



## AS-SAWAA'IQ AS-SALAFIYYAH AL-MURSALAH 'ALAL AFKAAR AL-QUTUBIYYAH AL-MUDAMMIRAH

### **Part 6: The Raid of the Faithful Believers<sup>1</sup> in Exposing the Scandal of the Qutubite Deceivers: The Tafseer of Ibn 'Abbaas of the Verses in al-Maa'idah**

The Imaam, al-Khateeb al-Baghdaadee has reported in his 'Taareekh' (10/186) that: A man from the Khawarij was entered upon al-Ma'moon who said to him, "What has led you to oppose us?" He replied, "An aayah from the Book of Allaah, the Most High." Al-Ma'moon said, "And what is it?" He replied, "And whoever does not judge by what Allaah has revealed, they are the Disbelievers" (5:44). So al-Ma'moon replied to him, "Do you have knowledge that this is a verse that has been revealed [by Allaah]?" He said, "Yes". Al-Ma'moon then asked, "And what is your proof?" He replied, "The ijmaa' (consensus) of the Ummah". So al-Ma'moon replied, "Then just as you are satisfied about their consensus that this is a revealed aayah, then also be satisfied about their consensus regarding its explanation." The man then said, "You have spoken the truth. May peace be upon you O Ameer ul-Mu'mineen"!

Al-Jassaas said in Ahkam ul-Qur'an (2/543), "The Khawarij have interpreted these verses to justify the Takfir of the one who does not rule by what Allaah has revealed without wilful rejection, juhud."

And Abul-Mudhaffar as-Sam'ani said in his tafsir (2/42), "And know that the Khawarij use this verse as evidence and they say, 'Whoever does not rule by what Allaah has revealed is a disbeliever' whereas Ahl us-Sunnah say such a one does not disbelieve by abandoning judgement by what Allaah has revealed."

The author of Tafsir ul-Manar stated (6/406) stated: "As for the apparent meaning of the verse, then none of the well-known scholars of jurisprudence, fiqh, have spoken by it, in fact not a single person has ever spoken by it."

Shaikh Ibn Uthaimen said, "Hence, built upon this, then our explanation of this verse (5:44) in the manner that has been mentioned, we judge that ruling by other than what Allaah has revealed is not the kufr that expels from the religion, rather it is the kufr of action, since the ruler (haakim) has departed by this act of his from the right mode of conduct. And it is not to be differentiated in any of that between a man who takes a secular law (qaanoon wad'iyy) from others and then makes it a referent point for judgement in his state (yuhakkimuhu fee dawlatihi), and between one who devises his own law (qaanoon), and then puts this secular law in place. Since, the most important thing is: Does this law oppose the Heavenly Law or not?" (Fitnat ut-Takfir, p.78, of Shaikh al-Albani, compiled by Shaikh Ali Hasan, originally from the cassette "Commentary on Fitnah of Takfir of Shaikh al-Albaani").

---

<sup>1</sup> Inshaa'allaah.

## Abstract

A Qutubi Charlatan, Abu Huthayfah al-Kanadie, nurtured upon the concepts and teachings of the Takfiri Intelligentsia such as Sayyid Qutb, Mohammad Qutb, Safar al-Hawali, Abu Jahl Ibn Haleemah, Abu Qataadah at-Takfiri and others, has qutubised the understanding of the concept of “the lesser kufr”, by way of false ta’weels and tahreefs of the words and phrases reported authentically from Ibn ‘Abbaas – entering into them the whisperings of his soul and the darkneses of his feeble intellect – then fleshing all of that with his half-baked knowledge of Arabic.

Adopting the modes of argument of the Intelligentsia that have suckled him, he has shown great deceit and treachery in his treatment of the words of our Scholars, sheer ignorance, and the perversion in his mind, behind which is only one goal – that is to ascribe to Imaam al-Albaani, the Irjaa’ of Jahm Ibn Safwaan and to portray Aal Qutb and their Puppets as the Carriers of the Flag of Haakimiyyah, whereas in reality, they are the Carriers of the Flag of Rafd and Khaarijiyyah.

This paper is a de-qutubisation of the foreign understandings that have been entered into this subject, by a people who are given to extremism and exaggeration – utilising in all of that the words of our Scholars, past and present. The Tafseer of Ibn ‘Abbaas is looked at from the point of view of text and isnaad, and then the various false arguments that al-Kanadie has constructed around his narrow Qutubi vision are deconstructed.

In his pathetic composition, al-Kanadie has lied upon many, if not most of those he has quoted from, by either clipping their words, or giving them meanings other than their true meanings and contexts, as will become abundantly clear – and this includes his lies upon the likes of Ibn ‘Abbaas and Ibn Mas’ood and others.

The findings reveal that there is nothing but pure charlatanism at work here.

SalafiPublications  
July 2001

# Contents

Foreword

Introduction

Concerning the Tafseer of Ibn 'Abbaas and Al-Kanadie's Opening Slogan from Shaikh Ibn Uthaimen

Part 1: The Full Quotation from Ibn Uthaimen and Its Context!

Part 2: Al-Kanadie on the Tafseer of Ibn 'Abbaas – A Summary

Part 3: The Mutoon and Asaaneed of the Statements Pertaining to the Concept of The Lesser Kufr

Part 4: Reversing the Qutubisation of Knowledge

- A) Concerning the Status of the Asaaneed
- B) Al-Kanadie's Wicked Forgery Against Ibn 'Abbaas
- C) The Innovated Explanation Not Known Or Spoken Of By Any of the Salaf!
- D) Another Innovated Saying Not Known to Any of the Salaf
- E) The Argument of the Definite Article Attached To "Kufr"
- F) The Doubt Concerning the Words of 'Abdullaah Ibn Mas'ood
- G) Concerning the Cause of Revelation
- H) Al-Kanadies Distortion of Juhood and the Nature of the Kufr of the Jews
- I) The Argument of Restricting This Kufr to the Hukkaam Only
- J) The Ummah has taken the concept of "the lesser kufr" with full acceptance

Part 5: Summary

Closing Remarks: Beware of the Charlatans...

## Foreword

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. I bear witness that there is none worthy of worship except Allaah, alone, without any partners and I bear witness that Muhammad is His servant and messenger.

O you who believe! Fear Allaah as He should be feared, and die not except in a state of Islaam (as Muslims) with complete submission to Allaah. (Aali Imraan 3:103)

O mankind! Be dutiful to your Lord, Who created you from a single person (Adam), and from him (Adam) He created his wife [Hawwa (Eve)], and from them both He created many men and women and fear Allaah through Whom you demand your mutual (rights), and (do not cut the relations of) the wombs (kinship). Surely, Allaah is Ever an All-Watcher over you. (An-Nisaa 4:1)

O you who believe! Keep your duty to Allaah and fear Him, and speak (always) the truth. He will direct you to do righteous good deeds and will forgive you your sins. And whosoever obeys Allaah and His Messenger (sallallaahu alaihi wasallam) he has indeed achieved a great achievement (i.e. he will be saved from the Hell-fire and made to enter Paradise). (Al-Ahzaab 33:70-71)

To proceed, verily the best speech is the Book of Allaah and the best of guidance is the guidance of Muhammad (sallallaahu alaihi wasallam). And the worst of affairs are the newly invented matters, every newly-invented matter is an innovation, every innovation is misguidance and all misguidance is in the Hellfire.

## Introduction

The common slogan amongst the Takfiri Intelligentsia today is that whoever does not make takfir 'alal-itlaaq (unrestrictedly) of ruling by the secular laws – in greater and lesser amounts, then such a one is a Murji' with the Irjaa' of Jahm Ibn Safwaan. And they took this concept from Aal Qutb, especially Mohammad Qutb, who is the main theoretician behind this onslaught against Ahl us-Sunnah.

The Qutubites start off with their assumption that the act (of ruling by the secular laws, whether those of the Kuffaar or one's own) is major kufr absolutely, and they are actually coming from the angle of Sayyid Qutb and his absolutions. They are coming from his perspective. So they believe first, having taken this from their Sayyid. Then they reverse engineer their position in the following manner:

- 1) Abolish the tafseer of Ibn 'Abbaas and claim that the narrations to him are weak and therefore unacceptable
- 2) Claim that the verse, in and of itself, from the linguistic viewpoint, refers to major kufr
- 3) Claim that the reasons for revelation also indicate that the asl (basis) of the verse is that it is major kufr (i.e. for Muslims as well)
- 4) Claim that the only exception to the application of this verse (i.e. that it is major kufr) is when the qaadees (judges) judge incorrectly in personal disputes between disputants, in which case it falls to minor kufr. Pay careful attention to this. The asl, (basis) to them is that this verse is major kufr (as opposed to minor kufr), and then they say that there are exceptional actions which make this kufr fall to the minor kufr
- 5) Claim that rejection with the heart (juhood) is actually an action of the limb, unrestrictedly, and then built upon this, to qutubise the tafseer of the verses in al-Maa'idah

And in this manner, they arrive at their unrestricted takfir, upon other than tafseel, of the situation predominant today. The Qutubi Intelligentsia have actually arrived at their position because they are upon the absolution and extremism of Sayyid Qutb. Then they used sophistry, innovated principles and ideas and foreign and alien understandings in order to come to this viewpoint of theirs, through the backdoor.

And there is in fact a huge difference between them and our scholars, like Shaikh Salih al-Fawzaan, Shaikh Ibn Uthaimen, Shaikh Ibn Ibraaheem and others, for our scholars affirm the tafseer of Ibn 'Abbaas and the tafseel of the Salaf, in general. However, there is a point of difference on a particular situation where a ruler rules by secular laws in their entirety (or for the most part), whether those of his own making or those of the Kuffaar, in his state. So some scholars say that this is a conclusive indicator of that which necessitates kufr (i.e. Juhood, Istihlaal, I'tiqaad, Kurh and the likes) and hence judge him to be a disbeliever. And others do not hold this and say that whether he judges by the secular law in one or a hundred or more issues in his state, then all of that still falls back upon the tafseel of the Salaf, so unless he expresses his Juhood, or makes Istihlaal, or claims that the opposing law is better, or that the Sharee'ah is no longer applicable, then he cannot be judged a kaafir. So this difference occurs within Ahl us-Sunnah.

However, the Qutubiyah, have come from an entirely different angle, which is from the absolution and extremism of Aal Qutb. So in order to justify their falsehood, they embark upon qutubising this particular issue. Therefore, they attempt to abolish the tafseel of the Salaf, use inapplicable linguistic arguments to prove that the kufr mentioned in Maa'idah 5:44 is major kufr, unrestrictedly, and that juhood is something that is on the limbs, unrestrictedly, and many other affairs, all of which indicate their lustful desire for the absolution of Aal Qutb. In the process, they lie upon the scholars, innovate understandings, distort and clip quotations.

Thus, the objective of this paper is to outline the sophistry of those charlatans who are actually upon the Qutubi manhaj in reality, but wear the gown of Salafiyyah and in their attempts to prove their stance, have actually exposed their own foolishness and ignorance. In the process, they rely upon the words of our scholars, most of which are doctored and clipped and do not even prove what is being attempted to be proved by them. And in this manner, they confuse many innocent people and lead them to desires and misguidance.

## Concerning the Tafseer of Ibn 'Abbaas and The Opening Slogan of al-Kanadie

Al-Kanadie, in the cover page of his 112 refutation, began by quoting the following statement of Shaikh Ibn Uthaimen rahimahullaah,

**Rule: "It was from the known rules from the 'Ulaama that they used to say, 'Bring evidence and then believe. Do not believe and then bring the evidence.'"**

-- From the cassette "*Fitnaat at-Takfeer li'Shaykh Al-Albaanee*" with commentary of *Shaykh* Ibn Uthaymeen, Side A

This is how he began. And note that he quoted the words of Shaikh Ibn Uthaimen in his commentary of Imaam al-Albaani's "Fitnah of Takfir" fatwaa. And also note that his intention here is to claim that he himself has brought evidence first, and has then believed, not the other way around.

And amongst the issues in which he believes that he has brought the evidence first and then believed, is the tafseer of Ibn 'Abbaas of the verses related to judging by what Allaah has revealed, as occurs in Surah al-Maa'idah.

## Part 1: The Full Quotation from Ibn Uthaimen and Its Context!

Before we continue further, let us just pause and see the full quotation from Shaikh Ibn Uthaimen, part of which has been quoted by al-Kanadie. And the reader will be amazed and shocked to realise, that the whole context of Shaikh Ibn Uthaimen's statement is in reference to those who doubt about the authenticity of the aathaar of Ibn 'Abbaas (radiallaahu anhumaa) concerning the tafseer of the verses in al-Maa'idah!! Which is what al-Kanadie **subsequently went on to do himself(!???)**.

Shaikh Ibn Uthaimen said, "Shaikh al-Albaanee has used this athar (narration) of Ibn 'Abbaas (radiallaahu anhu) as proof, and likewise other Ulamaa have taken this athar with acceptance, even there is in its chain of narration what there is<sup>2</sup>. Nevertheless, they have taken it with acceptance, due to its truthfulness in its reality, as indicated in many texts. For the Prophet (sallallaahu alaihi wasallam) said, "Reviling a Muslim is fusooq (sinfulness) and fighting him (to kill him) is kufr", yet despite this, his fighting against him does not expel a person from the religion, for the Most High has said, "And if two parties from amongst the Believers fight each other, then reconcile between them..." up until he said, "...Verily the Believers are brothers, so reconcile between your two (sets of) brothers". However, when this did not please those who have been put to trial (maftooneen) with takfir, they began to say, "This narration is not acceptable! It is not authentically related from Ibn 'Abbaas!" So it is said to them, how can it not be authentic when it has been accepted and adopted by those who are greater than you and more knowledgeable of you of hadeeth?! And you say, "We shall not accept it".

If we were to accept that the matter was as you said (i.e. that we should not accept this athar), that it is not authentic from Ibn 'Abbaas! Then we have many other texts that indicate that kufr can be applied to something without the kufr that expels from the religion being intended by that, such as what occurs in the verse mentioned before and also as occurs in his (sallallaahu alaihi wasallam's) saying, "There are affairs in my Ummah which are kufr: reviling the geneology and wailing of the dead". And we do not expel these from the Ummah. However, the affair is as it has been said, "**A paucity in knowledge, and paucity in understanding the general principles (qawaa'id) of the Sharee'ah – as Shaikh al-Albaanee has said, may Allaah grant him success, in the beginning of his words – is what brings about this misguidance.**" And then there is another matter and this is the evil intent which often brings about this evil understanding, because when a person desires something, it will lead his understanding to that which he actually desires, and then he will make tahreef (distort) the texts based upon that.

---

<sup>2</sup> Alluding to weakness in one of the routes of transmission.



**And from the well known principles of the Ulamaa', is that they say, "Seek evidence then believe, but do not believe (first) and then seek evidence (to support that belief), and as a result, go astray".<sup>3</sup>**

Hence the causes are three a) paucity of Sharee'ah knowledge b) paucity of understanding of the Sharee'ah principles c) an evil understanding that is based upon an evil intent.

As for the athar (narration of Ibn 'Abbaas) itself, which has been mentioned previously, then it is sufficient for us that the most learned and skilled of the Ulamaa like Shaikh ul-Islaam Ibn Taymiyyah and Ibn al-Qayyim, and others, then all of them have taken it with acceptance, and they speak by it, and they quote it, hence the narration is authentic." (Fitnah of Takfir, pp. 63-64, originally from the cassette "Commentary Upon Fitnah of Takfir").

What greater sickness and treachery to the words of the Ulamaa. Al-Kanadie seeks to accuse us of believing first, then finding evidence, using the words of Shaikh Ibn Uthaimen in his accusation, and then, we find in reality, the words of Shaikh Ibn Uthaimen are actually in relation to al-Kanadie and his likes, **ON THE VERY SAME ISSUE THAT HE IS DISPUTING WITH US(!)**.

By Allaah, what blindness...

And amongst those who have attempted to abolish the tafseer of Ibn 'Abbaas is Shaikh Sulaimaan al-'Ulwaan, who is a referent point for the neo-Qutubiyah and Takfiriyyah of today – and whose words are often used in this regard.

---

<sup>3</sup> And this is the paragraph that al-Kanadie quoted from Shaikh Ibn Uthaimen(!).

## Part 2: Al-Kanadie on the Tafseer of Ibn 'Abbaas of the Verses in al-Maa'idah – A Summary

We do not wish to tire ourselves in covering al-Kanadie's traces in his own "tahqeeq" and "ta'weel" of these aathaar, since his research is only borrowed from other people and from the Intelligentsia that he is following, whose aim is to actually cause doubt about the actual concept of "kufr doona kufr" in relation to the verses in Surah al-Maa'idah, such that they can then speak with the apparent meaning of it (i.e. claim it is in reference to major kufr absolutely), and make takfir 'alal-itlaaq (in absolute, unrestricted terms). And the general gist of their position is that this statement or concept (the lesser kufr), in its variety of wordings, which has been narrated from Ibn 'Abbaas, such as:

- 1) "It is a trait of kufr in him, but it is not kufr in Allaah, His Angels, Books and Messengers"
- 2) "It is not the kufr that they tend towards, it is not the kufr that expels from the religion, it is kufr less than [major] kufr"
- 3) "Whoever rejected (jahada) what Allaah has revealed has disbelieved, and whoever affirms it but does not judge by it, then he is a dhaalim, faasiq"

That it is not established from Ibn 'Abbaas, except for the one statement "It is a trait of kufr in him (Hiya Bihi Kufr)", which is reported authentically. And that the remaining statements or wordings, which indicate minor kufr, attributed to Ibn 'Abbaas are actually from other than him, such as his associates<sup>4</sup>. And then the way this is translated by al-Kanadie as, "This is sufficient for his *Kufr*". Hence, he and his likes conclude, that Ibn 'Abbaas's actual position is that these verses are in reference to major kufr(!!!), i.e. based upon their distorted translation. For this reason, al-Kanadie concluded:

So what is clear from the above is that Ibn Abbaas held the meaning of the *Ayaah*: **"And whosoever does not judge by what Allâh has revealed, such are the *Kâfirûn*."** – to be *Kufr Al-Akbaar*, and this is clear from his saying, "This is sufficient for his *Kufr*." And what is apparent is that these additional statements, which appear to lower the level of *Kufr* in the above *Ayaah* to *Kufr Al-Asqaar*, are in fact from other than Ibn Abbaas.

To further add to his ta'weel, he then claims that even the narration in which there is the statement, "It is a trait of kufr in him, but it is not kufr in Allaah, His Angels, Books and Messengers" (which is authentic to Ibn 'Abbaas), then what is meant is not that ruling by other than what Allaah has revealed is the lesser kufr, but that it is in fact major kufr, but not as severe as kufr in Allaah and His Angels, Books and Messengers. In other words, it is still kufr that expels from the religion, but not as severe as kufr in Allaah(!). So this is al-Kanadie's additional ta'weel, and he has followed his mentors in that.

<sup>4</sup> And the statements, "Kufr less than kufr, dhulm less than dulum and fisq less than fisq" and also "It is not the kufr that expels from the religion" have been narrated with Saheeh Isnaads from 'Ataa bin Abee Rabaah, and Taawoos respectively – both narrated by at-Tabaree, in relation to the verses in al-Maa'idah.

Then his additional ta'weel is that since the verses, according to at-Tabaree, and according to the cause of revelation, are in relation to the Jews, then the asl, (basis) in these verses are that they are in reference to Major Kufr, as a rule, and not minor kufr. So al-Kanadie said:

So if these *Ayaat* in *Surat Al-Ma'idah* were revealed for the Jews, who obviously disbelieved in *Islaam*, then Ibn Abbaas would not have held these *Ayaat* upon *Kufr Al-Asgaar* because it is clear that they were *Kuffar* and no one disputes this. So obviously Ibn Abbaas would hold these *Ayaat* upon the meaning, which expels one outside the realm of *Islaam*, because of the *Kufr* of the Jews. So if we are to find authentic instances in which Ibn Abbaas held these *Ayaat* upon *Kufr Al-Asgaar*, then we must determine whom he was holding their meaning upon less than *Al-Akbaar*. And it must be understood that these instances would not be the , *Usl* of the meaning of these *Ayaat*, rather Ibn Abbaas and others would be referring to a specific group whom he did not hold as disbelievers.

So therefore, by using this, he argues that the asl, (basis) of the verse is that it is Major Kufr – and what he intends by this sophistry, is to then equivocate between the Jews (upon whom these verses were revealed) and between the Muslims, and argue that the asl (basis), is the same for both groups of people, i.e. Major Kufr.

This argument is essential to the Qutubi Intelligentsia, because it allows them to apply this verse to what they see today of ruling by other than what Allaah has revealed (i.e. ruling by the secular laws in greater and lesser amounts) and also their very fuzzy and confused understanding of “tabdeel” (replacement of the Sharee’ah, as they call it) – and to make takfir based upon that – without adhering to the tafseel of the Salaf. In other words, the asl of this verse is major kufr to them, and hence the concept of kufr doona kufr (or the lesser kufr) is not the asl, (basis) in this verse FOR THE MUSLIM UMMAH. Make note of this argument. And we shall come to destroy it from its very foundations and illustrate that this is but the madhhab of the Kharijite Renegades who use the apparent meanings of this verse to make takfir of the Rulers who do not judge by what Allaah has revealed unrestrictedly.

Then later he supports this view by using the linguistic argument that the word “al-Kaafiroon”, used in the verse, instead of “Kaafiroon” without the definite article (al), is indicative of major kufr, relying upon the words of Shaikh ul-Islaam Ibn Taymiyyah, which he and his likes have misunderstood completely, as we shall explain in what is yet to come. And then he also quoted some clipped words of Shaikh Ibn Ibraaheem, attempting to strengthen his viewpoint that the verse is in relation to major kufr, aslan (fundamentally), and we shall expose his scandal of doctoring this quote in order to fit with his desires.

In short, al-Kanadie has bent over backwards in order to discredit the tafseer of Ibn ‘Abbaas and to preach the absolution of Sayyid Qutb. The above and other shubuhaat will be covered in what is to follow, inshaa’llaah.

## Part 3: The Mutoon and Asaaneed of the Statements Pertaining to the Concept of The Lesser Kufr

The discussion below is based upon Shaikh Ali Hasan's excellent treatise "Al-Qawl ul-Ma'moon Fee Takhreej Maa Warada 'An Ibn 'Abbaas Fee Tafseer Wa Man Lam Yahkum Bimaa Anzalallaahu Fa'ulaa'ika Humul-Kaafiroon", which was published in 1989 by Dar ul-Hijrah, Dammaam.

**ONE:** What is reported by Abdur-Razzaaq as-San'aanee:

[M'amar <- Ibn Taawoos <- Taawoos] who said, "Ibn 'Abbaas was asked about his saying, "And whoever does not judge...". He said, "**It is a trait of kufr in him (hiya bihi kufrun)**".

This athar is **SAHEEH**

Reported by Abdur-Razzaaq as-San'aanee in his "Tafseer" and also Ibn Katheer (2/97). It is also reported (in Mu'allaq form) by Abu Ubayd al-Qaasim bin Sallaam in "al-Eemaan" (p.94) and al-Baghawee in "Ma'aalim ut-Tanzeel" (2/260). Ibn Nasr al-Marwazee reported it also from two of his Shaikhs from 'Abdur-Razzaaq.

And at-Tabaree also reported it in "al-Jaami al-Bayaan" (6/256) by way of 'Abdur-Razzaaq. All of them also add the following, "And Ibn Taawoos said, "And it is not like the one who disbelieves in Allaah, His Angels, His Books and His Messengers". And this phrase is also reported from Ibn 'Abbaas himself.

**TWO:** What is reported by at-Tabaree:

[Hanaaad (Ibn as-Sariy) <- Wakee' (Ibn al-Jarraah) <- Sufyaan <- Ma'mar <- Ibn Taawoos <- Taawoos] and also [Sufyaan Ibn Wakee' <- Wakee' (Ibn al-Jarraah) <- Sufyaan <- Ma'mar <- Ibn Taawoos <- Taawoos] who narrates from Ibn 'Abbaas concerning the verse "And whoever does not judge by what Allaah has revealed they are the Disbelievers". He said, "**It is a trait of kufr in him. And it is not kufr in Allaah, His Angels, His Books and His Messengers**".

This athar is **SAHEEH**

Ibn Hajar said about Sufyaan Ibn Wakee', "He was truthful (sadooq), save that he was put to trial with his scrolls, and entered into them that which was not from his own hadeeth. He was advised about this, but did not heed it, and so his hadeeths fell (i.e. abandoned)." However, this does not affect the grading, since in the other sanad, there is Hannaad, who is Thiqah.

Ibn Nasr al-Marwazee also reported it in his "Ta'dheem Qadr is-Salaat" (no. 571) saying, "Ishaaq narrated to us: Wakee' informed us..." and then mentioned the above. And Ishaaq

is Ishaq Ibn Raahawaih, the Mountain of Memorisation. Ibn Nasr also narrated it (no. 572) but added at the beginning the following saying of Taawoos, "I said to Ibn 'Abbaas, "The one who does not judge by what Allaah has revealed, is he a kaafir?". He said **"It is a trait of kufr in him. And it is not kufr in Allaah, His Angels, His Books and His Messengers"** and then he quoted the rest of it. And this is **SAHEEH**.

And at-Tabaree reports with the following isnaad: [Al-Hasan <- Abu Usaamah <- Sufyaan <- Ma'mar <- Ibn Taawoos <- Taawoos] that a man<sup>5</sup> said to Ibn 'Abbaas, concerning these verses, "And whoever does not judge by what Allaah has revealed..." and asked "So whoever does that, has he disbelieved". Ibn 'Abbaas said, **"When he does that, it is a trait of kufr in him, and it is not like the one who disbelieves in Allaah, and the Last Day and such a such thing"**.

Al-Hasan is Ibn Yahyaa al-'Abdee, declared Sadooq by Abu Haatim and Thiqah by Ibn Hibbaan, and Ibn Hajar chose to declare him Sadooq. Abu Usaamah is Hamaad bin Usaamah, who is thiqah but was accused with tadlees, but adh-Dhahabi rejected it and declared it a false saying. So after calling him "One of the firmly established (thabt)", he said at the end, "Abu Usaamah, nothing has been reported about him, but let it be known that this saying is falsehood", and he intends to refute the one who accused him of stealing hadeeth (i.e. tadlees). And al-Haafidh [Ibn Hajar] said concerning him, "One of the Scholars, firmly established. They are united upon his trustworthiness". The sanad is **HASAN**.

**THREE:** What is reported by Al-Haafidh Ibn Nasr al-Marwazee in "Ta'dheem Qadr is-Salaat" (no. 573):

[Muhammad bin Yahyaa <- 'Abdur-Razzaaq (as-San'aanee) <- Sufyaan <- An unnamed man <- Taawoos] that Ibn 'Abbaas said, "It is not the kufr that expels from the religion".

Muhammad bin Yahyaa is Sadooq. But the sanad is **DA'EEF** due to the unnamed man, There is Ibhaam in the sanad.

However Ibn Nasr also reports this (no. 574) as does at-Tabaree (2/256) with the following: [Wakee' - Sufyaan - Sa'eed al-Makkee] that Taawoos said, "It is not the kufr that expels from the religion". Sa'eed is Ibn Hassaan al-Makhzomee, declared thiqah by Ibn Ma'een, al-Fasawee, Ibn Sa'd and Ibn Hibbaan. The isnaad in this manner is **SAHEEH** to Taawoos.

**FOUR:** What is reported by Imaam Abu Haatim in his tafseer (as occurs in Tafseer Ibn Katheer (2/97):

[Muhammad bin 'Abdullaah bin Yazeed al-Muqri' <- Sufyaan bin 'Uyainah <- Hishaam bin Hujayr <- Taawoos] who narrates from Ibn 'Abbaas concerning the saying of Allaah the

<sup>5</sup> And this is not Ibhaam, since the narration is not from the unknown man, but it is from Taawoos who includes a mention of the way in which the statement occurred in front of him - not that he is narrating from the unnamed man himself.

Most High, “And whoever does not judge by what Allaah has revealed, they are the Disbelievers”, that he said, “It is not the kufr that they tend towards”.

This is also narrated by Ibn Nasr al-Marwazi in his “Ta’dheem Qadr is-Salaat” (no. 569), and Ibn ‘Abdul-Barr in “at-Tamheed” (4:237) by way of Sufyaan.

Ibn Abee Haatim said about Muhammad bin ‘Abdullaah, “Sadooq Thiqah”. And Abu Haatim said, “Sadooq”. Al-Khaleelee said, “Thiqah, agreed upon”. An-Nasaa’ee also made him thiqah, as did Ibn Hibbaan, and Maslamah bin al-Qaasim.

As for Sufyaan bin ‘Uyainah, then the likes of him are not even asked about.

As for Hishaam bin Hujayr, then what has been narrated from the people of knowledge concerning him varies, even though the majority of what is said about him is jarh (criticism). For this reason, al-Haafidh Ibn Hajar said in at-Taqreeb (7288), “Sadooq, he has errors”. He also narrated him in the ninth section of his book “Hadee as-Saree” (p.448), in listing the names of those who had been criticised from the narrators of Saheeh al-Bukhaaree, saying, “Al-‘Ijlee and Ibn Sa’d declared him thiqah, but Yahyaa al-Qattaan, and Yahyaa bin Ma’een declared him da’eef...”. When Ibn Abee Haatim wrote the biography of Hishaam in “al-Jarh wat-Ta’deel” (9/53-54), narrating the words of those who declared him da’eef, he ended that with his saying, “He is Makkee (in origin) and his hadeeth are to be written down”. Hence, Hishaam’s weakness is due to memory, and his narrations are not accepted except in written form, subject to evaluation.

This athar has also been narrated by al-Haakim in “al-Mustadrak” (2/313), and then from him by al-Bayhaqee in “as-Sunan al-Kubraa” (8/20), by way of Alee bin Harb, from Sufyaan from Hishaam... with the wording, “It is not the disbelief that they tend towards, it is the kufr that does not expel from the religion, ‘And whoever does not judge by what Allaah has revealed, they are the disbelievers’, it is kufr less than kufr.”

This is reported also by Sa’eed bin Mansoor, al-Firyabee, Ibn al-Mundhir, Ibn Abee Haatim and some of them added to it, “...and dhulm less than dhulm, and fisq less than fisq”. This is also what is related in “ad-Durr al-Manthoor” (3/87) of as-Suyootee. And al-Haakim said, after mentioning the sources of the hadeeth, “This hadeeth is saheeh in its isnaad, but they (Bukhaaree and Muslim) did not make takhreej of it” and adh-Dhahabee agreed with him, and this also occurs in Ibn Katheer (2/97).

Though the sanad has this defect (in relation to Hishaam Ibn Hujayr), it is **HASAN LI GHAYRIHI**, since it is the same in meaning as the narrations that have preceded that are saheeh to Ibn ‘Abbaas.

**FIVE:** What is reported by Ibn Jareer in his tafseer (6/257):

[Al-Muthanna – ‘Abdullaah bin Saalih – Mu’aawiyah bin Saalih – Alee bin Abee Talhah] that Ibn ‘Abbaas said, concerning the aayah, “And whoever does not judge by what Allaah

has revealed”, “Whoever rejects (jahada) what Allaah has revealed has disbelieved, and whoever affirmed it but did not judge by it, then he is an oppressor, sinner”.

Ibn al-Mundhir and Ibn Abee Haatim also related it as occurs in ad-Durr al-Manthoor (3/78).

The narrating of Alee bin Abee Talhah from Ibn ‘Abbaas is Munqati’, as has been said by a group from the people of knowledge. Refer to “Jaami’ ut-Tahseel” (p.240-241). Hence, this narration is **MUNQATI’**.

### **SUMMARY**

The wordings,

- “It is a trait of kufr in him”
- “It is a trait of kufr in him. And it is not kufr in Allaah, His Angels, His Books and His Messengers”
- “When he does that, then it is disbelief only in that, and it is not like the one who disbelieves in Allaah, and the Last Day and such a such thing”
- “It is not the kufr that they tend towards”

Are authentically related from Ibn ‘Abbaas, being either SAHEEH or HASAN due to witnesses. In addition to that there are many authentic narrations to Taawoos, Ataa, the associates of Ibn ‘Abbaas, corroborating the meaning afforded in the above narrations, namely that is the lesser kufr or what does not reach the level of major kufr. And the authentic narrations from them are actually a conveyance of what they have acquired from the Mufassir of the Qur’aan, Ibn ‘Abbaas – and no one denies this save a heretical partisan, touched by the Khaarijiyyah of Aal Qutb.

## Part 4: Reversing the Qutubisation of Knowledge<sup>6</sup>

### **A) Concerning the Status of the Asaaneed**

The narrations to Ibn 'Abbaas, as has preceded are no doubt SAHEEH, and the meaning that is contained in the saying "kufr doona kufr (the lesser kufr)" actually exists in what is authentically narrated from Ibn 'Abbaas, even if this wording itself, "the lesser kufr", is not related from Ibn 'Abbaas himself. Rather, this meaning and this wording has been conveyed and transmitted from the associates of Ibn 'Abbaas, re-inforcing the narrations from Ibn 'Abbaas. And there is no one who doubts this save a doubting Qutubi, one put to trial with Takfeer!

### **B) Al-Kanadie's Wicked Forgery Against Ibn 'Abbaas**

The first thing to note is al-Kanadie's translation of the saying of Ibn 'Abbaas "hiya bihi kufr" as:

"This is sufficient for his *Kufr*."

And it is built upon this translation that al-Kanadie attempts to ascribe to Ibn 'Abbaas that he held the meaning of verse to be major kufr – whether in relation to Non-Muslims (like the Jews) or Muslims themselves, without any tafseel!

So what is clear from the above is that Ibn Abbaas held the meaning of the *Ayaah*: **"And whosoever does not judge by what Allâh has revealed, such are the *Kâfirûn*."** – to be *Kufr Al-Akbaar*, and this is clear from his saying, "This is sufficient for his *Kufr*." And what is apparent is that these additional statements, which appear to lower the level of *Kufr* in the above *Ayaah* to *Kufr Al-Asgaar*, are in fact from other than Ibn Abbaas.

So it is clear that al-Kanadie understands this phrase of Ibn 'Abbaas, based upon his own flawed translation of it, to be in reference to major kufr. And his objective in that is of course, to claim that this verse applies to those who rule by the secular laws in the sense of major kufr (without tafseel), since – in his view – this is how Ibn 'Abbaas has explained it, to be in reference to kufr akbar. And supporting all of this (as we shall see later) is his claim that this is the only authentic statement related from Ibn 'Abbaas (i.e. "hiya bihi kufr"), with everything else either not coming from Ibn 'Abbaas or having another alternate interpretation!

So we say:

**Firstly:** The forgery against Ibn 'Abbaas is clear. The wording, "hiyah bihi kufr", which more accurately translates as "It is a trait of kufr in him", is NOT in reference to major kufr, as al-Kanadie hallucinated. Rather it is in reference to the minor kufr, and this is

<sup>6</sup> And just as the Harakiyyoon amongst the Ikhwaan and others speak of "The Islamicisation of Knowledge", then similarly, there has occurred "The Qutubisation of Knowledge" over the decades on the issues of takfir, haakimiyyah and ruling by what Allaah has revealed, which need to be DeQutubised from the extremism, exaggeration and charlatanism that has been entered into them.



abundantly clear by the fact that the very next words of Ibn 'Abbaas are, "And it is not kufr in Allaah, His Angels, His Books and His Messengers" – which are actually part of the narration which is SAHEEH to Ibn 'Abbaas.

**Secondly:** To further prove the above, then we just need to look at the saying of Allaah's Messenger (sallallaahu alaihi wasallam), "There are two (traits) amongst the people which are kufr (humaa bihim kufr), reviling one's ancestors and wailing over the dead". (Muslim in his Saheeh). And it is known that this is NOT in reference to major kufr. Rather, it is in reference to the kufr of action, inherent in the particular action under question. And in fact, all the other statements of the Messenger (sallallaahu alaihi wasallam) which attribute kufr to certain actions, indicate likewise that it is the kufr of action, not the major kufr. Such as fighting a Muslim, or striking the necks of one another, or approaching a women from her anus, or calling another Muslim a Kaafir and so on. And the saying of Ibn 'Abbaas, "hiya bihi kufr" concerning ruling by other than what Allaah has revealed, is exactly the same.

Sulaimaan Aal ash-Shaikh, the author of Tayseer al-'Azeez al-Hameed (a commentary of Kitaab ut-Tawheed) said, in commenting upon the hadeeth mentioned above, "Meaning, they occur amongst the people, which means that there is kufr in them (i.e. the people). Shaikh ul-Islaam said, "Meaning that these two characteristics are both kufr which occur amongst the people. Hence, the mere characteristics are kufr, from the angle that they were from the actions of the Kuffaar, and they can exist in the people. However, it is not the case that when a person falls into a branch from the branches of kufr that he becomes a kaafir, with the absolute kufr, not until the true and real kufr (haqeeqat ul-kufr) arises from him. Just like a person who brings a branch from the branches of Imaan does not become a Believer, until the asl, (basis) of Imaan is found in him".

And this shows that what is meant by the tafseer of Ibn 'Abbaas is that whoever does not judge by what Allaah has revealed, then he has a trait of kufr in him, which is the kufr of action, and which is the trait of the outright Kuffaar, which they do while they are upon the true and real kufr.

So this is a clear forgery upon Ibn 'Abbaas and a distortion of his words and in Allaah is the refuge from such Qutubi deceptions... And this will become even more clear when we look further below, when we smash another scandal of al-Kanadie and those who suckled him with this misguidance.

### **C) The Innovated Explanation Not Known Or Spoken Of By Any of the Salaf!**

Then to make matters worse al-Kanadie, following the Takfeeri and Qutubi Intelligentsia then tried to make an additional baatil ta'weel of the authentic narration from Ibn 'Abbaas with the wording, "It is a trait of kufr in him. And it is not kufr in Allaah, His Angels, His Books and His Messengers". So this narration is clearly SAHEEH to Ibn 'Abbaas in its entirety. Now because the last phrase, "And it is not kufr in Allaah, His Angels, His Books and His Messengers" is also reported from the associates of Ibn 'Abbaas, such as Taawoos and Ibn Taawoos, then al-Kanadie has claimed or insinuated that there is a mistake in the

narration from Ibn 'Abbaas in that the narrator has wrongly ascribed this additional sentence to Ibn 'Abbaas.

And what is apparent is that these additional statements, which appear to lower the level of *Kufr* in the above *Ayaah* to *Kufr Al-Asgaar*, are in fact from other than Ibn Abbaas.

And in this manner does he attempt to render this narration, as it has been reported, to be unacceptable as proof, as he stated himself:

This is one possibility and it seems likely when we examine all the narrations from Ibn Abbaas in their entirety. And it is not uncommon that a narrator will sometimes mistakenly attribute a statement to the one who spoke the *Hadeeth* but in fact this statement actually came from another person in the chain or narration. (p.47).

And these words are in reality, mere doubts, which those “who have been put to trial with takfeer” (as said by Ibn Uthaimen) are employing in order to nullify the tafseer that the whole Ummah has accepted and to replace it instead with the absolution of Aal Qutb and the extremist manhaj of al-Haakimiyah that they are upon.

Firstly: Name one from the Salaf of the past, who have come with this explanation?!  
Secondly: Name one from the Muhadditheen of the past who have come with this explanation?!

Then another matter worthy of attention: If it was exactly as it was claimed by al-Kanadie and those of his ilk, namely that Ibn 'Abbaas only stated, “It is a trait of kufr in him (i.e. in his action)” (which is the more accurate translation), and that the words, “And it is not kufr in Allaah, His Angels, His Books and His Messengers” are actually from Taawoos and others, then this in itself is actually a TAFSEER of the saying of Ibn 'Abbaas from those who took it from him(!). So who then is the likes of this pathetic imbecilic Canadian Charlatan, a compound ignorant, to then come along and insinuate that Ibn 'Abbaas actually meant major kufr, and those who narrated from him actually twisted it to mean the minor kufr(!). Scandalous deeds O Sunni, scandalous deeds. Have you seen the sick condition of this one who continues in making a fool of himself and establishing his own sick nature...?!

Indeed, the affair is as Shaikh Ibn Uthaimen described it, “However, when this did not please those who have been put to trial (maftooneen) with takfir, they began to say, “This narration is not acceptable! It is not authentically related from Ibn 'Abbaas!” So it is said to them, how can it not be authentic when it has been accepted and adopted by those who are greater than you and more knowledgeable of you of hadeeth?! And you say, “We shall not accept it”.”

And he also said, “...And then there is another matter and this is the evil intent which often brings about this evil understanding, because when a person desires something, it will lead

his understanding to that which he actually desires, and then he will make tahreef (distort) the texts based upon that.

**And from the well known principles of the Ulamaa', is that they say, "Seek evidence then believe, but do not believe (first) and then seek evidence (to support that belief), and as a result, go astray".<sup>7</sup>**

Hence the causes are three a) paucity of Sharee'ah knowledge b) paucity of understanding of the Sharee'ah principles c) an evil understanding that is based upon an evil intent." End of his words. (Fitnah of Takrir pp.63-64, Refer to Part 1).

#### **D) Another Innovated Saying Not Known to Any of the Salaf**

And then another, even more foolish and debauched ta'weel is al-Kanadie's parroting of what he has acquired from his Intelligentsia - who have suckled and fostered him with the dung and blood of Qutubism- which is that this narration from Ibn 'Abbaas, "It is a trait of kufr in him. And it is not kufr in Allaah, His Angels, His Books and His Messengers" actually refers to two types of kufr, both of which are major kufr that expel from the religion, save that one of the two is more severe than the other. So in other words, Ibn 'Abbaas is saying that the kufr mentioned in the verse in al-Maa'idah IS major kufr, and then by adding the phrase, "It is a trait of kufr in him. And it is not kufr in Allaah, His Angels, His Books and His Messengers", Ibn 'Abbaas only intended to illustrate that the kufr in the verse in al-Maa'idah is actually less severe than kufr in Allaah and His Angels and His Books and Messengers, though it is still major kufr(!?!?!). Al-Kanadie hallucinated:

Or there is another possibility. It might mean that this statement was actually from Ibn Abbaas as it appears but was intended to show that the *Kufr* of the one who, 'Rules by Other Than What Allaah Revealed' is less severe than the *Kufr* of the one who disbelieves in Allaah and His Angels and His Books and His Messengers. Just as the *Kufr* of the one who curses at Allaah is not equal to the one who disbelieves in one of the Prophets sent by Allaah. (p.47-48).

And it is vital that we ask: From where have you got this meaning? And who has given this explanation? And who has preceded you in this from the Salaf? And where can the likes of this ta'weel (baatil) be found in the Books of Ahl us-Sunnah? Indeed it is only the fresh latecomers, put to trial with the manhaj of Aal Qutb, bloodthirsty for takfir, that have innovated this innovated farcical attempt to nullify what the whole Ummah, Muhaddithoon and Fuqahaa have agreed upon.

#### **E) The Argument of the Definite Article Attached To "Kufr"**

Let us quote from Al-Kanadie (p.54 of his 112 page document), to illustrate his total jahl and talbees and his Muqallidism of those he has blindly followed in his ignorance:

<sup>7</sup> And this is the paragraph that al-Kanadie quoted from Shaikh Ibn Uthaimen(!).

What we see in this *Ayaah* is that Allaah prefaced the word: **Kâfirûn** with the two letters: (*Alif*) and (*Lam*) which makes the word: **(the Kâfirûn)**. And it is known from the rules of the Arabic language that the word *Kufr* may have two meanings to it; either *Kufr Al-Akbaar* or *Kufr Al-Asgaar*. But when this word *Kufr* is attached with the *Alif* and the *Lam*, it takes on the meaning of “The *Kufr*”, which can only take the meaning of *Kufr Al-Akbaar*.

As Ibn Taymiyah said, “There is a difference between *Al-Kufr*, which comes attached with, *Alif Lam*, as in the Prophet’s saying, ‘There is nothing between the slave and *Al-Kufr* or *Al-Shirk*, except abandoning the *Salaat*’, and between *Kufr* which is not attached with *Alif Lam*.” (Look to *Iqtidaat As-Siraat Al-Mustaqeem*, Pg. 69)

And also from a language point of view is the phrasing of the sentence itself. Allaah has said that these people are, “**the Kâfirûn**”, so how can they not be disbelievers if Allaah has called them “**the Kâfirûn**”? And this is different than some of the *Ahadeeth* in which the word “*Kufr*” can sometimes be used as *Kufr Al-Asgaar*, because the word used here is “**the Kâfirûn**” and so the word Allaah used is not describing the act, He is describing the people themselves for committing the act. And this is the distinction here.

And as *Allamah* Muhammad Ibn Ibraheem ahl a-Shaykh said, “It is impossible for Allaah to call someone a *Kaafir* for, ‘Ruling by Other Than What Allaah Revealed’ and then for them not to be a *Kaafir*.” (*Takheem al-Qaw’aneen.*, Pg. 15)

So we say:

### **ONE: Shaikh Ibn Uthaimen on the argument by way of the definite article**

Shaikh Ibn Uthaimen said, “Also from the evil understanding is the saying of the one who attributed to Shaikh ul-Islaam Ibn Taymiyyah that he said, “When *Kufr* is mentioned with the definite article (i.e. *al-Kufr*), then the Major *kufr* is intended by it”, then seeking to use this as evidence to justify making *takfeer* on account of the verse “... then they are the disbelievers” (5:44)!! Despite the fact that there is nothing even in this verse to show it is the *kufr* (that expels from the religion)!

As for the correct saying from Shaikh ul-Islaam Ibn Taymiyyah, then it is his distinction - *rahimahullaah* – between *kufr* with the definite article (*al-kufr*) and the *kufr* without it (*kufr*). So as for the *wasf* (description), then it is correct if we say concerning it, “they are disbelievers (*haa’ulaa kaafiroon*)”, or “they are the disbelievers (*haa’ulaa il-kaafiroon*)”, based upon the *kufr* that they have been described with, of the *kufr* that does not expel from the religion. Hence he distinguished between the act being described, and the person doing the act being described<sup>8</sup>.

<sup>8</sup> Pay attention to this point and refer to what is quoted below from Shaikh Ibn Ibraaheem from his *fataawaa* where he uses the word *Kaafir* for the one who falls into both the major *kufr* and the minor *kufr*.

Hence, built upon this, then our explanation of this verse in the manner that has been mentioned, we judge that ruling by other than what Allaah has revealed is not the kufr that expels from the religion, rather it is the kufr of action, since the ruler (haakim) has departed by this act of his from the right mode of conduct. **And it is not to be differentiated in any of that between a man who takes a secular law (qaanoon wad'iyy) from others and then makes it a referent point for judgement in his state (yuhakkimuhu fee dawlatihi), and between one who devises his own law (qaanoon), and then puts this secular law in place.** Since, the most important thing is: Does this law oppose the Heavenly Law or not?" (Fitnat ut-Takfir, p.78, of Shaikh al-Albani, compiled by Shaikh Ali Hasan, originally from the cassette "Commentary on Fitnah of Takfir of Shaikh al-Albaani").

And after this what more can be said? We need to make no comment(!). Indeed these (the likes of al-Kanadie) are the deceiving, lying, surmising, treacherous, beautifiers of speech, may Allaah sever them.

## **TWO: AL-Kanadie's doctoring of the quote from Shaikh Ibn Ibraaheem, and his lie upon him**

Indeed al-Kanadie's quotation from Shaikh Ibn Ibraaheem above, in the particular context that he has, is a mighty fabrication upon Shaikh Ibn Ibraaheem, and this illustrates the actual deceit and treachery of al-Kanadie. By Allaah, what will he answer with such blatant doctoring of the words of the scholars?

The actual full quote from Shaikh Ibn Ibraaheem is:

**"And it is impossible for Allaah, the Most Perfect, to call the one who judges by other than what Allaah has revealed a Kaafir and for him to not be a Kaafir – rather he is a Kaafir – either being Kufr of action or Kufr of belief. And that which is reported by Ibn 'Abbaas (radiallaahu anhumaa) by way of Taawoos and others in explanation of this aayah, shows that the ruler by other than what Allaah has revealed is a Kaafir, either with the kufr of belief<sup>9</sup>, which takes him outside the religion - or with the kufr of action, which does not take him outside the religion."**

And from Shaikh Ibn Uthaimen's explanation it is clear that the real intent of Shaikh ul-Islam is that regardless of whether "kaafiroon" is being used or "al-kaafiroon" is being used (or whether "kufr" or "al-kufr" is used) the distinction is still to be made between the act that has emanated from a person from being described and between the actual person himself being described.

<sup>9</sup> Reflect carefully here, and you will note that Shaikh Ibn Ibraaheem rahimahullaah, indeed adheres to the tafseel on the issue of takfir of the one who does not judge by what Allaah has revealed. Unfortunately, this part of the quotation was clipped by the author of the "Decisive Refutation", and we will illustrate this and many other of his tragedies in the continuation of this series inshaa'llaah. Abu Fulaan al-Kanadie preached piety to others, but does not enact it himself...

Also Shaikh Ibn Ibraaheem has used this term, al-kufr al-i'tiqaadee to mean al-kufr al-akbar, and this is also the terminological usage of Imaam al-Albaani, until even for those actions that occur on the limbs and which expel from Islaam. For more detail on the saying of Shaikh Ibn Ibraaheem here, refer to GRV070006 (The Difference Between the Shaikhs of the Salafi Da'wah and the Qutubiyah).

Have you seen the deceit of al-Kanadie, this neo-Qutubite wolf, who has come with the overgarments of Salafiyah, yet all but huddling the undergarments of Qutubiyah? And his chits all but set ablaze with fire when he sees that the Salafis have seen through his sophistry and exposed his folly and foolishness?

He attempted to quote this statement to support his innovated viewpoint that the word *kufir* with the definite article (and likewise the word *kaafiroon* with the definite article) represents major *kufir*. So here he quoted the first part of the quote from Ibn Ibraaheem

And as *'Allaamah* Muhammad Ibn Ibraheem ahl a-Shaykh said, "It is impossible for Allaah to call someone a *Kaafir* for, 'Ruling by Other Than What Allaah Revealed' and then for them not to be a *Kaafir*." (*Takheem al-Qaw'aneen.*, Pg. 15)

And then he left the rest in which the Shaikh immediately says, "...– rather he is a *Kaafir* – **either being *Kufr* of action or *Kufr* of belief. And that which is reported by Ibn 'Abbaas (radiiallaahu anhumaa) by way of Taawoos and others in explanation of this aayah, shows that the ruler by other than what Allaah has revealed is a *Kaafir*, either with the *kufir* of belief<sup>10</sup>, which takes him outside the religion - or with the *kufir* of action, which does not take him outside the religion.**"

And hence it indicates that the Shaikh does not understand that the verse, in its asl, (basis) is major *kufir* – rather he adheres to the tafseel of the Salaf in distinguishing between the *kufir* of belief and the *kufir* of action, and that the verse carries both meanings, but that the asl, is that it is minor *kufir*, due to his affirmation of the tafseer of Ibn 'Abbaas. And then secondly, even in the clipped quotation of al-Kanadie, there is nothing which can even justify the conclusion that al-Kanadie has hallucinated to.

The saying of Shaikh Ibn Ibraaheem in his *Fataawaa* (1/80) dated 9/1/1385H – five years after *Tahkim ul-Qawanin* was published: "And likewise, the implementation of the meaning of 'Muhammad is the Messenger of Allaah' is by judging to his Shari'ah and confining oneself to that whilst rejecting whatever opposes it from the secular laws and all those matters for which Allaah gave no authority. And the one who judges by them (*hakama bihaa*) or refers to them (*haakama ilaihaa*) - for judgement whilst believing in the correctness (*sihhaa*) of that or the permissibility (to judge by them) (*jawaaz*), then **he is a**

---

<sup>10</sup> Reflect carefully here, and you will note that Shaikh Ibn Ibraaheem rahimahullaah, indeed adheres to the tafseel on the issue of *takfir* of the one who does not judge by what Allaah has revealed. Unfortunately, this part of the quotation was clipped by the author of the "Decisive Refutation", and we will illustrate this and many other of his tragedies in the continuation of this series inshaa'allaah. Abu Fulaan al-Kanadie preached piety to others, but does not enact it himself...

Also Shaikh Ibn Ibraaheem has used this term, *al-kufir al-i'tiqaadee* to mean *al-kufir al-akbar*, and this is also the terminological usage of Imaam al-Albaani, until even for those actions that occur on the limbs and which expel from *Islaam*. For more detail on the saying of Shaikh Ibn Ibraaheem here, refer to GRV070006 (*The Difference Between the Shaikhs of the Salafi Da'wah and the Qutubiyah*).

**kaafir with the kufr that ejects from the religion.** And if he does that without belief (I'tiqaad) in their correctness and (regarding it) permissible to judge by them (jawaaz), then **he is a kaafir with the kufr in action**, which does not eject from the religion.”

So here Shaikh Ibn Ibraaheem used the word “Kaaafir” for both the one who falls into the kufr of belief (concerning the act of judging to the secular laws or by them) and for the one who falls into the kufr of action. And it is irrelevant whether “kaafir” is used or “al-kaafir” is used. Hence, to use the above quote (in a clipped manner) to justify the falsehood that “al-kufr” represents major kufr and that “kufr” (without the definite article) represents minor kufr, as an unrestricted rule, is futile.

### **THREE: A decisive refutation of this principle**

And what will al-Kanadie al-Jahool say about the following:

The hadeeth reported from Ibn ‘Abbaas by al-Bukhaaree, in which there is the saying of the wife of Thaabit bin Qays, “But I hate the kufr in Islaam (innee akrahul-kufra fil-Islaam)”. (No. 5273, and also in al-Fath, 9/400). And this is in relation to the kufr towards the near relatives (i.e. ungratefulness).

The hadeeth reported by an-Nasaa’ee in al-Kubraa (118), and ‘Abdur-Razzaaq in his Musannaf (20953), from Ibn ‘Abbaas that he said concerning entering a woman through her anus “That is the kufr (dhaalik al-kufr)”. Its isnaad is strong as said by Ibn Hajr in at-Talkhees al-Khabeer (3/181).<sup>11</sup> And this itself is the saying of Ibn ‘Abbaas.

What is reported by Ibn Battah in al-Ibaanah (2/730) with a saheeh isnaad, by way of Kareemah bint al-Hashaas who said, “I heard Abu Hurairah say in the house of Umm ad-Dardaa, saying, “The Messenger of Allaah (sallallaahu alaihi wasallam) said, “There are three (matters) which are from al-kufr in Allaah (hunna min al-kufr billaah), wailing over the dead, tearing the pockets of one’s garment (i.e. a tradition of Jaahiliyyah) and reviling the ancestry.”

And Ibn Battah also narrates with a saheeh isnaad by way of Ibn Taawoos from his father Taawoos, who said, “Ibn ‘Abbaas was asked about the one who enters a woman through her anus, so he replied, “This person is asking me about al-kufr (haadhaa yas’alunee anil-kufr)”. (2/738).

So where does this lead the futile principle of al-Kanadie, or the principle that he was suckled and fostered upon by his mentors? If anything, this last narration of Ibn ‘Abbaas suggests the major kufr more strongly than in his saying, “hiya bihi kufr”. And clearly, it is not in reference to major kufr(!).

Indeed all of this is just another attempt to arrive at an alternative angle from which to speak with the apparent meanings of the verses in al-Maa’idah in order to support the

<sup>11</sup> And both of these narrations were pointed out by Shaikh Ali Hasan al-Halabi in the book “Fitnah of Takfir” by Shaikh al-Albaani.

Qutubite Agenda and to raise high the banner of the Carrier of the Flag of Rafd and Khaarijiyyah of the last century, Aal Qutb.

### **F) The Doubt Concerning the Words of 'Abdullaah Ibn Mas'ood**

Indeed, the Takfiri Intelligentsia wander in their misguided warm fuzzies, grossly ignorant of the aqeedah and manhaj of the Salaf, deprived of knowledge and all goodness, wandering in every valley, with their bankrupt intellects and cheap souls, lying upon the best of creation from the Companions of Allaah's Messenger and imputing to their words that which they are free of.

And amongst their scandals is their interpreting the saying of 'Abdullaah Ibn Mas'ood "That is the kufr (dhaalik al-kufr)" concerning taking bribes in judgements (al-hukm). Ibn Battah narrates with his isnaad, by way of Masrooq who said, "We asked Ibn Ma'sood about the saying of Allaah, the Mighty and Majestic, "who devour ill-gotten property" (5:42), and he said, "Bribes." I said, "And in judgement?". He said, "That is the kufr (dhaalik al-kufr)". (al-Ibaanah 2/733).

And this has actually been reported by Ibn Battah under the chapter title, "**A mention of the sins that take the one who commits them to the kufr that does not expel from the religion**".

However, to those suckled with Qutubism, it is in reference to major kufr. Al-Kanadie said:

We find in the same section we've been quoting from, in Ibn Jareer's *Tafseer*: "I was informed by Yaquub bin Ibraheem who said, 'I was informed by Hushaym who said, 'I was informed by ,Abdul-Maalik bin Abee Sulaymaan from Salaamah bin Qu'haayl from Alqaamah and Masrooq that they asked Ibn Masood about bribery and he said, 'It is from the unlawful trade.' So he (i.e. Qu'haayl) said, 'And in the *Hukm*?' He (i.e. Ibn Masood) said, 'That is the *Kufr*!' And then he recited: '**And whosoever does not judge by what Allâh has revealed, such are the Kâfirûn.**'"

So we see that Ibn Masood held the meaning of the *Ayaah* upon *Kufr Al-Akbaar*. And also from him as narrated from At-Tabaraane with a *Saheeh Sanaad* from Ibn Masood that he said, "The bribery in the *Hukm* is *Kufr* and between the people it is unlawful." (pp.52-53 of al-Kanadie's "refutation")

And in reply to this charlatan and his likes, we ask him what then is the ruling concerning entering a woman through her anus? And wailing over the dead? And reviling the ancestry, all of which have been labelled as "al-kufr" and in fact in the case of wailing over the dead, tearing the pockets and reviling the ancestry, to be "min al-kufr billaah" (from the kufr in Allaah)?!

As for the correct understanding, then it is that the saying of Ibn Mas'ood is in relation to the minor kufr that does not expel from the religion, and hence another cheap attempt to speak with the saying of the Khawaarij has been demolished.



Shaikh ul-Islaam Ibn Taymiyyah mentions those sins on account of which a person does not become a disbeliever saying, “And as for those sins which do not have a specific hadd punishment...” then he mentions amongst them “...or the one who gives false testimony or the one who takes bribes in judgement (yartashee fee hukmihi), or who rules by other than what Allaah has revealed...” (Majmoo’ Fataawaa 28/343). So this indicates that bribery in the hukm (judgement) is not the kufr that expels from the religion, rather this statement of Ibn Mas’ood is synonymous in meaning as the various other references to “al-kufr” which is not the major kufr.

And finally, al-Qurtubi said in his tafseer, “And al-Qushairi said, “And the madhhab of the Khawaarij is that the one who takes a bribery and judges by other than what Allaah has revealed is a Kaafir”, and he ascribed this to al-Hasan and as-Sudee”. (2/191).

### **G) Concerning the Cause of Revelation**

Al-Kanadie stated:

And what makes it even clearer that Ibn Abbaas, may Allaah be pleased with him, held the meaning of the aforementioned *Ayaah* upon *Kufr Al-Akbaar*, is the fact that he narrated the following: “By Allaah they were revealed with regards to these two (Jewish tribes), and it was these two that Allaah, *aza-wa’jaal* meant (in these verses).”

So if these *Ayaat* in *Surat Al-Ma’idah* were revealed for the Jews, who obviously disbelieved in *Islaam*, then Ibn Abbaas would not have held these *Ayaat* upon *Kufr Al-Asgaar* because it is clear that they were *Kuffar* and no one disputes this. So obviously Ibn Abbaas would hold these *Ayaat* upon the meaning, which expels one outside the realm of *Islaam*, because of the *Kufr* of the Jews. So if we are to find authentic instances in which Ibn Abbaas held these *Ayaat* upon *Kufr Al-Asgaar*, then we must determine whom he was holding their meaning upon less than *Al-Akbaar*. And it must be understood that these instances would not be the *Usl* of the meaning of these *Ayaat*, rather Ibn Abbaas and others would be referring to a specific group whom he did not hold as disbelievers. (p.49)

And what he means by this is to extend the apparent meaning of this verse to the Muslims as well, as a rule, without tafseel. As for the correct understanding then it is exactly what has been stated by at-Tabaree in his tafseer, “And the first of all of these sayings is most correct in my view, the saying of the one who said, “All of these verses were revealed for the Kuffaar amongst the People of the Book”, because the verses before and after them were revealed about them as well and they are the ones meant by them, and these verses (i.e. the three that mention al-kaafiroon, al-faasiqoon, adh-dhaalimoon) come in the course of the discussion of them, hence, that these verses also refer to them is naturally so.

But if someone should say that Allaah, Exalted is His remembrance, has made this general for everyone who does not judge by what Allaah has revealed, so how have you made it specific (for the Kuffaar amongst the People of the Book)?”. It is said in reply, “Allaah the Most High has generalised this for a people who rejected (jaahideen) the judgement of Allaah that He had decreed in His Book (the Tawrah). So he informed them that by their

leaving this judgement in the manner that they did<sup>12</sup> they are Kuffaar. And this is the same saying (i.e. view) concerning everyone who does not judge by what Allaah has revealed due to rejection (juhood), for such a one is a disbeliever in Allaah, just as Ibn Abbaas said, because in his rejection (juhood) of the judgement of Allaah after his knowledge that He revealed it in His Book, he is equivalent to one who rejects the Prophethood of His Prophet after having knowledge that he (Muhammad) is His Prophet". End of quote from at-Tabaree.

Hence, the truth of the matter is that there is tafseel to this issue in the case of the Muslims, and it is not major kufr absolutely, as al-Kanadie would have you hallucinate. The asl, basis of this verse with respect to the Muslims is that it is minor kufr. But al-Kanadie's Qutubi hallucination is as follows: To first claim that the verse is in relation to al-kufr al-akbar, fundamentally, without tafseel, even for the Muslim Ummah (by lies, deceit and pseudo-intellectualism). To then define and limit the scope of when it can be minor kufr, and here he brings some innovated understandings, such as his differentiating between qaadees (judges) and haakims (rulers). In this manner he tries to convince his reader that ruling by the secular laws in greater or lesser amounts, whether those of the Kuffaar or of one's own making, is therefore, outside of the scope he has defined already. And this, as one can clearly see is not any proof at all. Rather, it is merely playing games, and toying with the readers mind into believing his is a logical argument when it is actually futile.

Rather the truth of the matter is that ruling by the secular laws, once or a hundred times, or in one issue, or in a hundred different issues, does not exit from the aforementioned tafseel of at-Tabaree, save that the kufr is not restricted to Juhood alone, but can also include Istihlaal, and elements of I'tiqaad that necessitate kufr. And this is very clear in the sayings of many of the past and contemporary scholars<sup>13</sup>. Since what is defined as ruling

<sup>12</sup> And the manner in which they did that (i.e. the Jews) has already preceded in what has occurred above. And that is that they rejected the judgement of Allaah in the Tawrah out of Juhood (rejection, denial).

<sup>13</sup> And amongst those sayings:

Shaikh ul-Islaam Ibn Taymiyyah, "For many people have accepted Islaam but along with this they do not judge except by their natural [inherited] customs, those that are ordered by those whom they obey. **So if they know ('arafoo)** that it is not permissible to judge except by what Allaah has revealed and did not adhere to that, **but in fact declared it to be lawful (istahalloo)** for themselves to judge in opposition to what Allaah has revealed, then they are disbelievers. **And if not [i.e. did not declare it lawful for themselves] then they are [merely] ignorant people** – as has preceded about them" Minhaaj us-Sunnah (5/130)

Then there is the saying of the Allaamah, Shaikh Abdul-Lateef bin Abdur-Rahmaan Aal ash-Shaikh, "...and it is forbidden to pass judgement (tahkeem) when the judgement is based upon a false (baatil) Sharee'ah which opposes the Book and the Sunnah, **such as the laws of the Greeks (Ahkaam Yoonaan) and those of Europe, and those of the Tartars, and their various legislative codes (qawaaneen) the source of which are their own opinions and desires. Similar to this are the various cultural and customary practices of the Bedouins.** Hence, whoever made it lawful to judge (istahalla) by [any of] this in the issues pertaining to blood, or other than it is a Kaafir. Allaah the Most High said, "**And whosoever does not judge by what Allaah has revealed, they are the Unbelievers**" (5:44). And concerning this verse, some of the Mufasssiroon have said that the kufr intended here is the kufr that is lesser

than the Major kufr (kufr doona kufr al-akbar), because they understood that this verse applies to whoever judges by other than what Allaah has revealed but does not make that lawful (ghayr mustahill). But they do not dispute amongst themselves regarding its application in general to the mustahill (one who makes it lawful), and that the kufr in this case is the one that expels from the religion.” (Minhaaj ut-Ta’sees, p.71).

The saying of Shaikh Ibn Ibraaheem in his Fataawaa (1/80) dated 9/1/1385H – five years after Tahkim ul-Qawanin was published: “And likewise, the implementation of the meaning of ‘Muhammad is the Messenger of Allaah’ is by judging to his Shari’ah and confining oneself to that whilst rejecting whatever opposes it from the secular laws and all those matters for which Allaah gave no authority. And the one who judges by them (hakama bihaa) or refers to them (haakama ilaihaa) - for judgement **whilst believing in the correctness (sihha) of that or the permissibility (to judge by them) (jawaaz)**, then he is a kaafir with the kufr that ejects from the religion. And if he does that **without belief (I’tiqaad) in their correctness and (regarding it) permissible to judge by them (jawaaz)**, then he is a kaafir with the kufr in action, which does not eject from the religion.”

And Imaam Ibn Baaz said, “And whoever ruled by other than what Allaah has revealed (i.e. the secular laws) then he will not be in other than one of four situations:

- 1) The one who says: ‘I rule by this because it is superior to the Sharee’ah of Islaam.’ Such a one is disbeliever in the sense of the major disbelief
- 2) The one who says: ‘I rule by this because it is like the Sharee’ah of Islaam, so ruling by it is permissible and ruling by the Sharee’ah is permissible’. Such a one is a disbeliever in the sense of the major disbelief.
- 3) The one who says: ‘I rule by this and ruling by the Sharee’ah of Islaam is superior but ruling by other than what Allaah has revealed is permissible (jaa’iz).’ Such a one is a disbeliever in the sense of major disbelief.
- 4) The one who says: ‘I rule by this’ while he believes that ruling by other than what Allaah has revealed is not permissible and who says that ‘the Sharee’ah of Islaam is superior and it is not permissible to rule by other than it’ but he is neglectful, or treats matters lightly, or does this action due to a reason which proceeds from his rulers, then he is a disbeliever in the sense of minor disbelief which does not eject from the religion - and it is considered one of the greatest of major sins.”

(Al-Hukmu bi-Ghairi Maa Anzalallaahu wa Usool ut-Takfeer p. 71/72)

Imaam Ibn Baaz was also asked, “What is the ruling upon [judging] by secular law [al-qawanin al-wad’iyyah]? And is it permissible to enact them? And does a ruler become a disbeliever by instituting these laws [sannihi lihadhihil-qawanin]?”

Shaikh Bin Baz’s answer: “When these laws are in agreement with the Shar’iah then there is no harm in that, such as when he institutes laws regarding the paths [of travel] and streets and other things which benefit the people and in which there is no opposition to the Shari’ah, - and [when] these things assist in the smooth running of the affairs, then there is no harm in them. As for those laws which oppose the Shari’ah then no [it is not permissible]. When he institutes these laws, the meaning of this is that there would be no hadd punishment for the fornicator and nor any punishment for the thief or the one who takes intoxicants. This is falsehood, and these laws are falsehood. When the one in charge declares them to be permissible (istahallaha), then he has disbelieved, when he states (qaala) that they are lawful (halaal), and there is no harm in them, this is what becomes kufr (disbelief). Whoever declares to be lawful (istahalla) what Allaah has made unlawful has disbelieved”. (Muraaji’aat Fi Fiqh ul-Waqi’ as-Siyasi wal-Fikri (12) by ‘Abdullaah ar-Rifa’ee)

Shaikh ‘Abdul-Muhsin al-‘Abbaad was asked in the Islamic University of Madinah, during his lesson, “Sharh Sunah Abu Dawood” on 16/11/1420H, “Is Istibdaal (replacing) the Islamic Sharee’ah with the Secular Laws (al-qawaneen al-wad’iyyah) kufr in and of itself? Or does it require the

by other than what Allaah has ruled covers different manifestations – all of them are ruling by other than what Allaah has revealed. So whether one makes an incorrect judgement between two disputants, or whether one judges by one's ancestral customs, or whether one judges by aspects of the sharee'ah that have been distorted, altered or changed, or whether one rules by an English, or French law, or whether one judges by his own devised law, then all of that is within the scope of the verse. Since the most important thing is, is what has been judged by, in opposition to the Sharee'ah or not. This is the fundamental principle.

Shaikh Ibn Uthaimen said, "Hence, built upon this, then our explanation of this verse (5:44) in the manner that has been mentioned, we judge that ruling by other than what Allaah has revealed is not the kufr that expels from the religion, rather it is the kufr of action, since the ruler (haakim) has departed by this act of his from the right mode of conduct. **And it is not to be differentiated in any of that between a man who takes a secular law (qaanoon wad'iyy) from others and then makes it a referent point for judgement in his state (yuhakkimuhu fee dawlatihi), and between one who devises his own law (qaanoon), and then puts this secular law in place.** Since, the most important thing is: Does this law oppose the Heavenly Law or not?" (Fitnat ut-Takfir, p.78, of Shaikh al-Albani, compiled by Shaikh Ali Hasan, originally from the cassette "Commentary on Fitnah of Takfir of Shaikh al-Albaani").

Thus al-Kanadie's attempt to distort the proper explanation of the application of this verse, is another cheap attempt at qutubising the manhaj.

### **H) Al-Kanadies Distortion of Juhood and the Nature of the Kufr of the Jews**

Following on from the previous point, al-Kanadie distorted the meaning of the words of Ibn Jareer at-Tabaree which we have quoted earlier, in order to fit in which his Qutubite Agenda. Al-Kanadie makes mention of Ibn Katheers reference to the view of Ibn Jareer at-Tabaree, indicating that at-Tabaree referred the kufr to be in relation to Juhood. And the well known words of at-Tabaree are as follows:

"But if someone should say that Allaah, Exalted is His remembrance, has made this general for everyone who does not judge by what Allaah has revealed, so how have you made it specific (for the Kuffaar amongst the People of the Book)?". It is said in reply, "Allaah the Most High has generalised this for a people who rejected (jaahideen) the

---

Istihlaal of the heart of belief (I'tiqaad) in its permissibility? And is there a difference between ruling by other than what Allaah has revealed in one instance, and between making the secular laws (al-qawaaneen) as general legislation (tashree'an aamman), while one believes that this is not permitted?"

So the Shaikh replied, "It is clear that there is no difference between ruling in a matter, or ten or a hundred or a thousand, or less or greater than that. There is no difference as long as a person considers himself to be in error, that he is doing what is evil (munkar), and that he is committing disobedience, and that he is fearful of sin, so this is the minor kufr (kufr doona kufr). And as for Istihlaal, even if it was only in one matter, so he makes it lawful to judge by other than what Allaah has revealed, and considers it to be lawful, then this is kufr."

judgement of Allaah that He had decreed in His Book (the Tawrah). So he informed them that by their leaving this judgement in the manner that they did<sup>14</sup> they are Kuffaar. And this is the same saying (i.e. view) concerning everyone who does not judge by what Allaah has revealed due to rejection (juhood), for such a one is a disbeliever in Allaah, just as Ibn Abbaas said, because in his rejection (juhood) of the judgement of Allaah after his knowledge that He revealed it in His Book, he is equivalent to one who rejects the Prophethood of His Prophet after having knowledge that he (Muhammad) is His Prophet". End of quote from at-Tabaree.

Anyhow, after making mention of Ibn Katheer's reference to this view of at-Tabaree, al-Kanadie then commented (in his footnote on p.56) on what he understands to be Juhood, in this context:

Look to "*At-Tafseer*". Vol. 2/63-64 And the saying of Ibn Jareer here, "...and anyone else who rejects the *Hukm* that Allaah sent down in His Book" does not mean that this rejection must come from a belief in the heart in order to be *Kufr Al-Akbaar*, as the leaders of *Irjaa'* in our time have alleged. What is clear from the words of Ibn Jareer, may Allaah be merciful to him, is that the form of 'Ruling by Other Than What Allaah Revealed' which the Jews committed, where they replaced the *Hukm* of Allaah regarding the stoning of the married adulterer with their own fabricated law of whipping and blackening their faces and also the execution of the murderer with their own fabricated law in which, only the commoner would be executed etc. -- is the rejection of the "*Hukm* that Allaah sent down in His Book."

So here al-Kanadie is attempting to use what the Jews did to illustrate his understanding of Juhood, which is to portray that Juhood can be on the limbs absolutely, unrestrictedly. In reality, this shows his true ignorance of the affairs of Kufr and its types. Juhood is to reject something with one's heart, after knowing it to be true. However, since this does not please the Qutubites, they wish to make Juhood something that is tied only to the limbs. To this end they utilise what the Jews did (without even understanding what the Jews really did that necessitated their kufr), in order to prove that since the Jews replaced or altered the judgement of Allaah, this in itself is Juhood. In other words, they attempt to make the act synonymous with Juhood. And in this they display their ignorance, not only of Juhood, but also of their futile understanding of "tabdeel"<sup>15</sup>.

What is reported in the two Saheehs, that "The Messenger of Allaah (sallallaahu alaihi wasallam) said to them (the Jews), 'What do you find in the Tawrah for the one who commits adultery (zinaa)?' They replied, 'We disgrace them and they are lashed'." And in Saheeh Muslim in the hadeeth of al-Baraa there occurs, "A Jew who was being punished with scalding hot water and being lashed was made to pass by the Prophet (sallallaahu

<sup>14</sup> And the manner in which they did that (i.e. the Jews) has already preceded in what has occurred above. And that is that they rejected the judgement of Allaah in the Tawrah out of Juhood (rejection, denial).

<sup>15</sup> Refer to MNJ050018 for a detailed treatment of this matter.

alaihi wasallam), and so he called them over. He said, 'Is this what you find for the punishment of zinaa in your book?'. They replied, 'Yes'.

Hence, they ascribed what they themselves had invented of lashing and scalding to the Sharee'ah of Allaah, and they rejected the stoning to death that was mentioned in the Tawrah, as a matter of belief.

What is stated by Abu Umar Ibn 'Abdul-Barr about this hadeeth, "**And in this hadeeth is evidence to show that they used to lie upon their Tawrah, and they would ascribe their lie to their Lord and to their Book**, since they said that they find in the Tawrah that the adulterers should be lashed and scalded, whether they are married or not married. Yet in the Tawrah is something different, that is stoning of the married fornicators (i.e. adulterers)." (at-Tamheed 9/14).

What is stated by Ibn 'Arabi al-Maliki, "Ahkaam ul-Quraan 2/642 "If he rules with [the rules he brought from himself] **holding that they are from Allaah**, then that is tabdeel of the [rule of Allah] and necessitates disbelief and if he ruled by them due to a desire and out of disobedience, then that is a sin and upon the principle of Ahl us-Sunnah regarding forgiveness for the sinners, he will be able to reach forgiveness."

What is stated by at-Tabari in the tafsir of al-Maa'idah (5:44) about the practise of the Jews in the above hadeeth, "...however they changed (baddaloo) and altered (ghayyaroo) his judgement..." and also, "...and some of them (the exegetes) have stated something similar to that which we have said in that the kufr alluded to in this verse is in reference to the Jews who distorted (harrafoo) the Book of Allaah and who changed (baddaloo) His judgement."

And al-Jassaas said (regarding the verses of al-Maa'idah): "The intended (meaning) is rejecting (juhood) the Rule of Allaah, or ruling by other than it **and then informing that it is the rule of Allah**. So this is the kufr which ejects from the religion, and its doer is an apostate, even if he was a Muslim before that - and built upon this is the interpretation of the one who said: "Verily, (these) verses were revealed against Banee Israa'eel and they apply to us (also)" so they mean by this: "That whoever rejects (jahada) the rule of Allaah, or rules by other than what Allaah has revealed and then says "**this is the rule of Allah**" then he is a kaafir, just as Banu Israa'eel disbelieved when they did the likes of this" (Ahkaam ul-Quraan 2/439).

There is also the saying of al-Qurtubi, "Whoever does not judge by what Allaah has revealed, rejecting (radd) the Qur'aan and rejecting (jahd) the saying of the Messenger (sallallaahu alaihi wasallam) is a kaafir (disbeliever)..."

And all of this shows that the Jews rejected the stoning that was in the Tawraat, just like a person may reject one of Allaah's Names or Attributes or one of his rulings. Listen to the words of Ibn al-Qayyim, and al-Kanadie's refuse will become offensively discernible:

Ibn al-Qayyim said, “And there is another principle, that disbelief, kufr is of two types: a) the kufr of action and b) the kufr of juhood (denial) and ‘inaad (stubborn rejection). As for the kufr of juhood then it is when one disbelieves in what is known to have been brought by the Messenger (sallallahu alaihi wasallam) from Allaah, out of juhood and ‘inaad from amongst the Names, Attributes, Actions and rulings of the Lord. This type of kufr negates faith from every single aspect.” (Kitaab us-Salaat, p.72).

So for example if someone made Juhood (i.e. rejected as matter of belief) of polygamy, or stoning, or cutting of hands, or the likes, then he is a Kaafir, just like if he made rejection of one of the Names of Allaah. So juhood is actually tied to the heart – and sometimes it may be exhibited on the limbs and sometimes not. And what is exhibited on the limbs, then that is not always an indicator that Juhood exists, in the absence of other indicators. And this is what the Qutubiyah attempt to do away with, they wish to make Juhood to be on the limbs only, so that their bloodthirsty desire for takfir can be more readily realised.

Coming back to the Jews, the Jews rejecting the stoning to death that was in the Tawraat out of Juhood, i.e. they did not accept it and believe it, and instead distorted it and changed it to something else, rather they disbelieved in it. Then they attributed what they concocted to Allaah!! So they combined a number of matters, firstly they made juhood of the hukm of Allaah (i.e. rejected it, as a matter of belief), and then they fabricated their own law and ascribed it to Allaah (which is the proper meaning of tabdeel). And in all of they expressed their Juhood and their subsequent lie, by openly lying upon the Tawraah and claiming other than what was actually in it. And the fact that the Jews ascribed their own law to the Tawraat shows that they made Juhood of what was in the Tawraat. So this is an additional indicator. As for the mere act of not stoning the adulterer but scalding him instead, then that does not indicate that a person has made Juhood (i.e. rejected as a matter of belief) of the judgement of stoning that is actually in the Tawraat. Just like when a person persistently commits fornication, this does not indicate that he has made Juhood (rejection) of the prohibition of fornication. Or just like when a person persistently takes usury, this does not indicate that he has made juhood (rejected as a matter of belief) the prohibition of usury – unless there are associated indicators to show and prove that, such as when he says fornication is chastity or that it is allowed, or that ribaa’ is superior or is lawful and things like this.

Hence, al-Kanadie’s attempt to justify his baatil is itself baatil. In reality, it means that our scholars like Ibn al-Qayyim, who have correctly defined the kufr of Juhood, are also amongst the “leaders of Irjaa”(!). Listen to this imbecile:

Look to “*At-Tafseer*”. Vol. 2/63-64 And the saying of Ibn Jareer here, “...and anyone else who rejects the *Hukm* that Allaah sent down in His Book” does not mean that this rejection must come from a belief in the heart in order to be *Kufr Al-Akbaar*, as the leaders of *Irjaa*’ in our time have alleged.

And then listen to Ibn al-Qayyim, “And there is another principle, that disbelief, kufr is of two types: a) the kufr of action and b) the kufr of juhood (denial) and ‘inaad (stubborn rejection). As for the kufr of juhood then it is when one disbelieves in what is known to

have been brought by the Messenger (sallallaahu alaihi wasallam) from Allaah, out of juhood and 'inaad from amongst the Names, Attributes, Actions and rulings of the Lord. This type of kufr negates faith from every single aspect.” (Kitaab us-Salaat, p.72).

Need any further comment?! Look at these surmising liars, who wear the gown of Salafiyyah, but in fact huddle the undergarments of Qutubiyyah, pretending to be seeing, but blind, pretending to be knowing but ignorant.

As for the correct saying then it is that juhood is rejection with the heart, and then this can be manifested upon the limbs. However, whatever is observed upon the limbs in general, is not an absolute indicator that Juhood has been made. And in the absence of additional indicators, that prove that without doubt, then it cannot be claimed to be pure Juhood. And whoever understands this will also come to realise the reality of many of the generalised, ambiguous statements that are actually used by those who are under the shade of Qutubism to justify their unrestricted takfir, upon other than Juhood, Istihilaal, I'tiqaad and the likes.

Listen carefully to the saying of Mahmood Shakir, “... So whoever argued with these two narrations (i.e. of Abu Miljaz) out of context<sup>16</sup> and distorted their meaning, seeking to defend his ruler, or using them fraudulently to make it permissible to rule by other than what Allaah has revealed and made incumbent upon His servants, then the Sharee'ah ruling upon him is the ruling of the one who **willfully rejects** one of the laws of Allaah (**jahid**). His repentance is to be sought, but if he persists and displays arrogance and wilfully denies the rule of Allaah (jahada hukmallaah) and is pleased with the replacement of the laws [of the Shar'eeah] (tabdil), then the ruling of a disbeliever, kafir, who is persistent upon his disbelief, is well known to the people of this religion.” (Notes to Tafsir of at-Tabari 10/349)

And he also said, “..Indeed, the matter has reached [such proportions] that there are those who will argue for the preference of secular law above the Sharee'ah laws by arguing that laws of the Sharee'ah were intended for a specific period of time which has ended, and hence they are no longer valid...”.

So when a person comes along and attempts to make istihlaal of ruling by the secular laws, attempting to use certain narrations to justify making this permissible, then indeed this is a person who has rejected (as a matter of belief) the judgement of Allaah. Or if he tries to argue that the Sharee'ah laws are outmoded and invalid for the current times, then he indeed has made juhood of the laws of Allaah. His repentance to be sought and if he persists, he is a Kaafir, on account of his juhood and his pleasure and satisfaction with other laws. So here, merely ruling by the secular laws, is not an indicator of juhood, but when one attempts to fraudulently make them permissible, or claims that they are

---

<sup>16</sup> And this is concerning those who use these narrations to justify the act of ruling by other than what Allaah has revealed, seeking to make it permissible and claiming that the Sharee'ah is outmoded – intending thereby to defend their actions or those of their rulers.



outmoded, then that is an indicator that the hukm of Allaah has been rejected (as a matter of belief).

Finally, let us go back to the words of at-Tabaree once more, which if one were to read them again, after what has preceded, the affair will become clear:

“So he informed them that by their leaving this judgement in the manner that they did<sup>17</sup> they are Kuffaar. And this is the same saying (i.e. view) concerning everyone who does not judge by what Allaah has revealed due to rejection (juhood), for such a one is a disbeliever in Allaah, just as Ibn Abbaas said, because in his rejection (juhood) of the judgement of Allaah after his knowledge that He revealed it in His Book, he is equivalent to one who rejects the Prophethood of His Prophet after having knowledge that he (Muhammad) is His Prophet”. End of quote from at-Tabaree.

Pay attention to the last sentence of at-Tabaree and see how it explains the clear meaning of Juhood, exactly as Ibn al-Qayyim has explained it.

May the hands of al-Kanadie be wretched for his great deceit, sophistry and lies...in Allaah is the refuge.

### **I) The Argument of Restricting This Kufr to the Hukkaam Only**

And amongst the greatest of the doubts of the Takfiri Intelligentsia is that they attempt to apply the apparent meaning of the verse in al-Maa'idah to the Hukkaam (rulers only). And this is done by their differentiating between a haakim and a qaadee, in fact between a haakim and everybody else in the society.

And this due to their assumption that only the haakim can be guilty of what they understand to be “tabdeel” (i.e. their false understanding of it) or “tashree' aamm” and the likes.

And this differentiation is in fact false, and has no knowledge-based basis. While they acknowledge that the verse is general for everyone, due to the fact that the words “man” and “maa” (whoever, and whatever) have been used in the verse, they try to justify their claim by saying that the asl, (basis) of the verse is major kufr, and this applies to the haakim (who makes “general legislation” or commits “tabdeel” and “istibdaal” and the likes) and as for what is other than him (such as the qaadees and the general folk), then this is only minor kufr for them.

Firstly, what actually is the domain of ruling by what Allaah has revealed? There are the personal disputes which occur amongst the people, such as inheritance, qitaal (killing) and qisaas, (retribution) and so on amongst the social dealings and interactions. Secondly, there are specified hadd punishments for theft, murder, fornication, homosexuality,

<sup>17</sup> And the manner in which they did that (i.e. the Jews) has already preceded in what has occurred above. And that is that they rejected the judgement of Allaah in the Tawrah out of Juhood (rejection, denial).

bearing false witness, slandering chaste women and the likes. Then ruling by what Allaah has revealed has a more general application in that it refers to conforming to the Sharee'ah in both one's knowledge and action - and thus it applies to everyone, including non-Muslims - and covers the overall aspects of the religion. Then, it can be restricted and apply to those whose duty it is to enforce the judgements upon those who oppose the Sharee'ah, whether those which are in personal disputes (in which a person is contending for his own right, i.e in retribution, or dispute in inheritance), or which relate to the hadd punishments (which are the sole right of Allaah), such as for adultery, stealing and the likes. And there are also the Wullaat ul-Umoor (the overall rulers), and there can also be Hukkaam under their jurisdiction and then the general folk. And all of them are required to judge by what Allaah has revealed, in the broader sense of it and also the restricted sense of it, when it applies to specific individuals in specific roles.

So amongst their doubts is that they say when a Ruler makes a "hukm aamm" or "tashree aamm" or a general legislation, then he has committed major kufr. And what they intend by hukm aamm is that a ruler fabricates his own laws and then governs the people with them. Firstly, many of the Qutubiyah fail to understand what is meant by "hukm aamm" which is actually alluded to by Shaikh ul-Islaam Ibn Taymiyyah:

"For if the ruler (haakim) is pious, but he makes a judgement without knowledge, then he will be amongst the inhabitants of Hellfire. And if he knew (the judgement) but he judged in opposition to the truth that he knew, he will be amongst the inhabitants of the Hellfire. And when he judged without knowledge or justice, then it is more befitting that he should be amongst the inhabitants of Hellfire. This is when he makes a judgement concerning an affair in relation to a particular person. As for when he makes a general ruling (hukman aamman) regarding the religion of the Muslims and makes truth into falsehood, falsehood into truth, sunnah into bid'ah and bid'ah into sunnah, the ma'roof into munkar and the munkar into ma'roof, forbids what Allaah and His Messenger have commanded and orders what Allaah and His Messenger have prohibited. Then this is another manifestation, the Lord of all the Worlds, Diety of the Messengers and the Master of the Day of Judgement, to whom belongs praise in this world and the hereafter will pass judgement over it. "His is the Decision, and to Him you (all) shall be returned." (Al-Qasas 28:88) He it is Who has sent His Messenger (Muhammad) with guidance and the religion of truth (Islâm), that He may make it (Islâm) superior over all religions. And All-Sufficient is Allâh as a Witness." (Al-Fath 48:28)." Majmoo' al-Fataawaa (35/355-388).

Secondly, this whole subject has been covered in detail in GRV070016 so refer to it. Thirdly, what Shaikh ul-Islaam is talking about is when a ruler imposes his own Ijtihad in a particular matter, and makes it binding upon the people, asking them to adhere to it. As a result he may turn Sunnah into Bid'ah or truth into falsehood, or the ma'roof into munkar and therefore fall into a type of tabdeel (changing, distortion) of the religion. Shaikh ul-Islaam says this is not allowed, and he does not pass a judgement of takfir upon it either. This form of tabdeel is explained elsewhere by Shaikh ul-Islaam(35/396 and also 3/267) and in which he explains that the one who makes this lawful (istihlaal) or the one who claims that his judgement (i.e. his own viewpoint, which might be an outright lie, or an errant ijtihaad, or something that opposes the Sharee'ah and the likes) is actually the

Sharee'ah of Allaah (i.e. from it), then this is major kufr. So the matter falls back upon either tabdeel in which it is claimed that what one is enforcing is from the Sharee'ah of Allaah, or that it is lawful to make judgement by way of his own viewpoint and opinion. And it is not possible for the Qutubiyyah not to acknowledge this, as this is manifestly clear and apparent. And whoever wishes for a full treatment of this, let them refer to Majmoo' al-Fataawaa(35/355-onwards), in the whole section on al-Qadaa' (Judgements). So now having understood the true context of what is meant by hukm aamm (general legislation), and to illustrate this, then say for example a government allows the existence of brothels, or usurious banks, or the selling of alcohol and wine by way of shops and stores and the likes – then all of this is clear opposition to the Sharee'ah (and is worse than when a person merely enforces his errant ijtihaad or viewpoint, in a matter that relates to knowledge and action, upon the people). However, this is not major kufr, until it is claimed that this is the actual judgement of Allaah, is from the Sharee'ah, or if this is made lawful (i.e. istihlaal) from the point of view of the Sharee'ah.

And this is where the great confusion of the Qutubiyyah and their likes, in that they treat what is an organised manner of either committing sin, or encouraging sin, to be synonymous with Istihlaal and Juhood and the likes, and thus they make takfir by way of the act alone, and abandon the tafseel of the Salaf which is so clearly apparent.

To give another illustration of their false distinction. It is known to many Muslims, in the Muslim lands and otherwise, that many of those who are responsible for their families (i.e. fathers, or mothers, if widowed) lay down regulations for their offspring. So they order them to shave the beards, and they also prohibit them from wearing the hijaab and in fact order them to resemble the Kuffaar and so on. And they make this a hukm aamm (general legislation) upon them, in that they reprimand them if they do not comply and so on. And this is widespread and known by everybody. Thus, this father, or this mother, or whoever is in this position, has not judged by what Allaah has revealed and has actually issued a legislation, to which he requests compliance to, which is in opposition to what Allaah has revealed. Thus the distinction between the haakim, or the qaadee or the general folk is baatil (futile), because ruling by other than what Allaah has revealed is upon everyone. And making judgements can also be done by everyone, within their own jurisdiction of authority. And it is clear that those who call to sin and disobedience, forcing that upon those under them are not to be declared disbelievers until they make Istihlaal, or Juhood and express what necessitates kufr.

But you will see that the bloodthirsty Takfiris wish to feign ignorance of these affairs, and when they are informed of them, they flee on their heels, blocking their ears from hearing the destruction of their baatil.

Thus, this argument that they use of tashree' aamm (general legislation), only illustrates their total confusion and blatant contradiction. To add to their confusion, they also failed to realise the nature of the viewpoint of some of OUR scholars, who hold that instituting laws that oppose the Sharee'ah in a systematic, organised manner is major kufr, or that ruling by secular laws in their entirety is major kufr. For these scholars hold this view due to their belief that this act, in this manner, conclusively indicates istihlaal or the belief that

the secular law is better or superior, and hence this belief necessitates kufr. The manner some of OUR scholars arrive at this viewpoint is different to the way the Qutubiyah, and Hizbiyyoon (as you may have realised by now) arrive at their viewpoint<sup>18</sup>. However, some of the scholars do not consider this to be correct, since it has no proof except for one: which is their claim that such an act is only major kufr, because it conclusively indicates what necessitates disbelief (such as Istihlaal, believing these laws to be superior and so on). And in the view of other scholars, this does not bind at all. For this can be said about the persistent fornicator, the consumer of usury, and the one who continuously falls into a variety of major sins and so on. For ruling by other than what Allaah has revealed, for the individual, or the qaadee or the haakim, is a major sin. And a ruler ruling by a secular law or by a law that opposes the Sharee'ah (whether that be of his own making) in an instance is not major kufr. Rather there is tafseel to this matter. And if he request compliance to this law, then this too is not major kufr, until he makes Istihlaal, or Juhood or expresses his belief in its superiority and the likes. And this principle applies whether he did it with one law or a hundred laws.

Further, and this is of the greatest of examples against this viewpoint, at the time of Imaam Ahmad, the rulers of the time passed a hukm aamm or call it tashree' aamm (general legislation) if you like, imposing a saying of inherent kufr, (let alone one of opposition to the Sharee'ah) upon the Ummah, impisoning or beheading or slaying the one who did not adopt it and agree with it. Yet despite that the way of the greatest of the Imaams of the time was well known, and they withheld from takfir.

Imaam Ibn Baaz was also asked, "What is the ruling upon [judging] by secular law [al-qawanin al-wad'iyyah]? And is it permissible to enact them? And does a ruler become a disbeliever by instituting these laws [sannihi lihadhihil-qawanin]?"

Shaikh Bin Baz's answer: "When these laws are in agreement with the Shar'iah then there is no harm in that, such as when he institutes laws regarding the paths [of travel] and streets and other things which benefit the people and in which there is no opposition to the Shari'ah, - and [when] these things assist in the smooth running of the affairs, then there is no harm in them. As for those laws which oppose the Shari'ah then no [it is not permissible]. When he institutes these laws, the meaning of this is that there would be no hadd punishment for the fornicator and nor any punishment for the thief or the one who takes intoxicants. This is falsehood, and these laws are falsehood. When the one in charge declares them to be permissible (istahallaha), then he has disbelieved, when he states (qaala) that they are lawful (halaal), and there is no harm in them, this is what becomes kufr (disbelief). Whoever declares to be lawful (istahalla) what Allaah has made unlawful has disbelieved". (Muraaji'at Fi Fiqh ul-Waqi' as-Siyasi wal-Fikri (12) by 'Abdullaah ar-Rifa'ee)

<sup>18</sup> And the way of the bloodthirsty Takfiris is pretty much what has been refuted in this paper... which is one of innovated sayings, futile principles, lies and distortions, pseudo-intellectualism and downright charlatanry, all in order to speak with the apparent meanings of the verses, without tafseel. And what is worse, is that when they are refuted they do not return and recant from their neo-Pseudoism.

Shaikh 'Abdul-Muhsin al-'Abbaad was asked in the Islamic University of Madinah, during his lesson, "Sharh Sunah Abu Dawood" on 16/11/1420H, "Is Istibdaal (replacing) the Islamic Sharee'ah with the Secular Laws (al-qawaneen al-wad'iyyah) kufr in and of itself? Or does it require the Istihlaal of the heart of belief (I'tiqaad) in its permissibility? And is there a difference between ruling by other than what Allaah has revealed in one instance, and between making the secular laws (al-qawaaneen) as general legislation (tashree'an aamman), while one believes that this is not permitted?"

So the Shaikh replied, "It is clear that there is no difference between ruling in a matter, or ten or a hundred or a thousand, or less or greater than that. There is no difference as long as a person considers himself to be in error, that he is doing what is evil (munkar), and that he is committing disobedience, and that he is fearful of sin, so this is the minor kufr (kufr doona kufr). And as for Istihlaal, even if it was only in one matter, so he makes it lawful to judge by other than what Allaah has revealed, and considers it to be lawful, then this is kufr."

Shaikh Ibn Uthaimen said, "As for what is connected to [the issue of] ruling by other than what Allaah has revealed, then it is, as occurs in the Mighty Book, divided into three types: that which is kufr (disbelief), that which is dhulum (oppression) and that which is fisq (sinfulness) – all in accordance with the various reasons upon which this judgement is made:

1. So if a person judges by other than what Allaah has revealed due to following his desires, alongside his knowledge that the truth lies in what Allaah has decreed, then such a one does not disbelieve, however he is either a faasiq (sinner) or a dhaalim (oppressor).
2. Or when he legislates (yusharri'u) a general ruling (hukman 'aamman)<sup>19</sup> which the Ummah [adopts and] traverses upon, and he considers this to be of benefit (maslahah), and he is caught up in [confusion about it], then he does not disbelieve either, because many of the rulers have ignorance of the knowledge of the Sharee'ah and one who does not know the Sharee'ah ruling is often connected to them (i.e. by their side) and they (the rulers) consider such a one to be a great scholar, and opposition [to the Sharee'ah] occurs as a result of all of this.
3. And if he knows the legislation (Shar') however he judges by this [legislation] or he legislates this [law] and then makes it a code of law (dustoor) to be followed by the people<sup>20</sup>, believing (ya'taqid) that he is an oppressor (dhaalim) in all of that and

<sup>19</sup> And here Shaikh Ibn Uthaimen refers to al-hukm al-aamm, exactly as Shaikh ul-Islaam Ibn Taymiyyah has discussed it, and as we have outlined earlier.

<sup>20</sup> Here Shaikh Ibn Uthaimen did not differentiate between tahkeem and tashree', from the point of view of judgement over them.

Shaikh Abul-Hasan al-Ma'ribi said, "Sometimes, one amongst them (the Qutubiyah, Takfiriyyah) might say, "We hold onto the tafseel (clarification, distinction) of the Salaf on this matter, we hold on to the tafseel of the Salaf, and we do not reject it. But we hold this tafseel on the issue of ruling

that the truth is what has come in the Book and the Sunnah, then we are not able to make takfir of this one.

#### 4. But we make takfeer of:

- i) The one who holds that the a legislation other than Allaah's is more appropriate for the people to be upon
- ii) Or the one who believes that this legislation is equivalent to the legislation of Allaah, the Mighty and Majestic

It is this one who is a disbeliever because he is a mukhaddhib (makes takdheeb) of the saying of Allaah, the Blessed and Almighty, **“Is not Allaah the Best of all Judges?”** and also His saying, **“Is it the judgement of Jaahiliyyah they seek. And who is a better judge than Allaah for a people of sure (faith)?”**. (Refer to MNJO50017 for the actual audio recording of this statement).

Therefore, there is no proof for the Qutubiyah, Khaarijiyyah Asriyyah save their using some of the verdicts of OUR scholars (like Shaikh Salih al-Fawzaan, Shaikh Ibn Ibraaheem and others), and then mixing that with their own baatil (like the baatil that has been covered in this discourse) and then using that to raise high the Flag of their so-called

---

(al-hukmu) by other than what Allaah has revealed. But as for legislating (at-tashree') by other than the judgement of Allaah, we do not hold this tafseel.” These words of theirs are actually nothing but polemics and philosophy, because, there is no real difference behind these words, since the one who judges (hakama) by other than what Allaah has revealed in a particular matter, then he has legislated (shara'a) a judgement other than Allaah's judgement in this issue. And whoever judges (hakama) by other than what Allaah has revealed and then makes this judgement binding upon the people is just like the one who legislated (shara'a) a judgement upon other than the legislation (shar') of Allaah and made it binding upon the people. What is this philosophy?...”

So when these people saw that it was difficult to pass by the way of the Salaf (in this regard), they began to say, we hold on to the tafseel of the Salaf on this issue (of not judging by what Allaah has revealed), but there is a difference between ruling (al-hukm) by other than what Allaah has revealed and legislating (at-tashree') by other than the legislation of Allaah.

And if you were ask the one who says this, and you said to him, “What is the difference then?”, if he replied that the issue of ruling by other than what Allaah has revealed has the well-known tafseel applied to it, but the issue of legislatig (at-tashree') does not have tafseel in it, then say to him, “Has anyone from the Salaf said this before you? Name me a single person from the Salaf who said that the one who judges by other than what Allaah has revealed is different to the one who legislates by other than Allaah's legislation. Name me one from the Salaf.”

So when he is not able to mention a single one from the Salaf, yet the verses relating to ruling by other than what Allaah has revealed are present and those which censure those who legislate by other than Allaah's legislation are all present in the Book, present in the Qur'aan, yet alongside that the Salaf did not make note of this matter which the opponent has made note of in the current times.

And this in itself is sufficient to show that this distinction and this categorisation is a newly-introduced matter, to which no attention is given. Hence, exaggeration and extremism in this issue of ruling by other than what Allaah has revealed is a manifest characteristic of these people.” End quote. (Cassette: The Qutubi, Suroori School of Doctrine)

Haakimiyyah which applies only to the Rulers, and not the Innovators for whom they have displayed their allegiance and loyalty, whether that be the Rafidite Heretic of Aal Qutb or be that the Muqallid Hanafite Mutasawwif Deobandites of Afghanistan. For their understanding of Haakimiyyah is a restricted and narrow one – which is why we have seen the most blatant contradictions and wicked double standards in them – all of which have revealed their sick condition. For they strive to accuse Imaam al-Albaani, Imaam Ibn Baaz, Imaam Ibn Uthaimen and those upon their way, of falling into Irjaa' and not having filled the gap that exists in Haakimiyyah (according to their understanding of it), and then they are most wicked of people in their practical, extremist neo-Irjaa' - in their silence towards and their allegiance to the Mockers of the Prophets, the Revilers of the Caliphs, the Revivers of Innovation, the Callers to the abolition of aspects of the Sharee'ah and other than that from the greatest of calamities – rather their declaring them to be Shaheeds unrestrictedly, and making their Imaan like the Imaan of the greatest of the Salafi Shaikhs of Islaam. Allaahu Akbar! Allaahu Akbar! Allaahu Akbar! Allaah has indeed given the Salafis baseerah about the condition of these people.

### **J) The Ummah has taken the concept of “the lesser kufr” with full acceptance**

And the whole Ummah has taken the tafseer of Ibn 'Abbaas and his associates with acceptance, and they have taken the verses in al-Maa'idah to be in reference to minor kufr for the Muslims, and they only raise it to major kufr when it is accompanied with Juhood, Istihlaal, I'tiqaad and other than that. And al-Kanadie al-Jahool, following his Takfiri Intelligentsia, has feigned great ignorance of all of this!!

Imaam Ahmad (d. 241H), who was asked by Ismaa'eel bin Sa'eed about the kufr in the verse in Surah al-Maa'idah (5:44), so he asked, “What is this kufr?”. And Ahmad replied, “It is kufr that does not expel from the religion”. (Masaa'il us-Sijistaanee, 209, as quoted from Marwiyat al-Imaam Ahmad bin Hanbal fit-Tafseer, 2/45).

Also Shaikh ul-Islaam says in Kitaab ul-Imaan, “Thus, a human being may have some degree of Iman and some degree of hypocrisy, or he could be a Muslim who is guilty of [minor] unbelief, which does not exclude him from Islam completely, as Ibn Abbas and others have said. This is what Ahmad Ibn Hanbal said concerning the thief, the drunkard, and so on, whom our Prophet (pbuh) considered to be Muslims but not believers. Reference is made to the Quran and the Sunnah to demonstrate that such a person has Iman but not Islam. A man could be a Muslim and have unbelief that does not take him away from the Muslim community since unbelief is of two kinds: that which excludes one from Islam, and that which results from neglect of deeds, which does not exclude him from Islam, but causes him to be a mere Muslim rather than a believer. This is how Ibn Abbaas and his companions interpret Allah's saying: “Whomever rules by other than what Allaah has revealed, those are the unbelievers” (5:44). They say that unbelief that does not exclude one from the Muslim community is unbelief of a lesser degree than unbelief, sin of a lesser degree than sin, and wrongdoing of a lesser degree than wrongdoing. This is also cited by al-Bukhari in the first chapter of his Saheeh entitled The Book of Belief in which he indicates that deeds are part of Imaan. Here he includes the ideas of Orthodox Muslims as well as refutations of the Murji'ites as he was a supporter of the Sunnah and the

Orthodox Muslims who in turn sincerely followed the Companions of the Prophet and their Successors.” (Kitab ul-Imaan pp. 344-345)

Ibn Atiyyah said, “And a mighty and large group from the people of knowledge have said that the verse applies to everyone who does not judge by what Allaah has revealed, but for the rulers (Umaraa) of this Ummah it is the kufr of disobedience which does not expel them from Imaan.” (al-Muharrar al-Wajeez 4/456).

Allaamah Ibn al-Qayyim (d. 751H) who said, “And as for kufr it is of two types: a) Kufr akbar (major kufr) and b) kufr asghar (minor kufr). So kufr akbar - this necessitates eternity in the Hellfire. And the (kufr) asghar necessitates the fulfilment of the threat (of Hellfire) without eternally abiding in it. As occurs in the saying of the Exalted - and it used to be from what was recited and then it was abrogated, “And do not hate your fathers, for that is disbelief from you” and his (sallallahu alaihi wasallam’s) saying in the hadeeth, “There are two matters in my ummah, by which (my) Ummah falls into kufr, reviling the genealogy and lamenting (over the dead)”. And his saying in the Sunan, “Whoever comes to a woman from her anus has disbelieved in what was revealed upon Muhammad” and in another hadeeth, “Whoever comes to a sorcerer or a diviner and believes in what he says has disbelieved in what Allaah revealed upon Muhammad” and his saying “Do not become disbelievers after me, striking the necks of one another”. And this is the explanation of Ibn ‘Abbaas and the generality of the Companions regarding the speech of Allaah, “**And whoever does not judge by what Allaah has revealed, then they are the disbelievers**” (5:44). Ibn Abbaas said: “It is not the kufr that takes one out of the religion. Rather when he does it then it is [an act of] disbelief, and he is not like the one who disbelieves in Allaah and the Last Day” and Taawoos said the same and Ataa said: “It is disbelief less than disbelief, oppression less than oppression and rebellion less than rebellion” (Madaarij us-Saalikeen 1/336)

Allaamah Ibn al-Qayyim (d. 751H) also said: “And what is correct that judging by other than what Allaah has revealed is both types of kufr (disbelief) - kufr asghar (the minor disbelief) and kufr akbar (the major disbelief) - and [which of the two it is] depends on the condition of the ruler. If he believes in the obligation of judging by what Allaah has revealed in this situation but turned away from it - out of disobedience - and while acknowledging that he is deserving of punishment then this is kufr asghar. And if he believes that it is not obligatory and that he has a choice in the matter - along with his firm belief that it is the judgement of Allaah - then this is kufr akbar - and if was ignorant in the matter or made an error then he is one who errs (mukhtee’) and his ruling is as the same for those who err. (Madaarij us-Saalikeen 1/337)

Shaikh Abdur-Rahmaan as-Sa’dee (d. 1376H) said: “Judging by other than what Allaah has revealed is among the actions of the People of Disbelief - and it can also take one outside of the religion. And that is when he believes in its legality and its permissibility. And it can sometimes be one of the major sins and from the actions of disbelief - the one who is guilty of it will receive a heavy punishment - and He said: “And whoever does not judge by what Allaah has revealed, then they are the wrongdoers (dhaalimoon).” Ibn Abbaas said: “Kufr less than kufr and dhulm less than dhulm and fisq less than fisq.” It is



dhulm akbar when it is declared permissible but it is a great sin when it is done without declaring it permissible.” (Tayseer al-Kareem ar-Rahmaan 2/296-297)

Imaam Ibn al-Jawzee (d. 596H) said: “And the decisive speech in this regard is that whoever does not judge by what Allaah has revealed - while rejecting it [in belief] (jahahda) and he knows that it is Allaah who revealed it - as the Jews did - then he is a disbeliever. And whoever does not judge by what Allaah has revealed - inclining to his desires without rejecting it [in belief] then he is a dhaalim, faasiq and it has been reported from Alee bin Abu Talhah from Ibn Abbaas that he said: “Whoever rejects (jahada) what Allaah has revealed then he has disbelieved, and whoever affirms it (aqarra bihi) but does not judge by it - then he is a dhaalim, a faasiq.” (Zaad al-Maysir 2/366)

Shaikh Muhammad Ameen ash-Shanqeetee (d. 1393H) said: “Know that the liberating stance in this topic is that kufr, dhulm and fisq, all of them can be used in the legislation with the intent of ‘disobedience’ at one time and with the intent of ‘kufr that ejects from the religion another time’. And whoever does not judge by what Allaah has revealed, turning away and contradicting the Messenger (sallallahu alaihi wasallam) and nullifying the rulings (ahkaam) of Allaah, then his dhulm, fisq, and kufr - all of them are disbelief that eject from the religion. And whoever does not judge by what Allaah has revealed, whilst believing that he is committing a forbidden action and doing a reprehensible action, then his kufr, dhulm and fisq does not eject him from the religion. (Adwaa al-Bayaan 2/104).

Shaikh Abdul-Lateef bin Abdur-Rahmaan Aal ash-Shaikh, who said, “...and it is forbidden to pass judgement (tahkeem) when the judgement is based upon a false (baatil) Sharee’ah which opposes the Book and the Sunnah, **such as the laws of the Greeks (Ahkaam Yoonaan) and those of Europe, and those of the Tartars, and their various legislative codes (qawaaneen) the source of which are their own opinions and desires. Similar to this are the various cultural and customary practices of the Bedouins.** Hence, whoever made it lawful to judge (istahalla) by [any of] this in the issues pertaining to blood, or other than it is a Kaafir. Allaah the Most High said, “**And whosoever does not judge by what Allaah has revealed, they are the Unbelievers**” (5:44). And concerning this verse, some of the Mufasssiroon have said that the kufr intended here is the kufr that is lesser than the Major kufr (kufr doona kufr al-akbar), because they understood that this verse applies to whoever judges by other than what Allaah has revealed but does not make that lawful (ghayr mustahill). But they do not dispute amongst themselves regarding its application in general to the mustahill (one who makes it lawful), and that the kufr in this case is the one that expels from the religion.” (Minhaaj ut-Ta’sees, p.71).

The saying of Shaikh Ibn Ibraaheem in his Fataawaa (1/80) dated 9/1/1385H – five years after Tahkim ul-Qawanin was published: “And likewise, the implementation of the meaning of ‘Muhammad is the Messenger of Allaah’ is by judging to his Shari’ah and confining oneself to that whilst rejecting whatever opposes it from the secular laws and all those matters for which Allaah gave no authority. And the one who judges by them (hakama bihaa) or refers to them (haakama ilaihaa) - for judgement **whilst believing in**

**the correctness (sihhah) of that or the permissibility (to judge by them) (jawaaz), then he is a kaafir with the kufr that ejects from the religion. And if he does that without belief (I'tiqaad) in their correctness and (regarding it) permissible to judge by them (jawaaz), then he is a kaafir with the kufr in action, which does not eject from the religion.”**

And there are many other statements, all in the Books of aqeedah, those dealing with Imaan and other than them, from the works of the Salaf, past and present which make mention of this, so there is no need to prolong the affair, for they are much too numerous to mention.

## Part 5: Summary

Al-Kanadie has written, to date, over 200 pages, attempting to refute the manhaj of the Salaf and their knowledge based positions, based upon lies, charlatanism and deceit. His aim, to accuse Imaam al-Albaani of the Irjaa' of Jahm Ibn Safwaan and to justify the application of the apparent meanings of the verses in al-Maa'idah, abolishing and nullifying the tafseel of the Salaf. He is unscrupulous in his quoting, pathetic in translating, cannot even transliterate Arabic terms properly, let alone translate them, (following up his translational errors is a project on its own).

He secluded himself with the books of the People of Desires, who have emerged in the current times, and who have embarked upon large-scale Qutubisation of the Salafi Manhaj – and thus what he is parroting, is merely what he has been suckled with by the Qutubi Intelligentsia. Often he conveys and transmits arguments which he does not even verify and research further, illustrating his Muqallidite tendency – and often (as we saw in GRV070016) he narrates handfuls of passages from the likes of Shaikh ul-Islaam, every single one of them being clipped quotations, with distorted contexts.

The essence of this chapter is that the tafseer of Ibn 'Abbaas upon which the tafseel of the Salaf is based upon, in this issue (of ruling by other than what Allaah has revealed) applies to the various forms of ruling by other than what Allaah has revealed, whether that be judging incorrectly in a dispute, or judging by one's ancestral customs, or judging by a secular, or a hundred secular laws or others. And no differentiation is made between inventing one's own law and judging with it, or judging with laws of others. Rather, all of that is included within the meaning of ruling by other than what Allaah has revealed, and major kufr in these situations is only in the presence of Juhood, Istihlaal, I'tiqaad and other affairs, which necessitate major kufr.

The scholars of Ahl us-Sunnah affirm all of that, as a principle. However, a particular situation that is discussed amongst them is when a ruler rules by secular laws entirely (or in most matters), imposing them upon the people. So built upon the aforementioned tafseel, some scholars argue that this act conclusively indicates that the person believes these laws to be better and superior to Allaah's law, and therefore judge him to be a Kaafir. Take note that their takfir of the act (or takfir of the wasf [quality, description]), is actually based upon the tafseel of the Salaf, or in fact an extension of it. However, other scholars do not agree with this and say that this is not actually a conclusive indicator, and that just like when a ruler judges by a secular law in one issue, he may be doing that out of dhulm, fisq and hawaa, then this can also take place when he judges by one, ten, or a hundred secular laws, or in the majority of cases, whether of his own making or not. So they hold this plausibility, and therefore carry the matter upon the aforementioned tafseel of the Salaf and require the person to make Juhood, or express his Istihlaal, or his underlying beliefs that warrant takfir.

Now this matter could have remained an academic discussion within Sunni, Salafi circles, had it not been for the excessive Qutubisation that has taken place in this arena over the last decade or more, by neo-Qutubite elements, born of the Awakening of Mohammad

Qutb. Thus, an entirely different orientation, which is based upon the concepts and ideas of Sayyid Qutb on Haakimiyyah, Takfir and Khurooj, entered the scene, and saw the emergence of a new band of charlatans, who would enter into the da'wah and hijack it, by bringing confusion into this matter.

So the route these charlatans have taken to arrive at their viewpoint (in this particular situation) is entirely different to the route that our scholars have taken. The Charlatans have actually employed deceit, treachery, pseudo-intellectualism, innovated principles and concepts, all in order to speak with the apparent meanings of the verses in al-Maa'idah and to claim that they refer to major kufr absolutely for the Muslims, and that the tafseel of the Salaf does not hold concerning them, rather the asl, is major kufr, and in a few restricted cases, it falls down to minor kufr – in their view. So by bringing many false arguments to support this, they try to then pass judgement upon those who rule by secular laws in greater or lesser amounts.

Then in the midst of all of this they then bring the statements of some of our scholars, some of which are very general and do not provide any support for what the Qutubiyah are upon of this scandal of theirs, and other statements which are general but are qualified elsewhere – all in order to provide apparent support for what they are upon.

The deceit and treachery of the likes of Abu Huthayfah al-Kanadie is so readily apparent to us, and so crystal clear, that we wonder how does he ever think that he can get away with his Kharijite notions and his war against the Imaams of the Sunnah, veiling all of that with niceties and pleasantries which stink of degeneracy – when one considers that he lies upon the scholars, misquotes blatantly, and invents explanations for himself.

Had al-Kanadie merely said, “Here are some statements of scholars which support my view” and left it at that, it would have been fine. But in reality he is driven by the fact that the people with whom he has real allegiance and loyalty to, which is the Qutubites, are being refuted for what they are upon of praising, aggrandising and applauding and celebrating the Rafidee Heretics, the Mockers of the Messengers, the Revilers of the Caliphs and the Mukaffirs of the Companions, the Mujaddids of Innovation, and also their takfir of the sinners, their slanders against our Ulamaa – so seeing that those whose teachings he is poisoned with are being refuted and exposed – and rightly so – he has come along, attempting to write a “Decisive Refutation of Salafi Publications” (!!) only to discredit the truth that we have presented. In reality, he is only out to achieve two goals: a) to accuse Imaam al-Albaani of the Irjaa' of Jahm Ibn Safwaan b) to preach the absolution of Sayyid Qutb, which he has learnt via his isnaad, which is the books and teachings of Abu Jahl Ibn Halemah, Safar al-Hawaali, ash-Shu'aybee and other openly-proclaimed Qutubites.

He knows that if he titled his papers “A Decisive Refutation of Imaam al-Albaani”, he knows that rotten tomatoes would have been thrown at him, and he would have been paraded in the streets. Likewise if he had titled his papers “A Decisive Refutation of al-Albaani, Ibn Baaz and Ibn Uthaimen on Imaan, Kufr, Takfir and Ruling by Other Than What Allaah Has Revealed”, then people would have held their noses for fear of being

offended by the impending falsehood. But instead he has chosen instead to refute “Salafi Publications” and portray it like that, since that is a scape-goat for him and it allows his evil intentions to remain hidden. And we do not see that he is sincere, due to his abundant lies, misquotes and ridiculous blunders. He has claimed and declared sincerity, but there are no signs of it from him.

In a forthcoming instalment of this series we will learn of yet another great debauchery and one of the mightiest and greatest of contradictions of this debauched partisan – which he fell into in his second paper of refutation which was 94 pages – and which was a follow up to our defence of Imaam al-Albaani. He has made such an open display of his debauchery in that – and his total contradiction and double standards in the application of his principles in accusing al-Albaani of Irjaa’ (as opposed to others) – that renders his pathetic compositions evident of his great insincerity and having been fondled by innovation and its people.

The most appropriate saying here to finish with, is the very saying he attempted to apply to us:

Shaikh Ibn Uthaimen said, “And from the well known principles of the Ulamaa’, is that they say, “Seek evidence then believe, but do not believe (first) and then seek evidence (to support that belief), and as a result, go astray” (“Fitnah of Takfir”, also on the cassette “Commentary on Fitnah of Takfir”).

## **Closing Remarks: Beware of the Charlatans...**

We really do not know what to close with, after the concoction of sophistry, lies, deceit, misquotes, misinterpreting and excessive qutubisation that al-Kanadie is guilty of and which he has thrown in our faces?

What can be said about a people born of the Qutubite doctrine, all but nurtured by the writings of its theoreticians, thinkers and theorists – all but sensitised to the spectre of Irjaa' which haunts them every-time they read the statements of the Imaams of the Sunnah on ruling by other than what Allaah has revealed?!

Is this the way of a researcher? No it is the way of a pretender, who is either seeking fame, or is actually upon the doctrine of al-Hawali and Mohammad Qutb - may Allaah sever it and cut it off – and seeks to promote it in the name of defending the Salafi Aqidah, whereas it is in reality in defence of the Qutubi Agenda.

This O Sunni, is the Fitnah of Qutubiyah!! It is the fitnah of our times. And let this Charlatan know that every page he writes, he is only signing off his own humiliation, as we have already observed and exposed his excessive lies and distortions and fabrications and there are much more to come...

May prayers and peace be upon Mohammad, his family and whoever follows him until the affair is established.