



BUILDING PLACES
OF WORSHIP
IN
MUSLIM
TERRITORIES

Shaykh Ahmad Musa Jibril

*Building Places of Worship
in
Muslim
Territories*

Ash-Shaykh Al-Imām Ahmad Mūsa Jibrīl (حفظه الله)

بِسْمِ اللَّهِ الرَّحْمَنِ الرَّحِيمِ

Question: Is it permissible to build churches and Hindu temples in the Arabian Peninsula? What are the borders of the Arabian Peninsula? Is the UAE part of the Arabian Peninsula? Did the Madhhab of the Ahnāf allow the building of churches in the Arabian Peninsula?

Is it permissible to build churches and Hindu temples in the Arabian Peninsula?

First of all, it's not permitted to build any new places of Shirk (churches, synagogues, Hindu temples, or anything of that nature) in any of the various Muslim territories, for any of the various Kuffār and Mushrikeen. That's whether they were territories that were founded on Tawheed from the beginning, or conquered peacefully, or militarily. It's not permissible to build them on *any* Muslim territory, not *just* the Arabian Peninsula. All Muslim lands are equal in this matter. It's not permissible in what they refer to as Qatar, or what they refer to as UAE, or in Bilād Al-Haramayn, or in Egypt, or in 'Irāq, or even in Turkey — or even in Andalus! — or any of various Muslim territories. Even territories that were among the Islāmic territories at one point, and now they fall under some type of occupation, may Allāh سبحانه و تعالی aid the Muslims to liberate them.

Yes, it's more essential that Al-Jazeera Al-'Arabiyyah be kept more pure, and more protected, and fully shielded from Kufr and Kuffār — but this specific detail is not among the specialities of Al-Jazeera Al-'Arabiyyah — except that it's a bigger crime when it's done inside the borders of Al-Jazeera Al-'Arabiyyah, the heart of the Islāmic territories, the land that's supposed to be the base and fort of Islām. The land that's supposed to be the refuge for Islām and Muslims, and now, instead of being a refuge for the Muslims, it's the land that imprisons them or surrenders them

to the most hostile of the Kuffār. And instead of being the land that spreads the pure Tawheed, it's the land that promotes the Kufr of interfaith and Walā' to Kuffār. And even though it doesn't matter, as it pertains to this Mas'alah, whether it's in the Arabian Peninsula or the outside, [because] all Muslim lands are equal in the matter, I'll still define, as he asked, 'What are the borders of the Arabian Peninsula?'

What are the borders of the Arabian Peninsula?

I'll still answer that question because it's something we constantly get asked about. So, from the west, the border of Al-Jazeera Al-'Arabiyyah is the Red Sea. From the east, it's Al-Khaleej Al-'Arabi (the Persian Gulf or the Arabian Gulf). From the South, it's the Arabian Sea, which is part of the Indian Ocean, near The Gulf of Oman and Aden. And the Rājih is that Yemen is included as part of the Arabian Peninsula. So from the west, east, and south, Al-Jazeera Al-'Arabiyyah is bordered with the three bodies of water. Now from the north, Ibn Taymiyyah رحمه الله تعالى said it's up to the border of the beginning of Bilād Ash-Shām. What's Bilād Ash-Shām? Bilād Ash-Shām refers to what is today Al-Urdun (Jordan), Sūriyyā, Falastīn, Lubnān, and a small portion of what's today 'Irāq, and a small portion of what's today even Turkey, near Antākya. Jordan is the start of Bilād Ash-Shām from the border of Al-Jazeera. Jordan – Al-Urdun — and the rest of Bilād Ash-Shām behind it, along with 'Irāq next to it, are not part of Al-Jazeera, in the more correct opinion of the many opinions of the 'Ulamā' on this matter.

So the overall summary of the geographic border of Al-Jazeera Al-'Arabiyyah is that Al-Jazeera Al-'Arabiyyah is the territory that's surrounded by water from three directions, and then from the land side, it stops at what is Bilād Ash-Shām — Jordan and 'Irāq next to it.

The issue pertaining to building places of worship in lands of Muslims is clear, and among the clearest matters. So clear, some 'Ulamā' related an Ijmā' on it. The Messenger صلى الله عليه وسلم said, and its among the last of what he صلى الله عليه وسلم said — and we know that when one is on his deathbed and gives advice, its among the most essential advice, so imagine when it's revelation revealed from Allāh سبحانه و تعالی on the tongue of Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم on his last days on this earth!

كَانَ آخِرُ مَا تَكَلَّمَ بِهِ أَنْ قَالَ " قَاتَلَ اللَّهُ الْيَهُودَ وَالنَّصَارَى اتَّخَذُوا قُبُورَ أَنْبِيَائِهِمْ مَسَاجِدَ لَا يَبْقَيْنَ دِينَانٍ بِأَرْضِ الْعَرَبِ " .

One of the last things that the Messenger of Allāh صلى الله عليه وسلم said was, “May Allāh fight the Jews and the Christians. They took the graves of their Prophets as places of prostration.

Two Deens shall not co-exist in the land of the ‘Arabs.’”

In Musnad Ahmad, it was among the last of what the Messenger صلى الله عليه وسلم spoke, “Two Deens shall not coexist in the lands of the ‘Arab”, and more specifically, for the Arabian Peninsula. Sahīh Muslim, Hadīth ‘Umar ibn Al-Khattāb رضي الله عنه, the Messenger of Allāh صلى الله عليه وسلم said:

لَأُخْرِجَنَّ الْيَهُودَ وَالنَّصَارَى مِنْ جَزِيرَةِ الْعَرَبِ حَتَّى لَا أَدَعَ إِلَّا مُسْلِمًا " .

“I will expel the Jews and Christians from the Arabian Peninsula and will not leave any but Muslim.”¹

And there's other narrations similar to that. And in Musnad Ahmad, when the Messenger صلى الله عليه وسلم was asked what he was sent with, he said “I was sent to destroy

¹ Sahīh Muslim: 1767a

the idols”, وتُكْسَرُ الأوثانُ. Other Ahādīth imply this as well. Even if there was no specific Hadīth on this matter, it wouldn't be needed, because it's among the basics. Khamr is Harām. It's Harām to drink it, to sell it, and to buy it. So do you build a bar for them to drink in it? Zinā and prostitution are Harām. Do you build a prostitution house for them to commit Zinā in it? Shirk is the most horrendous sin committed on the face of this earth, mightier than Zinā and alcohol and Ribā combined. Whoever falls into Shirk is eternally destined to Jahannam. So how can one think it's permissible for Muslims to build them a cursed, doomed establishment, or to think it's permissible for them to construct it on the lands of the Muslimeen?

This is such a common matter that I said some 'Ulamā' related an Ijmā' on it. And keep in mind, when we speak on this matter, there's a detail that's overlooked. When most of the 'Ulamā' were talking about this issue — the earlier 'Ulamā' especially — it was in the context of Kuffār living in Muslims lands building and fixing up their own places of worship. They prohibited that for *them*, to build them for *themselves*. It's *them* building these places of worship with *their* wealth and money and energy, yet it was still prohibited. Imagine when it's Tawagheet, who claim to be on Tawheed, taking the wealth from the hungry stomachs of this Ummah, to build places of worship for the various Mushrikeen, who are hostile towards Islām and Muslimeen!

Among the 'Ulamā' who related Ijmā' on this matter is As-Subki. He said that there's Ijmā' that it's prohibited to build, or renovate, or fix, or update, or maintain a church. And of course when you say church, it includes other places of worship just like it, for the Mushrikeen and Kuffār. Az-Zaylaī, who's a Hanafī, related an Ijmā' on this matter. He said, “Kuffār living under Muslim rule in Muslim lands, if they wish to build places fo worship, they are not permitted to do so by Ijmā'.” And in Al-Insāf and Al-Furū', they related that Ibn Taymiyyah رحمه الله mentioned an Ijmā' on this matter as well. In Mukhtasar Al-Fatāwa Al-Misriyyah, he said,

لا يجوز تجديد الكنيسة باتفاق المسلمين

“It is not permissible to renovate a church, by the unanimous agreement of the Muslims.”

And back in the days when Shaykh Bakr Abū Zayd was active in what they call “the big 'Ulamā'” in Bilād Al-Haramayn, around the year 1420 or 1421, this matter was so obvious that they themselves even related an Ijmā' prohibiting this matter. They said, “Permitting and accepting places of worship for Kuffār, like churches, or having specialized designated places of worship for them, in any of the Muslim lands, is among the mightiest forms of aiding Kufr and displaying their symbols.” What they meant by “specialized, designated places” is something like what they have of designated prayer areas, or the multi-faith prayer areas in hospitals and airports, and they considered that prohibited.²

Al-Hasan Al-Basri said, “From the Sunnah is to destroy the churches in old and new countries.” At-Tartūshi in Sirāj Al-Mulūk said ‘Umar bin ‘Abdul-‘Azeez رحمه الله sent an order to his governor ‘Urwah ibn Muhammad, who was his governor in Yemen, that no church or place of worship shall remain in the lands of the Muslims, and his governor ‘Urwah carried that order out. Don’t forget Ash-Shurūt Al-‘Umariyyah. When Muslim lands were expanding and they got near Ash-Shām, where there’s Christians, the Muslims needed to know how to deal with them. So ‘Umar رضي الله عنه made a list of rules to govern the relationship as it pertains to Ahl Adh-Dhimmah, and they’re referred to as Ash-Shurūt Al-‘Umariyyah. Ibn Al-Qayyim mentioned them in his book ‘Ahkām Ahl Adh-Dhimmah’, and other 'Ulamā' did as well. Ibn Al-Qayyim said, “The popularity of these conditions is more sufficient than

² This may give rise to curiosity regarding the *validity* of prayer in such facilities, which had been answered [here](#)

its chain, because the Ummah received these conditions in acceptance and mentioned them in their books, and used them as proof and the Khulafā' after 'Umar رضي الله عنه abided by them.” Among those conditions is that the Nasārā (the Christians) are not permitted to build new churches or any places of worship in the lands of the Muslimeen.

Some 'Ulamā', from the Hanābilah and Mālikiyyah and others, went to the point of discussing or disputing the slight detail of allowing them to restore or repair portions of their places of worship if they decay over time. As-Subki said,

بناء الكنيسة حرام بالإجماع ، وكذا ترميمها

“Building a church is Harām by Ijmā', as is its restoration.”

“Restoration, renovation, or repair is Harām”. And that's the more correct opinion of that detail. All four Madhāhib, *all* four Madhāhib, without a doubt, agree on the prohibition of building any place of worship for Kuffār and Mushrikeen, in Muslim territories. Mālik, Shafi'ī, Ahmad, رحمهم الله, the Madhhab of the Ahnāf, all have specific statements on this issue. It's the opinion of all four Madhāhib, without a doubt. Now the question is, 'Did the Madhhab of the Ahnāf allow the building of churches in the Arabian Peninsula?'

Did the Madhhab of the Ahnāf allow the building of churches in the Arabian Peninsula?

Before I discuss that part of the question, the final part of the question — for one to leave the clear proofs on this matter, so clear some 'Ulamā' related an Ijmā', to leave the agreement of the four Madhāhib on a clear matter that's backed by proof, to leave the statements of the Sahābah (there's a statement of Ibn 'Abbās

رضي الله عنهما and Ash-Shurūt Al-'Umariyyah by 'Umar), the enormous overwhelming statements by other various 'Ulamā', and then come to a statement attributed to Abū Haneefah, **not** the Madhhab — rest assured, whoever does that is a person who has a disease in his heart, and he follows (or they follow) their desires.

One who continuously searches and follows exceptional opinions, called Rukhas Al-'Ulamā' — and here its Akhtā' Al-'Ulamā' (mistakes of the 'Ulamā') — is a Fāsiq. Ibn Hazm said, “It’s by Ijmā', one who follows the Rukhas of the 'Ulamā' is a Fāsiq.” And we spoke on this, the person who selects opinions who suits his desires, many times. Al-Awzā'i رحمه الله said,

من أخذ بنوادر العلماء خرج عن الإسلام

“Whoever takes the rare opinions of the 'Ulamā' leaves Islām, leaves the folds of Islām.”

What he most likely meant is that it ends up taking him out of Islām. We're talking about rare opinions that have no proof and are clearly wrong, like this matter.

As to the opinion of Abū Haneefah — note, it's the opinion of Abū Haneefah, *not* the Madhhab — the alleged statement is not as broad as they make it. The opinion attributed to Abū Haneefah is that it's okay, supposedly okay, to build churches in small towns that are fully occupied by Kuffār with no Muslims amongst them, and it has to be in the outskirts and the small towns. And I remember several brothers asked me, “How do we respond to claims that Abū Haneefah رحمه الله said you get Ajr for building churches, or renovating churches?” That's not even what Abū Haneefah رحمه الله said. Abū Haneefah رحمه الله distinguishes between the structure and what's done in it. He permits a Muslim to build the structure — in the conditions we met, that it be in the outskirts with no Muslims — because he separates between that and the act itself. The building is one thing, according to him, and what's

committed in it is another. And that's nearly identical or similar to his other erroneous opinion, رحمه الله, on alcohol. According to Abū Haneefah رحمه الله, transporting alcohol to a Dhimmi (a non-Muslim who lives under Muslim rule) is permissible. Why? He separates between transporting and the usage of it. The Dhimmi, according to them, may use the Khamr in something Halāl, like Takhleel. Both the opinion on transporting the Khamr and building of churches are wrong, both of them are wrong. Now, where some get that Abū Haneefah said you get Ajr for building or renovating a church, is either clear Tadrīs, clear deceit, or someone who's ignorant and needs to watch what they spread. And insha'Allāh it's only the latter. Someone who hasn't taken from 'Ulamā' or read books on 'Ulamā', should be careful what he says. And let me show you how dangerous that is from this example. In Al-Fatāwa Al-Hindiyyah, and other Hanafī reference books, Abū Haneefa رحمه الله said about a Muslim who's contracted to build a church, *جاز، ويطيب له الأجر*. The statement of Abū Haneefah رحمه الله says it's permissible for him to construct it and get the Ajr. 'Ajr' here was ignorantly or deceitfully mistranslated into Ajr from Allāh, when it meant monetary compensation for the work. Ajr in 'Arabi comes in the context of reward from Allāh. Many Hadīth and verses,

إِنَّ اللَّهَ عِنْدَهُ أَجْرٌ عَظِيمٌ

Verily, with Allāh is a great reward.³

or it comes in the context of being compensated by someone, for doing a job. In the Hadīth,

أَعْطُوا الْأَجِيرَ أَجْرَهُ قَبْلَ أَنْ يَجْفَ عَرَقُهُ

“Give the hired worker his wages before his sweat dries.”⁴

³ At-Tawbah: 22

⁴ Sunan Ibn Mājah: 2443

His [Abū Haneefah's] word "يطيب له" means "Saara Halalan". Abū Haneefah didn't mean he gets Ajr from Allāh, there's absolutely no way that can be taken as that. He meant Ajr as in wages, meaning he can accept the wages. Meaning, the ruling on that is that he can accept the wages.

I feel it's ridiculous and absurd for me to waste a moment to respond to such a detail, but several brothers, several, sent me this same question recently, and usually that happens after someone either mentioned it in a lecture or some type of article or something of that nature. If it was done by Tadhli and deceit, it amazes me the extent one would go in Tadhli and tampering of the Deen of Allāh, to justify building doomed establishments for the Kuffār and Mushrikeen. Now, as to the opinion of Abū Haneefah, he said it's permissible for them to have churches in the outskirts of Muslim lands, only if they're fully populated by non-Muslims. The Hanafi Madhhab itself strongly rejected that and condemned that opinion. May Allāh سبحانه و تعالی be pleased with them and with Abū Haneefah. This shows you how unbiased they were, and that's why I said all four of the Madhāhib are against this matter — they're in agreement on this matter.

The response to Abū Haneefah رحمه الله comes from the Imams of the Hanafi Madhhab before anyone else, and that's really all you really need to read. His top two companions, his top two famous companions, Imām Abū Yūsuf and Imām Muhammad ibn Al-Hassan Ash-Shaybāni, rejected that opinion. Muhammad Ibn Al-Hassan had among the most firm statements on this matter. He said, "There shouldn't be left a single church or place of worship in the lands of the Muslimeen." As-Subki — he's Shafi'i, he's not Hanafi — but he attempted to explain, he had a Fatwa on this matter and he tried to explain Abū Haneefah's opinion. He said, "It appears that Abū Haneefah meant it's only okay for them to build places of worship in small towns that they have where they live in, where it's fully occupied by them

with absolutely no Muslims amongst them, and it has to be in the outskirts.” Then As-Subki went on to indicate, even that is wrong. He said, “The other 'Ulamā' prohibit even that, because it's in the lands of the Muslimeen and under their control so they cannot build or construct churches.” When I mentioned the Ijmā' earlier, I said Az-Zayla'ī — Az-Zayla'ī related the Ijmā' — the author of Tabyeen Al-Haqā'iq, he's one of the Imāms of the Hanafiyyah. As-Sarkhasi, and it's also pronounced as As-Sarakhsi — both are proper, As-Sarakhsi may be more proper in pronunciation. In Radd Al-Muhtār, he said, — and he's one of the Imāms of the Hanafi Madhhab, he's not just anyone, he's one of the Imāms! — he said, “The Madhhab on this is that it's not permissible to build places of worship for non-Muslims in small towns for anyone.” He's Hanafi, and a giant of the Hanafi Madhhab who went to prison and wrote among the best of his books in prison. He said that the Madhhab is that it's not permissible for any of the various factions of Kuffār and Mushrikeen to construct churches or places of worship in the lands of the Muslimeen. He said, “One should not look to a Fatwa beyond this”. He said, “It's not permissible to follow a Fatwa that churches are permissible in small towns or in the outskirts, nor is it permissible to abide by it or accept it, and whoever gives such a Fatwa should be interdicted from giving Fatwas because that's following one's whims and desires and because that goes against the proof.” And he's a Hanafi.

The bottom line on this matter is that Muslim territories are divided into three categories, as it pertains to this matter. 1 - Territories founded and established on Tawheed and Islām from the beginning, 2 - Territories conquered by force. The ruling for both of those is the same: there can't be no places of worship in those territories other than the worship of Allāh وحده لا شريك له. Places of worship for other than Allāh have no room in those territories, old or new. The third type of territory is territories that were conquered through peace treaties by the Imām. In that situation, the Imām may allow them to keep what they have without public exposure or display of their Shirk and Kufr, and without being allowed to renovate or rebuild it if it's decayed or

destroyed over time. And we said the 'Ulamā' mentioned the issue of minor restoration, and we said the correct opinion on that little detail is that even that is not permissible.

Having said that, this issue is one of the many contemporary issues that unmasked the Munafiqeen of our time. When they come from politically motivated agendas, and they obtain their orders from their superiors, not from the Qur'an and Sunnah, you see the double standards and Nifāq in this issue. You see those who are pro-Turkey or pro-Qatar, attacking what's referred to as UAE for a Hindu temple, when Qatar and Turkey themselves have churches! To us, they're all the same in this matter, because we speak from the pure foundation of the Qur'an and Sunnah, and the true Manhaj of the Salaf — the pure Tawheed. The Hindu temples and places of Shirk in what's referred to as UAE or what's referred to as Qatar, or the cathedrals in Kuwait, and no different than that, and worse than that is the Husseiniyāt they have in Bilād Al-Haramayn, and like that are the Husseiniyāt that are allowed in Afghanistan, or even in 'Irāq and Egypt, and elsewhere throughout the Muslim territories, they're all the same in this matter. Worse than that is when Kufr and Shirk are allowed to be practiced openly and publicly while being protected and defended. Or when the construction of their doomed establishments are completed, they're celebrated or attended.

This issue is an example of the many contemporary matters that will tell you who are the pirates of the Da'wah of Imām Muhammad ibn 'Abdul-Wahhāb and who are the genuine pure guardians of the Manhaj of the Salaf, the followers of the pure Tawheed and the followers of Muhammad ibn 'Abdul-Wahhāb. To those extremists in obedience to their rulers, who give precedence to what they do and say over the Qur'an and Sunnah, building places of Shirk is Harām, but if their rulers do it, they'll find a justification. Just like interfaith, it's Kufr to them, but if their rulers do it, it's exempted, and the list goes on. They'll rightfully, rightfully, tear into a

modernist or some figure or head, who attends and promotes interfaith, but when their rulers do it, or promote it from Makkah, they'll find a way out for him. Counterfeit mock Salafīs, they're the sham bogus followers of Muhammad ibn 'Abdul-Wahhāb! Explain to me what type of Salafism they're on, and how they even have the audacity to even mention or touch the books of Muhammad ibn 'Abdul-Wahhāb, let alone teach them, when the Da'wah of Muhammad ibn 'Abdul-Wahhāb رحمه الله was centered on establishing pure Tawheed and more precisely, it's the Ijmā' of the globe, the universal globe — enemies and followers of the Da'wah — that the Da'wah of Imām Muhammad ibn 'Abdul-Wahhāb was notorious and blatant for demolishing symbols of Shirk throughout the lands that they controlled and ruled! Their Tawagheet establish and construct temples of Shirk and protect it and guard it and participate and celebrate and rejoice in its opening. Some boldly justify it while others are silent. Others pretend to be overly occupied in talking about the Bid'ah of the Mawlid, because of course Tawagheet don't care about that issue, they can quarrel about that as long as they want. At the same time, the temples of Shirk are being constructed and celebrated in the lands that your Messenger صلى الله عليه وسلم died deterring from that.

I know a brother who took on a big duty in life that took its toll on him and his family. His family complained to me to resolve that issue, and to tell him to stop. I asked him why he so strongly holds on to that particular task, rather it's a deed, it's something good. He said, “My father's last advice on his deathbed was to do this and I'll continue to do it insha'Allāh at all costs.” He loved his father. He knows what his father's last advice on his deathbed meant. We love Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم, that's why we hold on dearly to the advice he gave on his deathbed, صلى الله عليه وسلم. Yes no doubt, the Mawlid is a Bid'ah, but it doesn't compare in severity to the horrendous act of opening a Shirk temple on Al-Jazeera Al-'Arabiyyah. Some in the past gave Fatwas against building Shirk establishments on Muslim lands, but now turn a blind eye, and

are even part of the inner circle of the Tawagheet who violate that, and they have the audacity to accuse others of changing.

The 'Ulamā' were discussing the issue of allowing Kuffār themselves to open places of worship for themselves in Muslim lands. Now its Tawagheet opening places of Shirk in Muslim lands. The Murji'ah rejects and their Tawagheet are not followers of Muhammad ibn 'Abdul-Wahhāb رحمه الله. They're followers of 'Amr ibn 'Amir ibn Luhayy, the man who revived Shirk in the Arabian Peninsula and changed the Deen and Millah of Ibraheem in the Arabian Peninsula. In Bukhāri and Muslim, the Messenger of Allāh ﷺ said, "I saw 'Amr dragging his intestines in Jahhannam", because he was the first who devoted animals to Shirk. They're reviving the Da'wah of 'Amr ibn Luhayy who bought Shirk from Ash-Shām to the Arabian Peninsula and altered the pure Tawheed of Millat Ibraheem. They should be ashamed to utter the word they like to mention, that they're "Salafīs". Unless when they say that they're "Salafi", that their Salaf is 'Amr ibn Luhayy, then we can accept that. Day after day, they're unmasked, and their reality appears clearer and clearer for the slow ones. They falsely cling onto the Da'wah of Muhammad ibn 'Abdul-Wahhāb to gain legitimacy when he's free from them, and if he was alive — from what we know of his Manhaj, and what we learned, and what we taught of his books, and what we know of his history — he would be cleansing Al-Jazeera Al-'Arabiyyah from some of his own blood and flesh offspring there today. That's not even getting into the issue of the betrayal of the Muslims in this matter. 16 million to build a Shirk temple so they can worship peacefully, while at the same time, they're demolishing Masājid and killing our brothers and sisters.

And also, what I would want to add to this is, some say "If we stop them from building places of worship in our lands, they won't allow us to do so in their lands." And the response to that is, if that's the case, let it be so, that's fine. It will just be another matter they deny Muslims, no different than the issue of Niqāb or the other

obligations that they deny Muslims from. We hold on firm to the teachings of our Rasūl ﷺ. Let's assume they do ban all the Masājid. Warding off evil takes precedence over bringing benefits. Warding off the evil of having places of Shirk in our lands takes precedence over the benefit of establishing Masājid in their lands. Don't worry about it, Salah in your house is accepted. In their lands, they deny Muslimāt the right to wear Niqāb, and polygamy, and other matters, so this will be no different. Building places of worship in any of the territories of the Muslim lands, especially the Al-Jazeera, is an invitation for people to join Shirk and Kufr. And also, if anyone objects to this, especially from the modernists and the Murji'ah as well, tell them the Vatican sits on 121 acres. 57 acres of it is gardens. Go ask them for a few acres so we can build a Masjid there. Let's see if that's possible. No one criticizes that, it's okay to keep a stronghold of Shirk and abuse of Allāh سبحانه و تعالی, but we can't keep a fort of Tawheed and praise of Allāh سبحانه و تعالی.

And I'll conclude with three rulings on this matter. The first one, by Abul-Hasan Al-Ash'ari and Ibn Taymiyyah and Bakr Abū Zayd رحمه الله. Abul-Hasan Al-Ash'ari, as in *Al-Furū' lil-Qarrāfi*, considered it Kufr to build churches. Ibn Taymiyyah said, "Whoever believes that churches are the houses of Allāh," — Hindu temples and all other various places of worship for the Kuffār are the same — so, "Whoever believes that churches are the houses of Allāh, and that Allāh is worshiped in them, or what Jews and Christians do is 'Ibādah and nearness to Allāh, or if he likes what they do or is pleased with it" — [like] celebrating the opening (that's aside from building it) — "or if he aids them in opening their places of worship and in establishing their Deen, and considers that nearness and obedience to Allāh, then he is a Kāfir."

And as we concluded previously, with the question about children going to school in the West, we concluded with a statement from Shaykh Bakr Abū Zayd, and I'll do the same with that here as well. He has a book called *'Khasā'is Al-Jazeera*

Al-'Arabiyyah, The Specialties of the Arabian Peninsula. He said, "A Kāfir can't establish a church or any place of worship or any statue, because Al-Jazeera Al-'Arabiyyah must be pure from false religions and due to the many Ahādīth on that." He also mentioned that the Imām himself is not allowed to permit that, nor is allowed to let it remain whether it's new or old. He mentioned it in the context of the Arabian Peninsula because the book was pertaining to that matter, but that ruling applies to all Muslim territories.

Finally, let me add another thing, [which is] that when I was very young, maybe 12 years old or so, there is a book that I recommend if it's still around — it's among the best books that compiles the proofs and opinions of 'Ulamā' on this matter. It's called '*Hukm Bina' Al-Khana'is*', for one of the Shaykhs of our Shuyūkh, Isma'eel ibn Muhammad Al-Ansāri. It was freshly published and widely circulated back when my father was studying in Madeenah and we were children. Back then there was no internet and other matters that occupy people's time. In fact, there wasn't even but one TV channel, and it was only on for a few hours of the day, so people read more frequently — especially Talabat Al-'Ilm. So when new books like that were published, they were circulated for free and they used to place them in the Masājid or pass them around. Now, they fully and openly violate what they previously published and what some gave a Fatwa on. And the funny thing is that *they* change, and they go around accusing *others* of changing, and that's just one of the examples of who really changes and who is really firm on Tawheed. I advise you to read that book⁵, and we'll conclude with that.

⁵ Available for download and viewing [here](#).