

An in-depth investigation into their articles on *Kufr*,  
*Eemaan* and *Takfeer* and ‘RULING BY OTHER  
THAN WHAT ALLAAH REVEALED’.

---

**PART II: Replying to the followers of doubt; the slanderers; the envious and the enraged ones. Reviewing recent [www.salafipublications.com](http://www.salafipublications.com) responses to PART 1 in this series.**

**Tuesday, March 13, 2001**

---

**Ibn Hazm, may Allaah be merciful to him said:**

**“And it must be known to the one who reads this; our book, that we do not say it is *Halaal* – like the ones who have no goodness in them say it is *Halaal* – to attribute to someone as a text, that which he did not say, even if his saying leans towards that because it cannot be certain that this saying implies that and (his actual statements) would contradict that. So know that attributing a saying directly to a person, whether he is a *Kaafir*, or an innovator or a mistaken one, is a lie upon him and it is not permissible to lie upon anyone!” – “*Al-Fasil fee Al-Milaal*”, Vol. 5/33**

All Praise is due to Allaah. We praise Him, and seek His help and ask for His forgiveness. We seek refuge in Allaah from the evil in our souls and from our sinful deeds. Whomever Allaah guides, none can mislead. And whomever Allaah misguides, none can guide. I bear witness that there is no one worthy of worship except Allaah. He is One, having no partner. And I bear witness that Muhammad is His servant and Messenger.

**O you who believe! Fear Allâh (by doing all that He has ordered and by abstaining from all that He has forbidden) as He should be feared. [Obey Him, be thankful to Him, and remember Him always], and die not except in a state of Islâm (as Muslims) with complete submission to Allâh. (*Al'i-Imraan*, 102)**

**O mankind! Be dutiful to your Lord, Who created you from a single person (Adam), and from him (Adam) He created his wife [Hawwa (Eve)], and from them both He created many men and women and fear Allâh through Whom you demand your mutual (rights), and (do not cut the relations of) the wombs (kinship). Surely, Allâh is ever an All-Watcher over you. (*An-Nisaa'*, 1)**

**O you who believe! Keep your duty to Allâh and fear Him, and speak (always) the truth. He will direct you to do righteous good deeds and will forgive you your sins. And whosoever obeys Allâh and His Messenger he has indeed achieved a great achievement (i.e. he will be saved from the Hell-fire and made to enter Paradise). (*Al-Ahzab*, 70)**

To proceed:

Verily, the truest speech is the Book of Allaah. And the best guidance is the guidance of Muhammad . The worst of affairs are the newly invented matters. Every newly invented matter is a *Bid'ah* and every *Bid'ah* is a misguidance and every misguidance is in the Hell-Fire.

## **Introduction:**

We are at a place in history wherein those who have the greatest desires are the loudest of creation. When the least knowledgeable are the foremost to speak. When the most colorful of language contains the least benefit and substance. Indeed, the Muslims of *'Ahl As-Sunnah wal-Jamaa'ah* are surrounded by the barking and incessant chatter of the followers of desire and imposters of champions. In light of this tragedy, the people of knowledge are busied in refuting and calling out to purify the shouts of nonsense from the shouts of truth and reform. I fear that this phase in history has never been matched by the people who preceded us. When one considers the emptiness of the message of the people of desires and then compares this with the volume at which this message is screamed, it is a wonder that people can remain guided at all. And for this we must all affirm, "*Al-Hamdu'lillah.*" *Al-Hamdu'lillah* for the truth which stands clear from the falsehood. *Al-Hamdu'lillah* for the guidance which still resides in our *Ummah*. *Al-Hamdu'lillah* for the remaining people who are sincerely and genuinely interested in the state of affairs of the Muslims with respect to their *'Aqeedah* and concepts. And *Al-Hamdu'lillah* for the transparency of the plots of the people of desire and biased partisanship. With every sincere effort to separate the empty messages of hatred and spite from the messages of reform and counsel, the *Ummah* steps forward into the light of guidance and away from the darkness of deceit and shallowness.

And I ask Allaah to guide me and keep me safe from the traps of *Shaytaan* and his aids with respect to delivering a message of advice to my brothers and sisters who may read these words. And I seek refuge in Allaah from turning the message into an attack upon those who have reviled me simply for the sake of revenge and personal satisfaction. Yet, I affirm that the harshness, which comes in this project, comes only as a last resort and after multiple attempts to advise with gentleness and delicacy. And I testify that I am Allaah's weak slave and I rely upon Him, *tabaraka wa-ta'ala*, to maintain this message and temper it with the sternness it requires and the tact it deserves. And whatever shortcomings I possess – and they are infinite – I beg my Lord; *Ar-Rahmaan, Ar-Razzaaq*, to keep my personal deficiencies from entering the call I pronounce which is a clarification of the matters at hand. And Allaah is the Most Powerful and is capable of all things.

## **Here we go again:**

After receiving Part 1 in this series, a nerve was struck with the authors of [www.salafipublications.com](http://www.salafipublications.com), which must have caused some personal wounds on their part. And just days ago, they have responded to my project with their own series entitled, "**In Defense of the Imaam of Sunnah, al-Albaani : Part 1: Al-Albaani's Creed on Kufr**", which is another affirmation of what I said about them in my first project.

I said, "Concerning the issue of *Shaykh* Naasir ad-Deen Al-Albaanee, the reader might wonder why we spent so much time quoting and refuting his points in an article which was intended to address a book and series of articles of Khaalid Al-Anbaree. The reason is because of those individuals such as Khaalid Al-Anbaree and other than him who

throw his name around and mention how his opinion on the issue of 'Ruling by Other Than What Allaah Revealed', is the same as that of Al-Albaanee, may Allaah be merciful to him. So they hide behind the name of this well-known scholar and imply by association that if we are to hold them as misguided, then this would mean that we are saying the same thing about this scholar (i.e. Al-Albaanee). And for this precise reason we have chosen to address the subject of *Irjaa'* in the teachings of Al-Albaanee in order to illustrate the weakness of this defense which have been employed by Al-Anbaree and other than him. And if it weren't for the constant uttering of the name of the noble *Shaykh Naasir*, may Allaah be merciful to him, then we would not have even raised the issue ourselves. We also chose to quote from the cassette that we came across because it clearly demonstrated Khaalid Al-Anbaree seeing and hearing the *Irjaa'* with his own ears and eyes in the presence of *Shaykh Naasir* and then his claim that this was a scandalous lie. So we have seen clearly who is the liar and who is deluded in this regard and this all came about from the challenges of Al-Anbaree himself so he has no one to blame for this other than himself."

So [www.salafipublications.com](http://www.salafipublications.com) have fallen into the exact description of Khaalid Al-Anbaree and have decided to focus on the matters of *Shaykh Al-Albaanee* rather than the topic of 'Ruling by Other Than What Allaah Revealed'. And the reason is clear. Like Al-Anbaree, may Allaah guide him, they too see the value in using the name of *Shaykh Naasir*. And the reason is that they can bring principles derived from his teachings on the matter of *Kufr* and *Eemaan* and then by extension, attempt to use these principles to establish rules which would necessitate that the ruler who invents fabricated laws is not a *Kaafir* unless he makes his ruling to be *Halaal* or he rejects the *Hukm* of Allaah in his heart etc. And again, this is simpler than explaining the topic and bringing proof to substantiate their allegations because they are able to take the position which seems quite secure in the following of this particular scholar and when anyone dares to suggest that this scholar had mistaken concepts about the basis of *Eemaan* and *Kufr* – which would mean that their entire understanding was corrupted from its conception – they immediately slander, revile and denounce that person as a "neo-Kharajite", "Qutubee", "Takfeeree", "political activist" and enemy to the "Pure *Salafee Da'wah*". And what a brilliant, yet shallow plot they have entered into. Yet they have not achieved in fooling anyone except themselves and their avid readers.

They have drawn a line in the sand and declared, "Either you say that *Shaykh Al-Albaanee* is flawless and impeccable in his teachings of *Eemaan* and *Kufr* and that the ruler who 'Rules by Other Than What Allaah Revealed' is not a *Kaafir* merely for his action, or you are a "neo-Kharajite", "Takfeeree", "Qutubee", "Sorooree" liar and slanderer who follows his desires and has fallen into the trap of the *Shaytaan*." They make no middle ground between these two extremes. And for these poor pathetic individuals, this is the dividing line between *Salafeeyah* and innovation and straying away from the *Sunnah* with respect to this issue. They are not concerned with the principles, with which you arrive at your opinions. They are not interested in the evidence, which you bring to support your understanding. If this were the case, then their hearts would have been open to evidence in PART 1 of our series, which detailed the proofs from the *Qur'aan* and the *Sunnah* and the statements of the *Salaaf* and the people

of knowledge about 'Ruling by Other Than What Allaah Revealed'. And if they truly were interested in principles and evidence yet they saw mistakes and incorrect concepts being propagated in PART 1 of our series, then you would have seen them rush to correct and refute these, first and foremost.

But we do not see them rushing to explain the *Qur'aan* and the *Sunnah* and defend it from what they feel are distorted interpretations. No, the first thing which is a must for them to do is rush to show the world that one scholar, whose was mentioned in a project, wherein scores or names were mentioned, has been lied upon or attacked or reviled, or whatever colorful term they use to emphasize the importance of their efforts. The best similitude for them is the one who rushes into the burning building to rescue his worldly possessions and leaves his wife inside the blazing inferno. It is clear what this man's priorities are. And it is clear and unhidden to anyone who seriously looks at the most recent writings of [www.salafipublications.com](http://www.salafipublications.com) where their priorities are.

### **Reviewing the matters:**

We find on page 4 of this "Blazing Salafi Meteor"<sup>1</sup>, "The article was written by someone from Canada called Abu Huthayfah Yusuf al-Kanadie, and is actually centered around two individuals, Imaam al-Albaani and Shaikh Khaalid al-Anbari and attempts to ascribe Extremist Irjaa' to them both. The main bulk of the article is based around refuting the statements of Imaam al-Albaani – based upon some of his statements that occurred on cassette – and also refuting the clarifications of Khaalid al-Anbaree in his reply to the Permanent Committee, after their verdict concerning his book."

The first instance of PART 1, which mentions the name of *Shaykh* Al-Albaanee, may Allaah be merciful to him, begins on page 11 and concludes on page 20. The second instance was on page 63 and concluded on page 81. This is a total of 29 pages out of a 117-page document. Hardly the epicenter of the document much less the main bulk.

The first section was preceded by a lengthy explanation for why I was mentioning it and explained that it was neither to attack the *Shaykh* nor to belittle his accomplishments. Rather, I said words of high respect to the noble *Shaykh*, which I would urge [www.salafipublications.com](http://www.salafipublications.com) to revisit. This section was included to show two things:

1. To illustrate how [www.salafipublications.com](http://www.salafipublications.com) are vehement in their defense of particular '*Ulaama* – however noble – whom they blindly follow.'<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> As mentioned on page 46 of their article. I'm not kidding – it actually says this.

<sup>2</sup> I said, "However, in the email correspondence, which came after my response, I came to notice that this individual seemed more interested in defending *Shaykh* Al-Albaanee's reputation and attacking those who oppose him in the issues of *Eemaan* and *Kufr*, than he was in proving the correctness of the *Shaykh's* opinions about *Takfeer* etc. He also seemed more interested in attacking the authors whom I had quoted in my section on 'Ruling by Other Than What Allaah Revealed', than he was in disproving what they had said concerning the topic itself. I found this very interesting, although odd and I came to notice later, that this is quite a common strategy among these people and their readers."

2. To demonstrate how *Shaykh* Naasir, may Allaah be merciful to him, considered actions to be separate from beliefs in *Kufr*, which was referenced in the second section.

### **Issues of sensitivity:**

*Shaykh* Al-Albaanee has done much for this *Ummah*. His accomplishments must not be ignored or denied. Few others have achieved what he has in areas of *Hadeeth* and *Fiqh* in the entire history of *Islaam*, much less in our contemporary period. He spent his life in the effort of guiding others and teaching *Islaam* and refuting the innovators from the groups of misguidance and error. And because of this, we see that he made many enemies indeed.<sup>3</sup> In fact, the overwhelming majority of the people who have opposed him are not people of the *Sunnah*, rather they are the scorned members of heretical groups who have personal enmity to *Shaykh* Naasir, may Allaah be merciful to him. And because of this, we see that certain individuals, who are loyal to the scholarship of *Shaykh* Al-Albaanee, have interpreted every criticism of the noble *Shaykh* to be a kind of hatred and malice. And as such, these people have taken it upon themselves to blindly defend the noble *Shaykh* from every and all censure. So we see that one extremism has lead to another and the two are polar opposites. On the one hand, there are those who hated *Shaykh* Naasir so passionately that they attack him for his truth and then on the other hand, there are those who loved him so intensely, that they defend him for his errors.

And this would be fine and we would prefer not to add to the criticism except that those who defend the noble *Shaykh* have blindly gone to such extremes, that they have founded their entire concepts upon his mistakes in certain matters. You see, even if an individual chose to believe that *Shaykh* Al-Albaanee, may Allaah be merciful to him, was the greatest scholar who has ever existed and was completely infallible in all matters of knowledge – even the issues of *Eemaan* and *Kufr* – this would not cause us to address this matter. But when these people create a movement centered around the *Shaykh*'s errors in *Kufr* and *Takfeer*, and denounce those who oppose these mistakes and when certain individuals attempt to refute these concepts, they openly show their hatred and spite towards those who differ with the *Shaykh*. And this would be acceptable too except that they even gone to the length of removing the label of *Salafeeyah* and *Sunnah* from those who have dared to utter words of counsel and reform in this regard. So this alone is sufficient for us to become vocal and active in refuting them. But when these individuals go to even further lengths of evil slander and lies upon us, then we see that it is incumbent upon us to point out their deception, evil and mischief.<sup>4</sup>

---

And this most recent set of articles from them is an affirmation and a testament to the truthfulness of what was alleged in my earlier project.

<sup>3</sup> The authors of [www.salafipublications.com](http://www.salafipublications.com) would have you believe that I only mention these merits in order to lull you, the reader, into thinking of me as a reluctant criticizer of *Shaykh* Al-Albaanee, when in fact – as they have alleged – my real aim is to hide my zealous hatred of the *Shaykh* so I can twist his statements and slander him. *Subhaan-Allaah*, and what an evil accusation indeed!

<sup>4</sup> And by Allaah, what I would prefer to do is skip the issues of *Shaykh* Al-Albaanee altogether and avoid bring up this matter. By Allaah, it is greatly preferred to me to speak solely on the topic of 'Ruling by Other

And so we reiterate, once again, that this subject is not being raised by us for any other reason than how it relates to 'Ruling by Other Than What Allaah Revealed'. And if this matter was as simple as *Shaykh Al-Albaanee*, may Allaah be merciful to him, holding the opinion that the ruler who fabricates laws and replaces the clear *Islaamic Sharee'ah* with these invented laws, to be a major sin which did not remove one from the realm of *Islaam*, such as drinking intoxicants or committing fornication, then it would have been sufficient for us to bring the evidence from the *Qur'aan* and the *Sunnah*, which would contradict that and prove that this act is from the greatest nullifications of *Islaam*. But because this opinion from *Shaykh Naasir*, may Allaah be merciful to him, was not merely a matter of *Fiqh* and is directly related to issues of *Islaamic 'Aqeedah* and the *Usool* of *Eemaan* and *Kufr*, and because the likes of [www.salafipublications.com](http://www.salafipublications.com) and their mentors such as *Khaalid Al-Anbaree* and 'Alee Al-Halabee, have tied these two matters together, we are forced to revisit this topic again. And let it be known that we would never have brought this matter to the forefront if it weren't for their ilk constantly raising the subject of *Shaykh Nassir*, may Allaah be merciful to him, and his opinions in the topic of *Eemaan*, *Kufr*, *Takfeer* and 'Ruling by Other Than What Allaah Revealed', we would not be re-addressing this topic again. So the burden of all that follows is upon them and they have no one to blame except themselves for what they read herein.

---

Than What Allaah Revealed' and the rules and principles of *Takfeer* and to completely bypass mentioning the issues related to *Shaykh Al-Albaanee* in this regard. And the reason is to respect the memory of the noble *Shaykh Naasir*, may Allaah be merciful to him, and his position and status in the *Ummah*. This, despite what the authors of [www.salafipublications.com](http://www.salafipublications.com) would have you believe are my motivations. And Allaah, the Most High, is sufficient for me and He knows the reality of the heart and the intention of His slaves. However, as I pointed out in Part 1, people such as *Khaalid Al-Albaanee*, 'Alee Al-Halabee and the authors of [www.salafipublications.com](http://www.salafipublications.com) have tied these issues together so that they can prove that the ruler who legislates fabricated laws and substitutes them in place of the pure *Islaamic Sharee'ah*, does not disbelieve from this, unless he rejects the *Hukm* of Allaah in his heart or makes his ruling to be *Halaal*. And this is essential to them so that anyone who disagrees with this concept is in opposition to *Shaykh Al-Albaanee* and those who have taken this position, and therefore not under the banner of *Salafeeyah* or *Sunnah*. So in order to break these two issue apart (which infuriates [www.salafipublications.com](http://www.salafipublications.com)), one must disprove *Shaykh Al-Albaanee's*, may Allaah be merciful to him, concepts. And when it is pointed out that these concepts include principles which are foreign to *Ahl us-Sunnah* (i.e. *Irjaa'*) then the likes of [www.salafipublications.com](http://www.salafipublications.com) scurry and scramble towards two old-fashioned tactics:

- a) To smear the one who has alleged this matter (i.e. in this case, me) with personal attacks about that person's knowledge, popularity, intelligence and most of all, his chain of scholarship.
- b) To reach for interpretations of what was quoted in order to make the reality seem different than what was clearly presented.

And neither of these two approaches is sufficient without being accompanied with the other for these small-minded individuals. And this is apparent in their usage of flowery, alarmist, theatrical insults towards me personally as well as their far-fetched, seemingly incomprehensible interpretations of the quotations of *Shaykh Al-Albaanee*, may Allaah be merciful to him. Hopefully, by the permission of Allaah, the Most High, these two tactics are completely transparent and have not succeeded in fooling any, save themselves and those who are their blind supporters. *Wa'l-Hamdu'lillah*.

## Exposing the plot:

The author or authors <sup>5</sup> of Part 1: The Creed of al-Albaani on Kufr have struggled and worked hard to come up with a convincing *Ta'weel* of *Shaykh* Al-Albaanee's statements. And before we enter into this subject, it is interesting to mention the statement of [www.salafipublications.com](http://www.salafipublications.com) in the introduction to their first article, which responds to PART 1 of this series:

“In this series we will reply to the author of this document, and illustrate his nature and orientation and to answer his claims inshaa'allaah and also illustrate in the process, his ignorance, his invalid deductions, **his making the words of the likes of Imaam al-Albaani, to carry meanings and contexts that they do not in fact carry and much more.**”

And how interesting it is that [www.salafipublications.com](http://www.salafipublications.com) is so concerned with the correct interpretations of the words of *Shaykh* Al-Albaanee, may Allaah be merciful to him, when his words are in support of their corrupt concepts. And how fascinating it is that they pay such close attention to detail in their *Ta'weel* of his phrasing, because it is crucial and fundamental to what they perceive as *Salafeeyah*, yet they are completely oblivious to the twistings, wild allegations and outright lies upon the '*Ulaama* from their heroes; Khaalid Al-Anbaree and 'Alee Al-Halabee.

And just look at these two *Fataawa* from the *Lajnaa Ad-Da'imah* upon the writings of Khaalid Al-Anbaree and 'Alee Al-Halabee:

**1. *Al-Bayaan* (i.e. The Declaration) from *Lajnaa Al-Da'imaah li'l-Bu'hooth wal-Iftaa'* concerning the book entitled “*Al-Hukm bi'Ghayr ma-Anzaal'Allaah wa-Usool At-Takfeer*”, by its author Khaalid Al-Anbaree:**

*Fatwaa* #21,154 1420 H, 10<sup>th</sup> Month, 24<sup>th</sup> Day.

All praise is due to Allaah and may the mercy and blessings of Allaah be upon our Prophet Muhammad and his family and his companions.

And to proceed:

The Permanent Committee for Projects and Legal Verdicts has reviewed the book entitled “*Al-Hukm bi'Ghayr ma-Anzaal'Allaah wa-Usool At-Takfeer*” by its author Khaalid Al-Anbaree and after studying the book, it has come clear that **it is full of broken trusts concerning knowledge in what he narrated from the '*Ulaama* of *Ahl us-Sunnah wal-Jamaa'ah* in twisting the evidence away from that which they indicate in the Arabic language and the aims of the *Sharee'ah* and from that is what follows:**

---

<sup>5</sup> I say, “...author or authors...” as it is quite clear that [www.salafipublications.com](http://www.salafipublications.com) prefers not to actually mention the name of the writer or writers of their material. Perhaps this is so that no one could refer to them as Abu Fulaan because we all know how “well-known” and “well established” and “popular” these people are internationally and locally. And Allaah knows best.

1. **Changing the meanings of the evidences in the *Sharee'ah* and playing with some of the texts, which have been narrated from the people of knowledge by excluding or changing things in a way that they would be understood other than their original meaning.**
2. **Explaining some of the statements of the people of knowledge with that which does not comply with their intentions.**
3. **Lying upon the people of knowledge. From that, him attributing to the '*Alaamah Shaykh Muhammad Ibraheem Ahl'a-Shaykh*, that which he did not say.**
4. **His claim that there is *Ijmaa'* from *Ahl us-Sunnah* that the one who does not rule by what Allaah revealed in *Tashree' Al-'Aam* (i.e. general legislation) except with the making it *Halaal* with the heart; that this is not *Kufr*, just like the rest of the disobediences, which are less than *Kufr*, and this is a lie upon *Ahl us-Sunnah*; its basis being either *Jahl* or evil intention. We ask Allaah to keep us free from this.**

And based upon what has preceded, the Committee sees that it is *Haraam* to publish the aforementioned book or to distribute and sell it. **And we remind the author to make *Tauba* to Allaah, *ta'ala* and to return to the people of knowledge, whose knowledge is trusted, so he will learn from them what they will make clear to him, his error.** We ask Allaah for all of us for guidance and steadfastness upon *Islaam* and the *Sunnah*. May Allaah send prayers (of blessings) upon our Messenger Muhammad and his family and his companions.

The Permanent Committee for Projects and Legal Verdicts.

**2. *Al-Bayaan* (i.e. The Declaration) from *Lajnaa Al-Da'imaah li'l-Bu'hooth wal-Iftaa'* concerning the books "*At-Tahdheer Min Fitnat At-Takfeer* " and "*Saihatun-Nadheer* " by its author 'Alee Hasan Al-Halabee:**

In the name of Allah – the Most Merciful – the Dispenser of Mercy

*Fatwaa* Number: 21517 and Dated: 14/6/1421 AH

Praise be to Allah alone, and the *Salaah* and the *Salaam* be upon the one after whom there is no prophet.

And as for what follows:

For verily, The Permanent body for research and legal opinion was informed about what was mentioned to the eminent General Mufti from some of the sincere ones about the requests for a legal formal opinion specifically for the secretariat general of the Council of Senior Scholars with number: 2928 and dated: 13/5/1421 AH. And number: 2929 and

dated: 13/5/1421 AH, regarding the two books: **“at-Tahdheer Min Fitnatit-Takfeer”** [Warning from the tribulations of Takfeer] and **“Saihatun-Nadheer”** [An Outcry of the Warner] by their compiler – **‘Alee Hasan al-Halabi, and that they [the two books] are calling to the Madhhab of Irjaa’ [by claiming] that al-‘Amal [action] is not the condition for the correctness of Imaan,** and he attributes this to Ahlus-Sunnah wal-Jamaa’ah, and basis these two books upon distorted reports from Sheikh al-Islaam Ibn Taymiyah, al-Haafidh Ibn Katheer and others than them two – May Allah have mercy upon all, as well as the desire of those sincere ones for an explanation to what exists in these two books so that the readers may acknowledge the truth from falsehood... and so on...

And after the study carried out by The Body of the two aforementioned books and the examination of them, it has become clear to The Body that the book “at-Tahdheer Min Fitnatit-Takfeer” compiled by ‘Alee Hasan al-Halabi, in what he appended to the statements of the Scholars in his forward as well as his footnotes, comprises of the following:

**1 – Its author based it [the book] upon the false, innovated Madhhab of the Murji`ah,** those who encircle al-Kufr, with the Kufr of Juhood [rejection], Takdheeb [denial] and al-Istihlaal al-Qalbee [making permissible that which is forbidden – in the heart, only] as it [appeared] on p.6 f.2 and p.22 and this is contrary to what Ahlus-Sunnah wal-Jama`ah are upon, that al-Kufr occurs by al-I`tiqaad [belief], by al-Qawl [statements], by al-Fi`l [actions] and by ash-Shak [doubts].

**2 – His distortion while conveying from Ibn Katheer** – May Allah have Mercy upon him – from “al-Bidaayah an-Nihaayah” [The beginning and the end] 13/118, when he mentioned in the footnote on p.15, conveying from Ibn Katheer: “That Jankeez Khaan claimed regarding al-Yaasiq that it is from Allah, and this is the reason for their Kufr”, but when referring back to that passage [in the book we come to know that], what he attributed to Ibn Katheer – may Allah have Mercy upon him – was not found.

**3 – Attributing an unfounded statement to Sheikhul-Islaam Ibn Taymiyah** – may Allah have mercy upon him – on p.17-18 when the aforementioned compiler of the book, attributes to him, that the ruling on the Mubaddal [the one who replaces the Sharee`ah of Allah with other laws] according to Sheikh al-Islaam is not Kufr [Akbar], unless if [the replacement of the Sharee`ah] occurs with Ma`rifah [acknowledgement], I`tiqaad [belief] and Istihlaal [making permissible that which is forbidden], and this is merely a baseless statement attributed to Sheikhul-Islaam Ibn Taymiyah – May Allah have Mercy upon him – as he was the propagator of the Madhhab of the Salaf of Ahlus-Sunnah wal-Jamaa`ah, and their Madhhab is what has preceded, **whereas this [i.e. Alee Hasan’s Madhhab], indeed it is the Madhhab of the Murji`ah.**

**4 – His alteration of the intent of the eminent al-‘Allaamah ash-Sheikh Muhammad bin Ibraahim** – May Allah have Mercy on him – in his article – Tahkeem al-Qawaaneen al-Wadha`eeyah [Ruling by man-made laws], when the compiler of the aforementioned book claims that the Sheikh places a condition of Istihlaal al-Qalbee [making permissible

that which is forbidden – in the heart], **whereas the statement of the Sheikh is as clear as the sun in his aforementioned article to the mainstream of Ahlus-Sunnah wal-Jamaa'ah.**

**5 – His comments upon the statements of those whom he mentioned from the people of knowledge, by implying a meaning from their statements which do not carry that meaning, as it appeared on p.108 f.1, p.109 f.21 and p.110 f.2.**

**6 – As there exists in the book showing insignificance to ruling with other than the laws of Allah, and especially on p.5 f.1 with a claim that having concern for the realisation of Tawheed in this issue has similarities with the Shee'ah – ar-Raafidhah – and this is a grave error.**

7 – And by examining the second piece of work – Saihatun-Nadheer, it is found that it [the book] is as if a continuation of the aforementioned book [Fitnatut-Takfeer] – and its condition is as has been mentioned. For this reason, verily, The Permanent Body views that these two books, **it is not permissible to publish them, nor propagating them, nor circulating them, due to what they contain from falsehood and distortion. And we advise their author to fear Allah regarding himself, and regarding the Muslims and especially their youth,** and that he strives to gain Shara'ee knowledge first-hand from the Scholars, those trustworthy in regards to knowledge and correctness of their belief. And that knowledge is a trust, and it is not permissible to propagate it, unless it is in accordance to the Book and the Sunnah. And to uproot the likes of these opinions and the **despicable method of distorting the statements of the people of knowledge.** And it is known that to return to the truth is a virtue and nobility for a Muslim.

And Allah is the granter of success, and the Salaah and Salaam of Allah be upon our Prophet Muhammad, his followers and his companions.

The Permanent body for research and legal opinion:

**Head: Abdul 'Azeez bin 'Abdullah bin Muhammad Aal ash-Sheikh**

Member: 'Abdullah bin 'Abdur-Rahmaan al-Gudeyaan

Member: Bakr bin 'Abdullah Abu Zaid

**Member: Saalih bin Fawzaan al-Fawzaan <sup>6</sup>**

And if we were to list all the criticisms from the people of knowledge about the lies, twistings and fabrications upon the scholars, which have come from the likes of the two heroes of [www.salafipublications.com](http://www.salafipublications.com), when it would require an entire project to

---

<sup>6</sup> And we extend our thanks to brother Abu Zubair Al-'Azzaami, may Allaah protect him and grant him success, for his translation of this *Fatwaa*. We have borrowed this from his web site without permission, although I personally attempted to contact him for his permission without success. And we extend our apologies to our brother, Abu Zubair for using his material here, without his approval. And it is interesting to note here, that [www.salafipublications.com](http://www.salafipublications.com) have attacked him and reviled him as if he were the *Dajjaal*, himself, and all because he said words similar to our words in PART 1 of this series.

enumerate them. So *Inshaa'Allaah*, these two scathing indictments – which are nothing short of complete and utter condemnations of the two heroes of [www.salafipublications.com](http://www.salafipublications.com) – from the *Lajnaa Ad-Da'imah*, are sufficient to illustrate our point. And when we see that [www.salafipublications.com](http://www.salafipublications.com) have attempted to allege this same charge against our work in PART 1 of this series (twisting the words of *Shaykh Al-Albaanee* and narrating them outside of their intended meaning), it becomes evidently clear that [www.salafipublications.com](http://www.salafipublications.com) are the least qualified to accuse individuals of twisting statements and taking their words out of context. This, because they weren't even qualified to (or chose not to) recognize the misquoting, twisting and obvious lies, attributed to the 'Ulaama of *Ahl us-Sunnah* from the likes of their mentors, *Khaalid Al-Anbaree* and 'Alee Al-Halabee! And so, dear reader, the transparent plot of [www.salafipublications.com](http://www.salafipublications.com) becomes even more obvious.

Next, we see that they have attempted to attack and smear the individuals who they assume are our sources of reference. They said:

"It is vital to point out that the reference points of this individual are the likes of Abu Baseer Mustafah Halimah -a well known Takfiri based in Syria, Safar al-Hawali, Mohammad Qutb and others from the neo-Kharijite Think Tank - who have emerged in the current times and have promoted them and haakimiyah."

This is actually amusing for two reasons:

1. Because the reference points of [www.salafipublication.com](http://www.salafipublication.com) are from the likes of the two aforementioned liars and "twisters of words"; *Khaalid Al-Anbaree* and 'Alee Al-Halabee, may Allaah guide and forgive them. And the authors of [www.salafipublications.com](http://www.salafipublications.com) have not even bothered to hide the trail back to the references in the books of these individuals and have quoted freely from them on their web site frequently.
2. I did not quote a single word from Abu Baseer, Safar Al-Hawalee or Muhammad Qutb in the entire text of PART 1 in this series,<sup>7</sup> whereas

---

<sup>7</sup> The reason they have claimed this is because in my original email, which I sent to [www.salafipublications.com](http://www.salafipublications.com) entitled "Exposition and Refutation of *Irjaa'*" – and which was my initial attempt to advise and correct many of their concepts personally, without resorting to a public exposé – included the following quotation:

"And lastly, the following is the type of conversation between ourselves and the *Murji'yah* of this era (with respect to 'Ruling by Other Than What Allaah Revealed'). *Shaykh* Abu Baseer Abdul-Mu'nim Mustafah Haleemah has written this as an example in "*Qawaad fi Takfeer*":

Us: "When will these *Tawagheet* (plural of *Taghuut*) be *Kuffar* according to you?"

Them: "When they make the ruling by what Allaah did not reveal to be *Halaal*."

Us: Isn't the one who rejects the rulings that Allaah revealed and makes war against it and fights everyone who tries to force him to rule by what Allaah revealed, and he – with that, doesn't hesitate for one second to take the *Hukm* to the *Taghuut*. So he makes it appear nice and good and he obligates it (upon the people) with force, when it is required, upon the slaves and the countries. Hasn't the one whose description is this made it *Halaal* to rule by other than what Allaah revealed?"

---

Them: "No. Not until he clearly says with this mouth that he rejects the *Hukm* of Allaah or he makes *Halaal* the ruling by other than what Allaah revealed."

Us: We will increase it's clearness and your knowledge and this is on top of what has passed (in the former question): He does not avoid making as laws, the laws which attempt to be equal with the *Sharee'ah* of Allaah, which he opposes. And he forces his *Hukm*, and makes *Wajib* upon the *Ummah* its carrying out and its implication – and beware to those who oppose it or criticize it. Hasn't the one whose description is this made *Halaal* the ruling by other than what Allaah revealed?!"

Them: "There is no evidence from what has passed that he has made it permissible."

Us: "We will increase you in knowledge because maybe you are unaware. And this is all on top of what we have already mentioned: He describes the *Sharee'ah* of the *Taghuut*, whether or not he was the source (for the laws) or someone else was, and implies, that it provides well-being for the people and the society and other than that, from his words of praise and highness and maybe even describes it as the best types of laws that implicates justice for the people. So then what would you say?"

Them: "Have you opened his heart and known that he makes *Halaal*, the ruling by other than what Allaah revealed? Doesn't he say, '*La Illaha Il-Allaah*'?"

Us: "Then what is your saying about *Iblees*? Was his *Kufr* out of rejection and making *Halaal*? Or don't you even say that he was upon *Kufr*?! And if this – your saying – is not the eye of *Irraa'*, then what is? You are *Murji'yah*, even if you name yourself other than that name. And your claim upon the tongue that you are upon other than that *Menhaaj*, and Allaah, *ta'ala* is the One whom you will be accountable to."

And as for Muhammad Qutb, I mentioned the following single quotation:

"Muhammad Qutb said, "Ibn Abbas has been wronged (oppressed) because he said what he said when he was asked about *Banee Umayyah* and if they were ruling by other than what Allaah revealed. They (the *Khawarij*) asked, 'What do we say about them (*Banee Umayyah*)?' No one has said the *Banee Umaayyah* were *Kuffar* because they used to rule with the *Sharee'ah* in the general lives of the people but they went away from it in some of the matters that had to do with their *Sultaaneyah* either out of misunderstandings or due to their desires. However, they never made their disobedience a part of legislation that would oppose the *Sharee'ah* of Allaah. So Ibn Abbas said about them, 'It (the actions of *Banee Umayyah*) is *Kufr dun Kufr*.' Would it even be possible for Ibn Abbas to say this about those whom erases the Islamic *Sharee'ah* from its origin and replace it with man-made laws?" ("*Waq'iunah Al-Ma'asr*" Pg. 334)

And this single quotation from Muhammad Qutb was an illustration among several which I quoted to them, informing them that the sayings of Ibn Abbaas about the verse:

**And whosoever does not judge by what Allâh has revealed, such are the *Kâfirûn*.**

...were directed towards the rulers of *Banee Umayyah*, who never replaced the laws of the *Sharee'ah* with their own fabricated laws. And so I went on to explain the difference between those rulers who replace the laws and those rulers who simply rule by other than what Allaah revealed in particular instances, due to desire etc.

And as for *Shaykh* Safar Al-Hawalee, then I neither mentioned his name or his books or his statements in any of my correspondence with [www.saafipublications.com](http://www.saafipublications.com) and neither in my refutations of them. However, it is obvious why they have demonstrated their utter hatred to all three of these personalities. And it is for the same reason why they have attacked me and my writings.

As for the honorable *Shaykh* Abu Baseer, may Allaah preserve him, he was a former student of *Shaykh* Al-Albaanee's but when the now infamous cassette entitled "*Kufr Kufraan*" – recorded by "*Tasjilaat Bayt Al-*

www.salafipublications.com have not only quoted 'Alee Al-Halabee and Khaalid Al-Anbaree throughout their entire web site, but they have even attempted to use their words and explanations to refute us in their response to PART 1 in our series! And what an embarrassment for them and we seek refuge with Allaah from falling into such humiliation.

## **The *Ta'weel* of the Century: Getting to the Heart of the Matter**

---

*Maqdis*" in Amman Jordan in 1996, it was Abu Baseer who wrote the most popular refutation of the cassette and sent it to his former teacher as a personal *Naseeha* (i.e. advice). And only when the noble *Shaykh* Al-Albaanee, may Allaah be merciful to him, did not respond to the *Naseeha*, did Abu Baseer release the refutation to the public as a treatise which was later published in book form.

And this was all it took for the authors of www.salafipublications.com to consider him an enemy to their *Menhaj* and to attack and vilify him with names such as "*Takfeeree*" and "*Qutubee*" on their web site. And when we look to their news bulletin section, we see an article entitled "Amongst The Takfiri Intelligentsia: Abu Baseer Mustafa Haleemah", which claims:

"Abu Baseer Mustafah Haleemah has wallowed in the mires of ignorance, desire and misguidance in this aforementioned book, has innovated many principles in the issue of takfir, the sum total of which necessitate the takfir of the vast majority of the Ummaah."

And when we look to their quotations which they offer to substantiate their allegations, we find only a single reference to his statement, which compares the *Irjaa'* of *Shaykh* Naasir, may Allaah be merciful to him, to that of Jahm bin Safwaan. This was all they considered important enough for them to inform their reader. They state that this person basically considers the vast majority of the *Ummah* to be apostates, but rather than demonstrating the correctness of this alarming allegation, which any clear minded individual would consider a huge matter, they chose instead, to offer a single quotation about a statement which has nothing to do with what they have accused him of. And what is the opinion of one scholar about his former teacher compared to his *Takfeer* of the "vast majority of the *Ummah*"?! So what is it that makes him a *Takfeeree* in their eyes? It is his allegation that *Shaykh* Al-Albaanee was upon *Irjaa'* in his teachings. This is all it takes for them to label you with this name. Do you see, dear reader, how this is exactly how www.salafipublications.com has treated PART 1 in our series? Isn't it obvious that www.salafipublications.com is not remotely interested in the *Qur'aan* and the *Sunnah* and the narrations from the people of knowledge and all they are concerned with are individuals and personalities? And this is the precise description of the people of desire and contempt. May Allaah guide them and us, *Inshaa'Allaah*.

And as for *Shaykh* Safar Al-Hawalee, may Allaah preserve him, then it is the same issue for him as well. They call him all kind of names, some of which are hardly found in describing the worst stubborn innovator, and it all leads back to a single sentence he uttered about the *Irjaa'* of *Shaykh* Al-Albaanee in his doctoral thesis; "*Thaari'aat Al-Irjaa'*". And due to this book being supervised and edited by his former professor, Muhammad Qutb, this means that Muhammad Qutb is equally "*Takfeeree*" in his *Meth'haab* by association. And if these weren't such a staggering and defamatory, slanderous accusations, they would almost be funny in their simplicity and foolishness. And what was it that we found in their '*Aqeedah*' section, under the heading "Refutation of the Ash'arees"? It is an article entitled, "Are the Ash'arees from Ahl us-Sunnah wal-Jamaa'ah?" And this is the very same article, which used to bear the name of *Shaykh* Safar Al-Hawalee before they removed it. So their deception and evil is manifestly displayed!

As stated earlier, the crux of the response of [www.salafipublications.com](http://www.salafipublications.com) in their response to PART 1 of our series, is that they have attempted to make an interpretation of the statements of *Shaykh* Al-Albaanee, which would coincide with the principles of *Ahl us-Sunnah wal-Jamaa'ah*; thereby reinforcing the knot they've tied around the issues of 'Ruling by Other Than What Allaah Revealed' and *Shaykh* Al-Albaanee's opinion about actions and their relation to *Kufr* and *Takfeer* and what it necessitates.

Basically, they have stated that the term "*Kufr 'Amilee*", which *Shaykh* Al-Albaanee used in his conversation with the questioner in "*Kufr Kufraan*" refers to all types of *Kufr Al-Asgaar*, which does not take one outside the realm of *Islaam*. And likewise, his usage of the term "*Kufr 'Atiqaadee*" refers to all forms of *Kufr Al-Akbaar*, which do take one outside the realm of *Islaam* – be they actions, beliefs or statements. Then they have gone on to demonstrate how this method of terminology has been employed by the '*Ulaama* in previous writings, such as Ibn Al-Qayyim, Haafidh Al-Haakamee and Muhammad bin Ibraheem, may Allaah be merciful to them all. Next, they have brought a principle from *Ahl us-Sunnah*, about the actions of the limbs being tied to the actions of the heart, which would make the usage of this method of terminology consistent with statements of *Shaykh* Naasir, may Allaah be merciful to him. And lastly, they have attempted to go through selected lines of the excerpt, which I quoted in PART 1 of our series, and illustrate how *Shaykh* Al-Albaanee's comments are actually in compliance with this aforementioned usage of terminology. And of course, along the way, we have the usual evil natured insults and personal attacks on myself and my intelligence and lack of knowledge etc., which we have come to expect from these individuals, may Allaah forgive and guide them.

So let us go through this *Ta'weel*, point by point and make the matters clear to the reader and let us see if this interpretation holds any weight, being as objective as possible and seeking the truth in doing justice to the words and opinions *Shaykh* Al-Albaanee, may Allaah be merciful to him.<sup>8</sup>

## **Terminology:**

### **The common usage:**

- 1st. ***Kufr Al-'Amilee*** (i.e. *Kufr* of actions) is ordinarily used to refer to actions of *Kufr*, which would include statements and all forms of both *Kufr Al-Asgaar* and *Kufr Al-Akbaar*. And it is called *Kufr Al-'Amilee* primarily because it emphasizes the source where the *Kufr* manifested itself; the body. This is because actions are ordinarily

---

<sup>8</sup> And we mention again, here that none of this is due to hatred or spite towards the memory of the noble *Shaykh*, and none of this would be necessary if it wasn't for the likes of [www.salafipublications.com](http://www.salafipublications.com) and their ambitious contemptuous nature, concerning the subject of the *Irjaa'* of *Shaykh* Al-Albaanee, may Allaah be merciful to him.

understood to occur upon the limbs.<sup>9</sup> So this term refers to the cause or source of the *Kufr* and not its result.

And due to this inclusion of both *Kufr Al-Akbaar* and *Kufr Al-Asgaar*, it is not unusual to find 'Ulamaa using this added phrase in the term itself (i.e. *Kufr Al-'Amilee Asgaar* or *Kufr Al-'Amilee Akbaar*), thus avoiding confusion.

**Examples of *Kufr Al-'Amilee Al-Asgaar* or the *Kufr*, which does not remove one from the realm of *Islaam* merely due to the act alone:**

From the *Hadeeth* of Ibn Abbaas, may Allaah be pleased with him, who said, "The Prophet said, 'I was shown the Hell-fire and that the majority of its dwellers were women who were disbelievers (due to ungratefulness).' It was asked, 'Do they disbelieve in Allaah?' He replied, 'They are ungrateful to their husbands and are ungrateful for the favors and the good (charitable deeds) done to them. If you have always been good (benevolent) to one of them and then she sees something in you (not of her liking), she will say, 'I have never received any good from you.'"<sup>10</sup>

And the *Kufr Al-'Amilee Al-Asgaar* is demonstrated with her statement, "I have never received any good from you."

And the *Hadeeth* has been further explained by Al-Bukhaaree in his *Saheeh* by listing it under the heading entitled, "Ingratitude (*Kufr*) to the husbands and *Kufr* less than *Kufr* (i.e. *Kufr dun Kufr*)." Al-Qaadee Abu Bakr Ibn Arabee said, in his explanation, "The point of the author here is to make clear that just as acts of obedience are called *Eemaan*, acts of disobedience are called *Kufr*. But when it is said upon them (those who disobey) it isn't meant as the type of *Kufr* that takes one outside the fold of *Islaam*."<sup>11</sup>

And like that is the saying from him , "Swearing at a Muslim is wrongdoing (*Fasooq*) and fighting him is *Kufr*."<sup>12</sup>

And his saying, "Two of the people have *Kufr* in them; the one who curses his lineage and the bewailer of the dead."<sup>13</sup>

---

<sup>9</sup> Although this does not rule out the "Actions of the Heart" which can be nullified resulting in *Kufr* which removes one from the realm of *Islaam*.

<sup>10</sup> Narrated by Bukhaaree

<sup>11</sup> "*Fat'h al-Bari*", Vol. 1/83

<sup>12</sup> Narrated by Muslim

<sup>13</sup> Narrated by Muslim

And his saying, "Whoever approaches his woman (i.e. wife) (for sexual relations) during her period or his woman in her anus, or goes to a soothsayer, while believing what he says, has disbelieved in what has descended upon Muhammad." <sup>14</sup>

And from Tawoos, who said, "Ibn Abbas was asked about a man who approaches his wife from her anus, so he said, "This man asks me about *Kufr*?!" <sup>15</sup>

So these are examples from the *Sunnah* in which the work *Kufr* has been used, yet when this word is used it is meant as *Kufr Al-Asgaar*, and because these are actions which do not remove one from the realm of *Islaam*, they can be called *Kufr Al-'Amilee Al-Asgaar*.

**Examples of *Kufr Al-'Amilee Al-Akbaar* or the *Kufr* which removes one from the realm of *Islaam* due to the act alone:**

Allaah said:

**And whosoever does not judge by what Allâh has revealed, such are the *Kâfirûn*.** <sup>16</sup>

And:

**Surely, disbelievers are those who said: "Allâh is the third of the three (in a Trinity)." <sup>17</sup>**

And from the *Hadeeth* related by Junadah bin Abee 'Umaay who said, "We entered upon Ubaadah bin As-Saamit while he was sick. We said, 'May Allaah make you healthy. Will you tell us a *Hadeeth* you heard from the Prophet and by which Allaah may make you benefit?' He said, 'The Prophet called us and we gave him the Pledge of allegiance for *Islaam*, and among the conditions on which he took the Pledge from us, was that we were to listen and obey (the orders) both at the time when we were active and at the time when we were tired, and at our difficult time and at our ease and to be obedient to the ruler and give him his right even if he did not give us our right, and not to fight against him unless we noticed him having open *Kufr*, for which we would have a proof with us from Allaah." <sup>18</sup>

---

<sup>14</sup> Narrated Abu Dawood, Nisaa'ee, Ibn Majah and Tirmidhee. Authenticated by *Shaykh* Naasir, may Allaah be merciful to him, in "*Adaab az-Zafaaf*".

<sup>15</sup> Narrated by Nisaa'ee and authenticated by *Shaykh* Naasir, may Allaah be merciful to him, in "*Adaab az-Zafaaf*".

<sup>16</sup> *Surat al-Ma'idah*, 44 For a detailed discussion on this verse and its usage which includes *Kufr Al-Akbaar*, see pg. 45-61 in PART 1 of this series.

<sup>17</sup> *Surat al-Ma'idah*, 73

<sup>18</sup> Agreed upon

So these are actions which do nullify *Islaam* and which thusly, they can be called *Kufr Al-'Amilee Al-Akbaar*.

2nd. ***Kufr Al-'Atiqaadee*** (i.e. *Kufr* of beliefs) is ordinarily understood to refer to beliefs of *Kufr*, which include all forms of *Kufr Al-Akbaar*. And it is called *Kufr Al-'Atiqaadee* because these beliefs come from within an individual and result in beliefs in the heart which contradict *Islaamic* belief. However, it is quite rare to find the 'Ulaama using the terms *Kufr Al-'Atiqaadee Al-Asgaar* or *Kufr Al-Atiqaadee Al-Akbaar* because in most cases, the ascription of *Kufr* in the 'Atiqaad (i.e. beliefs) refers to those matters of the heart, which nullify *Islaam*. Hence, the term *Kufr Al-'Atiqaadee* is usually understood to be *Al-Akbaar* by default, except with rare exceptions. So again, this term refers to the cause or source of the *Kufr* and not its result.

So far we are in agreement with the authors of [www.salafipublications.com](http://www.salafipublications.com).

But as they have pointed out in their response to PART 1 in our series, these terms can also take on a different connotation. And this would be as follows:

1st. ***Kufr Al-'Amilee***: Actions of *Kufr Al-Asgaar* only. This usage of the term refers exclusively to actions, which carry the label of "*Kufr*" but which do not remove one from the realm of *Islaam*. Such acts would include all of the actions we listed in the section above in which we detailed *Kufr Al-'Amilee Al-Asgaar*; fighting a Muslim, approaching ones wife from her anus, ingratitude to ones husband etc. So this term refers to the cause or source of the *Kufr*, which does not completely nullify the *Eemaan* from the heart. However, this usage of the term *Kufr Al-'Amilee* does not include actions which nullify ones *Islaam* and the reason becomes clear in the next definition.

So this type of *Kufr* can also be called:

***Kufr less than Kufr (Kufr dun Kufr)***

***Minor Kufr (Kufr Al-Asgaar)***

***Kufr which does not cause one to leave the realm***

***Kufr of Ingratitude (Kufr an-Na'amah)***

2nd. ***Kufr Al-'Atiqaadee***: *Kufr*, which nullifies ones *Islaam*, whether it comes from the body (i.e. actions and sayings) or the beliefs. And this is referred to because once the *Kufr*, which removes one from *Islaam*, has occurred from an individual, he is a *Kaafir* both internally and externally. This means that a person who has committed an act, uttered a statement or taken a belief which nullifies his *Islaam*, then the heart has had its *Eemaan* removed and what is left is *Kufr*. So it can be said that the heart – wherein the beliefs lie – is the depository for what results after *Kufr Al-Akbaar* has occurred. And because the actions, statements and beliefs of *Kufr Al-*

*Akbaar* nullify the *Eemaan* in the heart, then what remains can be called *Kufr Al-'Atiqaadee*.<sup>19</sup> So whatever caused one to leave *Islaam* would be called *Kufr Al-'Atiqaadee* and would include all of what we mentioned in our description of *Kufr Al-'Amilee Al-Akbaar* and other than that from the matters of belief as well such as:

***Kufr of Stubbornness (I'naad)***<sup>20</sup>  
***Kufr of Denial (Inkaar)***<sup>21</sup>  
***Kufr of Pride (Kibr)***<sup>22</sup>

---

<sup>19</sup> www.salafipublications.com have awkwardly attempted to explain this on pages 8 – 9 of their response.

<sup>20</sup> Allaah said:

(And it will be said): "Both of you throw (Order from Allâh to the two angels) into Hell, every stubborn disbeliever (in the Oneness of Allâh, in His Messengers, etc.). [- *Surat al-Qaf*, 24]

And He said:

Nay! Verily, he has been stubborn and opposing Our *Ayât* (proofs, evidences, verses, lessons, signs, revelations, etc.). [- *Surat al-Mudathir*, 16]

<sup>21</sup> Concerning the *Kufr* of Denial, Allaah said:

They recognize the Grace of Allâh, yet they deny it (by worshipping others besides Allâh) and most of them are disbelievers (deny the Prophethood of Muhammad صلى الله عليه وسلم). [- *Surat an-Nahl*, 83]

<sup>22</sup> This is the same or close to the *Kufr* of Stubbornness except that the reason for the one who performs it is his pride and condescension. Allaah, the Most High said about them:

**They said: "Shall we believe in you, when the meanest (of the people) follow you?" He said: "And what knowledge have I of what they used to do? "Their account is only with my Lord, if you could (but) know. "And I am not going to drive away the believers."** [- *Surat al-Ashuurah*, 111-114]

And Allaah said about those did *Kufr* due to their pride:

**And they prostrated except *Iblîs* (Satan), he refused and was proud and was one of the disbelievers (disobedient to Allâh).** [- *Surat al-Baqarah*, 34]

He said about Pharaoh:

**And he and his hosts were arrogant in the land, without right, and they thought that they would never return to Us.** [- *Surat al-Qasas*, 39]

And Allaah said:

***Kufr of Rejection (Juhood)*** <sup>23</sup>  
***Kufr of Hypocrisy (Nifaaq)*** <sup>24</sup>  
***Kufr of making something Haraam into Halaal (Istih'laal)*** <sup>25</sup>  
***Kufr of Hatred (Kaarh)*** <sup>26</sup>

---

**Yes! Verily, there came to you My *Ayât* (proofs, evidences, verses, lessons, signs, revelations, etc.) and you denied them, and were proud and were among the disbelievers.** [- *Surat az-Zumar*, 59] And He said, [ - *Surat al-Baqarah*, 87]

And He said:

**But as for those who refuse His worship and were proud, He will punish them with a painful torment.** [- *Surat an-Nisaa*, 173]

<sup>23</sup> Allaah, the Most High said, about the *Kufr* of Rejection:

And they belied them (those *Ayât*) wrongfully and arrogantly, though their own selves were convinced thereof... [- *Surat an-Naml*, 14]

And He said:

But none denies Our Signs except every perfidious ungrateful. [- *Surat Luqman*, 32]

And He said:

...as also do some of these (who are present with you now like 'Abdullâh bin Salâm) and none but the disbelievers reject Our *Ayât* [(proofs, signs, verses, lessons, etc., and deny Our Oneness of Lordship and Our Oneness of worship and Our Oneness of Our Names and Qualities: i.e. Islâmic Monotheism)]. [- *Surat Anakbut*, 47]

<sup>24</sup> Allaah, the Most High said about them:

Verily, the hypocrites will be in the lowest depths (grade) of the Fire [- *Surat an-Nisaa*, 145]

And He said:

Allâh has promised the hypocrites; men and women, and the disbelievers, the Fire of Hell, therein shall they abide. It will suffice them. Allâh has cursed them and for them is the lasting torment. [- *Surat at-Tauba*, 68]

<sup>25</sup> This is the one who makes *Halaal* what Allaah made *Haraam*. There is no disagreement about the *Kufr* of one who does this because has put himself as a partner with Allaah and legislated ruling, which strives to be equal with the law of Allaah.

<sup>26</sup> Allaah said:

***Kufr of Mocking (Isti'sah)*** <sup>27</sup>  
***Kufr of Turning Away ('Iraadh)*** <sup>28</sup>

So any of these forms and descriptions of *Kufr Al-Akbaar* – whether in action, statement or belief – would cause the perpetrator of them to have his heart's *Eemaan* nullified and therefore *Kufr* would take its place and so when the term *Kufr Al-*

---

**But those who disbelieve (in the Oneness of Allâh Islâmîc Monotheism), for them is destruction, and (Allâh) will make their deeds vain. That is because they hate that which Allâh has sent down (this Qur'ân and Islâmîc laws, etc.), so He has made their deeds fruitless. [- Surat Muhammad, 8-9]**

And He said:

**Verily, those who have turned back (have apostated) as disbelievers after the guidance has been manifested to them, *Shaitân* (Satan) has beautified for them (their false hopes), and (Allâh) prolonged their term (age). This is because they said to those who hate what Allâh has sent down: "We will obey you in part of the matter," [- Surat Muhammad, 25-26]**

<sup>27</sup> Allaah said:

Say: "Was it at Allâh and His *Ayât* (proofs, evidences, verses, lessons, signs, revelations, etc.) and His Messenger *صلى الله عليه وسلم* that you were mocking?" Make no excuse; you have disbelieved after you had believed. [- Surat at-Tauba, 65-66]

And He said:

And it has already been revealed to you in the Book (this Qur'ân) that when you hear the Verses of Allâh being denied and mocked at, then sit not with them, until they engage in a talk other than that; (but if you stayed with them) certainly in that case you would be like them. Surely, Allâh will collect the hypocrites and disbelievers all together in Hell. [- Surat an-Nisaa, 140]

<sup>28</sup> Like Allaah, the Most High said:

**And who does more wrong than he who is reminded of the *Ayât* (proofs, evidences, verses, lessons, signs, revelations, etc.) of his Lord, but turns away from them forgetting what (deeds) his hands have sent forth. [- Surat Kahf, 57]**

And He said:

**And indeed We have given you from Us a Reminder (this Qur'ân). Whoever turns away from it (this Qur'ân i.e. does not believe in it, nor acts on its orders), verily, they will bear a heavy burden (of sins) on the Day of Resurrection. They will abide in that (state in the Fire of Hell), and evil indeed will it be that load for them on the Day of Resurrection. [- Surat Taha, 99-101]**

And turning away could be *Kufr* or it may be less than that depending upon what it leads to.

'*Atiqaadee* is used, it does not describe the source, rather it describes the resulting effect on the heart.

### **A Brief note about this terminology:**

Due to the obvious complexity of the different connotations of these terms and how they can be used, we would advise the reader to avoid using the terminology of *Kufr Al-'Amilee* and *Kufr Al-'Atiqaadee* for several reasons. From them:

1. The *Salaaf* did not use these terms; rather they used the term "*Kufr dun Kufr*" (i.e. *Kufr* less than *Kufr*) or *Kufr*, which does not take one outside the realm when referring to the *Kufr Al-Asgaar*, thus eliminating the usage which describes the source or the effect altogether. This usage is simpler and only refers to the level of *Kufr* and whether it is the type which nullifies all the *Eemaan* or the type which only reduces it.
2. This kind of usage of the terminology can lead to the misconception that only *Kufr* which emanates from the beliefs of the heart can cause one to leave *Islaam*. And verily, without a detailed explanation of the second usage of *Kufr 'Amilee* and *Kufr Al-'Atiqaadee*, many people have fallen into this precise mistake, such as the honorable *Shaykh* Muhammad Naasir Ad-Deen Al-Albaanee, may Allaah be merciful to him.

*Shaykh* 'Abdul-Qadr bin Abdul-'Azeez said, "...And from this, it is clear that the *Kufr 'Amilee* – and that is the *Kufr Al-Asgaar* – is other than *Kufr* through actions, which is *Kufr Al-Akbaar* that falls upon the sayings of the tongue and the actions of the body. And I call the people of knowledge and its students in our time and the upcoming eras, to avoid the use of the terminology "*Kufr 'Amilee*" and to use instead what was narrated from the *Salaaf* in its meaning and this is for two reasons.

'Firstly, because it is an innovated terminology which was employed by the later people and it was not narrated by the *Salaaf* from the *Sahabah* and the *Tabi'een* (i.e. those who witnessed the *Sahabah*). Rather, what was narrated from them was the description of *Kufr Asgaar* with the terminology "*Kufr*, which does not remove one from the *Milla* (i.e. realm of *Islaam*)" and the terminology "*Kufr dun Kufr*" and it was what was narrated by *Imaam* Al-Bukhaaree in his *Saheeh* in "*Kitaab Al-Eemaan* and the Terminology of *Kufr* of Ingratitude". **And the second reason being, that describing *Kufr Asgaar* as *Kufr 'Amilee* gives an impression that no one disbelieves by an action and that there is no *Kufr* except in belief and this is the *Meth'haab* of the *Murji'yah*...**" – to the end of his words.<sup>29</sup>

### **Analyzing the Statements of the People of Knowledge**

---

<sup>29</sup> "Al-Jami' Taalib Al-'Ilm Shareef", Vol. 1/

So if we want to look to some of the statements of the people of knowledge who employed this second, less common usage of *Kufr Al-'Amilee* and *Kufr Al-'Atiqaadee*, we might narrate some of what [www.salafipublications.com](http://www.salafipublications.com) have quoted.

Firstly, they narrate from Ibn Al-Qayyim, may Allaah be merciful to him, who said, "... And there is another principle, that disbelief, kufr is of two types: a) the kufr of action and b) the kufr of juhood ' (denial) and 'inaad (stubborn rejection). As for the kufr of juhood then it is when one disbelieves in what is known to have been brought by the Messenger (sallallaahu alaihi wasallam) from Allaah, out of juhood and 'inaad from amongst the Names, Attributes, Actions and rulings of the Lord. This type of kufr negates faith from every single aspect.

As for the kufr of action, then this divides into two types: 1) A type which negates Imaan and 2) a type which does not negate Imaan. So prostrating to an idol, belittling the mus-haf (the Qur'an), fighting the Prophet and reviling him negates Imaan (i.e. Islaam). As for ruling by other than what Allaah has revealed and abandoning the prayer, then that is from the kufr of action absolutely.<sup>30</sup> So the one who rules by other than what Allaah has revealed is a disbeliever and the one who abandons the prayer is a disbeliever due to the textual ruling of the Messenger (sallallaahu alaihi wasallam), however this is the kufr of action not the kufr of belief.

'It is also impossible for Allaah - free is He from imperfection - to call the one who rules by other than what Allaah has revealed to be a disbeliever and for the Messenger of Allaah to call the one who abandons the prayer to be a disbeliever, and then not apply the label of "disbeliever" to them. And the Messenger of Allaah (sallallaahu alaihi wasallam) negated Imaan from the fornicator, thief, and the one who consumes khamr, intoxicants. And also from the one whose neighbours are not safe from his evil.

'So when the label of Imaan has been negated from such a one, then he is a disbeliever from the point of view of his action, but the kufr of juhood and belief (i'tiqad) has been negated from him. It is likewise in his (sallallaahu alaihi wasallam's) saying, "Do not become disbelievers after me, striking the necks of one another.'" (Kitaab us-Salaat of Ibn al-Qayyim)<sup>31</sup>

---

<sup>30</sup> And what is intended by "...ruling by other than what Allaah revealed..." is the ruler or judge who leaves the *Hukm* of Allaah in specific instances due to desire and not in matters of *Tashree' Al-'Aam* (i.e. General Legislation) or *Tab'deel Shara' Allaah* (i.e. replacing the laws of Allaah's *Sharee'ah*). See pages 52 – 58 of PART 1 in this series for the distinction made by *Ahl us-Sunnah* in this matter. And although there are no apparent, clear narrations from Ibn Al-Qayyim in his *Takfeer* of the one who engages in *Tashree' Al-'Aam* or performs *Tab'deel Shara' Allaah*, the greatest proof is the absence of disapproval from him towards his teacher, *Shaykh Al-Islaam* Ibn Taymiyah, who made *Takfeer* of the Tartars who replaced the *Sharee'ah* with the "*Yaasiq*." And Allaah knows best.

<sup>31</sup> Our brothers from [www.salafipublications.com](http://www.salafipublications.com) neglected to include the reference point from the book, which they were quoting from. It is from page 72 of "*As-Salaat wa Hukmoo Taarikeeha* " published by *Al-Jafaan wa'l-Jabee* (Cyprus) and *Daar Ibn Hazm* (Beirut, Lebanon) 1<sup>st</sup> Edition, 1416 H. / 1996 G. or from page 25 of the original publication.

So let us look deeply into the words of Ibn Al-Qayyim here. Firstly, he defines *the Kufr Al-'Amilee* according to the generally accepted usage of the terminology. He said, **“As for the kufr of action, then this divides into two types: 1) A type which negates Imaan and 2) a type which does not negate Imaan.”** And then he goes on to use the lesser applied usage of the terminology, which is that *Kufr 'Amilee* is restricted to that which does not nullify all the *Eemaan* from an individual. This is clear from his words: **“So when the label of Imaan has been negated from such a one, then he is a disbeliever from the point of view of his action, but the kufr of juhood and belief (i'tiqad) has been negated from him.”**

So what we have here from *Imaam* Ibn Al-Qayyim, may Allaah be merciful to him, is a definition which has been clearly defined to the reader. And he has preceded his discussion of the one who abandons the prayer with this explanation of the terminology he was applying. And from this text, which [www.salafipublications.com](http://www.salafipublications.com) narrated we see two things:

1. Ibn Al-Qayyim, may Allaah be merciful to him, considered that actions, which are at the level of *Kufr Al-Akbaar*, nullify ones *Eemaan* merely by one committing this action and he did not stipulate a condition of all of the actions of *Kufr* to be accompanied with *Juhood* or *Istih'laal* in the heart for these actions to cause one to leave the realm of *Islaam*. And this is clear from his saying: **“So prostrating to an idol, belittling the mus-haf (the Qur'an), fighting the Prophet and reviling him negates Imaan (i.e. Islaam).”**
2. He made the point of clarifying this matter before employing his usage of the terminology of *Kufr 'Amilee* as to avoid any confusion and to reaffirm the basic principle of *Ahl us-Sunnah wal-Jamaa'ah* of the *Takfeer* of the one who commits acts of *Kufr Al-Akbaar*, due to the action itself. And his usage was not to imply the source of the *Kufr*, rather it was to demonstrate the effect of *Kufr Al-'Amilee Al-Asgaar* in the context of the *Islaamic* texts, which label certain actions as *Kufr* but are not at the level of *Kufr Al-'Amilee Al-Akbaar*.

Next, [www.salafipublications.com](http://www.salafipublications.com) narrates the words of Al-Haafidh Al-Haakamee who said, “When it is said to us: Prostrating to an idol, belittling the Book, reviling the Messenger (sallallahu alaihi wasallam), jesting about the religion - and so on - all of this is from the kufr of action - from what is apparent - so why then does it also expel from the religion, and you have at the same time, labelled the minor kufr (al-kufr al-asghar) with the kufr of action (al-'amali)? And the reply is: Know that these four - and whatever resembles them -are not considered to be from the kufr of action except from the point of view that they occur by the actions of the limbs as observed by the people. However [in reality] they do not occur except with the passing away of the action of the heart - of intention (niyyah) sincerity (ikhlaas) love (mahabbah) and compliance (inqiyaad) - none of that remains. So therefore, these actions, even though they occur by [physical] action [of the limbs] outwardly, they in fact necessitate (mustalzimah) the kufr of belief (al-kufr al-i'tiqadi) and there is no escaping from this...” Then he said, "And we do not define the minor kufr (al-kufr al-asghar) with the kufr of action (al-'amali) absolutely and

unrestrictedly - [but merely as occurring by action alone, which does not necessitate a belief (i'tiqaad) (that negates Imaan), and which does not negate the speech (i.e. the belief) of the heart, and nor its action." (A'laam us-Sunnah al- Manshoorah pp.181-182).<sup>32</sup>

So let us again, look into the words of Al-Haafidh Al-Haakamee, may Allaah be merciful to him. And from this narration we can conclude several points:

1. The *Shaykh*, may Allaah be merciful to him, has confirmed that these actions of *Kufr Al-'Amilee* expel from the religion without the additional condition of *Istih'laal* or *Juhood* etc. in the heart. And this is clear from his statement: **"...they do not occur except with the passing away of the action of the heart..."** by which he means that when a person commits these actions of *Kufr Al-Akbaar*, the result is the nullification of the action of the heart. And he did not say: **"...they do not occur except after the action of the heart has passed away..."**<sup>33</sup>

2. He also, as Ibn Al-Qayyim did before him, made it clear that his usage of the terminology of *Kufr Al-'Amilee* was intended to reflect the result of the *Kufr Al-'Amilee Al-Asgaar*, in the sense that it does not cause one to leave *Islaam*. Thus, he makes it clear that his usage of the term *Kufr 'Amilee* does not imply that there are no actions which cause one to leave *Islaam*, rather he has affirmed that they do as in the above narration.

And this is made even more explicit in another question from the same source which [www.salafipublications.com](http://www.salafipublications.com) selectively quoted:

"What is the *Kufr 'Amilee*, which does not take one outside the *Milla* (i.e. realm of *Islaam*)?" He answered, "It is every disobedience which the Legislator (i.e. Allaah) has labeled with the name "*Kufr*", while the name of "*Eemaan*" remains upon the one who performs it."<sup>34</sup>

3. As for his usage of *Kufr 'Atiqaadee*, then it is again clear that the *Shaykh*, may Allaah be merciful to him, is referring to the result of the *Kufr Al-Akbaar* on the actions of the heart. That is to say, he is not limiting the source of *Kufr Al-Akbaar* to matters of the heart, rather he has called all acts of *Kufr Al-Akbaar*, *Kufr 'Atiqaadee* because every *Kufr Al-Akbaar* – whether actions, statements or beliefs – end in the nullification of the actions or statements of the heart. And this all becomes obvious in

---

<sup>32</sup> Our brothers at [www.salafipublications.com](http://www.salafipublications.com), may Allaah guide them, are quoting from "*'Alaam As-Sunnah Al-Manshoorah li-'Atiqaad At-Ta'fah An-Najdeeyah Al-Mansoorah*", published by *Maktabaat Ar-Rushd lil'Naashr wa-Tawzee'*, 1<sup>st</sup> Edition, 1418 H./1998 G.

We will quote from this same book but from the original publication by "*Daar Al-Noor*" in Germany, 1406 H. / 1986 G. so the page numbers will not reflect the same quotations for those who wish to verify our references.

<sup>33</sup> *Inshaa'Allaah*, we will make clear the importance of this distinction shortly.

<sup>34</sup> "*'Alaam As-Sunnah Al-Manshoorah*", Pg. 82

his statement: **“So therefore, these actions, even though they occur by [physical] action [of the limbs] outwardly, they in fact necessitate (mustalzimah) the kufr of belief (al-kufr al-i'tiqadi) and there is no escaping from this...”**

And also, “The *Kufr* is two *Kufrs*; *Kufr Akbaar*, which takes one outside the *Eemaan* totally and it is *Kufr 'Atiqaadee*, which nullifies the sayings of the heart and its actions or one of the two. And *Kufr Asgaar*, which nullifies the completion of *Eemaan*, but does not nullify it totally and it is *Kufr 'Amilee*, which does not nullify the sayings of the heart not its actions and it does not necessitate that.”<sup>35</sup>

So we see that both Ibn Al-Qayyim and Al-Haafidh Al-Haakamee were quite meticulous in their qualification of the terminology which they used. And this was precisely as we have stated earlier; to avoid confusion and to confirm that some actions do, in fact, cause one to leave the realm of *Islaam*. So when the questioner asked Al-Haafidh Al-Haakamee to clarify his usage of *Kufr 'Atiqaadee*, we see a clear definition explaining this apparent contradiction. And his explanation was inline with what *Ahl us-Sunnah* would say about the result of *Kufr Al-Akbaar* on the statements and actions of the heart.

And Ibn Al-Qayyim, may Allaah be merciful to him, complied with this principle completely when he said, “So the *Eemaan Al-'Amilee* is opposed by *Kufr 'Amilee* and the *Eemaan Al-'Atiqaadee* is opposed by the *Kufr 'Atiqaadee* and the Prophet mentioned what we said in the *Saheeh Hadeeth*, “The swearing at the Muslim is *Fusooq* and the fighting him is *Kufr*.” So he differentiated between fighting him and swearing at him and he made one of the two *Fusooq*, which one does not disbelieve by, and the other *Kufr*. And it is known that he only intended the *Kufr 'Amilee*, not the *Kufr 'Atiqaadee* and this *Kufr* does not take him outside the realm of *Islaam* or the *Milla* totally like the fornicator or the thief or the one who drinks does not leave the *Milla*, even if the label of *Eemaan* does.”<sup>36</sup>

And finally, we find that [www.salafipublications.com](http://www.salafipublications.com) have brought a statement from the Noble *Shaykh Al-Albaanee*, may Allaah be merciful to him:

“And amongst the actions are those on account of which a person actually disbelieves with the kufr of belief (I'tiqadiyy) (i.e. apostatises). This is because such actions show his disbelief with absolute certainty and decisiveness in the sense that when a person commits them, it is as if he is actually expressing his disbelief with his tongue, such as the one who kicks the Qur'an while he knows it is the Qur'an and intending to do it, deliberately...” Refer to *Fitnah of Takfir* (p. 72 1<sup>st</sup> edition, 1417H).

And with this narration that we have counted numerous times from the articles of [www.salafipublications.com](http://www.salafipublications.com) is one, which they have consistently attempted to use to demonstrate that *Shaykh Al-Albaanee*, may Allaah be merciful to him, considered actions of *Kufr* to cause one to leave *Islaam*; thus clearing him of *Irjaa*'. And the reason is that

---

<sup>35</sup> “ ‘Alaam As-Sunnah Al-Manshoorah ”, Pg. 80

<sup>36</sup> “*As-Salaat* ”, Pg. 73

they have alleged that his usage of *Kufr* '*Atiqaadee*, in the above quotation, is in the same context as that of Ibn Al-Qayyim and Al-Haafidh Al-Haakamee.

So let us put this statement – which apparently is all [www.salafipublications.com](http://www.salafipublications.com) could come up with – under the same scrutiny which we have done with the likes of those of Ibn Al-Qayyim and Al-Haafidh Al-Haakamee, may Allaah be merciful to them all.

So in order to make this statement be under the same usage of the terminology employed in the earlier narrations, it would mean that *Shaykh* Al-Albaanee, may Allaah be merciful to him, was saying that these actions of *Kufr* cause the *Eemaan* (i.e. actions and statements of the heart) to be nullified; thus resulting in *Kufr Al-'Atiqaadee* (i.e. *Kufr* of the heart). So what this would mean is, the actions would occur and this would have their effect on the heart, rendering it devoid of any *Eemaan*, therefore causing the heart to contain the result of its absence; *Kufr*.

But when looking into the actual text of this statement, we do not find this meaning consistent with the words themselves. Look to the words: “This is because **such actions show his disbelief with absolute certainty and decisiveness** in the sense that when a person commits them, **it is as if he is actually expressing his disbelief** with his tongue...”

So the *Shaykh* has actually said that these actions are a result from the *Kufr*, which resides in the heart at the time of their perpetration. And this is clear from his words, “**This is because such actions show his disbelief...**” And this statement is like saying, “...so the **internal disbelief becomes apparent from the external action...**” And this is the same as saying, “Actions of *Kufr* are evidence for *Kufr* in the heart.” And this is the saying of the *Murji'yaat Al-Fuqahaa* and it is clear *Irjaa'*.<sup>37</sup>

So look at this statement which is mentioned by *Shaykh* Al-Albaanee, may Allaah be merciful to him, and compare it with one from Ibn Al-Qayyim, may Allaah be merciful to him:

“So like **he disbelieves by bringing a word of *Kufr* intentionally** – and it is a branch from the branches of *Kufr* – like that, **he disbelieves by acting a branch of its branches**, such as prostrating to a statue or belittling the *Mus'haaf*.”<sup>38</sup>

And so Ibn Al-Qayyim has said that the statements and actions themselves are *Kufr*, which takes one outside the *Milla* (i.e. realm of *Islam*), *Shaykh* Al-Albaanee has stated that these actions “...**show his disbelief...**” and this is not a mere difference in phrasing, but a complete contradiction in meaning.

And so yet again, the evidence put forth by [www.salafipublications.com](http://www.salafipublications.com) stands against them. And what a humiliation for them that the very book by which they attempted to

---

<sup>37</sup> Look to PART 1 in this series pages 6 – 9 for a refutation of the *Murji'yaat Al-Fuqahaa*.

<sup>38</sup> “*As-Salaat*”, Pg. 70

demonstrate parallel statements between Ibn Al-Qayyim and *Shaykh* Al-Albaanee is the same book wherein we find a great gap between their respective understandings of *Kufr* and apostasy.

**AN AMAZING BENEFIT:** A clear and obvious example of the lack of understanding of [www.salafipublications.com](http://www.salafipublications.com) can be found on page 7 of their document entitled, "The Creed of Imaam Al-Albaanee on Takfir and Apostasy", in which they write this exact same narration from *Shaykh* Al-Albaanee and followed it with this same quotation from Ibn Al-Qayyim, may Allaah be merciful to them both. Have they no eyes with which to see the huge difference between these two sayings?! And what is even more dumbfounding, is that they mentioned these two statements together in an attempt to demonstrate the similarities of the sayings of Ibn Al-Qayyim and *Shaykh* Al-Albaanee! And if this were not such an important matter, we would be amused instead of distressed.

But the insanity does not end here. Sadly, in the same document they also include the two following statements:

Shaikh ul-Islam Ibn Taymiyyah (rahimahullaah): "So whoever uttered a statement of kufr without having any need for uttering it, doing it deliberately knowing that it is a statement of disbelief, **then he becomes a disbeliever through that** both externally (dhahiran) and internally (batinan) and it is not permissible for it to be said that it is possible for him to still remain a believer internally..." and also "**And whoever reviled Allaah or the Messenger, then he disbelieves** both externally and internally..." See as-Saarim al-Maslool (p.513-515).

Imaam an-Nawawi (rahimahullaah) said in "Kitaab ur-Riddah" (The Book of Apostasy): "It is the cutting off of Islaam. **This occurs sometimes by a statement that constitutes kufr, and sometimes by an act.** And the **actions which necessitate kufr (that expel from the religion)** are those which are performed deliberately, and mocking the religion is clear [in this regard], such as prostrating to an idol or to the sun, or throwing the Qur'an into filth, and the magic which involves worshipping the sun and other such acts." Rawdat ut-Taalibeen (7/284-283)

*Allaahu Akbaar!* These are the sayings of *Ahl us-Sunnah* – those who consider the actions of *Kufr*, themselves to cause one to leave *Islaam!* And not the saying of the *Murji'yaat Al-Fuqahaa* – those who saw actions of *Kufr* as apparent evidence for the hidden *Kufr* of the heart. And although both these two groups saw the perpetrator of these acts to be *Kuffar*, the *Usool* that they apply to arrive at this ruling are valleys apart! And the reason was due to a separation between actions and *Kufr*, which is the same as removing actions from *Eemaan!* And this is one of the concepts of *Ahl us-Sunnah* and *Salafeeyah*, which has deluded the authors of [www.salafipublications.com](http://www.salafipublications.com). And the very fact that they could not recognize this point in their quotation of these narrations altogether and their attempt to use them alongside this one from *Shaykh* Al-Albaanee, is a deadlock, absolute, clear-cut proof that the authors of [www.salafipublications.com](http://www.salafipublications.com) are beguiled and deluded in

ignorance when it comes to the topic of *Kufr, Eemaan* and *Takfeer* and 'Ruling by Other Than What Allaah Revealed'!!!<sup>39</sup>

So look to the statement again:

“And amongst the actions are those on account of which a person actually disbelieves with the *kufr* of belief (*I'tiqaadiyy*) (i.e. apostatises). **This is because such actions show his disbelief** with absolute certainty and decisiveness in the sense that when a person commits them, it is as if he is actually expressing his disbelief with his tongue, such as the one who kicks the *Qur'an* while he knows it is the *Qur'an* and intending to do it, deliberately...” Refer to *Fitnah of Takfir* (p. 72 1<sup>st</sup> edition, 1417H).

And it would have been correct to say this instead:

“And amongst the actions are those which an individual disbelieves with the *Kufr* that takes him outside the *Milla of Islaam*. **This is because actions of *Kufr Al-Akbaar* nullify the *Eemaan* on their own** with absolute certainty and decisiveness in the sense that when a person commits them, they cause all the *Eemaan* to be removed from him rendering him an apostate; such as the one who kicks the *Qur'aan* while he knows it is the *Qur'aan* and intending to do it, deliberately.”

And in case, [www.salafipublications.com](http://www.salafipublications.com) insists that this is another “...twisting and distorting of the *Shaykh's* words...”<sup>40</sup> then let them look to their own words which indicate that the understanding I derived from this statement from *Shaykh Al-Albaanee*, is the very same way they, themselves understood it. We find on page 29 of “The Creed of Imaam Al-Albaanee on Takfir and Apostasy”:

“...And we have already quoted the words of Imaam al-Albani that **amongst the external actions are those that absolutely and with certainty give evidence that a person is guilty of disbelief that expels from the religion** and amongst them is kicking the *Qu'ran*. So there is no proof for the Innovators in this, may Allaah sever them. And the statement of Imaam al-Albani, “And amongst the actions are those on account of which a person actually disbelieves with the *kufr* of belief (i.e. apostatises ). **This is because such actions show his disbelief** with certainty and decisiveness in the sense that when a person commits them, it is as if he is actually expressing his disbelief with his tongue, such as the one who kicks the *Qur'an* while he knows it is the *Qur'an* and intending to kick it, deliberately (*qasd*)...”

And this statement is further clarified by another narration from him, while speaking to *Khaalid Al-Anbaree*, in the cassette “*At-Tah'reer li'Usool At-Takfeer*” – produced by

---

<sup>39</sup> In fact, the best similitude of the authors of [www.salafipublications.com](http://www.salafipublications.com) writing articles of *Kufr, Eemaan* and *Takfeer*, is that of a colorblind man hired to paint a portrait of a brilliant sunrise. And to Allaah is the refuge from ignorance and foolishness!

<sup>40</sup> As alleged on page 6 of “Part 1: The Creed of Imaam Al-Albaani on *Kufr*”, which is their response to PART 1 in our series.

“*Tasjilaat Eelaaf Al-Islaameeyah lil’Intaaj wa-Tawzee’*”, dated *Al-Ramadhaan* 1416 H., which is equivalent to February 10, 1996.

**Shaykh Al-Albaanee:** We are not disagreeing with you on this point...may Allaah bless you. **There are actions, which show what is in the heart. There are actions which emerge from an individual which show what is in the heart from *Kufr* and *Tughi’aan*. From that is *Isti’zaah* (i.e. mocking *Islaam*, the *Qur’aan*, the Prophet etc)...**

So again we find words from *Shaykh* Al-Albaanee which clearly state that he considered actions and statements as evidence for *Kufr* rather than *Kufr* in and of themselves. And we have responded to this idea in PART 1 in this series.<sup>41</sup> And the truth is that this concept is *Irjaa’* and mistaken. And we are not saying that it is impossible for a person to leave *Islaam* internally and then for an action to emerge from him, which will show his existing *Kufr*. In fact, this completely possible. But the point we are emphasizing here is that these actions and statements of *Kufr Akbaar*, would nullify the *Eemaan* of a person, even if he was a *Mu’min* one millisecond prior to committing them. And this is what should be understood from the student of knowledge when he hears the phrase: “Actions of *Kufr* are *Kufr*,” or “Statements of *Kufr* are *Kufr*.”

And one of the clearest indications of this from the Book of Allaah is:

**Whoever disbelieved in Allâh after his belief, except him who is forced thereto and whose heart is at rest with Faith but such as open their breasts to disbelief, on them is wrath from Allâh, and theirs will be a great torment. That is because they loved and preferred the life of this world over that of the Hereafter. And Allâh guides not the people who disbelieve.**<sup>42</sup>

---

<sup>41</sup> Refer to the footnotes on pages 69 and 70 for a refresher if necessary. And look to the refutation from *Shaykh Al-Islaam*, Ibn Taymiyah and *Imaam* Ibn Hazm, who said, “But as far as the one who swears at Allaah, *ta’ala*, **there is not on the face of the Earth a Muslim who disagrees that it is *Kufr* on its own except the *Jah’meeyah* and the *Ashar’eeyah* – and they are two groups who are not even considered –** who clearly state that swearing at Allaah, *ta’ala* and uttering *Kufr* is not *Kufr*. **And some of them say it is evidence that he believes *Kufr***, not that he is certainly a *Kaafir* due to his swearing at Allaah, *ta’ala*.” – “*Al-Fasil fee Al-Milal wal-Ah’wahee wa-Na’hiL’*”, Vol. 13/498

And look to the words of Ibn Hazm, may Allaah be merciful to him, who said, “But as far as the *Ashar’eeyah*, they have said, ‘Verily, the one who shows *Islaam* (externally); his swearing at Allaah, *ta’ala* and His Messenger, with the worst profanity and utters his disbelief in them upon his tongue not due to *Tuq’iah* (i.e. fear of death or torture etc.) and not merely through narration (i.e. reporting the words of another) and his confirming that he believes in that – nothing from that is *Kufr* (itself). **But then when they feared the attack of the people of *Islaam* against them, they said, ‘Rather, it is evidence that there is *Kufr* in his heart.’**” – “*Al-Fasil fi Al-Milal wal-Ah’wahee wa-Na’hiL’*”, Vol. 5/75

<sup>42</sup> *An-Nahl*, 106-107

So He, *ta'ala* has said, **“Whoever disbelieved in Allâh after his belief, except him who is forced thereto and whose heart is at rest with Faith...”** So this *Ayaah* is referring to actions and statements which take one outside the *Milla*. And this is because it is impossible for matters of the heart – be they statements or actions – to be coerced into submission. And it is only the statements of the tongue and actions of the body that can be **“...forced...”** And Allaah has affirmed that the only way these actions and statements will not cause one to leave *Islaam*, are when they come from a compelled person.

Ibn Taymiyah, may Allaah be merciful to him said, “He made everyone who speaks words of *Kufr* to be under the threat of punishment of the *Kuffar* except those who are compelled while their hearts are at rest with *Eemaan*. So if it is said, ‘But the Most High said: **...but such as open their breasts to disbelief...**’ It is said to them (in answer), ‘And this is said in compliance to its (i.e. the *Ayaah*’s) beginning because anyone who disbelieves without being compelled, has opened his breast to *Kufr*. And if it weren’t like that, then the nullification of its beginning would have come at its end. And if the meaning of ‘**...whoever disbelieved...**’ was the one who opened his breast to *Kufr* – that would be without compulsion – then He would not have only made an exception to the one who was compelled, rather it would have been obligatory to make an exception for the one who is compelled and the one who is not compelled – **if he says the words of *Kufr*, willingly then he has opened his breast to it and that is *Kufr*.**”<sup>43</sup>

### **...Continuing the Refutation...**

So next, we find in this “Blazing Salafi Meteor”:

“Shaikh Khalid al-Anbari read out the statement, “And there is no doubt that the kufr that expels from the religion - as is understood by Ahl us-Sunnah wal-Jamaa'ah - is of six types and it is not just a single type: (these being): takdhib (rejection), juhood (denial), 'inaad (wilful resistance), nifaq (hypocrisy), i'raad (turning away), shakk (doubt).” Imaam al-Albani affirmed this and agreed with this perfectly.”

And so we are not surprised that the *Shaykh*, may Allaah be merciful to him, would agree to these categories of *Kufr*, because there is not one of them which can not be in the form of internal *Kufr* of the heart. In fact, the majority of these types are firstly thought of as matters of the heart both in linguistic usage and in the terminology of the *Sharee'ah* anyway.

And then they go on to say:

“Then there occurs later in the tape: Shaikh Khaalid al-Anbari: "...therefore, I have understood from you right now that your saying is that indeed, kufr occurs by belief, and it occurs also by speech, and it occurs also by...". Imaam al-Albani: interjecting, "...by action (amal) ”.

---

<sup>43</sup> “*Al-Fataawa*”, Vol. 7/220

And here we would be tempted to understand from this dialogue that the *Shaykh* was referring to matters of *Kufr Al-'Amilee Akbaar*; however, we have seen too many statements from him, may Allaah be merciful to him, which would indicate that he is not saying that these actions take one outside the *Milla*, rather he is only saying that they are *Kufr*. And it is unclear from this if he intended the actions of *Kufr*, which causes one to apostatize upon committing the action, or the actions of *Kufr*, which do not cause one to apostatize upon committing them. And it is clear that *Shaykh* Al-Albaanee has called the action of abandonment of prayer "*Kufr*", however he understood this to mean the *Kufr* of ingratitude rather than the *Kufr*, which removes one from the *Milla*.

So we do not assume that a person, who says, "Such-and-such action is *Kufr*," is necessarily referring to those acts of *Kufr*, which nullify *Eemaan* absolutely. And so this was another vain attempt from [www.salafipublication.com](http://www.salafipublication.com) to deceive the reader. And to Allaah is the refuge.

And when we look to the nature of *Shaykh* Al-Albaanee's usage of this term, when referring to actions, we see that he requires these actions to be accompanied with *Juhood* or *Istih'laal* in the heart before he will consider them to nullify the *Eemaan* of an individual. And when we look to his discussion on sinful actions and their effect on *Eemaan*, we see that the *Shaykh*, may Allaah be merciful to him, did not see any sins, which takes one outside *Islaam* merely due to their being committed.

In *Shaykh* Al-Albaanee's commentary of the text of "*Al-'Aqeedah At-Tahawiyyah*", we see that he, may Allaah be merciful to him, quite clearly alluded to this understanding when quoted Ibn Abee Al-'Izz as saying, "...Narrated from *Ahl us-Sunnah* – those who say that *Eemaan* is sayings and actions and that it increases and decreases – that the sin, **whatever sin it is**, it is *Kufr 'Amilee* and not *'Atiqaadee* and that the *Kufr* according to them is at levels; *Kufr dun Kufr* just as *Eemaan* is according to them." <sup>44</sup>

And this extra wording of the additional phrase "...**whatever sin it is**..." is not found in the wording of Ibn Abee Al-'Izz in his own commentary. <sup>45</sup> And so this added phrasing was not that of Ibn Abee Al-'Izz, rather it was that of *Shaykh* Al-Albaanee himself, may Allaah be merciful to him. And this is exactly like saying, "There is no sin in existence, which nullifies *Islaam* on its own without being accompanied by a belief in the heart."

And this is a clear refutation of the *Baatil Ta'weel* of the likes of [www.salafipublications.com](http://www.salafipublications.com) and those like them, upon his usage the terminology *Kufr 'Amilee* and *Kufr 'Atiqaadee*. He is not saying here that only sins which are less than *Kufr Al-Akbaar* are *Kufr 'Amilee*. He is saying that *Takfeer* can not be made to the perpetrator of a sin, "...**whatever sin it is**..." because these are actions and not beliefs!

---

<sup>44</sup> "*Al-'Aqeedah At-Tahawiyyah Sharh' wa-Taaleeq Al-Albaanee*", Pg. 40 – 41, Published by Al-Maktaab Al-Islaamee, 1397 H

<sup>45</sup> Look to "*Sharh' 'Aqeedah At-Tahawiyyah*", by Ibn Abee Al-'Izz Pg. 262 – 263, Published by *Al-Maktaab Al-Islaamee*, 1403 H.

But it is clear from the actual words of Ibn Abee Al-'Izz, that he was employing the terminology of *Kufr 'Amilee* with respect to actions of *Kufr Al-Asgaar* because this section of the text of *Al-'Aqeedah At-Tahawiyyah* was in refutation of the *Khawaarij* – those who made *Takfeer* due to the sins which do not remove one from the *Milla*, such as drinking alcohol or fornication etc. And what further confirms that Ibn Abee Al-'Izz, may Allaah be merciful to him, did not intend his words as *Shaykh* Naasir quoted and added to them, is his words which follow these one as found later in his commentary.

He said, “...**And because of this, many *Imaams* refused to generally say that we do not make *Takfeer* to anyone due to a sin, rather it is to be said that we do not make *Takfeer* to them by every sin as the *Khawaarij* do.**”<sup>46</sup>

And we see that the ‘*Ulaama* who used this phrasing would differentiate between the sins which do not nullify *Islaam* and those which do. Such as *Shaykh Al-Isaam* Ibn Taymiyah who said, “And if we say *Ahl us-Sunnah* are in agreement that no one disbelieves due to a sin, we mean by this, the sins such as fornication and drinking (alcohol).”<sup>47</sup>

So this becomes clear that the *Ta'weel* of [www.salafipublications.com](http://www.salafipublications.com) is false from its outset in their attempt to trick their readers into accepting *Shaykh* Al-Albaanee's usage of the terminology of Ibn Al-Qayyim and Al-Haafidh Al-Haakamee, may Allaah be merciful to them all. This is because the honorable *Shaykh* Naasir, may Allaah be merciful to him, did not see the *Kufr* in actions the same way *Ahl us-Sunnah wa'l-Jamaa'ah* did. This is clear in that he, may Allaah be merciful to him, only saw the *Kufr 'Amilee* to be evidence for the *Kufr*, which may or may reside in the heart at the time of the perpetration, rather than being a nullification of *Eemaan* absolutely. And no matter how many times the likes of [www.salafipublications.com](http://www.salafipublications.com) and their heroes, ‘Alee Hassan Al-Halabee and Khaalid Al-Anbaree, may Allaah guide them, attempt demonstrate the refutation of *Shaykh* Al-Albaanee against some of the branches of *Irjaa'*, this does not ensure that the *Shaykh* did not fall into other branches.<sup>48</sup> And his separation of actions from the *Kufr Al-Akbaar* is but one of these branches.

---

<sup>46</sup> “*Sharh 'Aqeedah At-Tahawiyyah*”, by Ibn Abee Al-'Izz Pg. 355 – 356, Published by *Al-Maktaab Al-Islaamee*, 1403 H. And when we look to the *Imaams* of the *Salaaf*, we see what Ibn Abee Al-'Izz, may Allaah be merciful to him, is saying to be exemplified precisely. Look to the following narration from *Imaam* Ahmad, may Allaah be merciful to him:

“Al-Khalaal said, ‘Muhammad bin Haroon informed me that Ishaq bin Ibrahim narrated to them as he said, ‘I was present when a man asked Abu Abdullah, ‘O Abu Abdullah, there is *Ijmaa'* of the Muslims concerning the *Eemaan* in *Qadr*; the good and the bad (effects) thereof.’ Abu Abdullah said, ‘Yes.’ **He said, ‘And we do not make *Takfeer* to anyone due to a sin.’ So Abu Abdullah said, ‘Be silent! Whoever abandons the *Salaat*, has disbelieved and whoever says the *Qur'aan* is created then he is a *Kaafir!*”** – Look to “*Al-Musnad*” by *Imaam* Ahmad bin Hanbal with the *Tah'qeeq* (i.e. verification) of Ahmad Shaakir, may Allaah be merciful to him, Vol. 1/79

<sup>47</sup> “*Al-Fataawa*”, Vol. 7/302

<sup>48</sup> This will become clearer in our upcoming section, *Inshaa'Allaah*.

And from the clearest statements, which proves this is his own statement in his cassette, *Kufr Kufraan*:

**Shaykh Al-Albaanee:** “You...may Allaah bless you...have you paid attention previously and just now during this sitting, **that the *Kufr* is an action of the heart and not an action of the body?** Did you pay attention to this or not?!”

And if the allegation of [www.salafipublications.com](http://www.salafipublications.com) were correct, then this statement should read:

“You...may Allaah bless you...have you paid attention previously and just now during this sitting, that the *Kufr* ‘*Amilee* is *Kufr Al-Asgaar* and the *Kufr* ‘*Atiqaadee* is the *Kufr Al-Akbaar* or whatever causes one to leave *Islaam* – be it from actions or statements or beliefs.”

Or, alternatively, he should have said:

“You...may Allaah bless you...have you paid attention previously and just now during this sitting, that the *Kufr* is what results in the heart after any *Kufr Al-Akbaar* is committed – be it from actions or statements or beliefs?”

And we would even accept:

“You...may Allaah bless you...have you paid attention previously and just now during this sitting, that the *Kufr* ‘*Atiqaadee* is all of what takes you outside *Islaam* – be it from actions or statements or beliefs, and the *Kufr* ‘*Amilee* are all the actions of *Kufr*, which do not cause one to leave the *Milla*?”

So look to the wreckage of the *Ta'weel* of the blind adherents and the followers of desires! O, [www.salafipublications.com](http://www.salafipublications.com) is it even possible that you could have read this statement and not see the clearness of the *Irjaa* therein! May Allaah forgive and guide you to the *Salafeeyah*, which you claim to call to!

And as they continue to construct their fortress of *Ta'weel*, in which they hide their innovated principles of *Kufr*, *Eemaan* and *Takfeer*, their walls begin to crumble and corrode such that even the slightest breeze knocks it over. It is truly as Allaah said:

**...but verily, the frailest (weakest) of houses is the spider's house; if they but knew.**<sup>49</sup>

So when this statement of *Shaykh* Al-Albaanee, may Allaah be merciful to him is uttered, [www.salafipublications.com](http://www.salafipublications.com) continue to stumble in their blindness and struggle to come up with a some sort of explanation for this obvious *Irjaa*. So look to their pitiful attempt:

---

<sup>49</sup> Al-'Ankabût, 41

**Shaykh Al-Albaanee:** “You...may Allaah bless you...have you paid attention previously and just now during this sitting, **that the *Kufr* is an action of the heart and not an action of the body?** Did you pay attention to this or not?!”

The author(s) of the response to PART 1 in our series said:

“[Comments]: The Shaikh here is speaking from the angle that is outlined in some of the quotations that we outlined in Part 1, in which the meaning afforded is that the heart is the *asl* (basis, foundation), and the actions follow on from that, being a branch of it, giving *daleel* (evidence) to it (such as Shaikh ul-Islaam Ibn Taymiyyah). And as for the "action of the body" being alluded to by the Shaikh, then because the context of the question is ruling by other than what Allaah has revealed, which the Shaikh considers to be the *kufr* of action to begin with, and which he does not consider to be the *kufr* that expels from the religion unless it is accompanied with *juhood*, *istihlaal*, *i'tiqaad* and the likes, then what the Shaikh intends is what he understands to be *al-kufr al-'amali*, or what is considered to be *al-kufr al- asghar*, and what will give the clearest of evidences to this is what follows below when the Shaikh gives actual examples of the types of actions he is talking about. [/Comments].”

*Al-Hamdu'lillah.* This is what was referred to in the introduction in which we mentioned the frailty of the logic of the people of blindness. Their twistings and interpretations are completely transparent and this is a blessing from Allaah, the Most High, who has kept His *Deen* pure from ambiguity.

So [www.salafipublications.com](http://www.salafipublications.com) are alleging that this statement is in the spirit of their *Baatil Ta'weel* of the usage of terminology of *Kufr 'Amilee* and *Kufr 'Atiqaadee* – which they attempted to demonstrate that the *Shaykh*, may Allaah be merciful to him, intends by this, the *Kufr 'Atiqaadee* to refer to all those actions, statements and beliefs that nullify one's *Islaam*. However; what this statement means in its phrasing and in its context is that there are no actions which cause one to leave the *Milla* of *Islaam*, unless they are accompanied with a belief in the heart at the time of their perpetration. And the best possible interpretation we could surmise from this statement is in line with what was established earlier; that the *Shaykh*, may Allaah be merciful to him, only considered the actions of *Kufr* to indicate the hidden *Kufr* of the heart and not that these actions themselves nullify the *Islaam*. And the *Irjaa'* of this concept is clear to anyone with knowledge. So this is either the saying of the *Ghulaat Al-Murji'yah* and *Jahmee'yah* in its worst possible connotation, or the *Murji'yaat Al-Fuqahaa*, in its most lenient implication.

And they, may Allaah forgive and guide them, are also trying to say that this statement was not a general description of *Kufr*, rather it is only in the context of the specific issue raised by the questioner – that of 'Ruling by Other Than What Allaah Revealed'. And this is simpleminded illogic, which almost needs no refutation here. However, for the purpose of thoroughness, let us look into the context of this statement:

**Questioner:** “Concerning the *Ijmaa'* that Ibn Katheer mentioned in “*Al-Bidaaya Wa-Nihaaya*,” that whoever rules with “*Al-Yasaaq*” (i.e. the book put together by the Tartars

who added their own *Hukm* to the *Sharee'ah* as well as some of the laws of the People of the Book) that he is a *Kaafir* by *Ijmaa'* of the *Muslimeen*, and also O our *Shaykh*, just like Muhammad bin Abdul-Wahhab says, "The *Tawagheet* (plural of *Taghuut*) are five..." and from them, "...The unjust ruler that changes the laws of Allaah..." and he mentioned the one who rules by other than what Allaah revealed. And like we know that disbelief in the *Taghuut* is the second pillar of *Tawheed*, because Allaah *az'awajaal* said, "**Whoever disbelieves in the *Taghuut* and believes in Allaah, then he has grasped the firm hand-hold...**" (Surat *Al-Baqarah*, 256) ...so the disbelief in the *Taghuut* is the second pillar from the pillars of *Eemaan*. So if we say that the *Ijmaa'* has been narrated about the *Kufr* of the one who changes the laws of Allaah, *az'awajaal*, then I must establish this *Aqeedah* and establish the *Islaamic* state – as we have heard from you – inside my heart. So I must not believe this in my heart, especially when the *Ulamaa'* of the *Muslimeen* ... more than one '*Alaam* ... have narrated the *Ijmaa'* of the *Kufr* of the ruler who changes (the *Hukm*) and from them was Mah'mood Shaakir and 'Umar Al-Ashqaar and about six *Ulamaa'* have narrated the *Ijmaa'* on this point."

**Answer from the *Shaykh*:** "You...may Allaah bless you...have you paid attention previously and just now during this sitting, **that the *Kufr* is an action of the heart and not an action of the body?** Did you pay attention to this or not?!"

**Questioner:** "We do not agree with this."

**Answer from the *Shaykh*:** "This is where the problems arise. What is the *Kufr*? What does 'disbelieved' mean linguistically and in the terminology of the *Sharee'ah*?"

**Questioner:** "The *Kufr* in the language means the rejection but in the terminology of the *Sharee'ah*, the *Ulamaa'* have broken it down into *Kufr Al-'Atiqaadee* and *Kufr Al-'Amilee* or *Kufr Akbaar* and *Kufr Asgaar*. And the *Kufr Al-Akbaar*, they said, is what takes you outside the *Milla*. So the *Kufr Al-Asgaar*..."

**Answer from the *Shaykh*:** "It doesn't matter...may Allaah bless you...we do not want lectures right now! We want understanding – *wa* (Q & A). Just now you said that there is *Kufr 'Amilee* and *Kufr 'Atiqaadee*. Do you mean what you say? Fine. The *Kufr 'Amilee*...does the one who commits it disbelieve?"

So this statement of *Shaykh* Naasir, may Allaah be merciful to him, is in fact, in the most general context possible. This is clear from what he says immediately after this statement:

"This is where the problems arise. What is the *Kufr*? What does 'disbelieved' mean linguistically and in the terminology of the *Sharee'ah*?"

So if this statement about the *Kufr* in action vs. the *Kufr* of the heart were limited to the context of 'Ruling by Other Than What Allaah Revealed', then this next statement – which is a question of the most general type – could not possibly fit in the discussion at this place. Also, what indicates that this statement is was not limited to the context of the questioner's question about 'Ruling by Other Than What Allaah Revealed' is the what

appears in the statement itself, from *Shaykh Al-Albaanee*, may Allaah be merciful to him: **“...have you paid attention previously and just now during this sitting...”** So this means that even before the questioner asked his question about ‘Ruling by Other Than What Allaah Revealed’, *Shaykh Al-Albaanee* was emphasizing that none of the actions themselves take one outside the *Milla* and **“...that the *Kufr* is an action of the heart and not an action of the body...”**

This is all too clear for anyone with common sense and the faculties or reason. And the obvious discrepancies between the actual text of *Shaykh Al-Albaanee*’s statements and the allegations of [www.salafipublications.com](http://www.salafipublications.com) can only exist because they have not truly understood the reality of *Kufr* and Apostasy according to the principles of *Ahl us-Sunnah wa’l-Jamaa’ah* and the precepts of *Salafeeyah* itself.

Look to the following statements, which appear on page 16 of their response to PART 1 of our series:

**“The Extremist Murji’ah say either:**

- 1) that the act itself is not kufr at all, externally or internally, but it is just indicative of kufr, or...”** and at this point, they add the footnote: **“And this is in reference to those acts that are al-kufr al-akbar, such as kicking the Qur’aan, reviling the Messenger (sallallahu alaihl wasallam) and the likes.”**

But this is not the *Meth’haab* of the *Ghulaat Al-Murji’yah*, rather it is from the *Murji’yaat Al-Fuqahaa* – those who did not see actions of obedience to be *Eemaan* itself, rather that it was evidence for the pre-existing *Eemaan* in the heart and therefore they did not see any sins – **“...whatever sin it is...”** – to be *Kufr* itself, rather that it was evidence for pre-existing *Kufr* in the heart.

*Allaahu Akbaar!* So this example of the ignorance of the author(s) of their response to PART 1 in our series, clearly demonstrates their lack of understanding the concepts they are attempting to explain. And this statement itself, is a condemnation of *Shaykh Al-Albaanee* as an *Extreme Murji’ee* – this because they have only been able to bring a single statement in which the noble *Shaykh* said that kicking the *Qur’aan* intentionally with knowledge that it was the *Qur’aan* will **“...show his disbelief...”** with is the same as saying, **“...it is indicative of *Kufr*...”** And then they include a footnote which says that this act (i.e. kicking the *Qur’aan* intentionally) is a *Kufr Al-Akbaar*, which is *Kufr* itself! So they have labeled him with the *Irjaa’* of the *Ghulaat Al-Murji’yah* in the same sentence which they were attempting to defend him! And what more would we have to say to prove their ignorance?! By Allaah, if this single demonstration of their lack of understanding were all that was to emerge from us as a refutation, it would suffice to silence their chatter! So they have not understood the difference between the *Ghulaat Al-Murji’yah* and the *Murji’yaat Al-Fuqahaa* and they combine this ignorance with words, which indict the same individual with the very charge they are attempting to clear him from!! What a disgrace and what an embarrassment for them.

O www.salafipublications.com, if only you read carefully the article I sent you, with sincerity, in order to advise and correct your mistakes, entitled “Exposition and Refutation of *Irjaa'* ”, and considered what was therein, this gross error on your part would have been avoided.

And for the next few pages (16 – 20), www.salafipublications.com have attempted to demonstrate the difference between *Shaykh* Al-Albaanee and some of the principles of the *Murji'yah*. And at this point, we must make some issues clear to the reader.

### **Explaining the Difference Between the *Usool* (i.e. roots) of the *Murji'yah* their *Furoo'* (i.e. branches).**

When we look to the *Usool* of the different groups who fell into *Irjaa'* such as the *Ghulaat Al-Murji'yah*, the *Murji'yaat Al-Fuqahaa*, the *Jah'meeyah*, the *Ashaa'ira*, the *Karameeyah*, the *Matureedeeyah* or other than them, we can see certain similarities and differences. And these differences are either in the form of *Usool* or *Furoo'*.

One basic '*Usl* of their deviation comes down to a separation of actions and *Eemaan*. So all of the various groups of *Irjaa'* have some varying degree of this concept.<sup>50</sup> And because of this, and all of the differences between them, it is difficult to pin down *Irjaa'* to one clear definition. But what is clear is that both the '*Usl* and the *Faraa'* are labeled with the term "*Irjaa'*".<sup>51</sup> So when we look to an individual who has some branches of *Irjaa'* in his ideology, it is not a necessity that all of the *Usool* of the *Murji'yah* are present in him at the same time. And likewise it is not a necessity that all of the *Furoo'* of *Irjaa'* would be identical between two groups of *Irjaa'* even if they agreed upon an '*Usl*.

For example, we find that some of the groups of *Irjaa'* agreed to the '*Usl* that *Eemaan* does not increase or decrease but they differed as to whether or not a person could be made *Takfeer* to, due to a statement or an action. Likewise, we see that some of them agreed upon the '*Usl* that actions are not from *Eemaan*, yet they differed as to the necessity of uttering the *Shahadatayn* in order to be a Muslim.

Also, we see that the *Murji'yah* and the *Khawaarij* – who are the greatest in opposition to one another – both agreed upon the mistaken '*Usl* that *Eemaan* is a constant entity, which is either present in totality or absent in totality. So the *Khawaarij* interpreted this '*Usl* to mean that if a person committed any sin, his *Eemaan* would leave completely and the *Murji'yah* interpreted it to mean that if a person committed a sin – “...**whatever sin it**

---

<sup>50</sup> So this might result in a difference between whether actions of *Kufr* would merely be considered evidence for the internal *Kufr* at the time of their being committed, or if they would not even be considered evidence for this internal *Kufr* at all. And although both of these mistaken concepts are derived from a common '*Usl* – that being a separation of actions and *Eemaan* – they are not agreed in the *Furoo'* of what these actions prove. And this is but one example. So both are *Irjaa'* but they are not identical in their understanding of *Takfeer* and Apostasy.

<sup>51</sup> Just as when we say the '*Usl* of *Eemaan* is in the heart and what comes from the body is *Faraa'*. This does not mean that the matters of the heart are sufficient for *Eemaan* to exist, it means that we call actions of the body *Eemaan* just as we call actions of the heart *Eemaan*.

is...” – he would always remain a Muslim because these sinful actions would not remove any of the *Eemaan*, which to them, was *Tasdeeq*. So here we have an example of where two groups of *Bid'ah* have agreed to a common '*Usl* but were in direct opposition with respect to the *Furoo'*.

So when www.salafipublications.com attempt to bring statements of *Shaykh* Al-Albaanee which are in opposition to some of the *Usool* of the *Murji'yah*, this does not necessarily clear him from all of the *Furoo'* of *Irjaa'*. And likewise, when they bring some words or statements from him, which refute the *Furoo'* of *Irjaa'*, this does not necessarily prove that he did not take some of their *Usool*.

Furthermore, there are statements, which encompass the basic teachings of *Islaam* that are adhered to by *Ahl us-Sunnah wa'l-Jamaa'ah* that are sometimes employed by the people of *Bid'ah* also and this is because they can take on a different meaning than what *Ahl us-Sunnah* intends by them.

Such as the saying of the *Khawaarij*, who used the phrase: “*Eemaan* is statements and actions and beliefs”, in a different way than how *Ahl us-Sunnah* use it. This is because they understood this phrase to imply that any statement, action or belief – which is in disobedience to Allaah – would be *Kufr* by necessity and a lack of all *Eemaan* in its entirety.

So when we say that the *Shaykh*, may Allaah be merciful to him, took some of the *Furoo'* of the *Murji'yah*, this does not mean that we are saying he took all of what they believed in every matter. Nor does it mean that he took all of their *Usool*. And it is not strange to find the *Shaykh*, may Allaah be merciful to him saying, “*Eemaan* is statements, actions and beliefs,” or “Actions are from *Eemaan*,” or “*Eemaan* increases and decreases,” – and these are refutations from sayings of *Ahl us-Sunnah* against the general *Usool* of the *Murji'yah* – because we must look into the understanding that is implemented with these statements as well as the other statements, which tend to affirm some of the *Furoo'* of *Irjaa'*.

So for an encompassing explanation of this concept, we turned to *Shaykh* Sulaymaan bin Naasir Al-'Ulwaan, may Allaah preserve him. And we called twice and asked slight variations of the same question.

### **The First Question**

Question: “Can we say about a person that he is a *Murji'ee* due to his saying, ‘There is no action, which takes a person outside *Islaam* unless it is accompanied with *Juhood* or *Istih'laal*,’ while at the same time he says, ‘*Eemaan* is sayings and actions and beliefs?’”

Answer: “The principle when labeling a person a being a *Kharaajee* or a *Murji'ee* or a *Mu'taazilee* or other than that, is that his *Usool* are the *Usool* of that *Meth'haab*.<sup>52</sup> An

---

<sup>52</sup> So look to the answer of the noble *Shaykh* Sulaymaan, may Allaah preserve him, and look to how the very beginning of his answer contains a distinction between the outright declaration of a person, with a

example of that is if a person says, 'I believe that *Eemaan* is sayings and actions and beliefs, but I also say that the actions – there is nothing from them that is *Kufr* except that which is based upon *Juhood* or *Istih'laal* or something like that.' **This man took an 'Usl from the Usool of the people of *Irjaa'*, even if he says, 'I believe that *Eemaan* is sayings and actions,' because this belief is not correct and not established in his heart. And that is because if he truly believed that *Eemaan* is sayings and actions and beliefs, then he would have declared the *Kufr* of the one who abandons the actions.** <sup>53</sup> Because there is no difference of opinion among *Ahl us-Sunnah* that *Tawheed* is sayings and beliefs and actions. So if he truly believed that *Tawheed* was sayings, beliefs and actions, then why does he not make *Takfeer* to the one who abandons the actions? And for this, *Shaykh Al-Islam* Muhammad Ibn 'Abdul-Wahhab, may Allaah the Most High grant him mercy, in "*Kashf Ash-Shubuhaat*" – in its conclusion – he said, 'There is no difference of opinion that the *Tawheed* must be in the heart and upon the tongue and the actions. And if any of those were absent, then the man would not be a Muslim. So if he knows *Tawheed* but does not act upon it, then he is a stubborn *Kaafir*, such as Fir'aun and Iblees and the likes of them. And this is the general thing of most of the people. They say, 'This is true, and we understand this and we bear witness that it is correct; however, we are unable to perform it and it is not allowed amongst the people of our country except for us to comply with them,' or other than that from their excuses. And this poor person does not know that most of the *Imaams* of *Kufr* know the truth and they did not abandon it except for something of the excuses like He, the Most High said: **They purchased with the *Ayaat* of Allaah a miserable gain,**' and other than that from the *Ayaat*. Such as His saying: **They know him as they know their own sons.** And if he acts upon the *Tawheed* through apparent actions, and does not understand it, or does not believe it in his heart, then he is a *Munaafiq* and he is more evil than the pure *Kaafir*. He, the Most High, said: **Verily, the *Munaafiqeen* are in the lowest depths of the Fire.**' –

---

branch of *Bid'ah* as being outside *Ahl us-Sunnah* immediately and he who takes the entire *Usool* of that group. And this is a good example for the asinine ramblings of [www.salafipublications.com](http://www.salafipublications.com) who immediately cast one outside *Ahl us-Sunnah* and remove the description of *Salafeeyah* and categorize him with their own innovated labels and fabricated groups such as *Qutubiyyah* and other than that!

<sup>53</sup> *Inshaa'Allaah*, we will discuss *Shaykh* Naasir's opinion about the actions as related to *Eemaan* but at this point we should mention that he was asked:

**Khaalid Al-Anbaree:** Our *Shaykh*, what is the place of actions in *Eemaan*? And are they a condition for its completeness or a condition its existence? I hope for clarity on this matter. May Allaah bless you.

**Shaykh Al-Albaanee:** What we have understood from the evidences of the Book and the *Sunnah* and from the sayings of the *Imaams* from the *Sahabah* and the *Tabi'een* and the *Imaams* who have witnessed them is that whatever exceeds the actions of the heart and passes it to what has to do with the actions of the body, **then it is a condition of the completeness (*Shart Kamal*) and not a condition for its existence (*Shart Sihhah*).** From the first question of side A of "*At-Tah'reer li'Usool At-Takfeer*" – produced by "*Tasjilaat Eelaaf Al-Islameeyah lil'Intaaj wa-Tawzee'*" , dated *Al-Ramadhaan* 1416 H., which is equivalent to February 10, 1996.

So what we see here in this clear, unambiguous answer, is that the noble *Shaykh* Al-Albaanee, may Allaah be merciful to him, would consider a person within the realm of *Islam*, even if he did not have one single action of *Eemaan* to his credit.

until the end of his (i.e. Muhammad Ibn 'Abdul-Wahhab's) words, may Allaah, the Most High, be merciful to him. And they should be reviewed because they are beautiful words and are fierce in their refutation of the people of *Irjaa'*.<sup>54</sup> And like that also, is the *Khaarajee* if he says, '*Eemaan* is sayings upon the tongue and beliefs and actions but I also say that the perpetrator of a major sin disbelieves.' So how does the perpetrator of a major sin disbelieve while the Prophet did not make *Takfeer* to him!? We say that this is the *Meth'haab* of the *Khawaarij*. And like that is the *Murji'ee* in the beginning. We say that he is a *Murji'ee* and like that is if a person says, 'I judge upon the texts [of *Islaam* (i.e. *Qur'aan* and *Sunnah*)] with the intellect and I do not accept the *Ahaad* (i.e. non-continuous) narrations,' then we say that he is a *Mu'tazilee*. So everyone who takes from the *Usool* of the people of *Bid'ah*, we say that he is astray in this issue and that he upon the *Usool* of the people of *Irjaa'* in this matter. And Allaah knows best."

## The Second Question

Question: "If there is a man who says, '*Eemaan* increases and decreases,' and that, '*Actions* are from *Eemaan*,' then can he be called a *Murji'ee* if he says that actions do not take a person outside *Islaam*."

Answer: "We know that the *Murji'yah* are (different) sects. From them are those who say that the *Eemaan* is sayings and beliefs with out actions. And from them are those who say that *Eemaan* is sayings and actions and beliefs; however, the one who abandons *Jins Al-'Amal* does not disbelieve – meaning that the one who leaves the actions of the body, does not disbelieve. And this is the saying of Jahm bin Safwaan, as *Imaam* Ibn Hazm, may Allaah be merciful to him, mentioned that from him. And it is attributed to the *Ghulaat Al-Murji'yah*. So if this person who said it is from the people of *Ijtihad*, then his saying is rejected but he is not attributed to the people of *Irjaa'*, even if his words are from the words of the *Murji'yah*, because not everyone who falls into *Irjaa'* becomes a *Murji'ee*. But there is no doubt that his saying that *Eemaan* is sayings and beliefs and

---

<sup>54</sup> **AN AMAZING BENNEFIT:** And what an embarrassment for the authors of [www.salafipublications.com](http://www.salafipublications.com) who are currently (as of the writing of this document) producing a series of studies based upon the text of this same book entitled, "Readings in *Kashf ush-Shubuhaat*" in which they are going through it line by line adding and expounding upon its meanings. And we find in article ID: TAW010005 in the *Tawheed* section on [www.salafipublications.com](http://www.salafipublications.com), which is the basic text of the original work of *Shaykh* Muhammad Ibn Abdul-Wahhab, translated into English: "Let us conclude with another important problem about which much has been said before. There is no disagreement that tawhid must take place in the heart, in the mouth, and in the arm. If it is deficient in any of these areas, there is no Islam. Whoever knows the principles of tawhid and does not act on them is an unbeliever, on a par with Pharaoh and Iblis (Satan) or their likes..." And this was from their own translation in their own web site in the very treatise which they are attempting to offer a commentary on! So they are the epitome of the blind leading the blind and this is further proof. And yet again, we have found within their very domain, a refutation, which they have produced against themselves! And not only that; they are even offering an in-depth commentary upon that very treatise which contains a fierce condemnation of their wicked and innovated concepts! O [www.salafipublications.com](http://www.salafipublications.com), your ignorance has betrayed you once more and what a shame that is for you! You are not even capable to grasp the concepts, which you are attempting to explain to others. May Allaah guide you and us all.

actions does not intercede for him because it is a must that he makes *Takfeer* to the one who abandons the *Jins Al-'Amal* just as it is *Ijmaa'* from *Ahl us-Sunnah*. Their *Ijmaa'* was narrated by Al-Aajooree in "*Ash-Sharee'ah*" and *Imaam* Ibnu Buttah in "*Al-Eebaanah*" and *Shaykh Al-Islam* Ibn Taymiyah, may Allaah be merciful to him, in "*Kitaab Al-Eemaan*" within the seventh volume of the *Fataawa*. **And we know that some of the groups from the people of *Irjaa'* in this time say that *Eemaan* is sayings and beliefs and actions but they remove the *Kufr* from the label of actions and this – in reality – is the *Meth'haab* of Jahn bin Safwaan and the *Ghulaat* of the people of *Irjaa'*. And Allaah knows best."**

And with this explanation, along with what preceded it, we can understand that the fact that *Shaykh* Naasir Ad-Deen Al-Albaanee, may Allaah be merciful to him, refuted the some of the *Usool* and *Furoo'* of the *Murji'yah* and at the same time, he fell into some of their *Usool* and *Furoo'*. So when the likes of [www.salafipublications.com](http://www.salafipublications.com) and their heroes such as Khaalid Al-Anbaree and 'Alee Al-Halabee, may Allaah guide them, bring statements from the *Shaykh* about actions being included in *Eemaan*, and *Eemaan* increasing and decreasing, this does not necessitate that he is cleared from all of what the various groups from the people of *Irjaa'* fell into. And some of this is his saying that actions are merely a condition for the completeness of *Eemaan* (*Shart Kamal*) rather than a condition for its existence (*Shart Sihhah*) and the withholding *Takfeer* due to actions themselves and instead considering actions of *Kufr* as evidence for *Kufr* in the beliefs. And the reason for this was that his understanding of the real import of the phrases, "*Eemaan* is statements, actions and beliefs," and "*Eemaan* increases and decreases" was not a complete understanding, because when the *Salaaf* uttered them, they intended that the *Eemaan* of statements and beliefs was equal to the *Eemaan* of actions, which means that abandoning all the actions was equivalent to abandoning all the statements and beliefs and there is no doubt that these are *Kufr*.

During our research for this project we came across a *Fatwaa* from *Shaykh* Abu Qataada Al-Philastinee,<sup>55</sup> which explains this concept rather concisely entitled:

### **The Difference Between a *Murji'ee* and a Man Who Has *Irjaa'* in Him:**

"To the honorable *Shaykh* Abu Qataada, may Allaah keep you steadfast. *As-Sallaamu 'Alaykum wa-Rah'maat-Allaahee wa-Barakaatoo*.

To proceed:

My question concerns an issue, which has confused me and I believe it has confused others as well. And that is the difference between a man who is a *Murji'ee* and a man who has *Irjaa'* in him. And the truth is, that this question was raised when one of the young men who denies the *Irjaa'* of *Shaykh* Al-Albaanee, telephoned one of the *Shaykhs*, who have been witnessed to the correct '*Aqeedah* and one whom has always taught the

---

<sup>55</sup> And we know that this individual is hated and feared by the likes of [www.salafipublications.com](http://www.salafipublications.com) precisely as they have their hatred of *Shaykh* Abu Baseer Mustafah Haleemah, so watch for them to openly attack and revile him upon their wicked fear mongering web site soon!

correct 'Aqeedah. And he endured the effort in contacting him and asked him about Shaykh Al-Albaanee, may Allaah be merciful to him and forgive him, if he was *Murji'ee* or not. So he answered him that Shaykh Al-Albaanee, may Allaah be merciful to him, had the correct 'Aqeedah; however, his speech met with that of the *Murji'yah*. So I failed to understand what was meant by this.

Secondly, I have a cassette tape, in which Shaykh Al-Albaanee was discussing with one of his students, about *Eemaan* and he said that the actions are (merely) a condition of the completeness of *Eemaan* (i.e. *Shart Kamal*) and he also said that he is aware that some people have called him by that name (i.e. *Murji'ee*) but this is the correct matter (i.e. regarding actions). And I believe that your virtuous self must have heard this cassette tape. So my question is: What is the condition of Shaykh Al-Albaanee, may Allaah be merciful to him, and the condition of his followers, who have filled the world with their claims. I apologize for exceeding in time and may Allaah reward you.

In the name of Allaah, the Merciful, the Most Kind and from Him we seek help...

The difference between the saying that a man is *Kharaajee* or a man has *Kharaajee'ah* in him or their saying that a man is *Murji'ee* or a man has *Irjaa'* in him is due to the difference of the condition of the two men.

So the man who adheres to the 'Usl of the *Bid'ah* and calls to it, is the one who is attributed to it indefinitely (i.e. *Murji'ee*). However, the one who does not adhere to the 'Usl of the *Bid'ah* and does not adopt this 'Usl could possibly fall into its implications or some of its *Furoo'* and this one is described with this attribute (i.e. *Irjaa'* as opposed to being a *Murji'ee*).

This is the difference but the answer of the one who was questioned about Shaykh Al-Albaanee, may Allaah be merciful to him, was ambiguous. This is because he said that Shaykh Al-Albaanee's 'Aqeedah was correct and he only mentioned his speech and his phrasing and he declared that these were mistaken and this is not (completely) correct. While, Shaykh Al-Albaanee's *Usool* in belief are from the *Sunnah*, he has taken the appearance of *Irjaa'* in his beliefs (as well). **So he (i.e. Al-Albaanee) is saying that *Eemaan* is statements and actions; however, he explains this statement in a way, which differs with *Ahl us-Sunnah wa'l-Jamaa'ah*. And this was where he fell into *Irjaa'*, which was his saying that actions can not be a condition for existence (i.e. *Shart Sihhah*) of *Eemaan*. So this (concept) is present with his declaration that statements and beliefs are a condition for the existence (i.e. *Shart Sihhah*) of *Eemaan*. So he differentiated between actions and statements which is opposite to what the *Salaaf* said and that is indeed, the birth of the *Meth'haab of Irjaa'*. And Shaykh Al-Albaanee did not merely make a mistake in his speech, rather he also made a mistake in his beliefs. **And he struck the *Meth'haab of Irjaa'* in some of its *Furoo'*.****

And some of those who claim in their defense of this accusation have attempted to raise some statements from the *Salaaf* such as *Imaam Ahmad*, may Allaah be merciful to him, who said that *Eemaan* is statements and actions and they say that Al-Albaanee also says

that *Eemaan* is statements and actions. And accordingly, they clear him from *Irjaa'*. But this saying is not scientific for those who understand the *Metha'haab* and the groups. And to demonstrate the mischief of this example, I'll offer this example:

The *Ashaa'ira* say that the *Qur'aan* is the speech of Allaah *ta'ala*. So is this saying sufficient to make them – in this matter – upon the belief of the Prophet and his *Sahabah* and those who followed them in this issue? The answer: Every student of knowledge knows the answer; no. And this statement (i.e. “The *Qur'aan* is the Speech of Allaah.”) – although it is correct – does not make them upon the correct belief. And the reason is that they explain this statement in a way, which opposes the way that the *Salaaf* did. Even though they say a correct word, they interpret it in a way, which is outside the boundaries of the truth that is known by its people. So they (i.e. the *Ashaa'ira*) make the Speech to be a (mere) expression of “*Al-Qadeem*” (i.e. “The Ancient”, by which they mean Allaah) which stands by the self (of Allaah).<sup>56</sup> Yet, they do not make what the person recites from the letters of the *Qur'aan*, to be the Speech of Allaah. And that is because they differentiate between the pronunciation and the meaning. So they said a correct statement (i.e. The *Qur'aan* is the Speech of Allaah); however, they carried it in a different way than what it (truly) means. So they were correct in one matter and they were mistaken in another matter. **And Shaykh Al-Albaanee in this matter also, he said a correct statement; which is “Eemaan is statements and actions,” however, he carried it in a different way than the people of truth since he differentiated between the actions and the statements.** So he considered *Al-Kufr Al-Akbaar* all ‘*Atiqaadee* and that a person does not disbelieve due to an action.<sup>57</sup> And the *Kufr Al-Asgaar*; it is all ‘*Amilee* (according to him) and this is false and a mistake in the *Deen* of Allaah, *ta'ala*. And the statements of Al-Albaanee, that actions are a condition for the completeness (*Shart Kamal*) is from the false statements, which are refuted with hundreds or thousands of the texts of the Book of Allaah, *ta'ala* and the *Sunnah* of the Messenger of Allaah and from the words of the people of knowledge. And there have been entire books written about that from the earlier and the later generations and may they be revived. And Allaah is the one who makes things possible.”

### ...Continuing the Refutation...

And who have [www.salafipublications.com](http://www.salafipublications.com) used to reinforce their *Ta'weel* of the statements of Shaykh Al-Albaanee, may Allaah be merciful to him? And whose words have they quoted and used to show that Shaykh Naasir actually refuted some of the *Usool* and *Furoo'* of the *Murji'yah* in an attempt to clear him from the accusation of *Irjaa'*? It is

---

<sup>56</sup> So what is meant here, is that the *Ashaa'ira* used the word “*Al-Qadeem*” (i.e. The Ancient) to describe Allaah and they said that His “Speech” was His “Intended Expression” which was separate from His actual being, and not His actual attribute of speech. So they used this *Ta'weel* to cover the attribute of Allaah's Speech, while at the same time they used a statement from *Ahl us-Sunnah* which is “The *Qur'aan* is the Speech of Allaah.”

<sup>57</sup> And we have clarified that this usage of *Kufr 'Atiqaadee* was not the same as what [www.salafipublications.com](http://www.salafipublications.com) have alleged in their *Baatil Ta'weel*. And this was clear from the context and the usage and other than that so let [www.salafipublications.com](http://www.salafipublications.com) fear Allaah!

Khaalid Al-Anbaree <sup>58</sup> and 'Alee Hasan Al-Halabee, <sup>59</sup> may Allaah guide and forgive them.

And aren't these the same two individuals who have fallen into the well of *Irjaa'* such that they are completely immersed therein?! <sup>60</sup> Is not Khaalid Al-Anbaree the one about whom the honorable *Shaykh* Hamood bin Aqla'aa said, "I have looked at all of the sayings of Khaalid Al-Anbaree and it has become clear to me by my reading of these sayings and some of his books **that he is a *Murji'ee* from the pure *Murji'yah*; the ones that are under the school of thought of Jahm bin Safwaan in *Irjaa'* "**?!"

And is not 'Alee Hasan Al-Halabee the one about whom 'Abdul-'Azeez Aal Ash-Shaykh, 'Abdullah Al-Gud'yaan, Bakr Abu Zayd and Saalih Al-Fawzaan unanimously declared, **"Its author based it [the book] upon the false, innovated *Meth'haab* of the *Murji'yah*..."**?! And did not this same committee call both Khaalid Al-Anbaree and 'Alee Hasan Al-Halabee to make *Tauba* and ban the distribution and sale of their books due to the poison of *Irjaa'* which was throughout their writings?!

Are these the people whom [www.salafipublications.com](http://www.salafipublications.com) are relying upon to disprove the charge of *Irjaa'* from *Shaykh* Naasir Ad-Deen Al-Albaanee?! This is like using a doctor, who has been fired for malpractice, to defend his colleague who is on trial for the same charge! He has no credibility because he has been proven guilty of the very crime, which he is seeking to defend another person from! Also, the fact that 'Alee Hasan Al-Halabee is considered by most to have been the number one student of the noble *Shaykh* Al-Albaanee, does not help much to clear the *Shaykh* from the charge of *Irjaa'* in his teachings due to the overwhelming criticisms of 'Alee Halabee's own extremist *Irjaa'* concepts. And this is because if we are to ask who taught the student the *Irjaa'*, which he is upon, the trail leads back to his teacher. <sup>61</sup>

And what follows this section is a summary of what they have alleged are our motivations for the points, which we raise. Firstly, they claim that our intention in raising the topic of acts of *Kufr Al-Akbaar* (such as swearing at Allaah or His Messenger or kicking the *Qur'aan* etc.) to demonstrate the futility of whether or not they are

---

<sup>58</sup> Look to page 15 of "Part 1: The Creed of *Imaam* al-Albaani on *Kufr* and Apostasy."

<sup>59</sup> Look to pages 17 – 18 of the same source as above.

<sup>60</sup> And the similitude of the "well of *Irjaa'* " is particularly fitting here because, just as a person who falls into an actual well has his mouth filled with water – such that he opens his mouth and water spills out – these two individuals can scarcely open their mouths without *Irjaa'* gushing forth; all from the well that they have fallen into. And we seek refuge in Allaah from this wicked *Meth'haab*.

<sup>61</sup> We would like to emphasize here, again, that we in no way are holding the noble *Shaykh* Al-Albaanee, may Allaah be merciful to him, at the same level as his misguided student, 'Alee Al-Halabee – may Allaah guide and forgive him – rather, we are only pointing out the relationship between the *Irjaa'* of the student and that of the teacher. And the benefit, which Allaah has brought to His *Ummah* from the efforts of *Shaykh* Naasir Ad-Deen Al-Albaanee, may Allaah be merciful to him, is unmatched by many of the scholars in the history of *Islaam* – let alone in our contemporary period. And we are just as adamant about affirming this fact as we are in refuting the *Irjaa'* which came along with it.

accompanied with *Istih'laal* or *Juhood* or *Tak'theeb* etc., is so that we can trick the reader by following these examples with acts of *Kufr*, such as 'Ruling by Other Than What Allaah Revealed' – which to them, *do* require these matters of the heart before a ruling of *Takfeer* can be made. And they have stated that this was done so that we can establish that those who do not hold the rulers who 'Rule by Other Than What Allaah Revealed' as disbelievers, are separating actions from *Eemaan* and upon the *Meth'haab* of *Irjaa'*. And so they have slandered us again with their accusations and created a climate of distrust towards our very intentions. And how strange it is that when a person speaks of the *Kufr* of the ruler who 'Rules by Other Than What Allaah Revealed', they are the first to point out that this person does not know the intention of that ruler and they find every possible excuse imaginable to demonstrate how we can not possibly see into that ruler's heart and therefore a ruling of *Takfeer* can not be made. Yet at the same time, with people whom they oppose, they are very quick to point out to their readers our "intention" and what lies in their hearts. So to clarify our intention and free ourselves from the slanderous lies of [www.salafipublications.com](http://www.salafipublications.com), we reiterate the point that we have made in our introduction to this project and repeat what was alluded to in our previous one. We are concerned with the English speaking brothers and sisters who have taken the likes of [www.salafipublications.com](http://www.salafipublications.com) as an authoritative source for *Salafee* material concerning the subject of *Kufr*, *Eemaan*, *Takfeer* and 'Ruling by Other Than What Allaah Revealed'. And although we may agree with [www.salafipublications.com](http://www.salafipublications.com) in most of the topics they have written on, we have found them extremely negligent when it comes to the matters of *Kufr* and *Eemaan*. And this is undoubtedly because they have founded their entire understanding of this subject upon the mistaken concepts of the likes of 'Alee Hasan Al-Halabee and those like him. And because they have filtered all their articles on this subject through the mischievous writings of this individual and his type, we have found it obligatory upon us to refute them because at this time, there are very little sources available in English for the *Salafee* student of knowledge to arrive at the truth in matters of 'Ruling by Other Than What Allaah Revealed' and *Takfeer* in general.

So [www.salafipublications.com](http://www.salafipublications.com) correctly pointed out that we have brought examples of *Kufr Akbaar* which are *Kufr* on their own and how these things do not require *Istih'laal* or *Juhood* before a ruling of *Takfeer* can be issued. And such acts would include prostrating to an idol, swearing at Allaah or His Messenger and kicking the *Mus'haaf* etc. and then they have alleged:

"Once this is established, they (\* meaning us) then come to their actual and real objective, which is to try and portray that ruling by other than what Allaah has revealed is major kufr absolutely, just like the acts mentioned above. Once they have tried to prove this (and we will refute their attempts in what is yet to come inshaa'llaah in the continuation of this discourse), they then state that anyone who tries to adhere to the tafseel of the Salaf in arriving at the judgement of takfir (i.e. by distinguishing between al-kufr al-i'tiqaadee and al-kufr al-'amali on this particular issue) is an Extremist Murji' who has separated actions from Imaan. This is why you see them, alongside all of this trying to prove that the aathaar from Ibn Abbaas are weak, and that his real position is that the verses in al-Maa'idah actually indicate major kufr, absolutely, and that juhood

(that is internal rejection of the heart) is on the limbs (absolutely) -all in order to flee from the tafseel of the Salaf in this regard.”

Let us examine this accusation. So [www.salafipublications.com](http://www.salafipublications.com) have denied that the ruler who fabricates laws and rules with them in the lives of the people is *Kufr* absolutely. And when they mention the following line, “...they then state that anyone who tries to adhere to the tafseel of the Salaf in arriving at the judgement of takfir (i.e. by distinguishing between al-kufr al-i'tiqaadee and al-kufr al-'amali on this particular issue) is an Extremist Murji' who has separated actions from Imaan.” So this is a lie and this is misguidance and this is quite foolish indeed.

As for their denial that the one who replaces the *Hukm* of the *Sharee'ah* with his own fabricated laws has committed major *Kufr*, then this contradicts the *Ijmaa'* as narrated by the '*Ulaama* of the past and present. And this was pointed out in PART 1 of this series with narrations from *Shaykh Al-Islam* Ibn Taymiyah, *Al-Haafidh* Ibn Katheer, *Shaykh 'Umar Al-Ashqaar* and Mah'moud Shaakir.<sup>62</sup> And as for their claim that they are adhering to the *Tafseel* of the *Salaaf* in their distinguishing between *Kufr Al-'Amilee* and *Kufr Al-'Atiqaadee*, this is falsehood for two reasons:

1. The *Tafseel* of the *Salaaf* was concerning the topic of a ruler or judge who 'Rules by Other Than What Allaah Revealed' in particular instances and not in general legislations. And we made this more than clear in PART 1 in this series.<sup>63</sup> And this was because the *Salaaf* – we wholeheartedly adhere to their views – did not witness a period in which the laws of the *Sharee'ah* were replaced wholesale. So it is quite clear that their *Tafseel* was regarding the particular instances as this *did* exist in their era. And their attempt to stretch this *Tafseel* to cover the rulers who have replaced the laws of the *Sharee'ah* with their own fabricated laws is incorrect and unfounded and unproven with the statements of the *Salaaf* and it opposes the *Ijmaa'* of the Muslims and therefore it is rejected.

2. Their claim that this subject was what we have defined as the dividing line between *Murji'yah* and *Ahl us-Sunnah*, is clearly a lie and an evil fabrication from which we seek refuge with our Lord. This is typical of the exaggerations of the people of envy and desire! This type of fear mongering and propaganda is what has molded the authors of [www.salafipublications.com](http://www.salafipublications.com) into the brutal slanderous liars that they are!! O [www.salafipublications.com](http://www.salafipublications.com)! Where in the entire correspondence between you and us have we ever limited our definition of *Irjaa'* to one's opinion of the ruler who 'Rules by Other Than What Allaah Revealed'!!! So this lie is typical of the deception and treachery which the authors of [www.salafipublications.com](http://www.salafipublications.com) perpetrate upon the English speaking youth who have embraced the virtues of *Salafeeyah*! And to Allaah is the refuge. This characterization is absolute falsehood for the following reason:

If we were to find an individual who held the opinion that the ruler who replaces the laws of Allaah with his own fabricated laws is a *Kaafir*, and yet at the same time, he believed

---

<sup>62</sup> Look to pages 32-33 in PART 1 of our series.

<sup>63</sup> Look to pages 51-56 in PART 1 of our series.

that actions were merely a *Shart Kamal* (i.e. condition for completeness) of *Eemaan* as opposed to a *Shart Sihhah* (i.e. condition for existence), and he believed that actions of *Kufr* did not actually nullify *Eemaan* rather they only indicated pre-existing *Kufr* of the heart and if he did not believe that any single action took a person outside the realm of *Islaam* without being accompanied with *Juhood* or *Istih'laal*, and if he believed that *Eemaan* were merely *Tasdeeq* of the heart, then we would say about this person that he has fallen into to many of the *Usool* and the *Furoo'* of *Irjaa'*. And the fact that he held the same opinion as us in the matter of the ruler who rules with *Tashree' Al-'Aam* (i.e. general legislations, which oppose the *Hukm* of Allaah and His Messenger, would not benefit him in our eyes one inch!! And the reason for this is because the judging with *Irjaa'* is dependant upon the general concepts of *Eemaan* and not in specific issues where *Eemaan* is concerned.

For example, we say that the one who abandons the *Salaat* is a *Kaafir* who has left the realm of *Islaam* for this action. <sup>64</sup> And we say that the one who abandons it due to laziness has left *Islaam* even if he does not deny its obligation or its status and even if he says, "I know I am guilty of sinfulness for abandoning my prayers," due to the *Saheeh* texts of the *Qur'aan* and the *Sunnah* and the sayings of the *Imaams* of the *Salaaf*, which indicate that. <sup>65</sup> Yet we see that the more established opinion, which has been attributed to

---

<sup>64</sup> And the refusal to comply with an order and the failure to act upon it is considered an action according to the terminology of *Fiqh*.

<sup>65</sup> And from these texts are:

(Always) Turning in repentance to Him (only), and be afraid and dutiful to Him; and perform *As-Salât* (*Iqâmat-as-Salât*) and be not of *Al-Mushrikûn* (*Rum*, 31)

And "Between the slave and '*Al-Shirk*' and '*Al-Kufr*' is leaving the *Salaat*." (Narrated by Muslim) and in another narration: "Between the slave and '*Al-Kufr*' is leaving the *Salaat*." (Narrated by Muslim, Ahmad, Abu Dawood, At-Tirmidhee and Ibn Maajah) And Thawban narrated that the Messenger of Allaah

said, "Between the slave and *Kufr* and *Eemaan* is the *Salaat*, so whoever has left it has committed *Al-Shirk*." (Narrated by Tabaraanee; "*Saheeh At-Targheeb wa-Tarheeb*", #565) Buraidah reported that the Prophet said, "The covenant between us and them is *Salaat*. Whoever abandons it has disbelieved." (Related by Ahmad, Abu Dawood, At-Tirmidhee, an-Nisaa'ee and Ibn Maajah.) And 'Umar Ibn Al-Khattaab, may Allaah be pleased with him, reported that a man asked the Prophet, "O Messenger of Allah, what action is the dearest to Allaah, the Most High?" The Prophet said, "*Salaat* in its proper time. The one who does not pray has no religion. *Salaat* is the main pillar of the religion (of *Islaam*)." (Narrated by Al-Bayhaaqee) And the Prophet said, "Whoever leaves three *Salaat Al-Juma'ahs* without a valid excuse then he is written from among the *Munafiqeen*." And in another narration: "...then he has thrown Islam behind his back." ("*Saheeh At-Targheeb wa-Tarheeb*", #731 & #735) So if this is the ruling about the one who leaves three Friday prayers, what would be said about the one who leaves his five daily prayers?!

And from the understanding of the *Sahabah*:

Abdullah bin Shaqeeq Al-'Uqaylee said, "The *Sahabah* of Muhammad did not consider the abandonment of any act except the *Salaat*, as being *Kufr*." (Related by At-Tirmidhee and Al-Haakim, who said it met Bukhaaree's and Muslim's conditions for calling their *Ahadeeth* '*Saheeh*', also "*Saheeh At-Targheeb wa-Tarheeb*", #564)

the *Imaam of Usool Al-Fiqh*, Ash-Shafa'ee, may Allaah be merciful to him, was that the abandoner of the *Salaat* is not to be considered a *Mortad* unless he denies its obligation or something like that. And so if we were to limit our definition of *Irjaa'* to one's opinion of the abandoner of the *Salaat*, then we would say that *Imaam* Ash-Shafa'ee, may Allaah be merciful to him, was upon *Irjaa'* as well. And there is nothing further from the truth! So when we mention the subject of *Shaykh* Al-Albaanee, may Allaah be merciful to him, we are not saying that he fell into *Irjaa'* merely due to his opinion on the one who 'Rules by Other Than What Allaah Reveals', rather it is because his opinion of this matter was governed by his mistaken views on *Eemaan*, *Kufr* and *Takfeer* and what each of these necessitates. This is because to him, *Eemaan* requires mere *Tasdeeq* and does not require actions of the body for its existence. And to him, *Kufr* requires an action of the heart to accompany the action of *Kufr*. And to him, *Takfeer* requires the knowledge of what has occurred in the heart at the time of committing the act or at least an action, which would indicate the existence of *Kufr* in the heart upon the action's perpetration. And what is all this if not a separation of actions and *Eemaan*?! So let [www.salafipublications.com](http://www.salafipublications.com) fear Allaah!

Then we come to their statement:

---

And *Imaam* Maalik narrated: "Umar sent instructions to his administrators that the *Salaat* was the most necessary and important of all their functions. He wrote: 'He who learnt the rules and regulations (of *Salaat*) and said it at its proper time, presented and safeguarded his religion and he who neglected it has lost his religion...' ("Al-Mu'watta' " with a *Saheeh* chain according to *Shaykh* Sulaymaan Al-'Ulwaan.) And Abdullah Ibn Masood, may Allaah be pleased with him said, "Whoever leaves the *Salat*; then there is no *Deen* for him." ("Saheeh Tt-Targheeb wa-Tarheeb ", #563 also narrated by Muhammad bin Naasir Al-Mirwaazee) And Abu Ad-Dardaa' said, "There is no *Eemaan* for the one who has no *Salaat* and no *Salaat* for the one who has no *Wudhu*." ("Saheeh At-Targheeb wa-Tarheeb ", #574)

And *Imaam* Ibn Hazm narrates: "It has come from 'Umar, 'Abdurahman Ibn 'Auf, Mu'aadh Ibn Jabal, Abu Hurayrah and other companions that anyone who skips one obligatory *Salaah* until its time has finished becomes a *Mortad* And we find no difference of opinion among them on this point." (This was mentioned by Al-Mundhiree in "At-Targheeb wa Tarheeb ") Then he comments, "A group of *Sahabah* and those who came after them believed that an intentional decision to skip one *Salaat* until its time is completely finished makes one a *Kaafir*. The people of this opinion include 'Umar Ibn Al-Khattab, Abdullah Ibn Masood, Abdullah Ibn Abbaas, Mu'aadh Ibn Jabal, Jaabir Ibn Abdullah and Abu Ad-Dardaa'. Among the non-companions who shared this view were Ibn Hanbal, Ishaq bin Rahwaih, Abdullah Ibn Al-Mubarak, Nn-Nakha'ee, Al-Haakim Ibn 'Utaybah, Abu Ayyub As-Sakhtiyaanee, Abu Dawood At-Tayalisee, Abu Bakr Ibn Abu Shaybah, Zuhayr Ibn Harb, and others." ("Saheeh At-Targheeb wa-Tarheeb", pg. 235)

What has been narrated from the 'Ulaama about the understanding of the *Salaaf*:

Ibn Taymiyah said, "The *Takfeer* of the one who abandons the *Salaat*, is the best-known narration of the majority of the *Salaaf* from the *Sahabah* and the *Tabi'een*..." "...and (some have asked), 'Is he killed as a *Kaafir* or as a Muslim who is a *Faasiq*?' About this, there are two sayings **and the majority of the *Salaaf* are upon (the opinion) that he is killed as a *Kaafir*, and all of this (ie. *Takfeer* and punishment of death) happens even if he accepts its obligation.**" ("Majmoo' Al-Fataawa ", Vol. 20/96 and Vol.22/49) And he said elsewhere, "...but if he is insistent upon leaving it (i.e. the *Salaat*) and does not pray at all and dies upon this insistence (of not praying) and the abandonment (of the *Salaat*), then this person could not (have been) a Muslim." ("Majmoo' Al-Fataawa ", Vol. 28/308)

“This is why you see them, alongside all of this trying to prove that the aathaar from Ibn Abbaas are weak, and that his real position is that the verses in al-Maa'idah actually indicate major kufr, absolutely, and that juhood (that is internal rejection of the heart) is on the limbs (absolutely) -all in order to flee from the tafseel of the Salaf in this regard.”

So look to the exposed desires of the people of jealousy! And look to how their pleasure or displeasure is tied to the authenticity of certain narrations from the *Salaaf*. And notice how their hostility becomes apparent in the face of our adherence to the principles of *Hadeeth* terminology and classification! So it has angered them when we have employed the fundamentals of *Ahl us-Sunnah wa'l-Jamaa'ah* in our discussion on the narrations of Ibn Abbaas, Ibn Masood, Abu Majliz and Tawoos etc. And it has angered them that we have brought authentic narrations from the *Salaaf*, which explained the *Tafseer* of the *Ayaat* in *Surat Al-Ma'idah* from an alternate interpretation from what they fight so hard to prove.<sup>66</sup> But are the authors of [www.salafipublications.com](http://www.salafipublications.com) able to counter our criticism, classification and explanation of these narrations? Indeed no! Rather, they are forced to come up with some kind of allegation about our “ulterior motives” – again looking into our hearts to disclose our intentions – in an attempt to demonstrate our “...fleeing from the *Tafseel* of the *Salaaf*...” However, they have not been able to bring a single thing – be it from the *Salaaf*, the Arabic language, the principles of *Tafseer*, historical reality, or the statements of the ‘*Ulamaa* of *Tafseer* etc. – which could nullify what we’ve written. So let them choke in their rage and let them review what was written (if they can stomach the correct principles of the *Salafeeyah*, which they claim to call to) and let them reflect that the *Tafseel* that they have understood, was not the *Tafseel* of the *Salaaf* at all!

Next, the authors of the response to PART 1 in our series have demonstrated how *Shaykh* Muhammad bin Ibraheem Ahl'a-Shaykh, may Allaah be merciful to him, categorized the ‘Ruling by Other Than What Allaah Revealed’ – in the sense that this ruler establishes law courts and institutions, which judge in opposition to what Allaah has revealed, as well as the ruling of the Bedouins, who ruled by their ancestors traditions – under the heading of *Kufr Al-'Atiqaadee*. And with this, they have attempted to show that our understanding of the terminology “*Kufr 'Atiqaadee*” and “*Kufr 'Amilee*”, in the earlier discussion of *Shaykh* Al-Albaanee’s usage was mistaken. And they have tried, by implication, to extend the point that if we were to hold *Shaykh* Al-Albaanee upon the *Meth'haab* of *Irjaa'*, then we must also do the same to the likes of *Shaykh* Muhammad bin Ibraheem, may Allaah be merciful to them.

### **AN AMAZING BENEFIT:**

So let us go through this muddle of contradictions and self-indictments, which the ignorant authors of [www.salafipublications.com](http://www.salafipublications.com) have concocted.

They have stated:

---

<sup>66</sup> Look to pages 45 – 57 of PART 1 in this series.

“Shaikh Muhammad bin Ibraaheem described them as “kufr in belief ” at the beginning of his discussion of these six types, saying, “And it is impossible for Allaah, the Most Perfect, to call the one who judges by other than what Allaah has revealed a Kaafir and for him to not be a Kaafir - rather he is a Kaafir - either being Kufr of action or Kufr of belief. And that which is reported by Ibn Abbaas (radiallaahu anhumaa) by way of Taawoos and others in explanation of this aayah, shows that the ruler by other than what Allaah has revealed is a Kaafir, either with the kufr of belief, which takes him outside the religion - or with the kufr of action, which does not take him outside the religion.”

And they have followed this with two footnotes as follows:

“Reflect carefully here, and you will note that Shaikh Ibn Ibraaheem rahimahullaah, indeed adheres to the tafseel on the issue of takfir of the one who does not judge by what Allaah has revealed. Unfortunately, this part of the quotation was clipped by the author of the “Decisive Refutation”, and we will illustrate this and many other of his tragedies in the continuation of this series inshaa'allaah. Abu Fulaan al-Kanadie preached piety to others, but does not enact it himself...”

And:

“It is interesting to note that the neo-Khawaarij, Khaarijiyyah Asriyyah, attempt to discredit the statements of Ibn ‘Abbaas in which he makes tafseer of the verse in al-Maa’idah in that it is kufr less than kufr (i.e. major kufr), and here we have Shaikh Ibn Ibraheem, whose words they quote, affirming the exact opposite, namely he affirms that this is indeed Ibn ‘Abbaas's explanation. AN AMAZING BENEFIT: Not only that, this saying of Shaikh Ibn Ibraheem is a decisive refutation of the thesis of the author of the “Decisive Refutation”. Firstly, the Shaikh has categorized kufr here into kufr of action and kufr of belief. Secondly, those actions which he considers to expel from Islaam (which are types e) and f) in the list of the 6 manifestations of ruling by other than what Allaah has revealed), then he did not include that within the kufr of action (al-kufr al-'amali), rather he included it within the kufr of belief (al-kufr ai- i'tiqaadee). Now, when we come to Part 3 in our discourse and look at the actual discussion that the author of the “Decisive Refutation” has relied upon in order to ascribe Irjaa' to Imaam al-Albaani, then it is necessitated upon him that he also ascribe this Irjaa' to Shaikh Muhammad bin Ibraaheem Aal ash-Shaikh. It is binding upon him to do that and announce that. Otherwise, his whole argument is nullified, and his contradiction made apparently clear walhamdulillaah.”

So let us examine these points line by line. Firstly, they have shot themselves in the foot – so to speak – by using the comments of *Shaykh* Muhammad bin Ibraheem here and this is for several reasons:

1. The *Shaykh's* own opinion in this matter is precisely that of ours, which was made abundantly clear in PART 1 of our series. And that is that the ruler who ‘Rules by Other Than What Allaah Revealed’ is considered a *Kaafir*, outside the realm of *Islaam*, when he replaces laws of the *Islaamic Sharee'ah* with those of his own fabrication but he makes a distinction for the ruler or judge who leaves the *Hukm* of Allaah in specific

instances, due to desire etc.<sup>67</sup> And this was the *Tafseel* employed by *Shaykh* Muhammad bin Ibraheem, may Allaah be merciful to him, as well as the *Tafseel* we have explained in PART 1 of our series. So their entire attempt to use this argument here was a particularly bad decision from the authors of [www.salafipublications.com](http://www.salafipublications.com) as the entire text of "*Tah'keem Al-Qawaneen*" is a reinforcement of PART 1 in our series. In fact, we quoted it extensively in our first project to refute their own misguided concepts! So how can they attempt to use these minor points to back themselves while the entire *Risala* they are quoting from was written as a refutation of their very concepts!? It is only the most ignorant of people who draw their swords against their enemies, and in the process they wind up wounding themselves fatally.

2. His usage of the terms "*Kufr 'Atiqaadee*" and "*Kufr 'Amilee*" is in the usage employed by *Al-Haafidh* Al-Haakimee and Ibn Al-Qayyim – who used them to describe the result of *Kufr* – in our earlier discussion and not that of *Shaykh* Al-Albaanee, may Allaah be merciful to him – who used them in the sense of the source of *Kufr*. And this is abundantly clear between them in the context of this very topic of "Ruling by Other Than What Allaah Revealed".

For example, *Shaykh* Al-Albaanee said: "And the reason behind this is that kufr is of two types: kufr in belief and kufr in action, and the kufr in belief is linked to the heart, and the kufr in action is linked to the limbs. **So the one whose actions are kufr due to their contradicting the Sharee'ah, and this kufr follows on from what has become established in his heart i.e. kufr in belief,**<sup>68</sup> then this is the kufr which Allaah will

---

<sup>67</sup> Just look to his saying:

"As far as the one who it was said about him, '*Kufr dun Kufr*,' this is if he rules with other than what Allaah revealed, while he believes that he is disobedient and that the *Hukm* of Allaah is the truth. This is concerning when it comes from him once or like that. But as far as the one who puts laws in an order and to be followed, then this is *Kufr* even if they say that we made a mistake and the *Hukm* of the *Shara'* is more just, so there is a difference between the one who approves and implicates and make it as a text to return to. They make it a thing to return to an this is *Kufr* that takes one outside the *Milla*." ("*Fataawa Al-Imaam Muhammad bin Ibraheem Ahl'a-Shaykh*", Vol. 12/280)

So what is the difference between these words of *Shaykh* Muhammad bin Ibraheem, may Allaah be merciful to him, and our in PART 1 of our series?:

"So what is clear from what has passed in the *Tafseer* of this *Ayaah* is that their meaning is *Kufr Al-Akbaar*; however, if it is held upon the rulers who do not 'Rule by Other Than What Allaah Revealed' in the sense that they do not replaced the laws of *Islaam* and they do not engage in *Tashree' Al-'Aam* with legislation that opposes the *Hukm* of Allaah, then we say the same as some of what has been narrated: "*Kufr dun Kufr, Fisq dun Fisq, Thulm less than Thulm,*" and, "It is not the *Kufr* that removes one from the realm (i.e. of *Islaam*), etc." (PART 1 in our series, page 57)

And with this, the iron door is slammed in the faces of the liars of [www.salafipublications.com](http://www.salafipublications.com) so let them fear Allaah!

<sup>68</sup> **AN AMAZING BENEFIT WITHIN AN AMAZING BENEFIT:** So we see here that the *Shaykh*, may Allaah be merciful to him, is speaking generally here with his usage of the terminology "*Kufr* in actions" and "*Kufr* in belief", and he has stated quite clearly here that actions of *Kufr* are only *Kufr Akbaar* when there is already *Kufr* present in the heart at the time of their perpetration. This is clear from his statement, "**...and this kufr follows on from what has become established in his heart i.e. kufr in belief...**" And this statement is clearly referring to the source of *Kufr* and not its result, so the *Ta'weel* of

**not forgive and this person will reside in the Fire forever.** But if (these kufr actions) contradict what is established in his heart, then he is a believer in the Rule of his Lord, but he contradicts this with his actions. So his kufr is kufr of action only, and it is not kufr in belief.”<sup>69</sup>

Whereas, Muhammad bin Ibraheem said: “So maybe you will ask: What if the one who rules with the laws says, ‘I believe these laws are *Baatil*?’ **There is no effect. Rather, this is removing the *Sharee’ah* just like if one said, ‘I worship these idols and believe that it is *Baatil*.’**”<sup>70</sup>

So it is clear that the usage of “*Kufr ‘Atiqaadee*” and “*Kufr ‘Amilee*” of *Shaykh* Muhammad bin Ibraheem is completely different than that of *Shaykh* Al-Albaanee, may Allaah be merciful to them. This is because the action of ‘Ruling by Other Than What Allaah Revealed’ to *Shaykh* Al-Albaanee is not *Kufr Akbaar* unless it is accompanied with *Kufr* already present in the heart, whereas Muhammad bin Ibraheem has stated that this same action is *Kufr Akbaar* even if the person does not believe in his action at the time of committing it. So when Muhammad bin Ibraheem classified this action “*Kufr ‘Atiqaadee*” within his “*Risala Tah’keem Al-Qawaneen*”, he means that the result of this action causes the *Eemaan* of the heart to be nullified as a result of the action. And therefore it may be called *Kufr ‘Atiqaadee* and classified in this category. But *Shaykh* Al-Albaanee called this action “*Kufr ‘Amilee*” – which to him, is a description of its source – and only becomes “*Kufr ‘Atiqaadee*” when it is performed with the *Kufr* already existing in the heart. And as we have pointed out earlier, this means that this action would never be a source of *Kufr Akbaar* because to him, it is only *Kufr Akbaar* after the person has already apostated due to the pre-existence of *Kufr* in the heart. And the point here is that this was a general rule from *Shaykh* Al-Albaanee and not just limited to the subject of ‘Ruling by Other Than What Allaah Revealed’ as he has stated it himself and in earlier quotations from him

---

www.salafipublications.com is rendered void yet again. And it is important to note that the *Shaykh* is speaking quite generally here and not restricting his statements to the issue of ‘Ruling by Other Than What Allaah Revealed’. And what this means is that *Takfeer* can only be made when the person commits an action of *Kufr* at the time his heart contained *Kufr*. And this means that *Takfeer* is only made for beliefs in the heart and not for actions of the body because a person who already has *Kufr* in his heart was already a *Kaafir*, even before he even committed the act of *Kufr*. And this is definitely a branch of *Irjaa*’ if not one of its very roots! So *Shaykh* Al-Albaanee could not possibly be using the terminology of “*Kufr* in actions” and “*Kufr* in beliefs” in the same context as that of *Al-Haafidh* Al-Haakimee and Ibn Al-Qayyim or *Shaykh* Muhammad bin Ibraheem, may Allaah be merciful to them, because he is referring here to the source of *Kufr* and not the result of *Kufr*. So the entire built-up *Ta’weel* of www.salafipublications.com is again crushed into rubble! And where did we find this amazing benefit (i.e. quotation) with which to destroy the lies and allegations of www.salafipublications.com? Nowhere but on their very web site (Article ID: MNJ050002), proving once again that they are the epitome of ignorance on the subject they are screaming so loudly to clarify! What a shame and what an embarrassment for them.

<sup>69</sup> “*Silsilaat Ahadeeth As-Saheehah*”, Vol. 6 no.2552

<sup>70</sup> “*Fataawa Al-Imaam Muhammad bin Ibraheem Ahl’a-Shaykh*”, Vol. 12/280

3. Next, their attempt to show that the “*Risala Tah’keem Al-Qawaneen*” is in agreement with their position and that *Shaykh* Muhammad bin Ibraheem has adhered to what they consider the *Tafseel* of the *Salaaf* contradicts what they and their hero, Khaalid Al-Anbaree have stated in past [www.salafipublictions.com](http://www.salafipublictions.com) articles. As Al-Anbaree said, “...hence, anyone who quotes from me that he – may Allaah have mercy upon him - recanted from his first view [found in *Tahkim ul-Qawanin*] has erred in his quotation.” And he said, “...Since I did not say that the Shaikh [Ibn Ibrahim] recanted [from his first opinion]. Rather, I stated that "he has some other words"..."<sup>71</sup>

Also look to his saying when asked the question:

**Moderator:** “The same questioner asks, ‘What is your view concerning the one who accuses you of lying upon *Shaykh* Muhammad bin Ibraaheem?’”

**Answer:** *Shaykh* Khaalid Al-Anbaree: “Subhaanak. This is a mighty fabrication. His (Muhammad bin Ibraaheem’s) *Tafseel* is the one which I alluded to which exists in his *Fataawaa* (1/8), **then I did not say that he recanted from his original position which occurs in *Tah’keem Al-Qawaneen* and which is the absolute ruling of *Takfeer*...”<sup>72</sup>**

So Khaalid Al-Anbaree himself, has confirmed here that the words of “*Tah’keem Al-Qawaneen*” are not those wherein he pointed out any *Tafseel* (as it is understood by the likes of [www.salafipublications.com](http://www.salafipublications.com)) and this means that if these “other words” – wherein Khaalid Al-Anbaree *did* see evidence of the *Tafseel* – are different than “his first view”, then this means that the “first view” did not contain the *Tafseel* that [www.salafipublications.com](http://www.salafipublications.com) are trying to convince us can be found in “*Tah’keem Al-Qawaneen*”. So look to the self-contradiction and inconsistency of the followers of doubt!<sup>73</sup>

---

<sup>71</sup> Look to Article ID: MNJ050009

<sup>72</sup> And again, we’ve found this gem of a refutation against the allegations of [www.salafipublications.com](http://www.salafipublications.com) in their own web site; Article ID: MNJ050015. What a humiliation for the beguiled ones.

<sup>73</sup> And what makes this even clearer is how the authors of [www.salafipublications.com](http://www.salafipublications.com) have introduced these “other words” (i.e. those which they claim contains the *Tafseel* that they understand) and how they conclude them in the 2<sup>nd</sup> footnote in Article ID: MNJ050014 They said:

[2] “And this is the very same that we preached to the Qutubis in the days gone by and we presented to them some **other words** of Shaikh Muhammad Ibn Ibraaheem, to which they showed nothing but deafness and dumbness and blindness ... and from Allaah do we seek refuge from dishonesty towards the words and statements of the Scholars...” – until their saying – “The understanding in **this statement** is the very same that the likes of Imaam al-Albani, Imaam Ibn Baz, Ibn Uthaimen and Shaikh Salih al-Fawzaan are upon, as we have explained elsewhere.”

So if these are the “other words”, and they are intended to show the *Tafseel*, which was not found in “*Tah’keem Al-Qawaneen*”, then how can they now claim that the *Risala* does contain the *Tafseel* that they have understood?! If it were true that “*Tah’keem Al-Qawaneen*” already contained the *Tafseel* that they are trying to convince their readers of, then what would be the point of bringing “other words” to demonstrate it in another *Fatwaa* from the *Shaykh*?! Look to the weakness of the logic and reasoning of the envious ones.

4. Next, we come to their attempt to demonstrate and reinforce what they have understood from Ibn Abbass, may Allaah be pleased with him, in the *Tafseer of Surat Al-Ma'idah*, 44. Firstly, the only way these narrations could be used as a proof in the *Sharee'ah* is when they are authentic. And for some inexplicable reason, they have attempted to lend strength to the authenticity of this narration, simply because it was used and explained by *Shaykh* Muhammad bin Ibraheem, may Allaah be merciful to him.<sup>74</sup> If this is the method for determining the *Tas'heeh* (i.e. authenticity) and *Taw'theeq* (i.e. reliability) in the classification and grading of *Ahadeeth* and *Aathaar*, then let us all thank [www.salafipublications.com](http://www.salafipublications.com) for sharing this with us. And this would mean that all we have to do to establish the usability of any narration – be it from the *Sunnah* or the narrations of the *Salaaf* – is to find a reliable scholar who uses them in any of his treatises! Is this the advice [www.salafipublications.com](http://www.salafipublications.com)?! And if we were to write an entire project wherein we listed the *Da'eef*, *Munkaar*, *Munqaateeh*, *Mawthoo'*, *Mawqoof*, *Mursal* etc. narrations which have been used in the writings of the reliable scholars in the history of *Islaam*, then we would not stop writing until we passed away. So what a feeble attempt by the authors of [www.salafipublications.com](http://www.salafipublications.com) and what a perfect demonstration of their scrambling for leverage.

And what makes this argument even more ridiculous, is that fact that even though *Shaykh* Muhammad bin Ibraheem, may Allaah be merciful to him, has used this narration from Ibn Abbass to explain this *Ayaah* from *Surat Al-Ma'idah*, he has done so in a way which agrees with what we have written anyway!<sup>75</sup> So anyway you look at it, [www.salafipublications.com](http://www.salafipublications.com) have developed an entire self-defeating argument here and it all gets thrown back upon them under cursory analysis. And with Allaah is the refuge.

5. Finally, the authors of [www.salafipublication.com](http://www.salafipublication.com) have brought their argument back to the point of *Shaykh* Muhammad bin Ibraheem's usage of "*Kufr 'Amilee*" and "*Kufr 'Atiqaadee*" and we have dealt with this claim in number one of this section. And in the end they have said, "...then it is necessitated upon him (i.e. meaning me) that he also ascribe this *Irjaa'* to *Shaikh* Muhammad bin Ibraheem Aal ash-Shaikh. It is binding upon

---

<sup>74</sup> The narration in question here is: Narrated by Al-Haakim, from the path of Hishaam bin Hujaayr and Tawoos who said, "Ibn Abbass, may Allaah be pleased with him, said, "It is not the *Kufr* you are taking it to. It is not *Kufr*, which takes one outside the *Milla* (i.e. the realm of *Islaam*). "And whosoever does not judge by what Allâh has revealed, such are the *Kâfirûn*." It is *Kufr* dun *Kufr* (i.e. *Kufr* less than *Kufr*)." ["*Mustaadraq Al-Haakim*", Vol. 2/313 Al-Haakim said, "This is a *Hadeeth* whose chain is *Saheeh*."] And in another narration: "...by Ibn Abee Hatim as mentioned by Ibn Katheer, from the path of Hishaam bin Hujaayr from Tawoos from Ibn Abbass about Allaah's saying: "And whosoever does not judge by what Allâh has revealed, such are the *Kâfirûn*." He (i.e. Ibn Abbass said, "It is not the *Kufr* you are taking it to." ["*At-Tafseer*", Vol.2/62]

And both of these narrations are weak due to Hishaam bin Hujaar. – Look to PART 1 in our series pages 45-47 for a detailed discussion of their authenticity.

<sup>75</sup> See footnote 66 a few pages back for a refresher if necessary.

him to do that and announce that. Otherwise, his whole argument is nullified, and his contradiction made apparently clear walhamdulillah.”

However, in the course of these earlier four points in this section, we have shown the distinction between the words of *Shaykh* Muhammad bin Ibraheem and those of *Shaykh* Al-Albaanee, just as we did previously with those of Al-Haafidh Al-Haakimee and Ibn Al-Qayyim, may Allaah be merciful to them all. But this statement of theirs offers us a much more scathing challenge to them and we will provide them with the same opportunity:

O, www.salafipublications.com, since you hold that the one who says that the ruler who replaces the *Hukm* of Allaah with his own fabricated laws and implements them upon the people is a *Kaafir* for this act, then it is binding upon you to label these same men with the same names you have ascribed to us:

1. *Shaykh Al-Islam*, Ibn Taymiyah <sup>76</sup>
2. Al-Haafidh Ibn Katheer <sup>77</sup>
3. *Shaykh* ‘Abdul-‘Azeez Ibn Baaz <sup>78</sup>
4. *Shaykh* Muhammad bin Saalih Al-‘Uthaymeen <sup>79</sup>
5. *Shaykh* Ma’mood Shaakir <sup>80</sup>

---

<sup>76</sup> Who said: “And it is known by necessity in the *Deen* of the Muslims and by the agreement of all the Muslims that whoever follows a *Sharee’ah* other than the *Sharee’ah* of Muhammad then he is a *Kaafir* and it is like the *Kufr* of the one who believes in some of the Book and disbelieves in some of the Book.” – “*Al-Fataawa*”, Vol. 28/524

<sup>77</sup> Who said: “So whoever leaves the clear *Sharee’ah*, which was revealed to Muhammad Ibn Abdullah, the Seal of the Prophets, and takes the *Hukm* to other than it from the laws of *Kufr* which are abrogated, he has disbelieved. So what about the one who takes the *Hukm* to the ‘*Yasaaq*’ and puts it before it?! Whoever does that, he has disbelieved by the *Ijmaa’* of the Muslims.” – “*Al-Bidaayah wa Nihaayah*”, Vol. 13/119

<sup>78</sup> Who said: “There is no *Eemaan* for the one who believes the laws of the people and their opinions are superior to the *Hukm* of Allaah and His Messenger or that they are equal to it or that they resemble it or who leaves it or replaces it with fabricated laws and institutions invented by people, even if he believes that the laws of Allaah are more encompassing and more just.” – “*Risalaat Wujoob Tah’keem Sharee’at Allaah*” Pg. 39, which follows the “*Risalaat Tah’keem Al-Qawaneen*” Published by “*Daar Al-Muslimin*”

<sup>79</sup> Who said: “The first type is when the *Hukm* of Allaah is removed and replaced with another *Taghuutee Hukm*, so that the *Hukm* of the *Sharee’ah* is eliminated between the people and he puts in its place another *Hukm* from the fabrication of the humans and they remove the laws of the *Sharee’ah* concerning the *Mu’amilah* (i.e. the general actions between people) and they put in its place fabricated laws and this, without doubt, is *Istib’daal* (i.e. replacement) of the *Sharee’ah* of Allaah *subhaanahu wa-ta’ala*, with other than it. And this is *Kufr* which removes one from the *Milla* because this person put himself at the level of the Creator because he *Shara’a* (legislated) for the slaves of Allaah that which Allaah *ta’ala* did not give permission for and that is *Shirk* in His, *ta’ala*’s saying: “Or have they partners with Allâh (false gods), who have instituted for them a religion, which Allâh has not allowed?” (*Ash-Shu’ara*, 21) – “*Fiqh Al-‘Ebaadaat*”, #60

<sup>80</sup> Who said: “So their question wasn’t the ‘*Eebadeeyah*’s question to Abee Majliz about the *Tafseer* of this *Ayaah* – about that which the *Mub’tadah* of our time agree with concerning the judgement in money and blood with a law that opposes the *Sharee’ah* of the people of *Islam* and not concerning implicating a law upon the people of *Islam* and forcing them to take the judgement to other than the rule of Allaah in

6. Ibn Jareer At-Tabaree <sup>81</sup>
7. 'Umar Al-Ashqaar <sup>82</sup>
8. 'Alaamah Muhammad Al-'Ameen Ash'Shanqeete <sup>83</sup>
9. Imaam Ahmad Shaakir <sup>84</sup>
10. 'Alaamah Muhammad bin Ibraheem Ahl'a-Shaykh <sup>85</sup>

---

His Book and upon the tongue of His Prophet . So this action is turning away from the *Hukm* of Allaah and from His *Deen* and putting the laws of the *Kuffar* above the law of Allaah, *subhaanahu wa-ta'ala* and this is *Kufr*. No one from the people of the *Qiblah* with their difference, doubts the *Kufr* of the one who says or calls to this.” – From his commentary of At-Tabaree (“*Tafseer At-Tabaree*” Vol. 10/348)

<sup>81</sup> Who said: “He *ta'ala* says, whoever conceals the *Hukm* of Allaah, which He revealed in His Book and made it a law between the slaves – so he hides it and rules with other than it like the *Hukm* of the Jews concerning the married fornicators with whipping of the guilty and blackening their faces and concealing the *Hukm* of stoning and like their judging upon some of their murdered with full blood-money and some with half of their blood-money. And concerning the noble people, they would have *Qisaas* but the commoner would only get the blood money. But Allaah made all of them equal in the *Tauraat*: ... such are the *Kāfirūn*. They are the ones who concealed the truth, which was upon them to uncover and make clear. And they hid it from the people and they showed something different to the people and they judged according to that (changed *Hukm*) because of a bribe they took from them.” (\* So the point of At-Tabaree here is that he considers this *Ayaah* general for anyone who does what the Jews did and hold this *Ayaah* meaning of *Kufr Akbaar* upon anyone who does what they did.) – “*Tafseer Al-Tabaree*” Vol. 4/592)

<sup>82</sup> Who said: “And from this explanation it becomes clear to us that there are two types of people who have fallen into *Kufr* about which there is no doubt. The first, the ones who legislate that which Allaah did not reveal, and those are the ones who fabricate the laws that oppose the legislation of Allaah they implicate it upon the people and the *Ijmaa'* is upon their *Kufr* without doubt.” – “*Al-Sharee'ah Al-Eelaheeyah*”, Pg. 179

<sup>83</sup> Who said: “And with these Heavenly texts that we have mentioned, it becomes quite clear that the ones who follow the fabricated laws, which the *Shaytaan* has legislated upon the tongues of his '*Auliya* and which oppose that which Allaah, *jala-wa'ala* has legislated upon the tongues of His Messengers, peace be upon them, that no one doubts their *Kufr* and their *Shirk* except him who Allaah has removed his sight and has blinded them to the light of the revelation as they are!” – “*Adhwaa Al-Bayaan*”, Vol. 4/82-85

<sup>84</sup> Who said: “The matter in these fabricated laws is clear with the clearness of the sun. It is clear *Kufr* and there is nothing hidden about it and there is no excuse for anyone who attributes themselves to *Islaam*, whoever they may be, to act according to it or to submit to it or to approve of it. So each person should beware and every person is responsible for himself. So the '*Ulaama* should make the truth clear and tell what they have been ordered to tell without concealing anything.” – “*Umdaat At-Tafseer Mukhtaasir Tafseer Ibn Katheer of Ahmad Shaakir*”, Vol. 4/173-174

<sup>85</sup> Who said: “... The fifth, and it is the greatest and the most encompassing and the clearest opposition of the *Sharee'ah* and stubbornness in the face of its laws and insulting to Allaah and His Messenger and opposing the courts of the *Sharee'ah* on their roots and branches and their types and their appearances and judgements and implementations the references and their applications. So just like the courts of the *Sharee'ah* there are references, all of them returning back to the Book of Allaah and the *Sunnah* of His Messenger like that, these courts have references, which are laws that are assembled from many legislations and laws like the laws like the laws of France and America and England and other laws and from the *Metha'haab* of some of the innovators who claim to be under the *Sharee'ah*. And these courts are now fully operational in the settlements of *Islaam*, people entering them one after another, their rulers judge upon them with what opposes the *Sunnah* and the Book with the rules of that law and they impose that on them and approve it for them. So what *Kufr* is there beyond this *Kufr* and what nullification of the *Shahadah* of *Muhammadar Rasool-Allaah* is there beyond this nullification?! – “*Tah'keem Al-Qawaneen*”

11. *Shaykh* Muhammad Al-Ghunaymaan <sup>86</sup>
  12. 'Abdur-Razaq Af-Feefee <sup>87</sup>
  13. *Shaykh* Ibn Qassim <sup>88</sup>
  14. *Shaykh* Hamd bin 'Ateeq An-Najdee <sup>89</sup>
  15. *Imaam* Abdullah bin Humayd <sup>90</sup>
- 

**AN AMAZING BENEFIT:** And this is the same text, about which the authors of [www.salafipublications.com](http://www.salafipublications.com) have attempted to demonstrate the *Tafseel* (as they understand it) wherein *Shaykh* Muhammad bin Ibraheem, may Allaah be merciful to him, classified this action as *Kufr* '*Atiqaadee*. And in his explanation of this condition, we find that the *Shaykh* has referred to nothing but the action. So again, it becomes crystal clear that his context is referring to the result of this action of *Kufr* and not its source, which reinforces our distinction between his usage and that of *Shaykh* Naasir Ad-Deen Al-Albaanee, may Allaah be merciful to them. And to Allaah is the refuge of the scandalous lies!

<sup>86</sup> Who said: When asked, "The one who leaves the *Hukm* by what Allaah revealed; if he makes the general judgements with the fabricated laws, does he disbelieve? And is there a difference between that and the one who judges with the *Sharee'ah* but then he opposes the *Sharee'ah* in some of the matters due to desire or bribery or other than that?" So he answered, "**Yes, it is *Waajib* to differentiate between them. There is a difference between the one who throws away the *Hukm* of Allaah, *jala-wa'ala* and replaces it with the judgements with the laws and the judgement of mankind. This is *Kufr*, which takes one outside the *Milla of Islaam*. But the one who is *Multazim* (i.e. religiously committed) upon the *Deen* of *Islaam* except that he is disobedient and a *Thaalim* by following his desires in some of the *Ah'kaam* and goes after a benefit from the *Dunyah*, while accepting that he is *Thaalim* with this, then this is not *Kufr*, which takes you out of the *Milla*. And whoever sees the *Hukm* with the laws to be equal to the *Hukm* of the *Shara'* and makes it *Halaal*, then he also disbelieves with the *Kufr* that takes one outside the *Milla*, even if it is in one instance.**" – "*Mujaalit Al-Mishkaat*", Vol. 4/247

And this is the *Tafseel* that we have adhered to as well as the others whom we have quoted from previously.

<sup>87</sup> Who said: "Thirdly: The one who is attributed to *Islaam* and knows its laws and then fabricates for the people, laws and makes them an institution for them to conduct themselves by and to take their judgements to and he knows that it opposes the laws of *Islaam*. Then he is a *Kaafir* out of the *Milla of Islaam*. And like that is the *Hukm* concerning the one who orders a committee or committees to be formed for that and the one orders the people to take their judgements to these institutions or laws or makes them take the judgements to them, while he knows that they oppose the *Sharee'ah* of *Islaam*. And like that is the one who judges with it and implicates it upon the matters and the one who obeys them in these judgements out of his own choice, while he knows that it opposes *Islaam*. So all of these are partners in their turning away from the *Hukm* of Allaah." – "*Shubu'haat Howl As-Sunnah Wa-Risalaat Al-Hukm bi'Ghayr ma'Anzaal-Allaah*", Pg. 64

<sup>88</sup> Who said: "Like the ones who rule with the laws of *Jahiliyyah* and the international laws, rather even one who rules by other than what Allaah revealed, whether he rules with the laws or with something which has been invented that is not from the *Shara'* or affirmed in the *Hukm*, then he is a *Taghuut* from the greatest *Tawagheet*." – From his commentary on "*Usool ath-Thalathah*", Pg. 96

<sup>89</sup> Who said: "And the Fourteenth Matter is Taking the *Hukm* to Other than the Book of Allaah and His Messenger . . ." And then he mentions the *Fatwaa* of Ibn Katheer under the *Ayaah*: "Is it the *Hukm* of *Jahileeyah* which they seek?", which we have narrated earlier. Then he said, "And like this is what the general people of the Bedouins and those like them fell into with regards to taking the *Hukm* to the customs of their forefathers and that which their ancestors established from the accused customs, which they label 'The *Sharee'ah* of *Reefawah*' they put it before the Book of Allaah and the *Sunnah* of His Messenger. So whoever does that; then he is a *Kaafir* and it is *Waajib* to fight him until he returns to the *Hukm* of Allaah and His Messenger." – "*Majmoo'at At-Tawheed*", Pg. 412

16. *Shaykh* Muhammad Hamad Al-Faqeeh <sup>91</sup>
17. *Imaam* Ash-Shawkaanee <sup>92</sup>
18. 'Abdul-Lateef bin 'Abdur-Rahmaan (i.e. Ibn 'Abdul-Wahhab's great-grandson) <sup>93</sup>

<sup>90</sup> Who said: "And whoever makes a general legislation (*Tashree' Al-'Aam*) and implicates it upon the people which opposes the *Hukm* of Allaah, then this one leaves the *Milla* as a *Kaafir*." – "*A'hameeyaat Al-Jihaad*" by 'Alee bin Nafee' Al-'Ilyanee Pg. 196

<sup>91</sup> Who said: "And like or (even) worse than this are the ones who take the words of the *Kuffar* as laws, which they judge with in matters concerning blood and wealth and they put that before that which they know and that is has been made clear to them from the Book of Allaah and the *Sunnah* of His Messenger . So he, without a doubt, is a *Mortad* if he continues upon that and does not return to the *Hukm* of what Allaah revealed and he will not be benefited by any name which he labels himself with and neither by any outward action that he does from *Salaat* or *Siyaam* or anything else!" – From the *Hamish* (i.e. margins) of "*Fat'h Al-Majeed*", Pg. 406

<sup>92</sup> Who said, "Now we will make clear to you the condition of the second type and it is the *Hukm* of the people of the state who aren't under the command of the state – until his saying – from it is that they judge and take the *Hukm* to the ones who know the *Ah'kaam* of the *Tawagheet* in all of the matters that they are in charge of and they take it to them without making *Inkaar* and without any shame in front of Allaah or His slaves and they do not fear anyone, rather they can rule with that anyone who they are able to reach from the citizens and those who surround them. And this is a known matter, which no one can deny or reject, and this is well known. **And there is no doubt that this is *Kufr* in Allaah, *subhanahu wa-ta'ala* and His *Sharee'ah*, which He ordered with upon the tongue of His Messenger and chose for His slaves in His Book and upon the tongue of His Messenger. They even disbelieved in all of the laws from the time of Adam (pbuh) until now and the *Jihaad* against them and fighting them is *Waaajib* until they accept the laws of *Islaam* and submit to them and rule among with the pure *Sharee'ah* and they leave what they were upon of *Tawagheet Shaytaaneeyah* – until his saying – and it is known from the rules of the pure *Sharee'ah* and its texts that whoever puts himself to fight those people and seeks the aid of Allaah and makes his intention sincere, then he will be from the victorious and he will have the reward because Allaah will give victory to whoever supports Him. And: '**And if you give victory to Allaah, He will give victory to you and firmly plant your feet.**' And the reward is for the *Mutaqun*.' – until his saying – so if he who was able to fight them, leaves the making *Jihaad* against them, then he is under the threat of punishment descending upon him and deserving of what comes upon him because Allaah has placed over the people of *Islaam* certain groups as a punishment for them because they would not leave the *Munkaarat* and they did not try to adhere to the pure *Sharee'ah* just like what happened with the conquering of the *Khawaarij* in the early days of *Islaam* then the conquering of the *Qaramatah* and the *Batineeyah* then the conquering of the Turks until they almost wiped out *Islaam* and like what occurs often with the conquering of the Europeans and the people like them. So keep and open mind, O people of sight! Verily, there is a lesson in this for whoever has a heart or was given hearing and the gift of sight!" – From his letter, "*Al-Dawa Al-'Ajaal*" Pg. 33-35 which came within "*Ar-Rasa'il As-Salafeeyah*"**

<sup>93</sup> Who said: When asked concerning what the Bedouins judge with according to the customs of their fathers and grandfathers. "Do we label them with *Kufr* after it is made clear to them (that this is not permissible and when they continue)?" So he answered, "Whoever takes the judgement to other than the book of Allaah and the *Sunnah* of His Messenger after it is made clear to him (that this is not permissible), then he is a *Kaafir*. He, *ta'ala* said: 'And whosoever does not judge by what Allâh has revealed, such are the *Kâfirûn*.' 'Is it other than the *Deen* of Allaah that they seek?' 'Have you seen those (hypocrites) who claim that they believe in that which has been sent down to you, and that which was sent down before you, and they wish to go for judgement (in their disputes) to the *Tâghût* (false judges, etc.) while they have been ordered to reject them.' 'And the *Ayaat* with this meaning are many.'" – "*Dur'ur As-Saneeyah fi'Al-Ajweebah An-Najdeeyah*", Vol. 8/231 Published by "*Dar Al-Iftaa' bil'Saudeeyah*" 1385 H

**AN AMAZING BENEFIT:** So we see that *Shaykh* 'Abdul-Lateef bin 'Abdur-Rahmaan used the *Ayah* in *Surat Al-Ma'idah* with the meaning of *Kufr Akbaar*, which takes you outside the realm of *Islaam*. And

19. 'Abdur-Rahmaan bin Hasaan ( i.e. Ibn 'Abdul-Wahaab's grandson) <sup>94</sup>
20. *Shaykh* Muhammad Shaakir Ash-Shareef <sup>95</sup>
21. Saalih bin Ibraheem Al-Layhee <sup>96</sup>

---

according to the principals established earlier by the authors of www.salafipublications.com (wherein they held that the usage of the narration from Ibn Abbas; "...*Kufr dun Kufr*...", from *Shaykh* Muhammad bin Ibraheem, was sufficient to prove its authenticity) then this means that this *Ayaah* is held upon its meaning of *Akbaar*, simply because a reliable scholar has used it this way in his writings. And this means that all our explanation in PART 1 of this series which employed the principles of *Hadeeth* classification, *Tafseer* and the Arabic language and the rules of the *Qur'aan*, were redundant because all we needed to do to establish this – according to www.salafipublications.com – was find a scholar who used it this way. And we seek refuge with Allaah from the innovated principles of the followers of desire!

<sup>94</sup> Who said: In his commentary of *Surat At-Tauba*, 31: "So it is made clear with this, that the *Ayaah* proves that whoever obeys other than Allaah and His Messenger and turns away from taking from the Book and the *Sunnah*, concerning making *Halaal* what Allaah made *Haraam* or making *Haraam* what Allaah made *Halaal* or obeys him in the disobedience of Allaah and follows him in what Allaah did not give permission for, then he has taken him as a lord and something worshipped and made him a partner with Allaah and that contradicts the *Tawheed* which is the Deen of Allaah that the words of *Ikhtlaas: La Illaaha il-Allaah*, have indicated. (This is) because the *Ilaah* is the thing, which is worshipped, and Allaah, *ta'ala* labeled their obedience as worship towards them and called them lords. Like He, *ta'ala* said: '**And He does not order you to take the angels and the Prophets as lords...**' In other words, '...as partners with Allaah in His worship...' – '**Does He order you to do *Kufr* after you were Muslims?**' **And this is the *Shirk*** because anything which is worshipped is a Lord and all things, which are obeyed or followed concerning other than what Allaah or His Messenger have legislated, then he has been taken by the obedient one or the follower as a Lord and a thing to be worshipped. Like He, *ta'ala* said in *Surah An'am*: '**And if you obeyed them, then you are *Mushrikeen*.**' And this is the meaning of this *Ayaah* and like this *Ayaah* in meaning is His, *ta'ala*'s saying: 'And do they have partners who have legislated in the *Deen* what Allaah did not give permission for?' And Allaah knows best." – "*Fat'h Al-Majeed*", Pg. 110-111 Published by "*Dar Al-Fikr*"

<sup>95</sup> Who said: In his "Chapter concerning making clear when the one who rules by other than what Allaah revealed is a *Kaafir*; with the *Kufr* that does not take one outside the *Milla*."

Then he said, "He does not disbelieve with three conditions:

- a) That he is *Mul'tazim* (i.e. religiously committed) and accepts upon the outside and the inside every *Hukm* or *Tashree'* which has come from Allaah *subhaanahu wa-ta'ala* or His Messenger
- b) That he accepts and confesses that he has left the *Hukm* with what Allaah *subhaanahu wa-ta'ala* has revealed **in that matter or that specific instance** that he judges in that he is sinful and that his *Hukm* is a mistake and that the *Hukm* of Allaah is the correct.
- c) **That the opposing *Hukm* is a *Hukm* in specific instances and not in full general matters and this third condition is the one, which many of the contemporary people have not understood and paid attention to.** – "*In'Allaah Huu'al-Haakim*", Pg. 88-91 published by "*Daar Al-Waton*", 1413 H.

And this is the *Tafseel* that we have adhered to throughout our entire series and that which has been proven with more evidences than we have been able to produce here!

<sup>96</sup> Who said, concerning the meaning of the "*Daleel*", "So the ruling with the fabricated laws, which oppose the *Islaamic Sharee'ah* is atheistic and *Kufr* and *Fasad* and *Thulm* among the slaves because the security is not ensured and the *Shara'ee* rights are not preserved except by acting upon the *Islaamic Sharee'ah* in its entirety in the '*Aqeedah* and worship and ruling and etiquettes and the conduct and institutions, because the 'Ruling by Other Than What Allaah Revealed' is ruling with a created action upon a creation like it. And it is ruling with the laws of the *Taghoot* and there is no difference between the individual conditions and the general and specific and whoever differentiates between them in the *Hukm*, then he is an atheist/*Zandeeq*

22. *Shaykh Saalih Al-Fawzaan* <sup>97</sup>
23. And finally *Shaykh Al-Albaanee*, himself... <sup>98</sup>

So please, O [www.salafipublications.com](http://www.salafipublications.com), feel free to label these twenty-odd men <sup>99</sup> with any of the following slanderous names, with which you have slandered others and ourselves with:

1. *Takfeeree*
2. *Surooree*
3. *Kharaajee*
4. *Qutubee*
5. Political Activists
6. Extremists
7. Biased Partisans

So please [www.salafipublications.com](http://www.salafipublications.com), for once have some integrity and show your true colors and admit your contempt for the men on this list and let your tongues loose upon them with the same rage you have unleashed it upon us. And let your slanderous innovated categories and descriptions fly against them as well. <sup>100</sup>

---

(i.e. Hypocrite in denial)/*Kaafir* in Allaah *Al-'Atheem!*" – "*As-Salsabeel*", Vol. 2/384, which is his commentary upon "*Zaad Al-Mutaqnah*".

<sup>97</sup> Who said, "So whoever takes the *Hukm* to other than the legislation of Allaah from all of the institutions and the man-made laws, then has taken the implicators of these laws and the ones who rule with them as partners with Allaah in his legislation. He, *ta'ala* said: 'Or do they have partners who have legislated for them what Allaah has not allowed?' And He said: 'And if you obeyed them, then you are *Mushrikeen*.' – "*Al-Irshaad ila 'Saheeh Al-'Atiqaad*", Vol.1/72

And then again, after narrating what *Al-Haafidh* Ibn Katheer wrote concerning the Tartar's and "*Al-Yasiq*", he said, "And the likes of the law that he mentioned from the Tartars, and judged upon with *Kufr*, those who put in the place of the *Islaamic Sharee'ah*, are the fabricated laws, which have – in our time – been established as sources of laws in many countries and the *Islaamic Sharee'ah* has been disregarded in favor of them except in what they call 'personal matters'." – "*Al-Irshaad ila 'Saheeh Al-'Atiqaad*", Vol.1/74

<sup>98</sup> Who said, in one of his earlier cassette recorded lessons, wherein he is describing an argument he had with someone about the *Takfeer* of Mustafah Ata'turk, the secularist who converted the constitution of Turkey from the *Hanafee* code *Sharee'ah*, to the man-made laws. So *Shaykh Al-Albaanee* said, "I made clear to him (i.e. his opponent) that the Muslims did not make *Takfeer* to Ata'turk who was Muslim. No. (They did so) when he freed himself from *Islaam* when he implicated upon the Muslims an institution other than the institution of *Islaam*. And from that was the example of his equalizing between the inheritance of the male and the female. But Allaah says according to us, '**And for the male is the share of two females.**' And then he obligated upon the Turkish masses, the *Qobah* (i.e. a Turkish-style hat)." – "*Fataawa Ash-Shaykh al-Albaanee wa-Maqara 'netihah bi 'Fatawaa Al-'Ulaama*", Pg. 263 from his cassette #171.

<sup>99</sup> And we chose a mere twenty or so for the sake of brevity as to avoid belaboring the point. Were we to bring more than these, we certainly could have done so with the permission of Allaah, *ta'ala*.

<sup>100</sup> There is no doubt that [www.salafipublications.com](http://www.salafipublications.com) will scurry to resurrect the "other words" of the likes of *Shaykh Ibn Baaz*, Ibn 'Uthaymeen, may Allaah be merciful to them, and Saalih Al-Fawzaan, which would take on a different meaning than what we have presented here, but the challenge remains for them to address these words. And this is not a case where our quotations are ambiguous or unclear, it could only be

## THE NEXT AMAZING BENEFIT:

Next, [www.salafipublication.com](http://www.salafipublication.com) have brought the words of *Shaykh* Saalih Al-Fawzaan, which they have just reprinted here wholesale, from Article ID: MNJ050014.

So they write:

**“Questioner:** "Someone has understood from your words in *Kitaab ut-Tawheed*, which are from your comments, with regards to the issue of al-Haakimiyyah and ruling by other than what Allaah has revealed. So they have understood from them that [by the act alone] you perform specific takfir of a specific ruler who does not judge by what Allaah has revealed. And then they applied (what they understood from your words) to the rulers of the Gulf states.

**Shaikh al-Fawzan:** [Laughs]... is it due to hawaa (desire)?... the words are clear, there is no ambiguity in them, the words are clear. The distinction (tafsil) that is mentioned (i.e. previously in the beginning of the chapter) relates to them. And it was then said after that that the one who banishes the Shari’ah entirely and puts another law in its place, that this indicates that he views the [secular] law to be better than the Sharee’ah, and whoever holds this opinion, he is the one who is a kaafir [emphasis given]. This is in the same book itself... however they only take [from the book] according to their own understanding of it and what is of benefit to them, yet they abandon the rest of the words. If they had read the words from the beginning, the matter would have become clear [to them].

**Questioner:** And the statement of Shaikh Muhammad Ibn Ibraheem is [understood] in the same way?

**Shaikh al-Fawzan:** Yes, it is the same. His words mean that the one who abolishes the Shari’ah and puts in its place another law, then this indicates (daleel) that he considers this law to be better than the Sharee’ah. And [subsequently] whoever considers this law to be better than the Sharee’ah, then such a one is a kaafir in the view of everybody, there is no doubt in this.”

And this is another inexplicable quotation from the authors of [www.salafipublications.com](http://www.salafipublications.com), which they have attempted to use against our position about the *Takfeer* of the rulers who replace the laws of Allaah with their own fabricated laws. And again, as has been the case throughout our series, we will find that these words are actually against themselves.

Firstly, it should be pointed out that this text, from the question put to *Shaykh* Saalih Al-Fawzaan, is in agreement with our position in some ways and it disagrees with our

---

that there was a change of opinion from them or the latter words abrogate the earlier ones. So this would mean that the earlier words were those of *Tafeerees*, *Khaarajees* etc. and for us, this would be sufficient for [www.salafipublications.com](http://www.salafipublications.com) to admit this alone.

position in other ways. But in both cases, it flies directly in the faces of the authors of [www.salafipublications.com](http://www.salafipublications.com) and we will show why, *Inshaa'Allaah*.

With respect to what agrees with us, in this text, is the general *Takfeer* of the one who replaces the laws of the *Sharee'ah* with the fabricated legislations. This is clear from what was written in the book "*Kitaab At-Tawheed* " as well as what the *Shaykh* has confirmed here.<sup>101</sup> So this means that there is no difference between our opinion (about the one who replaces the *Sharee'ah* with the fabricated laws) and that of *Shaykh* Saalih Al-Fawzaan from the point of view of the *Takfeer* itself. Because we have agreed that this one is a *Kaafir* and as he has said, this *Kufr* is absolute as he has stated: "**And he affirmed that this disbelief expels from the religion absolutely.**" So both our position and that of *Shaykh* Saalih Al-Fawzaan is upon the absolute *Takfeer* of the one who rules with the fabricated laws. So let this be established.

Are you ready to come this far with us, O [www.salafipublications.com](http://www.salafipublications.com)? Will you agree with ourselves and *Shaykh* Al-Fawzaan in this absolute *Takfeer* upon the rulers who rule with the fabricated laws? Not likely. So then who is in opposition with Saalih Al-Fawzaan in the issue of the *Takfeer* of the rulers who rule with the general legislation then? Is it us or yourselves? How could you have possibly written these words and thought that they would be a reinforcement of your position? Are you all that blind? Will you at last be guided? Are you prepared to call Saalih Al-Fawzaan a "*Takfeeree*"? Or would you perhaps prefer the term "*Qutubee*" as you have opted to call those who make absolute *Takfeer* of the rulers with the general legislation? We will leave the method of his slander upon you to decide.

The next item of notice, which *Shaykh* Saalih Al-Fawzaan has benefited our position here is in his understanding of the *Tafseel* that we have been upon from the outset of this series. So Saalih Al-Fawzaan said: "The distinction (*tafsil*) that is mentioned (i.e. previously in the beginning of the chapter) relates to them." So let us examine what this "*Tafseel*" is in the beginning of the chapter.

---

<sup>101</sup> As for the book, *Shaykh* Saalih Al-Fawzaan quoted *Shaykh* Muhaamd bin Ibraheem saying: "As far as the one who it was said about him, '*Kufr dun Kufr*,' this is if he rules with other than what Allaah revealed, while he believes that he is disobedient and that the *Hukm* of Allaah is the truth. This is concerning when it comes from him once or like that. **But as far as the one who puts laws in an order and to be followed, then this is *Kufr* even if they say that we made a mistake and the *Hukm* of the *Shara'* is more just, so there is a difference between the one who approves and implicates and make it as a text to return to. They make it a thing to return to an this is *Kufr* that takes one outside the *Milla*."** And then he explains it by saying: "So he distinguished between the partial judgement (by Other than What Allaah Revealed) which does not recur and between the general law which becomes a reference point in all of the rulings or most of them. **And he affirmed that this disbelief expels from the religion absolutely.** This is because the one who removed the *Islaamic Sharee'ah* and put secular law in its place, in replacement of it, then this indicates that he considers that this [secular] law is better and more beneficial than the *Sharee'ah*, and there is no doubt that this is the major disbelief which expels from the religion."

And as for the affirmation of this meaning, he said: "And it was then said after that that the one who banishes the *Sharee'ah* entirely and puts another law in its place, that this indicates that he views the [secular] law to be better than the *Sharee'ah*, and whoever holds this opinion, he is the one who is a *Kaafir* [emphasis given]."

So in the beginning of this chapter we find some of the descriptions wherein the *Shaykh* shows some examples 'Ruling by Other Than What Allaah Revealed' in the sense of *Kufr Akbaar* and then he illustrated the *Tafseel* being referred to with the following quotation:

“However, if he believed in the obligation to rule by what Allaah has revealed and knew what the judgement was in this instance, but he turned away from it while acknowledging that he is deserving of punishment, then he is a sinner and is labeled a *Kaafir* with the minor form of disbelief. And if he was ignorant of the judgement of Allaah concerning it while having striven hard and expended efforts in knowing the judgement but erred, then he will receive a reward for his *Ijtihad* and his error will be forgiven. **This is in relation to a particular matter.**”

*Allaahu Akbaar!* So what is the difference between our *Tafseel* and that of the *Shaykh* here? Have we not been saying this all along? Look at our saying:

“So what is clear from what has passed in the *Tafseer* of this *Ayaah* is that their meaning is *Kufr Al-Akbaar*; however, if it is held upon the rulers who do not 'Rule by Other Than What Allaah Revealed' in the sense that they **do not replaced the laws of *Islaam*** and they **do not engage in *Tashree' Al-'Aam* with legislation that opposes the *Hukm* of Allaah**, then we say the same as some of what has been narrated: “***Kufr dun Kufr, Fisq dun Fisq, Thulm less than Thulm,***” and, “**It is not the *Kufr* that removes one from the realm (i.e. of *Islaam*), etc.**” (PART 1 in our series, page 57)

And look to:

“So after all that has passed it becomes clear that the people whom the *Ibaadheeyah* were attempting to make *Takfeer* with these *Ayaat*, were not 'Ruling by Other Than What Allaah Revealed' in the sense that they abolished the *Islaamic Sharee'ah* and brought their own fabricated laws and forced them unto the people. **This is very far from the truth; however, what is affirmed from what has passed, is that they used to rule in particular instances according to their desires but as a whole, the system of governing in their era was the complete *Islaamic Sharee'ah* and they did not replace any of it with their own laws and they did not engage in *Tashree' Al-'Aam*, which legislates opposing laws to those of the *Sharee'ah*.** And they continued to rule the people by the *Hukm* of Allaah in general **with the exception of those rare instances and they left the *Hukm* of Allaah in specific cases in which they were overtaken by their desires, such as in their passing the *Khaleefaah* from father to son and they new they were guilty and admitted to their sin.**”<sup>102</sup>

And look to:

“...And it is quite clear from what has passed that the *Ayaah* is only held upon it's '*Usl* of *Kufr Al-Akbaar* in the case where the laws from the *Sharee'ah* itself have been replaced

---

<sup>102</sup> Page 58 of PART 1 in our series.

or changed, **and although the case of a judge who 'Rules by Other Than What Allaah Revealed' in a particular instance due to his desires or whims etc., is from the greatest of sins, we do not hold this equal with the *Haakim* who replaces and abolishes the entire *Sharee'ah* or even specific laws from Allaah's *Hukm*.**"<sup>103</sup>

So the *Tafseel* of *Shaykh* Saalih Al-Fawzaan is the same *Tafseel* that we have applied in the issue of *Takfeer* for 'Ruling by Other Than What Allaah Revealed'. And this is what the *Qur'aan* and the *Tafseer* of the *Salaaf* and the *Mufaasireen* have indicated in light of the causes for the *Ayaat* in *Surat Al-Maa'idah* being revealed.<sup>104</sup>

O [www.salafipublications.com](http://www.salafipublications.com), are you willing to agree with ourselves and *Shaykh* Saalih Al-Fawzaan in the *Tafseel* being presented here? Or will you call him a "*Kharaajee*" too now that we have proven that his *Tafseel* is the same as our own. Do what you will because you can not frustrate *Ahl us-Sunnah* as the Messenger of Allaah said:

"There shall not cease to remain a single group from my *Jamaa'ah* upon the Truth, victorious; **they are unharmed by those who abandon them and those who oppose them.** They will remain until they fight the liar (i.e. the *Dajjaal*)."<sup>105</sup>

So both the general *Takfeer* of the rulers who rule with the fabricated laws and general legislations as well as the *Tafseel* between the ones who rule by 'Other Than What Allaah Revealed' in particular instances vs. those who replace the *Hukm* of Allaah with the fabricated laws, are agreed upon between ourselves and *Shaykh* Saalih Al-Fawzaan. And the authors of [www.salafipublications.com](http://www.salafipublications.com) have vehemently disagreed with the *Shaykh* and us so we know who is truly in opposition with him in this matter. And we extend our appreciation to our misguided brothers at [www.salafipublicatoins.com](http://www.salafipublicatoins.com) for presenting us with yet another opportunity to openly refute them with their own texts.

As for the point of difference between ourselves and *Shaykh* Saalih Al-Fawzaan, then although we both agree with the general *Takfeer* upon those who rule with the fabricated laws, he considers this act as sufficient proof that he replaced the laws of the *Sharee'ah* because he considered preferred these fabricated laws to those of the *Shara'*. Therefore, his *Takfeer* comes from what the action indicates and not from the action itself.

This is indicated by his saying:

"...And it was then said after that that the one who banishes the *Sharee'ah* entirely and puts another law in its place, **that this indicates that he views the [secular] law to be**

---

<sup>103</sup> Page 58 of PART 1 in our series.

<sup>104</sup> Look to pages 45 - 62 in PART 1 in our series for a detailed discussion on the *Ayaat* being referred to here.

<sup>105</sup> Narrated by *Imaam* Muslim in his *Saheeh*.

**better than the *Sharee'ah*, and whoever holds this opinion, he is the one who is a *Kaafir*...**"

So we see that *Shaykh* Saalih Al-Fawzaan sees this action as an absolute evidence for a reason for *Takfeer* and not a cause of *Takfeer*.<sup>106</sup> And he was not the only one to hold this position. We see from the late honorable *Shaykh* Muhammad bin Saalih Al-'Uthaymeen, may Allaah be merciful to him, that he has given a similar explanation for his general *Takfeer* of the rulers who rule with the fabricated laws. So he said:

"As far as the one who establishes the fabricated laws, while he knows the *Hukm* of Allaah and that these laws oppose Allaah's *Hukm*, then this person has replaced these laws in place of the *Sharee'ah*. Therefore he is a *Kaafir*. **This because he does not invent these laws and turn away from Allaah's *Sharee'ah* except because of his belief that they are superior for the people and the country than the law of Allaah.** And when we say that he is a *Kaafir*, then the meaning of this is that this action reaches *Kufr*."<sup>107</sup>

And we find in the cassette recording of *Shaykh* Ibn 'Uthaymeen's commentary of *Shaykh* Al-Albaanee's booklet entitled "*Fitnaat At-Takfeer*", that he said:

"...**But we disagree with him (i.e. *Shaykh* Al-Albaanee) regarding the matter wherein he does not judge with *Kufr* upon them (i.e. the *Huh'kam*) except when they held that to be permitted.** This issue requires further investigation because we say, 'Whoever rules by what Allaah has revealed yet he holds that something other than the rule of Allaah is better or more befitting, then he is a *Kaafir* even if he judged by the rule of Allaah.' And his *Kufr* is a *Kufr* of belief. **However, our discussion here is concerning an action. And I see that it is not possible for a person to apply and establish these laws, which oppose the *Sharee'ah* and which are referred to by the slaves of Allaah for judgement unless he declares this to be permissible and holds the belief that such laws are superior to the *Sharee'ah* laws. Therefore he is a *Kaafir*.** This is what is apparent. If not, then why would he have done this (i.e. establish the fabricated laws)?"<sup>108</sup>

---

<sup>106</sup> We will proceed to a brief explanation of the "reasons of *Kufr*" and the "causes of *Kufr*" shortly, *Inshaa'Allaah*.

<sup>107</sup> "*Al-Qawl Al-Mufeed fee Sharh' Kitaab At-Tawheed*" Vol. 2/269

<sup>108</sup> **AN AMAZING BENEFIT:** So we see here that the opinion of *Shaykh* Ibn 'Uthaymeen regarding the rulers who rule with the fabricated laws is completely different than that of *Shaykh* Al-Albaanee, may Allaah be merciful to them. And this is illustrated clearly in his saying: "But we disagree with him regarding the matter wherein he does not judge with *Kufr* upon them (i.e. the *Huh'kam*) except when they held that to be permitted." – until his saying – "However, our discussion here is concerning an action. And I see that it is not possible for a person to apply and establish these laws, which oppose the *Sharee'ah* and which are referred to by the slaves of Allaah for judgement unless he declares this to be permissible and holds the belief that such laws are superior to the *Sharee'ah* laws. Therefore he is a *Kaafir*." So *Shaykh* Ibn 'Uthaymeen sees the rulers who rule with the general legislations to be *Kuffar* (just as Saalih Al-Fawzaan) because, according to him, this ruler could not have replaced the laws of the *Sharee'ah* with those of his

And he said:

“And ruling by other than what Allaah has revealed is of two types: The first type: that the ruler replaces (yastabdilu) the law of Allaah the exalted by this law whilst he has knowledge of the law of Allaah but he holds that the opposing law is more befitting and more beneficial for the servants than the law of Allaah or that it is equal to the law of Allaah or that turning away from the law of Allaah is permissible (jaa’iz) - **so therefore he makes this law (qaanoon) the one that it is obligatory to refer back to for judgement (yaijib at-Tahaakum ilaihi) - so the likes of this one is a kaafir with the kufr that ejects from the religion** and that because he is not pleased with Allaah as his Lord, Muhammad as his Messenger and Islaam as his religion...” (Fataawaa 2/145).<sup>109</sup>

So are you prepared, O www.salafipublication.com, to agree ourselves and with *Shaykh* Ibn ‘Uthaymeen and *Shaykh* Saalih Al-Fawzaan in the general absolute *Takfeer* of the rulers who knowingly replace the laws of the *Sharee’ah* with those of their own fabrication? And are you prepared to accept their *Tafseel* between the ruler of judge who ‘Rules by Other Than What Allaah Revealed’ in particular instances vs. the ruler who uses another *Sharee’ah* altogether to govern his masses? Are you prepared to agree with us, O youth of delusion? Or will you now recant and end your support for these two figures in this matter and resort to your treachery and betrayal and slander them as well as ourselves?! May Allaah guide you and may you fear Him, *ta’ala!*

So now that we have established clearly that we do not differ with *Shaykh* Saalih Al-Fawzaan and *Shaykh* Ibn ‘Uthaymeen, may Allaah be merciful to him, in the matter of the *Takfeer* of these rulers and the *Tafseel* of the condition of the rulers, we will point out the matters wherein there is a difference with them in the matter of the reasons for *Takfeer*.

### **The “Reasons of *Kufr* ” vs. the “Causes of *Kufr* ”:**

We see here that both *Shaykh* Ibn ‘Uthaymeen and Saalih Al-Fawzaan<sup>110</sup> have used the action of the body to indicate a condition of the heart and they have made *Takfeer* due

---

own invention unless he held that they were preferable. So keep this in mind as you read the following lies from the authors of www.salafipublications.com:

1. Shaikh al-Albaani, like Imaam ibn Baaz, **and like Ibn Uthaimen does not fall into what the questioner is describing of ruling by other than what Allaah reveals, (meaning that he rules by the secular laws instead of the Sharee’ah laws) is major kufr.** (From Article ID: GRV070007)
2. **And this is the tafsil of the Salaf of our times**, the likes of Imaam al-Albaani, Imaam Ibn Baaz and **Ibn Uthaimen** have tended to on this issue. (And this is clearly wrong because the *Tafseel* of *Shaykh* Ibn ‘Uthaymeen is the same as Saalih Al-Fawzaan’s above. And neither of them agrees upon the *Tafseel* of *Shaykh* Al-Albaanee as established earlier.) (From Article ID: MNJ050018)

<sup>109</sup> Again, taking this directly from their web site; Article ID: MNJ050018

<sup>110</sup> And this discussion is not limited to these two figures, rather we are discussing it in this context as we have narrated their opinions regarding this issue earlier.

what that action indicates. So from one point of view, it could be said that they make *Takfeer* for this action, in the sense that the action was the catalyst for the *Takfeer*,<sup>111</sup> but the clear ruling in their words and the phrasing of their statements shows that they have used this action of *Kufr* as a revealing of the “reason of *Kufr*” rather than the “cause of *Kufr*”.<sup>112</sup> In other words, they hold that the people have disbelieved in their hearts and they have held this action as evidence. And so they make *Takfeer* based upon the action but they say that his *Kufr* occurred in the heart.<sup>113</sup>

---

<sup>111</sup> And this might be interpreted from the words of *Shaykh* Ibn ‘Uthaymeen, may Allaah be merciful to him who said: “However, our discussion here is concerning an action. And I see that it is not possible for a person to apply and establish these laws, which oppose the *Sharee’ah* and which are referred to by the slaves of Allaah for judgement unless he declares this to be permissible and holds the belief that such laws are superior to the *Sharee’ah* laws. Therefore he is a *Kaafir*.”

<sup>112</sup> And this is more likely based upon their saying: “This is because he does not invent these laws and turn away from Allaah’s *Sharee’ah* except because of his belief that they are superior for the people and the countries than the law of Allaah.” (Ibn ‘Uthaymeen from “*Al-Qawl Al-Mufeed Sharh’ Kitaab At-Tawheed*” Vol. 2/269) And: “...And it was then said after that that the one who banishes the *Sharee’ah* entirely and puts another law in its place, that this indicates that he views the [secular] law to be better than the *Sharee’ah*, and whoever holds this opinion, he is the one who is a *Kaafir*...” (Saalih Al-Fawzaan from Article ID: MNJ050014)

<sup>113</sup> And this probably delights the authors of [www.salafipublications.com](http://www.salafipublications.com) as they attempt to use these statements to show that the action itself is not *Kufr*; however, they have failed to notice three important points:

This opinion from Saalih Al-Fawzaan and *Shaykh* Ibn ‘Uthaymeen, may Allaah be merciful to him, is not found with respect to all actions, rather it is in respect to this one action specifically. So any comparison between them and *Shaykh* Al-Albaanee, may Allaah be merciful to him, can only be limited to this topic and not with respect to actions of *Kufr* at large. This is because *Shaykh* Al-Albaanee does not see the actions themselves to be the *Kufr* at all unless they show the already-existing *Kufr* of the heart or the person admits to his internal *Kufr* at the time of his committing the action. And we have established this earlier so review that if this is still unclear.

We have already demonstrated the difference between them in the matter of the *Takfeer* of the rulers who rule with the general legislations and shown the general *Takfeer* of these rulers from both Saalih Al-Fawzaan and Ibn ‘Uthaymeen whereas *Shaykh* Al-Albaanee did not see the *Takfeer* of the rulers at all unless they clearly state upon their tongues that the rulers hold their ruling as permissible. So the *Takfeer* itself is the separating factor between them, which shows that they are not in agreement at all upon the *Takfeer* of the rulers. As for actions of *Kufr* generally, we will demonstrate the difference shortly, *Inshaa’Allaah*.

These very statements from these two individuals (and other than them), which refer to the general *Takfeer* of the rulers who rule with the fabricated laws, is the precise *Tafseel* which we have used in PART 1 of our series and throughout this project, and this *Tafseel* was not that of *Shaykh* Al-Albaanee or [www.salafipublications.com](http://www.salafipublications.com) either. So this is the distinction between their words and opinions and those of *Shaykh* Al-Albaanee, may Allaah be merciful to him; therefore proving that they were not in agreement in the matter of he who ‘Rules by Other Than What Allaah Revealed’.

So let us explain why we differ with the opinion of *Shaykh* Saalih Al-Fawzaan and *Shaykh* Ibn 'Uthaymeen, may Allaah be merciful to him. <sup>114</sup>

When it comes to *Kufr*, there is the motivation for *Kufr*, which is an internal matter and then there is the *Kufr* itself. In some cases, the motivation for the *Kufr* of the body is *Kufr* itself. For example, the person who kicks the *Mus'haaf* might do so because he hates *Islaam*. But we also say that the one who hates *Islaam* is a *Kaafir* even before he kicked the *Mus'haaf*. (In fact, we say that anyone who hates *Islaam* is a *Kaafir* whether or not he kicks the *Mus'haaf*.) So in this case the "motivation" or "reason" for his *Kufr* was his hatred for *Islaam*, but as far as the *Takfeer* is concerned, we say he is a *Kaafir* for kicking the *Mus'haaf* because a ruling of *Takfeer* is dependant upon the *Thaahir* (i.e. outward appearance) and no one can look into the heart of another one. <sup>115</sup> And based upon this

---

<sup>114</sup> Keeping in mind that we have not disagreed with them in the *Takfeer* of the ruler nor in the application of the *Tafseel* between the one who replaces the *Sharee'ah* vs. the one who rules by 'Other Than What Allaah Revealed' in particular instances.

<sup>115</sup> And the evidences for the correctness of this rule in the texts of the *Sharee'ah* are overwhelming. And with the explanation from the '*Ulaama of Ahl us-Sunnah wa'l-Jamaa'ah*, they are undeniable. And from them:

- 1) His \_\_\_\_\_'s saying, in the two *Saheehs*, "I was ordered to fight the people until they say, '*La Illaha il-Allaah wa Muhammad ar-Rasool Allaah*,' and they establish the *Salaat* and pay the *Zakaat*. So if they say that then their blood and their money is safe from me except in the right of *Islaam* and their reckoning is for Allaah." And *Shaykh Al-Islaam*, Ibn Taymiyah said about this *Hadeeth*: "It means: 'I have been ordered to except from them their outward appearance of *Islaam* and trust their inner selves to Allaah. So the Prophet \_\_\_\_\_ did not used to perform the *Hudood* out of his (personal) knowledge, nor from the information of one person, nor through the revelation, nor with the (minor) indications or testimonies, until what is *Waaajib* to be known was affirmed (i.e. until that person had the proof established against them) with confirmed clarification or confession. Did you not see how he was informed about the pregnant lady that if she gave birth to a child which resembled so-and-so (and he said), '...then it is from the one you have been accused with...' and it came resembling this terrible resemblance so he said, 'If it was not for the *Eemaan*, then it would have been for me and her \_\_\_\_\_'?" And there was a woman in *Madeenah* who used to make the evil known (i.e. spread the evil of others) and he said, 'If I were to accuse anyone without clarification, I would accuse her!' And he said to those who disputed with him, 'Verily, you dispute with me (as the judge) and perhaps some of you are better in speech than others, so I judge based upon what I hear. So whenever I judge against the right of his brother, then he (i.e. the winner) must not take that (i.e. what he was granted) because I have only granted him a portion of the fire.' So his leaving the killing (of the *Munafiqeen*) – while they are *Kuffar* – was because of them not showing the *Kufr* and the (absence of the) a *Hujjah* (i.e. clarifying argument) from the *Sharee'ah* (being established against them)." – "*As-Saraam al-Maslool 'ala-Shaatim Ar-Rasool*", Pg. 356-357
- 2) And his \_\_\_\_\_'s saying, "Whoever prays our prayer and faces our *Qiblah* and eats from our slaughtering, then he is the Muslim. He has the protection of Allaah and the protection from His Messenger." (Narrated by Al-Bukhaaree in his *Saheeh*)
- 3) And from Ussamah bin Zayd, who said, "Verily, the Messenger of Allaah \_\_\_\_\_ sent a squad of the Muslims to a tribe of *Mushrikeen*. Both the armies confronted one another. There was a man from the army of *Mushrikeen* who – whenever he wanted to kill a man from the Muslims – he killed him. Amongst the Muslims too was one who was anticipating his unmindfulness (i.e. so he could kill him). We (i.e. the narrators) mentioned that it was Ussamah bin Zayd. When he raised his sword, he (i.e. the *Mushrik* soldier) uttered, '*La Illaha il-Allaah*.' But he (i.e. Ussamah)

- killed him. When the messenger of news came to the Messenger of Allaah , he questioned him (about the events of the battle) and he informed him about that man (i.e. Ussamah) and what he had done. He called for him and asked him why he had killed him. He said, 'O Messenger of Allaah, he struck the Muslims and killed such-and-such of them. And he named some of them. (He said), 'I attacked him and when he saw my sword he said, '*La Illaha il-Allaah.*' The Messenger of Allaah said, 'Did you kill him?' He said, 'Yes.' He (i.e. the Prophet ) said, 'What would you do with, '*La Illaha il-Allaah*' when he comes before you on the Day of Judgment?' He said, 'O Messenger of Allaah, beg forgiveness for me.' He said, 'What would you do with, '*La Illaha il-Allaah*' when he comes before you on the Day of Judgment?!' And he added nothing more but kept saying, 'What would you do with, '*La Illaha il-Allaah*' when he comes before you on the Day of Judgment?!' (Agreed upon) And *Imaam* An-Nawaawee said: "And as for his (i.e. the Prophet's ) saying, 'Did you tear out his heart...?' In it, there is evidence for the well-known rule in *Fiqh* and *Usul* (i.e. Islamic jurisprudence and the fundamental principals upon which it is based) that the rulings go upon the outward appearance and to Allaah remains the unknown." – "*Sharh Saheeh Muslim*", Vol. 1/107 And Ibn Taymiyah said: "There is no difference of opinion that the criminal who enters *Islaam* when he sees the sword, no matter if he is general or specific, that his *Islaam* is correct and his *Taubah* from *Kufr* is accepted (from the Muslims), even if the condition he is in, seems to indicate that his inside is different than his outside." – "*As-Saraam al-Maslool*", Pg. 329
- 4) And from Muqdad Ibn Al-Aswad, that he said, "O Allaah's Messenger! If I meet a *Kaafir* and we have a fight, and he strikes my hand with the sword and cuts it off, and then takes refuge from me under a tree, and says, 'I have surrendered to Allaah (i.e. embraced Islam),' may I kill him after he has said so?' Allaah's Messenger said, 'Do not kill him.' Al-Muqdad said, 'But, O Allaah's Messenger! He had chopped off one of my hands and he said that after he had cut it off. May I kill him?' The Prophet said. 'Do not kill him for if you kill him, he would be in the position in which you had been before you killed him (i.e. considered a Muslim) and you are in the position that he was before he said the words which he said.'" (Agreed upon) An-Nawaawee, may Allaah be merciful to him, said, "...he would be in the position in which you had been before you killed him (i.e. considered a Muslim) and you are in the position that he was before he said the words which he said..." The best and the most clear thing which is said about it, is what *Al-Imaam* Al-Shaafi'ee and Ibn Al-Qasaar Al-Maalikee and others have said that it means: That his blood is safe and his killing is *Haram* after his saying, '*La Illaha il-Allaah,*' as you were before you killed him. And you, after your killing him; your blood is not safe and your killing is not *Haram*, just like his was before he said, '*La Illaha il-Allaah.*'"
  - 5) And from Abu Sa'eed Al-Khudree, may Allaah be pleased with him, "A man stood up whose eyes were deep sunken in, and whose forehead protruded, and whose beard was thick with a shaved head, and whose waist covering was bunched up, and he said, 'O Messenger of Allaah, fear Allah!' So he said, 'Woe to you! Am I not the most worthy of the people of the Earth to fear Allaah?' He (the narrator) said, 'Then the man turned and walked away. So Khaalid Ibn Al-Waleed said, 'O Messenger of Allaah, should I not cut off his head?' So he said, 'No, perhaps he observes the *Salaat.*' Khaalid said, 'How many are they who observe the prayer and profess upon the tongue what is not in their heart?' So the Messenger of Allaah said, 'I have not been ordered to pierce the hearts of people nor to rib open their bellies (i.e. to see what really lies inside them).' And he again looked towards him (i.e. that man) as he walked away. Then he said, 'There will arise a people from the descendants of this (man) who will recite the *Qur'aan* perfectly but it will not go beyond their throats. They will leave the *Deen* just as the arrow leaves the bow.' And I (i.e. the narrator) also think he said, 'Verily, if I found them, I would kill them like the killing of '*Aad.*'" (Narrated by Muslim in his *Saheeh*)
  - 6) And from Nu'maan Ibn Basheer, who said, "We were with the Prophet and a man approached swaggering. So he said, 'Kill him.' Then he said, 'Does he bear witness to '*La Illaha il-Allaah*'?' He said, 'Yes. But he only says it to seek refuge (i.e. to protect himself from the Muslims).' So the Messenger of Allaah said, 'Do not kill him because I have only been ordered to fight the people until they say, '*La Illaha il-Allaah*'. So if they say that, their blood

rule of *Takfeer*, we say that the reason for his *Kufr* was his hatred of *Islaam* but the cause of his *Kufr* (i.e. that which we base *Takfeer* upon) was his action of kicking the *Mus'haaf*. So this was an example of where the "reason for *Kufr*" (i.e. the motivating factor) was *Kufr* itself in that he actually disbelieved even before the action of *Kufr* was committed.

However, we do not encompass all the "reasons for *Kufr*" into the same level as the "causes of *Kufr*", although we maintain that this motivating factor (i.e. reason for *Kufr*) is an internal matter. For example, the person who becomes a Magician and practices sorcery is a *Kaafir* for this act.<sup>116</sup> But he might have become a Magician due to his desire

---

and their wealth is safe from me except in its right (i.e. debts and punishments etc.) and their reckoning is for Allaah." ("Saheeh An-Nisaa'ee", # 3714)

And the evidences from the *Sunnah* about this matter are almost infinite so pay attention to that, O student of knowledge.

<sup>116</sup> As for the one who commits sorcery. He disbelieves from this action with the evidence of Allaah *ta'ala*'s saying:

"They followed what the *Shayâtin* (devils) gave out (falsely of the magic) in the lifetime of Sulaimân (Solomon). Sulaimân did not disbelieve, but the *Shayâtin* (devils) disbelieved, teaching men magic and such things that came down at Babylon to the two angels, Hârût and Mârût, but neither of these two (angels) taught anyone (such things) till they had said, "We are only for trial, so disbelieve not (by learning this magic from us)." And from these (angels) people learn that by which they cause separation between man and his wife, but they could not thus harm anyone except by Allâh's Leave. And they learn that which harms them and profits them not. And indeed they knew that the buyers of it (magic) would have no share in the Hereafter. And how bad indeed was that for which they sold their own selves, if they but knew." (*Al-Baqarah*, 102)

So the ruling of sorcery and magic in this *Ayaah* is *Kufr*. And the majority of *Ahl us-Sunnah* hold the action, in all of its forms to expel one from *Islaam*. And this is due to the act itself. [And for a *Sharee'ah* definition of *Si'hr* (i.e. sorcery and magic), look to the discussion of Ash-Shanqeetee in "*Adhwaa Al-Bayaan*", Vol. 4/444]

*Shaykh* Ibn Baaz, may Allaah be merciful to him said: "The Seventh Nullification: And this is the sorcery and from it is causing division between the spouses and causing attraction between two people. So he who performs it or accepts it has disbelieved. And the evidence is the statement of Allaah: "...but the *Shayâtin* (devils) disbelieved, teaching men magic and such things that came down at Babylon to the two angels, Hârût and Mârût, but neither of these two (angels) taught anyone (such things) till they had said, "We are only for trial, so disbelieve not..." – "*Al-'Aqeedah As-Saheeha wa ma'Udadhoohaah wa-Nawaaqith Al-Islaam*", published by "*Al-Humaydee* Printing House", Pg. 27

And we find no difference from the '*Ulamaa* of the *Salaaf* except from *Imaam* Ash-Shaafa'ee and some of the jurists from this *Meth'haab*. "And Ash-Shaafa'ee said, 'If he learns magic, we ask him, 'Describe your magic to us.' So if he describes what causes *Kufr* such as the beliefs of the people of Babylon and drawing nearer to the seventh stars (i.e. astrological causes of events) and that they do what he asks, then he is a *Kaafir*. And if it does not cause *Kufr*, but he says that it is permissible, then he disbelieves." – "*Fat'h Al-Majeed*" Pg. 316, published by "*Maktabaat Al-Mu'ayyad*", 1408 H. / 1988 G. 2<sup>nd</sup> Edition

to become famous. So in this case, we say that this person's "reason for *Kufr* " was his desire to become famous but his "cause for *Kufr* " (i.e. that which a ruling of *Takfeer* is based upon) was his action of sorcery. So this one did not disbelieve before he committed his action; rather his action nullified his *Eemaan*. And this is the difference.

Likewise, a person who does not pray. <sup>117</sup> We say that he might have any number of "reasons" for his *Kufr*, such as *Istih'laal* (i.e. he considers the abandonment of prayer as permissible) or *Tak'theeb* (i.e. he does not believe in prayer at all) or because of *Inkaar* (i.e. he holds that the *Salaat* is not from *Islaam*) – and all these would be *Kufr* on their own even before he abandoned his first prayer. (And we say that even if he prayed all five prayers regularly and on time, this one would be a *Kaafir* for his *Kufr* in belief.) Yet, at the same time, this person might not pray because he wants to fit in with the people around him, or due to laziness or due to a desire to relax or something of this condition. And so this person was not a *Kaafir* for being lazy or for desiring to be popular etc.; rather his *Kufr* came from the abandonment of the *Salaat* itself. So in the examples listed, (i.e. the Magician or the one who abandons the *Salaat*) we see that we can not encompass the "reasons of *Kufr*" (i.e. and they are the motivational factors which begin internally) to the same ruling as the "causes for *Kufr*" (i.e. and they are the actions and statements upon the *Thaahir* which nullify *Islaam*).

And we see that *Islaamic Fiqh* is governed by this principle in all matters wherein the *Ah'kaam* (i.e. judgements) in the *Dunyah* is dependant upon the actions of the individual. For example, the Muslim who intentionally murders another Muslim is subject to the ruling of *Qisaas* (i.e. retaliatory execution of the murderer) for his action of murder. But not all murderers commit this crime for the same reasons. So one person might have murdered due to his desire to receive the inheritance of his victim, and one person might have murdered due to revenge for something the other had done, or for hatred, or someone might have actually committed his murder due to his sympathy for his victim who was confined to life-support machines. So although these people have different motivating factors, which lead to the crime, they are all equal in the subjugation to the law of *Qisaas* under the *Islaamic Sharee'ah*.

And the ruling of *Takfeer* follows this rule precisely. If an action is defined as being *Kufr Akbaar*, then the *Takfeer* comes to the perpetrator of this action independent of the

---

And from some of the 'Ulamaa, there are those who differentiated between illusionary, slight-of-hand magic tricks and those acts of sorcery, which clearly are not possible except by witchcraft and divination. And for this there is an explanation from *Imaam* Muhammad Al-'Ameen Ash-Shanqeetee, may Allaah be merciful to him in "*Adhwaa Al-Bayaan* ", Vol. 4/456

So we see that this matter is an academic one between the different types of sorcery. But let us suppose for the sake of our example, that we are referring to the magic, which was learned in Babylon; that which is referred to in this *Ayaah* with the *Kufr* that removes one from the realm of *Islaam* due to the perpetration of the act itself.

<sup>117</sup> And some of the texts, which narrate the *Kufr* of the one who abandons the *Salaat*, have past. So review them if necessary.

motivation for that person who committed that act of *Kufr*<sup>118</sup> and we do not hold them all equal in their “reason for *Kufr*”. Yet we do hold them all equal to their “cause of *Kufr*” with the ruling of the *Takfeer* falling upon them because of their committing the action of *Kufr*. And this is a misunderstanding which has become widespread in our time and we say that the ones who fall into this mistake of confusing between the “reasons of *Kufr*” and the “causes of *Kufr*” in certain instances have committed a mistake in these instances. But the one who falls into this confusing between the “reason of *Kufr*” and the “causes of *Kufr*” in every case, has fallen into a branch of *Irjaa*’.

So when it comes to the ruler who legislates laws, which oppose the *Islaamic Sharee’ah*, and replaces the *Hukm* of Allaah in his country with these fabricated laws, we say that he might have done so due to a motivating factor, which is *Kufr* on its own (i.e. such as *Tak’theeb*, *Istih’laal*, *Juhood* or preferring these laws to the *Hukm* of Allaah etc.) or he might have done so for a “reason of *Kufr*”, which was not *Kufr* on its own, such as his desire to imitate the Western countries, or his desire to gain monetary benefit from certain international companies or any other reasons, which may have lead to his committing this action. And from this point of view, our approach has a more lenient implication as regards the status of this ruler’s heart at the time he committed this action. And we do not necessarily say that he has committed this act due to his belief that these laws are superior to those of the *Sharee’ah*. However, we say that this action is a “cause of *Kufr*”, which nullifies *Eemaan* even if it were present at the time he committed the action. And due to the rule of *Takfeer*, which states that we hold the rulings of *Takfeer* upon the “causes of *Kufr*”, we say that this person has disbelieved as a result of his action without tying that action to a particular “reason of *Kufr*”.<sup>119</sup>

So regarding the mixing of the “reason of *Kufr*” and the “cause of *Kufr*” from Saalih Al-Fawzaan and *Shaykh* Ibn ‘Uthaymeen, may Allaah be merciful to him, then we know that this is an instance where they have done so and not an indication of their adhering to this linking in all cases. And it may be that they had attempted to reconcile the authentic *Ijmaa*’ regarding the *Kufr* of the one who legislates laws in replacement of the *Sharee’ah*, with some of the texts about ‘Ruling by Other Than What Allaah Revealed’ in particular instances. And Allaah knows best.

But we hold that this is a mistake and do not agree with this linking the “reason for *Kufr*” with the “cause of *Kufr*” in this matter or in any other matter wherein a ruling of *Takfeer* is concerned. And during our research for this series, we telephoned *Shaykh* Sulaymaan bin Naasir Al-‘Ulwaan with the following question:

**Question:** “We have read words from *Shaykh* Muhammad bin Saalih Al-‘Uthaymeen, may Allaah preserve him, from his book “*Al-Qawl Al-Mufeed fee Sharh Kitaab At-Tawheed*” in which the *Shaykh* says what means: “That the one who rules with other than

---

<sup>118</sup> This, of course, excludes ignorance or *Ijtihaad* or the acceptable *Ta’weel* and any of the preventative factors of *Takfeer*.

<sup>119</sup> So let the authors of [www.salafipublications.com](http://www.salafipublications.com) review the rules of *Takfeer* as defined by *Ahl us-Sunnah wa’l-Jamaa’ah*. And let them understand these rules themselves, before they attempt to explain them to others!!

what Allaah revealed, he would not have done this except for the fact that he believed that these laws are superior for the countries and the people, and superior to the *Sharee'ah* of Allaah.” So is this true that the replacing of the *Ah'kaam* of the *Sharee'ah* is an evidence that the *Haakim* considers these laws to be better than the *Sharee'ah* of Allaah? And is this the reason for his *Kufr*? Or is it that this action is *Kufr* on its own?”

**Answer:** “What the general population of the Muslims are upon such as *Al-Haafidh* Ibn Katheer narrated their *Ijmaa'* in “*Al-Bidaayah wa-Nihayyah*”, in the thirteenth volume in the biography of Genghis Khan, is that **the action on its own is *Kufr* and *Ridah* without looking and without tying it in with the beliefs or *Juhood* or *Tak'theeb* or *Taf'theel* or things like that.** So when we see the one who ‘Rules by Other Than What Allaah Revealed’, it could be due to his belief that this *Hukm* is superior than the *Shara'* of *Allaah*, or it could be that this action is not due to beliefs, rather it is only an action. **So we make *Takfeer* from the action itself, without looking to the beliefs.** And if he adds to this (action) beliefs, then his *Kufr* has increased. Otherwise, the action itself is *Kufr* and *Ridah* from the *Deen*. Like He, *ta'ala* said: ‘**And whosoever does not judge by what Allâh has revealed, such are the *Kâfirûn*.**’ And like He, *ta'ala* said: ‘**Have you seen those (hypocrites) who claim that they believe in that which has been sent down to you, and that which was sent down before you, and they wish to go for judgement (in their disputes) to the *Tâghût* (false judges, etc.) while they have been ordered to reject them.**’ So we say about His, *jala-wa'ala*’s saying: ‘**And whosoever does not judge by what Allâh has revealed, such are the *Kâfirûn*.**’ – *Kufr* in leaving the *Hukm* and *Kufr* in legislation and *Kufr* in ruling with that legislation. So they (i.e. the rulers who do this) join between three matters, which take them outside *Islaam*. So whoever says, “They do not disbelieve except with *Juhood* or belief,’ then this is the *Meth'haab* of the *Ghulaat Al-Jahmee'yah* or the *Murji'yah*.”

And as for the statement of *Shaykh* Saalih Al-Fawzaan, may Allaah preserve him, in which he was asked:

**Questioner:** And the statement of Shaikh Muhammad Ibn Ibraheem is [understood] in the same way?

**Shaikh al-Fawzan:** Yes, it is the same. His words mean that the one who abolishes the *Shari'ah* and puts in its place another law, then this indicates (daleel) that he considers this law to be better than the *Sharee'ah*. And [subsequently] whoever considers this law to be better than the *Sharee'ah*, then such a one is a kaafir in the view of everybody, there is no doubt in this.”

So about this statement, we make the following observations:

1. We do not agree that the opinion of *Shaykh* Muhammad bin Ibraheem, may Allaah be merciful to him, was that this replacing the laws of the *Sharee'ah* with his own fabricated laws, is evidence that he considers these laws preferable and therefore he disbelieves from this matter of the heart. And this is clear from his words, which we have quoted earlier, “So maybe you will ask: What if the one who rules with the laws

says, 'I believe these laws are *Baatil*?' **There is no effect. Rather, this is removing the *Sharee'ah* just like if one said, 'I worship these idols and believe that it is *Baatil*.'**<sup>120</sup>

2. We see the words of *Shaykh*: "And [subsequently] whoever considers this law to be better than the *Sharee'ah*, then such a one is a *Kaafir* in the view of everybody, there is no doubt in this," are an indication of how he has attempted to reconcile the view that 'Ruling by Other Than What Allaah Revealed' is *Kufr Al-Asgaar* with the *Ijmaa'* that the one who replaces the laws of the *Sharee'ah* has disbelieved. This, because he has agreed with the *Takfeer* of these rulers, yet at the same time, he has not made *Takfeer* for the "cause of *Kufr*", rather he has made *Takfeer* for what he views as the "reason of *Kufr*." And that was his preference of the man-made laws to those of the *Sharee'ah* of *Islaam*. And we have clarified this error in the section just passed.

...Continuing the Refutation...

Next up in the "Blazing Salafee Meteor", we find the text of *Shaykh* Ibn 'Uthaymeen, may Allaah be merciful to him, in which they quote:

"As for what is connected to [the issue of] ruling by other than what Allaah has revealed, then it is, as occurred in the Mighty Book, divided into three types..." – until he said – "... And if he knows the legislation (Shar') however he judges by this [legislation] or he legislates this [law] and then makes it a code of law (dustoor) to be followed by the people, believing (ya'tadid) that he is an oppressor (dhaalim) in all of that and that the truth is what has come in the Book and the Sunnah, then we are not able to make takfir of this one..."

Firstly, there is no reference for this quotation other than the claim from the authors that this was stated on "22/03/1420 H." Secondly, this quotation is a contradiction from what they themselves have quoted from him in other places, such as:

"And ruling by other than what Allaah has revealed is of **two types**: The first type: that the ruler replaces (yastabdilu) the law of Allaah the exalted by this law whilst he has knowledge of the law of Allaah but he holds that the opposing law is more befitting and more beneficial for the servants than the law of Allaah or that it is equal to the law of Allaah or that turning away from the law of Allaah is permissible (jaa'iz) - **so therefore he makes this law (qaanoon) the one that it is obligatory to refer back to for judgement (yaijib at-Tahaakum ilaihi) - so the likes of this one is a kaafir with the kufr that ejects from the religion and that because he is not pleased with Allaah as**

---

<sup>120</sup> "*Fataawa Al-Imaam Muhammad bin Ibraheem Ahl'a-Shaykh*", Vol. 12/280 And within these words, there is a clarification that the *Shaykh* is calling the act itself of 'Ruling by Other Than What Allaah Revealed' to be *Kufr* itself, independent from the motivation which lead to his replacing these laws. And this comes with his statement: Rather, this is removing the *Sharee'ah* just like if one said, 'I worship these idols and believe that it is *Baatil*.' So it is "...removing the *Sharee'ah*..." which the *Shaykh* is referring to as the "cause of *Kufr*" and this is what leads him to make *Takfeer* regardless of the "reason of *Kufr*", which may have caused this ruler to commit this act. So let this be clear to you, O reader. And let this be a refutation of you, O beguiled youth of [www.salafipublications.com](http://www.salafipublications.com)!

**his Lord, Muhammad as his Messenger and Islaam as his religion..." (Fataawaa 2/145).<sup>121</sup>**

And thirdly, this contradicts what he is confirmed to have said in the past on the very same topic:

“The first type is when the *Hukm* of Allaah is removed and replaced with another *Taghuutee Hukm*, so that the *Hukm* of the *Sharee’ah* is eliminated between the people and he puts in its place another *Hukm* from the fabrication of the humans and they remove the laws of the *Sharee’ah* concerning the *Mu’amilah* (i.e. the general actions between people) and they put in its place fabricated laws and this, without doubt, is *Istib’daal* (i.e. replacement) of the *Sharee’ah* of Allaah *subhaanahu wa-ta’ala*, with other than it. **And this is *Kufr* which removes one from the *Milla* because this person put himself at the level of the Creator because he *Shara’a* (legislated) for the slaves of Allaah that which Allaah *ta’ala* did not give permission for and that is *Shirk* in His, *ta’ala*’s saying: “Or have they partners with Allâh (false gods), who have instituted for them a religion, which Allâh has not allowed?” (*Ash-Shu’ara*, 21)<sup>122</sup>**

And so even if this unfounded statement, which the authors of [www.salafipublications.com](http://www.salafipublications.com) have brought from *Shaykh* Ibn ‘Uthaymeen, may Allaah be merciful to him, were confirmed as his actual saying, then this would only succeed in demonstrating that the *Shaykh* uttered contradictory statements about the topic of replacing the laws of the *Sharee’ah* with the fabricated laws. And this either means that the *Shaykh* held different views about this action at different times or that his latter statements abrogated his earlier ones. But there is no room for the deceivers of [www.salafipublications.com](http://www.salafipublications.com) to attempt to reconcile these statements. And this is because the first statement (i.e. the unfounded one) shows that *Takfeer* can never be made to the *Haakim* for his replacement of the laws of the *Sharee’ah* with the man-made laws unless he confesses his disbelief in them.<sup>123</sup> And the second statement (i.e. the one which we have discussed earlier in detail) shows that we are necessarily obliged to make *Takfeer* of the *Haakim* for his replacement of the laws of the *Sharee’ah* with the man-made laws, because this would prove that he considered these laws as preferable to those of the *Sharee’ah*.<sup>124</sup> And the third statement (i.e. the one, which he has called the action itself

---

<sup>121</sup> Article ID: MNJ050018

<sup>122</sup> “Fiqh Al-‘Eebaadaat”, #60

<sup>123</sup> This is because if we say that the action is not *Kufr* on its own, and if we say that the “reason of *Kufr*” is not necessarily *Kufr*, then we have no way of knowing if this *Haakim* disbelieved according to this view. And this contradicts the *Ijmaa’*, the *Tafseer* of the *Salaaf* and people of knowledge as well as the Arabic language and other than that, so this saying is rejected.

<sup>124</sup> This is based upon his own saying: “...And I see that it is not possible for a person to apply and establish these laws, which oppose the *Sharee’ah* and which are referred to by the slaves of Allaah for judgement unless he declares this to be permissible and holds the belief that such laws are superior to the *Sharee’ah* laws. Therefore he is a *Kaafir*. This is what is apparent. If not, then why would he have done this (i.e. establish the fabricated laws)?” – From the *Shaykh*’s cassette commentary on *Shaykh* Al-Albaanee’s booklet “*Fitnaat At-Takfeer*”. And this saying is one in which the error of mixing between the “reason for

“...*Kufr* which removes one from the *Milla*...” shows that the action is the cause of this ruler’s *Kufr* and it is not dependent upon the status of his heart at the time of its perpetration.<sup>125</sup> So how can they possibly be reconciled when these statements are in direct contradiction with one another?!

Next, the foolish ones from [www.salafipublications.com](http://www.salafipublications.com) have brought the following statement from *Imaam* Muhammad Al-‘Ameen Ash-Shanqeetee, by which they have attempted to include him among the ones who held that the act of ‘Ruling by Other Than What Allaah Revealed’ is not *Kufr* unless it is due to that ruler’s belief that the man-made laws are equivalent or superior to the laws of the *Sharee’ah*. So they write:

“Until even *Imaam* ash-Shanqeetee, who said, "And by this it is known that the *halaal* (lawful) is what Allaah has declared lawful and the *haraam* (unlawful) is what Allaah has declared unlawful, and the *deen* (religion) is what has been legislated by Allaah. Therefore, every legislation (*tashree'*) from other than Him is falsehood, and acting upon it - instead of (*badala*) the legislation of Allaah, for the one who believes that it is equivalent to it, or better than it - is clear, manifest *kufr*, there being no doubt in it." (*Adwaa ul-Bayaan* 7/162)

So we are pleased with the quotation of the excellent “*Adhwaa Al-Bayaan*” with which the authors of [www.salafipublications.com](http://www.salafipublications.com) have afforded us the opportunity to reveal *Shaykh’s* true opinion in the matters of general legislation and ‘Ruling by Other Than What Allaah Revealed’ with the man-made laws. And it all comes from the same book that [www.salafipublications.com](http://www.salafipublications.com) have quoting; however, they have conveniently left out what follows:

1. “And since the legislation and all of the laws, whether they are from the *Sharee’ah* or *Qadr* laws, they are from the specific characteristics of *Ruboobiyyah*, like the aforementioned *Ayaat* indicate. **Based upon that, anyone who follows a legislation other than the legislation of Allaah; then he has taken that legislator as a Lord and has associated him with Allaah.**”<sup>126</sup>
2. “As for the legislative institutions, which contradict the legislation of the Creator of the Heavens and the Earth; then judging with these is *Kufr* in the Creator of the Heavens and the Earth. Such as saying that the preference of the males over the females in the inheritance is unjust and that it should be that they are equal in inheritance and like the saying that polygamy is *Thulm* and that divorce is *Thulm*

---

*Takfeer*” and the “cause for *Takfeer*” has been committed. Also, it contains an element of extremism by which we say that this ruler necessarily held *Kufr* in his heart at the time of his action. And so it is rejected.

<sup>125</sup> And this is in agreement with everything we’ve established in PART 1 of our series and this project as well. And this saying is consistent with the *Tafseel* we’ve employed as well as the *Ijmaa’* and the principles of *Takfeer* from *Ahl us-Sunnah*, which we’ve adhered to throughout this refutation. And this statement does not mix between the “reasons of *Kufr*” and the “causes of *Kufr*” nor does it attempt to declare the status of this ruler’s heart at the time of his *Kufr*. Therefore it is approved and accepted and used in support of what we’ve been proving all along, much to the dismay of the authors of [www.salafipublications.com](http://www.salafipublications.com)!

<sup>126</sup> “*Adhwaa Al-Bayaan*,” Vol. 7/169

against the women and that stoning and cutting off the hand and things like this are barbaric acts which should not be carried out against the people and things like that. **So ruling by institutions such as these upon individuals and the society and their wealth and their property and minds and Deen is Kufr in the Creator of the Heavens and the Earth and it is a rebellion against the law of the Heavens, which was given by the Creator of all the creation and He, subhanahu wa-ta'ala, is more knowledgeable of the benefits towards His creation than to have another legislator along with Him!** 'And do they have partners who have legislated in the Deen what Allaah did not give permission for?'<sup>127</sup>

3. "And from the guidance of this *Qur'aan* to the ones who are more worthy its making clear that whoever follows a legislation other than the legislation of the Master of the Children of Adam, Muhammad Ibn Abdullah , then his following of that opposing legislation is a clear *Kufr*, which takes one outside the *Milla* of *Islaam*. And when the *Kuffar* said to the Prophet , 'When the sheep dies, who kills it?' So he said to them, 'Allaah killed it.' So they said, 'What you have slaughtered by your hand is *Halaal* but what Allaah slaughtered by His Hand, you say it is *Haraam*.' So then you are better than Allaah?!' Allaah sent down concerning them His saying: 'Do not eat from that which Allaah's Name has not been uttered upon it and that is *Fisq* and verily, the *Shaya'teen* revealed to their 'Auliyah to argue with you and if you obey them, you would be *Mushrikun*.' And when there was no letter (i.e. 'Fa') in His saying, '...you would be *Mushrikun*,' this indicates that there is an unmentioned oath. (And here the *Shaykh* proved this rule by bringing verses of Arabic poetry, which we have not bothered to translate here.) And it is an oath by Allaah, *jallaa-wa'ala*, that whoever follows the *Shaytaan* in making *Halaal*, the dead meet, **then he is a *Mushrik* and this is a *Shirk*, which takes one outside the *Milla* with the *Ijmaa'* of the *Muslimeen*.** And Allaah will address the one who commits this on the Day of Judgement with His saying: 'Did I not take an oath from you O Children of Adam, to not worship the *Shaytaan*? Verily, to you he is a clear enemy.' (This is) because obeying him in his legislation, which opposes the revelation is worshipping him. He *ta'ala* said: 'Verily, they only make *Du'a* to other than him to females. And they only make *Du'a* to the *Shaytaan*.' In other words, '...they do not worship anything but the *Shaytaan* and that comes from them following the legislation. And He said, 'And like that was made to appear good to many of the *Mushrikeen* to kill their children by their partners – till the end of the *Ayaah*.' **So He called them partners because they obeyed them in the disobedience of Allaah *ta'ala*.** And He said about His *Khaleel* (i.e. Ibraheem

): 'O my father, do not worship the *Shaytaan* – until end of *Ayaah*.' In other words, '...by obeying him in *Kufr* and disobedience. And when 'Adee bin Hatim asked the Prophet *صلى الله عليه وسلم* about His *ta'ala*'s saying: 'They took their priests and Rabbis as lords beside Allaah – the end of the *Ayaah*,' he made clear to them that the meaning of this was that they obeyed them in the making *Haraam* what Allaah made *Halaal* and making *Halaal* what Allaah made *Haraam* and the *Ayaat* like this are many. And the strange thing which some of the people judge by other than the legislation of Allaah and then claim *Islaam* like He, *ta'ala* said: 'Have you

<sup>127</sup> "Adhwaa Al-Bayaan", Vol. 4/85

seen those (hypocrites) who claim that they believe in that which has been sent down to you, and that which was sent down before you, and they wish to go for judgement (in their disputes) to the *Tâghût* (false judges, etc.) while they have been ordered to reject them. But *Shaitân* (Satan) wishes to lead them far astray.' And He said: 'And whosoever does not judge by what Allâh has revealed, such are the *Kâfirûn*.' And He said, 'Shall I seek a judge other than Allâh while it is He Who has sent down unto you the Book (The Qur'ân), explained in detail." Those unto whom We gave the Scripture [the Taurât (Torah) and the Injeel (Gospel)] know that it is revealed from your Lord in truth. So be not you of those who doubt.'" <sup>128</sup>

4. And he said, "And with these Heavenly texts that we have mentioned, it becomes quite clear that the ones who follow the fabricated laws, which the *Shaytaan* has legislated upon the tongues of his '*Auliya* and which oppose that which Allaah, *jala-wa'ala* has legislated upon the tongues of His Messengers, peace be upon them, **that no one doubts their *Kufr* and their *Shirk* except him who Allaah has removed his sight and has blinded them to the light of the revelation as they are!**" <sup>129</sup>
5. And from the *Shaykh's* cassettes of the *Tafseer* of *Surat At-Tauba*, at Allaah, the Most High's saying:

....

**They (Jews and Christians) took their rabbis and their monks to be their lords besides Allâh ...**

...he said, "Associating with Allaah in His *Hukm* is like associating with Him in his worship and there is no difference between them at all, **so the one who follows an institution other than the institution of Allaah, or other than that which Allaah legislated and a law which opposes the legislation of Allaah from that which has been fabricated by human beings**, turning away from the light of the heavens that Allaah revealed upon His Messenger. **Whoever does this and whoever worships an idol or prostrates to a statue; there is no difference between them at all from any point of view. They are both one thing and they are both *Mushriks* with Allaah. This one associated with Allaah in His *Hukm* and they are both the same."**

So look to his words, may Allaah be merciful to him, "...then he has taken that legislator as a Lord and has associated him with Allaah," and "...then judging with these is *Kufr* in the Creator of the Heavens and the Earth," and "So ruling by institutions such as these upon individuals and the society and their wealth and their property and minds and *Deen* is *Kufr* in the Creator of the Heavens and the Earth..." and "...then his following of that opposing legislation is a clear *Kufr*, which takes one outside the *Milla of Islaam*..." and "...the ones who follow the fabricated laws... no one doubts their *Kufr* and their *Shirk* except him who Allaah has removed his sight and has blinded them to the light of the revelation as they are!" and "...and a law which opposes the legislation of Allaah from that which has been fabricated by human beings... Whoever does this and whoever worships an idol or prostrates to a

<sup>128</sup> "*Adhwaa Al-Bayaan*", Vol. 3/439-441

<sup>129</sup> "*Adhwaa Al-Bayaan*", Vol. 4/84

**statue; there is no difference between them at all from any point of view. They are both one thing and they are both *Mushriks* with Allaah.”** Do these words sound like those of a person who is making *Takfeer* due to his belief or due to his action?! So let the authors of [www.salafipublicatons.com](http://www.salafipublicatons.com) fear Allaah!

And we see that his earlier quotation (i.e. the one narrated by [www.salafipublications.com](http://www.salafipublications.com)) does not limit the *Kufr* to the *Kufr* of the heart as they have alleged, rather the *Shaykh* has mentioned that the one who legislates laws and believes that these laws are equal or better than the *Hukm* of Allaah is a *Kaafir*. And we agree that this one is a *Kaafir* but we have not – nor has the *Shaykh*, himself – limited this *Kufr* to this description only. And this is a common deception which [www.salafipublications.com](http://www.salafipublications.com) tries to perpetrate against their readers.

Next, [www.salafipublications.com](http://www.salafipublications.com) have again brought the words of *Shaykh* Ibn ‘Uthaymaan, may Allaah be merciful to him, in which he said:

“Whoever accused *Shaykh* Al-Albaanee of *Irjaa*’ has erred. Either he is one who does not know Al-Albaanee or he is one who does not know *Irjaa*’. Al-Albaanee is a man from *Ahl us-Sunnah* – may Allaah have mercy upon him – a defender of it, and an *Imaam* in *Hadeeth*. We do not know of anyone who has surpassed him in our time. However, some people – and we ask Allaah’s pardon – have jealousy in their hearts. For when (one of them) sees that a person has been met with acceptance (by the people), he begins to find fault with him on account of something, just like the hypocrites, those who used to defame those believers who would give freely in charity – and those (i.e. hypocrites) who would find nothing but the striving of (the believers). So they would defame the one who would give charity in abundance, and also the poor person who would give charity! We know the man from his books, may Allaah be merciful to him, and I know him from sitting with him on occasions. He is *Salafee* in ‘*Aqeedah*, of sound *Menhej*. However some people desire to perform *Takfeer* of the servants of Allaah on account of something that Allaah did not perform *Takfeer* of them. Then they claim that whoever opposes them in this *Takfeer* is a *Murji’ee* – a lie, slander, and mighty fabrication.”

However, this time they have wisely and consciously omitted the words of the *Shaykh* where he said, “**...and I do not know of any of his statements which indicate *Irjaa*’...**” which comes in another text from the *Shaykh*.<sup>130</sup> And they have done so with he intention of tricking their readers into thinking that *Shaykh* Ibn ‘Uthaymeen, may Allaah be merciful to him, had been presented with the words of *Shaykh* Al-Albaanee on *Eemaan* and *Kufr* and then declared that these words are not the words of *Irjaa*’. And so they leave out the quotation where the *Shaykh* says clearly that he has not seen his words of *Irjaa*’. But, O [www.salafipublicatons.com](http://www.salafipublicatons.com), you can not erase what you have, yourselves, established and that is that *Shaykh* Ibn ‘Uthaymeen did not hear the words of *Irjaa*’ from Al-Albaanee so your deception is manifestly exposed!

---

<sup>130</sup> Article ID: MSC060001

And we have already responded to this quotation in PART 1 of our series so just as [www.salafipublications.com](http://www.salafipublications.com) can copy and paste their own text over and over, we will address these words with the very same ones we used in PART 1:

“So again, it is clear that the words of *Shaykh* Ibn ‘Uthaymeen are directed towards the *Khawaarij*; those who make *Takfeer* for major sins and these words are also directed to those who have labelled *Shaykh* Al-Albaanee as a *Murji’ee* because out of jealousy and contempt and not due to the principles of *Ahl us-Sunnah* and this is very clear from the words: “However some people desire to perform *Takfeer* of the servants of Allaah on account of something that Allaah did not perform *Takfeer* of them. Then they claim that whoever opposes them in this *Takfeer* is a *Murji’ee*.” So those who “...desire to perform *Takfeer* of the servants of Allaah on account of something that Allaah did not perform *Takfeer* of them...” are the *Khawaarij* and those who “...claim that whoever opposes them in this *Takfeer* is a *Murji’ee*...” are the various deviated groups such as the *Khawaarij* and other than them who have attacked *Shaykh* Al-Albaanee unjustly and have taken the just and honest criticisms of *Shaykh* Al-Albaanee from the scholars of *Ahl us-Sunnah* and used these criticisms to attack and revile him and label him as a *Murji’ee* without investigation and not in the interest of preserving the ‘*Aqeedah* of *Ahl us-Sunnah*, but rather to blemish his reputation as a great scholar while appearing to act as the defenders of *Al-Islaam* and its creed. (And in this regard, we see the same type of behavior from [www.salafipublications.com](http://www.salafipublications.com) themselves. In fact they are both two partners in this deception on opposite sides of the same coin. And may Allaah protect us from that!) And it is clear from the two quotations which [www.salafipublications.com](http://www.salafipublications.com) have narrated from *Shaykh* Ibn Al-‘Uthaymeen are directed to those groups of extremism and *Ifraat* in matters of *Takfeer* and those who have labelled him as *Murji’ee* and we have not done either of these two things in this project. Rather, we have defined *Irjaa’* (in the beginning) linguistically and in the context of the *Sharee’ah* and we have also aided our explanations with the statements of the *Salaaf* and the ‘*Ulamaa* of *Ahl us-Sunnah* and we have brought the explanations and refutations against *Irjaa’* from the ‘*Ulamaa* and these statements from them are not ambiguous or unclear and free from twisting just as the quotations from *Shaykh* Al-Albaanee himself are not twisted or otherwise perverted from their context, *Inshaa’Allaah*.”<sup>131</sup>

Next, in the “Blazing Salafi Meteor” (Pg. 25-28) comes their narrations from Khaalid Al-Anbaree and ‘Alee Hasaan Al-Halabee, may Allaah guide them. And we have already addressed the futility of narrating statements of defense of *Shaykh* Al-Albaanee from those whose *Irjaa’* is even more clearly established, so we will not dwell too long in this section.

### **Summary of Khaalid Al-Anbaree’s defense of *Shaykh* Al-Albaanee:**

Khaalid Al-Anbaree has attempted, here, to do the same thing, which we have exposed earlier whereby these people narrate that *Shaykh* Al-Albaanee says, “*Eemaan* is statements and actions and beliefs,” and they do this so they can attempt to demonstrate that the *Shaykh* considered actions to be included in the definition of *Eemaan*. However,

---

<sup>131</sup> Look to Pg. 81 of PART 1 in this series.

he fails to point out that the *Shaykh* did not say this phrase with the same understanding as *Ahl us-Sunnah* and he failed to point out that the *Shaykh* said this phrase with the meaning that actions are evidence on *Eemaan*, which to him is *Tasdeeq*.<sup>132</sup> And he failed to mention that the *Shaykh* would still consider a man a Muslim even if he did not perform a single action and abandoned this 1/3<sup>rd</sup> of *Eemaan* completely.<sup>133</sup> And we have already demonstrated how this is not a defense of *Irjaa'* at all. And then he tries to demonstrate how the *Shaykh* makes *Takfeer* for actions but fails to mention that the *Shaykh* is not making *Takfeer* for the actions themselves, rather he makes *Takfeer* for what these actions indicate exists in the heart at the time of their perpetration.<sup>134</sup>

---

<sup>132</sup> And this is clear from Khaalid Al-Anbaree's own conversation with Shaykh Al-Albaanee, may Allaah be merciful to him, where even the student of *Irjaa'*, Khaalid Al-Anbaree, argued against the *Shaykh* when he made *Tasdeeq* equal to *Eemaan*! Look to the words yourself, dear reader (and the following quotations are from the cassette "*At-Tah'reer li'Usool At-Takfeer*" – produced by "*Tasjilaat Eelaaf Al-Islaameeyah lil'Intaaj wa-Tawzee'*" , dated *Al-Ramadhaan* 1416 H., which is equivalent to February 10, 1996):

**Shaykh Al-Albaanee:** Very good. Now we will raise one of these two words. And we will put in its place another word. And it is "*Al-Eemaan*". In my opinion, it can be replaced with "*At-Tasdeeq*", unlike "*Al-Ma'arifah*". So we do not differentiate between the one who is a *Musaadiq* concerning the Messenger and between the one who is a *Mu'min* who is a Messenger. Is there a difference from what you know?

**Khaalid Al-Anbaree:** Yes, there is a difference.

**Shaykh Al-Albaanee:** This is what I need to know.

**Khaalid Al-Anbaree:** My saying, "...*Musaadiq* concerning the Messenger..." means that he has a pillar from the pillars of *Eemaan*. And that is *Tasdeeq* concerning the Messenger. Because perhaps he has *Tasdeeq* in his heart but he does not confess it upon his tongue.

Shaykh Al-Albaanee: From where do we take this (idea) from?!

And this cassette tape is AN AMAZING BENEFIT for the student of knowledge to see the clear *Irjaa'* and it is even more clear for those who hear the deceitful Khaalid Al-Anbaree witnessing the *Irjaa'* of *Shaykh* Al-Albaanee plainly and then see him attempting to clear the *Shaykh* of the charge of *Irjaa'* !!

<sup>133</sup> Look to what he told Khaalid Al-Anbaree:

**Khaalid Al-Anbaree:** Our *Shaykh*, what is the place of actions in *Eemaan*? And are they a condition for its completeness or a condition its existence? I hope for clarity on this matter. May Allaah bless you.

Shaykh Al-Albaanee: What we have understood from the evidences of the Book and the *Sunnah* and from the sayings of the *Imaams* from the *Sahabah* and the *Tabi'een* and the *Imaams* who have witnessed them is that whatever exceeds the actions of the heart and passes it to what has to do with the actions of the body, then it is a condition of the completeness and not a condition for its existence (of *Eemaan*).

<sup>134</sup> And from the same cassette:

**Khaalid Al-Anbaree:** Ok. Leave this (explanation) then *Shaykh*. Perhaps he believes in his heart while he mocks the *Ayaat* of Allaah and His Messengers. So this making fun of the *Ayaat* of Allaah and His Messengers means that he does not have in his heart, respect and love for Allaah and His Messengers. Would we not make *Takfeer* to him?

**Shaykh Al-Albaanee:** Of course. Of course we would make *Takfeer* to him...

## Summary of 'Alee Hasaan Al-Halabee's defense of *Shaykh* Al-Albaanee:

What we see from the words of 'Alee Al-Halabee are in agreement with *Ahl us-Sunnah* in this quotation from [www.salafipublications.com](http://www.salafipublications.com), especially when he says:

“As for the brother’s question, afterwards, concerning these matters which cause a person to become an Unbeliever (those matters which negate Eemaan from every angle), ‘Is it a condition for the person's becoming an Unbeliever that he holds these things to be permissible (al-Istihlaal)?’” Then the reply is: **the presence of the pre-conditions (wujood ash-shuroot) and absence of the preventing factors with regard to those type of things that cause a person to become an Unbeliever is itself sufficient for istihlaal (the person's holding them to be permissible) not being taken into consideration as a condition for declaring the one who is guilty of them to be an Unbeliever, conclusively. This is because of their particular and distinguishing characteristics of being Kufr that negates Eemaan from every aspect...** Whereas, holding prohibited things to be permissible (al-Istihlaal), willful rejection (al- Juhood), outright denial (al-Inkaar), repudiation (at-Takdheeb) (and other types of Kufr) are a condition necessary for takfeer (declaration of the persons being an Unbeliever) of one who commits Kufr of speech or action, which is not counted as being a negation of Eemaan from every angle ...”

So we deduce from these words that he is saying that actions of *Kufr* nullify the *Eemaan* on their own without necessitating *Istih'laal* in the heart at the time of their perpetration.

And then 'Alee Al-Halabee goes on to say:

**“I say all of this yet again emphasizing the fact that this is what we have held as our belief for many years, and it is exactly what we took from our Shaikh, rahimahullaah, and from his brothers - the scholars.”**

And this would delight us and we would be content if this were the truth if it weren't for the fact that they this same individual (i.e. 'Alee Al-Halabee) and other than him from the

---

**Khaalid Al-Anbaree:** By him leaving this pillar?

**Shaykh Al-Albaanee:** We are not disagreeing with you on this point...may Allaah bless you. **There are actions, which show what is in the heart. There are actions which emerge from an individual which show what is in the heart from *Kufr* and *Tughi'aan* (i.e. exceeding the boundaries). From that is *Isti'zaah* (mocking the religion) but right now our research is that we understand from your words that there is a difference between *Al-Eemaan* and *Tasdeeq*. So it is like they say in other than this topic, that there is generality and specification.**

So here we see that *Shaykh* Al-Albaanee, may Allaah be merciful to him, makes *Takfeer* for the action of mocking the religion, yet he has confirmed that this *Takfeer* comes because, to him, this action "...shows what is in the heart from *Kufr*..." so he does not make *Takfeer* for this action itself, rather he makes *Takfeer* for what the action indicates. And he has telling this directly and clearly to Khaalid Al-Anbaree and now we see him attempting to deny this!!

students of *Shaykh Al-Albaanee* have also recently come out with the following treatise entitled: “*Mujmil Masaa’il Al-Eemaan Al-Ilmeeyah fi’Usool Al-‘Aqeedaat As-Salafeeyah*”, and they say, under the heading of *Kufr*:

“Whoever’s *Islaam* is established with *Yaqeen* (i.e. certainty), it would not be taken from him except with *Yaqeen*. Not every saying or action, which the texts have described as *Kufr* is a *Kufr* which would take one outside the *Milla*. (This), as the *Kufr* is two *Kufrs*; *Asgaar* and *Akbaar*. So the judging upon these statements or actions will only be upon the way of the ‘*Ulaama* of *Ahl us-Sunnah* and their rules. It is not allowed to put the judgement of *Takfeer* upon any Muslim except he who the Book and the *Sunnah* indicate his *Kufr* with clear evidence, which is obvious and apparent. So it does not suffice to rely upon doubts and assumptions. It might occur in the Book and the *Sunnah*, something which is understood to mean that such-and-such statement or action or belief is *Kufr*, however; no one is made *Takfeer* to specifically due to this, until the *Hujjah* (i.e. clarifying argument) is established upon him through the establishment of the conditions; knowledge, intention,<sup>135</sup> being unforced and the removal of the preventative factors (of *Takfeer*) and they are the opposite of these and what opposes them.<sup>136</sup> From the *Kufr Al-‘Amilee* and *Al-Qawlee*, that which takes one outside the *Milla* on their own and the *Istih’laal* of the heart is not a condition and it is that which negates the *Eemaan* from every aspect, such as swearing at Allaah, the Most High, and the prostration to an idol and the throwing the *Mus’haaf* into excrement and what is under its meaning.<sup>137</sup> And the placing of the judgement (of *Kufr*) upon individuals like other than them (i.e. these matters of *Kufr*) do not occur except with its conditions. **And we say like what *Ahl us-Sunnah* says; that the actions that are *Kufr*, is *Kufr*, which the one who commits it disbelieves because it indicates (*yadil*) the *Kufr* of the inside and we do not say – as**

---

<sup>135</sup> And here we must mention that it depends what is meant here by “...intention...” Because it is not a condition for the *Takfeer* of an individual that he intended to disbelieve by his statement or action or belief. Because most of the people who apostate from their religion in our time did not intend to become *Kuffar*, rather they only intended to perform the action or declare the action or hold the belief which caused them to disbelieve. So if what is meant here was the “...intention...” to perform the action, declare the statement or hold the belief, then we agree with this but if what is meant by “...intention...” is that the person intended to disbelieve, then this is a false, innovated, mischievous condition from the *Usool* of *Takfeer* and we have discussed this earlier so refer to it for a refresher if necessary. And *Shaykh Al-Islaam* Ibn Taymiyah said, “And generally, whoever says or does that which is *Kufr*, he disbelieves with that even if he did not intend to become a *Kaafir*.” – “*As-Saraam Al-Maslool*”, Pg. 177-178

<sup>136</sup> Meaning that the preventative factors for the specific *Takfeer* would be things like ignorance, accidents or compulsion etc. And this is all correct and fine.

<sup>137</sup> So look to how they have stated that these actions, which were mentioned such as swearing at Allaah, the Most High, and the prostration to an idol and the throwing the *Mus’haaf* into excrement are not considered, by them, to require the condition of *Istih’laal Al-Qalbee* (i.e. being considered permissible in the heart). So this implies with a great implication that the other actions, statements or beliefs which are also *Kufr Akbaar*, do require the condition of *Istih’laal Al-Qalbee* before a person can be made *Takfeer* to specifically and this is a great lie against the *Deen* of Allaah!

**the people of *Bid'ah* say – that the action of *Kufr* is not *Kufr* but it is indicative (*daleel*) of the *Kufr* and the difference is clear.**"<sup>138</sup>

*Al-Hamdu'lillah wa'Allaahu-Akbaar!* Look to this double-talk from the people of innovation in the matters of *Eemaan* and *Kufr*! And look to what they have said. From the beginning of their conclusion in their addressing of *Kufr* and *Takfeer* they as state, "...**that the actions that are *Kufr*, is *Kufr*, which the one who commits it disbelieves because it indicates (*yadil*) the *Kufr* of the inside...**" and then in the same breath they wish to refute themselves with what follows it; "...**as the people of *Bid'ah* say – that the action of *Kufr* is not *Kufr* but it is indicative (*daleel*) of the *Kufr*...**"

And we say that these two groups are the same because the group who says that the one who commits actions of *Kufr Al-Akbaar* is a *Kaafir* because it indicates the *Kufr* of the heart, does not actually make *Takfeer* for the action itself, rather only what that action indicates, which is a belief and not an action at all! So then what is the difference between this group and the group who does not say that the action itself is *Kufr*, rather it only indicates *Kufr*?! By Allaah, there is no difference and they are the same group!! And this is the same *Irjaa'* which they have learned from their teacher, *Shaykh* Naasir Ad-Deen Al-Albaanee<sup>139</sup> and they have aptly labeled this group "...**the people of *Bid'ah*...**" and this has come from their own pens without the aid of our writing. So they bear witness to their own *Irjaa'* with the very treatise which was intended to free them from it! And this is always the case for the people of desire and innovation and we ask Allaah to keep us free from such an embarrassment and humiliation.

So we agree quite readily with the authors of [www.salafipublications.com](http://www.salafipublications.com) that we should look to the students of the *Shaykh* to see what his teachings contained and we have done so and found that they are exactly in keeping with what we have alleged throughout this series. And that is how *Shaykh* Al-Albaanee, may Allaah be merciful to him, did not see the *Kufr* and apostasy and *Takfeer* for the perpetrator of actions, rather what these actions indicated from actions of the heart at the time of their being committed. And this teaching has been completely swallowed up by his students until we can see its traces in the very writings they have attempted to use to defend themselves from this charge!

---

<sup>138</sup> From the recently released "*Mujmil Masaa'il Al-Eemaan Al-Ilmeeyah fi'Usool Al-Aqeedaat As-Salafeeyah*" by the authors 'Alee Al-Halabee, Saleem Al-Hilaalee, Husain Al-Awaishah, Muhammad Musa Nasr and Mashoor Hasaan.

<sup>139</sup> And they have testified to this fact in the introduction of this treatise wherein they write: "So it was necessary for us to distribute this summarization so that the far and the near would know that which we are upon for three decades by the praise of Allaah and His Virtue from authentic *Sunneeyah* 'Aqeedah and a clear *Salafee Menhaj*, which we have learned from our honorable *Shaykhs*; Abee 'Abdur-Rahmaan Muhammad Naasir Ad-Deen Al-Albaanee, Abee Abdillaah 'Abdul-'Azeez bin Baaz, may Allaah be merciful to them and Abee Abdillaah Muhammad As-Saalih Al-'Uthaymeen, may Allaah preserve and protect him." [\* But as for their claim that they have learned this 'Aqeedah from *Shaykh* Ibn Baaz and *Shaykh* Ibn 'Uthaymeen, may Allaah be merciful to them, then this is not established and we do not see either the *Usool* nor the *Furoo'* of *Irjaa'* in their writings or cassettes so this required investigation and this is not the place for this discussion.]

So let us examine some of these teachings, keeping in mind that the *Baatil Ta'weel* of the likes of [www.salafipublications.com](http://www.salafipublications.com) have been rendered futile. The *Shaykh* said, "...And the summary of this discussion is that it is a must to know that *Kufr* – like *Fisq* and *Thulm* – is categorized into two types: ***Kufr* and *Fisq* and *Thulm*, which does remove one from the *Milla* and all of that returns to the *Istih'laal* of the heart** and another type, which does not remove one from the *Milla*, which returns to *Al-Itsih'laal Al-'Amilee*." <sup>140</sup>

So we see here that the *Shaykh Al-Albaanee*, may Allaah be merciful to him, has clearly stated that the type of *Kufr* (along with *Fisq* and *Thulm*), which takes one outside the *Milla* of *Islaam* – and by this he means actions because there is no disagreement about *Kufr* in beliefs – are those that are tied to his making them *Halaal* with his heart. So if this is the case, then this person already disbelieves due to his belief in the heart that these actions of *Kufr* are *Halaal*. And this means that the actions of *Kufr* are only *Kufr Akbaar* when the person holds them to be permissible and only when that is established, could we make *Takfeer* to him. So O, [www.salafipublications.com](http://www.salafipublications.com) where is your *Ta'weel* of this statement?! And please continue to scurry about in search of some kind of interpretation which would free this statement from its obvious *Irjaa*! You have succeeded in beguiling yourselves and many of your readers but you can not deceive *Ahl us-Sunnah* so fear Allaah!

And as far as what this statement implies on the application of *Takfeer*, we see that he has clearly stated elsewhere, "So you can not declare his *Kufr* until he expresses that which is in his heart that he does not see the (obligation) of ruling by what Allaah revealed. And at this time only can you say that he is a *Kaafir*, with the *Kufr* of *Ridah* (i.e. apostasy)." <sup>141</sup>

So when it comes to the application of *Takfeer* on the one who 'Rules by Other Than What Allaah Revealed' the *Shaykh* does not see the *Takfeer* of this one until that person clearly says upon his tongue that he believes in his heart that this action is permissible. And only then he is to be called a *Kaafir/Mortad*. And the reason for this is not simply because he considered this action to be *Kufr Asgaar*, <sup>142</sup> rather it is because he considered

---

<sup>140</sup> "At -Tah'theer min Fitnaat At-Takfeer", Pg. 68

<sup>141</sup> "Fitnaat At-Takfeer", Pg. 25 And this is not to be confused with "At -Tah'theer min Fitnaat At-Takfeer" as it is a separate publication.

<sup>142</sup> And by Allaah, if this were the case that the *Shaykh* merely did not make *Takfeer* for this action due to his belief that this action fell into the category of *Kufr Al-Asgaar*, then we would not trouble ourselves with the task of writing this project. Rather, it would have been sufficient to point out the proofs that this action is *Kufr Akbaar* and that would have ended the matter. But since the subject has become more robust and more in-depth than just a discussion of *Kufr Akbaar* vs. *Kufr Asgaar*, and because our opponents from [www.salafipublication.com](http://www.salafipublication.com) have insisted in their challenge for us to destroy their mischievous, dishonest and malicious *Ta'weel*, then it became obligatory upon us to address this issue with the attention it requires and the sternness that it deserves. And we have taken on this task because it is abundantly evident that the *Shaykh* did not make *Takfeer* for this action because it is an action – which to him, are all *Asgaar* unless accompanied with *Kufr* in the heart at the time they are committed. So let the authors of [www.salafipublication.com](http://www.salafipublication.com) sputter and stammer in their rage and fury. They can not frustrate the adherents of *Salafeeyah* even though they attempt to hide beneath its shade.

this to be an action and the actions are not *Kufr Akbaar* ever, according to him and this becomes even more clear in his statement:

“And the secret of this is that the *Kufr* is of two types; ‘*Atiqaadee* and ‘*Amilee*. So the ‘*Atiqaadee* – it resides in the heart and the ‘*Amilee* – it resides upon the body.”<sup>143</sup>

And to make it even clearer, we will narrate an answer to a question posed to him in the cassette “*Kufr Kufraan*”, in which he said:

“The matter of *Kufr*, in reality is a very dangerous matter and here I will mention the *Hadeeth* and complete my answer to that question.<sup>144</sup> The *Hadeeth*, which has been narrated by *Imaam* Al-Bukhaaree in his *Saheeh* from the Prophet that he said, ‘Allaah had given a man wealth and children. When his death approached, he said to his sons, ‘What kind of father have I been to you?’ They replied, ‘You have been a good father.’ – and here is the proof – ‘He said, ‘I have not performed any good deeds for Allaah, and if Allaah were able to punish me, He would punish him with a great torment.’ And this is the *Kufr*. This man doubted the power of Allaah *aza’wa-jaal* and His ability to punish this criminal who had never performed any good deeds in his entire life. And he added to this *Kufr* what he asked them to do after his death. He said, ‘So if I die, burn me in the fire and take my remains and scatter half of them in the sea and half of them in the wind.’ So why would he believe this...because he would be hidden from his Lord? The proof: ‘After he died they threw his ashes into the wind and the sea. So Allaah, *ta’ala* command to his atoms, ‘Become so-and-so,’ so they became so-and-so and (Allaah said,) ‘O, My slave! What made you do what you did?’ He replied, ‘I feared You.’ He said, ‘I have forgiven you.’”

“Here now, we come to His, *ta’alas* saying, ‘**Verily, Allaah does not forgive that partners be set up along-side Him but he forgives other than what whatsoever He wills.**’ This person committed *Shirk* and some of you might say, ‘No, he did not commit *Shirk*. He committed *Kufr*.’ But I say, concerning this matter, that the *Shirk* and the *Kufr* – in the terminology of the *Sharee’ah* – they are two interchangeable phrases. So everyone who has committed *Kufr*, he has committed *Shirk* and whoever has committed *Shirk*, he has committed *Kufr*. And the proof is that this man, when his negation of the power of Allaah emerged from him, and His being capable to bring him back together and resurrecting him and punishing him based on the fact that that man did not perform a single good deed in his life...when this emerged from him, he disbelieved. So then what is our response concerning His, *ta’alas* saying: ‘...**but he forgives other than what whatsoever He wills.**’? And he disbelieved but despite that, He forgave him. The answer: **This was not *Kufr* that was intended in his heart and it was not tied to (i.e. believed in) his heart.** But only due to his fear of his Lord *tabaraka wa-ta’ala*, because of what his hands sent forth from disobediences and sins he recommended this awful advice, which has not occurred in the history of the world ever (i.e. his advice to scatter

---

<sup>143</sup> “As-Silsilaat As-Saheehah”, Vol. 6/112

<sup>144</sup> He was asked about the ruling of the one who swears at Allaah or his Messenger, “There are some narrations which are about swearing at Allaah and his Messenger...”

his ashes to avoid Allaah's resurrection). **So Allaah forgave his *Kufr* because it was not tied to his heart.**"<sup>145</sup>

"Because this man... when he uttered these words and when he recommended this advice, it was *Kufr* and it was *Thalaal* (i.e. misguidance) but we say that not everyone who falls into *Kufr* has the *Kufr* fall upon him (i.e. not everyone who commits *Kufr* is a *Kaafir*.) This is a reality, which we must understand so that we will not be from the *Khawaarij* who go to extremes concerning the *Takfeer* of the Muslims due to their committing some of the sins and disobedience. **And our discussion is not concerning a sin and disobedience, rather it is concerning *Kufr* but we differentiate between the *Kufr*, which was not intended in the heart, rather it is merely an action.** This was what I wanted to remind you of."<sup>146</sup>

And here we clearly see the fruits for why he, may Allaah be merciful to him, held that actions do not nullify *Eemaan* without being accompanied with *Kufr* in the heart at the time they are committed. And this was because he felt that this concept was the *Menhaj* of the *Khawaarij*. However, the *Khawaarij* made *Takfeer* for all sins; whether *Akbaar* or

---

<sup>145</sup> So here, we clearly see that *Shaykh* Al-Albaanee, may Allaah be merciful to him, did not see this man as being a *Kaafir* specifically because his action – according to him – was not believed in his heart at the time it was committed. So this obvious action of *Kufr Al-Akbaar* was not held upon this man – according to the *Shaykh* – because it was unaccompanied with *Kufr 'Atiqaadee*. And this is a clear refutation of the *Ta'weel* of [www.salafipublications.com](http://www.salafipublications.com) who have attempted to fool their readers into understanding that *Shaykh* Al-Albaanee only uses the term "*Kufr 'Atiqaadee*" as referring to any *Kufr* from an action or a belief or a statement, which takes one outside the *Milla* of *Islaam*. And this is clear from his words here: "This was not *Kufr* that was intended in his heart and it was not tied to (i.e. believed in) his heart." And the *Shaykh*, may Allaah be merciful to him, is saying that this man was forgiven by Allaah because his *Kufr* was only the *Kufr* of action and not the *Kufr* of the heart which he makes abundantly clear with his saying: "So Allaah forgave his *Kufr* because it was not tied to his heart."

And this is not correct and there is no proof from within this text that this man did not believe what he said, "...if Allaah were able to punish me..." Rather this man, in fact, did believe what he stated and he acted upon it so he did combine his belief of the heart with his action of the body. But Allaah forgave this man due to his ignorance of Allaah *ta'ala*s power. And as we have stated before, ignorance (i.e. *Jahl*) is a preventative factor from the specific *Takfeer*.

*Shaykh Al-Islaam* Ibn Taymiyah said, "So the most that is contained herein is that this man was not knowledgeable concerning all of what Allaah is deserving of in His Characteristics and specifically that He is "*Al-Qadr*" and many of the believers can have ignorance in something concerning this so that he would not become a *Kaafir*." (*Al-Fataawa* ", Vol. 11/490 & 411)

And Ibn Hazm said, "So this was a person who was ignorant until he died, that Allaah *aza'wa-jaal* is capable of resurrecting his remains and bringing him back to life and He forgave him because of his fear and ignorance." (*Al-Fasil fee Al-Milaal* " Vol. 3/252)

And Ibn Al-Qayyim said, "But rejecting that due to ignorance or misinterpretations that the one who does it does not disbelieve with that like the *Hadeeth* of the one who denied the power of Allaah over him and ordered his family to burn his body and throw his remains in the wind. But despite this, Allaah forgave him and showed mercy upon him due to his ignorance." (*Madaarij As-Salikeen*", Vol. 1/339)

<sup>146</sup> Cassette "*Kufr Kufraan*", Side A

*Asgaar*. And the *Murji'yah* do not make *Takfeer* for any sins whether *Akbaar* or *Asgaar*, rather they only make *Takfeer* for what these sins indicate was in the heart at the time they were committed as Ibn Hazm has correctly pointed out earlier.<sup>147</sup> And in view of this misconception, it becomes even clearer why he has added the phrase, "...**whatever sin it is...**" to the words of Ibn 'Abee Al-'Izz's quotation.<sup>148</sup> Whereas, Ibn 'Abee Al-'Izz actually said, "...**And because of this, many *Imaams* refused to generally say that we do not make *Takfeer* to anyone due to a sin, rather it is to be said that we do not make *Takfeer* to them by every sin as the *Khawaarij* do.**"<sup>149</sup> But as for *Ahl us-Sunnah*, we take the middle approach between these two extremes and we make *Takfeer* for the sins, which are *Kufr Al-Akbaar*, and not for those which are *Kufr Asgaar*. And when the *Takfeer* comes from us, it comes from the action itself and not what that action indicates was present in the heart at the time it was committed.

As *Shaykh Al-Islam* Ibn Taymiyah said, "And generally, whoever says or does that which is *Kufr*, he disbelieves with that (i.e. statement or action itself) even if he did not intend to become a *Kaafir*."<sup>150</sup>

---

<sup>147</sup> "But as far as the one who swears at Allaah, *ta'ala*, **there is not on the face of the Earth a Muslim who disagrees that it is *Kufr* on its own except the *Jah'meeyah* and the *Asha'eeryah* – and they are two groups who are not even considered** – who clearly state that swearing at Allaah, *ta'ala* and uttering *Kufr* is not *Kufr*. **And some of them say it is evidence that he believes *Kufr***, not that he is certainly a *Kaafir* due to his swearing at Allaah, *ta'ala*." – "*Al-Fasil fee Al-Milal wal-Ah'wahee wa-Na'hil*", Vol. 13/498

And this narration from *Imaam* Ibn Hazm, may Allaah be merciful to him, is even more fitting here because it refers to the precise question that *Shaykh Al-Albaanee* was asked. And that is concerning the ruling of the one who swears at Allaah or His Messenger

<sup>148</sup> As he mistakenly quoted him as saying, "...Narrated from *Ahl us-Sunnah* – those who say that *Eemaan* is sayings and actions and that it increases and decreases – that the sin, **whatever sin it is**, it is *Kufr 'Amilee* and not '*Atiqaadee* and that the *Kufr* according to them is at levels; *Kufr dun Kufr* just as *Eemaan* is according to them." – "*Al-'Aqeedah At-Tahawiyah Sharh' wa-Taaleeq Al-Albaanee*", Pg. 40 – 41, Published by *Al-Maktaab Al-Islamee*, 1397 H

<sup>149</sup> "*Sharh' 'Aqeedah At-Tahawiyah*", by Ibn Abee Al-'Izz Pg. 262 – 263, Published by *Al-Maktaab Al-Islamee*, 1403 H.

<sup>150</sup> "As-Saraam Al-Maslool", Pg. 177-178

And refer to what Ash-Shawkaanee said in his book "*Addur An-Nadheed*", Pg. 49, published by *Daar Al-Quds* in Sanaa', Yemen in his refutation of what As-Sanaanee and Sadeeq Hasaan Khaan wrote in his book "*Ad-Deen Al-Khaalas*", Vol. 4/87-92 published by *Maktabaat Daar At-Turaath* in Cairo, Egypt.

And also, to what *Shaykh* Muhammad Basheer As-Sah'sawaanee Al-Hindee refuted against Ahmad Zaynee Dah'laan, the *Muftee* of *Makkah* in his differentiation between *Kufr* of actions and *Kufr* of beliefs and his claim that the *Kufr* of actions are always *Kufr Asgaar*, which can be found in "*Siyanaat Al-Insaan An-Waswasaat Shaykh Dah'laan*" Pg. 367-368, published by *Maktabaat Ibn Taymiyah* in Cairo, Egypt, 1410 H. And this appears to be the exact same mistake that *Shaykh Al-Albaanee* has fallen into, notwithstanding the *Baatil Ta'weel* of the likes of [www.salafipublications.com](http://www.salafipublications.com).

And when we consider all of this, we can see that *Shaykh* Al-Albaanee's words from the cassette "*Kufr Al-Kufraan*", wherein he later states, "And I will summarize what has passed. The *Kufr 'Amilee*, which could be *Kufr 'Atiqaadee* – such as what you have stated in your answer – **this must be necessarily tied in with *Kufr 'Atiqaadee***.<sup>151</sup> But as far as the *Kufr 'Amilee*, which has the same ruling as that of *Kufr 'Atiqaadee*, **in the sense that he is a *Mortad* from the *Milla* – while being a believer in his heart**<sup>152</sup> – **then this does not exist at all in *Islaam***."

Then it all comes around full circle to what we have stated in PART 1 of our series and that is that the *Shaykh*, may Allaah be merciful to him, did not see any actions themselves to have equal nullifications upon one's *Eemaan* as the beliefs in the heart and he could never conceive of actions of *Kufr*, which would necessitate *Takfeer* unless these actions were committed while at the same time, *Kufr* of the heart was already present. And it is clear that he is referring to the source of *Kufr* at the time it is committed and not the result of *Kufr* upon one's heart after it is committed, so the likes of [www.salafipublications.com](http://www.salafipublications.com) can't possibly use their *Ta'weel* where they attempt to make *Qiyas* between the statements of Ibn Al-Qayyim and *Al-Haafidh* Al-Hakamee, may Allaah be merciful to them.

### **A Word About *Shaykh* Al-Albaanee and his Application of "*Kufr 'Amilee*" and "*Kufr 'Atiqaadee*" in 'Ruling by Other Than What Allaah Revealed.'**

When we are trying to clarify the usage of then *Shaykh's* usage of these terms – as we have established earlier – we must examine it both generally and specifically. That is, we must look to how he uses the terms in a basic sense and with respect to specific matters and this will lead to a clearer definition as used by the individual.

So let us see how he has used these terms in another cassette recording, wherein he addresses the subject of 'Ruling by Other Than What Allaah Revealed'.<sup>153</sup> We find in a question and answer session in the cassette entitled, "*Min Menhaaj Al-Khawaarij*", recorded on the 29<sup>th</sup> of *Jumaadee Al-Akhiraah*, 1416 H., which corresponds to the 23<sup>rd</sup> of October, 1995 #1 of 830 from the series called "*Duruus Al-Hudaa' wa-Nuur*."

**Questioner:** They make *Ta'weel* of the saying of Ibn Abbaas, may Allaah be merciful to him, of His *ta'ala's* saying: '**And whosoever does not judge by what Allâh has**

---

<sup>151</sup> So again, we see her that *Shaykh* Al-Albaanee will only consider a person to be a *Kaafir* due to his committing an action at the time that *Kufr 'Atiqaadee* is present in his heart. And this is clear from his words above and again, this refers to the source of *Kufr* and not the result of *Kufr* so the *Ta'weel* of [www.salafipublications.com](http://www.salafipublications.com) is demolished yet again.

<sup>152</sup> And this phrase "...while he is a believer in his heart..." means "...while he has *Tasdeeq* in his heart..." as we have quoted him earlier saying to Khaalid Al-Anbaree that *Tasdeeq* is equivalent to *Eemaan*. So do not become confused with this, O reader.

<sup>153</sup> And of course, we have already seen this usage employed in "*Kufr Kufraan*", but let us diversify to ensure the context is the same in another discussion.

revealed, such are the *Kâfirûn*.' saying that Ibn Abbaas did not intend with his saying those who make legislations of their laws and the legislation of Allaah, *ta'ala* equal and brought legislations, which attempt to be equal to the legislations of Allaah, rather he intended with his saying, those who change the way of he ruling from *Shu'araa* (i.e. collective consultation) and *Khilaafah* into a kingship...<sup>154</sup>

**Shaykh Al-Albaanee:** This *Ta'weel* will not benefit you anything at all. This is because, it is like any of their *Ta'weel* because we are going to say to them, 'What is your evidence for this *Ta'weel*?' They will not be able to answer this.<sup>155</sup> This is firstly. Secondly, the *Ayaah* that Abdullah Ibn Abbaas said these words is known, '**And whosoever does not judge by what Allâh has revealed, such are the *Kâfirûn*.**' With what did the '*Ulaama* make *Tafseer* of this *Ayaah* with? The argument will return back to its origin. **The '*Ulaama* of *Tafseer* have all agreed that he *Kufr* is of two types: *Kufr 'Atiqaadee* and *Kufr 'Amilee* and they say that this *Ayaah* specifically: 'And whosoever does not judge by what Allâh has revealed... then he is in one of two conditions: Either he does not act upon this *Hukm* due to disbelief in it, then this person is from the people of the Fire. He will remain therein eternally or he follows it due to desire, not out of belief and he only acts upon it as an action of those *Kuffar* who do not believe in *Islaam*.' So there are no words for this person, concerning the *Kufr 'Atiqaadee*.** And like those Muslims who, among them is he who takes *Riba* and the one who commits *Zina* and the one who steals and, and... Those people, we do not label them with *Kufr* in the meaning of *Ridah*, if they believe in the forbiddance of those matters, at this point, the '*Ulaama* of *Tafseer* at this *Ayaah* clearly have said what contradicts their *Ta'weel*. They said that the *Hukm*, which Allaah sent down, **'If the person does not act upon it because of belief, then he is a *Kaafir*** but if he does not act upon it, while believing in it, **but only leans away from it occasionally, then this is *Kufr 'Amilee*.**' So we see that they (i.e. those people who make this *Ta'weel* of the statements of Ibn Abbaas) not only contradict the *Salaaf* but also their followers from the *Mufasireen* and they *Fuqahaa*' and the *Muhaditheen*. So in other words, they have contradicted the "*Firqaat An-Najjeeyah*" (i.e. The Saved Sect)." – End of Excerpt

So here we find a clear definition with an unmistakable context in which the *Shaykh* has used and encompassed the terms "*Kufr 'Amilee*" and "*Kufr 'Atiqaadee*" and linked them to a specific topic; in this case, 'Ruling by Other Than What Allaah Revealed'.

---

<sup>154</sup> And the questioner here is most definitely referring to what we have established in PART 1 of this series, wherein we proved with evidences from the *Qur'aan*, the rules of *Tafseer*, the rules of language, the understanding of the *Salaaf* with authentic narrations, and the understanding and explanations of the leaders of *Ahl us-Sunnah* in *Tafseer* and historical facts, that the particular narrations of Ibn Abbaas and Abee Majlis and Tawoos and other than them, which refer to the minor form of *Kufr* in 'Ruling by Other Than What Allaah Revealed', refers only to the application of this *Ayaah* upon the rulers of *Banee Umaayah* from the *Khawarij* when the rulers left the *Hukm* of Allaah in specific instances rather than legislating fabricated laws. So refer to that for a refresher if necessary.

<sup>155</sup> Yet we have aptly answered it in some 17 pages of *Salafee*-based principles and evidences. Look to pages 45 – 62 of PART 1 in our series.

So let us go back to the *Baatil Ta'weel* of [www.salafipublications.com](http://www.salafipublications.com), where they have attempted to beguile their readers into accepting *Shaykh Al-Albaanee's* usage of "*Kufr 'Atiqaadee'*". They have stated that when the *Shaykh* uses "*Kufr 'Atiqaadee'*" he means by that all actions, statements and beliefs, which nullify *Islaam*. And this is because, once a person's *Islaam* has been nullified, he no longer has *Eemaan* in his beliefs – therefore his *Kufr* can be called *Kufr 'Atiqaadee* or *Kufr* of the beliefs. And this is because, once the *Eemaan* has been removed from the heart, *Kufr* takes its place. So the term *Kufr 'Atiqaadee* is used this way by *Ahl us-Sunnah* because it refers to the status of the heart and the beliefs after *Kufr Al-Akbaar* has been committed by way of a statement, an action or a belief.<sup>156</sup>

But we see in the above words of *Shaykh Naasir*, may Allaah be merciful to him, in which he states, "**Either he does not act upon this *Hukm* due to disbelief in it...**" and follows these words immediately with "**...then this person is from the people of the Fire. He will remain therein eternally...**" And this means that the person who does not "...act upon this *Hukm*..."<sup>157</sup> while at the same time, he "...disbelieves in it..." has committed, what *Shaykh Al-Albaanee* has called "*Kufr 'Atiqaadee'*". So the *Shaykh* could not possibly be using this terminology as the '*Ulaama* from *Ahl us-Sunnah* have used it because when they use it, they mean by that, the result of *Kufr* and not the source. However, *Shaykh Al-Albaanee*, may Allaah be merciful to him, is not referring to the result of *Kufr*, rather he is referring to what accompanies the action at the time it is committed – in this case, "**...disbelief in it...**" So this would be the source according to him.

And what makes this definition even more limited to what we have stated, is the next occurrence of the term *Kufr 'Atiqaadee* in which he states, "...he follows it due to desire, not out of belief **and he only acts upon it as an action of those *Kuffar* who do not believe in *Islaam*.**' So there are no words for this person, concerning the *Kufr 'Atiqaadee*."

So what is apparent from this text, is that if this person does not accompany his action with a belief at the time it is committed, then this could not ever be *Kufr 'Atiqaadee* because it is merely an action. So the *Shaykh* has negated the possibility of describing this action as *Kufr 'Atiqaadee* when it is an action unaccompanied with a belief. And according to the definition of the *Shaykh's* usage, as established by the authors of [www.salafipublications.com](http://www.salafipublications.com), this directly implies that a person will not have his *Islaam* nullified by this action, ever unless it is accompanied with a belief at the time it is committed. And this usage of the terminology was not only with respect to this particular action, rather it is held upon this meaning whenever the *Shaykh* uses the term *Kufr 'Atiqaadee* and this is a huge refutation against the deceivers of [www.salafipublications.com](http://www.salafipublications.com).

---

<sup>156</sup> And this was the usage employed by *Imaam Ibn Al-Qayyim* and *Al-Haafidh Al-Haakamee*, may Allaah be merciful to them, as we have demonstrated in an earlier discussion. And these were the very statements, which the likes of [www.salafipublications.com](http://www.salafipublications.com) have attempted to my *Qiyaas* with *Shaykh Al-Albaanee's* words, hoping, vainly that the obvious differences would not be detected.

<sup>157</sup> And we see by the context that this means, "...rule with it..."

And finally, the third and last occurrence of the *Shaykh*'s usage of the terms *Kufr 'Amilee* and *Kufr 'Atiqaadee* come in the following text, in which he said, "**If the person does not act upon it because of belief, then he is a Kaafir** but if he does not act upon it, while believing in it, **but only leans away from it occasionally, then this is Kufr 'Amilee.**" So this is a confirmation of what we have established in the first quotation of this narration from the *Shaykh* and it affirms what we alleged to the letter. And this is that the *Shaykh* excludes the category of *Kufr 'Amilee* from anything which is an action. And the reason is not as the authors of [www.salafipublications.com](http://www.salafipublications.com) have claimed – that he considers all actions of *Kufr Al-Asgaar* to be synonymous with *Kufr 'Amilee* – rather, it is because he considers all actions, which are unaccompanied with a belief of *Kufr Al-Akbaar*, to be the type of *Kufr*, which does not remove one from the *Milla* of *Islaam* on their own. And the furthest he would go in this matter is to say that certain actions indicate that *Kufr* existed in the heart at the time they were committed. And if this is not a concept from the *Murji'yah*, then where did it come from!?

### **Conclusion of the Analysis of the *Ta'weel* of [www.salafipublications.com](http://www.salafipublications.com)**

We now come to the end of our in-depth analysis of the futile attempt of the authors of [www.salafipublications.com](http://www.salafipublications.com) and we can establish the following without doubt in our conclusion:

1. Although the terms "*Kufr 'Atiqaadee*" and "*Kufr 'Amilee*" are, at times, used to be synonymous with *Kufr Al-Akbaar* and *Kufr Al-Asgaar* by *Ahl us-Sunnah wa'l-Jamaa'ah*, there is a limited usage for these terms and what they imply about the result of *Kufr*.
2. A point-by-point comparison of the application of *Shaykh* Al-Albaanee's usage of these terms with those from *Ahl us-Sunnah wa'l-Jamaa'ah* who make *Takfeer* for the perpetrator of actions, themselves, reveals that he could not have been using these terms in the same way that they did.<sup>158</sup>
3. The only conceivable understanding from the usage of the terms "*Kufr Al-'Atiqaadee*" and "*Kufr Al-'Amilee*" is that he means by them that a person only disbelieves from his beliefs and not from his actions.<sup>159</sup>

---

<sup>158</sup> And this was more that clear when we discussed the usage from the likes of Ibn Al-Qayyim and Al-Haafidh Al-Haakamee, may Allaah be merciful to them.

<sup>159</sup> And the evidence from his own words are so plentiful from within this project such that it is hardly possible to turn to a single page of this document and not stumble on one quote or another which would prove this beyond any reasonable doubt. And from them are the following statements:

*Shaykh* Al-Albaanee: "You...may Allaah bless you...have you paid attention previously and just now during this sitting, that the *Kufr* is an action of the heart and not an action of the body? Did you pay attention to this or not?!" and: "...that the sin, whatever sin it is, it is *Kufr 'Amilee* and not '*Atiqaadee*..."

## Final Words of Advice to the Authors of [www.salafipublications.com](http://www.salafipublications.com)

O people of desire and deception:

You have brought your best foot forward and have fallen on your faces. Your hounding and barking has been silenced and we see that what remains, after your so-called “Blazing *Salafee* Meteor” has fizzled, is hollow, empty rhetoric which exists only to reassure yourselves. Is this all you were able to come up with in your explanation of the “Creed of Imaam al-Albaani on *Kufr*”? Is this fruitless *Ta'weel* of the words of *Shaykh* Al-Albaanee all you were able to derive to come to his defense? What an embarrassment for you. Still, it is not too late for you to repent and give up your fruitless *Taqleed*. Why don't you put down your Thesaurus and instead, turn to the books of *'Ilm* instead of sipping at the *Irjaa'ee* springs of your mentors such as 'Alee Al-Halabee and his ilk? And although I have certainly not written this project in the same spirit as its predecessor<sup>160</sup> and the one which I addressed to you privately<sup>161</sup> along with the email correspondence before it, which were admonitions and words of counsel and advice, I have not totally given up hope for you to return to the *Salafeeyah* which you claim to call to.

The issue of the *Irjaa'* of *Shaykh* Al-Albaanee – in reality – is not a hugely important matter to us. Rather we are concerned with the *Usool* of *Eemaan*, *Kufr* and *Takfeer* and only when you people declared your *Walaah wa'l-Baraa'* based upon what others say about the *Shaykh*, and you attack them senselessly, and your only allegiance is to personalities and not the evidence of the *Qur'aan* and the *Sunnah*,<sup>162</sup> and other than that from your wicked methodology, which disguises itself as *Salafeeyah*, then it became obligatory upon us to refute and expose your mischievous nature with project after project and treatise after treatise until your threat and danger upon the English speaking *Salafee* youth is eliminated. And as long as you continue tying the matters of 'Ruling by Other Than What Allaah Revealed' and the *Usool* of *Takfeer* to the issue of *Shaykh* Al-Albaanee, then we will continue to demonstrate and refute his errors with pure, clear evidence from the texts of *Ahl us-Sunnah wa'l-Jamaa'ah*, and in doing so, we will expose your writings as the fraudulent pseudo-*Salafee* nonsense that they are.

Your attacks upon the '*Ulaama* such as Abu Baseer Mustafah Haleemah, Muhammad Qutb and *Shaykh* Safar Al-Hawalee etc., has no effect upon our writings and we have distinguished ourselves from you by adhering to the evidence and the principles – something that is foreign to your approach – and we have not busied ourselves in the defense and fortification of the personalities whom you hate. Rather we have gone to the heart of the issues at hand and addressed them firstly and foremost and these are what concern the true adherents of *Salafeeyah* and *Sunneeyah*. *Wa'al-Hamdu'lillah*. As for your lying upon them and reviling them and slandering them, then this is between you

---

<sup>160</sup> PART 1 in this series

<sup>161</sup> Entitled “Exposition and Refutation of *Irjaa'*”

<sup>162</sup> And what clearer definition and description of a “*Hizbee*” can there be?!

and your Lord and they, no doubt, will take their rights from you on the Day of Judgement. So delight in the time you have in this *Dunyah* because a day is coming in which no one will escape their debts as the Messenger of Allaah said, “The *Thulm* is three: A *Thulm* that Allaah will not forgive, a *Thulm* that He will forgive and a *Thulm* that will not be ignored. The *Thulm*, which Allaah does not forgive, is *Shirk*. Allaah said: **“Verily! Joining others in worship with Allâh is a great *Thûlm* (wrong) indeed,”** however, the *Thulm* which is forgiven is the *Thulm* that is between themselves and their Lord. And the *Thulm*, that Allaah will never ignore is the *Thulm* of the slaves towards one another until it is settled between them.”<sup>163</sup> And also from Abee Hurayrah, may Allaah be pleased with him, that the Prophet said, “Whoever has wronged his brother of honor or anything else, he must correct it today before there will be no *Dinar* or *Dirham* (i.e. no money will help them on the Day of Judgment). If he has good deeds, they are taken from him according to the amount of his wrongdoing and if he has no good deeds, he takes from the sins of the one whom he was done wrong to and they are carried upon him.”<sup>164</sup>

However, your repentance and turning to the Straight Path seems unlikely and this is distressing indeed, because you have been raised and taught that this approach, which you call the “Methodology of the *Salaaf*”<sup>165</sup> is what defines you as *Salafees* and members of *Ahl us-Sunnah wa'l-Jamaa'ah*. And as long as you maintain this doomed, false association, the possibility of your guidance seems truly remote. Perhaps the only way for you to see the clear error that you are upon is to reflect and take notice of how simple it was for us to defeat you, while at the same time, taking evidence against you from your own web site. Because, after the wounds and humiliation and embarrassment of this fact fades, there is a valuable lesson to be taken from this experience. So allow your desires and your pride to be subdued momentarily and focus on what has been presented and there may be a narrow opportunity for you to seize some redemption. And we ask Allaah to guide you and ourselves and the entire Muslim *Ummah*.

And I close by saying that this small project has come from me after research and interrupted writing sessions. So I have attempted to reference my source material as thoroughly as possible and I urge the reader to verify our translations and contexts by going to the original texts to validate our narrations and quotations etc.

And I say: Whatever truth has been conveyed in this project has come from Allaah, *ta'ala* Alone and unassociated. And whatever mistakes and shortcomings are herein, they are from myself and the *Shaytaan*, my enemy.

Abu Huthayfah Yousef Al-Canadee  
*Rabee' Awwal*, 26, 1422 H

---

<sup>163</sup> “Saheeh Jami’ As-Sagheer”, #3,961

<sup>164</sup> Narrated by Al-Bukhaaree

<sup>165</sup> And what an insult to the *Salaaf* and their noble Methodology