

***SETTING THE STAGE FOR
CROSS-WORSHIP IN THE
MUSAAJID***

**KUFR IN
A
U.K.
MUSJID**

**THE MAJLIS
P.O. Box 3393
Port Elizabeth
6056, South Africa**

KUFR IN THE MUSJID – OUR RESPONSE

In response to our critique and condemnation of the kufr perpetrated by Mumtaazil ‘Haq’ (*Mumtaazul Baatil*), the imam of a Musjid in U.K., he issued a rebuttal for which our response and refutation are as follows:

He claims in his response that:

(1) THE INTER-FAITH KUFR DIALOGUE WAS NOT IN THE “MASJID DESIGNATED AREA”

This response is devoid of Shar’i substance and validity. Regardless of the venue not being part of the actual Musjid area, it is an annex of the Musjid, hence as far as the sanctity of the place is concerned, it enjoys the same sanctity as that of the Musjid. Even the Wudhu Khaanah and the Sehn area have to be treated as if these are part of the Musjid, and even the immediate environ outside the Musjid should be respected. Smoking, satanism and kufr propagation are not permitted even outside the doors of the Musjid

on any area which is part of the Musjid's Waqf land.

Furthermore, of importance is the fact of the propagation of kufr , and this propagation of kufr to Muslims in the Musjid environs was by invitation, and that too, by the invitation of the Imaam. The dispute does not pertain to the technicality of whether the area in which the kufr was propagated and Islam insulted is part of the Musjid proper or not. In the context of our discussion this technicality is of peripheral or of no significance. With this technicality, the imam attempts to divert attention from the main, vile, dastardly issue of the priest having been invited to propound kufr and insult Islam inside the Musjid area.

The imam claims that:

(2) THERE WAS “NO WORSHIP OF THE CROSS”

In fact *there was worship of the cross*. Whether the worship consists of only singing Christian religious songs (hymns) or uttering such prayers in which not a word of shirk is said, or merely sitting in the church listening

to the kufr sermon of the priest, all of it is *cross worship*.

Understand well that Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) has predicted cross-worship inside the Musaaqid in times in close proximity to the Musaaqid. What the Imaam of the U.K. Musjid had committed was setting in motion the ultimate act of literally worshipping the literal cross right inside the Mihrab of the Musjid.

The Qur'aan Majeed does not say: *Do not commit zina*. The command is: "*Do not approach near to zina*." This Aayat is the basis for a principle applicable to all sins. It is haraam to approach near to sin or to set in motion the process which will ultimately cause the actual sin. Thus, zina of the eyes, the ears, the tongue, the mind, etc., are all haraam. While technically these acts are not literally zina, nevertheless, in terms of the Aakhirat, these misdeeds are zina and punishable, hence the Hadith states:

"Whoever, looks at the beauty of a strange (ghair mahram) woman with lust, hot iron

rods will be inserted into his eyes on the Day of Qiyaamah.”

It is the standard reaction of people of deviance to seek aid in technicalities and to vindicate their *baatil* with Fiqhi texts which have no relevance to the sins and villainy practically perpetrated. The technicalities of juridical principle have not been designed for the augmentation of sin and shaitaniyat.

Shaitaan unfurls his plot of kufr and shirk gradually by degrees until he swallows Muslims. He firstly completely desensitizes their Imaan to make it conducive to tolerate shirk and kufr, and this is exactly what Iblees is doing by embroiling Muslims in the inter-faith plot, constraining them to listen to sermons of kufr which pollute their hearts.

When Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) did not tolerate recitation of even the Tauraah by Hadhrat Umar (Radhiyallahu anhu), then by what stretch of Imaani logic can it ever be tolerable for Muslims to sit and allow their ears to be dinned with shirk and their hearts polluted with the kufr of a biblical sermon by

a kaafir priest right inside the Masjid environ? The flaccid argument of the Imaam in justification of his kufr act is bereft of Islamic validity. It is utterly baseless. The kufr sermon was cross-worship in the initial stage.

Even if it is not accepted as actual cross-worship, there is absolutely no justification for inviting a kaafir priest to address Muslims with a sermon of kufr which incorporated insult of Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam), of the Qur'aan and of Islam in general. All such acts of blasphemy are the effects of cross-worship.

The imam claims that:

(3) IN TERMS OF THE PRINCIPLE OF JURISPRUDENCE, WE DID NOT MAKE AN INVESTIGATION

Seeking shelter behind a principle of jurisprudence cannot and will not exonerate the imaam from the dastardly act of kufr he has publicly committed. If he believes that he had not invited the priest; that the priest did not propagate kufr and baatil; that the priest had not denigrated Islam, etc., then he (the

imaam) must state so and deny the charge. He should categorically state that none of the incidents mentioned by our informer on which we had based our criticism and pronouncement of kufr, had taken place. Only then will it be appropriate to institute an investigation, and if proven wrong, then it will devolve on us to retract and apologize.

But, unable to deny the factual position, the imaam is abortively seeking cover and justification in a juridical principle which does not apply to the matter for which he has been criticized. On the contrary, the Hadith pertaining to a 'liar' is applicable to him. He is infact a great 'liar' for justifying his kufr with a juridical principle and a Hadith which has absolutely no relevance to the subject at hand.

What investigation did this fellow institute when he had criticized Shiah's and Tariq Jameel Dajjaal? He should explain the details of his investigation. There are numerous issues of public significance which are undeniable. We need not investigate the fisq, fujoor and kufr of the so-called 'prince' MBS, to criticize his villainy. There is no need to investigate the

Saudi embassy murder of the Saudi journalist for the purpose of criticizing the murder. Issues which stare us in the face as clear as daylight do not require investigation for comment and criticism.

Furthermore, our informer is not an anonymous ignoramus. We believe him to be a man of integrity and honesty. The information provided by him and corroborated by others suffices for condemning and branding the imaam. The evil which he had perpetrated was not a clandestine sin. It was a public act. He cannot deny the fact that he had invited the kaafir priest to propagate the kufr of Christianity to a Muslim audience inside the Musjid area.

The imam claims that:

(4) SINCE MUSLIMS IN UK ARE A MINORITY, THESE TYPES OF DIALOGUE ARE NECESSARY FOR PROTECTING THE IMAAN OF MUSLIMS

This contention is absolutely trash – *ghutha* – which must be rejected with contempt. It

should not be difficult for even a sincere moron Muslim to reject this stupidity tendered by the imaam to vindicate the villainy he had committed.

The Imaan of ignorant Muslims cannot be protected from the propagation of Christian missionaries by subjecting Muslims to listen to sermons of kufr by kuffaar priests inside the Musjid. Only such Muslims who are kuffaar at heart, and for whom Allah Ta'ala has decreed Jahannam, will renounce Islam for accepting Christianity or any other kufr religion.

Also, the doubts which Christian missionaries create in the minds of stupid Muslims is due to *jahaalat*. The answer for ignorance is knowledge. If the imaam believes that Muslims in the U.K. are accepting Christianity, then it devolves on him and on the other Ulama as an obligation to initiate *Ta'leemi* programmes to educate the people and to impart to them the fundamentals of Islam as well as the knowledge of the basic teachings.

Their Imaan cannot be protected by their ears dinned with sermons of kufr and insult inside the Musjid. The imaam has been trapped in a satanic plot from which he is not even attempting to extricate himself. On the contrary he has embarked on a self-vindictive exercise to justify the evil which he has perpetrated.

Being a minority is not a threat to Imaan. If professed Muslims do have Imaan embedded in their hearts, then being a minority in any kuffaar country does not pose a threat to their Imaan. If they are placed under unbearable duress to abandon Islam, then it is Fardh on them to migrate. Just as millions of ignorant Muslims migrate from their home countries in search of safety and worldly prosperity, so too, in fact to a greater degree, will it be incumbent to migrate for the sake of safe-guarding one's Imaan and Islamic honour. The solution is not to listen to a kaafir priest propagating Christianity inside a Musjid. This in fact, aggravates the *jahaalat* of ignoramuses. The permission to the priest to propagate his blasphemy inside the Musjid, accords some validity to his kufr ideology, and it weakens

the Imaani opposition to kufr which is an inborn attitude of every Muslim.

If the imaam had desired to “accept the challenge” of the Christian missionaries whom he alleges are converting Muslim immigrants, then he was supposed to issue his challenge for a public debate, and thoroughly neutralize all the kufr arguments posed by the priests against Islam. Far from engaging in such a debate, this miscreant imaam issued a friendly invitation to the kaafir priest to deliver his sermon of kufr inside the Musjid. The priest did not barge in uninvited.

What had transpired inside the Musjid at the invitation of the imaam was not a public debate to demolish kufr. It was an orderly Christian sermon, and the priest had the upper hand with his belligerent attitude while the imaam’s reaction was like a meek, stupid poodle at the feet of the priest. It is intolerable to allow an inter-faith exercise inside a Musjid whereby the kaafir priest is given the opportunity to propagate Christian kufr to Muslims. Such permission is condonation of cross-worship inside the Musjid. If the plan is

to refute Christian kufr, it must be announced as such and the programme should be conducted in such a manner which clearly demolishes the kufr and asserts the Truth of Islam. The style of the inter-faithers is repugnant to Islam and is designed for the subjugation of Islam. A debate between Haqq and baatil has to incumbently be infused with a degree of belligerency. It will suffice to say that the scenario organized by the imaam was not a debate or a confrontation between Haqq and baatil. On the contrary, baatil had the upper hand.

While the Imaan of the Muslim audience or of the vast majority, was hopefully not shaken, it is expected that the vast majority must have been repulsed by what had transpired.

(5) THE IMAAM CLAIMS THAT WE HAVE BRANDED GREAT ISLAMIC SCHOLARS AS ‘MUDHILLEEN’ “MERELY BECAUSE THEY HAVE READ THE BIBLE”.

This is another red herring designed to deflect attention from the core issue of having invited the kaafir priest to deliver a sermon of kufr in

the Musjid to a Muslim audience. He says in his response: *“If merely reading from the bible and quoting is an act of Shaitaan and mudhilleen, will the Majlis give the same fatwa on great Islamic scholars like Ibn Taimiyah. Molana Rahmatullah Kiranwi, Molana Idrees Kandhlavi and Molana Qasim Nanotvi.....”*

The analogy with these Ulama which the imaam presents in vindication of his act of kufr is palpably fallacious, deceptive and misleading. The following facts for dismissing his baseless argument and stupid fallacious analogy, should be noted:

(a) Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) had most certainly prohibited one of the greatest among the Sahaabah, viz., Hadhrat Umar (Radhiyallahu anhu) from *“merely reading the Tauraah”*. This is undeniable. And, who was Hadhrat Umar? About him, Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) said: *“If a Nabi had to come after me, it would have been Umar.”* Despite the lofty status and perfection of Hadhrat Umar’s Imaan, Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) was

enraged when he saw Hadhrat Umar “*merely reading the Tauraah*”. When he observed the anger in Rasulullah’s mubaarak face, Hadhrat Umar (Radhiyallahu anhu) immediately abandoned his ‘*mere reading*’ of the Tauraah.

In the kutub of Hadith, this episode is narrated as follows:

“Umar Ibn Khattaab (Radhiyallahu anhu) came to Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) with a manuscript which he received from some people of the Ahl-e-Kitaab. Then he recited it to Nabi (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam), who became extremely angry, and he commented: “O Ibn Khattaab! Do you want to be cast into confusion (and destruction) just as the Yahood and Nasaaraa had fallen into confusion? I take oath by The Being in Whose control is my life! Verily, I have come to you with a glittering white Shariat. Do not ask them (the Yahood and Nasaaraa) for anything (about Deeni matters). They will then inform you of some truth which you may reject and with some falsehood which you may accept, or with baatil which you will accept. By The One in Whose control is my life! If even Musa was alive (today), he would

have had no choice but to follow me.”
(*Musnad Imaam Ahmad*)

About this “*mere reading*” of the Tauraah by Hadhrat Umar (Radhiyallahu anhu), Mullah Ali Qaari presenting the *Tafseer* of the Hadith, says in *Mirqaat*:

“*Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) said reprimandingly to Umar and others like him (who were reading or may read the scriptures of the Yahood and Nasaaraa): ‘Do you want to be cast into confusion regarding your Deen by acquiring knowledge from other books and from (sources) other than your Nabi, just as the Yahood and Nasaara had done? They cast the Kitaab of Allah behind their backs and followed the ahwaa (vain and haraam desires of the nafs) of their scholars and saints.*

Thus, it should be understood that ‘*mere reading*’ of the Tauraah or bible is not permissible even if such ‘*mere reading*’ is engaged in by great scholars of Hadhrat Qasim Nanotvi’s calibre. But these Ulama did not read the bible for the purpose of ‘*mere reading*’.

(b) Yes, ‘mere reading the bible’ for wiling away the time or for interest/curiosity or merely for ‘knowledge’, is NOT permissible. However, studying the bible or any scripture or book of the kuffaar for executing the obligation of *Amr Bil Ma’roof Nahy Anil Munkar*, for Da’wat and Tableegh of the Haqq and to combat the kufr propagations of the enemies of Islam, is permissible and even sometimes necessary.

Therefore, understand well that Hadhrat Maulana Qaasim Nanotwi (Rahmatullah alayh) and the other illustrious Ulama did not indulge in ‘mere reading of the bible’ as Hadhrat Umar (Radhiyallahu anhu) had done and which ‘*mere reading*’ Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) had severely reprimanded and proscribed.

Hadhrat Umar (Radhiyallahu anhu) had engaged in ‘mere reading of the Tauraah’. He did not read the Tauraah with the intention of debating with the Yahood and Nasaaraa. It should also be remembered that more than 14 hundred years ago, the Tauraah, unlike its

corrupted version of today, contained much Haqq – Wahi from Allah Ta’ala. Despite this fact, Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) forbade reading it. But the mudhil imaam simply dismisses this severe prohibition of Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) by adopting total silence in this regard, and seeking to extract capital from the valid reading and study which Ulama had made for a valid purpose.

After all, the prohibition forcefully announced by Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) is not meaningless. The mudhil has attempted to scuttle this prohibition despite the fact that the prohibition applies to Muslims reading the bible, not to kuffaar priests reading it. Thus, it is irrelevant and devoid of the slightest support for the mudhil’s invitation to the priest to propagate Christianity in the Musjid.

It is therefore, stupid and baseless for this mudhil imaam to seek justification for his grievous error of kufr by presenting ‘great Islamic scholar’s’ to negate the express and emphatic prohibition issued by Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam).

(c) The ‘reading’ of the illustrious Islamic Scholars – the Ulama-e-Haqq – was not ‘mere reading’ as the mudhil wishes Muslims to swallow. Their ‘reading’ was an in-depth study for the sake of substantiating the Haqq of Islam and demolishing the baatil of Christian kufr.

(d) There is a vast difference between an Aalim studying the bible for valid reasons, and inviting a kaafir priest to propagate bible kufr inside the Musjid, and along with it to insult Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) and the Qur’aan Majeed. While the great Islamic Scholars studied the bible, not merely reading it for pleasure to squander their leisure, to demolish Christian and Cross Kufr, the mudhil imam invited a kaafir priest who propagated Christianity inside the Musjid and who blasphemously criticized the Qur’aan and Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam).

(e) In the scenario in the Musjid enacted by the mudhil imaam, it was not a case of a Muslim ‘merely reading the bible’. It was a kaafir priest doing the reading in a bid to

convince Muslims of the ‘truth’ of his kufr religion and the ‘falsehood’ of Islam. Hadhrat Maulana Qaasim Nanotwi reading the bible and a kaafir priest reading the bible to a Muslim audience in the Musjid are issues as vastly different and opposites as Heaven and Hell.

(f) Our condemnation made no reference whatsoever to the status of bible-reading by a Muslim. What is the Fiqhi ruling on the issue of a Muslim ‘merely reading the bible’? We did not deal with this question nor is there a need in the context of this discussion to ramify into it. The mudhil has simply introduced this issue as a red herring in an attempt to deflect from the actual subject, namely: *the Christian priest by invitation propagating Christianity inside the Musjid and blaspheming Nabi (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) and the Qur’aan Majeed*. This is the issue, not ‘*merely reading the bible*’. There was no Muslim reading the bible at the haraam function. It was a kaafir priest who did the reading.

(g) Regarding reading the bible, there are three issues:

- (i) Mere reading by a Muslim out of curiosity or interest.
- (ii) Studying to refute baatil and to combat the kuffaar slanders against Islam.
- (iii) Reading by a kaafir.

In our criticism of the mudhil imaam we did not touch on the first two masaa-il since there was no need for it. The reading at the kufr propagation in the Musjid was done by a kaafir priest, not by Muslims. Thus the issue was not an issue of issuing a fatwa for the two first masaa-il. While we dealt with the third issue which had occurred at the invitation of the Agent of Iblees, he sought to deflect attention from the core issue by introducing the first two unrelated masaa-il. He employed claptrap to divert attention from the kaafir's reading by seeking to create confusion with the issue of a Muslim's reading which had not occurred at the session of the kufr sermon inside the Musjid.

The aforementioned facts demonstrate the fallacy of the 'bible-reading' argument baselessly introduced by the mudhil imaam.

(6) THE EPISODE OF NAJRAAN

The mudhil imaam has abortively attempted to extravasate capital for his kufr baatil from the episode of Najraan. He has miserably failed to note the vast difference between the Najraani delegation and the cross-preaching priest who propagated his kufr at the invitation of the mudhil imaam.

This miscreant imaam refers ignorant Muslims who have no access to the kutub to refer to the book of Maulana Idrees Kandhlavi for an account of the discussion between Nabi (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) and the Christian delegation. Even in the account proffered by Maulana Kandhalvi there is no corroboration and no support for the haraam episode arranged by the mudhil imaam. The brief account we had given is from the *tafseer* of the Akaabir authorities. There is no incumbency to refer to the kitaab of Maulana Kandhlavi.

The mudhil says: *“Majlis dismissed the whole episode of the delegation of Najraan and gives the impression that Nabi sallallaho alaihi wasallam simply invited the Christians to*

Islam and offered them to pay Jizyah which they accepted.”

The Majlis did not ‘dismiss’ the episode to create an erroneous impression. On the contrary we presented an elucidation to apprise Muslims of the reality of this episode – a reality which the mudhil is either ignorant of or has deemed it appropriate for concealment.

We again present the salient facts and features of the Najraani delegation:

(a) Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) had written to the Christian leadership of Najraan to accept Islam. If they refused, they had to pay Jizyah. If they refused this option, the only alternative then was WAR-JIHAD. The Najraanis did not ‘offer’ to pay Jizyah of their own free sweet will. They paid Jizyah because they were unable to confront the Muslims in war.

(b) The Najraani delegation came of its own accord, not by the invitation of Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) for dialogue on

religion. The kaafir priest who had appeared in the Streatham Mosque in London to propagate Christianity and malign Islam, came at the express invitation of the mudhil imaam. Their presence in Madinah was not to propagate Christianity, not to distribute Christian literature, not to deliver a sermon of kufr to the Sahaabah, not to malign the Qur'aan , and not to insult Rasulallah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam). They came out of fear. It was the threat and ultimatum of Jihad issued by Rasulallah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) which had constrained the arrival of the delegation.

While they came with their tail between their legs, the Christian priest, at the invitation of the Agent of Iblees, came fluttering his standard of kufr in the faces of Muslims in a citadel of Islam forcefully delivering his sermon of kufr to Muslims sitting stupidly and agape.

(c) When the Christians intransigently adhered to their kufr and shirk doctrines which they did NOT propagate to Muslims in Madinah Munawarah, Allah Ta'ala ordered Rasulallah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) to issue the

challenge (*the Mubaahalah*) to the Najraanis. Both parties would have to invoke Allah's *La'nat* on the liars. The consequence of the *Mubaahalah*, if it had proceeded, would have been the transformation of the Christians into apes and pigs and the destruction of the entire region of Najraan. This was clearly stated by Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) to the Christians. There were no niceties, no bootlicking and no inter-faith dialogue.

(d) It was clearly mentioned to them that their belief of trinity, cross-worship and consumption of pork prevented them from entering into the fold of Islam.

(e) The discussion between the Najraanis and Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) did not centre on inter-faith dialogue. They were not accorded the slightest opportunity to deliver any sermon of kufr and to propagate Christianity. On the contrary, they were informed with the greatest clarity and with a belligerent attitude that they were plodding falsehood. The discussion was between the delegation and Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam). It was not a kaafir priest of the

Najraanis lecturing to a Muslim audience who sat like stupid dumb animals listening to the kufr being dinned into their ears and polluting their minds and hearts. Muslims who sat through silently listening to the disgorgement of the kufr sermon inside the Musjid are more dumb than cattle as Allah Ta'ala says in the Qur'aan Majeed: "*They are like cattle or even more astray.*"

(f) From the very inception, Rasulallah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) had cold-shouldered the delegation which had arrived *uninvited*. He refused to even respond to their greeting. Rasulallah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) had adopted this 'unfriendly' attitude because the Christians were clad in garments which are described as '*adornment of Iblees*'. Only after they had changed to their travel-dress on the advice of Hadhrat Ali (Radhiyallahu anhu), did Rasulallah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) engage them in discussion.

(g) The interaction with Rasulallah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) was a straightforward demand to the Christians to accept Islam or

pay Jizyah or be prepared for War. The Agent of Iblees speaks bunkum by denying this fact. He only portrays his jahaalat. If he has any expertise in merely kitaab-reading, he should check the *tafseer* of the *Mubaahalalah* Qur'aanic Aayat as well as the Ahaadith pertaining to the Najraani delegation. There is not a stitch of support in the Najraani episode for the *ghutha and hufaalah (rubbish and trash)* disgorged by this mudhil imaam who has committed the vilest act of misguidance by inviting the kaafir priest to deliver a sermon of kufr in the Musjid and to even distribute biblical literature to the Muslims.

An important question for the mudhil Agent of Iblees is: *Will you invite a Shiah priest to the Musjid to deliver a kufr sermon on Shi'ism, and malign Hadhrat Aishah, Hadhrat Abu Bakr, Hadhrat Umar and the rest of the Sahaabah (Radhiyallahu anhum)? Will you invite a Shiah priest to propagate Shi'ism in the Musjid and distribute Shiah literature which blasphemes the Sahaabah?* He should consult his conscience if there still are any remnants of Imaani conscience in him after this dastardly act of having invited a Christian

priest to deliver a sermon of kufr maligning Islam inside the Musjid.

It is abundantly clear from the *tafseer* of the Qur'aanic Aayat pertaining to the Najraani delegation, and also from the Ahaadith that there is absolutely no basis for drawing an analogy between the kufr act of inviting the kaafir priest to propagate Christianity in the Musjid and the Najraani episode in which the Najraani delegation came after Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) had delivered to them his ultimatum of Islam or War.

(7) INTO THE DREGS OF STUPIDITY

Demonstrating the degree of the rot of vermiculation of his brains, the murtad, mudhil Agent of Iblees, stupidly says:

“Nabi sallallahu alaihi wasallam offered them Islam and they eventually agreed to pay Jizyah because Nabi sallallahu alauhu wasallam had the political authority. Will the Majlis lead the way and now tell the South African government to accept the authority of Muslims in the country and accept Islam or pay JIZYAH to the Muslims as the article gives the impression.”

Indeed, kufr vermiculates the brains of its utterer. The moron mudhil suffering from divinely cast *rijs (filth)* on his brains – cast by Allah Ta’ala – fails to understand the insult he has heaped on his own *aql* by blurting out foolishly and disingenuously this rubbish. Even if we should entertain his rubbish momentarily, it will be said that the moron conceded that Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) was in a position to demand Jizyah or declare Jihad because he “had the political authority”. What political authority do we have to enable us to issue such an ultimatum to the South African government. Should any Muslim citizen of the country issue such a stupid ultimatum to the government, we are sure that instead of arresting him, he will be assigned to a madhouse for treatment to a vermiculated brain such as the brain of the mudhil Agent of Shaitaan.

Our criticism nowhere conveys even the slightest impression that Muslims in the UK are expected to issue such an ultimatum to the government of the UK. We had only criticized the kufr of the mudhil, and pointed out that

there is absolutely no justification in the Najraani episode for the kufr of having invited the Christian priest to deliver a sermon of kufr in the Musjid, to malign Islam and to distribute Christian literature in the Musjid. That was the be all of our criticism.

This stupidity of the mudhil Agent of Iblees comes within the scope of the Qur'aanic Aayat:

“Thus does He (Allah) cast rajs (filth) on (the brains of) those who cannot understand.”

(Yoonus, Aayat 100)

The moron is either too dumb in the brain to have understood the context in which we had mentioned Rasulullah's ultimatum of Jizyah or Jihad, or he has insidiously attempted to obfuscate the issue with falsehood and deception. The demand of Jizyah made by Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) with the alternative of Jihad, and informing them that all of them would have been transformed into apes and swines if they had taken up his *Mubaahalalah* challenge, and that their entire region would have been divinely destroyed,

clearly demonstrates the belligerency and dominance of Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) on the Najraani occasion.

Here it is not suggested that Muslims adopt the stance and attitude of Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) which he had demonstrated to the Najraani delegation. Muslims today are the underdogs lying prostrate in humiliation, licking the boots of the kuffaar. We are not advising Muslims in the UK or anywhere else to be belligerent. On the contrary we emphasize the imperative need for Sabr, Istighfaar in abundance and Islaah-e-Nafs, and complete dissociation from kuffaar politics, and the insidious interfaith trap of shaitaan.

Our advice is that the Ulama should not stoop to the despicable level of making bootlicking their trade. They should not fear shadows. The Qur'aan Majeed says: "*Allah will protect you.*" And, we are not advocating that they adopt the methodology of *The Majlis*. Allah Ta'ala requires them to only proclaim the Haqq without two-tongued obfuscation which

confuses and misleads the masses. Do not frolic with kufr and the kuffaar.

What was the need for inviting a kaafir priest to deliver a sermon to Muslims in the Musjid? Just what prompted this miscreant imaam to embark on such a wretched, disingenuous venture? Now the defence he is engaging in is a desperate attempt to stir up smoke to confuse and deceive unwary and ignorant Muslims. Honesty demands that the grievous error be acknowledged and to refrain from such exercises which are extremely inimical to Islam and Muslims.

Therefore, it is breathtakingly stupid to compare the kaafir priest's presence in the Musjid delivering kufr and propagating Christianity to Muslims with the presence of the Najraan delegation. This delegation came not by invitation as the Christian priest had arrived in the Musjid. The delegation came to save their people by endeavouring to enter into a truce with Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam). They did not come to preach Christianity. Furthermore, their discussion and the truce agreement was with only Rasulullah

(Sallallahu alayhi wasallam). The occasion was not one where the Christians preached kufr to the Muslims. The comparison is thus glaringly fallacious.

(8) THE LABELS OF THE SHARIAH

The labels of murtad, Agent of Iblees, mudhil, etc. which are offensive to this miscreant imaam who has acquitted himself treacherously, betraying Allah Ta'ala, Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) and the Ummah, are the orders of the Shariah. A man who so flagrantly and dastardly perpetrates kufr, aids and abets a kaafir priest in his kufr propagation, must be prepared for the epithets of the Shariah. The Qur'aanic Aayat which he cites does not grant him any succour. As long as he intransigently clings to the heinous blunder he has committed, the Shariah's Fatwa will remain glued to him.

These epithets are not 'nicknames' as he is attempting to show to ignorant people. The labels are effects of the Shariah for a man who commits kufr blatantly and yet has the satanic audacity of seeking to exculpate himself from the perfidy of his kufr. The consequences of

the Shariah's Fatwa are extremely grave. Salaat behind this mudhil is not valid. It is Waajib for the trustees of the Musjid to forthwith terminate his imaamate services. If he refuses to retract, repent and renew his Imaan, he has to be ostracised by the community.

How was it ever possible for Muslims to have dined and swined with the priest and exchange niceties after he had so blasphemously maligned the Qur'aan and Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam)? The ignorant laymen have been misled by these molvis who are enacting the role of the Ulama and Ruhbaan of Bani Israaeel. But following these Ulama-e-Soo' is severely castigated by Allah Ta'ala. The Qur'aan Majeed says:

“They (the people) take their Ahbaar (molvis) and Ruhbaan (sheikhs) as Gods besides Allah.....”

(9) TARIQ JAMEEL DAJJAAL

We are not the followers of any bootlicking molvi/sheikh. If the Agent of Iblees refrains from branding and labelling Tariq Jameel

Dajjaal despite his blatant support for Shi'ism, he should not expect us to emulate him in his stupidity and methodology. His *uswah* is not our guide.

The mudhil has attempted to vindicate his aiding kufr with his flapdoodle and dubious stance towards Christianity. And, even if he speaks against Christianity, the issue on which we have clobbered him is the assistance he has accorded the kaafir priest for propagating Christianity in the Musjid and thereby being constrained to tolerate the malignment of Islam by the priest. Interfaith dialogue is satanic dialogue. Never can Islam be defended by satanism, and never can kufr be validly refuted with the satanically conciliatory approach and methodology of the inter-faith movement which has been developed to eliminate Islam.

(10) CHAMPIONS OF HAQQ?

The mudhil says: *“At no point, do we consider ourselves the champions of haq....We accept our shortcomings and weaknesses.....we are merely like the child to learn to crawl.....we request our elders and learned at the Majlis to*

provide leadership and practical guidance in how to tackle and confront these issues.”

For his edification, our advice is:

(a) Acknowledge the error of having invited the priest to the Musjid.

(b) Aiding kufr is kufr. Regardless of whether the aid was unintentionally, it remains kufr. The Fuqaha have ruled that if a Christian asks the direction to the church, it will be kufr to point in the direction to guide him to the church. Therefore, it is necessary to repent and renew Imaan.

(c) Concentrate on the ills, fisq, fujoor and bid'ah which are so rife in the Muslim community.

(d) Be firm in executing the obligation of *Amr Bil Ma'roof Nahy Anil Munkar*.

(e) Seek Allah's pleasure, not the pleasure of the government and of the priests of the interfaith satanism.

(f) Do not compromise with baatil.

(g) Do not assign the Deen a secondary role. Do not make the Deen a hobby. The Deen cannot be made subservient to secular pursuits.

(h) Understand well, that the condition of the Ummah will be changed by Allah Ta'ala only if Muslims themselves change what is within them.

SALAAM ON THOSE WHO FOLLOW THE
GUIDANCE OF ALLAH AZZA WA JAL