

## Ruling on the Entering of Disbelievers Belonging to Political Parties in the West to Support Their Own in the Mosques of the Muslims.

Dr. Tariq Abdelhaleem

October 10, 2023 – Rabi' Al-Awwal 25 1445

Praise be to God and prayers and peace be on the Prophet Mohammed ﷺ.

Indeed, God has certainly tested this nation and its children with great trials and with innumerable oppressive probations. From them are those specific to western countries and specific to the Muslim minority that which resides in them.

Perhaps the crux here is to emphasize the indelible ruling of Sharia from the narration of the Prophet ﷺ, *“The Messenger of Allah ﷺ sent an expedition to Khath'am. Some people sought protection by having recourse to prostration and were hastily killed. When the Prophet ﷺ heard that, he ordered half the blood-wit to be paid for them, saying: I am not responsible for any Muslim who stays among polytheists. They asked: Why, Messenger of Allah? He said: Their fires should not be visible to one another.*

The hadith was narrated with continuity and a chain of transmission. It has been deemed authentic by Albani and its meaning is certainly correct.

\*\*\*\*\*

(1)

**It is from consensus that allyship and disassociation are a part of Tawheed. Considered by some as a pillar and as a condition by others. It is thus imperative for the establishment of Tawheed.**

To elucidate, it is the championship of the believers to their faith with loyalty and the resentment of the polytheists to their polytheism with disassociation. Before I legislate in the explanation, I wish to emphasize that the acts of disassociation are greater in degree from the acts of allyship. This principle is derived from the saying of the Prophet ﷺ, *“Avoid that which I forbid you to do and do that which I commanded you to do to the best of your capacity”* (Narrated in Muslim). The evidence here is that rejecting is chief over the implementation of a general action (الترك مقدم على الفعل بإطلاق). That is why the verses were mentioned regarding the refusal of polytheism then the abidance of Tawheed, *“So, whosoever disbelieves in Taghut, and believes in God, has certainly grasped (it) with a firm hold”* (Surah Al-Baqarah 256).

Thus, allyship and disassociation are of two types: Allyship and disassociation of disbelief, and allyship and disassociation of disobedience (mere sin).

The first of which, **allyship and disassociation of disbelief** (ولاء وبراء المكفر), is what depends on acts of allyship and assistance for other Muslims. Such acts include spying, revealing their plans, the destruction of their places of worship, the misguiding of their descendants, etc. So, loyalty tantamount to disbelief is like the one who sides with a disbelieving group whose agenda is against Islam, who harbors animosity towards the believers, who spreads atheistic culture, who strives in the distortion of Islamic beliefs, who attempts to sabotage Islamic culture like that which is seen today by dint of spreading perversion in schools, etc. Disassociation against the aforementioned actions must come in the form of verbal or physical opposition against those groups of spies, in the exposing of the spies' plans, in the exposing of the plans of the disbelieving parties and the states that act as such, and in the renouncing of their politics that which is built on disbelief. However, if one shall not, then let silence be best, for as the saying of the Prophet ﷺ, *“He who believes in God and the last day must either speak good or remain silent”* (Narrated in Riyad-As-Salihin).

As for the second of which, **allyship and disassociation other than disbelief or that of mere sin** (ولاء وبراء المعصية), it falls under the dealings between individuals, and not between organizations, governmental agencies, or public institutions, or those who deal with the general public. For example, a believer favors a disbeliever in a matter of trade over another believer where all things are equal, or in a matter of employment, or aiding a disbeliever over a believer in a case of in which the believer will be harmed or come at a loss.

Failing to pay heed to this distinction between the two types of allyship and disassociation will result in a state of predominant ignorance which can only bring about great creedal errors.

(2)

### **The situation of the Muslim minorities in the west governed by the laws of disbelief.**

The Muslim communities in the west live in societies among those that practice Christianity and Judaism, all under laws of disbelief, submitting to it in spite of the Sharia. This situation must be tentative and not perpetual. For if a land cannot be found that rules by the Sharia, then the intention must be made to leave.

So, what is obligatory upon those minorities is to be cautious about what they follow in those lands and what actions they consider permissible. Any confusion between these situations can be very easy and dangerous at the same time.

As for what is of matters of worship, there is no room for concessions or compromises as their positions in Sharia are immutable.

And as for what is in regard to dealings, there are two sides. The first of which has firm evidence and established Fatwas, so there is no right to follow the laws of the land in any case. The second allows for Ijtihad of a text depending on the situation. These matters must be brought back to capable jurists (الفقهاء) who have expertise in Islamic jurisprudence (فقه), its fundamentals (أصول الفقه), jurisprudence of calamities (فقه النوازل), understanding of the general spreading of adversity

(عموم البلوى), and are familiar with the subtleties of life in the west. Therefore, this falls under *specific Ijtihad* (الاجتهاد الخاص)<sup>1</sup>. An individual must choose carefully the one whom he allows to judge his case, making sure that he has the aforesaid attributes. Mistakes and carelessness in that regard are the reason for great error. In fact, we have already seen great faults due to that flaw, like the Fatwas of some Saudi jurists in the allowing of America to enter the Arabian Peninsula to oppose Saddam Hussein. The result of those Fatwas led to naught except permanent military bases in the region for the Americans and the destruction of the east.

(3)

**It must be known that one matter can fall under two different rulings depending on the reality of the situation.**

The meaning of that is that an action or behavior may be prohibited in one situation but be made permissible in another due to unforeseen circumstances. For every original ruling there is an exceptional one. For instance, the drinking of alcohol holds an original ruling of impermissibility, however, in times of necessity, the emergency ruling comes into play. As God Almighty says, “*But, whosoever is forced due to hunger and not an inclination to sin, then indeed, God is Forgiving and Merciful*” (Surah Al-Maidah 3). It is worth mentioning that an exceptional ruling does not warrant inordinate actions, rather, only what is necessary. So, going back to the example of alcohol, it is verboten for the desiccated drinker to drink except in a manner that removes the threat of death, and not to completely quench his thirst. This is according to the rules in the fundamentals of jurisprudence (أصول الفقه) “*necessities are evaluated according to what they require*” (الضرورات تقدر بقدرها).

(4)

**The Idol that is public interest (المصلحة).**

It is one of the most salient afflictions that befell the Muslim community in these unfortunate days of ours. The taking of the “public interest” as a primary and fundamental source of legislation (تشريع) is a great tribulation. It has become a deity worshipped and obeyed unaccompanied by any cross-referencing with texts, methods of legal theory, or legal reasoning according to Ahlu-Sunnah. This tribulation has surfaced due to the prioritization of reason over transmission, rational over the transmitted without an effort to reconcile the two, and the neglect of texts in the first place.

I shall not here introduce an explanation of Islamic public interest (المصلحة) and its conditions for that is a broad topic about which I have written separate books. Nevertheless, I will refer to specific conditions relevant to the topic. They are that there must not be an opposing text or a general opposing rule lest it be considered a violation of correct jurisprudential reasoning. The

---

<sup>1</sup> The Reconciliation of the Fundamentals of Islamic Law by Ash-Shatibi. (الموافقات في أصول الشريعة, الشاطبي).

interest sought must be an actuality and not imaginary, and a current reality and not something hoped for.

Another point worth mentioning is in response to those who use public interest (المصلحة) to justify their doings.

They say, *The Sharia came as a benefit for God's slaves.*

They say, *And what we say about the bringing of the politicians is that in it is a benefit for God's slaves.*

And ultimately, they conclude, *it is thusly from the Sharia.*

Their lies and inventions against God are clear. **Invariably, what is in Sharia is the public interest, not what they judge with their reasoning and desires to be an interest.**

They say, *Wherever the public interest is found, the Sharia is found.*

We and our righteous predecessors say, *Wherever the Sharia is found, the public interest is found.*

To explicate that, the Sharia is itself and all its prescriptions in the interests of the people. Those who wish to follow their desires have transposed the two, making it permissible for them to legislate whatever they will. One must use the laws of Sharia as a reference for their decisions, if he finds something to be impermissible, then impermissible it is.

It is as if the words of God almighty have come true between us and them, “*And indeed, we or you are either upon guidance or in clear error*” (Surah Saba 24).

Indeed, this is a difference stemming from opposition and divergence from the will of God, not one of diversity and continuance.

(5)

### **Inviting polytheist politicians to publicize their agendas in Mosques.**

From the above, we shall present the ruling on this matter. Then, shall follow its grounds and rationale.

**Inviting polytheist politicians to publicize their parties and agendas in Mosques is a prohibited criminal act according to the Sharia. It is most erroneous for such to be carried out by the body of a m**

**osque in which people pray to God Almighty and the Quran is recited. It is a considerable act of disobedience, a great sin, and a wide door to corruption for the Muslim communities in the lands of disbelievers. It is an action that may amount to the disbelief of an individual depending on his intention, whether or not he is content or pleased with such an action and its purpose.**

Grounds for the ruling:

1. God says, *“And that the Mosques are only for God, so do not call on anyone but God”* (Surah Al-Jinn 18),

Al-Qurtubi says in his exegesis (تفسير) of verse 36 of Surah An-Noor:

“Point six: Mosques have also been protected from selling, buying, and work altogether. This is from the saying of the Prophet ﷺ to the man who called looking for his red camel in the Mosque, *‘May you not find it, for Mosques have only been built for what they were built (i.e., prayer; remembrance, etc.)’*. Muslim extracted this from the statement of Sulayman son of Baridah from his father that the Prophet ﷺ said, *‘May you not find it, for Mosques have only been built for what they were built (i.e., prayer; remembrance, etc.)’*. This indicates that the fundament is that there is not to be done in a mosque except prayer, remembrance of God, and the reciting of the Quran. Furthermore, an explanation has come from the saying of Anas, *‘While we were in the mosque with the Messenger of God ﷺ a Bedouin came and began to urinate in the mosque. So, the Companions of the Prophet ﷺ said ‘Stop, Stop!’.* The Prophet ﷺ said to them *‘Do not interrupt him but leave him.’* So, they left him until he finished, then the Prophet ﷺ called on him and said, *‘These Mosques are not suitable places for urine and filth, but are only for remembrance of God, and recitation of Quran.’* After that, the narrator said, *‘Then, the Prophet ﷺ ordered one of the men who came with a bucket of water to pour it over.’* And this is evidenced by the saying in the book of truth *‘and his name be mentioned therein’* (Surah Noor 36). And its also evidenced by the saying of the Prophet ﷺ to Mu’awiya son of Hakam, *‘No talk to others is suitable in these mosques. Rather, only the glorifying of God, declaring His greatness, and recitation of Quran.’* This statement was narrated by Muslim in its entirety, and so it should suffice you. Then is the story of ‘Umar ibn Al-Khattab when he heard the voice of a man in the mosque, so he said, *‘What is this sound? Do you know where you are!?’* Khalaf ibn Ayyub was concurrently sitting in the mosque when his son came to him and asked him a question. He then stood and left the mosque and responded to him. He then said, *‘I do not utter in the mosque the talk of this world (Dunya). So, I should hate to speak today.’*<sup>2</sup>

Moreover, is the authentic statement of the Prophet ﷺ, *“Whosoever hears a man inquiring about something he has lost, he should say: ‘May God not return it to you,’ for mosques are not built for this purpose. (Narrated by Muslim).*

And from what follows came the laws of contracts and its plight if they are done in mosques: Imam Ahmed and Abu Dawud both narrated from Omar son of Shu’ayb, from his father, from his grandfather that he said, *“The Messenger of God ﷺ prohibited buying and selling in the mosque.”* This hadith has been authenticated by Tirmidhi in his collection, by Imam An-Nawawi in Riyad As-Salihin, and by Ibn Hajar in Nataiju Al-Afkar. (نتائج الأفكار). And the majority of scholars have said that it is a prohibition of hate,

---

<sup>2</sup> Tafsir Al-Qurtubi, Surah An-Noor, verse 36, volume 11-12, Print of دار الكتاب العربي 1967, page 269.

and the buying or selling is correct in spite of it being hated. However, the Hanbalis consider it forbidden.

I do not want to expand on this point more than that for the point of the proofs is clear. It is that if buying and selling – which are originally permitted – are prohibited and hated in mosques, so what say you regarding the entering of disbelievers so they may stand next to the pulpit (minbar) of the beloved Prophet ﷺ, propagating their ideology and their opinions those which may conform with what we believe on a few matters, but the majority of guidance is disagreed upon.

Could it be that a sane Sunni Muslim believes such a thing?

2. Alignment or standing with the polytheists and disbelievers in their programs, or political campaigns is of two types: The first of which is alignment that carries with it satisfaction and agreement with what is done by the disbelievers in their campaigns and such. This renders a person a disbeliever with no disagreement amongst Muslim scholars. As for one who intends to spread a belief that is in their campaigns and propaganda that which aligns with a certain understanding of Sharia, then this action is a prohibited sinful act of alliance because it casts a false idea amongst the Muslim public of the legitimacy of these parties, what they represent, and the rest of their programs. Most importantly, this matter will not be free from the layman who is deceived by those who align themselves politically with the disbelievers and they go and vote for them without any inspection of Islamic Law.
3. As for the act of voting for the disbelievers in general, the act itself is an act of disbelief and is strictly prohibited<sup>3</sup>, no two saying about it. This is because it entails acceptance

---

<sup>3</sup> Refer to the answer of Al-Albani when asked regarding this issue:

سؤال: ما هو حكم المشاركة بعض المسلمين الأمريكان في التصويت لإنتخاب رئيس أمريكا، مستندين في ذلك على قاعدة أخف الضررين، متوهمين “ أن واحدا من هؤلاء الرؤساء مرشحين سيكون أخف وطأة وأقل بأسا على الإسلام والمسلمين

جواب: الكفر ملة واحدة. وربنا غز وجل يذكر هؤلاء المسلمين الذين يظنون أنهم يطبقون قاعدة أخف الضررين، قال تعالى: "ولن ترضى عنك اليهود ولن نصارى حتى تتبع ملتهم." وأنا أعجب، فأعجب كل العجب من هؤلاء الشباب الذين يرددون إلى مثل هذا الوهم كما جاء في سؤالك، بارك الله فيك. والله غز وجل يقول: "ولا تركنوا إلى الذين ظلموا فتمسكم النار." نار الدنيا قبل نار الآخرة. ولذلك نحن نقول لا يجوز المشاركة في مثل هذه الانتخابات، لأن المشاركة تعني موالة العملية للكفار، ولذلك محرم بنص القرآن حيث قال رب الأنام، "ومن يتولهم منكم فإنه منهم.

Question: What is the ruling of Muslims participating in the voting of the elections for the American presidency? The supporters of that learn on the principle of taking the lesser of two evils. They envisage that one of these candidates will end up lightening the pressure and being less oppressive on Islam and Muslims.

Answer: Disbelief is one religion. Our lord reminds those Muslims who think that they are applying the principle of taking the lesser of two evils, He says, *"and never will the Jews or Christians approve of you until you follow their religion"* (Surah Al-Baqarah 120). So, I am extremely amazed at these youth who rely upon delusions like this that came in your question, God bless you. And God says, *"and do not incline towards those who do wrong, lest you be touched by the fire"* (Surah Hud 113). The fire of the Dunya before the fire of the hereafter. Due to that, we that it is impermissible to participate in the likes of these elections because participation entails taking the disbelievers as

and satisfaction with man-made laws legislated in the west by the disbelievers. However, it does not render the doer a disbeliever if he is ignorant on the matter. If he has been made known of the reality of the issue, and should it be that he insists on the matter and is in deference with its entailments, then he has committed Greater Shirk and is a disbeliever. It came in Sahih Muslim *“You will have rulers some of whom you approve and some of whom you disapprove. He who dislikes them will have disassociated himself, and he who denounces them will be safe. But he who is pleased and follows them...”* (Narrated by Muslim). It can be extracted from this hadith that patronage (المتابعة) and contentness (رضًا) have a biconditional relationship. It cannot be said that they can occur separately. Hatred was mentioned on its own and described with disassociation without patronage. Denunciation was mentioned also on its own and described with safety. Thus, nothing remains except the combination of the two remaining matters (being patronage and contentness) as its description and judgment go hand in hand. One cannot claim that they are not content with and do not accept western forms of government while simultaneously being a patron of those same governments. Furthermore, the ruling of shirk on the layman may also be waived from the doubts casted by the fatwas of the misguided scholars.

4. As for whoever argues with a text coming from Ibn Uthaymin or some of the jurists of the peninsula, it must be known – as it was stated in point number two – that there have been many egregious mistakes that came from scholars, whose knowledge is not doubted, throughout Islamic jurisprudential history. Rather, it would be difficult to even quantify it. It is the case that the jurists of the peninsula are the last to be taken from in matters regarding the west because of their degree of distance and separation from its ways of life and even its news and media. Therein are too many things ludicrous to even mention.

Over and above that, we must carry out the examination of the context of the statement, for this examination is a part of this Fatwa.

Indeed, those jurists were speaking about entering, running for, participating in, or voting for parliamentary ostensibly democratic systems in the Middle East whose lands are originally based on Islam and whose entire populations are Muslims. Then, an element of disbelief had entered the realm of rule and is limited to legislative councils. The disbelief is not applied to the society as a whole except with the Khawarij. So, the general ruling is that the people are Muslims, including those who put themselves up for candidacy and other involvement with the pseudo government. This is justified by the principle in Islamic law *“Punishments are waived when doubts are present”* (الحدود تدرأ بالشبهات). Note that there is another opinion which says that those who do such actions even in Muslim countries are committing acts of disbelief. In any case, our issue is not regarding this situation, rather it is regarding lands of original certain disbelief and legislative councils in those lands, where the overwhelming majority are disbelievers, where they are

---

allies. And this is prohibited according to text from the Quran where the Lord of mankind says, *“and whoever is an ally to them among you, then indeed, he is one of them.”*

determined on their disbelief, that that disbelief is being called for in their lands, and where they have become religious on their disbelief or have resorted to atheism. In addition, they are in complete agreement with the man-made laws which are being implemented there, with no exception. So, how can a rational person hold to the sayings of someone from the scholars of the peninsula? No one, except a man of desire.

5. Then there is who says, *but the basic principle regarding things is that they are permissible. We say, this is the transgression of an ignorant man, for that only applies to that about which is no textual evidence with prohibition.* And we have responded to that in what has preceded.
6. As for what we cited in clause one with respect to not residing among the polytheists, how can a rational person conflate the matter of not abiding with polytheists and disbelievers except by necessity, an urgent purpose, or a temporary purpose, and calling on the disbelievers to promote their principles and campaigns for nothing except votes.

If someone says: As long as we are already here, why don't we participate to benefit ourselves? We say: refer to point number three above, for indeed whosoever lives here, is doing so because of an exception until he departs. And if he resides therein until his days are spent and did so out of necessity, then it is not permitted for him to take from any of the means of life politically except what sustains life and does not increase, and it cannot go beyond the level of improvement in any case.

7. Some people use as evidence the story of the Najran delegation that came in some of the biographical books.

This event was not mentioned in any of the six authentic books, nor the collection of Al-Tabari, nor in Musnad Ahmed, nor in any collection or authentic book for that matter. Rather, it was narrated in the books of biography, which are unreliable as a source of Hadith. Moreover, the scholars have agreed that this hadith is weak and that it cannot be used for evidentiary purposes. So, we do not need to debunk such an argument any further.<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>4</sup> Anyways, lest we reinvent the wheel, we shall provide a comprehensive response to it which has come from the website Islam Question and Answer. It follows:

Praise be to God.

**First: Commenting on the authenticity of the story of the prayer of the Najran Christian delegation.**

The report on the prayer of the Najran Christian delegation in the Prophet's Mosque ﷺ is weak, its chain of transmission is not authentic, and it cannot be used as evidence.

It was narrated from three different ways, all of which are unauthentic.



---

The first way:

Ibn Ishaq extracted in his biography (1/574), and from Al-Tabari in his tafsir (2/171), and from Al-Tha'labi in his tafsir (3/6) that on the authority of Mohammed son of Ja'far son of Az-Zubair, he said, "When they came to the Prophet ﷺ in Madina, they entered his mosque when he was praying Asr. On them were the clothes of Jewish priests, jubbahs, and robes, bedecked in the beauty of the sons of Harith son of Ka'b.' He said, 'Some say 'who saw them from the companions of the Prophet ﷺ that day? We have not seem a delegation like them. And their prayer time was drawing near, so they stood in the mosque of the Messenger of God ﷺ and began to pray. So, the Messenger of God ﷺ said 'leave them,' so, they prayed to the east."

This narration has been cut off and is classified as *معضل* (meaning that two people are missing between the Prophet ﷺ and Az-Zubair) due to Mohammed son of Ja'far son of Az-Zubair being from the class of the Followers of the Followers (*تابعو التابعين*), so his narration from the Messenger of God ﷺ is problematic.

The second way:

Al-Tha'labi extracted in his tafsir (3/6) from Mohammed son of Marwan Al-Sudyy.

Its chain of transmission is damaged, and it contains from Mohammed son of Marwan Al-Sudyy who is abandoned in the field of Hadith and is accused of lying.

Bukhari says in *Al-Du'afaa As-Saghir* (*الضعفاء الصغیر*) (340) "they remained silent about him, and his hadith are never written down." And An-Nasai said in *Al-Du'afaa wa Al-Matrukun* (*الضعفاء والمتركون*) (538) "The hadith is abandoned." And Abu Hatem said in *Al-Jarh wa At-Ta'deel* (*الجرح والتعديل*) (8/86) "The hadith is to be left and is abandoned and his hadith are never written down." And Ibn Habban said in *Al-Majruhin* (*المجروحين*) (2/286) "He was from those who narrate fabrications. It is not permissible to use his hadith under any circumstances except for the sake of consideration, and it is not permissible to use his hadith as evidence under any circumstance."

The third way:

Al-Tha'labi extracted form his tafsir (3/6) from Abdullah Ibn Abi Ja'far Az-Zari, from his father, from Rabe' Ibn Anas.

And this chain is cut off and weak.

It contains Rabe' Ibn Anas, a veracious man from the Followers (*التابعين*) and the hadith is classified as *mursal* (*مرسل*) (meaning that the hadith was transmitted from the Prophet ﷺ by a Follower (*تابع*) and not a companion (*صحابي*)) thusly. Then, Abu Ja'far narrated it from Ibn Anas, and narrations from Abu Ja'far are weak (*ضعيف*) and he is doubted by many different people (*مضطربة*).

Ibn Habban said in *Ath-Thiqat* (*الثقات*) (4/228) regarding Rabe' Ibn Anas "People fear his hadith as long as they were narrated by Abi Ja'far because in him are many doubts."

## **Second: It is valid to use this information as evidence that it is permissible to allow non-Muslims into the mosques of the Muslims.**

It is incorrect to argue with this story against the impermissibility of non-Muslims to perform their infidel rituals, which includes their prayers in our mosques. For indeed, it is not permissible to sanction them to commit Shirk in the houses of God.

And God says, "And that mosques are only for God, so do not call upon anyone besides God" (Surah Jinn 18).

8. We return to clause (4) regarding the public interest.

It is what is relied upon by those who hold the opinion of bringing disbelievers to the mosque, which is contrary to Islamic law and is at the least heretical.

- a. They say, *wherever a public interest is found, the Sharia is found. Thus, we use our minds* (The meaning of mind here, truly, is any one from the people who stand on the pulpit of the mosque, or leads a group, or is the head of an organization.). *So, if we find a benefit in an action* (A benefit from what? And on what bases), *then it is the*

---

Al-Qurtubi says in his exegesis (تفسير) of verse 18 of Surah Al-Jinn: “*In regard to God’s saying, ‘so do not call upon anyone besides him’ this is a rebuke of the polytheists in their supplication to other gods in the Sacred Mosque. And Mujahid said ‘The Jews and Christians when they entered their churches and synagogues, they associated others with God. So, God commanded his Prophet ﷺ and the believers to restrict their prayers and supplications to God when they enter any of the mosques.’ He says further, ‘So do not associate any idol in them.’ And it was said about the meaning of this, ‘Set aside the mosques only for the remembrance of God, and do not take them as a place of jest, as a place of business, as a place to sit, and do not make them for anything other than God.’*”

And Ibn Rajab said in *Fath Al-Bari* (فتح الباري) (3/243) “*Just as they are not permitted to carry out their acts of worship in mosques, by the same token, Muslims should not perform their prayers in the places of worship of the disbelievers, those which are a sire for disbelief.*”

Furthermore, regarding the hadith, if it is true, it only means that the Prophet ﷺ wanted to familiarize them with that at that time in order to ingratiate himself with them and out of a fear that it might have alienated them away from Islam. The need for something like this no longer exists, so it cannot be permissible to approve of something like it.

Therefore, Omar – may God be pleased with him – stipulated in the pact of the denizens (أهل الذمة) that they should hide their religions, to not raise their voices in their prayers, and to not recite their prayers outloud when Muslims are present.

As for the polytheist who enters a mosque that is not the Sacred Mosque in Mecca, this is a point of contention amongst the scholars. If he enters for a legitimate benefit with the permission of a Muslim, then the matter is allowed.

Ibn Qudamah said in *Al-Kafi* (الكافي) (4/176) “*And they may not enter the Mosque of Al-Hall except with the permission of a Muslim. If one does, he is to be punished. Umm Ghurab narrated, she said, ‘I saw Ali – may God be pleased with him – on the pulpit, and he saw a magus. So, he came down, hit him, and made him leave from the doors of Kindah.’*”

So, if a Muslim gives him permission, he is allowed according to the madhab. This is because A delegation of the tribe of Thaqif came upon the Prophet ﷺ, and he took them to his Mosque before they became Muslims.

The other opinion is to say that is impermissible because ‘iyad Al-Ash’ari narrated, “*that Abu Musa came to Omar while he (Abu Musa) was with a Christian. Omar was amazed at his handwriting, so he said, ‘Tell this writer to read his book to us.’ Abu Musa said, ‘he cannot enter the mosque.’ Omar said, ‘Why? Is he in a state of impurity?’ Abu Musa said, ‘He is a Christian’. So, Omar scolded him.*”

So, if state of impurity does not allow for the entering of a mosque, then, a polytheist is more worthy of not being entered.

In conclusion:

This hadith is not authentic in its chain of transmission and cannot be used as evidence in jurisprudence.

*law of God*. From this understanding we can conclude that these people are essentially returning the rule of law to themselves as they use their desires to decide what to do.

This problem stems from *prioritizing mind/reason over the tradition* (تقديم العقل على النقل). One must first search for proofs about the issue, either in texts, or in qiyas (قياس). And if we narrow it down, we conclude with: Where the Sharia is found, the public interest is found. The guidance of Sharia is the essence of public interest (مصلحة).

- b. Next, where is the public interest found in letting disbelievers preach in mosques? When have they ever helped the Muslim's cause? When have the purported benefits for the Muslim's that come from their preaching ever been instantiated? In which matter? We still hear of politicians being present in mosques and smiling in the faces of the Muslim people. So, have we seen, for example, funding of Muslim schools at any time or in any place? The answer is, we have not. Have we seen any support in stopping the spread of immorality? The answer is, we have most certainly not. So, where is the public interest? The interest for the Muslim people is naught except for the candidate of the party, especially if he is of Islamic origin and claims to be a Muslim and that he earns more money and fame from his infidelity.
- c. We said previously that the conditions of public interest is only that there is not a text on that subject. Otherwise, the situation does not fall under the name of public interest. Also, we mentioned that it must be real and not imaginary, and more so not mere conjecture. Thus, under no circumstance is it correct.
- d. The legal or rational interest is non-existent in this matter, as evidenced by the reality and experience.

### **In conclusion:**

The inviting and the preaching of politicians who are Islamists or originally disbelievers to promote any matter is, whether you agree or disagree with the points from our Sharia, a violation of the principle of Tawheed, an act of disobedience, a great sin, and an evil innovation that has never come to pass from our predecessors previous to what we are seeing now. It is forbidden according to our creed (عقيدة) and according to Islamic jurisprudence and in some forms, it may lead to disbelief.

So, whosoever has a modicum of faith left in his heart and has not yet fallen victim to the devils works and takes excuses and proofs that make him quiver and sweat, must be weary of embroiling the Muslim people in these verboten acts. Especially because they open the doors of pretext to accept these parties, and the downplay of their dangers, and the contradiction of adhering to it or supporting it in the minds of the Muslims.

## Ruling of the Mosques That Engage in These Prohibited Acts or its Likes.

1. Prayer in those mosques is valid.
2. Donating to those mosques is permissible.
3. It is better for one to search for a mosque that does not engage in such activities, so as to avoid doubts.
4. Donating to those mosques is dubious in that one is supporting with money those who may be supporting in some way or another the laws of the disbelievers. Thus, searching for another mosque is preferable.

Dr. Tariq Abdelhaleem

October 10, 2023 – Rabi' Al-Awwal 25 1445