal persuasion and inclination to some worldly objective, e.g. political goals, or the nafsani crave for aggrandizement or love for wealth, pretend to be stupid, hence they aver that as long as the *janaabat* of the mushrikeen is not known, they should be allowed into the Musjid. These muftis, even the very senior ones lack *Khauf-e-Ilaahi*. They are extremely deficient in Taqwa. Therefore they disgorge this absurd drivel. Every Tom, Dick, Harry and Jane know that the Hindus and Christians, and all mushrikeen in this era do not submit to the law of ghusl-e-janaabat. Thus the onus of proving that they are NOT in the state of *janaabat* lies squarely on the moron muftis who venture such claims of *jahl*.

We do not understand why they are so audacious in their proclamation of nonsense. When the fear of Allah Ta'ala is not in the heart and when Qiyaamat is so extremely remote in their minds, then their belief in this fundamental of Islam borders on *kufr*. A mufti who has a valid understanding and a real perception of Maut, Qabr and Qiyaamat will issue fatwas with the greatest of circumspection and trepidation. But these *maajin* muftis among whom are even some seniors, blurt out just any *nafsaaniyat* which they bolster with just any Hadith torn out of its context and divorcing it from its original scenario and circumstances. The fatwas of the glut of *maajin* muftis of today are compounded rubbish.

There is a difference of heaven and earth between Rasulullah's permission to the mushrik delegations, and the invitations which the juhala of our age extend to the kuffaar to enter the Musjid to perpetrate their fisq, fujoor and kufr. Just as there was such a mammoth difference between women attending the Musjid during the age of Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) and women attending the Musaajid in our era. Only those whose brains are overwhelmed with *ghabaawat* (*morosity of the worst kind*) degenerate to this extremely low ebb of deception and stupidity by presenting the Ahaadith to justify the current conditions of fisq, fujoor and kufr.

A Mufti who lacks in Taqwa is not fit to issue Fatwa. It is haraam for him to be in the Department of Ifta. Such a character is *hufaalah* (*chaff, waste, rubbish*). Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) said:

“The Saalihoon are departing (from this dunya) one after the other (in quick succession). Then there will remain only the hufaalah (the waste/chaff/rubbish) such as the hufaalah of barley or dates. Allah will not have the slightest care for them.”

CONCLUSION

The purpose of the Musaajid is ONLY *ibaadat* – pure *ibaadat*. The slightest divergence from pure *ibaadat* prohibits the activity in the Musjid. Thus, according to the Hanafi Math-hab, even the Janaazah Salaat is not permissible in the Musjid. Pure, chaste, taahir Muslim women are not permitted in the Musjid. How then can it ever be permissible to allow kuffaar, impure, unchaste women wallowing in janaabat and haidh in the Musjid?

The prohibition based on *janaabat* takes precedence even if there is no *fitnah* in allowing impure non-Muslims in the Musjid. Allowing them in the Musjid to commit fisq, fujoor and kufr is absolutely haraam according to all Math-habs even if the kuffaar is imagined to be paak (taahir, ceremoniously clean). But this imagination in this era is pure satanic hallucination.

The Ahaadith pertaining to the mushrik delegations are NOT a valid basis for the blanket disgorgement of permissibility for the kuffaar in our age. The permissibility during the age of Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) applied to an exceptional scenario, and may not be extended to the haraam shenanigans being perpetrated today in the Musaajid by kuffaar at the behest of zindeeq ‘muslims’ and moron ‘muftis’.

Just as the Ahaadith regarding the initial permission for women to perform Salaat in the Musjid cannot be cited as a basis for permissibility in our age, so too will it be impermissible to justify non-Muslim entry into the Musajid today on the basis of the *Wufood* Ahaadith.

The considerable difference of opinion among the Fuqaha of all Math-habs on this issue of permissibility confirms the absolute weakness of the grounds cited for the permissibility.

The initial permissibility is prescribed with conditions which are totally lacking in today's scenarios of kuffaar entry into the Musajid.

It is haraam – totally haraam – according to ALL Four Math-habs to allow non-Muslims into the Musjid in these times of *fitnah* and *fasaad*. Muslims are bootlicking their Imaan away. They are being called on to wear crosses to show shaitaani 'solidarity' with Christians. They are called on to abandon Islam for the satanism of kufr 'solidarity'.

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

“O People of Imaan! If you follow those who commit kufr (who are kuffaar), they will turn you on your heels (away from your Deen). Then you will become the losers. But, Allah is your Friend, and He is the best of helpers.”
(Aal-e-Imraan, 149 and 150)