

AN EXPLANATION OF THE DECEPTION OF THE QUTUBIYYAH
THE CREED OF IMAAM AL-ALBAANEE ON
TAKFIR AND APOSTACY

www.salafipublications.com

PART 1

Version 1.14 (3rd October 2000)

Abu Uthmaan as-Saaboonnee (d. 449H) - may Allaah have mercy upon him - said:

“And the characteristics [resulting] from [the effects of] innovations upon their people are obvious, and manifestly clear. The most apparent of their signs and characteristics is the severity of their enmity and hatred towards the Carriers of the narrations of the Prophet (*sallallaahu alaihi wasallam*), their disdain of them, their scorn of them [considering them to be valueless] and naming them with *Hashawiyyah* (Worthless People), *Jahalah* (the Ignorant), *Dhaahiriyyah* (Literalists), and the *Mushabbihah* (those who liken Allaah to the creation). [And this], due to their belief [concerning] the narrations of the Prophet (*sallallaahu alaihi wasallam*) - that they are devoid of any knowledge and that the [real] knowledge is that which *Shaytaan* throws at them from the results of their corrupt intellects, the dark whisperings of their chests [i.e. souls], the false notions of their hearts [which are] empty of any goodness, their words and proofs which are devoid [of truth] and their unjustified and futile doubts.

Aqeedatus-Salaf wa Ashaabil-Hadeeth (p.101-107)

THE ESSENCE OF THE MATTER

Shaikh Ali Hasan Bin Ali Bin Abdul-Hameed said, **“And just as Imaan, in the view of Ahl us-Sunnah consists of speech, action and belief, then likewise, kufr consists of speech, action and belief. However, the principle of Ahl us-Sunnah, and this is very important, is that not everyone who falls into an act of kufr has the appellation of kufr (i.e. kaafir) applied to him. Since, it is necessarily required for the takfir of a specific individual that the conditions are present and the preventative barriers are absent.**

As for the first condition, then it is knowledge (‘ilm) and its preventative barrier is ignorance (jahl). As for the second condition, then it is choice (ikhtiyaar) and its preventative barrier is compulsion (ikraah). As for the third condition, then it is intending the act (qasd ul-fi’l), and its preventative barrier is unmindfulness (dhuhood), or error (khata’) or ijtihaad [or ta’weel].

And it is necessary to pause here and to look at this issue of intent (qasd) because some people have fabricated a lie against us and against our Mashayikh that when we mention intent (qasd) that we mean by this “desiring kufr” (qasd ul-kufr). Meaning, that we hold that a person cannot be considered a disbeliever except when he desires kufr (of the heart) (i.e. to leave Islaam). And this is an error.

Even a Kaafir does not desire kufr. If we asked a Jew or a Christian, “You say Allaah is one of three, is this Imaan or Kufr?” He will reply, “This is Imaan”. [If we said], “You are a Christian, why? Because you desire kufr or because you desire Imaan?” He will reply, “Because I desire Imaan”. Until even the people of the first Jaahiliyyah (prior to Islaam), those who used to worship idols and mere names (even they did not desire kufr)... **And if you (O Muhammad) ask them: "Who has created the heavens and the earth," they will certainly say: "Allâh."** (Luqman 31:25) **And those who take Auliya' (protectors and helpers) besides Him (say): "We worship them only that they may bring us near to Allâh."** (Az-Zumar 39:3)

For this reason Shaikh ul-Islaam said, “No one in the creation of Allaah desires (yaqsud) kufr.” Therefore, what is not meant is the “desire for kufr” but what is actually meant is the “desire for the act which necessitates kufr”. This is a point that should be understood well. This is a principle.” The Fitnah of Takfir (Cassette Lecture, Birmingham UK, 29th July 2000)

BENEFIT

In the cassette 'At-Tahreer Li Masaa'il it-Takfir', a discussion between Shaikh Khaalid al-Anbari and Imaam al-Albani, there occurs, concerning the matter of Takfir:

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.

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)**".

BENEFIT

Stated Shaikh Ibn Uthaimen (hafidhahullaah):

"Whoever accused Shaikh 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, 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 have mercy upon him – and I know him from sitting with him on occasions. He is Salafi in aqeedah, of sound manhaj. **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' – a lie, slander, and mighty fabrication.

Therefore, do not listen to this saying regardless of whomever it comes from!

Source: Cassette: Makaalamaat Ma'a Mashaayikh ad-Da'wah as-Salafiyyah (Part 4)

Dated 12/6/2000CE.

BENEFITS

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).

He (rahimahullaah) also said: **“I am one of those most severe in forbidding that a person in particular should be declared to be a Kaafir, Faasiq or Sinner until it is known that the Prophetic proof has been established upon him - the like of which one who denies it is a Kaafir sometimes, a Faasiq at other times and sinful at others. And I affirm that Allaah has forgiven the mistakes of this Ummah - and this covers both matters of belief and sayings and actions.”** Majmoo' Al-Fataawaa (3/229)

Shaikh ul-Islam Nasir ud-Deen al-Albani (rahimahullaah): **“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...”** Refer to Fitnah of Takfir (p.72, 1st edition)

Shaikh ul-Islam Ibn al-Qayyim (rahimahullaah): **“And likewise, the branches of kufr (amongst them are) those which are statements and those which are actions. And just like a person can fall into disbelief (that expels from the religion) by wilfully saying a word constituting disbelief, and which is a branch of disbelief, then likewise, he can fall into disbelief (that expels from the religion) by doing an act of kufr, from amongst its branches that are actions, such as prostrating to an idol, belittling the mus-haf. So this is a principle.”** Kitaab us-Salaat (pp.53-54)

Imaan 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)

INTRODUCTION

All praise is due to Allaah, we praise Him, seek His aid and His forgiveness. We seek refuge in Allaah from the evils of our souls and the evils of our actions. Whomsoever Allaah guides there is none to misguide and whomsoever Allaah misguides there is none to guide. And I testify that there is none worthy of worship except Allaah alone, without any partners. And I testify that Muhammad is His servant and messenger.

All praise is due to Allaah who made it sufficient honour and nobility for His servants that they defend the honour of the Prophets of Allaah and the integrity of the Caliphs of Islaam and the Islaam of the Companions of Allaah's Messenger. And it is sufficient honour for them that they defend the honour and integrity of the Inheritors of the Prophets – especially the Muhadditheen amongst them, those who are closest to the Messenger (sallallaahu alaihi wasallam) in all of their affairs.

And all praise is due to Allaah who made it sufficient humiliation, disgrace and ignominy for Ahl ul-Bid'ah that they defend and aggrandize the mockers of the Messengers of Allaah, the slanderers of the Caliph Uthmaan (radiallaahu anhu), and those who declare the Companions of Allaah's Messenger to be disbelievers and accuse them of hypocrisy, treachery, deception and the likes.

To proceed:

In our exposition of that ignorant and unjust Qutubi of the West, who in his description of the Salafis and their Mashayikh and Imaams – amongst them Imaam al-Albani and Imaam Ibn Baaz - stated, "Murji'ah, not Salafis" and who described them in their totality as "a contemporary movement of Irjaa disguised as Salafiyyah", and whose teenage followers accused Imaam al-Albani of the Irjaa of Jahm Ibn Safwaan¹, we present to you the creed of the Noble Imaam al-Albani on the issues of takfir and apostasy. And know also that the apparent love that the Qutubiyah display for the two Imaams of Ahl us-Sunnah is only a cover and a veil by which they seek nearness to the Salafis in order to beguile them, confuse them and lead them to desires, misguidance and destruction. Firstly, because they have quite clearly displayed their own ignorance of the two Imaams positions² in truth, their lack of objectivity and research in these issues, their evil suspicions towards the people of knowledge and excellence, and their very apparent contradictions and double standards³.

¹ Such as the young child, Abu Zubair al-Azzaami who sitting behind his glass screen - day and night - feigns the gown of knowledge but is in reality a muqallid of his Qutubis cohorts and teachers from the US.

² And soon shall we bring to the attention to the Qutubis – inshaa'allaah - the position of Imaam Ibn Baaz on the issues of Imaan and also the topic of ruling by other than what Allaah has revealed, in all its various forms.

³ In the days of old, the Permanent Committee were but "paid workers", "spies", "under control", "scholars of women's menses", "not worthy of being referred to in verdicts" – in the view of Safar and Salman and their muqallid followers, and in the view of Abdur-Rahmaan Abdul-Khaliq, they were worse than that: "skin-deep Ulamaa", "mummified", "a group of blind men who have taken it upon themselves to give verdicts" and so on. Now the Permanent Committee is the only criterion of truth in our times – as has been explicitly stated by some of the ignorant partisans, following their recent verdicts against some of the Mashayikh and their books. This is the way of the biased-partisans – political expediency and Machiavellian machinations!

You should come to know – my dear brother and sister for the sake of Allaah – that amongst the first to make allegations of Irjaa’ against the Salafi Mashayikh in general (and not those of Jordan!) was Mohammed Qutb, and this was because, unlike him and those of his ilk, they did not perform absolute and unrestricted takfir of those who rule by other than what Allaah has revealed⁴.

Then he poisoned some of the youth, the likes of Safar al-Hawali and Salman al-Awdah⁵ and so he enticed Safar to author a book in this regard, Safar being one of his foremost and close students. And this saw the emergence of “The Emergence of Irjaa in Islamic Thought” the first edition of which included a lavish introduction by the originator of the thought himself, Mohammad Qutb. This introduction however was subsequently omitted in future prints. In this book, he performed takfir on account of sins and also reviled the likes of Imaam al-Albani. Al-Hawali, with no shame or restraint, drew parallels between al-Bootee, the Innovator and Imaam al-Albani, since in his view, they shared in some of their orientations and viewpoints!⁶

⁴ The Shaikh, Abdul-Malik bin Ahmad al-Mubarak al-Jaza’iri said about the delegate of Alee Bin Haaj, “The delegate of Alee bin Haaj in The Algerian Front, called al-Hashimi Sahnouni used to label everyone that did not perform takfir of the rulers with this name, “Murji”. So when I asked him, what was his reference point for this, he said, ‘**Mohammad Qutb and ‘Abdur-Rahman Abdul-Khaliq**.’” Madarik un-Nadhar (p.110, 2nd edition).

⁵ As for Salman al-Awdah, then he was an acquaintance of Muhammad Suroor, when the latter used to be present in Qaseem, Saudi Arabia as has been reported by numerous reliable authorities. And some of our Kuwaiti Shaikhs (known personally to us) used to be close friends with Salman al-Awdah in the days when they used to study together, the books of Muhammad Suroor, one of the heads of the Khawarij of today. They would engage in group study and then test each other on what they had learnt and memorised from the books of their mentor. But Allaah guided some amongst them and so they abandoned the Suroori brand of Qutubism and broke off attachments from the remainder of the Qutubis with whom they had love and affection – and all praise is due to Allaah.

⁶ Stated Shaikh Ali Hasan al-Halabi, “Imaam al-Albani pointed out in excess of 80 mistakes in the book ‘Dhahirat ul-Irjaa’ some of which were serious knowledge related issues and others linguistic... Imaam al-Albani described the book as having reached “the extremity in evil”... and he also said that he did not consider that the author would have reached such a level... He also said that “It has become clear to me that our brothers in Madinah (i.e. Shaikh Rabee et. al) were more knowledgeable of them than us.” (29th July 2000, Birmingham, UK). And all of this can be found in the cassette “Fitnat ul-Asr” (2 tapes). The observations that Imaam al-Albani made on this evil book will soon be published inshaa’llaah.

Imaam al-Albani was asked concerning the book, “Dhahiratul-Irjaa fil-Fikr al-Islami” of Safar al-Hawali, and in this book takfir is performed on account of certain sins! He replied: **“I gave my viewpoint on a matter about thirty or so years ago when I used to be in the [Islamic] University (of Madinah) and I was asked in a gathering about my opinion on Jamaa’at ut-Tabligh. So I said on that day, ‘They are the Sufis of this era’. And now it has occurred to me that I should say about this Jamaa’ah who have emerged in the present times and who have opposed the Salaf, I say here, in accordance with the statement of al-Hafidh adh-Dhahabi: They have opposed the Salaf in much of the issues of manhaj, and it is befitting that I label them the Khawarij of the era. And this resembles their emergence at the current time – in which we read their statements – because they, in reality, their words take the direction and objective of that of the Khawarij in performing takfir of the one who commits major sins. And perhaps I should say, this is either due to ignorance on their behalf or due to devised plot!! And I say this in light of [the statement of Allaah], “Let not the hatred of a people make you depart from justice. Be just and fair and that is closer to taqaa”. I do not know whether they say that every major sin takes one outside the fold of Islaam! However, they always revolve around certain major sins but remain silent or just pass by other major sins! And for this reason I do not see that we should make this label absolute, and that we should say, ‘They are Khawarij’, except from certain aspects. And this is the justice that we have been ordered to abide by...”** [The Cassette: The Surooriyyah are the Khawarij of the Era, end of the first side]. Dated 17th Dhul-Hijjah 1417H.

Imaam al-Albani also stated in one the most recent of his books that were published, Adh-Dhabb al-Ahmad an Musnad al-Imaam Ahmad, p.33 (1999, 1420H): “And Shaikh ul-Islaam Ibn Taymiyyah has explained the perspective from which faith, Imaan, consists of actions, and that it increases and decreases - [his discussion] needing no further elaboration - in his book ‘al-Imaan’. So the one who requires more detail can refer back to it. **I say: This is what I**

It is also worthy to note that in his other work “al-Ilmaaniyyah” Safar quoted extensively from Mohammad Qutb on the issue of ruling by other than what Allaah has revealed while ignoring the well-known tafsir of the Salaf concerning the verses of Surah al-Ma’idah (concerning ruling by other than what Allaah has revealed) – illustrating the degree of influence of Mohammad Qutb over al-Hawali. In fact, he didn’t even dare to mention the tafsir of Ibn Abbaas, which the whole Ummah as taken with acceptance, and then he continued to apply the apparent meaning of the verse to all the rulers today⁷, which undoubtedly, is the essential teaching of the two Qutbs and the remainder of the activists.

The accusation of Irjaa gained currency on the lips of the Qutubis in general – though they were aforesaid ignorant of such affairs – as had been Mohammad Qutb prior to settling in Saudi Arabia and becoming familiar with the aqidah of the Salaf.⁸

In the face of this false accusation, **the angle and perspective of which had its basis in the issue of ruling by other than what Allaah has revealed**, the Qutubis then elucidated upon this by preying upon the writings and statements of the Imaam of the Sunnah, Shaikh al-Albani:

- A tape in which Shaikh al-Albani was asked about those who revile Allaah, or the Messenger (sallallaahu alaihi wasallam) or the religion and to which he replied that they ought to be given exemplary punishment and then left, without any other judgement being made upon them and that it is possible for reviling the Messenger (sallallaahu alaihi wasallam) to occur unintentionally or due to ignorance and hence the ruling of takfir cannot be made in these cases. The tape was called “Kufr is of Two Types” and this particular tape was targeted by the Qutubis in order to base their accusation of Irjaa’ against Imaam al-Albani. Some went as far as accusing him of being a Jahmi! May Allaah free the Noble Imaam from this ignorance, misguidance and scum.
- The position of Imaam al-Albani on those who rule by secular laws and that they are not to be declared disbelievers, just by the act alone and that the cause of disbelief in all instances of ruling by other than what Allaah has revealed is what the heart contains of the various beliefs and motivations,

used to write for more than twenty years, affirming the madhhab of the Salaf and the aqidah of Ahl us-Sunnah - and all praise is due to Allaah - in the issues pertaining to Imaan, and then there come - in the present times - reckless ignoramus, who are but young newcomers accusing us of Irjaa!! To Allaah is the complaint of the evil that they are upon, of ignorance, misguidance and scum...”

⁷ Refer to p. 785 onwards, ‘al-Ilmaaniyyah’.

⁸ It is interesting to note that when the Ikhwanis were crushed in their own countries (the likes of Syria and Egypt) after the failure of their “da’wah” and “secret and underground movements” and their “ways of reform” (i.e. takfir and khurooj), many of them fled to “the land of the Wahabbis” and sought refuge therein. However, instead of being grateful for this favour of being accommodated in a land wherein safety and security was found, they replaced this favour with ingratitude and then began to preach the same ideas as they had aforesaid in their own countries and in which they had failed miserably. To this end, they poisoned some of the youth who lived in the peninsula, the likes of Safar, Salman, Aa’id al-Qarnee, Nasir al-Umar and others. So we saw from these youth, takfir on account of sins, calls to dissension and civil strife, opposition to many of the issues of the Salafi manhaj, co-operation with Ahl ul-Bid’ah and showing Walaa and Baraa to the Innovators, repugnant statements against the Committee of Scholars and the Salafi Mashayikh, calls to democracy and much more. So the methodology of Qutubism was taught by those who had fled their countries from amongst the Ikhwaan, and they introduced the books of bid’ah and misguidance to the youth and infused those ideas into their minds, such that the Tafsir of the Salaf (as found in the works of at-Tabari, Ibn Kathir and others) was pushed aside and the tafsir of Qutb was raised to the same level as those Tafsirs, in fact made superior to them all.

or istihlaal, or juhood or hatred and so on, in other words he tends to the tafseel that the Qutubiyyah avoid.⁹

⁹ And in this issue, Imaam al-Albani is in agreement with the likes of Imaam Ibn Baz, Shaikh Ibn Uthaimen, Shaikh Salih al-Fawzaan and others, all of whom ascribed disbelief to what is in the heart of either istihlaal, juhood, considering the Shari'ah to be outmoded, or considering the secular laws to be equal to or better than the Shari'ah, or considering it to be permissible to judge by them, disliking the Shari'ah and so on. **As for the two Imaams then they do not consider that a ruler can become a disbeliever by any of the forms of ruling by other than what Allaah has revealed except by way of the beliefs of the heart or istihlaal.** As for the remainder, then they consider that if a ruler **completely abolishes the Sharee'ah**, or resorts to general legislation, then this act gives evidence (daleel) of what is in the heart of the ruler of the various beliefs that necessitate kufr. So either way, whichever position you take, the Qutubi mode of thought necessitates that all of the abovementioned Ulamaa are Murji'ah and from Allaah is the refuge. And it is a shame that many of the ignorant muqallidah (blind-followers) who speak in these affairs do not even understand the position of the scholars they claim to be following – accusing those who oppose them of being Murji'ah – and not even realising that even those whose opinions they hold onto would also be guilty of Irjaa' according to the Qutubi mode of thought!! Since, if an act is an act of major kufr in and of itself, then to make the basis for the kufr to be that the act gives evidence (daleel) as to what is in the heart of the various beliefs – and that these beliefs are what expel from Islaam, then this is Irjaa' – **according to the Qutubi mode of thought with respect to ruling by other than what Allaah has revealed.** And hence, interpolating the outward acts of kufr to be kufr on account of what the heart contains of the various beliefs and motivations such as what has occurred from Shaikh Salih al-Fawzaan, or because they indicate the istihlaal of the heart such as what has occurred from Shaikh Ibn Uthaimen is an element of Irjaa' – according to Qutubism.

Stated Shaikh Ibn Uthaimen in "Fitnah of Takfir" (pp.73-74), "And it is in my opinion (dhann) that it is not possible for a person to apply and establish such laws that oppose the Shari'ah and which are referred to by the slaves of Allaah for judgement **except that he declares this to be permissible (istahallahu) and holds the belief (ya'taqidu) that such laws are better than the Shari'ah laws. Hence, he is a disbeliever. This is what is apparent, and if not then what [motive] is it that carried him to undertake this?!** Sometimes it can be his fear of not undertaking this act on account of people who are stronger than - that makes him undertake this act. So here he would be compromising with them. So here we would say that such a one is like those who compromise with respect to the other sins."

Shaikh Salih al-Fawzaan said, when asked that some people are using his statement in his Kitaab ut-Tawheed to make takfir of the Rulers of the Gulf States, "[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 (this givesdaleel) 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].**" (Cassette: Questions and Answers on Haakimiyyah). Refer to Article **MNJ050014** at SalafiPublications.Com

So will the Qutubiyyah, Khawarij of the Era, also accuse the rest of our Mashayikh as being Murji'ah, Jahmiyyah?!

The reason being that they have already accused Imaam al-Albaani of being a Murji and Jahmi because he explained that the one who kicks the Qur'an knowing it is the Qu'ran and intending to kick it deliberately, disrespecting it, then his outward act is kufr and also gives absolute and certain evidence (daleel) as to his internal disbelief (i.e. kufr of I'tiqaad). So the Qutubis took this and accused the Imaam of agreeing with the Jahmiyyah and Murij'at ul-Fuqahaa for interpolating the outward act of kufr to be inward kufr. However, the truth is that the words of the Imaam are in perfect agreement with those of Shaikh ul-Islaam Ibn Taymiyyah and others, who explained that the outward acts of major kufr (such as reviling the Prophet (sallallaahu alaihi wasallam) and so on) are kufr on the outside and they necessitate kufr on the inside – as we will soon see later in this discourse from the words of Shaikh ul-Islaam Ibn Taymiyyah. And this is the meaning intended by Imaam al-Albaani.

In light of the Qutubi mode of reasoning against Imaam al-Albaani, then it follows that the likes of Shaikh Salih al-Fawzaan and Shaikh Ibn Uthaimen are also Murji'ah and Jahmiyyah because of their using exactly the same explanation to indicate the nature of the kufr of the Ruler who completely replaces the Sharee'ah or who replaces parts of the Sharee'ah!!

- The position of Imaam al-Albani on the one who does not pray out of laziness while affirming its obligation.¹⁰

¹⁰ IMAAM AL-ALBANI'S POSITION ON ABANDONMENT OF PRAYER

And to illustrate the ignorance of Safar al-Hawali and his revilement of Imaam al-Albani because he does not perform takfir of the one who abandons the prayer, we present you the position of the Imaam in his own words.

Shaikh Al-Albaanee says : "As is known the scholars disagree about the one who abandons Prayer whilst believing in its being prescribed - so the majority hold that he does not become a Kaafir because of that but a Faasiq, and Ahmad holds that such a one is a Kaafir and is killed because of apostacy - not as a prescribed punishment. And it is established from the Companions that they had not used to regard the abandonment of anything as Kufr - except for Prayer - which is reported by at-Tirmidhee and al-Haakim - and I hold that the saying of the majority is correct and that what is reported from the Companions is not a clear statement that what they meant by Kufr' was the Kufr which causes a person to remain forever in the Fire and whom Allaah will not forgive and how can that be when Hudhaifah ibn al-Yamaan - one of the foremost of those Companions - replied to Silah ibn Zafr who was about to understand the matter in the same way as Ahmad, so he said : "'Laa ilaaha illallaah' will not benefit them if they do not know what is Prayer," so Hudhaifah replied after turning away from him : "O Silah it will save them from the Fire" three times. So this is a clear statement from Hudhaifah (radiiallaahu anhu) that the one who abandons Prayer - and likewise the other pillars of Islaam - is not a Kaafir, rather he is a Muslim who will be saved from remaining eternally in the Fire."

Then he (rahimahullaah) quotes as-Sakhaawee, who after mentioning the ahaadeeth about the Kufr of one who abandons Prayer, who says : "But all of this is taken at face value with regard to one who abandons it whilst denying its obligation after having grown up amongst the Muslims - since in that case he will be a Kaafir and an apostate by ijmaa' of the Muslims - so he either returns to Islaam or is killed - but as for the one who abandons it without valid excuse but out of laziness whilst still believing in its obligation then what is correct and clearly stated by the majority failing to pray a Prayer in its essential time - such as leaving Zuhr until the sun sets, or Maghrib until the sun rises - then his repentance is sought just as the repentance of the apostate is sought - then if he does not repent he is executed, then he is washed, prayed over and buried in a Muslim graveyard - and the rest of the rulings applicable to Muslims apply to him and application of the term `kufr' to him is explained to be due to the fact that he shares with the Kaaafir in some rulings with regard to action, this explanation is in order to harmonize between these texts and the texts such as what is authentic from him (sallallaahu `alaihi wasallam) that he said : **"There are five Prayers which Allaah prescribed... if He wishes He punishes him and if He wishes He forgives him and he also said : He who dies knowing that none has the right to be worshipped but Allaah enters Paradise Therefore the Muslims have not ceased to give inheritance to and to inherit from those who abandon Prayer. And if he were a Kaafir then he would not be forgiven and would not inherit or be inherited from."** (Al-Fataawaa al-Hadeethiyyah 2/84)

And he (rahimahullaah) quoted Shaikh Sulaimaan ibn `Abdullaah who said : "And because that is the ijmaa' of the Muslims because we do not know of any time when a person who abandoned Prayer was not washed and prayed over, nor whose inheritance was prevented - even though those who abandon Prayer are many - whereas if he were a Kaafir then these rulings would apply - and as for the preceding ahaadeeth then they are to be taken as a severe warning and as describing their condition as being similar to the Kaafirs - not that it is to be taken literally - such as his (sallallaahu `alaihi wasallam)saying : Abusing a Muslim is open sin and fighting him is Kufr and He who swears by other than Allaah has committed Shirk etc Al-Muwaffiq said : "And this is the most correct of the two sayings." (Haashiyatul-Muqni' 1/95-96)

Then he (rahimahullaah) said : "And there is a fine point here which I have rarely seen pointed out or noticed so it is essential to point it out and explain it, so I say : That the one who abandons Prayer out of laziness is judged a Muslim as long as there is nothing to reveal the secrets of his heart or indicate that and he dies before repentance is sought from him - as is the case these days - **but if he is given the choice between death and between repentance and returning to regular Prayer, but he chooses death then in this case he dies a Kaafir.** Shaikhul-Islaam [Ibn Taymiyyah] said : **"And when a man refuses to pray even if he is to be killed then he will not be inwardly agreeing to the obligation of Prayer nor one who establishes it - and he is a Kaafir by agreement of the Muslims as is shown by the many reports from the Companions that such a one is a Kaafir - and as is shown by the authentic texts."** (Majmoo'ul-Fataawaa' 2/48)

Refer to as Silsilah as-Saheehah (1/117)

- The statement of Imaam al-Albani that kufr, just like dhulm and fisq returns back to making the unlawful to be lawful with one's heart (stihlal al-qalbi) in his discourse on ruling by other than what Allaah has revealed.¹¹

The Noble Shaikh al-Albani also said, **“It is feared for the one who takes the affair of prayer lightly that he may die upon disbelief, and refuge is in Allaah, the Mighty”** (As-Silsilah ad-Da'eefah 1/132)

And confirming this meaning is the Imaam, 'Abdul-Haqq al-Ishbeeliyy who said, “Know – may Allaah have mercy upon you – that abandoning the prayer, even if it is not kufr (that expels from the religion) – as has been stated by those – may Allaah be pleased with them – **then it is indeed one of the greatest of causes that lead to kufr...**” (As-Salaat wat-Tahajjud p.96)

So the position of Imaam al-Albani is clear walhamdulillaah, but unfortunately it was not clear to the one who wrote his oppressive and vile book which reached “the extremity in evil”!!

11 IMAAM AL-ALBAANEE'S STATEMENT ON ISTIHLAAL QALBI AND KUFR

The statement that Imaam al-Albani made in this regard in the book “Fitnah of Takfir” has been taken by the Innovators, those with a disease in their hearts, in order to accuse Imaam al-Albani that he does not perform takfir except due to istihlaal al-qalbi **absolutely and without exception**. And this is, as we shall make clear, a fabrication and misrepresentation of the Imaam's position in truth.

Imaam Al-Albani stated: “The essence of the matter is that it is vital for us to know that kufr – just like fisq and dhulm – is divided into two categories: the kufr, fisq and dhulm which expels from the religion, and all of that has its basis in holding something to be lawful with one's heart [in belief] (al-istihlaal al-qalbi). and the other which does not expel from the religion has its basis in holding something to be lawful in one's action only.” Fitnah of Takfir (p.70, 1st Edition)

ONE: The intent of the Shaikh is clear in that he intends the actions of kufr which do not negate Imaan from every single aspect, meaning the sins and acts of disobedience. And this is understood from the context of his discussion prior to this statement which is ruling by other than what Allaah has revealed and concerning which there is the well known tafsil of the Salaf.

And then immediately after these words the Imaam stated, **“Every act of disobedience (ma'aasee) – and especially such matters that have become widespread in this time such as holding it lawful (in action) to work with usury, to commit fornication, drink intoxicants and other things – is from the kufr of action.** Therefore it is not permissible that we declare the disobedient people in general, those who have been deceived with some of these acts of disobedience, merely because they commit these actions, and because they have made them lawful for themselves in terms of action [as opposed to belief]! Unless something proceeds from them, with certainty, that uncovers what is in their hearts, that they do not hold to be unlawful that which Allaah and His Messenger have made unlawful, in their belief (I'tiqadan). So if we come to know that they have fallen into this opposition of the heart, then we judge them to have disbelieved with the kufr of apostasy ... Therefore, the fundamental relationship of the kufr of belief (al-Kufr al-I'tiqadi) is not with mere action alone, rather its greatest relationship and link is with the heart.

And we have no way of knowing what is in the heart of a fasiq or a fajir (i.e. sinner), or a thief, a fornicator, one who takes interest and whoever is similar to them. Unless he expresses what is in his heart with his tongue. As for his action then that merely informs us that he has opposed the Shar'iah in his action and we would therefore say: “You have opposed (the Sharee'ah)! You have sinned (fusooq)! You have sinned (fujoor)!” But we do not say: “You have disbelieved and have apostatised from your religion” until something occurs from him that is a justification for us in the sight of Allaah the Mighty and Majestic to make a judgement of apostasy against him. Then the well known ruling in Islaam will be applied to him (i.e. death), and this is his (sallallaahu alaihi wasallam) saying: “Whoever changes his religion, then kill him.” End of the Shaikhs words.

So what is evident here, is that the Shaikh's discussion is related to major sins and acts of disobedience. But the Qutubi's did not understand that, rather they understood only what their desires allowed them to and instead of making excuses for the Shaikh, having good thoughts and being open-minded, they thought otherwise...and what they displayed towards their sayyid, Sayyid Qutb of reverence and excuses was not displayed to one who is much more worthy of it, a Muhaddith, Mujtahid, Faqeeh and Imaam.

TWO: Imaam Ibn Baz heard this statement and did not comment upon it or criticise it or raise any objection to it, rather he praised the treatise of Imaam al-Albani and said that he is upon the truth concerning it[*]. Likewise Shaikh Ibn Uthaimen in his well known commentary upon the treatise of Imaam al-Albani (in the cassette, "Commentary Upon Fitnah of Takfir" where the full text of the treatise was read out to him) **did not comment upon these words or criticise them or find fault with them.** So we gather from this that the intent of Shaikh al-Albani was very clear to them and they, unlike Salman al-Awdah and the remainder of the Qutubis, did not harbour suspicions about him and misconstrue his words and understand them in a manner that he did not intend.

[*] Imaam Ibn Baaz stated, "I came across the beneficial, valuable reply which was given by the Eminent Shaikh Muhammad Naasir ud-Deen al-Albaanee - out of his graciousness - may Allaah grant him success in the publication: "Ash-Sharq al-Awsat" and the Magazine "al-Muslimoon" - the one in which he replied to the one who asked him about "performing takfeer of the one who judged by other than what Allaah has revealed without elaborating (upon the matter more fully)" So he replied to it with a word of truth, and has arrived at the truth in it, and has travelled upon the path of the believers by it and has made manifestly clear - may Allaah grant him success - that it is not permissible for anyone amongst the people to declare the one who judged by other than what Allaah has revealed - **a disbeliever - merely on account of an action, without his knowledge that this person declared such an act to be permissible with his heart (istihalla dhaalik biqalbihi). And he used evidence for that what has come from Ibn Abbaas (radiiallaahu anhu) and others from among the Salaf.**" Fitnah of Takfir (1st Edition) and originally in al-Muslimoon (vol 639).

So the other Mountain and Imaam of Knowledge, Ibn Baaz understood the context of Imaam al-Albani's words and knew they were related to those acts which do not negate a person's Imaan completely, and he knew they were not meant absolutely, but restricted to the acts under discussion, in opposition to the Qutubiyah, who took them in absolute terms, and so strayed and caused others to stray, and made great the straying!

THREE: When Shaikh Alee Hasan went through the treatise with Imaam al-Albani himself in order to check it and allow Imaam al-Albani to make modifications to it, and when he (Imaam al-Albani) arrived at this point in the treatise, he added a comment shortly after, and which is actually included in the footnote (if only the People of Desires had done justice to the reading of the book!), Imaam al-Albani made an additional comment.

Concerning his own statement, "Therefore, the fundamental relationship of the kufr of belief (al-Kufr al-I'tiqadi) is not with mere action alone, rather its greatest relationship and link is with the heart", Imaam al-Albani said:

"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)." Refer to Fitnah of Takfir (p.72, 1st edition)

FOUR: It is also possible for us to take various statements of other scholars, which are general and then make them absolute and claim that this is the final and only view of that particular scholar. However, if we were to look elsewhere at their other words and statements we would find that which specifies or restricts the general. To give an example, in one of the verdicts the Committee of Major scholars stated that the one who makes istihlaal (declares it lawful) to make secular laws as a reference point in judgement for the sake of some material benefit, then this is not kufr. Refer to Fataawaa Lajnah ad-Daaimah of Shaikh Ahmad bin Abdur-Razzaq ad-Dawaish 1/540-541, Question 3 of Fatwaa No. 6310, where it is stated that, "...Judging (at-Tahaakum) is to Allaah the Most High and to the Sunnah of the Messenger (sallallaahu alaihi wasallam). **So if he does not judge to them both (yatahaakam ilaihimaa), whilst making it lawful to judge to other than them (mustahillan it-Tahaakuma ilaa ghayrihimaa) amongst the secular laws (al-qawaaneen al-wad'iyyah) with the hope of deriving some material benefit or for the sake of honour or for seeking a better position then he is one who is sinful (murtakibu ma'siyyatin) and is a sinner, faasiq, with the lesser fisq with does not expel him from Imaan.."** Hence, we could say here that the Lajnah has meant Istihlaal of belief and that this is the view of Lajnah absolutely. However, if we return to the other statements of the signatories of this fatwaa, such as Shaikh Ibn Baaz, then we would come to realise that in other places they make a distinction between istihlaal of belief and istihlaal of action and from this we would come to know how to understand this particular fatwaa that we have just quoted – that istihlaal of action is actually intended. But if we did not take this approach, then it is would be possible for us to ascribe to many of the Imaams and Ulamaa of Ahl us-Sunnah that which they are free from.

So while the original accusation was directed at the Salafi Ulamaa in general, from the direction of the Ikhwan and due to the plot of Mohammad Qutb¹², after Mohammad Qutb had toyed with the mind of Safar al-Hawali the accusation was then focused towards the camp of Imaam al-Albani and his students specifically, due to the Imaam's position on ruling by the secular laws, the issue of the abandonment of prayer, some of his statements in cassette called "Kufr Kufraan", alongside some other positions that they held, such as their discouragement of involvement with politics and their position on Jihaad.

In what follows is an explanation of the aqidah of the Noble Imaam, al-Albani on the issues of apostasy, reviling the religion, and the ruling of takfir based upon a discussion between Shaikh Ubaylaan and Imaam al-Albani in early 1999.

And inshaa'allaah, this discourse aims to demolish the false claims of the liars, the (faulty) interpretations of the ignorant and the distortion of the exaggerationists – seeking in all of that Allaah's aid, assistance and pleasure.

To give other examples: Shaikh ul-Islam Ibn Taymiyyah said, "The basis (asl) of kufr is rejection (inkaar) of Allaah." (Majmoo ul-Fataawaa 3/345). Ibn al-Qayyim said, "Certainly, kufr is juhood (denial)" (Akhaam Ahl udh-Dhimmah 3/1156). And likewise Imaam as-Sa'dee said, "The apostate, murtad, is the one who exits from Islaam and enters into disbelief on account of an action, statement, a belief or doubt. And the Scholars - may Allaah have mercy upon them - have mentioned the specific detail and explanation of the matters by which a servant leaves Islaam. **And all of them have their basis in the rejection, jahd, of what the Messenger (sallallaahu alaihi wasallam) came with, or rejection, jahd, of some of it.**" (Manhaj us-Saalikeen p.112).

So do we say as the Qutubis would say, "Ibn Taymiyyah has restricted kufr to rejection of Allaah" and "Ibn al-Qayyim has restricted kufr to Juhood only" and "Imaam as-Sa'dee has restricted kufr to Juhood absolutely"?? Or do we say that these are general statements which are not to be taken absolutely and hence it is necessary to refer back to the decisive and clear statements which explain these statements?

So we say that this the case with respect to Imaam al-Albani in that his statement was made concerning the acts of disobedience and sin which do not expel from Islaam. Otherwise, why would he say elsewhere that there are some actions on account of which a person disbelieves without istihlaal, or juhood or takdheeb and so on.

So from this we can gather that Imaam al-Albani does not perform takfir only on account of istihlaal-qalbi – even though Salman al-Awdah, his students and his blind followers may detest it – and it also shows that those who find fault with the Shaikh's position only do so because of their own ignorance and their own sinister machinations. From Allaah is the refuge. And it is surprising indeed that the Qutubiyyah should fail to note this exception and clarification that Imaam al-Albani made on the very next page after having made his statement on istihlaal qalbi!!

¹² Shaikh Salih al-Fawzan said, "And the end part of that is what we are living in now, the arrival of strange and suspicious ideas in our land in the name of 'da'wah' - through the hands of the various groups which are called by various names such as al-Ikhwaan al-Muslimeen, Jamaa'at ut-Tabligh and the Jamaa'ah of such and such. **And the goal of all of them is the one and same and that is to drive away the da'wah of Tawheed and to take up its place [with something else].** And in reality, the intent of these groups is not different from the intent of those who have preceded them **from amongst the enemies of this blessed da'wah - all of them desire to put an end to it.** However the difference between them is only with respect to their modes of action. And if not, then if these groups had desired - truthfully - da'wah to Allaah, then why do they overlook and abandon their own countries - from where they are dispatched to us? And yet these same countries are most in need of da'wah and rectification. **They overlook their own countries and then they come out to battle against the land of Tawheed,** desiring to change its correct course of rectification to one that is twisted - and they desire to deceive its youth and to bring about fitnah and enmity between them..." (Haqeeqat ud-Da'wah ilallaah of Sa'd Abdur-Rahmaan al-Haseen).

THE CREED OF IMAAM AL-ALBAANEE ON APOSTASY AND TAKFIR

Questions of Shaikh Al-'Ubaylaan to Shaikh Al-Albaanee Concerning Reviling the Religion

Shaikh al-'Ubaylaan: In the name of Allaah, the Most Merciful, the Bestower of Mercy. All praise is for Allaah, the Lord of all of the creation; and may He extol and send blessings of peace upon our Prophet and Messenger, and upon his true followers, and all of his companions. Noble Shaikh Muhammad Naasirud-Deen al-Albaanee, may Allaah preserve him, in a previous sitting with you, three years ago, you were asked about some fools who mock the religion, and may even revile the religion. So your answer was that the like of those people should be punished by being lashed, and then that they should be left and no further judgement given with regard to them. So, in reality, some people have understood from this matter something that was not intended by Shaikh Naasir, may Allaah preserve him. So they thought that the Shaikh was making an unrestricted statement that mocking the religion, for example, or reviling the religion, or reviling the Prophet (ﷺ) is not kufr. I would like the Shaikh, may Allaah preserve him, to clarify this, and if the Shaikh permits, before replying, that I should read a little from the verdicts of the great scholar Shaikh Muhammad ibn Ibraaheem, the Mufti of Saudi Arabia, rahimahullaah, when the Shaikh was asked this question, and replied...

Shaikh al-Albaanee: If you wish, then go ahead.

Shaikh al-'Ubaylaan: He said: "In the name of Allaah, the Most Merciful, the Bestower of Mercy. From Muhammad ibn Ibraaheem to the Assistant Judge of the court of Saatah, as-Salaamu 'alaykum wa rahmatullaahi wa barakaatuhu. Then we have read your letter, no. ... and date ..., concerning Mu'awwidh son of so and so, **and his reviling the religion followed by Muhammad ibn al-Mahdee, and your judgement that he should be lashed ten times as a punishment.** Then that his repentance be sought, such that he repents and seeks Allaah's forgiveness; and that you requested that we be informed of that. So we inform you that his reviling the religion followed by Muhammad ibn al-Mahdee; and the fact is that Muhammad ibn al-Mahdee is a Muslim; so this is reviling the religion of Islaam. So reviling the religion, as will not be hidden from you is Apostasy, and Allaah's refuge is sought. So therefore it is upon you to add to what you imposed, that the afore-mentioned person be brought, and he be commanded with ghusl, then that he should say the two Shahaadahs, and that he should renew his repentance, after informing him of its three conditions, which are desisting from the sin, regretting having done it, and being firmly resolved not to return to it. **But bearing in mind what you mentioned, that he was ignorant of what is indicated by what he said, then the punishment that you imposed is sufficient.** May Allaah grant you success in attaining what is correct.

Was-Salaam 'alaykum. The Mufti of Saudi Arabia."

If you allow me, I will read another verdict...

Shaikh al-Albaanee: Go ahead.

Shaikh al-'Ubaylaan: Also here we have the ruling of Muhammad ibn Ibraaheem concerning: 'whoever called 'the knowledge of Tawheed': the knowledge of devastation; and 'the knowledge of Fiqh': 'drivel of the old-folk'".

Shaikh al-Albaanee: They called it what?

Shaikh al-'Ubaylaan: 'Drivel of the old folk', 'drivel of the old folk'.

Shaikh al-Albaanee: Meaning what? 'old folk', 'drivel (Hazaawee) meaning what?'

Shaikh al-'Ubaylaan: Meaning: Talking, speech of old folk?

Shaikh al-Albaanee: Is it a dialect of Nejd?

Shaikh al-'Ubaylaan: I do not know, O Shaikh.

Shaikh al-Albaanee: Fine.

Shaikh al-'Ubaylaan: From Muhammad ibn Ibraaheem, to the noble judge of Hirjaab, may Allaah preserve him. As-Salaamu 'alaikum wa rahmatullaahi wa barakaatuhu. To proceed. Your letter, no. ... and date ... has reached us, in which you described to us the condition of some of the school of students, from the youth, and they call the knowledge of Tawheed: 'the knowledge of devastation', and that they call the knowledge of Fiqh: 'drivel of the old folk', and you ask about the ruling concerning those people. So the answer is that the like of those people are transgressing against the Islamic legislation, and its knowledge, and this shows their mockery of the religion and their insolence towards the Lord of the creation. So whoever applies this saying to the knowledge of Tawheed, with which Allaah sent the Messengers, and with which He sent down the Revealed Books, and he knows the meaning of it, then there is no doubt that he is an Apostate. However it must be understood that there is a difference between giving a judgement about a particular individual, and between saying whoever does 'so and so', or says 'so and so', then he is a kaafir; **because with regard to a specific individual, it must be established that this occurred from him by his choice, and that he is one who is bound by the obligations, adult and sane.**

Then whoever applies this saying to the knowledge of fiqh, then he is upon error, and is transgressing against the knowledge of the legislation, however it does not reach the level that he be judged guilty of apostasy.

Furthermore then any who says the like of these words may be punished. **If they are children or the feeble-minded, then their affair is less serious. But if they are adults and sane people, then this is more serious, and Allaah's refuge is sought.**

So the reality is that this is something astonishing, particularly when it occurs from students in the schools who learn these branches of knowledge in their schools; and these things are from the most important things which they study ..."

This is the end of what we wished to quote from him, may Allaah have mercy upon him."

Shaikh al-Albaanee: What I hold, and take as my religion for Allaah, and I say, after praising Allaah and asking Allaah to extol and send blessings of peace upon His Messenger, **is that the affair, in my belief**

does not exceed what you have read to me from the words of the Shaikh, rahimahullaah, in his verdicts.¹³

13 THE AFFAIR DOES NOT EXCEED WHAT IS IN THE VERDICTS OF THE COMMITTEE OF SCHOLARS

And the truth of the matter is that the affair does not exceed what the Committee of Scholars of have stated in their verdicts.

The Committee was asked: "What is the Shari'ah ruling upon the one who mocked one of the Sunnahs of our Prophet Muhammad (sallallaahu alaihi wasallam), such as the one who mocks the beard, or who mocks the one with a beard by calling out to him "O Beard". We request from your noble selves to explain the ruling upon such a one."

So the Committee replied: "All praise is due to Allaah alone, and prayers and peace upon the Messenger, his family and his companions. **To proceed, mocking the beard is a very great evil. If the person intended (qasada) mockery by this phrase of his "O Beard" then that is disbelief, kufr.** And if he only intended (qasada) to acknowledge the person, ta'reef, then this is not disbelief but it is desirable that he doesn't call him with such a title. And this is due to the saying of Allaah, the Mighty and Majestic, "says **"Say : "Was it at Allaah, and His Ayaat (proofs, evidences, verses, lessons, signs, revelations, etc.) and His Messenger that you were mocking?" Make no excuses: you have disbelieved after you had believed. [at-Tawbah : Aayah 65-66]**". In Allaah lies all success and prayers and peace upon our Prophet Muhammad, his family and his companions." Fatwaa no.5044. Signed by Ibn Baz, Ibn Qu'ood, Ibn Ghudayan and 'Abdur-Razzaq al-Afeefi.

The Committee was also asked: "What is the ruling for one who abuses the Deen if he is ignorant - Does he have the excuse of ignorance or not in this case?" The reply was : "Abusing Allaah or His words or anything from Him is Kufr - and likewise abusing the Messenger or his Sunnah or anything from it, or abusing the Deen of a person if his Deen is Islaam - **so if he is ignorant of that then the ruling must be explained to him - and if he does not give up his abusing then he is a Kaafir and Apostate, outside Islaam - he either repents or is executed** as Allaah ta'aalaa says **"Say : "Was it at Allaah, and His Ayaat (proofs, evidences, verses, lessons, signs, revelations, etc.) and His Messenger that you were mocking?" Make no excuses: you have disbelieved after you had believed. [at-Tawbah : Aayah 65-66]**" Fatwaa no.5213, dated 15/1/1403H.

The Committee also answered another question concerning the excuse of ignorance about the actions of kufr such as mocking the religion and others. So part of their answer included:

"Thirdly: Reviling the religion and mocking anything from the Qur'an and the Sunnah and mocking strict adherence to them both, such as when one lets his beard grow, or when a woman wears hijab, then this is disbelief (kufr) if it comes from one who is mukallaf (i.e. has made the testimony of faith, is above the age of puberty and is sane). **It is required that it should be explained to him that this is disbelief, kufr. But if he persists after having this knowledge (ba'da al-I'lm), then he is a disbeliever (kafir).** Allaah the Most High said: **"Was it at Allâh, and His Ayât (proofs, evidences, verses, lessons, signs, revelations, etc.) and His Messenger that you were mocking? Make no excuse; you have disbelieved after you had believed."** (At-Tawbah 9:65-66)

Fourthly: Worshipping the graves and worshipping the Taaghoot is the Major Shirk with Allaah. **The person from whom these acts arise must have the ruling explained to him, so if he accepts it (then fine) and if not then he is a Mushrik.** And if he dies upon this Shirk, then he will be in the Hellfire eternally. He will not be excused after the ruling has been explained to him, and it is the same for the one who sacrifices for other than Allaah.

And in Allaah lies success, and prayers and peace upon our Prophet Muhammad, his family and his companions."

The Permanent Committee for Research and Verdicts

Member Abdullah bin Ghudayan

Deputy Head `Abdullaah bin Qu'ood

Head `Abdul-`Aziz bin Baz

Refer to "Fataawaa of the Permanent Committee for Research and Verdicts", compiled by Shaikh Ahmad bin `Abdur-Razzaq ad-Duwaish, Volume 2 (Aqidah) p.13-14.

However I wish to clarify something included in the reply of the Shaikh, which requires some explanation. So I say: **It is known to all of the scholars that sayings are to be taken in accordance with the intention (qasd) of those who said them.** So if a person says a word that carries the possibility of meaning something conflicting with the legislation, and that this matter further carries a two-fold meaning, so that it may be kufr and apostasy, or it may be a sin. Then the clearest example of this is swearing by other than Allaah, the Exalted and Most High. So we all know the saying of the Prophet, (sallallaahu 'alaihi wa sallam), "Whoever swears by other than Allaah has committed shirk," and in another wording "... has committed Unbelief".

But it is not possible for us to say that everyone who swears by other than Allaah has disbelieved, with the meaning of Apostasy. Rather this person who has sworn by other than Allaah may have disbelieved, with the meaning of Apostasy. This may be the case, and it may not be the case. Therefore in order to confirm one of the two possibilities, and to negate the other possibility, we must come to know, by one means or another, what the person who swore the oath intended. So if he actually intended veneration of the one whom he swore by, who was other than Allaah, the Mighty and Majestic, like the veneration of Allaah, the Mighty and Majestic; and this is something which I do not believe any Muslim will do; then in this case this will be the kufr of apostasy. However, as I just said I do not think that any Muslim, and how many there are who swear in the name of other than Allaah, the Mighty and Majestic, in the lands of Islaam, but I do not think that one of them intends veneration of the one besides Allaah, the Mighty and Majestic, in whose name he is swearing, just as is the case when he swears by Allaah, or that he holds that one greater than Him. I do not believe this. Therefore we see many of those Muslims who have been overtaken by this habit: the habit of swearing by their forefathers, and by the Prophets and Messengers, indeed by the man's head, and his beard and moustache and so on, the rest of the foul oaths; that if one of them is reminded and told: 'Allaah's Messenger (sallallaahu alaihi wasallam), said ... so and so ...', then he replies: 'may Allaah reward you with good, I did not know this, and I ask for forgiveness from Allaah.'

This is an example by which I mean to arrive at the matter of one who reviles Allaah, the Mighty and Majestic, or who reviles His Prophet, sallallaahu 'alaihi wa sallam, or who reviles the religion.

Then this affair returns back to a person's intention (qasd)¹⁴, because a person may say something or do something in a state of severe rage, **which blinds him to the straight way in which he should be speaking.** So when we hear one of those people, some of whom the Shaikh described as: 'the feeble-minded' (sufahaa), reviling the legislation, or the religion, or the Mighty Lord, or His Prophet, sallallaahu 'alaihi wa sallam, etc., when they are reminded, and it often happens that people do this, and are then advised and reminded, they say: 'May Allaah's curse be upon Satan. Satan made use of my rage. I ask for Allaah's forgiveness.'

So this indicates something very important, and which necessitates that he do not become hasty in delivering a verdict that the person has become an Unbeliever, because he did not intend (to commit) that

¹⁴ And what is meant here is the same as what was mentioned in the text of Shaikh Muhammad bin Ibraaheem's fatwaa, "...because with regard to a specific individual, **it must be established that this occurred from him by his choice, and that he is one who is bound by the obligations, adult and sane...**", and also what has mentioned by the Committee of Major Scholars in their verdicts quoted previously - meaning that a person actually intended the meaning of his words, since it is plausible for a person to utter statements of kufr but without intending a meaning which entails kufr. And this is a matter firmly established with the Ulamaa of Ahl us-Sunnah.

kufr¹⁵. How could he have done when he asks Allaah to forgive him, and acknowledges that what occurred from him was an error.

But this does not mean that we exempt him and are lax about his saying, rather we severely criticize him for that saying, and if there is an Islamic judiciary, or a judge who judges according to the legislation, then we suggest that he be lashed ten times as a punishment, as occurs in the well-known hadeeth of the Messenger, sallallahu 'alaihi wa sallam. But it is most unfortunate that the like of this judiciary is not to be found in most of the lands of Islaam today.

So perhaps this allows me to say that because of the absence of these Islamic regulations, which the Legislator has told us the benefit of, in the like of the Saying of Allaah, the Exalted and Most High, in the Noble Qur'aan:

And there is for you in the Law of Retribution (Qisaas) a saving of a life

Soorah al-Baqarah (2):179

So the rulers' not applying the rulings of the Legislation is one of the causes that allow the tongues of those people to be set loose to say things that should not be said, and which are not permissible in the Legislation.

So, in summary, declaring someone to be an Unbeliever (takfeer) is a matter that is a very difficult affair, as is known to the people of knowledge; and the authentic ahaadeeth in 'al-Bukhaaree' and elsewhere with this meaning are well-known.

But at this opportunity I wish to mention a fiqh point which occurs in the books of certain madh-habs, and in reality it agrees fully with the warning given in those ahadeeth to the Muslim against hastening to declare his Muslim brother to be an Unbeliever, for fear that he is not actually an Unbeliever, so that the Kufr returns to the one who declared it.

So they mention that if it happens that a group of ninety nine scholars were to give a verdict that a Muslim has become a kaafir, but one scholar says; 'No, he is not a kaafir', then the ruling of that person's being an Unbeliever should not be given, since there is a scholar that says that this is not kufr.¹⁶

So I understand from this that those people who mentioned this detail, were keeping in mind the danger of declaring a Muslim to be an Unbeliever, especially if he is known for observing the pillars of Islaam. Not just the 'Shahaadah', rather also the Prayer, Fasting and so on. So we frequently hear of disagreements occurring between husband and wife. So the wife comes and says: 'My husband reviled such and such.' So

¹⁵ Refer to previous footnote. And what is meant by the phrase "because he did not intend that kufr" is that "he did not intend to perform the act which is kufr", or "he did not intend the meaning that is kufr by the words that he uttered", as is clear from what is yet to come from the Shaikh's words. And this clarification comes from the Shaikh from the perspective of outlining the required conditions and preventative barriers to takfir.

¹⁶ And Shaikh Abdul-Lateef bin Abdur-Rahmaan Aal Shaikh said in his treatise 'AL-Ittihaaf fir-Radd alas-Suhhaaf' (p.49): "And the Shaikh [Muhammad bin Abdul-Wahhaab] - may Allaah have mercy upon him - did not declare anyone to be a disbeliever save the one whom Allaah and His Messenger declared to be a disbeliever, **and about the disbelief of whom the whole ummah was agreed upon**", and the likes of this is in 'Usool wa Dawaabit...' (p.10) belonging to him.

we ask: 'Does he pray?' She replies: 'Yes, he prays, he fasts etc.' The how has this happened?!' (she says): 'Well I had an argument with him, and he started shouting ... etc.' So reviling like this, if it happens when a person is enraged, means that repentance should be sought from the person, and he should be punished, and lashed etc.

But if we want to pass a judgement that he has become an Unbeliever, and apostatised, then we must accompany it with his approval of what he has done. If he approves of it, then it is Apostasy and he is to be executed, as is well-known in Islaam, from his, (sallallaahu 'alaihi wa sallam), saying, "**Whoever apostasizes from his religion, then kill him.**"¹⁷

But if he follows his words with asking for forgiveness, and with repentance to Allaah, the Mighty and Majestic, then this is a proof that it was an eruption of rage, and we cannot apply to it the same consequences that we would apply to speech emanating deliberately and intentionally¹⁸.

So the Messenger, sallallaahu 'alaihi wa sallam, said, "Actions are in accordance with the intentions."

¹⁷ Refer to the verdicts of the Committee of Major Scholars cited earlier, which provide the same meaning and contain the same ruling.

¹⁸ **SCOLDING ABU ZUBAIR AL-AZZAAMI, THE IGNORANT TEENAGER WHO ACCUSED IMAAM AL-ALBANI OF THE IRJAA' OF JAHM IBN SAFWAAN**

Stated this ignoramus (on Saturday, September 16, 2000 - 06:45 pm), attempting to use the following example in order to ascribe Irjaa' to Imaam al-Albani:

"Similarly when the Sheikh was asked: "Some of the narrations have come from some of the Imaams, and from some of the companions, such as, Khaalid Ibn al-Waleed, and some of the Imaams, such as, Imaam Ahmad about the Kufr of the one who insults Allah or the Messenger, and they considered it to be the Kufr of Riddah (apostasy). So is this in absolute terms? We hope for benefit".

To which the Sheikh replied: "We do not see this in absolute terms, for the insult or curse may result due to Jahl (ignorance) or bad upbringing, or it may occur due to one being unmindful. And lastly, it may also occur due to intent and knowledge, and if it occurs in this way, due to intent and knowledge, then it is Riddah (apostasy) in which there is no ambiguity. But if it happens in a case from other cases to which I pointed, then taking care in abstaining from Takfeer is more important Islaamically than rushing towards Takfeer" (Cassette: al-Kufr Kufraan: Tasjeelat Bait al-Maqdis)."

So this ignorant teenager claimed that this is Irjaa' from Imaam al-Albani and if only he had waited another 10 years so that he matured and moved further away from the age of puberty and adolescence, he would have realised that the point of discussion of the Shaikh is related to the conditions required for takfir (not as to whether an act is major kufr or not). So the Shaikh mentions that if a person had knowledge of his act - that it necessitates kufr - and if he did it deliberately, intending the act (as opposed to being compelled, etc.), then he is guilty of major kufr and has fallen into apostasy. And this matter is explained fully in this discourse anyway, and it is also found in the words of Shaikh Muhammad Ibn Ibraaheem and also in the verdict of the Committee of Scholars.

But as for this Juwaihil who has taken it upon himself to discuss these issues and to narrate them to the people day and night, morning and evening, then he couldn't even understand what is as clear as daylight from the very statement he is using to ascribe innovation and misguidance to the Imaam of Ahl us-Sunnah of our times - and from Allaah is the refuge from his ignorance, misguidance and scum. Know also that this Abu Zubair al-Azzaami was also the one who accused Imaam al-Albani of having the Irjaa' of Jahm Ibn Safwaan approximately 18 months ago - following his Qutubi teachers of the US in that - and may the curse of Allaah be upon those who lie.

So this person was not intending (qasd) revilement of what he reviled¹⁹, so it is not permissible for us to judge him in accordance with his words when his heart is in opposition to his saying. This is my view concerning this matter.²⁰

¹⁹ And this clarifies the Imaam's position on the issue of intent (qasd), since he made it linked to the speech which includes deliberate and wilful revilement and not that the heart intends kufr, with the meaning that the person – when committing the act - desires to actually leave the religion and choose kufr!

²⁰ **THE CREED OF IMAAM AL-ALBANI IS THAT OF IBN AL-QAYYIM**

And the view of Imaam al-Albani does not exceed either, what has come in the words of Ibn al-Qayyim (I'laam ul-Muwaqqi'een (3/53-54), even though the Qutubiyah may detest it:

“As for a person who is enraged (ghadbaan), then his being excluded from the issues of deliberate intention and knowledge (al-qasd wal-ilm) is just the same as the exclusion of the intoxicated and the insane. This is because rage is a state which robs a person of his intellect in the same way that intoxicants do, indeed more severely so. Moreover it is a branch of insanity, and no one who has knowledge about human nature will doubt about the fact that his declaration of divorce does not take effect. Therefore the great scholar of this Ummah, the one for whom the Messenger, (sallallaahu 'alaihi wa sallam), supplicated that he should be granted knowledge and understanding of the Religion, said, “Divorce only applies when done on purpose,” al-Bukhaaree mentioned it in his Saheeh, meaning: done whilst intending to effect a divorce. So this was from the completeness of his knowledge and understanding, may Allaah be pleased with him, and shows how Allaah has responded to the supplication of His Messenger.

So the consequences of the words will only apply in accordance with the intention (qasd) of the person who spoke them. Therefore Allaah does not bring us to account for oaths that are spoken unintentionally. So from unintentional oaths are what the Mother of the Believers and the great majority of the Salaf mentioned, that it refers to a persons swearing, “No, by Allaah!” and “Yes, by Allaah!” whilst talking, without establishing an ‘oath,’ (yameen).

Likewise it means that Allaah will not make us accountable for oaths relating to divorce, such as a person's saying, “I will not do it, (and if I do), then divorce will come about,” or “Divorce will be binding upon me if I do that,” without intending to establish an oath by that. Indeed if the name of the Lord, the Sublime in His Majesty, does not cause the oath to become effective if it is said unintentionally, then the oath with a mention of divorce has even more right not to become effective, since nothing has more sanctity than an oath sworn in Allaah's name. This verdict is one of the two sayings in the madhhab of Ahmad and it is what is correct. Its extraction from the words of Ahmad is correct since he stated that exception was to be taken into consideration regarding an oath involving divorce.

This was because in his view it is an ‘oath’ (yameen). He also stated that ‘unintentional oaths,’ means that a person says, “No, by Allaah!” and “Yes, by Allaah!” not intending to establish an ‘oath’ (yameen). Furthermore the Prophet, (sallallaahu 'alaihi wa sallam), said, “Allaah forbids you from swearing by your forefathers,” and it is established from him that he said, “he has succeeded, by his father, if he has spoken the truth.” So there is no contradiction between these two sayings, and the Prophet, sallallaahu 'alaihi wa sallam, never established an oath sworn by other than Allaah. **Also Hamzah said to the Prophet, sallallaahu 'alaihi wa sallam, “Are you anything but slaves of my father?!” when he was intoxicated by wine (before the prohibition of intoxicants [Transl. Note]). So he did not become an Unbeliever because of that.** Likewise, the Companion who recited:

**Qul Yaa Ayyuhul-Kaafiroon. A'budu maa ta'budoon.
Wa nahnu na'budu maa ta'budoon
Say, “O Unbelievers! I worship that which you worship.
And we worship that which you worship.**

And this occurred before the prohibition of intoxicants, yet he was not counted as an Unbeliever because of that, since he was not intending that (li adam al-qasd). **Rather the words came from his tongue without his intending their meaning.**

So beware of ignoring the intent and intention of the person who speaks, and his usage of terms, and therefore fall into transgressing against him and against the Legislation by attributing to it that which it is innocent and free of, and into obliging the one who swore, affirmed, stated a vow or an oath, to carry obligations that were not placed upon him by Allaah and His Messenger.

So the scholar having knowledge of human nature will say, "What you intended applies," whereas the 'half-scholar' will say, "What you said applies."

So saying things unintentionally is the same as actions done by mistake (al-khata'), and through forgetfulness (an-Nisyaan), and Allaah has taken away any accountability for either of these, so this is why when the Believers say: **O our Lord! Do not punish us if we act forgetfully or by mistake ...** (Soorah al-Baqarah (2):286), their Lord says: **"I have granted that."** End of his words.

How free is Allaah from imperfection... this is the creed of Imaam al-Albani embodied!

THE CREED OF IMAAM AL-ALBANI IS THAT OF SHAIKH IBN UTHAIMEEN

Shaikh Ibn Uthaimen stated, "And these preventive barriers are many, amongst them dhann (speculation) which is ignorance and amongst them ghalabah (which means being overcome by something).

So the man who said to his family, "When I die burn me and scatter my ashes in the sea because if Allaah grasps me He will punish me with a punishment that He has never inflicted upon anyone in the world". The apparent belief of this man is kufr and doubt in the power of Allaah. However, when Allaah brought him together [to his original form] and addressed Him, his reply was, "O my Lord, I feared You!" Or a wording similar to it. So he forgave him, and therefore, this act arose from this person unintentionally.

Similar to him is the person who was overcome by joy and took hold of his camel [which he had lost] and said, "O Allaah, You are my servant and I am your Lord", a statement of kufr. However, this person did not become a disbeliever on account of it, because he was overwhelmed and was overcome (by something he could not repel). On account of the severity of his joy he erred. He actually intended to say, "O Allaah, You are my Lord and I am Your servant", but he said, "O Allaah, You are my servant and I am your Lord".

The one who is compelled is compelled to kufr, so he says a statement of kufr or does an act of kufr, but he does not become a disbeliever from any textual [evidence] from the Qur'aan because he did not intend this act and did not choose it." Fitnah of Takfir (1st Edition, p. 96-97)

And this too, is the creed of Imaam al-Albani in the issue of making the judgement of takfir upon an individual, **in that it must be verified that a person intended the act, wilfully choosing it.**

THE CREED OF IMAAM AL-ALBANI IS THAT OF SHAIKH UL-ISLAAM IBN TAYMIYYAH

Shaikh ul-Islam stated, "And likewise, rejection (takdheeb) of the Messenger with the heart, hating him, having envy of him and showing arrogance towards following him, [all of these] compromise greater sin (ithm) than those acts which are devoid of these characteristics, such as fornication, drinking and stealing. **And as for what is kufr (disbelief) from the external acts, such as prostrating to an idol, reviling the Messenger and so on, then that is so because it necessitates internal disbelief (kufr al-baatin) [*]. And if it could occur that a person prostrated in the direction of an idol, but did not intend (lam yaqsud) to make prostration to it, but rather intended prostration to Allaah with his heart, then that would not be disbelief [**].** And this can sometimes be permissible if he is amongst the Mushriks, fearing for his soul from them and so he shows agreement to them in his outward action, but intends in his heart to prostrate to Allaah – as has been mentioned that some of the Ulamaa of the Muslims, and also some of the Ulamaa of the People of the Book did something similar to this with some pagan people when they called them to Islaam, and so they became Muslims at their hands without fleeing from them (i.e. from the Muslims) from the very beginning." (Majmoo al-Fataawaa 14/120).

[*] And this meaning is exactly the same meaning found in the statement of Imaam al-Albani quoted above from Fitnah of Takfir (p.72)

[**] And the **principle** contained in the example given here, namely, the verification of a person's qasd (intent) to commit that which is kufr (as opposed to being compelled, or due to reasons of fear and the likes) is the same as that which Imaam al-Albani holds in the issue of making takfir of an individual.

Shaikh al-'Ubaylaan: Is it possible for us to summarize and say that the conditions for takfeer are three and that the factors preventing takfeer are three: **The first condition is knowledge (al-'Ilm), and it is confronted by ignorance; its preventing factor is ignorance (al-jahl).**

Then acting by choice (al-Ikhtiyaar), and its preventing factor is being forced against ones will (al-Ikraah) and being compelled (al-jabr).

Then acting upon an interpretation (at-Ta'weel), and its preventing factor is that there is no (possible) interpretation. Meaning: If we did not open the door to excuse because of regard to matters which may be affected by interpretations, then we would have declared the Jahmiyyah to be Unbelievers; we would not have declared the Mu'tazilah to be Unbelievers: those who say: 'I do not know whether Allaah is above the Throne ('Arsh) or beneath the Throne', and the Salaf did no do that.

Shaikh al-Albaanee: This is correct.

Shaikh al-'Ubaylaan: The Salaf did not do that. Here, may Allaah keep you safe, I wish to read to you a quote from Shaikhul-Islam (Muhammad bin Abdul-Wahhaab), may Allaah's mercy be upon him.

Shaikh al-Albaanee: Rahimahullaah.

Shaikh al-'Ubaylaan: Quoted in the book of the noble Shaikh Saalih Ublood. The Shaikh said: "The Shaikh declared as Unbelievers those who are Unbelievers by consensus of the Muslim; they are the ones upon whom the proof has been established, and he did not declare as Unbelievers those upon whom the proof has not been established."

Shaikh al-Albaanee: Quite right.

Shaikh al-'Ubaylaan: To the point that the Shaikh said, may Allaah's mercy be upon him: "The first of the five pillars of Islaam is the two Shahaadahs, and the scholars are united in consensus that one who abandons them is an Unbeliever and must be fought. As for the four remaining (pillars), then if a person consents to them, but leaves them due to laziness, then the Shaikh said: Even though we fight him until he performs them, then we do not declare him to be an Unbeliever for having left them..."

Shaikh al-Albaanee: Maa shaa Allaah

Shaikh al-'Ubaylaan: "Because the scholars differ regarding the one who leaves them due to laziness, as long as he does not reject them."²¹

Shaikh al-Albaanee: Maa shaa Allaah.

Shaikh al-'Ubaylaan: Also there is another connected report, may Allaah keep you safe, which Shaikhul-Islam Ibn 'Abdul-Wahhaab related from Shaikhul-Islam Ibn Taimiyyah that he said: "When a few of the companions and the Taabi'een allowed drinking wine, such as Qudaamah and his companions, thinking

²¹ Durar as-Sunniyyah 1/70.

that it was lawful for those who do righteous deeds, based upon what they understood from an Aayah in Sooratul-Maaidah.

So the people of knowledge from the companions, such as Umar and 'Alee and others, agreed that repentance should be sought from them. Then if they persisted upon declaring it permissible they would become Unbelievers. But if they consent to its prohibition they should be lashed. So they did not initially declare them to be Unbelievers, because of their declaring it permissible, on account of the doubt they had. That was not to be done until the truth was made clear to them, and then if they had rejected that they would have become Unbelievers.

Therefore I used to say to the Jahmiyyah who denied that Allaah is above the Throne: 'If I agreed with you I would be an Unbeliever, but you, in my view are not Unbelievers because you are ignorant; and we know necessarily' ... these words now are perhaps those of Shaikhul-Islaam Ibn 'Abdul-Wahhaab... 'And we know necessarily that the Messenger, sallallahu 'alaihi wa sallam, did not legislate for his Ummah' ... or perhaps these are the words of Shaikhul-Islaam ... 'he did not legislate for his Ummah that they should invoke any living or dead person, not the Prophet, nor anyone besides them. Not in the name of seeking rescue, nor in the name of seeking refuge, nor for anything else. Just as he did not legislate that they should prostrate to a dead person, nor to any other person, and so on. Rather we know that he forbade all of that, and that these things are the shirk that Allaah and His Messenger forbade. **However because of the preponderance of ignorance, and paucity of knowledge of ..., amongst many of the later people, then they are not to be declared Unbelievers because of that until what the Messenger, sallallahu 'alaihi wa sallam, came with is made clear to them. Therefore I have never explained this matter'** ... of course this is the speech of Shaikhul-Islaam Muhammad ibn 'Abdul-Wahhaab ... **to those who know the fundamentals of Islaam except that they were pleased with it and said: "This is the foundation of the Religion of Islaam", and some of the elder Shaikhs who had knowledge from our companions said: This is the greatest affair that you have clarified to us.**"²²

Shaikh al-Albaanee: "May Allaah reward you with good. This is the speech of Shaikhul-Islaam for certain."

Shaikh al-'Ubaylaan: The speech of Shaikhul-Islaam, yes. Now here there are some words from Shaikhul-Islaam Muhammad ibn 'Abdul-Wahhaab (also), if you permit me, O Shaikh.

Shaikh al-Albaanee: Go ahead.

Shaikh al-'Ubaylaan: Concerning the accusation that he declares the Muslims to be Unbelievers, he said: "As for the lie and the false slanders, such as their saying that we declare the people in general to be Unbelievers, and that we declare it to be obligatory that they migrate to us, even those who can openly manifest their religion, and that we declare as Unbelievers those who do not declare others as Unbelievers and do not fight, and they claim the like of this, and much more"; and that he declares those against

²² **BENEFIT:** So in the view of the people of knowledge and excellence surrounding the Shaikh of Islaam, Muhammad bin Abdul-Wahhaab, this was **the greatest principle** that he had clarified for them. And indeed this matter can only be realised by the people of knowledge and excellence, due to Allaah having favoured them in knowledge and wisdom. As for the Qutubiyah, may Allaah sever them, then when this great principle is uttered by the Shaikh of Islaam of our times, Imaam al-Albani, then it is **the most repugnant principle** that he has ever clarified, in their view. And this claim only emanates from them due to Allaah's not favouring them with knowledge and wisdom, rather they have merely inherited the traits of Ahl ul-Bid'ah of old, and in their ignorance, wander blindly, without guidance and without light.

whom the proof has not been established are Unbelievers, and he said: “All of this is lies and false slanders which they use to prevent people from the religion of Allaah and His Messenger. **So when it is the case that we do not declare as Unbelievers those who worship the idol upon (the grave of) ‘Abdul-Qaadir’, perhaps he refers to what they build over the graves, “and when it is the case that we do not declare as Unbelievers those who worship the idol upon (the grave of) ‘Abdul-Qaadir, and the idol upon(the grave of) Ahmad al-Badawee and the like of them, because of their ignorance and the fact that there is no one to admonish them, then how can we declare as Unbelievers those who do not commit shirk with Allaah because of their not migrating to us, and their not declaring others to be Unbelievers and not fighting them. How free and far removed is Allaah from all imperfections, this is a serious lie.”**

Shaikh al-Albaanee: Subhaanallaah. **These are very great words, and I say: This is the truth, it is not hidden, so don’t expect me to follow the side roads.** We have said its like in many gatherings, and our brothers who are present know this. **But we find a new generation whose major concern is declaring the Muslim rulers to be Unbelievers, and then following on from that their subjects. They say about us that we declare the common people to be Unbelievers, but do not declare the rulers who judge by other than what Allaah sent down to be Unbelievers. So our verdict concerning judging by other than what Allaah sent down is well known, so there is no need to delve into that.** But my intention is to state that I do not declare as Unbelievers those common folk who perform tawaaf around the graves, due to predominance of ignorance²³. Rather I have said, and perhaps brother Abul-Hasan remembers this, I am surprised at some of the people of knowledge who say that there are no, ‘Ahlul-Fatrah’ (people who have not been reached by the truth) in existence today ... but I say ahlul-Fatrah exist, particularly in the lands of Unbelief, Europe and America, and so on. Indeed, I say a saying which I do not think other people will say today, I say: Ahlul-Fatrah exist among us, and by that I mean the ignorant people who are supported in their misguidance by others: in their supplicating for rescue to other than Allaah, their making vows to other than Allaah, their performing sacrifice for other than Allaah; and they call all of these acts of shirk tawassul’ (seeking a means of nearness to Allaah). Whereas tawassul, as you know, is of two kinds. So how can we declare those people to be Unbelievers

²³ In perfect agreement with the methodology of Shaikh ul-Islam Muhammad bin Abdul-Wahhaab. And it is perhaps because of clarifications such as these that the newly-arisen, foolish minded have set loose their tongues and reviled the Noble Imaam and declared him to be Murji and Jahmi – may Allaah free him from such ignorance, misguidance and scum. So they opined that the Noble Imaam does not consider these acts to be major kufr, showing their evil intent and poor understanding. Imaam al-Albani’s words revolve around the judgement of takfir and when it can be made and when it ought not to be made. And because he discussed this in detail and made his position clear and outlined some of the conditions for takfir in these instances – namely, having knowledge (of the ruling) and having wilfully chosen the act (or statement), intending it – then the Qutubiyah, and amongst them the students and followers of Salman al-Awdah, took this to mean that he does not consider these acts and statements to be the kufr that expels from the religion, and on account of this judged him to be guilty of Irjaa – and claimed that he performs takfir by way of istihlaal qalbi on.ly, a mighty and great slander indeed.

Shaikh Ibn Uthaimen was asked, “The questioner asks that some people say that Shaikh al-Albani – rahimahullaah – his position on the issues of Imaan is that of the Murji’ah. What is your view on this?” The Shaikh paused for a while, remaining silent and then replied, “...I say, just as one who has preceded has said: “Al-Albani is a scholar, a muhaddith, a jurist – even if he is greater in being a muhaddith than a jurist – and I do not know of any of his statements which indicate Irjaa, ever. **However, it is those who want to perform takfir of people, they are the ones who accuse him and those like him of being Murji’ah, and this action of theirs is by way of ascribing evil names [to him].** I testify for Shaikh al-Albani – may Allaah have mercy upon him – with uprightness, (istiqamah), a sound creed, and good intention...” Cassette: Questions from Qatar on the Issues of Imaan and the Accusation of Irjaa Against Imaam al-Albani, 25th Muharram 1421.

when the call of the Book and the Sunnah has not reached them. I mean those common folk, and some of the misguided from the elite. Whereas the others may be found in one land, but not in another.

Therefore these words which you have just read to me, greatly impress me, to the extent that I say what I said: that Ahlul-Fatrah exist among us today: praying along with us, fasting and performing Hajj, but they do not understand what they say when they bear witness that none has the right to be worshipped except Allaah, and that Muhammad is the Messenger of Allaah. **So the affair is just as you indicated in your words, and in what you read, that we must verify before anything else that the person speaking knows what he is saying, and means what he is saying. If either of these two is lacking, then it is not permissible for us to apply anything to him except correctional punishment.**

Then a few days ago a discussion occurred between myself and some brothers in refutation of those who hasten to declare the rulers to be Unbelievers, and – as they say with us, in Syria, altogether, meaning all of them. So some of those outside accuse us of ... [interrupted by a phone call] ...

What is intended is that we explained to the one with whom we were discussing the danger and seriousness of takfeer, and I indicated those who invent lies against us, just as they invented lies against Shaikh Muhammad ibn Abdul-Wahhaab and others, and we have a fine example to follow in the Prophets and Messengers, as is known from the Qur'aan. So I said: if we see a Muslim, one whom we know to be a Muslim, tread upon the Mushaf. Then no doubt this is an evil deed (munkar adheem)²⁴. However, it is not allowed for us to hasten to declare him to be an Unbeliever until we verify that firstly he did that intending disrespect to the Mushaf, and that he knew that the book which he was treading upon was the Noble Qur'aan. **So if he knew that it was the Noble Qur'aan and was intending disrespect to it, then his Kufr is the Unbelief of Apostacy.**²⁵

²⁴ And this does not mean that the Noble Imaam does not consider this act to be an act of major kufr, since describing it as a "great evil" does not exclude it from being major kufr. And what gives evidence to this is that in the very next sentence the Noble Shaikh said, "However, it is not allowed for us to hasten to declare him to be an Unbeliever...", and if in the view of the Shaikh, this act had not been an act of major kufr, he would not have uttered these words. And it is the likes of these kinds of doubts and misconceptions that the Qutubiyah – may Allaah sever them – have used in order to accuse the Shaikh with that which he is free of.

²⁵ And in these words – in addition to what is yet to come from his words - is a refutation of those who claim that the Noble Imaam performs takfir by way of Istihlaal Qalbi only. Imaam al-Albani also stated, **"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)"** Fitnah of Takfir (p. 72, 1st edition)

SHAIKH ALEE HASAN ON KUFR AND ISTIHLAAL-QALBI

And the students of the Noble Imaam have corroborated this matter as well. Shaikh Alee Hasan wrote, in response to some questions posed to him concerning his stance on the issues of Kufr:

"All praise is for Allaah, and may Allaah extol and send blessings of peace upon Allaah's Messenger, and upon his true followers, his Companions, and those who have love and allegiance to him. To proceed:

Then my brother Ismaa'eel al-'Umaree, may Allaah grant him correctness, showed me the text of some answers I had given to some questions relating to knowledge and 'aqeedah which a brother asked me.

Then just for clarification I would like to mention that I did not previously know al-Muwahhid who asked the questions. Rather one of the brothers having love for us connected me to him via the telephone (from his house) in Makkah al-Mukarramah, may Allaah grant him increase from His Bounty.

Then I was surprised to see the questions and the answers, in abridged form, on the Internet, carrying the name, 'al-Muwahhid.' However I was pleased from another angle because I, 'am also his brother 'al-Muwahhid.' This along with the fact that the aforementioned brother, may Allaah grant him increase in attainment of what is correct, had sought permission from me to put the answers on the Internet, even though he did not mention that title, and I did not ask him about it!!

So when I saw the abridgement of my answers I found that it was generally a good abridgement, so may Allaah reward the questioner with good!

However, it appeared to me that I should add a note to a word occurring in some of his questions, and it is his saying, "Why do we not say that a saying or an action is Kufr because of the fact that the authentic texts indicate that it is Kufr?"

So I say here: **because the Kufr that is a negation of eemaan from every angle includes the addition of a further clarification that requires awareness of the true reality of the text with regard to its clear indication of its being [either] this type of Kufr [which expels from Islaam] or that type [which does not expel from Islaam] ...**

Whereas if we were to say, 'This is Kufr because of the fact that the authentic texts indicate that it is Kufr', **then this (statement) will include different kinds and types of Kufr:** the Kufr of action and of speech which does not take a person outside the Religion and that about whose verdict the Imaams of the Sunnah differ, such as swearing by other than Allaah, fighting against a Muslim, going to soothsayers ..., and so on, **which are to be distinguished from that which is established to be Kufr, because of the fact that the authentic texts indicate that it is Kufr.**

So these affairs, even though they are Kufr, yet they are not from, 'the Kufr that is a negation of Eemaan from every single angle', which is in itself Major Kufr (al-Kufr al-Akbar).

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), wilful 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 this is the way in which the affair is to be determined, with the speech of the Imaams of knowledge, not with the deficient wordings with which people upon their deluded whims err, and which lead people off on flights of fancy ...

I say all of this, yet again, emphasising 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. **So whoever has understood something about us, different to this, then let him accuse himself before accusing us, and let him check his own understanding before slandering us, and in particular those who, 'are unable to ask pertinent questions and who do not understand the words'. And Allaah is the one who grants success to what is correct and straight.**

27th April 2000

However whilst there is the possibility that this book was not the Qur'aan, the Speech of Allaah, since it was possible that the book which he trod upon was not the Book of Allaah. **Then along with the other possibility, that it was the Book of Allaah, and that he intended to mock and revile it – then that is Apostacy**²⁶. But if he did that in a state of an explosion of rage, then he is not to be held accountable for that but rather he is to be confronted with what he has done²⁷.

Then I mention at the like of this place that I do not make any difference, regarding the result and outcome, between a person's taking the Mushaf and stepping upon it and between his throwing it to the ground. Both of the situations are such that we must make a difference for each of the two possibilities. Firstly that he knows that it is the Speech of Allaah, secondly that he intends disrespect and mockery of Allaah's Speech.

For otherwise we read in the Noble Qur'aan that the one to whom Allaah spoke, Moosaa, threw the Tablets upon the earth. So is this to be counted as Kufr, and Kufr of Apostacy?! Far from it! Rather he, because of his jealous zeal for Tawheed, when he saw that his people had worshipped the calf, his rage – out of jealousy and respect for Tawheed – was provoked, and what occurred occurred. However it did not occur due to his intending that. **So the intention (qasd) is the fundamental principle with regard to accountability and punishment. So if this intention is not present along with words, then it is not permissible to hasten the takfeer, but rather correctional punishment is to be applied.**

Shaikh al-'Ubaylaan: Perhaps this is a case which will further clarify what you have intended: we might see two men. Each of them tears up a mushaf, yet we apply one ruling to the first and a different ruling to the other. So the first tore it up in order to preserve its respect, so that it would not be degraded, so he receives his ruling, whereas we come to know that the other tore it intending disrespect.

Shaikh al-Albaanee: Fine. Actions are in accordance with their intentions. You have spoken well. There is no ability and no action except as Allaah wills.

Shaikh 'Alee Hasan: The words of Ibn al-Qayyim, perhaps our brother Aboo Haatim will add it to the tape ...

Shaikh al-'Ubaylaan: And also here are the words of Ibn al-Qayyim, indicating the same as the previous words of the Noble Shaikh al-'Allaamah Muhammad ibn Ibraaheem. Ibn al-Qayyim said, "And he was asked by al-Hajjaaj ibn al-'Ilaat, 'I have wealth and family in Makkah, and I want to go to them. Then can

²⁶ And this is an indication that Imaam al-Albani considers the act in this circumstance to be major disbelief that necessitates Apostacy, and this is a corroboration of the fact that Imaam al-Albani holds kufr to be in belief, statements and actions.

²⁷ **BENEFIT:** It is not always the case that presence of anger negates the presence of intention (qasd) and wilful choice (ikhtiyaar). For a person may wilfully choose and intend to utter a statement of major kufr, displaying anger alongside that, and his anger being a confirmation and corroboration of his intent (qasd). And this is a fine detail that ought to be pointed out and in light of which the necessity of establishing the proof (qaamat ul-hujjah) before making the judgement of takfir is known. For it is not known with certainty, in the presence of anger, whether a person actually intended what he said, wilfully chose to say it, showing anger and ferocity in all of that, or whether he was overcome by anger and could not control himself and uttered that which is kufr. If a person persists upon his revilement and does not repent after he is called to do so, then this is an indication that his anger was not a preventative barrier, that he intended what he did or said and hence he is an apostate who is to be executed.

allowance be granted to me to say anything against you, or to say anything?' So Allaah's Messenger allowed him to say whatever he wanted."²⁸ Reported by Ahmad ... **So it contains a proof that speech, if the person who said it does not intend its meaning, either because of his not desiring that, or because of his not knowing it, or that he intended other than its meaning, then he cannot be held responsible for something which he did not intend by his speech.**

This is the Religion of Allaah, with which He sent His Messenger. Therefore the one who is forced to say a word of Unbelief does not have that imposed upon him. Likewise one whose intellect passes away through insanity, sleep or intoxication does not have the consequence of what he has said imposed upon him.

And he did not impose upon al-Hajjaaj ibn 'Ilaat the consequent ruling for what he said because he desired something other than its meaning, and it was not something which he held in his heart.²⁹ And Allaah, the Most High, said:

Allaah will not punish you and hold you accountable for unintentional oaths, but he will hold you accountable for deliberate oaths.

Soorah al-Maa'idah (5):89

And in the other aayah:

But He will hold you accountable for what your hearts have earned.

Soorah al-Baqarah (2):225

So the rulings in this world and the Hereafter **apply to what the heart earns, and intentionally does, and what the person intends (yaqsud) by his speech.**" End of Ibn al-Qayyim's words.³⁰

Shaikh al-Albaanee: may Allaah grant you safety and well-being, may Allaah reward you with good. How fine is what Allaah has willed ...

The words of the scholars, to them applies the saying, "The finest speech is that which enters the ear without permission." May Allaah reward you with good.

²⁸ This is in reference to the Companion who wanted to see his family in Makkah but feared the persecution of the pagans. Hence, he asked permission to say things in criticism, revilement and objection to the Messenger (sallallaahu alaihi wasallam) and he was granted that.

²⁹ And this is the meaning that Imaam al-Albaanee has clarified and one that the Qutubiyah could not understand or they pretended not to understand, may Allaah sever them. And perhaps they might also have the courage and boldness of accusing Ibn al-Qayyim of also having the Irjaa' of Jahm Ibn Safwaan?

³⁰ I'laam (4/403). And will the Qutubiyah, Khawarij of the Era, after all this, accuse Ibn al-Qayyim of being Murji' and Jahmi in his aqidah?!

AN EXPLANATION OF THE DECEPTION OF THE QUTUBIYYAH

The Qutubiyah— may Allaah sever them — showed the true depths of their evil and ignorance and began to quote from the words of the Ulamaa of the Salaf, those which have no direct bearing on the view of Imaam al-Albani — which they had misunderstood —, in order to refute him and to accuse him with the Irjaa' of Jahm Ibn Safwaan.

Yet what is truly amazing is that the Qutubiyah go to such great lengths to hide the great calamities and errors of Sayyid Qutb and detest that they be pointed out and that he be refuted - **rather they consider any such negative talk about him to be greater and more serious than negative talk about the Prophets of Allaah and the Companions of Allaah's Messenger** - since their display of rage and fury to those who criticize him and refute him is one that is not observed from them when the Prophets are mocked and Companions of the Prophets are reviled and cursed and declared to be conniving and treacherous, and some of them to be disbelievers, and from Allaah is the refuge from such misguidance and filthy and repugnant hizbiyyah.

So how keen they are to defend their sayyid, and how incessant they are in ascribing misguidance and innovation to the Imaam of the Sunnah and Destroyer of Innovation, Imaam al-Albani — rahimahullaah, on account of mere lies and fabrications, evil suspicions and manners and paucity of understanding.

And to illustrate the deception of the Qutubiyah, we say:

- They quoted the statement of Ibn Jareer at-Tabaree, in tafsir of the verse: “Say (O Muhammad): ‘Shall We tell you the greatest losers in respect of (their) deeds? Those whose efforts have been wasted in this life while they thought that they were acquiring good by their deeds!’” (Al-Kahf 18:103-104) in which there occurs, “... and this is one of the most clear of evidences for the error of the one who claimed that a person cannot become a disbeliever in Allaah unless he actually intends (yaqsuda) to commit disbelief, after his knowledge of the Tawheed (Wahdaaniyyah) of Allaah...”³¹

And we have already established that what is meant by intent (qasd) is not to intend kufr in one's heart and the desire to exit the religion, but the intent to perform the act (which entails kufr) or to utter the statement (which necessitates kufr). And this meaning exists in the words of Shaikh Ibn Ibraaheem and those of the Permanent Committee quoted above and likewise in the clarification of Imaam al-Albani himself. And Imaam al-Albani's use of the phrase “to intend kufr” **means to intend the statement or the act which is kufr or to intend mockery of the religion with a statement (that can have more than one intended meaning), or to intend disrespect to the Qur'an by the act of tearing it up (which can have more than one plausible motive behind it)**. So when Imaam al-Albani used the phrase “to intend kufr” then this is in reference to an act or statement which comprises and entails kufr. The Imaam does not hold that even though a person willfully committed an act of major kufr, not being compelled but actually intending to commit the act of kufr or to utter the statement of kufr — that unless he had the desire (qasd) to exit the religion in his heart, then he cannot be declared a disbeliever and that this act is not major kufr. The Noble Imaam - as is clearly evident in what has preceded - does not intend

³¹ Jaami' ul-Bayaan (16/28)

this meaning. But the People of Bid'ah and Qutubiyah ascribed to the Imaam's words that which he is free from and understood this meaning from his words.

- They quoted the statement of Shaikh ul-Islam Ibn Taymiyyah, "...and it is for this reason that the philosophers amongst them such as Jahm and whoever agreed with him, they made this as a binding requirement and said, 'If he committed one of the external acts (of kufr) he still would not be a disbeliever internally, but it would merely be an indicator (daleelan) of disbelief in order for the rulings of the world (i.e. the punishments) to take effect.'"³²

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 Qur'an. 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)**³³. **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)**"³⁴, is itself a refutation and demolition of the views of Jahm and his likes, those about whom Shaikh ul-Islam is speaking about in his words quoted above. **For these words of Imaam al-Albani establish that the one guilty of this act is a disbeliever both internally and externally, without requiring istihlaal or takdheeb and the likes.**³⁵

- They quoted statement of Shaikh ul-Islam Ibn Taymiyyah, "And in essence, whoever says or commits that which is disbelief, kufr, disbelieves on account of it, even if he did not desire (lam yaqsud) to become a disbeliever (by the act), since no one desires disbelief except as Allaah wills."³⁶

³² Majmoo al-Fataawaa (7/250)

³³ And this is statement is the exact replica of the various statements of Shaikh ul-Islam Ibn Taymiyyah such as, "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).

³⁴ Fitnah of Takfir (p.72, 1st edition)

³⁵ And this statement of Imaam al-Albani is parallel to the refutation of the Jahmiyyah contained in the statements of Shaikh ul-Islam such as, "So those who speak with the view of Jahm and as-Saalihee have made it clear that reviling Allaah and His Messenger and saying that Allaah is one of three (i.e. the Trinity) **and every other statement of disbelief is not internal disbelief,**[*] but it is in reality an outward indication of disbelief and despite this it is possible for this one who reviled to be one who acknowledges Allaah, unifying (his belief and worship) for Him and a believer in Him internally. So when the proof is established against them, either by way of textual evidence or a consensus on this issue, they reply, "This means that such acts necessitate internal rejection, takdheeb."

[*] So where is this compared to the creed of Imaam al-Albani and compared to his words quoted previously O you deceiving, lying, surmising, treacherous Qutubis?!

³⁶ As-Saarim al-Maslool (p.178)

- They also quoted the statement of Ibn Hajar said, “Amongst the Muslims are those who exit the religion without desiring (qasd) to leave the religion and without choosing a religion other than that of Islaam”.³⁷

We have already explained that what is meant by the issue of intent or desire, qasd, as a barrier to the performance of takfir, is that the person desires and intends to commit the act (which is what necessitates kufr), not that he desires to commit kufr in his heart and leave the religion thereby. So again, O Innovators, die in your rage...

- They quoted the statement of Shaikh ul-Islaam Ibn Taymiyyah, “So those who speak with the view of Jahm and as-Saalihee have made it clear that reviling Allaah and His Messenger and saying that Allaah is one of three (i.e. the Trinity) and every other statement of disbelief is not internal disbelief, but it is in reality an outward indication of disbelief and despite this it is possible for this one who reviled to be one who acknowledges Allaah, unifying (his belief and worship) for Him and a believer in Him internally. So when the proof is established against them, either by way of textual evidence or a consensus on this issue, they reply, “This means that such acts necessitate internal rejection, takdheeb.”³⁸

And Imaam al-Albani is free from such falsehood like the freedom of the lion from the blood of Yusuf (alaihis salaam), as has preceded in this discourse.

- They quoted the words of Shaikh ul-Islaam Ibn Taymiyyah in explanation of the verse in Surah Nahl, “Whoever disbelieved in Allâh after his belief, except him who is compelled 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. (An-Nahl 16:106)” where he stated, “And it is known that he did not intend by the disbelief mentioned here, the disbelief that relates to belief (I’tiqad) of the heart only, because a man cannot be compelled with respect to this. And He excepted the one who is compelled (to disbelief) **but did not mean the one who uttered (disbelief) and believed in it**, because he excepted the one who is compelled. **So such a one is not compelled with respect to his intent (qasd)³⁹ and speech**

³⁷ Fath ul-Baree (12/373)

³⁸ Majmoo Fataawaa (7/557)

³⁹ And this particular phrase destroys the claims of the Qutubiyyah, since it affirms the creed of Imaam al-Albani. A person cannot be compelled with respect to his qasd (intent, desire). So when an act or statement of kufr occurs from him – and he was compelled in that – then the qasd (desire) for the act is non-existent and hence he is excused. In light of this, it is necessary that when an act or statement of kufr occurs, that a part of ensuring the conditions for takfir are present we verify that a person desired the act, wilfully, not being forced in all of that.

To make this matter clear – in light of the verse that Shaikh ul-Islaam Ibn Taymiyyah discusses in the above quote (16:106) we say:

Shaikh Khalid al-Anbari said, in reply to the claim of the one who claims that no-one can become a disbeliever unless he desires (yaqsud) kufr (i.e. desires to leave the religion), “This is an erroneous saying and it opposes the belief of Ahl us-Sunnah. What is necessitated from this the absence of the takfir of Iblees, the Accursed, for he did not intend kufr, and it would also necessitate the absence of the takfir of those who mocked (the Companions) since they did not intend kufr, rather they intended mockery as a means to put an end to the hardships of journey.

And this statement emanates from a faulty understanding of His, the Most High’s saying, “Whoever disbelieves in Allaah after having had faith, except for the one who is compelled but his heart is secure in faith. However the one who opens up his chest to disbelief...” **then its correct meaning is ‘the one who opens up his chest to disbelief**

(together), rather he is compelled with respect to his speech only. Hence, it is known that He intended the one who uttered a statement of disbelief and upon such a one would be the anger of Allaah and he would have a tormenting punishment. He would become a disbeliever on account of this, except the one who is compelled while his heart is secure in faith... **However, the one who opens up his breast to disbelief amongst those who are compelled, then he is a disbeliever as well.** Hence, the one who uttered disbelief becomes a disbeliever except the one who was compelled and uttered a word of disbelief with his tongue while his heart is secure in faith. And Allaah the Most High said concerning those the mockers, “Make no excuse; you have disbelieved after you had believed. (At-Tawbah 9:66)”, so He explained that they are disbelievers on account of a statement (that they uttered) **despite the fact that they did not have belief in its correctness.**⁴⁰ And this is a vast topic in itself.”⁴¹ End of Shaikh ul-Islam’s words.

So the Innovators who quoted this in order to accuse Imaam al-Albani of being a Jahmi² did not realise that this statement of Shaikh ul-Islaam is in perfect agreement with what the Noble Imaam has chosen as his methodology. For, whoever utters a statement of disbelief, having desired (qasd) to make the statement, or who utters a statement, having desired (qasd) mockery by it, then such a one is an apostate.

from amongst those who are compelled to disbelief and its meaning is not that the one who disbelieves [i.e. performs an act of major kufr] out of choice does not become a disbeliever except when he opens up his chest to disbelief. And if this is not the case then the first part of the verse contradicts the latter part of the verse.” (Meeting with al-Saaha al-Arabiyyah, 8th September 2000)

Hence, the context and import of the verse in Surah Nahl is that when a person utters a statement of kufr or commits an act of kufr under compulsion (i.e. due to a threat to his life or personal safety and the likes) then he is expelled since he did not desire to commit the act of kufr and nor to utter a statement of disbelief. Hence he does not disbeliever. However, if in this situation, when he is under compulsion, he then wilfully chooses the act or statement of kufr, his heart being in agreement with his action, being satisfied with its performance, agreeing with it and to it – having opened his chest to disbelief, under compulsion – then such a one is a disbeliever, since – although it is not possible for him to be compelled with respect to his qasd (desire), he has nevertheless chosen it himself and has desired (qasada) the act or statement of kufr.

And in all of this there is no proof for the Qutubiyyah at all – and all praise is due to Allaah who aligned Ahl us-Sunnah with the Inheritors of the Prophets and made Ahl us-Sunnah far removed from the Qutubiyyah whom He has aligned with the Slanderers and Mockers of the Prophets.

⁴⁰ And having belief in the correctness of a statement of disbelief is not a required condition for someone to have fallen into major kufr and be declared a disbeliever. Rather the mere intent to say the words and intend the meaning is sufficient. Such as when one mocks the religion for example. A person might use some words, intending mockery by them, but he might not believe that these words are true, rather he merely used them to achieve his purpose of mocking the religion. In this case, although he did not believe in the correctness of his words, he is still a disbeliever. Therefore, believing in the correctness of a statement of disbelief or mockery is not necessarily required for kufr to have occurred. And we have explained this matter in detail in Article **GSC050005** at SalafiPublications.Com, so refer to it. Refer also to our other articles related to this topic, **GSC050004** and **GSC050006**

⁴¹ As-Saarim al-Maslool (p.524)

⁴² Said one of them – may Allaah cause him ruin and loss, or otherwise guide him – “The Jahmiyyah of our times have further added that the external actions (of disbelief) are not indicative of disbelief, neither in this world nor in the Hereafter, so long as the person does not intend (qasada) the disbelief of the heart”!! May Allaah bring this ignominy of innovation to account, for this is a mighty fabrication and a colossal slander, and his purpose behind all of this was to impute the view of Jahm Ibn Safwaan to Imaam al-Albani, and this is but takfeer and tabdee’ of Imaam al-Albani!

And in such a case, a person leaves Islam without having intended to leave Islaam or having desired disbelief of the heart.⁴³

There are many other statements from the Ulamaa of the Salaf that the Innovators have used, all of them similar to what we have quoted above – all in order to refute the methodology of Imaam al-Albani and to draw parallels between him and Jahm Ibn Safwaan. But as we have explained before, the methodology of Ahl ul-Bid'ah is to ascribe to the Salafis beliefs and views that they are free of ⁴⁴, and then proceed to refute them. And this is what they have done with the accusation of Irjaa'.

⁴³ Shaikh Saleem al-Hilaalee was asked about the issue of qasd, intent (as a condition for takfir of an individual) and what is meant by it. Whether he means by it that a person's intent (qasd) is to commit kufr or whether his intent (qasd) is the action. So he replied that it **means that a person actually intends the action itself and not that he intends kufr, because the worshippers of the cow do not say that their intent is to commit kufr by worshipping it.** The Shaikh made this clarification (on 17th May 2000), commenting upon the words of Shaikh Alee Hasan al-Halabi (quoted above) in his comments upon a discussion he had with someone over the phone and which was subsequently placed on the Internet.

So here the Shaikh has falsified the claims of the Innovators that the students of Imaam al-Albani only perform takfir of person when he actually intends (qasada) to commit kufr when doing an act of kufr. And this is utter falsehood and is the madhhab of the straying Murji'ah and the Salafis are free from it. So there is nothing for the Qutubiyah, only lies, distortion, deception and machinations...

⁴⁴ Shaikh Ali Hasan said, after affirming the position of the Salaf that kufr is by beliefs, statements and actions, "I say all of this – once again – affirming that which has been our belief for many years – **and this is the exact same belief that we have taken from our Shaikh (al-Albani) (rahimahullaah) and from this brothers amongst the Ulamaa.** So whoever understood about us, or from us anything other than this, then let him accuse his own soul before suspecting us, and let him investigate his own understanding before making fun of us – and especially those who do not ask questions in a forthright and sincere manner and who do not understand our words" (Last week of April 2000, quoted directly from Ismaa'eel al-Umree from the handwriting of Shaikh Ali Hasan)

A CHALLENGE TO THE PEOPLE OF BIDAH AND QUTUBIYYAH

We grant the Qutubiyyah a respite of 70 years to pronounce with the might of their tongues and to write, spread and distribute the saying that their sayyid, Sayyid Qutb fell into kufr akbar when he reviled and mocked the Prophet of Allaah, Moosa alaihis-salaam⁴⁵. And that he exited from the religion by these words of these and **that it is not necessary to look at whether he intended (qasada) mockery by these words of his or whether he desired (qasada) to utter the words in the first place or whether his overflowing imagination and sentiments led him to make statements the meanings of which he did not really intend.**

And we request them, to include in their judgement, the various statements of the Ulamaa that they used in order to ascribe the Irjaa of Jahm Ibn Safwaan to Imaam al-Albani, to strengthen their judgement and to validate it with these very statements and that they illustrate that looking at a person's intent (qasd) is from the ways of the Extreme Murji'ah and that they, the Qutubiyyah, are free from it.

And if they refuse to show consistency in their own principles and teachings then we have a greater right to call them Extremist Murji'ah for failing to pass a judgement of takfir of one who, in their view and understanding, would be deserving of it...

Likewise, we grant them respite for another 70 years to perform takfir of Sayyid Qutb due to his other statements of apostasy such as calling for the abolition of parts of the Islamic Sharee'ah such as slavery⁴⁶

⁴⁵ In a lesson with Shaikh Ibn Baaz some parts of the book of Sayyid Qutb 'at-Tasweer al-Fanee fil-Qur'aan' were read to him such as his speech about Moosaa - 'alaihis-Salaam - upon whom he said: "Let us take Moosaa - as the example of the leader of excitable nature - and this excitable impulse quickly passes away and he regains his composure, as is the case with the excitable folk." Then he said with regard to the Saying of Allah - the Most High - "Fa as-ba-hu fil madinati kha bi fan..." :- "This is the description of a well known state: the restlessness or fear of one expecting evil at every turn - and this is the characteristic of the excitable folk." ['at-Tasweer al-Fanee fil-Qur'aan': p.200,201,203. 13th]

So the Shaikh replied to this: "**Mockery of the Prophets is apostasy in its own.**" And it was said to him that Shaikh Rabee' al-Madkhalee has written a refutation of Sayyid Qutb, so the Shaikh said: "Rebuttal of him is good." (During a lesson of Shaikh 'Abdul - 'Azeez ibn Baaz - hafizahullaah - in his house in ar-Riyaadh: 1413H, Minhaajus-Sunnah tapes of ar-Riyaadh)

⁴⁶ Sayyid Qutb said concerning slavery, "And concerning the slaves, that was when slavery was a world-wide structure and which was conducted amongst the Muslims and their enemies in the form of enslaving of prisoners of war. And it was necessary for Islam to adopt a similar line of practise until the world devised a new code of practise, other than enslavement." [in 'az-Zilal', Surah Tawbah (3/1669), found also in tafsir of Surah Baqarah (/230), tafsir of Surah Mu'minoon (4/2455), tafsir of Surah Muhammad (6/3285)]

Shaikh Salih al-Fawzaan said, "**These words are falsehood and (constitute) deviation (ilhaad) - and refuge is from Allaah. This is deviation and a false accusation against Islaam.** And if it had not been for the excuse of ignorance [because] we excuse them on account of (their) ignorance, so we do not say that they are Unbelievers because they are ignorant and are blind followers who have merely quoted this saying without reflecting upon it, hence we excuse them on account of ignorance. **Otherwise, these statements are very dangerous and if a person said them deliberately he would become apostate and leave Islaam... So these words are falsehood and whoever says them deliberately then he is an Unbeliever.**" Refer to "Tazkiyaat Ahl ul-Bid'ah" of Isaam bin Abdullaah as-Sinaanee.

and also his statements in which he claims Islaam is shaped and moulded from Communism and Christianity and that it has the same goals and objectives as them both⁴⁷.

So we ask this stray sect, behave with your Sayyid and Imaam as you behaved with one of our Imaams, the Muhaddith and Faqeeh, Nasir ud-Deen al-Albani – if you are truthful, and label your Sayyid and Imaam with evil titles as you labelled our Imaam with evil titles, if you are truthful, and reject the repugnant writings and books of your Imaam (those filled with deviation, misguidance and heresy), as you rejected the writings of our Imaam, if you are upon guidance and speak the truth. **And proclaim all of this in front of the whole of creation and display it openly, as you have made an open display of your accusation against our Imaam, if you speak the truth and only desire rectification of the affairs.**

But by Allaah, my dear brother and sister Muslim, except from a very few of them whom Allaah has favoured, you will not see this from them, and you will never see this from them!!

⁴⁷ Shaikh Hammaad al-Ansari – rahimahullaah - was asked about the statement of Sayyid Qutb, “And it is necessary for Islaam to judge, since it is a unique, constructive and positivist aqidah which has been moulded and shaped from Christianity and Communism together, in the most perfect of ways and which comprises all of their (i.e Christianity and Communism’s) objectives and adds in addition to them harmony, balance and justice.” (Ma’arakat ar-Ra’samaaliyyah wal-Islaam).

The Shaikh replied, **“If the one who said these words was alive, then his repentance should be sought, so if he repents (then so) otherwise he is to be killed as an apostate. And if he has died then it is obligatory to explain that these words are falsehood. However we do not perform takfir of him since we have not established the proof against him.”**

From the book of Shaikh Rabee’ ‘al-Awaasim Mimmaa Fee Kutub Sayyid Qutub Minal-Qawaasim’ (p. 24) and who read it out to Shaikh Hammaad himself on the night of 3/1/1415 in order to corroborate it.

SUMMARY

It is evident that Imaam al-Albani considers that kufr can occur by way of actions and statements, in addition to beliefs and conditions of the heart, in agreement with all of Ahl us-Sunnah and in agreement with the other Salafi Imaams and Mashayikh of our times such as Imaam Ibn Baz, Shaikh Muhammad Ibn Ibraaheem, Shaikh Ibn Uthaimen and others. Likewise he considers that kufr can occur without istihlal of the heart.

Further, the Noble Imaam has taken the path of the Salaf in his position on the takfir of one who falls into any of these acts of major kufr or utters that which is major kufr and so he explained – may Allaah have mercy upon him – that apostasy occurs and takfir is performed when one intends to commit the act, wilfully choosing it, not being forced or compelled – and in this area of takfir he has taken the path of the Imaams before him, the likes of Ibn al-Qayyim, Shaikh Muhammad bin Abdul-Wahhaab, Shaikh Muhammad Ibn Ibraaheem and likewise his position is in agreement with the verdicts issued by the Committee of Major Scholars of Saudi Arabia. Likewise, he took into consideration the predominance of ignorance as being a preventative barrier to those who fall into some of the major acts of disbelief, following in that the way and methodology of Shaikh Muhammad bin Abdul-Wahhab.

However, the Qutubiyah confused the affair and focused on the general ruling (upon the acts of apostasy) and kept referring the discussion as to whether these actions constitute the kufr that expels from the religion or not. Yet, the context of the discussion is with respect to making an actual ruling of takfir upon a specific individual. And because the Qutubiyah either misunderstood, or had a perversion in their hearts, they thought that Imaam al-Albani reduced these actions from major disbelief to minor disbelief, and thought that he claims that the one who reviles the religion or abuses the Messenger (ﷺ) cannot become a disbeliever by these acts, unless he intends disbelief of the heart by them (i.e. the desire to exit the religion). And this is a great slander and a mighty fabrication.

But as for when this act actually occurs and we hear about someone that he reviled the religion or the Messenger (ﷺ), is he declared an apostate and beheaded immediately? Or is he declared an apostate and asked to repent and renew his Islaam, and if he refuses, then he is killed? Meaning, that the hujjah is established against him (in that he actually intended what he said and then persists upon that) prior to killing him. And is it verified that he actually intended what he said, given the fact that it may have occurred from him as an error, or due to severe anger or heedlessness and the likes, without actually intending the meaning of what he uttered?

So the Qutubiyah were ignorant or feigned ignorance of the distinction between passing judgement upon an act (that it is kufr) and passing judgement upon a person who commits an act of kufr (that he is an Unbeliever) and this is where their deception lies in their treatment of the position of the Imaam of Ahl al-Hadeeth of our times, Imaam al-Albani.⁴⁸

⁴⁸ THE AFFAIR DOES NOT EXCEED THE VIEW OF SHAIKH IBN UTHAIMEEN EITHER

There occurs in Liqaa ul-Baab al-Maftooh (V36. No 1020) of Shaikh Ibn Uthaimen:

Question: O Shaikh, may Allaah preserve you and take care of you – what is the meaning of the statement of Shaikh ul-Islaam Ibn Taymiyyah, "Takfir of a specific individual requires specific evidence (takfir ul-mu'ayyan yahtaju ila dalil mu'ayyan)"?

For Imaam al-Albani's statements and clarifications on this topic revolve around the actual judgement of takfir, its required conditions and preventative barriers, and not whether actions such as mocking the religion, dishonouring the quran and others constitute disbelief or not. So when Imaam al-Albani spoke in this regard (as had the likes of Shaikh Muhammad bin Abdul-Wahhaab before him, and likewise Shaikh Muhammad bin Ibraaheem before him), then the Qutubiyah pounced upon these words and claimed that the Noble Imaam does not consider that a person can become a disbeliever by these actions in absolute terms. And from Allaah is the refuge from such evil and suspicion.

Answer: You know, may Allaah bless you, that the (Shari'ah) rulings are sometimes associated with a description (wasf) and sometimes associated with an individual. For example we say, 'Every believer is from the people of Paradise'. This is a general statement which is associated with a description, every believer is in Paradise and every disbeliever is in the Fire. However, do we say in the case of a specific individual, so and so is from Paradise? Do you say about this specific individual, so and so is from the people of Fire?

Hence, there is a difference between that which is associated with a description and that which is associated with an individual. **When a person utters a statement of disbelief or commits an act of kufr, then we do not declare him to be a disbeliever until we look at what motivated him to do that.**

Then, we behave with him (i.e. pass a ruling over him) based upon what his (specific) situation demands.

A man is compelled to prostrate to an idol, so he prostrates. And another is compelled to utter a statement of kufr, so he says it. Have both of these men disbelieved? No. Because Allaah has said, **Whoever disbelieved in Allāh 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 Allāh, and theirs will be a great torment. [Nahl 16:106]**

So His statement "**Whoever disbelieves in Allaah after having faith**" is inclusive of the one who disbelieves by words or deeds. So this man who prostrated to an idol under compulsion and the man who uttered a statement of disbelief under compulsion, is his action one of kufr or not? Yes, his action is one of kufr. But is he a kafir? No. This is because, there exists a preventative barrier that restrains from takfir, and that is compulsion.

And then [there is the case of] the man who exceeded in transgression against his own soul and who said to his family, 'When I die, burn me and scatter my ashes into the sea'. He did this thinking that he will be saved from the punishment of Allaah by it. Then his family did what he had ordered them. And Allaah – the Mighty and Majestic – gathered his ashes together and brought him back and asked him 'Why did you do it?' He replied, 'My Lord, I feared Your punishment'. And so Allaah forgave him. [Bukhari, Kitab ut-Tawhid].

The act of this man is one of kufr, why? Because he doubted in the power of Allaah, and doubted that Allaah is able to bring him together again and punish him. However, since the reason behind this act of his was his fear of the punishment of Allaah – the Mighty and Majestic – Allaah forgave him.

Hence, the meaning of the words of Shaikh ul-Islam – may Allaah have mercy upon him – it is said: the disbelief that is associated with a description, then judgement can be made by it in all circumstances, [such as] whoever disbelieves in Allaah will be in the Fire, whoever prostrates to an idol is a disbeliever, whoever says that there is another deity alongside Allaah is a disbeliever [and so on]. **However, with respect to a specific individual, you must not make a judgement against him until you investigate; he could be ignorant and not know, or he could have made an interpretation (ta'wil) [that is incorrect], or there could be a situation in which he was made to utter words without actually intending them.**

The Prophet – may the prayers and peace be upon him – informed us that Allaah rejoices more with the repentance of his servant than [the rejoicing of] a man who has lost his camel in the desert, seeking to find it but to no avail, so he despairs of finding it again. Then he rests under a tree and awaits death. And then he finds that the camel is tied to the tree by its reins, so he takes it by the reins and says out of extreme joy, 'O Allaah you are my servant and I am your Lord.' [Muslim]. **This word here is a word of kufr since he claimed Lordship (rububiyyah) for himself and claimed Allaah is a servant. However, he did not actually intend this (laa yaqsud haadhaa), but he was made to err on account of his great excitement and joy, and as the Prophet – may prayers and peace be upon him – said, 'Allaah will not take him to account'.**

In light of what has been mentioned above, the evil of ignorance, misguidance and scum prevalent in the current times - the evil that necessitates that the Noble Imaam is Murji and Jahmi in his aqidah in that he does not perform takfir by the acts of apostasy and does not consider the acts of apostasy to be as such - is one that has been adopted by those infested with the takfir of the rulers and whose sole concern is pointing fingers at the rulers and making them the scapegoat for all of the Ummah's trials and tribulations, since it supports their madhhab and causes the unsuspecting and ignorant to lose trust in the Imaams of Ahl us-Sunnah and instead to gain trust in them, the activists – the very ones who wallowed in the methodology of the Khawarij and performed takfir on account of sins⁴⁹. And this practice of theirs is not

⁴⁹ As Salman al-Awdah states (about those artists who promote their music and singing by distribution of cassettes), **"I am at perfect ease (of conviction) that the one who does this, the least that can be said about him is that he belittles sin. And there is no doubt that belittling sin – especially when it is a major sin and its unlawfulness is agreed upon – is disbelief (kufr) in Allaah. So there is no doubt concerning the likes of these people that this act of theirs is apostasy from Islaam. I say this and my heart is tranquil and at perfect ease with it"** [Cassette: Ash-Shabaab, As'ilah wa Mushkilaat]

So note how he introduces into the readers mind that this act is a belittlement of sin, and then labels that as being kufr in Allaah absolutely, and then completes the affair by then saying that therefore this act is apostasy. And he was resolute upon that and boldly stated that his heart was at perfect ease in making this judgement upon what is a sin. And he is preaching this to an audience of youth who are captivated by him...

Shaikh Salih al-Fawzan was asked (in relation to the murmurings of this Takfiri), "Is the one who beautifies evil and lewd acts (faahishah) to the people to be declared a disbeliever? He replied, **"Only those who call to kufr, disbelief, are to be declared disbelievers. As for when they call people to sins which do not reach the level of kufr, or shirk, then they are not to be declared disbelievers, however they are sinful on account of this.** He (sallallahu alaihi wasallam) said, "Whoever called to guidance will have the reward of all of those who followed him without there being any decrease in the reward of those who followed him. And whoever calls to misguidance will carry the sin of all those who followed him in that, without there being any decrease in the sin of those who followed him." [Muslim (2674), Abu Dawud (4609)]. Refer to al-Ajwibah al-Mufidah.

And yet another one, Nasir al-Umar says, ascribing to more than a million people, whom he has never met, sat with, or advised, that they have declared usury to be lawful with their hearts – and this is but takfir of every single one of them on account of a major sin: **"The imagination that the evils present in our society are just sins? Many people now imagine that [involvement with] usury is only a sin or a major sin, and that intoxicants and drugs are merely sins, that bribery is a sin or one of the major sins. ... No my brothers! I have investigated this matter and it has become clear to me now that many of the people in our society have declared usury to be lawful – and refuge is from Allaah!! Do you know that in the usurious banks in our country there are more than a million people. Allaah is over you. Do all of those millions know that usury is unlawful and that they have only committed this act while it is just a sin? No, by Allaah!! Due to the spread and abundance of sin, the great danger present is that many have declared lawful (istahalloo) these major sins – and refuge is with Allaah"** [Cassette: Taweed Awwalan].

So the likes of these activists – weak in their aqidah and their manhaj - portrayed to the people that these major sins were committed only due to istihlaal, and they left no room for it to be otherwise, justifying the performance of takfir on the act alone. In fact, one of them (al-Awdah) made it abundantly clear, he said in his cassette "Jalsah ala ar-Rasif" about the singer who openly commits fisq: "Allaah will not forgive him! Unless he repents, because the Prophet (sallallahu alaihi wasallam) ruled that he will not be forgiven [saying] 'All of my Ummah will be forgiven' ...! **This is because they are apostates [murtaddoon] due to this act of theirs!!... This is apostasy from Islam!! This one will abide eternally in the fire** – and refuge is with Allaah -, unless he repents!! Why? This is because they do not believe in the saying of Allaah, the Mighty and Majestic, "And do not come near to zina (fornication or adultery), verily it is an obscenity and an evil way indeed" Allaah is watchful over you! The one who acknowledges that zina is unlawful and an obscenity and which angers Allaah, would he then boast (about his sin) in front of the people?! In front of millions, or many thousands of people?! ... A believer would never do this!..."

And when the Salafi Mashayikh, stood to discipline these fresh and reckless newcomers and to expose their affectations with the madhhab of the Khawarij, they but showed silence and deafness and dumbness, unable to respond, and then displaying great cowardice, began to label those who refuted them as Jaamiyyah. And if Allaah

unfamiliar to the practice of the Ahl ul-Bid'ah of old and of every age and era, those who accuse Ahl us-Sunnah with evil and ascribe to them evil names and appellations, in order to hide their own innovation, and their own deviations and errors.

By the praise of Allaah, the aqidah of Imaam al-Albani is sufficiently clear in what has preceded and it will constitute and proof against the newly-arisen, foolish minded Qutubis, those who have arisen in the current times, and who seem only to see Irjaa in the Imaams of Ahl us-Sunnah but pretend to be blind to the Irjaa' of the Innovators of Ikhwaan and al-Bannaa whom they are so keen to defend. Have they not observed:

ONE: Hassan al-Banna said, "And visiting the graves is legislated and a reported sunnah. **However, seeking aid, isti'aanah from those in the graves, whoever they may be, and calling upon them, requesting the fulfilment of needs from them, whether in proximity to the graves or being far away from them,** and making oaths to them, setting up tombs over the graves, putting cloth over them, putting lights around them, touching them (for blessings etc.), making an oath by other than Allaah and **what is similar to these innovated matters,** are **major sins.** It is necessary to fight against them..."⁵⁰.

So here al-Bannaa reduces the acts of major shirk (i.e. apostasy) to being mere acts of innovation and major sins. Reflect upon this very carefully and understand it well!

TWO: It is also known about Hassan al-Banna that he used to travel to the shrines and tombs and sometimes spend whole days, as he himself explains in his own works⁵¹, and there he would give talks and lectures and encourage the people to purify their hearts of ill-feelings and grudges against each other and to show good manners and so on. And he is standing in the places where the greatest shirk is taking place, seeking aid and assistance from the dead and their likes. So it did not befit him to warn those around him from this Shirk and from the various acts that constitute major kufr.

THREE: Hasan al-Banna was followed by hundreds of thousands of followers. Yet we never observed that it was a fundamental aspect of his da'wah to set the condition that everyone must abandon their innovation, deviation and shirk before joining him and his work. And what also gives evidence to this is that he strived his utmost to bring about unity between the Sunnis and the Shi'ites. So he stated in ugly and despicable words, "Know that the Sunnah and the Shi'ah are Muslims, the statement *Laa ilaaha ilallaaha Muhammad Rasoolullaah*' unites them, and this is the basis of the aqidah. The Sunnah and the Shi'ah are equal in this respect **and they are both upon purity.** As for the difference between them, then it is only in matters in which it is possible to bring them both together."⁵²

And we need not comment any further, for every Sunni, Salafi who has been given a bit of knowledge and wisdom will know about the despicable nature of the beliefs of the Shi'ah, their great kufr and shirk and

wills we will highlight Shaikh Muhammad Amaan al-Jaamee's chastisement of these youth, like a father chastising his own children, and who in return showed no reply but silence and dumbness. And when they realised that they had no reply, they began to accuse their opponents as spies, paid workers and so on.

⁵⁰ In his Fourteenth Text as quoted in 'Nadharaat Fee Risaalah at-Ta'aaleem' of Muhammad Abdul-Haleem Hamid (80)

⁵¹ Refer to Hasan al-Bannaa's "Mudhakkiraat".

⁵² Quoted by at-Tilmisaani in 'Dhakariyaat Laa Mudhakkiraat' (p.249-250).

other great calamities. And alongside all that al-Bannaa says that they and the Sunnis are **“equal in this respect and they are both upon purity”**!⁵³ And almost every one of the prominent Ikhwan leaders have called for the unification between the Sunnis and Shi’ites including Qaradawi, Turabi and Ghazali.

FOUR: But if that wasn’t ghastly enough, al-Bannaa goes further and even shows love and friendship to the infidel Jews. He said in a gathering of Americans and Britons in discussion of the issue of Palestine, **“And I affirm here that our dispute with the Jews is not one concerning the religion because the Quran has encouraged us to befriend them and be cordial with them. And Islam is Shari’ah for humankind before it is a Shari’ah for a specific group of people. And it has praised them (the Jews) and has placed agreement between us and them, “And do not dispute with the People of the Book except by that which is best”. And when the Noble Quran touches upon the issue of the Jews it does so from an economic and legal point of view...”**!⁵⁴

And this affair of showing love and affection to the infidels is a matter that is established with the Ikhwan in general, and whom the Qutubis are only so keen to defend.

In the magazine al-Mujtama’ (dated 30th Dhil Qa’dah 1415), the Ikhwan ul-Mufliseen stated **“Our position with respect to our brothers, the Christians in Egypt and the Arab world is clear and one that is quite old and well known: What is due to them is what is due to us and what is binding**

⁵³ And this gives evidence to one of two things: 1) Al-Bannaa’s **total and complete and compound ignorance** of the affairs of aqidah and the heresy and disbelief of the Shi’ah or 2) **His consideration of the beliefs and teachings of the Shi’ah (which are but Kufr and Shirk) to be “purity” and mere “differences” which can be reconciled.** And the latter is worse and is but the Irjaa of the Extreme Murji’ah and from Allaah is the refuge.

Shaikh ul-Islaam Ibn Taymiyyah said in Kitaab ul-Imaan “Then he said, “And they (the Murji’ah) say: We profess that Imaan increases. That is, every time Allah sends down a verse, it should be accepted. Thus, this acceptance will be combined with the acceptance that precedes it. However, after the completion of the revelation, no one’s Imaan will be greater than anyone else’s. That is, all peoples’ Imaan becomes the same no matter what everyone’s belief is, be it the belief of the earliest believers such as Abu Bakr (al-Siddiq) and Umar (Ibn al-Khattab), or that of the most immoral of people, such as al-Hajjaj (Ibn Yusuf), Abu Muslim al-Khurasani, and others.”

He also said, “For this reason, the Murji’ah presumed the possibility of matters that never occurred due to their failure to affirm the connection between the body and the heart. For example, they said a man might have Imaan in his heart similar to that of Abu Bakr [al-Siddiq] and Umar [Ibn al-Khattab], although he neither prostrates nor fasts during Ramadan, fornicates with his mother and his sister, and drinks wine in the daylight hours of Ramadan. They [the Murji’ah] say that such a man has complete Imaan. On the contrary, all believers would absolutely deny such a claim.” Refer to Kitaab ul-Imaan (7/195-205)

So the Murji’ah of the earlier times equated between the pious and the sinner, with reference to the acts of the body, and claimed that the Imaan of both of them was the same.

Then there comes this innovating ignoramus, Hasan al-Bannaa and says that that which the Sunnis are upon (of Tawhid and the Sunnah) is equivalent to that which the Rafidah are upon (of Kufr, Shirk and Bid’ah) and calls all of that “purity”, collectively, **and so equates between the Muwahhid and the Mushrik, and equates the actions of Tawheed and Imaan with those of Shirk and Apostacy!** And al-Bannaa’s teachings are spread far and wide and have affected millions of the common-folk, let alone the main leaders of Ikhwaan such as Qaradawi, Ghazali, Tilmisani, Turabi and others all of whom call for nearness between the cursed Rafidi Shi’ites.

Yet the Qutubiyah close their eyes to the Extremist Irjaa of the Imaams of Bid’ah and Qutubiyah, and instead attack the honour of the Imaams of Sunnah and Salafiyah and label them Murji’ah and Jahmiyyah! And from Allaah is the refuge!

⁵⁴ Ikhwan ul-Musilmoon, Ahdaath Sana’at Tarikh (1/409-410)

upon them is what is binding upon us. They are our partners in this land. In our long struggle in this land, they are our brethren and they have every right in the land, both the material and the spiritual, religious or political... and whoever states anything other than this then we are free of him and of what he says”!!!

And it is known that some from the Ikhwan also call for a unification of all religions, let alone unification between Sunnis and Shi'ites!

FIVE: Now listen to the filth of Mustafaa as-Sibaa'ee (a former overall leader of the Ikhwaan). He said, **“Islaam is not a religion that is opposed to Christianity. In fact it acknowledges it and reveres it... And Islaam does not differentiate between a Muslim and a Christian and neither does it give a Muslim greater rights over a Christian in the state. And the legislation⁵⁵ will actually state the equality of all the citizens with respect to their rights and duties...”⁵⁶**

And then we could illustrate Tilmisani and Sa'eed Hawaa's justification of the acts of Shirk acts of piety and devotion and mention how Salaah as-Sawee reduces the Major Shirk into mere innovation⁵⁷ and explain how these thoughts and ideas are rampant amongst the Ikhwaan and amongst the millions of Muslims whom they have influenced and so these Muslims remain in their Shirk, thinking they will not be rendered apostates by these acts of theirs. A simple look at the realities in Egyptian, Somalian, Sudanese, Syrian and Jordanian societies where the Ikhwan have a stronghold shows that indeed millions remain upon this Shirk, because in the view of the leaders and directors of Ikhwaan, the most that can be said about it is that it is innovation (and in the view of some of them, acts of piety and nearness to Allaah!!). And this phenomenon has never ceased, ever since al-Banaa the Innovator and all the Innovators of Ikhwaan after him have embodied this vile methodology of Irjaa' and the Murji'ah.

And after all of this we ask: Why did Irjaa' only emerge after the Gulf War?

So why did they pretend to be ignorant of the clear and manifest Irjaa of the Innovators and Strayers and then turn to assaulting the Salafis and their Mashayikh and their Imaams from every direction, only because they refused to make absolute and unrestricted takfir of the Rulers, and because they exercised extreme caution in making takfir of a specific individual and also chose to propound the methodology of the Prophets in calling to Allaah, instead of the methodology of the Khawarij?

Why is it that this great crime of the Ikhwan and their reducing the greatest of the acts of Shirk to being only innovations and major sins, or lesser kufr, (kufr doona kufr) - and they have continued like this for decades and decades, promoting such teachings, writings and books - why was this never shown any rejection and why did we not see a book supervised by Mohammad Qutb and

⁵⁵ And the Ikhwan are the ones who make it permissible to rebel against the Muslim rulers when they do not rule by what Allaah has revealed... !!

⁵⁶ 'At-Tareeq ilaa Jamaa'at ul-Umm' (p.134).

⁵⁷ As-Saawee stated, "In the offerings that are made to the people of the graves, and in the du'a by which they address the people in the graves - when the intent by that is seeking intercession from the wali with Allaah, and in tawaaf around them, all of that - the most [i.e. the uppermost limit] that can said about it is that it is innovation and not Shirk." In ath-Thawaabit wal-Mutaghayyaraat (p.290). And he is the Principal of the Islamic Open University in America!!

released by the name ‘Dhahirat ul-irjaa fee Fikr al-Ikhwaan’ (The Emergence of Irjaa in the Ikhwaani Ideology)?? Or a book titled ‘Dhahirat ul-irjaa fee Fikr al-Bannaawi’ (The Emergence of Irjaa in al-Banaa’s Ideology)”, if they but desired rectification and correction of the aqidah of the Muslims??

Know – dear brother and sister Muslim - that Qutubism is an ideology that has departed from the dictates of the Book and the Sunnah and has entered into the confines of ignorance and bid’ah. The starting point of Qutubism is takfir of all Muslim societies and nations states and the end goal is the establishment of Allaah’s rule upon the earth by bloody and violent revolutions. And what leads from the starting point to the end point is but incitement to civil discord and strife in the land alongside the many innovated principles and ideas of Qutubism and Banaa’ism.

The main Qutubi innovation being: **takfir of all Muslim societies and nation states.**

The main Bannaawi innovation being: **the accommodation of every Innovator and Misguided Deviant and showing love and affection and nearness to them all.**

And these two principles are the pillars of the Qutubi da’wah, in essence – and from which the other innovated Qutubi principles and fundamental or subsidiary teachings are derived .

And if Allaah wills, we will explain this in detail elsewhere.

We ask Allaah, that he establishes our hearts upon the concepts of Sunnah and Salafiyyah and protects us and the Salafi youth from the concepts of Bid’ah and Qutubiyah; that He increases us in knowledge and guidance; that He strengthens our link and relationship with the Inheritors of the Prophets; and that He protects our ears and hearts from the innovatory suggestions and tendencies which but destroy the hearts, confuse the minds and lead to the Hellfire...

And may prayers and peace be upon the Messenger of Allaah, his family, his Companions and all those who follow his methodology in calling to Allaah, that of intellect and wisdom, till the affair is established.