



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

Part 5: Concerning Al-Hukm ul-Aamm

Doctoring, Twisting and Distorting the Words of Shaikh ul-Islaam Ibn Taymiyyah, and Lying upon Him : The Sick Condition of Abu Huthayfah al-Kanadie.

The Affairs of Da'wah Today

The First Position

There are those who hold the view that judging by the secular laws, in place of the Sharee'ah laws in the majority of matters is major kufr – and at the same time, they refute Sayyid Qutb and his heresies and declare him a Jaahil who uttered kufr and apostasy. They enjoin obedience to the Rulers, declare Tawhid al-Haakimiyyah to be an innovation and misguidance, and warn from takfir of rulers and nation states, warn against open rejection upon the pulpits, and also refute those who deviate in the methodology of the Prophets in calling to Allaah, and who are upon the manhaj of Qutb and Bannaa. Indeed this is the likes of Shaikh Salih al-Fawzaan and others.

The Second Position

Then there are those who hold the view that judging by the secular laws, in place of the Sharee'ah laws in the majority of matters is not major kufr absolutely and is to be carried upon the tafseel of the Salaf – and at the same time, they refute Sayyid Qutb and his heresies and declare him a Jaahil who uttered kufr and apostasy. They enjoin obedience to the Rulers, declare Tawhid al-Haakimiyyah to be an innovation and misguidance, and warn from takfir of rulers and nation states, warn against open rejection upon the pulpits, and also refute those who deviate in the methodology of the Prophets in calling to Allaah, and who are upon the manhaj of Qutb and Bannaa. Indeed this is the likes of Imaam Ibn Baaz, Imaam al-Albaani, Shaikh Abdul-Muhsin al'Abbaad and others.

And so they differ with each other, on this one issue (of the ruling on judging by the secular laws in place of the Sharee'ah), while being united upon the rest.

The Third Well-Defined Orientation

Then there are the Charlatans, Biased Partisans, neo-Qutubites, born of the Awakening of Qutubism and who upon the manhaj of those declared “The Khawaarij of the Era” by Imaam al-Albaani who monopolise upon this difference between OUR scholars, while they praise and aggrandise the Innovators, declaring them “Shaheeds” and “Imaams of Guidance”, and who make Takfir 'alal-Itlaaq, secretly promote the manhaj of Sayyid Qutb and Hassan al-Banna, who have deviated in the methodology of the Prophets in calling to Allaah, innovated into the matter of Tawheed, innovated Shurocracy, adopted the methods of the Infidels in their da'wah (revolutions, open demonstrations, rallies), and made the focus of da'wah to be shifted from what the Prophets were upon to field and arena of the Kharijites – of takfir and haakimiyyah and khurooj. They remain silent upon the Innovators, make walaa and baraa for their sake, while showing the greatest of enmity towards the Imaams of Ahl us-Sunnah, and striving the utmost to accuse them with the Irjaa of Jahm Ibn Safwaan.

These Neo-Qutubites (like Safar al-Hawali, Salman al-Awdah and others), adopted the madhhab of Sayyid Qutb, and then called to it, nurtured the youth upon it, and then removed the fine line that used to exist between the Salafis and the outright Khawaarij and Takfiris. So these Takfiris and Khawaarij entered into the da'wah, and then, whereas before they would make takfir 'alal-itlaaq based upon a nullification of the tafseer of Ibn

'Abbaas and speak with the apparent and absolute meanings of the verses in al-Maa'idah and an-Nisaa' – just like the Khawaarij of old, they then began to play upon the concepts of tabdeel, istibdaal, tashree' etc. to further support their manhaj – using some of the words of OUR scholars for that.

We see them, and we know them, and their signs, and their distinguishing characteristics, and their hijacking of the da'wah!

And if they really wish to truly make Allaah's word supreme, then let them free themselves from the Raafidee Heretics, and the Soofee Innovators, around whose beliefs and teachings, their whole manhaj of Extremist Takfir and Haakimiyyah and Irjaa' towards the Innovators is based!!

Before you continue...

It is very important to make note of the fact that the Qutubiyyah – those who are upon the extremist manhaj of Sayyid Qutb, Mohammad Qutb and others – have penetrated the da'wah of Ahl us-Sunnah in recent times and entered their extremism in activism, takfir and haakimiyyah into it. Whereas before they would make takfir of the rulers, without exception, using the apparent meanings of the verses in al-Maa'idah, and nullifying the tafseer of Ibn 'Abbaas in absolute terms – all based upon the absolusions and exaggerations of Sayyid Qutb and those upon his way from the Ikhwani figureheads – when they penetrated the da'wah of Ahl us-Sunnah (after they had poisoned some of the youth by the teachings of Sayyid Qutb) they then monopolised on the differing verdicts of the Salafi scholars on certain issues related to the subject, and used them to further push their extremist manhaj of Sayyid Qutb.

Many of those who used to be upon the tafseel of the likes of Ibn Baaz and Ibn Uthaimen and al-Albaani in making takfir and who became affected by the da'wah of Qutubiyyah, then moved towards the Itlaaq of Sayyid Qutb, Mohammad Qutb and others in Takfir – and showed great vehemence towards those who adhered to tafseel. Further, many of the bloodthirsty takfiris then began to use the verdicts of some of our scholars in order further push their agenda of takfir. In the cassette “Questions and Answers on al-Haakimiyyah” there occurs:

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

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

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

Questioner: They mean the rulers of the Gulf states O Shaikh?

Shaikh al-Fawzan: [words unclear] the words [in the book] are general. As for people and specific individuals, then this requires investigation. **Questioner:** So there is a difference between [takfir of] a specific individual and a general ruling? **Shaikh al-Fawzan:** Yes, between a general ruling... **Questioner:** So you intended only a general ruling [not a ruling upon specific individuals]? **Shaikh al-Fawzan:** Yes, a general ruling, there is no doubt about this. So he said 'the rulers of the Gulf states (was meant)?' **Questioner:** Yes, this is it, however al-hawaa (desire) overtook him? **Shaikh al-Fawzan:** Yes, hawaa (desire).. .[words unclear]... Is this rectification? Performing takfir of the rulers of the Gulf states, is this from rectification (of the affairs)? **Questioner:** No it is not... **Shaikh al-Fawzan:** It is not rectification... it is but kindling of tribulation (fitnah). **Questioner:** May Allaah reward you..." End of the discussion. (MNJ050014 contains the actual recording).

When Safar al-Hawali and Salman al-Awdah and others got affected by the Qutubi da'wah - through Mohammad Qutb and Mohammad Suroor - and began to preach the doctrines of Sayyid Qutb to the youth, they opened up the door and gateway for the outright Takfiris and Khawaarij, who then penetrated the da'wah of Ahl us-Sunnah. Subsequently, they began to compile the statements of OUR scholars that would help them to justify their extremist manhaj. Great confusion occurred here, and the topics of takfir, khurooj, haakimiyyah and others became the subject of great contention. In addition, many people who were either new to the da'wah or who were oblivious to what was going on, could not make head or tail of the confusion – and all they saw or perceived was one set of people (i.e. the Qutubiyyah and the Activists) calling to something and others refuting them and their manhaj and what they were upon of extremism. And so they became really confused.

In reality, Ahl us-Sunnah refuted the Qutubiyyah and the Activists because of what they fell into of extremism and exaggeration and because of what they fell into in deviating from the Methodology of the Prophets in rectification and calling to Tawheed, and what they fell into of loyalty to the Innovators and declaring the Innovators to be "Imaams of Guidance" and "Shaheeds", unrestrictedly, and because of what they fell into of Takfir of the Sinners and Takfir by way of the Kabaa'ir, and because of what they fell into of accusing the Ulamaa of being "scholars of women's menses" and "paid workers", and their Takfir 'alal Itlaaq, and because of what they fell into in adopting the ways and means of the Infidels in their da'wah, and gathering and amassing the youth into organised masses, and so on. So the issue to Ahl us-Sunnah was not just ruling by other than what Allaah has revealed, its forms, types, rulings and so on. That was only a part of it. Rather, these people who had hijacked the da'wah and entered into what they had of extremism, had many other matters worthy of rejection and rebuke, matters which as a whole proved they were upon an adulterated manhaj, opposed to the Book and the Sunnah in its general and specific details. Indeed, it was the manhaj of Sayyid Qutb and Hassan al-Banna. And all of this narrowed down the fine line that used to exist previously, between the da'wah of Ahl us-Sunnah and that of the Takfiris and Khawaarij, who had a field day.

So Ahl us-Sunnah began to refute them, from all the angles in which they had deviated, and exposed what they were upon of deviation in manhaj in general and in specific terms. This saw the refutation of Tawheed al-Haakimiyah as a fourth, independent category, the refutation of al-Muwaazanah, the refutation of open rejection, the refutation of the Innovators they had accommodated, the refutation for their exaggeration in political work and “shurocracy”, their lenience towards the groups and sects of innovation and so on. However, when they and their followers and loyalists saw some of the positions held by the likes Shaikh Salih al-Fawzaan, Shaikh Ibn Ibraaheem, and some of the old statements of Shaikh Ibn Baaz and others on the issues of rule and rulership, which supported what they were upon, they compiled and gathered these statements and then used them to justify their manhaj of extremism in Haakimiyah and Takfir. The already existing phenomenon of Takfir ‘alal Itlaaq (takfir of individuals in absolute terms) became even more widespread – and all of this using the words of OUR scholars. More shifts in the actual focus of da’wah work were observed. Then anyone who did not agree with their manhaj of calling the youth to studying the constitutions, and applying the labels of kufr, and creating a general orientation around the likes of these affairs, such that it became a focus of da’wah, with the youth becoming busy with the likes of these things, then such a one was labelled a “spy” or “stooge” or “paid worker” and the likes.

As for the issues of ruling by other than what Allaah has revealed and the concepts of tabdeel and istibdaal and tashree’ and related issues which have been talked about, then amongst Ahl us-Sunnah there are differing viewpoints. Had it not been for the fact that many of the sons of Ahl us-Sunnah got poisoned by the da’wah of Sayyid Qutb, through the Activists, and also deviated from the methodology of the Prophets in calling to Allaah and reforming the society, and also adopted “Shurocracy” and promoted “political” work in a framework which according to them was kufr to being with (i.e. the situation predominant in the Muslim lands as they see it), and fell into Irjaa’ with the Innovators, and were working towards khurooj or an organised overthrow, or at least gathering the masses for some organised activity, and many other matters that they fell into that were worthy of criticism and rejection – so had it not been for these affairs, and had the disease of the Innovators of Ikhwaan not affected them, then severe rejection would not have been shown to them – and this specific issue (of rule and rulership) would have remained an issue of discussion within the circles of the Salafis and their Imaams and Mashaayikh – and none of this would have brought about any confusion or turmoil in the da’wah. But unfortunately the affair was not like that.

Nevertheless, in the middle of all of this turmoil were those people who thought that this whole fitnah was merely restricted to the issue of ruling by other than what Allaah has revealed and the details related to it. So when they saw the Salafis refuting the “Qutubiyah” and “Takfiriyyah” and “Surooriyyah” and so on, all of whom were upon the manhaj of Sayyid Qutb and Hassan al-Bannaa in general, so when they saw the Salafis refuting the likes of these on the affairs of manhaj in general and also in the field of takfir and haakimiyah – they thought that this dispute was only about an academic discussion concerning ruling by other than what Allaah has revealed. And this was far from the truth. So when they saw some of the words of OUR scholars, like Shaikh Salih al-Fawzaan and Shaikh Ibn Ibraaheem and others, they thought that there were double standards being

applied and that a people were unjustly being labelled Qutubiyah and Surooriyyah and the likes, merely for holding on to certain viewpoints on the issue of ruling by other than what Allaah has revealed. Yet all of this was from their ignorance of the true state of affairs and of the reality of what had been entered into the da'wah by the Innovators and those who befriended them and were poisoned by them.

So the likes of these individual – failing to grasp this - fell pray to the shubuhaat of the Takfiris and Khawaarij. Pay attention to this: many of the Takfiris and Khawaarij, when they wish to enter the Salafi youth into their extremist manhaj, they first use some of the statements of OUR scholars as bait. Then when they have got their fish, the youth are subsequently introduced to the Takfiri Intelligentsia and figureheads, and it is only a matter of time before unrestricted takfir upon other than the Sharee'ah guidelines is observed, and then subsequently the orientation and general manhaj of these individuals becomes focused upon the issues of rule, rulership, haakimiyyah and takfir, political work and similar matters fundamentally – and so they deviate from the methodology of the Prophets in calling to Allaah.

And all of this is damaging to the da'wah in that the focus is shifted into those arenas in which, in the current state of affairs, no benefit is to be found, and in fact has never been found. Rather, it merely involves a wastage of the youth, loss of lives and of time and effort – and the bringing about of even more difficulties and hardships. So the affair is like Shaikh Ibn Uthaimen described it, “These words are very good (i.e. Imaam al-Albaanee's). Meaning, that those people pass judgement against the Rulers of the Muslims, that they are disbelievers, what benefit do they achieve by judging them to be disbelievers? Are they able to put an end to them? They are not able. And when it is the case that the Jews have occupied Palestine for around 50 years, yet despite that the Islamic Ummah has not been able in its entirety – Arabs and Non-Arabs alike – to remove them from their place! How then, after this, can we go and strike those who rule over us with our tongues (i.e. make takfir of them) while we know that we are not capable of putting an end to them, and that blood will be shed, and the taking of wealth will become lawful, and even the honours of people. And then we will not even have achieved the desired result!! Therefore, what is the benefit – such that if a person was to believe – in that which is between him and his Lord – that amongst the rulers is one who is a disbeliever in truth, with the kufr that ejects from the religion - what then is the benefit in announcing this and spreading this, except the kindling of tribulation?!” (Fitnah of Takfir, p.74)

The point that is being made is that the da'wah of Ahl us-Sunnah, the Salafis, has been hijacked by Qutubi, Khariji and Takfiri elements who have monopolised on certain occurrences within the ranks of the Salafis and the viewpoints of certain scholars, in order to strengthen their own particular da'wah. There are many signs and indications of this and amongst the clearest of them is the fact that they remain silent in the face of the calamities of the Raafidee Heretics, those who make Tabdeel of the Islamic aqeedah, mock the Prophets, revile the Companions, and call for aspects of Islaam to be abolished, so they remain silent about these ones – rather they turn them into “Imaams of Guidance” and “Shaheeds” unrestrictedly!! – and in turn they spend the greater part of their time in

pulling down the Imaams of the Sunnah, accusing them with deviation and heresy, and with senility and being “paid workers” and “stooges” and “flatterers” and the likes. So this so called claim of “making the word of Allaah supreme” is actually falsified, and their great contradiction made abundantly apparent, and their real agenda and goal laid bare, and their true and real orientations made clear.

And finally, coming to the actual relationship between the above discussion to this particular paper, is that during this fitnah, many Charlatans, Pseudo-Intellectuals and Dajaajilah have arisen, who are actually upon the manhaj of Mohammad Qutb, Safar al-Hawali, Abu Jahl Ibn Haleemah, Abu Qataadah at-Takfiri and others from the Takfiri intelligentsia. Being driven by this manhaj, they have entered into this da'wah, attempting to justify this extremist manhaj, using the words of OUR scholars – and also in the process, making great lies, distortions and fabrications, making obvious tahreef of quotations in both text and meaning – all in order to arrive at what their desires fancy.

The scope of this paper is to expose this charlatanism, pseudo-intellectualism and outright clowning with the words of the scholars, by a people, who are in fact upon the manhaj of Sayyid Qutb, though they may hide it and portray otherwise.

Abstract

Following the Anbari and Halabi affairs, an attempt has been made by a person named Abu Huthayfah al-Kanadi, to ascribe Irjaa' to Imaam al-Albaani, and to ascribe the Irjaa' of Jahm Ibn Safwaan to Dr. Khalid al-Anbari and also to Shaikh Ali Hasan al-Halabi – in the form of a 112 page document, entitled “A Decisive Refutation of SalafiPublications.Com” and also its follow up. The referent points of the author in general are actually Mohammad Qutb, Safar al-Hawali and Abu Baseer Mustafa Haleemah, Abu Qataadah al-Philasteenee, as well as other takfiri sources from which he has borrowed his ideas and from which he has learned his doctrines, whether from the Internet or otherwise. In addition, the author has relied upon the views of Hamood bin Uqlaa ash-Shu'aybee, a well-known Qutubi who is open in his praise and aggrandisement of Sayyid Qutb and his extremist manhaj, and also known for his extremism in Takfir – he was recently banned from giving fataawaa by the Scholars of Saudi, following his takfir of a person, without first fulfilling the conditions of takfir, and establishing the hujjah.

Al-Kanadie has, overwhelmingly, transmitted ideas that he has borrowed from others, not even understanding what he is writing and not even knowing where he is quoting from, and what those quotes actually mean.

Al-Kanadie attempts to nullify the tafseer of Ibn Abbaas on the verses in al-Maa'idah, by claiming they are weak and inauthentic, and claims ruling by other than what Allaah has revealed is major kufr that expels from the religion in absolute terms, and also ascribes Irjaa' to Imaam al-Albaani, as well as many other assumptions, built upon ignorance and fuelled by Qutubism.

The current paper is related only to pages 89-93 of his document in which he attempts to speak of what he has called at-tashree' al-aamm (general legislation) – by which he intends what the Rulers of today fall into of ruling by the secular laws, whether of their own making or otherwise - and claiming Shaikh ul-Islam Ibn Taymiyyah has spoken of this, and declared it to be major kufr and that it is his mutawaatir view.

This paper is an analysis of his claims and also of the many quotations he brought to justify his viewpoint. The findings revealed:

- His total misunderstanding of what is referred to al-hukm al-aamm (general ruling) in the words of Shaikh ul-Islam
- His total misunderstanding of what is tabdeel (changing, distortion) of the Sharee'ah
- His splitting, doctoring and stitching of a passage from Majmoo ul-Fataawaa (3/267-268)
- His quotation of many statements from Shaikh ul-Islam upon other than their true meanings and imports, being in total oblivion to their contexts
- His poor translating capabilities

The author's document as a whole is in fact an encyclopaedia of pure ignorance, deceit, extremely poor understanding, and charlatanism, and this work is only a small part of an overall exposition of it.

Shaikh ul-Islaam on numerous occasions speaks of the legislation (shar') that is acted upon by the Ummah to be of three types:

- a) that which is the pure revealed legislation (ash-shar' al-munazzal), to which it is necessary to refer back to and to adopt in all affairs
- b) that which is the interpolated legislation (ash-shar' al-mu'awwal), which is the opinions of the scholars, and the various madhabs, in the matters of ijtihaad
- c) that which is the altered, changed legislation (ash-shar' al-mubaddal), which is the distortion and changing of the Sharee'ah by way of lies, fabrications, false opinions and what opposes the Book and the Sunnah, that have been entered to it

The jurisdiction of the rulers (hukkaam) in their judgement has been confined to the issues of personal disputes between the people and related affairs, and in which they ought to judge by the Book or the Sunnah, and if nothing is found, then they judge by their ijtihaad. The rulers may make their judgements binding upon the disputants. As for the issues that pertain to the religion in general, such as the affairs of fiqh, ibaadah, knowledge based issues, (and which may be from ash-shar' al-mu'awwal or ash-shar' al-mubaddal) then the ruler has no right to pass judgement in these issues, in the sense that he can impose his particular viewpoint, or ijtihaad upon the people in an issue in which there may be varying viewpoints and various ijtihaads. Even worse, when the issue in question is in opposition to the Book and the Sunnah, or is alien to it. If he was to do such a thing, and make a general ruling in a specific issue and make it binding upon the people, then he would have made a "general legislation" (al-hukm al-aamm) pertaining to the religion, and would have made tabdeel of the Sharee'ah, in the sense that he has distorted it and altered it, and so he would have turned Sunnah into Bid'ah, truth into falsehood, the ma'roof into munkar (and vice versa) and so on. And all of this is considered ruling by other than what Allaah has revealed.

Subsequently, if the ruler made this lawful (Istihlaal), or he claimed that his judgement is actually the Sharee'ah, or from the Sharee'ah and therefore ascribed it to Allaah, he is a Kaafir, Apostate.

Al-Kanadie has totally failed to grasp the issues, and in his ignorance and confusion has thought that Shaikh ul-Islaam distinguished – in what he chose to quote from him – between a ruler ruling by other than what Allaah has revealed in one issue and between a ruler who rules by other than what Allaah has revealed in many or most issues. In other words the ruler who judges by the secular laws, those of his own making or otherwise – in greater or lesser degrees. And this is nowhere to be found in the words of Shaikh ul-Islaam he has quoted. His claim is built upon his generalised and fuzzy concept of "at-tashree' al-aamm" or "al-hukm al-aamm" which he thinks is in reference to a ruler legislating a large number of laws - whereas in reality – from the explanation of Shaikh ul-Islaam, it refers to a judgement that is made binding upon the people in general, in an issue pertaining to the

affairs of the religion (whether it be a matter of ijtihaad, an errant opinion or even something that actually opposes the Book and the Sunnah, which Shaikh ul-Islaam refers to ash-shar' al-mu'awwal or ash-shar' al-mubaddal respectively).

Regardless, based upon his flawed understanding, he then thought that many of the statements of Shaikh ul-Islaam Ibn Taymiyyah that he quoted actually supported what he himself had (mis)understood (or what he had merely transmitted of the ideas of the Takfiri Intelligentsia to whom he has taken). And the most famous of these quotes used is the saying of Shaikh ul-Islaam, "And whoever altered, changed (baddala) something from the legislation that is unanimously agreed upon, he is a Kaafir, Murtad, by unanimous agreement of the Jurists" – and which has been explained and put into context in this paper.

All of the quotes that he brought were actually in relation to something else, entirely. And this in reality is where the great confusion of many of the neo-Qutubiyah lies, in their not giving detail to this matter. So they end up lying upon the scholars and twisting their words.

The issue with al-Kanadie is that if he had merely stated that so and so Scholar is of this view concerning this matter, and Shaikh Ibn Ibraaheem holds this view and that so and so scholar also holds this view and so on and left it at that – without attempting HIMSELF to "find his own proofs" from Shaikh ul-Islaam, then that would have been fine. No problem. You are entitled to your view. But upon following him up, we have found that he is nothing short of a charlatan, who lies and distorts in his quotations. Had he merely stated his view and the views of the scholars that he follows in the matter that would be one thing. But the matter is not like that.

Since those who distinguish between ruling by other than what Allaah has revealed in one or a few matters, and between a ruler ruling by secular laws – whether of his own making – or otherwise, in greater or lesser amounts, then they have no proof from the Book and the Sunnah, for this distinction, and hence their proof lies in the sayings of mostly contemporary scholars. In the face of this are those who actually do not see a distinction at all, and carry both situations upon the tafseel of the Salaf. So if al-Kanadie had merely quoted the statements of these scholars in support of his view and left it at that, it would have been fine. But in his foolishness, he attempted to then twist many of the sayings of Shaikh ul-Islaam in order to fit in with his notions, lying upon Shaikh ul-Islaam in all of that. And it might not be unreasonable to say that he has actually merely transmitted the lies of the Takfiri Intelligentsia that he has scavenged off the Internet and the various Takfiri discussion forums that make up his abode and resting place on the Internet.

Take note of this matter and remember it well, before you read anything further: This paper is to expose a charlatan who in attempting to justify his view, has ended up lying upon the scholars. In this paper, the actual passages he has used are analysed and their proper contexts given.

In summary, scolding and chastising al-Kanadie - for lying upon the scholars, raising the flag of pseudo-intellectualism and charlatanism, and concealing his Qutubism by using the sayings of our Scholars as a shield - at a time when there is already so much confusion, has been justified.

As for what occurs on the difference on the ruling of the one who systematically, in an organised and arranged manner institutes non-Islamic laws, then that difference arises because one group of scholars (such as Shaikh Salih al-Fawzaan, Shaikh Ibn Ibraaheem and others) hold that this cannot from him occur except while the ruler considers these secular laws to be superior to the Sharee'ah and more decisive and hence judge him to be a Kaafir. Both scholars like Shaikh al-Albaani, Shaikh Ibn Baaz, Shaikh Abdul-Muhsin al-'Abbaad and others, do not hold that this is true in absolute terms. They consider it is still plausible for this to occur due to (excessive) dhulm and fisq, or due to other affairs, and that it does not necessarily follow that a ruler, by his institution of these laws (which might pertain to usury, or social, political or economic affairs, or whatever is opposed to the Sharee'ah), considers them to be better and more decisive or for them be lawful, or that he has a choice in the matter – just like it does not necessarily follow that the one who commits fornication, continuously, considers it to be lawful or better than chastity, or the one who opens a gambling house or a brothel and then invites people to it, considers it lawful or better than chastity. So these scholars require Istihlaal or Juhood or expression of I'tiqaad and the likes.

The existence of this difference has allowed the activist partisans to monopolise upon it and to hide their true and real orientation – which actually comes from Mohammad Qutb, Sayyid Qutb and others. They have monopolised upon it in order to give da'wah to the Salafis, by first using the statements of our scholars (like Shaikh Salih al-Fawzaan and others) to invite them and entice them, and then polarise them against the rest of Ahl us-Sunnah. Then they subsequently introduce them to the Takfiri Intelligentsia and their books and writings and so on, until the person finally ends up having fully imbibed the Qutubi manhaj, and thus deviates from the methodology of the prophets in perception, outlook, dawah and methods of rectification.

The Takfiri Intelligentsia monopolise upon this and accuse those who withhold from absolute takfir and applying the label of kufr in absolute terms, of defending the "Tawaagheet". And amongst them are the likes of Safar al-Hawali and Abu Baseer Mustafa Haleemah, who both pour their rage and accuse with Jahmism, anyone who does not make Takfir alal-'Itlaaq. The former in his book "Dhaahirat ul-Irjaa'" (who attacks Imaam al-Albaani therein, accusing him of Irjaa' alongside many other slanders) and the latter in his book "Al-Intisaar Li Ahl it-Tawheed war-Radd 'alaa Man Jaadala Ani-Tawaagheet" (who accuses Imaam al-Albaani of what is worse than the Irjaa' of Jahm Ibn Safwaan and also belittles and mocks al-Albaani).

Although it is not the scope of this paper, when one truly understands the sophistry of these neo-Qutubites, one will come to realise that their madhhab necessitates that Shaikh Salih al-Fawzaan and Shaikh Ibn Uthaimen also have Irjaa'. And this will be explained in a future discourse, inshaa'allaah, when we continue to expose al-Kanadie, the Charlatan.

So it is obligatory upon Ahl us-Sunnah to take caution of the charlatans, diseased partisans and other than them, who have emerged in the recent times and who are in reality upon the manhaj of Sayyid Qutb – and whose isnaad actually returns back to Sayyid Qutb, though they hide this and pose as Salafis and scavenge upon the sayings of our scholars.

SalafiPublications
22nd June 2001

Contents

Foreword

Introduction

Concerning Tashree' ul-Aamm (General Legislation) and the Words of Shaikh ul-Islaam Ibn Taymiyyah

Part 1: What is meant by al-Hukm al-Aamm In the Context of the Passage From Shaikh ul-Islaam?

Part 2: Summarising the Text

Part 3: Exposing the Scandal

Part 4: Splitting, Doctoring and Stitching

Part 5: Exposing the Bankruptcy of al-Kanadie

1. Majmoo' Fataawaa 28/524

2. Majmoo' Fataawaa 35/364-365

3. Majmoo' Fataawaa 35/200

4. Majmoo' Fataawaa 11/262

5. Majmoo' Fataawaa 35/372-373

6. Majmoo' Fataawaa 8/106

Part 6: Al-Kanadie Passing Judgement Upon Himself

Part 7: Returning to at-Tashree' al-'Aamm (General Legislation) : The Fatwaa of Shaikh Ibn Uthaimen

Closing Remarks

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

You should know, O Sunni, that a pertinent and most appropriate and highly accurate description of the actual state of affairs today, and of the affairs of the Salafi Da'wah today and of the affairs of the "Khaarijiyyah Asriyyah", the Khawaarij of the Era, is:

“All the Ahl ul-Ahwaa are united upon the hatred of Imaam al-Albaani and Imaam Ibn Baaz and their manhaj (even though they may outwardly portray otherwise) and all of the Ahl ul-Ahwaa are united upon the manhaj of Sayyid Qutb and Mohammad Qutb (even though they may outwardly portray otherwise).”

Continuing in our exposition¹ of one who has secluded himself with the books of the Takfiris and the Qutubiyah, such as Abu Baseer Mustafaa Haleemah, Safar al-Hawaali and others, and is incensed and enraged that Ahl us-Sunnah should refute the referent point of all their extremism and exaggerationism, Sayyid Qutb, this paper intends to illustrate the manner of quoting and extraction of proof that the Qutubiyah and those poisoned with the manhaj of Aal Qutb use. In particular, their lies upon Shaikh ul-Islaam Ibn Taymiyyah and their twisting and distorting his intent.

This is the fifth part in a series that highlights the sophistry, deceit, lies, misquotes, and much more of a 112 page document that was supposed to be a "Decisive Refutation" of the aqeedah and manhaj of Shaikh al-Albaani and Shaikh al-'Anbari and by default, Salafi Publications, written by the one calling himself Abu Huthayfah al-Kanadie.

Indeed, the 112 page document of this individual is a farcical attempt to nullify the tafseer of Ibn 'Abbaas, to speak with the apparent meanings of the verses of al-Maa'idah, to enter the aqeedah of Sayyid Qutb on the issues of takfir and haakimiyyah, and then to clothe all of that with statements of our scholars that mostly do not indicate what al-Kanadie claims they indicate.

In just three of his pages (which we are the subject of this paper) he has made lie upon lie upon Shaikh ul-Islaam Ibn Taymiyyah, twisting and distorting the actual meaning and import of the words of Shaikh ul-Islaam – and in this paper, it has taken more than 10 times those 3 pages to expose the great Canadian Fraud that has taken place therein, the sheer scale of which is unimaginable. For al-Kanadie – if he had been sincere in his reply, and was someone who actually had knowledge and understanding, then he would have been replied to in the appropriate manner, but in reality he is a wanton pretender, a liar and fabricator who has made distortions (tahreefs) of an unexcusable and unjustifiable nature, with blatant doctoring of the texts he is quoting from. It is better for al-Kanadie to stop his propaganda campaign and his bid to establish the aqeedah of Sayyid Qutb, Mohammad Qutb, Abu Qatadah at-Takfir, Abu Jahl Ibn Haleemah, and Safar al-Hawaali, vilifying the Imaams of the Sunnah in all of that – and to instead learn his deen. For in

¹ The previous parts in this series were entitled "In Defence of the Imaam of the Sunnah, al-Albaani" and were four in number, GRV070007, GRV070008, GRV070009, GRV070011.

translation² he is pathetic, and in quoting he is a clown, and interpreting he is an imbecile. And perhaps the one who reads what is to follow, will say even harsher words than us, when he comes to realise the great scale of this Qutubi Fraud and the sick nature of al-Kanadie al-Jahool.

O Sunni, seclude yourself for an hour or so and read, and you will come to realise the true nature of the neo-Qutubiyah, who have emerged in recent times, and have penetrated the da'wah of Ahl us-Sunnah and have monopolised on some of the statements of our Scholars in order to conceal themselves and their manhaj which is in reality the manhaj of Sayyid Qutb. They have no other concern but to establish the following: That Imaam al-Albaani is upon the aqeedah of Irjaa' and that the tafseer of Ibn 'Abbaas is nullified, and that all of the rulers of today are Kuffaar, and that the apparent meanings of the verses in the Qur'aan can be applied to them without tafseel. This in reality is their deen and their way, for it is only by way of these matters that they have decided to assault Ahl us-Sunnah – they have no other concern but this.

² And a separator paper in itself would be required to illustrate that.

Concerning Tashree' ul-Aamm (General Legislation) and the Words of Shaikh ul-Islaam Ibn Taymiyyah

Let us first quote the relevant section from the author of the "Decisive Refutation", before we continue to expose his scandal and his lies upon the Scholars. Note that all original bold and underlining has been left intact to indicate what has been emphasised and stressed by al-Kanadie from these quotations.

He stated (on pages 89-91):

Next, the reckless Khaalid Al-Anbaree reports the words of Ibn Taymiyah: Shaikh ul-Islaam Ibn Taymiyyah said in Minhaj us-Sunnah (5/130): "So when they know that it is not permissible to rule by other than what Allaah has revealed, and did not adhere to this, but rather declared it lawful (istahalloo) for themselves to rule with that which is in opposition to what Allaah has revealed, then they are disbelievers. And if not, then they are ignorant people. And ruling by what Allaah has revealed is obligatory..."

And again, Khaalid Al-Anbaree has used the words of Ibn Taymiyah here to imply that this *Kufr* only falls on the ruler when he considers this ruling to be permissible...

Also, it is unclear from these words of Ibn Taymiyah whether he is referring to the ruler who rules in particular cases by his desires or to the *Haakim* who legislates fabricated laws from his own invention and governs the people by them.

And why did Khaalid Al-Anbaree not assemble a collection of the available statements regarding the ruling by other than what Allaah revealed which have been recorded by *Shaykh Al-Islaam* in order to reveal his complete and *Mutawaatir* (i.e. often narrated) opinion concerning the ruler who legislates fabricated laws and governs the masses with them?

For example:

"And it is known by necessity in the *Deen* of the Muslims and by the agreement of all the Muslims that whoever follows a *Sharee'ah* other than the *Sharee'ah* of Muhammad then he is a *Kaafir* and it is like the *Kufr* of the one who believes in some of the Book and disbelieves in some of the Book. Like He, *ta'ala* said: **Verily, those who disbelieve in Allâh and His Messengers and wish to make distinction between Allâh and His Messengers (by believing in Allâh and disbelieving in His Messengers) saying, "We believe in some but reject others."** (*Nisaa'*, 150) (Al-Fataawa', Vol. 28/524)

Or,

“Whoever changes the *Sharee'ah* of the Prophets and brings a new *Sharee'ah* then his *Sharee'ah* is *Baatil* and it is not allowed to follow it. Like He *ta'ala* said: **“Or have they partners with Allâh (false gods), who have instituted for them a religion, which Allâh has not allowed”** And due to this, the Jews and the Christians disbelieved because they adhered to an abrogated *Sharee'ah*.” (Al-Fataawa' Vol. 35/365)

Also, “...like the one who said, ,This *Taraut* has been changed and it is not allowed to act upon what is in it. And whoever acts upon its laws today, which are changed and abrogated, then he is a *Kaafir*. So these words and words, which resemble them, are true and there is nothing upon the one who says them.” (Al-Fataawa', Vol. 35/200)

And he said, “And the *Sharee'ah*, which has been revealed by Allaah, *ta'ala*; and that is the Book and the *Sunnah*, which Allaah sent to His Messenger with and this *Sharee'ah*; it is not for anyone of the creation to leave it and no one leaves it except the *Kaafir*.” (Al-Fataawa', Vol. 11/262)

“And it is known that whoever removes an order or a forbiddance, which Allaah sent His Messenger with, then he is a *Kaafir* with the agreement of the Muslims and the Jews and the Christians.” (Al-Fataawa', Vol. 8/106)

Or,

“And whenever the *Alaam* leaves what he knows from the Book of Allaah and the *Sunnah* of His Messenger and he follows the *Hukm* of the *Haakim*, which opposes the *Hukm* of Allaah and His Messenger, then he is a *Mortaad/Kaafir* deserving of punishment in this life and in the Hereafter. He, *ta'ala* said: ***Alif-Lâm-Mîm-Sâd*. (This is the) Book (the Qur'ân) sent down unto you (O Muhammad), so let not your breast be narrow therefrom, that you warn thereby, and a reminder unto the believers. [Say (O Muhammad) to these idolaters (pagan Arabs) of your folk:] Follow what has been sent down unto you from your Lord (the Qur'ân and Prophet Muhammad's *Sunnah*), and follow not any *Auliyâ'* (protectors and helpers, etc. who order you to associate partners in worship with Allâh), besides Him (Allâh). Little do you remember! And a great number of towns (their population) We destroyed (for their crimes). Our torment came upon them (suddenly) by night or while they were sleeping for their afternoon rest. No cry did they utter when Our Torment came upon them but this: “Verily, we were *Zâlimûn* (polytheists and wrong-doers, etc.).** (*Araaf*, 1 -5) Even if he is beaten and imprisoned and tortured with all different types of torture in order that he would leave what he knew from the *Sharee'ah* of Allaah and His Messenger, which is *Waajib* to follow and then to follow the *Hukm* of other than him; then he is still deserving of the punishment of Allaah. Instead, it is for him to be patient even if he is tortured for Allaah because this is the *Sunnah* of Allaah with respect to the Prophets and their followers. Allaah *ta'ala* said: ***Alif-Lâm-Mîm*. Do people think that they will be left alone because they say: “We believe,” and will not be**

tested. And We indeed tested those who were before them. And Allâh will certainly make (it) known (the truth of) those who are true, and will certainly make (it) known (the falsehood of) those who are liars, (although Allâh knows all that before putting them to test). (*Anakbut*, 1 -3)
(Al-Fataawa', Vol. 35/373)

So he has quoted these narrations claiming that they are “concerning the ruler who legislates fabricated laws and governs the masses with them?” Remember this well, he has claimed that these statements of Shaikh ul-Islam are in relation to the ruler who “legislates fabricated laws and governs the masses with them”, intending by this to differentiate between ruling in one instance and between what he actually understands to be at-tashree' al-aamm.

And then later on page 94, he says:

...And although Khaalid Al-Anbaree has attempted to demonstrate that *Shaykh Al-Islam* did not differentiate between the ruler who rules in particular instances by other than what Allaah revealed, he has failed to grasp the import of the following quotation: “If its from *Deen* but he judges without knowledge, then he is from the people of the Fire (i.e. for judging in a matter in which they were not qualified to). And if he is knowledgeable but judges with that which contradicts the truth that he knows, then he is from the people of the Fire. And if he judges without justice and without knowledge, then he is more deserving to be of the people of the Fire. And this is if he judges in a specific instance for an individual. **But if he judges a *Hukm 'Aam* (i.e. general judgement) in the *Deen* of the Muslims; so he makes the *Haaq* to be *Baatil* and the *Baatil* to be *Haaq* and the *Sunnah* to be *Bid'ah* and *Bid'ah* to be *Sunnah* and the *Mar'oof* to be *Munkaar* and the *Munkaar* to be *Mar'oof* and he forbids what Allaah and His Messenger ordered and he orders that Allaah and His Messenger forbids, then this is a different category (i.e. literally, –this is a different colour). The Lord of the Worlds, *Illah* of the Messengers, Master of the Day of Judgement will judge him.” (Al-Fataawa', Vol. 35/388)**

So this shows that Ibn Taymiyah did, in fact, differentiate between *Tashree' Al-'Aam* and made it separate from the ruling in one instance. And although he, may Allaah be merciful to him, did not specifically make *Takfeer* to this second category of ruling by other than what Allaah revealed, he has clearly done so in the other texts which have passed.

So the intent of Abu Fulaan al-Kanadie, in all of this, is to demonstrate that in these narrations (and in the particular one he is quoting above), Shaikh ul-Islam Ibn Taymiyah has spoken of at-Tashree' ul-Aaamm (as al-Kanadie understands it), and made takfir upon it, and differentiated it from ruling by other than what Allaah has revealed in one instance. And we shall discuss the reality of all of this in what is to follow below, inshaa'allaah – and illustrate the depths of Abu Fulaan's ignorance.

Part 1: What is meant by al-Hukm al-Aamm In the Context of the Passage From Shaikh ul-Islaam?

It is from the ignorance of Abu Fulaan al-Kanadie that he does not actually understand the context of the quotations of Shaikh ul-Islaam he has actually quoted. And in fact, in some of the above quotations he has outright lied upon Shaikh ul-Islaam – as we shall demonstrate – by claiming that they mean something that they really do not. And indeed this is a manifest characteristic of all the neo-Qutubiyyah, who have been put to trial with the Extremist Manhaj of Sayyid Qutb. They claim to be rectifiers and refuters of those “poisoned with Irjaa’”, but they are the most ignorant and unscrupulous of people in quoting from our Scholars in order to justify their agendas and the Innovation and Extremism of their sayyid, Sayyid Qutb, who is in reality, the source of their teachings – even though they may wear the gown of Salafiyyah, and quote from our scholars – the reality is otherwise. And the greatest of evidences for this is their silence in the face of the calamities of this Raafidee Heretic, his great innovations and statements of kufr and apostasy, coupled with their persistent efforts to silence Ahl us-Sunnah, and to make their People of Knowledge to fall, with the accusation of Irjaa’. All of this so that the Extremist Manhaj of Haakimiyyah that they are upon and which they have imbibed from their sayyid, can be infused into the minds of the youth.

Before we look at the above quotations, it is necessary to point out that three of the quotations are taken from a lengthy passage in Majmoo’ ul-Fataawaa Vol. 35. This section will be discussed in detail first, so that we can actually understand the context, and what is the reality that is being discussion by Shaikh ul-Islaam.

It is our contention that al-Kanadie does not even understand what is actually meant by at-tashree’ al-aamm (or al-hukm al-aamm) and in his ignorance, has ended up lying against Shaikh ul-Islaam.

Synopsis of the Passage from Majmoo al-Fataawaa Vol 35 pp. 355-408

NOTE: Most of this synopsis is a translation of the meaning and in most cases the wording used is a translation of the actual words of Shaikh ul-Islaam. It is strongly suggested that you have Majmoo’ al-Fataawaa with you and read through this passage, as it is very beneficial.

1) This entire section is called “The Chapter on Qadaa (Judgement)” and is related to the judgements made by the Haakim in relation to disputants, and the establishment of the giving of rights to those to whom they are due, and how reconciliation, and the establishment of due right is achieved. This is stated on the first two opening pages of the chapter (pp.355-356) and sets the scope and context of the discussion. These issues are decided by the judgement of the Haakim and which may result in either perfect conciliation between the parties, or one party may be unhappy with the judgement, yet it is the truth, and the dispute has been ended, or one may give up the point of contention, even though he may have been upon the truth (in the matter) – and hence the truth in this matter has not really been arrived at, even though conciliation has been achieved.

2) This sets the scene for distinguishing between those matters in which Allaah has given the Haakim (ruler) the sole right to judge (i.e. in disputes that occur between people concerning inheritance, personal differences, and so on), and between those matters which are not unique to the Haakim or any specific individual alone, but for anyone from the creation, and that in these matters it is not permissible for the Haakim to exclusively judge in these matters. And these matters are the all-inclusive, overall matters of the religion in general (al-umoor al-kulliyyah) which Allaah has commanded all of the creation with, or those matters in which a dispute may arise between the Haakim himself and between any of the common Muslims, or a Scholar, or a soldier and so on. And this relates to the matters of fiqh, ibaadah, issues of knowledge and the likes. (p.357).

3) Then Shaikh ul-Islaam Ibn Taymiyyah gives examples of what is actually meant, to illustrate this. So he mentions the following issues, in which there is a difference amongst the Scholars (pp.358-359):

- Concerning the saying of Allaah “**Or if you touch (laamastum) your women**” (Maa'idah 5:6) and whether refers to sexual intercourse, or otherwise, just merely touching. And does touching with desire nullify the wudhoo or not and so on. So Shaikh ul-Islaam mentions that the most apparently correct view is that this touching does not nullify the wudhoo.
- The example of whether the wudhoo of the one who bleeds due to injury, or blood-letting or the likes, whether it is valid or not and the variance of the scholars in this regard.
- Then Shaikh ul-Islaam mentions that they have differed over many of the issues of Faraa'id (concerning shares, ownerships, divisions etc.) and also many of the issues of Divorce and Oaths, and also in many of the issues of prayer, fasting and Hajj, and likewise the manner and details of how to visit the graves.
- Then he speaks of how the Muslims have differed over issues such as whether Masjid ul-Haraam or Masjid un-Nabawiyah (in Madinah) is superior and related issues to travelling to these Masjids and makings oaths in relation to this travelling and fulfilling the expiating for these oaths and so on.

4) After mentioning these matters, Shaikh ul-Islaam then says that in the likes of these matters it is not for any Haakim whatsoever – until even if it was someone from the Companions of Allaah's Messenger – to pass a judgement on these issues, by his own opinion, against the one who disputes with him concerning the likes of these issues (be that a scholar or common person etc.) such that he says “I have made it binding upon him that he does not act, or does not speak except with the saying that agrees with my madhhab”. Shaikh ul-Islaam says that passing judgement in these affairs are for Allaah and His Messenger, and the Haakim is merely an individual from amongst the Muslims. Hence whoever speaks the truth upon knowledge, then that is to be followed, since it is

obligatory upon all people to follow the judgement of Allaah and His Messenger. And that it is not allowed for anyone to prevent him from his view except with knowledge and evidence and explanation (of the evidence). (p.360).

5) Then Shaikh ul-Islaam continues and says that as for using force, and subduing (others) in judgement, then that is only in the case where disputes arise, such as when a person dies and his inheritors argue of the division of the inheritance. So he judges between them, and passes a judgement based upon one of the two sayings of the scholars, and then makes it binding upon the disputant. Then it is not for the disputant to say, "I am not happy until he judges with the other saying" (p.360).

6) Then on the next three or four pages, Shaikh ul-Islaam speaks of the necessity of the rulers to judge with justice (adl), and that this is whatever Allaah has revealed. And that it is obligatory to obey those in authority, which is linked to obedience to the Messenger. And that Allaah is the actual judge (al-Hakam) who actually judges between His servants (by that which He has revealed), and that the Messengers convey His Judgement (in the form of revelation) and hence obedience to them is obedience to Him and their orders are like His orders. And hence whatever the Messenger judges and commands and legislates, then it is upon the whole of creation to follow and obey it, since that is the judgement of Allaah for his creation. That it is upon the whole of creation to judge to the Messenger (sallallahu alaihi wasallam), and that it is not permissible for anyone to leave his judgement and law, whether it is a scholar, or a king, or a shaikh and so on. And that if Eesaa or Moosaa or any of the other Messengers were at his time, they would have to follow the Messenger, and that Allaah took an oath from all the Messengers from the time of Nooh, that if Allaah sends Muhammad during their time, that they should believe in him and follow him. That He took an oath from previous Messengers that they believe in the Messenger to come, and that He took an oath from the Messenger to believe and in the Messengers before him. (pp.361-364)

7) And the above then leads into the discussion that the religion (deen) of all the Messengers was one and the same and it is Islaam, but that aspects of the Sharee'ah they had differed, and that at one time something might be legislated for a particular wisdom or reason and another time (i.e another Messenger) another legislation is made for a particular wisdom. Hence, the legislations vary but the religion (Islaam) is one. And then he strikes examples and says that facing Shaam (in prayer) was from the deen of Islaam, and then when Islaam abrogated that prayer was made in the direction of the Ka'bah. Hence, whoever held onto that which was abrogated (mansookh), and not that which abrogated it (naasikh), then such a one cannot be upon the deen of Islaam, and nor is he a follower of any of the Prophets. Then he says that anyone who changes the Sharee'ah of the Prophets, and innovates a new one, then it is baatil and it is not allowed to follow it. And he explains that the Jews and Christians are Kaafirs because they held onto an abrogated, changed Sharee'ah. Then he explains that it is upon the whole of creation to believe in all of the Books and Messengers and Muhammad (sallallahu alaihi wasallam), the Seal of the Messengers. And hence, it is upon the whole of creation to adopt the Book and the Sunnah, and that no one is allowed to not follow it, and that this is exactly what the Mujaahidoon fight for - that is to call people to the Book and the Sunnah. (p. 365).

8) Then Shaikh ul-Islaam explains that the scholars of the Muslims, those from the Companions and Taabi'een and all of the scholars thereafter, that they may make statements and hold views based upon their ijtihaads – and that it is permissible to speak with these sayings though it is not obligatory upon any Muslim except to adhere to the saying of the Messenger (sallallahu alaihi wasallam). And that this (the sayings of the scholars) is a legislation in which ta'weel and ijtihaad has entered and that it can also at the same time be in agreement with the legislation that is revealed (ash-Shar' al-Munazzal), in which case the person receives two rewards, and sometimes it might not be in agreement (in which case the person receives one reward). (p.367).

9) Shaikh ul-Islaam then says that since this is the condition of most people, then it is not correct for anyone to reproach him or blame him or punish him. However, when such a one comes to know the truth, which is in opposition to his own saying, then it is not permissible for him to leave the truth that Allaah sent His Messenger with, for the saying of anybody else. And that this (the truth) is the actual revealed legislation (ash-Shar' al-Munazzal), and this is actually the Book and the Sunnah, and this but the Deen of Allaah and His Messenger. And that this is what Jihaad is made for, not for the saying of a Shaikh or Aalim, but so that Allaah alone is worshipped, and that all religion is for Allaah. Then the Shaikh mentions that what is meant by Jihaad and what the purpose behind it, is that no one is worshipped except Allaah alone and that all the forms of Ibaadah are for Him alone. (pp.367-368).

10) Shaikh ul-Islaam then talks generally about the reality of Tawheed of Uloohiyyah and Ruboobiyyah and about Shirk which Allaah has forbidden, illustrating that this is the actual desired end behind Jihaad. And he expands on some of the specific features of Uloohiyyah and Ruboobiyyah. (pp. 368-372).

11) Then it is mentioned that the Messenger is the delegate and intermediary between the creation and Allaah, and that he is the one who conveys the commands, prohibitions, threats and promises, what He has made halaal, what He has made Haraam. And that the halaal is what Allaah has made halaal and the haraam is what Allaah has made haraam and that the deen is what Allaah and His Messenger have legislated, and that it is not permissible for anyone to depart from any of that, and that this is the legislation which those in authority should judge the people with and so on. Then he mentions that what is not meant by the Shar' (legislation) which is required, is the various judgements a ruler (haakim) may make – even if he was the best of those in his time. And that the judgement of a haakim who is just, is only binding upon specific people, those who refer their dispute to him in a specific issue, and that this judgement of the ruler is not binding upon the whole of creation. (p.372).

12) Then he mentions that it is not obligatory upon a scholar to blindly follow a ruler (haakim) in either a few or many matters, when he comes to know what Allaah and His Messenger have commanded. And that it is not even for the common folk to blindly follow the haakim in anything related to the religion. Rather, he should seek fatwaa from anyone who is permitted to give fatwaa, even if he is not a haakim. And that when a scholar

abandons what he knows from the Book and the Sunnah and follows and adopts the judgement of the haakim, which is in opposition to the judgement of Allaah and His Messenger, then this is kufr and apostasy. And that even if he was beaten and imprisoned so that he should abandon what he knows, then he should have patience, otherwise he deserves the punishment of Allaah. And then Shaikh ul-Islaam illustrates what is meant here by saying that when a haakim makes a judgement in an issue of ijtihaad and in which the Companions and Taabi'een themselves differed in and then the haakim makes a judgement with one of their sayings, and yet in the view of others it opposes the Sunnah of the Messenger, then in this situation it is upon the scholar to actually follow what he knows to be from the Sunnah, and he should order it, give verdicts based upon it, call to it and not blindly follow the saying of the haakim. (pp.373-374).

13) Then Shaikh ul-Islaam says that when a Muslim, whether a scholar or not, leaves what he knows is from Allaah and His Messenger for the saying of someone else, that he is deserving of punishment. And that if a text is hidden from someone, and he makes ijtihaad in the absence of knowing this text, and as result opposes the text, then he is excused. However, it is not permissible for the one who knew something from the Sunnah to turn away from it. Then the Shaikh says that whatever afflicts the servant is because of his sins and not because of his following the Messenger. And that by following the Messenger is he helped, aided, shown mercy and so on, and by his sins is he punished and abandoned. Then he explains the link between a servant's afflictions and his sins and that all favours and blessings are from Allaah. (pp.375-376).

14) Then the Shaikh states once more that the legislation that is obligatory to follow upon the Muslim and which those in authority should aid and make Jihaad for (in order to call to it) is the Book and the Sunnah. And as for the judgement of a ruler (haakim), then it is to be considered just like the decision of a qaadee (judge), and is not actually legislation that Allaah has made obligatory to follow upon all of His creation. That even a just and upright judge who is a scholar can be right sometimes and wrong sometimes – until even the Messenger (sallallaahu alaihi wasallam). Then he quotes the hadeeth of Umm Salamah in which the Messenger (sallallaahu alaihi wasallam) says, “Indeed you bring your disputes to me, and perhaps one of you may be more eloquent and soft in presenting his case to me than the other, and so I judge in his favour based upon what I hear. So if I judge anything in the favour of him, from the right of his brother (disputant), then he should not take it, for all I have done is cut him a piece from the piece of the Fire.” (Bukhaaree, Muslim and others). (pp. 376-377).

15) Then Shaikh ul-Islaam mentions the types of judges quoting the hadeeth, “Judges are of three types: Two in the Fire and one in Paradise. A person who knows the truth and judges by it, he is in Paradise. A person who judges in the cases of the people upon ignorance. He is in the Fire. And a person who knows the truth and judges in opposition to it, he is in the Fire” (Abu Daawood, Ibn Maajah). Here the Shaikh makes the point that when the Qaadee who is in Paradise makes a judgement in a case, and a person knows that it is error then he is not allowed to accept it, due to the Sunnah (i.e. the hadeeth quoted in the previous point) and due to the consensus of the Muslims. And if this is the case, how much more so is it when this Qaadee passes a judgement concerning an affair of the

religion itself, and in which he has no right to impose his judgement. The Shaikh says that this Qaadee, in this judgement of his, is merely one person amongst the generality of the Muslims, and that like anybody else, if he has knowledge, he should speak with it, otherwise he should keep silent. Then the Shaikh gives an example of this. This is when he (the Qaadee, or Haakim) judges that travelling to other than the three mosques (Masjid al-Haram, Masjid an-Nabawi and Masjid al-Aqsa) is legislated and is recommended, and that the one who does it is rewarded and that the one who says, "it is not recommended" is to be harmed and punished or imprisoned. Shaikh ul-Islaam says that such a judgement is falsehood by consensus of the Muslims and that it is not permissible for the one who knows the deen of Islaam to follow this, and it is not for the wali ul-amr to put this type of ruling into effect, and that anyone who does so is deserving of punishment ('iqaab) if the proof is established against him, and that if he does this out of ignorance and makes something binding upon the people, then he too is to be punished. And as for the one who made ijtihaad in this and erred, then he is pardoned. (pp.377-378).

16) Then Shaikh ul-Islaam says that Allaah has made it obligatory upon all of those with authority over the Muslims (Wullaat ul-Umoor) to follow the legislation which is the Book and the Sunnah and that when some of the Muslims differ on a matter in any of the affairs of the religion, even if the one who disputes is one of the students of knowledge, it is not permissible for those in authority (wullaat ul-umoor) to make the judgement of a haakim binding upon him. Rather, they should explain the truth to him just like the truth is explained to one who is jaahil and is learning. So if the truth becomes clear to him, that which Allaah sent his Messenger with, and then he resists this, he deserves to be punished. And as for the one who says that that which I said is my saying, or a saying of a group of the scholars and that I said it out of ijtihaad and taqleed, then such a one is not to be punished by consensus. Then Shaikh ul-Islaam says that if this person had made an error and opposed the Book and the Sunnah, and was then to be punished, then all Muslims would have to be punished because there is none amongst them who has sayings in which he has made ijtihaad or made taqleed and in which he is in error. So if Allaah had punished the one who errs he would have punished the whole of creation. (p.379)

17) Then he said that when a soldier, or a muftee, or a common person speak on a matter based upon their own ijtihaad or due to taqleed, intending and seeking to follow the Messenger, in accordance with the level and extent of their knowledge, they do not deserve punishment, by consensus of the Muslims – even if they were to err in a matter that was unanimously agreed upon. And when they say, "we speak the truth" and they use Sharee'ah evidences, then it is not allowed for any of the rulers (hukkaam) to make his own viewpoint binding upon them, and nor to pass a judgement that what he is saying is the truth in opposition to their saying. Rather he should judge between himself and between them by the Book and the Sunnah. So if the truth comes clear, then all should follow it, and if no truth is found, then everyone should remain silent (from imposing their view). And those in authority (wullaat ul-umoor) should prevent all of them (i.e. the hukkaam and the subjects) from wronging each other, such that if some of them overstep the bounds with others, then they (those in authority) should prevent them from that. And it is not right for those in authority to allow strife to occur by allowing some of the people

(hukkaam or otherwise) to pass and impose their judgements over others on account of their own sayings or madhhab (i.e. preferred opinions). (p.380).

18) Then Shaikh ul-Islaam says that when the rulers judge in a matter in which there is ijtihaad (i.e. no text from the Book and the Sunnah exists) and a well-known difference exists, and then their own saying and viewpoint that they judge by has not been said by any of the Scholars of the Muslims, and is not it the madhhab of the scholars they ascribe themselves to, and has not been said by any of the Companions or Taabi'een, and there is no verse from the Book of Allaah or anything from the Sunnah of His Messenger – rather their saying opposes the Book and the Sunnah and the Ijmaa' of the Ummah, then how can it be lawful, alongside all of this for them (the rulers) to impose this upon the scholars of the Muslims to follow this saying, and to pass this judgement that opposes the Book and the Sunnah and Ijmaa', and for it to be said that the saying which is indicated by the Book and the Sunnah and the sayings of the Salaf is not to be spoken of, and nor is a verdict to be given by it, and the one who gives a verdict by it or speaks with it is to be harmed – and for the Muslims, their families and their wealth to be met with harm because they have followed what they know to be from the deen of Islaam, even if this was hidden from others. So how then the one who does not know the truth be assisted, and how can he judge with jahl and dhulm, and to make binding upon the one who knew what he knew from the Sharee'ah of the Messenger, to abandon it, for the sake of this (judgement of the ruler)?! (pp.380-381).

19) Then Shaikh ul-Islaam says that no one has the right to do this and that those who follow the Book and the Sunnah and what they know from the Sharee'ah then they do not harm anyone in any way. Rather they are the ones who follow whatever they know from the Sharee'ah, from the Book and the Sunnah, of Tawheed and Ibaadah and following the Sharee'ah and obeying the Messenger and so on and so forth, and that they follow all of this, and that if anyone else opposed any of this, even if he erred, then it is not upon them to follow him, rather it is upon them to follow the Messenger. Then Shaikh ul-Islaam says that it is not for the ruler to judge that so and so matter has been commanded by the Messenger, or that this particular act is an act of nearness and obedience (to Allaah), or that it is not so, or that travelling to the mosques (other than the three) and to the graves and the grave of the Prophet (sallallaahu alaihi wasallam) is legislated or is not legislated. There is no exclusive role for the rulers (hukkaam) in this, rather all the Muslims can enter to this, and hence anyone who has knowledge can speak based upon what he has of knowledge. (p.382).

20) Then Shaikh ul-Islaam says that it is not for anyone to judge upon a scholar (i.e. in the manner that a judge rules over two disputants). Rather his error is to be outlined by Sharee'ah evidences which he would have to accept, and if he does not accept and persists, then he should be restrained, and he should be punished if he does not withhold. And when it has not been made clear to him or become clear to him with Sharee'ah evidences then he is not to be punished, by consensus. (p.382).

21) Then the Shaikh reinforces that Allaah has made following the Messenger and obeying him obligatory upon the people and to follow his commands and judgements and his

religion. And that the hujjah is established by way of the Messengers and that what they bring is what is obligatory upon the people to follow, and that all the people should refer to the Book and the Sunnah for their judgements. Then Shaikh ul-Islaam says that from the Usool of Ahl us-Sunnah is that with respect to anyone after the Messenger (sallallaahu alaihi wasallam), including the Caliphs, it is not obligatory for them to be singled out with having exclusive knowledge that other people do not know. Rather all the Muslims share the knowledge of the religion. So when some of them have some hadeeths that others do not have they convey it to them. And for this reason the Caliphs used to ask the Companions about certain matters, “do you have any knowledge from the Prophet (sallallaahu alaihi wasallam)?”, and when the Sunnah became clear to them they judged by it. Then the Shaikh gives a few examples of this, with Abu Bakr and the issue of the inheritance of the grandmother and ‘Umar and the unborn child that is killed (whilst in the womb). So they were informed of the Sunnah and so they acted by it. And though ‘Umar was one who was inspired with the truth, then despite that he did not pass judgement in the general affairs (laa yahkum fee al-umoor al-aammah), rather he would consult with the Companions, and recant from his previous saying, and he would have one saying and then a woman would relay to him and so we would make reference to her saying and adopt it. And that Alee would have his view and Ibn Mas’ood would have his view, and Zaid bin Thaabit would have his view, and yet no one made it binding for the saying of ‘Umar to be adopted, while ‘Umar was actually the Imaam of all the Ummah, the most knowledgeable of them. So how then can one of the Rulers be better than ‘Umar, and this is when he speaks on a matter of Ijtihad. (pp.384-385).

22) So after the above, Shaikh ul-Islaam says, if that is the case, how then can it be when what he (i.e. the haakim) says has not been said by any of the scholars of the Muslims, and nor the four Imaams and nor anyone before them from the Companions and the Taabi’een. But only he (the haakim) and his likes speak with it, those who have no knowledge of the Book and the Sunnah and the sayings of the Salaf and the scholars. Rather, they judge by the mere customs they were brought up with like those who say (in the Qur’aan) “We found our forefathers upon a certain way and we shall guide ourselves by them” (Zukhruf 43:23). And just like the Bedouin Arabs judge by the customs and practices which they have, and just like the Tartars judge by the Yaasaaq which goes by their customs. And as for the people of Islaam and Imaan and knowledge and religion, then they judge by the Book and the Sunnah as Allaah said, “But no, they can have no real faith unless they make you (O Muhammad) judge in all disputes between them and then find no resistance in their souls to what you judge and then accept with full submission” (Nisaa 4:65), and also, “Is it the rule of Jaahiliyyah they seek. And who is better in judgement than Allaah for a people who have certain (faith)” (Maa’idah 5:50). (pp.385-386)

23) Then Shaikh ul-Islaam illustrates that even when two spouses dispute and separation is feared for them, Allaah has commanded that two arbitrators (hakam) should judge over their affair, not just the one. So if they (the two arbitrators) see any benefit in them remaining together then they remain together and if they see the benefit to be in their separating then they separate. So the point here is that when the truth might become obscure, Allaah did not make the issue restricted to the judgement of one person, and this

is only in a specific issue of judgement (qadiyyah mu'ayyanah) between (the dispute) of two spouses. How then for the general aspects of worship and religion, which are shared between all the Muslims, and these affairs have become obscure and confusing to many people. And these issues are not be judged in except by Allaah and His Messenger, by the consensus of the Muslims. Hence, whoever has knowledge of whatever the Messenger (sallallaahu alaihi wasallam) came with, then he should explain it, and make it clear to the Muslims, and the Muslims when they come to know of the legislation (shar') of their Prophet, they should not turn away from it. (p.387).

24) Then Shaikh ul-Islaam says that when the wali ul-amr (one in authority) knows what has come in the Book and the Sunnah then he should judge between the people by it, and if he does not know it and it is possible for him to know it, he should not speak until he knows the truth so that he can judge by it. And it is not his right to impose upon anyone the saying of anyone else, even if he was a haakim (ruler, judge). And when those in authority (wullaat al-umoor) depart from (adhering to) this (mode of conduct) then they have judged by other than what Allaah has revealed, and then strife will occur between them, as the Prophet (sallallaahu alaihi wasallam) said, "Never do a people judge by other than what Allaah has revealed except that strife occurs between them". And this is one of the greatest of causes in the changes of states, as has happened time after time in our era and also in other than our times. And then Shaikh ul-Islaam says that Allah has promised to assist and aid those who aid Him, and aiding Him is aiding His Book and His religion and His Messenger. And that there is no aid for those who judge by other than what Allaah has revealed, speaking with that in which he has no knowledge. (p.387).

25) Finally we come to the actual words of Shaikh ul-Islaam in which there is mention of al-hukm al-aamm, which comes immediately after the above. So he said, concluding this section of the chapter:

"For if the ruler 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 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)."

End of Synopsis from Majmoo' al-Fataawaa (35/355-388).

Part 2: Summarising the Text

It is important that we summarise and explain the above, to help us appreciate the context more clearly:

In the above passage Shaikh ul-Islaam is speaking about the difference between the jurisdiction of those in authority (wullaat), the rulers (hukkaam) and the qaadees (judges) in issues in which personal disputes are brought to them (between two contenders) and in issues which pertain to the religion in general and pertain to the affairs of fiqh, ibaadah, aqeedah, and the overall aspects of the religion in both knowledge and action.

With respect to the first type (disputes in personal affairs etc.) the haakim and qaadee can insist on his viewpoint and his judgement and make it binding upon the people, though if he judges in the favour of the wrong person, and the person who has received the favourable judgement knows that, he cannot accept the judgement of the haakim.

However, with respect to the second category of matters, which pertain to the actual affairs of the religion, then the haakim has no right to impose his particular viewpoint and make it binding upon those who differ with him. So to illustrate, on the issue of whether a person places his hands on his chest after the rukoo' or leaves them by the side (a well known issue of difference)³, then just because the haakim is a haakim (ruler, judge) he has no right to impose his viewpoint as an actual judgement in the religion, just like he would impose his viewpoint and ruling when two disputants come to him in personal affairs. This is because the knowledge of the religion is not restricted to the haakim alone, rather it is shared between all the creation, and hence whoever had knowledge of a particular matter, then he should explain it and clarify it – whoever that might be, and hence if it is the truth it should be adopted.

Likewise, when the ruler (haakim) himself has a difference of opinion with say a soldier, or a common person, or a student of knowledge, or a scholar about an issue, then the haakim, is just like any other person from the community of Muslims and the issue boils down to the proof and what is in the Book and the Sunnah. And it is not the haakim's right that he impose his particular viewpoint upon others, passing judgement that they should adopt it, and that any other view should not be adopted. There may be issues which there are clear texts in which case they are presented and so everyone adopts what is in the Book and the Sunnah and leaves what they were upon if they were in error. Or there may be matters of ijtihaad (in which there are no texts clearly) so these matters are not to be shown rejection, and the haakim cannot impose his view, and pass judgement that everyone should adopt his particular view. And if he did do this then this is what is known as al-hukm al-aamm (a general ruling), so if he makes a general ruling, concerning an issue pertaining to the deen itself, and then passes judgement that everybody should adopt his view, then this is al-hukm al-aamm (a general legislation). And this general legislation can be with respect to an ijtihaad that a ruler has made (on an issue of knowledge or action pertaining to the religion, and in which there are other views), or something that actually

³ This is only an illustrative example we have given. Shaikh ul-Islaam has given many examples in the text, which have been alluded to in the synopsis of his words.

opposes the Book and the Sunnah, having no support from it, or customs and habits (like those of the Bedouins), and other such matters. However, Shaikh ul-Islaam passed no judgement of takfir upon any of that at all, let alone doing it in absolute terms.

This is the essence of the passage, and there are some other benefits scattered throughout it.

Part 3: Exposing the Scandal

After you have understood all of that O Sunni, now let us have a look at the scandal of this individual who has come out against us, having been nurtured upon the books of the Takfiris and Qutubis, being driven by their madhhab of Sayyid Qutb on Haakimiyyah, hell-bent on ascribing Irjaa' to Ahl us-Sunnah – let us see the state of this individual piecemeal.

The first quote: Abu Fulaan al-Kanadie said:

...And although Khaalid Al-Anbaree has attempted to demonstrate that *Shaykh Al-Islam* did not differentiate between the ruler who rules in particular instances by other than what Allaah revealed, he has failed to grasp the import of the following quotation: “If its from *Deen* but he judges without knowledge, then he is from the people of the Fire (i.e. for judging in a matter in which they were not qualified to). And if he is knowledgeable but judges with that which contradicts the truth that he knows, then he is from the people of the Fire. And if he judges without justice and without knowledge, then he is more deserving to be of the people of the Fire. And this is if he judges in a specific instance for an individual. **But if he judges a *Hukm 'Aam* (i.e. general judgement) in the *Deen* of the Muslims; so he makes the *Haaq* to be *Baatil* and the *Baatil* to be *Haaq* and the *Sunnah* to be *Bid'ah* and *Bid'ah* to be *Sunnah* and the *Mar'oof* to be *Munkaar* and the *Munkaar* to be *Mar'oof* and he forbids what Allaah and His Messenger ordered and he orders that Allaah and His Messenger forbids, then this is a different category (i.e. literally, –this is a different colour). The Lord of the Worlds, *Illah* of the Messengers, Master of the Day of Judgement will judge him.” (Al-Fataawa', Vol. 35/388)**

So this shows that Ibn Taymiyah did, in fact, differentiate between *Tashree' Al-'Aam* and made it separate from the ruling in one instance. And although he, may Allaah be merciful to him, did not specifically make *Takfeer* to this second category of ruling by other than what Allaah revealed, he has clearly done so in the other texts which have passed.” End quote from al-Kanadie.

So we say, seeking the aid and assistance of Allaah, in exposing the scandal of this ignoramus:

ONE: The great ignorance of al-Kanadie of the meaning of “al-hukm al-aamm” (a general ruling, legislation) in the passage that he has quoted (which he calls at-tashree' al-aamm) – by totally ignoring the context of the whole chapter. What he intends by his understanding of at-tashree' al-aamm is to refer to the rulers who rule by the secular laws to greater or lesser extents, as opposed to the Sharee'ah, whether of their own making or otherwise.

TWO: This saying of Shaikh ul-Islam (at the very end of the lengthy passage) clearly refers to a ruler (haakim) who passes a judgement concerning one of the issues of the

religion be that in fiqh, or ibaadah, or aqeedah, or any of the issues of knowledge (and in which he has no right of exclusivity) and then imposes this upon the people. And hence as a result of this, by imposing his own particular viewpoint on a matter, he may turn the truth to be falsehood and falsehood to be truth (when his opinion is erroneous) and also the sunnah into bid'ah and bid'ah into sunnah (when his opinion or practice is innovated, with no support from the Book and the Sunnah)⁴ and what is good (ma'roof) into evil (munkar) and what is evil to be good, and forbid that which Allaah and His Messenger commanded and command that which they forbade.

THREE: The distinction that is made in the words of Shaikh ul-Islaam is between a judgement in personal disputes (i.e. when a qaadee or haakim passes a judgement in personal disputes, which are not in relation to knowledge-based positions about religious matters) and between a judgement in the affairs of the religion in general, and imposing one's own view (upon a particular matter related to fiqh, or aqeedah, or ibaadah and so on) upon the people, by passing a general judgement that the people should adhere to the haakim's viewpoint, as opposed to other viewpoints – even when his viewpoint is opposed to the Book and the Sunnah, and is not from what Allaah has revealed. So it is not allowed for him to make a judgement pertaining to the religion regarding it, since he, just like everybody else, is from the generality of the Muslims, and their saying can be taken or left.

This has nothing to do with differentiating between a ruler who rules with a secular law in one issue and one who rules by a secular law in many issues or most issues, whether of his own making or otherwise.

FOUR: Shaikh ul-Islaam is not even talking about the subject of takfeer.

FIVE: Shaikh ul-Islaam did not even pass a judgement of kufr upon this; rather he submitted the judgement upon this to Allaah Most High!! As for al-Kanadie and those of his ilk, then their judgement is every ready and present, not from this particular statement, but by other statements from Shaikh ul-Islaam – as they presume and as we shall see shortly in this treatise.

SIX: From another angle, the actual distinction that Shaikh ul-Islaam is making is between ruling by other than what Allaah has revealed in a particular issue (due to dhulm and fisq) and between a form of tabdeel (alteration) of the religion⁵. There is no distinction

⁴ Like those who imposed the saying of the creation of the Qur'aan upon the Ummah – though this is a bid'ah mukaffirah – and this was a “general legislation” imposed upon the whole Ummah. This is the type of matter being alluded to.

⁵ Compare with the saying of Shaikh ul-Islaam, “As for when anyone attributes to the Sharee'ah what is not actually from it, such as fabricated ahaadeeth, or (faulty) interpretations of the texts upon other than what Allaah intended and other such things, **then this is a type of tabdeel**. Hence, it is obligatory to differentiate between the revealed legislation (ash-shar' al-munazzal), the interpolated legislation (ash-shar' al-mu'awwal) and the altered, changed legislation (ash-shar' al-mubaddal) – just like it is to be differentiated between the creational and religious realities, and between a matter for which evidence is sought in the Book and the Sunnah, and merely sufficing oneself with the intuition and impulse of a person.” (Majmoo al-Fataawaa 11/265).

in this passage between ruling in a particular issue (due to dhulm or oppression) and between ruling by the secular laws in greater or lesser amounts.

SEVEN: Shaikh ul-Islaam **did not** pass a judgement of takfir on this general legislation (al-hukm al-aamm), which is a form of tabdeel – because the ruler here did not claim that his judgement and viewpoint is the actual judgement of Allaah and is from the Sharee'ah of Allaah, and nor did he make this form of ruling by other than what Allaah has revealed to be permissible.

This is indicated by the following.

Shaikh ul-Islaam in the same chapter that we have quoted from (Chapter on Qadaa) (35/396) says, after speaking about the legislation that is revealed (ash-shar' al-munazzal)⁶, the legislation which is interpolated (ash-shar' al-mu'awwal)⁷, he then says, “And the third: the legislation that is altered, changed (ash-shar' al-mubaddal), such as what is established by way of false testimony, or when judgement is made upon ignorance, or oppression, without justice, and truth, judging by other than what Allaah has revealed (in that). Or when the affirmation of falsehood is ordered so that the right (of a person) can be wasted, for example when a sick person affirms for one of the inheritors with what he does not deserve, in order to take the due right of the other inheritors, and such a command is forbidden, and testifying over it is forbidden...”

This has been labeled as a legislation that has undergone tabdeel (or alteration) and Shaikh ul-Islaam called it ash-shar' al-mubaddal. However no judgement of takfir was pronounced here. And doing this is actually ruling by other than what Allaah has revealed, which is dhulm and fisq.

In Majmoo' Fataawaa (3/267), we find that Shaikh ul-Islaam discusses the same matter:

“... because it is known from him, the specific and the general, that he turned what he did in this particular matter, to be the actually legislation (shar') of Muhammad Ibn Abdullaah (i.e. ascribed it to the Sharee'ah)⁸. And when a person makes lawful what is unanimously agreed upon to be unlawful, or makes unlawful what is unanimously agreed upon to be lawful, or (the one) who altered the Sharee'ah (baddala ash-Shar') - that [from it] which is agreed upon - he is a kaafir, an apostate by agreement of the jurists and it is regarding the likes of this that the verse was revealed - according to one of two sayings⁹: “and whoever

⁶ Which is the pure teachings of the Book and the Sunnah, that is revelation and legislation exactly as it is, as Allaah has revealed it.

⁷ This is the views and opinions of the scholars, their ijtihaads and so on.

⁸ This is in relation to the Qaadee, Ibn Makhloof, who passed legislated a matter which is in opposition to the Book and the Sunnah “from at least twenty odd angles”, in the words of Shaikh ul-Islaam.

⁹ And the other saying is that this verse is exclusively for the Kuffaar, as occurs in the tafsir of at-Tabaree. And there occurs in Saheeh Muslim (no. 1700), Sunan Abu Dawood (4448), Musnad Ahmad (4/286), from al-Baraa' bin 'Aazib from the Prophet (sallallaahu alaihi wasallam), that he

does not judge by what Allaah has revealed, they are the disbelievers” (5:44) - meaning the one who declares ruling by other than what Allaah has revealed to be permissible (mustahill).

And the word Shar' it is used - in the understanding of men - with three meanings:

Ash-Shar' al-Munazzal (the revealed legislation): And this is whatever the Messenger (sallallahu alaihi wasallam) came with. It is obligatory to follow this, and it is obligatory to punish anyone who opposes it.

Ash-Shar' al-Mu'awwal (the interpolated legislation): This is the opinions of the scholars, who make ijtihaad in these matters, such as the madhhab of Maalik and what is like that. It is permissible to follow this (ittibaa'), but it is not obligatory and it is not haraam. And it is not for anyone to make this binding upon the general people, and nor should they be prevented from it.

And the third: ash-Shar' al-Mubaddal - and this is lying against Allaah¹⁰ and against His Messenger or upon the people with a false testimony and its likes, and clear oppression. So whoever says: ‘Indeed, this is from the Shar' of Allaah (i.e. a particular judgement), then he has disbelieved - there being no doubt or dispute in this - such as the one who says: ‘That consuming blood and the dead animal is lawful’, even if he said, ‘this is my madhhab’ and the likes. If that which Ibn Makhkloof had judged (in the matter) was actually the madhhab of Maalik or al-Ash'ari, then he has no right to impose it upon all of the people, and to then punish those who do not agree with him, by consensus of the Ummah. So how then is it when the saying that he speaks by and which he imposes and makes binding upon the people, is actually in opposition to the text of Maalik, and the scholars from among his associates, and in opposition to the text of al-Ash'ari, and the scholars from his associates...But then how will it be when this judgement which (Ibn Makhkloof) has passed is opposed to the Sharee'ah of Islaam, from around twenty-odd angles?...¹¹ (3/267-269).

And here Shaikh ul-Islaam passed the judgement of takfir. And the difference between the two scenarios is that in the first one (35/396) a person rules by other than what Allaah has revealed, altering the judgement of Allaah (such as the example of not distributing the inheritance in the correct manner, or an incorrect judgement based upon dhulm and so

said, **“They (these verses) are in relation to the Kuffaar, all of them** (i.e. the verses) [Hiya Fil-Kuffaar, kulluhaa]”. It has also been reported by Ibn Maajah (2558), an-Nasaa'ee in “al-Kubraa”, at-Tabaraee (6/254) and others.

¹⁰ Just like the Jews did concerning the issue of stoning the adulterer, when they ascribed their invented law to Allaah and the Tawraat. See what follows below.

¹¹ Note that even though this judgement of Ibn Makhkloof that Shaikh ul-Islaam is referring to (which is a matter pertaining to issues of the religion) is opposed to the Sharee'ah of Islaam (which is worse than it simply being an issue of ijtihaad), then Shaikh ul-Islaam, in the whole of this section, did not declare this judgement and the subsequent imposition of it upon the people to be kufr. But he ascribed kufr to the one who said that this imposing judgement on a matter that is alien or opposed to the Sharee'ah is a) actually from the Sharee'ah, from Allaah or b) that it is permissible to judge by this judgement, which is Istihlaal.

on), so this is tabdeel, but he does not ascribe this judgement of his to Allaah (and nor does he declare it be permissible). But in the second scenario (i.e. in 3/267-268), the person claims that his law or judgement is the actual judgement of Allaah, and this is kufr, and is the tabdeel that is kufr, and there is also mention of Istihlaal (i.e. the one who makes this form of tabdeel to be lawful).

In short, in the passage in which Shaikh ul-Islaam mentions, "...As for when he makes a general ruling 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, Deity 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..." (35/388), there is no judgement of takfir, though this is a form of tabdeel of the religion (as later confirmed in the same chapter (in 35/396) – because here the person guilty of this has not gone another step further and claimed that his judgement is actually the Sharee'ah or that it is lawful to judge by his judgement (i.e. Istihlaal) and the likes (as is made clear in 3/267-268).¹²

But as for when he falls into this general legislation (al-hukm al-aamm), which is a form of tabdeel, and then claims that his judgement is from the Sharee'ah or is the Sharee'ah or that it is lawful to judge by his saying (as opposed to ash-Shar' al-Munazzal) then this is kufr.

And all of this is made clear by the following (quoting from MNJ050018):

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 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 made tabdeel of that particular law, and it became ash-shar' al-mubaddal (the replaced legislation), then 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.

¹² Now compare all of this with the saying of Ibn al-Qayyim: "And as for the replaced law (al-hukm al-mubaddal) - and that is ruling by other than what allaah has revealed - then it is not permissible to implement (tanfeeth) it nor to act by it ('amal), and it is not permissible to follow it ('ittibaa), and the one guilty of it (saahibuhu) **is between (the states) of kufr (disbelief), fusoq (rebellion) and dhulm (oppression)**." (Kitaab ur-Rooh, p.394).

And this agrees perfectly with what has been explained above, and these words of Ibn al-Qayyim are precise, concise, and summarise the essence of this matter!

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 [i.e. make tabdeel of the judgements of Allaah], and they would ascribe their lie to their Lord and to their Book¹³, 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 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 opposing and resisting (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).

NINE: Rejoice O Ahl us-Sunnah for the sorcery of al-Kanadie, this neo-Qutubite Wolf, clothing himself in the gown of Salafiyyah, has been exposed, walhamdulillah. Reflect upon the jahl of al-Kanadie, when he says:

And why did Khaalid Al-Anbaree not assemble a collection of the available statements regarding the ruling by other than what Allaah revealed which have been recorded by *Shaykh Al-Islaam* in order to reveal his complete and *Mutawaatir* (i.e. often narrated) opinion concerning the ruler who legislates fabricated laws and governs the masses with them?

...So this shows that Ibn Taymiyah did, in fact, differentiate between *Tashree' Al-'Aam* and made it separate from the ruling in one instance.

¹³ Compare with the saying of Shaikh ul-Islaam quoted earlier, “And the third: ash-Shar' al-Mubaddal - and this is lying against Allaah and against His Messenger or upon the people with a false testimony and its likes, and clear oppression. So whoever says: “Indeed, this is from the Shar' of Allaah (i.e. a particular judgement), then he has disbelieved - there being no doubt or dispute in this - such as the one who says: “That consuming blood and the dead animal is lawful”, even if he said, ‘this is my madhhab’ and the likes.”

And look at how he wallows in misguidance, lying upon our scholars, imposing meanings and understandings upon their words and statements that they do not even carry. Since what al-Kanadie means by at-Tashree' al-Aamm (general legislation) is one thing¹⁴, and what Shaikh ul-Islaam Ibn Taymiyyah is talking about is something else. Our Scholars are in one valley and al-Kanadie is on a different planet! The hallucinogenic mind of al-Kanadie, who secluded himself with the books of the Innovators and became sensitised to the Haleemic and Hawaalic syndrome, sees one thing, (a mirage), and in reality it is something else! The meaning of al-hukm ul-aamm and also tabdeel in the words of Shaikh ul-Islaam means one thing, but to al-Kanadie it means something else?! Hence, there is no proof in the words of Shaikh ul-Islaam for al-Kanadie. And Shaikh ul-Islaam did not even pass the judgement of takfir upon this.

TEN: As for the issue of “at-tashree' al-aamm” as it is understood in the usage of some of the scholars – and which is in essence what is referred to as Istibdaal (replacement) then that has its own discussion and it has been discussed this in MNJ130016, so refer to it. We do not negate that those who fabricate laws (or use the secular laws) and then judge the people by them – in greater or lesser amounts - are great criminals. But we hold to tafseel in arriving at takfir of them. However, this Istibdaal (or call it at-tashree' al-aamm) is differed over amongst the Scholars, so some require Istihlaal and Juhood and I'tiqaad before making takfir and yet others do not, since they consider it to be major kufr absolutely.¹⁵

¹⁴ That is the rulers who rule by secular laws, or by their own judgements and viewpoints, without making them lawful, or claiming they are from Allaah, or believing they are better than Allaah's laws – and so they rule by these laws. And this word, at-tashree' al-aamm has been used by some of the contemporary scholars, and what is meant by it is synonymous with Istibdaal and making the secular laws in general a reference point for their judgements – in greater or lesser amounts.

¹⁵ And amongst those who do not make takfir absolutely (upon, or by way of the act itself) is Shaikh 'Abdul-Muhsin al-'Abbaad, who 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-qawaneen) as general legislation (tashree'an aammaan), 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.”

And it is actually this difference of opinion that the Qutubiyyah have monopolised upon and used as a veil in order to conceal themselves and enter into the da'wah of Ahl us-Sunnah. They are already upon the manhaj of Sayyid Qutb, but when they found something in the verdicts of our scholars, they rejoiced, and then entered their fitnah into the Salafi da'wah. Make note of this!! For many people think that the issue we have is with those who hold the view that replacement of the Sharee'ah with other Sharee'ah's is major kufr absolutely. And then they think we have double standards, by not labelling some of our scholars as Qutubiyyah, Khaarijiyyah.

But the likes of these people have not truly understood what has happened. The fitnah of Qutubiyyah caused a great deal of confusion, and it allowed the Khawaarij, the Takfiris and others to enter into the da'wah of Ahl us-Sunnah. Because they were already upon the absolution of Sayyid Qutb and his extremist manhaj in al-Haakimiyyah, then when the likes of Safar al-Hawaali and the

other Puppets of Aal Qutb, began to preach these doctrines to the youth (from the books of Sayyid Qutb), it allowed all of the outright Khawarij, the Qutubiyyah, the Activists and many of the youth that became poisoned to have a common-platform and to come together on this platform – that is the Haakimiyyah of Sayyid Qutb and his Extremism in this regard. And these people have a goal and an agenda. Then they monopolised on the differences that occur in the understanding of the scholars of Ahl us-Sunnah on only some aspects of this issue (of ruling by other than what Allaah has revealed) – such as the difference between the views of Shaikh Ibn Baaz, Shaikh al-Albaani and Shaikh Ibn Uthaimen and others, and those of Shaikh Ibn Ibraaheem and Shaikh al-Fawzaan and others. So the Qutubiyyah, the Azaamiyyah and many others, already upon the extremist manhaj of Sayyid Qutb, then monopolised and scavenged upon this and then caused confusion amongst Ahl us-Sunnah in this manner.

Many people who were not aware of what had happened, then thought that this whole fitnah of Qutubiyyah is only related to the issue of ruling by other than what Allaah has revealed. But it was in fact much more than that. The issue of ruling by other than what Allaah has revealed is only part of it. So the general people did not realise that when the Salafis began to spread and defend the views of Shaikh Ibn Baaz, Shaikh al-Albaani, Shaikh Ibn Uthaimen (his last view) and others on this topic, and refute the Qutubiyyah and their distortions and lies against our scholars (like Ibn Taymiyyah) – and their monopolising upon the words of our scholars – in order to strengthen and justify the general manhaj they were already upon which they had taken from Sayyid Qutb, through the likes of Mohammad Qutb, Safar al-Hawali, Abu Jahl Ibn Haleemah, Abu Qataadah at-Takfiri and others – then many people thought that there were double standards in that why were the Qutubiyyah attacked and yet the scholars like al-Fawzaan and Ibn Ibraaheem were not labelled Qutubiyyah and Khaarijiyyah.

And all of this was due to their ignorance of the reality of this fitnah of the Qutubiyyah that has entered into the da'wah. The clearest of examples that there is a distinct and separate breed of neo-Kharijites, who are actually miles apart from our scholars (like Shaikh al-Fawzaan, Shaikh Ibn Ibraaheem and others), is that they take certain verdicts of the scholars, then abandon others. So for example when Shaikh al-Fawzaan passes the verdict that Saudi judges by the Sharee'ah and establishes the Hudood and supports Islaam and its adherents, and that this is a thorn in the throat of the people of nifaaq and shiqaaq, then they reject this verdict and claim that al-Fawzaan is paid to say this and is a government stooge or he fears the government. Yet when Shaikh al-Fawzaan expresses his view on Istibdaal and so on, they jump upon it and argue by it – even though there is from the other scholars (like Shaikh Ibn Baz and Shaikh Ibn Uthaimen) what totally opposes this view. Indeed, even in the view of Shaikh Salih al-Fawzaan there is such a refutation against the Qutubiyyah – those who accuse the likes of al-Albaani of Irjaa' – and inshaa'llaah, this will be outlined in detail in a future paper in this series.

So we wish that the people can distinguish between our scholars, and between the Qutubiyyah who have hijacked the da'wah with their extremist manhaj and their many adulterated false principles, and monopolised on certain issues in order to make apologetic arguments for their own manhaj of takfir and haakimiyyah.

And to see clear evidence of this reality, refer to MNJ050017 in which Shaikh Abul-Hasan al-Misri asks Shaikh Ibn Uthaimen on his actual view, since many people were using his previous views to make takfir of the Rulers (you can read this at the end of this paper). And likewise refer to MNJ050014 to see how the same phenomenon occurred with the words of Shaikh Salih al-Fawzaan (in his Kitaab ut-Tawheed), in that the Takfiris and Kharijites began to use his words to make unrestricted takfir. Read these two articles O Sunni, and you will see what we mean. The Qutubiyyah have hijacked the da'wah, monopolised on some of the views of OUR scholars, and then used them to justify their own manhaj of Takfir and Haakimiyyah. This has allowed many Qutubi Charlatans and Wolves, to pose as Salafis and confuse much of our youth. And they have also managed to make many people become averse to the Salafi manhaj, in this manner.

However, we give them glad tidings, that we can smell them wherever they are, for they have signs and distinguishing characteristics, and though they may hide behind the views of some of OUR scholars, they will not remain undetected for long!! Wicked Charlatans, born of the Awakening of Qutubism, who lie upon our scholars, such as al-Kanadie. May Allaah sever them...Ameen.

We do not negate that there is a separate discussion concerning this and there are one of two views, but the point is that the Takfiriyyah and Qutubiyah, those who monopolise on these issues, and in fact scavenge upon them, then they have striven hard to compile and gather evidence, which is not for them at all, and does not even support them.

Hence, the concern of these people with this issue of at-tashree' al-aamm and so on, is actually to establish that their opponents are upon Irjaa'. And the greatest of proofs of that is from the words of one of the well-known Takfiri Intelligentsia, and a Qutubi figurehead by the name of Hamood bin Uqlaa ash-Shu'aybee, who is one of the teachers of Salman al-Awdah, and who also openly proclaims his adherence to the manhaj of Sayyid Qutb.

So he (ash-Shu'aybee) said, "I have looked at the sayings of Khaalid al-Anbari and it has become clear to me by my reading of these sayings and some of his books that he is a Murji' from the pure Murji'ah; the ones that are under the school of thought of Jahm Ibn Safwaan in Irjaa'...", and this was quoted by al-Kanadie himself. And this is only because Khalid al-Anbari adheres to tafseel on the issue of ruling by the secular laws – so he associated him with Jahm Ibn Safwaan!!

Al-Kanadie quoted this wicked statement, which is slanderous, and is an outright fabrication, not just upon the one whom this statement was directed to, but also upon the likes of Imaam Ibn Baaz, Imaam al-Albaani, Imaam Ibn Uthaimen, Shaikh Abdul-Muhsin al-'Abbaad and many of the other scholars of Ahl us-Sunnah who adhere to tafseel on Istibdaal (or at-tashree' al-aamm)!!

Part 4: Splitting, Doctoring and Stitching

The passage concerning at-tabdeel and ash-shar' al-mubaddal that we quoted in the previous section (Part 3) from 3/267-268 of Majmoo' al-Fataawaa was also quoted by al-Kanadie (in his so called refutation), however he had doctored the quote to facilitate his subsequent interpolation and distortion (ta'weel and tahreef) of it. And this indicates his lack of trustworthiness in quoting and narrating.

Putting aside his errors in translation¹⁶, look at how al-Kanadie doctored this quotation from Shaikh ul-Islaam. He actually SPLIT, EDITED and REVERSED the order of the quote! Al-Kanadie quoted (on page 92 of his document):

As for Ibn Taymiyah, may Allaah be merciful to him, then lets examine its entire text:
 "And the *Shara'* in the customs of the people is used upon three different meanings:

Firstly, *Ash-Shara' Al-Munazil*¹⁷ (i.e. the revealed legislation) and it is what the Messenger (----) came with and is following this is *Waajib*. And whoever contradicts it, it is *Waajib* to punish him.

And the second, *Ash-Shara' Al-Mu'awil*¹⁸ (i.e. the explained legislation) and it is the opinions of the *Mujtahideen/Ulaama* like the *Meth'haab* of Malik and the likes of it. And it is allowed to follow this and it is not *Waajib* and it is not *Haraam* and it is not allowed for anyone to hold it upon the general people. And it is not for anyone to forbid it to the general people.

Thirdly, *Ash-Shara' Al-Mubaddal* (i.e. the replaced legislation) and it is the lying on Allaah and His Messenger or upon the people with false witness and the likes of that. And (this is) the clear *Thulm*. So whoever says, This is from the legislation of Allaah, then he has disbelieved without disagreement. Like the one who says, The blood is *Halaal*, and The dead (meat) is *Halaal*, even if he says, This is my *Meth'haab* and the likes of that. Or whoever replaces a law which there is *Ijmaa'* upon, then he is a *Kaafir/Mortaad* with the *Ijmaa'* of the *Fuqahaa*. And about this came His saying.
 → according to one of the two sayings: **And whosoever does not judge by what Allâh has revealed, such are the *Kâfirûn***-, meaning that he makes the *Hukm bi'Ghayr ma'Anzaal-Allaah, Halaal*"

¹⁶ In fact, a separate paper on its own would be needed to point out his poor understanding of the Arabic language and his extremely weak translating capability. Since it would divert us from the main issues, we have not made great efforts to point this out, though if time allows, and al-Kanadie al-Jahool, does not restrain himself, we will highlight his ignorance...

¹⁷ This is actually ash-Shar' al-Munazzal (the passive form), whereas al-Kanadie thinks it is al-Munazzil(!) – and there is a huge difference.

¹⁸ This is actually ash-Shar' al-Mu'awwal (the passive form), whereas al-Kanadie thinks it is al-Mu'awwil(!) – and there is a huge difference.

The section that is underlined (and indicated by the arrow) actually comes FIRST on pages 267/268. And the rest of the text that is before it comes AFTER this first part on page 268. And even then this section (the underlined sentences) that he doctored and stitched, is not even complete, as can be seen from our translation! So why did al-Kanadie al Khadhdhaab do this? Why did he cut part of a text that comes first, then leave bits out of it, and then put it at the end of a section that actually comes after this text, conveniently merging them together?

Lets look at the reason why, and it becomes clear from his commentary on these words of Shaikh ul-Islaam (in fact his tahreef!). He first made tahreef (distorted) the ACTUAL TEXT, and then goes on to make TAHREEF of the actual meaning. He cut what came first (in which there is mention of tabdeel i.e. “or (the one) who altered the Sharee'ah (baddala ash-Shar’) - that [from it] which is agreed upon”) and then he added it to the paragraph which occurs later on the next page, and which it states that the one who invents a law and ascribes it to Allaah, then this is kufr. So his purpose behind this is to make it look as if there are in reality, two types of tabdeel being mentioned. So the end result we get is the following (distorted text):

Thirdly, *Ash-Shara' Al-Mubaddal* (i.e. the replaced legislation) and it is the lying on Allaah and His Messenger or upon the people with false witness and the likes of that. And (this is) the clear *Thulm*. So whoever says, This is from the legislation of Allaah, then he has disbelieved without disagreement. Like the one who says, The blood is *Halaal*, and The dead (meat) is *Halaal*, even if he says, This is my *Meth'haab* and the likes of that. Or whoever replaces a law which there is *Ijmaa'* upon, then he is a *Kaafir/Mortaad* with the *Ijmaa'* of the *Fuqahaa*. And about this came His saying, according to one of the two sayings: **And whosoever does not judge by what Allâh has revealed, such are the *Kâfirûn*** -, meaning that he makes the *Hukm bi'Ghayr ma'Anzaal-Allaah. Halaal*”

So notice how the sentence that is underlined, begins with “Or...”, and this part onwards is actually from a page earlier. So it has been added to a later section, and because it begins with the word “Or..” anyway, to put it at this point, would make it look as if it indicates that Shaikh ul-Islaam is giving a different definition of it.

Let's look and comment upon al-Kanadies words, after he committed his tahreef (as in his document p.93):

And again, this statement does not limit the *Shara' Al-Mubaddal* to the cases where the ruler declares these laws to be from Allaah. In fact, upon close examination of this statement of *Shaykh Al-Islaam*, we see that he has broken down the *Shara'Al-Mubaddal* into two categories...

And this is a lie, because Shaikh ul-Islaam has not broken it down into two categories at all. Rather, the first time he mentions it he says, “or (the one) who altered the Sharee'ah (baddala ash-Shar’) - that [from it] which is agreed upon - he is a kaafir, an apostate by

agreement of the jurists” (and al-Kanadie doctored this and put it at the END of his version of the quote!).

So this is what Shaikh ul-Islaam mentions FIRST. Then LATER on in the passage, he actually explains what exactly is this tabdeel. This is when he says (LATER in the section), “And the third: Shar’ al-Mubaddal - and this is lying against Allaah and against His Messenger or upon the people with a false testimony and its likes, and clear oppression. So whoever says: ‘Indeed, this is from the Shar’ of Allaah (i.e. a particular judgement), then he has disbelieved - there being no doubt or dispute in this - such as the one who says: ‘That consuming blood and the dead animal is lawful’.” (And this part was actually put FIRST in al-Kanadies quoting of it!!).

So Shaikh ul-Islaam has not mentioned two categories at all, rather he has just clarified what is actually meant by the tabdeel that he mentioned earlier and which he stated was kufr and apostasy, when it is either claimed that it is actually from Allaah or that it is lawful to judge by this distorted, changed ruling.

Then al-Kanadie continued:

The first is the one who declares the fabricated laws to be from Allaah and the second is the one who actually replaces the laws of the *Sharee’ah* with his own fabricated laws.

So now, after he has doctored the quotation, made tahreef of it in both wording and meaning, he now proceeds to deduce from it what he has wanted to do all along. By claiming that Shaikh ul-Islaam has actually mentioned two categories of ash-Shar’ al-Mubaddal (which is a total lie), he now wishes to impose something into the words that are not even there. He wishes to enter into the meaning of the words of Shaikh ul-Islaam, the concept and idea of the ruler who rules by the secular laws instead of Allaah’s laws, in greater or lesser amounts, but without saying they are from Allaah – and then claim that it is the likes of this one that Shaikh ul-Islaam has made takfeer of in this passage!! And all of this is a blatant and wicked lie, and a fabrication upon Shaikh ul-Islaam – as is clear as the daylight sun. Then he continues:

This is indicated by his saying, “So whoever says, ‘This is from the legislation of Allaah’, then he has disbelieved without disagreement”. And the second category is the actual replacement of the *Sharee’ah* laws. And this is indicated by his words, “Or whoever replaces a law which there is *Ijmaa’* upon, then he is a *Kaafir/Mortaad* with the *Ijmaa’* of the *Fuqahaa*.”

And again, this is from the greatest depths of ignorance of al-Kanadie, and his impudency and wanton condition.

Shaikh ul-Islaam said, (35/396) “And the third: the legislation that is altered, changed (ash-shar’ al-mubaddal), such as what is established by way of false testimony, or when judgement is made upon ignorance, or oppression, without justice, and truth, judging by other than what Allaah has revealed in that. Or when the affirmation of falsehood is

ordered so that the right (of a person) can be wasted, for example when a sick person affirms for one of the inheritors with what he does not deserve, in order to take the due right of the other inheritors, and such a command is forbidden, and testifying over it is forbidden...”

Shaikh ul-Islaam also said (which explains the above), “And when a person makes the unlawful to be lawful, or makes the lawful to be unlawful or (the one) who changed the Sharee’ah (baddala ash-Shar’) - that [from it] which is agreed upon - he is a kaafir, an apostate by agreement of the jurists and it is regarding the likes of this that the [following] verse – according to one of two sayings¹⁹ – was revealed, “And whoever does not judge by what Allaah has revealed, they are the disbelievers (5:44)” - meaning that it is the one who declares ruling by other than what Allaah has revealed to be lawful.” (Majmoo al-Fataawaa 3/267)

And the meaning here is that whoever altered or changed a law of Allaah, and then made it permissible or lawful (istihlaal) to judge by it, then he is a Kaafir.

So when a person falls into the likes of these matters, then this is all a manifestation of altering, changing the legislation and hence it become the “altered legislation” (ash-shar’ al-mubaddal). Then whoever made istihlaal to actually judge by the likes of this altered, distorted law, he is a Kaafir, or the one who subsequently claimed it is from Allaah, he is a Kaafir. And this was the kufr of the Jews, who made tabdeel and tahreef of parts of Allaah’s law (like stoning the adulterer) as has preceded. Then al-Jahool al-Ahmaq continued:

And it is known by reason and intellect that the first category can be done by anyone; whether the ruler or the ruled. Anyone who says that such-and-such fabricated law is from Allaah is a *Kaafir* whether he is the ruler or not. And this is clear to any capable-minded person. However, the second category; the replacing of the laws themselves can only be done by the ruler. And in this case, it is the actual replacement, which causes the *Kuf*, which has been made clear from our previous quotations.

And all of this makes the sophistry of al-Kanadie openly clear. He first lied upon Shaikh ul-Islaam claiming he spoke of TWO categories of ash-Shar’ al-Mubaddal, which is lie, rather what is meant by ash-Shar’ al-Mubaddal is actually only one thing – which has been clearly defined by Shaikh ul-Islaam in what we have quoted from him (3/268 and also 35/396) above. Then built upon this lie, he claims that the second of the two forms is in relation to a ruler who “replaces” the laws (and what he actually means here is a ruler who rules by secular laws, in greater or lesser amounts – without saying they are from Allaah). Then he claims that the act in itself is kufr that expels from the religion. And all of this is a wicked lie against Shaikh ul-Islaam, and is a fabrication against him, for this passage, does not prove what al-Kanadie al-Jahool has claimed at all.

¹⁹ And the other saying is that it is in relation to the original Kuffar, like the Jews and Christians. Refer to the Tafsir of at-Tabari.

Then he claims that the quotations that he has quoted previously prove this. And these quotations that he is referring to are the actual quotations that we will be analyzing in Part 5 of this treatise – and in which al-Kanadie's debauchery is made even more apparent.

Repent O Kadhdhaab. Repent from a) Your doctoring of the ACTUAL TEXT and making a blatant and wicked tahreef of it in wording and twisting it around, b) Your doctoring of the ACTUAL MEANING and making a blatant and wicked tahreef of it in wording, c) Your fabrication against Shaikh ul-Islaam, and ascribing your Qutubi refuse to him!!

Part 5: Exposing the Bankruptcy of al-Kanadie

After having come to appreciate the mires of ignorance and the darkneses of al-Kanadie's intellect, let us continue to expose his wicked lies upon the Ulamaa of Ahl us-Sunnah, in his bid to push the da'wah and manhaj of Aal Qutb. Let us now review each of the quotes he used in order to prove his claim. Al-Kanadie said:

And why did Khaalid Al-Anbaree not assemble a collection of the available statements regarding the ruling by other than what Allaah revealed which have been recorded by *Shaykh Al-Islam* in order to reveal his complete and *Mutawaatir* (i.e. often narrated) opinion concerning the ruler who legislates fabricated laws and governs the masses with them? For example:

Then he proceeded to list the so-called quotes (and which we quoted right at the beginning of this treatise). So let us look at them one by one (all italics, bold and underlining has been left intact):

1. Majmoo' Fataawaa 28/524

"And it is known by necessity in the *Deen* of the Muslims and by the agreement of all the Muslims that whoever follows a *Sharee'ah* other than the *Sharee'ah* of Muhammad then he is a *Kaafir* and it is like the *Kufr* of the one who believes in some of the Book and disbelieves in some of the Book Like He, *ta'ala* said: **Verily, those who disbelieve in Allâh and His Messengers and wish to make distinction between Allâh and His Messengers (by believing in Allâh and disbelieving in His Messengers) saying, "We believe in some but reject others."** (*Nisaa'*, 150) (Al-Fataawa', Vol. 28/524).

Firstly, this translation is wrong, and words have been clipped from this translation. Secondly, the context has been removed and not even indicated. So we say:

ONE: The translation of actual text is:

"And it is known by necessity from the religion of the Muslims and also by agreement of all the Muslims that the one who permits (man sawwagha) the following of a religion other than Islaam, or the following of a Sharee'ah other than that of Muhammad, then he is a Kaafir. And this is similar to the kufr of the one who believes in part of the Book and disbelieves in a part. As He, the Most High said, **"Verily, those who disbelieve in Allâh and His Messengers and wish to make distinction between Allâh and His Messengers (by believing in Allâh and disbelieving in His Messengers) saying, "We believe in some but reject others."** (an-Nisaa', 4:150)."

And we say that the one who permits this is indeed a Kaafir!

TWO: What occurs immediately after the above text this is the following: "And the Jews and the Christians enter into this, and likewise the Philosophers who believe in a part and disbelieve in a part. And likewise those who philosophise amongst the Jews and Christians, they remain upon their kufr, from two angles..."

THREE: More importantly, what occurs before the above text is the following, "...then amongst them (i.e. the Tartars) is the one who prefers the religion of the Jews or that of the Christians and amongst them are those who prefers the religion of the Muslims. And this is a saying that is spread amongst them, until even amongst their Jurists and Worshippers, especially the Jahmiyyah amongst the Fir'aunite Ittihaadees, and those like them...".

And the actual passage as a whole (i.e. the section as a whole) is in relation to the ruling upon the Tartars, those who entered upon Shaam and then uttered the Shahaadatayn, and left kufr and entered the ranks of the Muslims.

FOUR: It is clear from the above that the saying of Shaikh ul-Islaam is in relation to permitting and allowing the following of other religions and other Sharee'ahs, and all of this is in our favour, not al-Kanadie's – for he distorted the text, and left out its context!

FIVE: And most importantly, what has this got to do with at-tashree' al-aamm? And where is the so called difference that al-Kanadie is claiming?!

2. Majmoo' Fataawaa 35/364-365

"Whoever changes the *Sharee'ah* of the Prophets and brings a new *Sharee'ah* then his *Sharee'ah* is *Baatil* and it is not allowed to follow it. Like He *ta'ala* said: **"Or have they partners with Allâh (false gods), who have instituted for them a religion, which Allâh has not allowed"** And due to this, the Jews and the Christians disbelieved because they adhered to an abrogated *Sharee'ah*." (Al-Fataawa' Vol. 35/365)

Let us actually reproduce the passage, with a more accurate translation²⁰ (as al-Kanadie as omitted some words from his translation of the above sentences):

Shaikh ul-Islaam said:

So the deen of the Prophets is one, and it is the deen of Islaam. All of them are Muslims, Believers, as Allaah has explained in more than one place in the Qur'aan. However, some of the legislative laws vary, and so can be legislated in a particular time for a wisdom, and then another matter may be legislated another time for a particular wisdom. Just like at the beginnings of Islaam, prayer was performed towards the Bait ul-Maqdis, and then it was abrogated by prayer towards the Ka'bah. Hence, the Sharee'ah (laws) may vary, but the deen is one. And facing Shaam was from the deen of Islaam at that time, and similarly the Sabbath for Musaa was from the deen of Islaam. Then when all of that was abrogated, the deen of Islaam became the abrogator (naasikh), and this was prayer towards the Ka'bah. Hence, whoever adhered to the abrogated (mansookh) instead of the abrogator, then he is not upon the deen of Islaam, and nor is he a follower of any of the Prophets. And whoever changed (baddala) the legislation of the Prophets, and innovated a new legislation, then his legislation is baatil (false) and it is not allowed to follow it, as He said,

²⁰ To understand the context refer to point no. 7 in our synopsis, and what is before and after it.

“Or have they partners who have legislated for them in the religion that for which He has given no permission” (Shooraa 42:21). And it is for this reason that the Jews and Christians disbelieved, because they held onto a distorted, abrogated legislation (shar' mubaddal mansookh). Yet Allaah has obligated upon all of the creation that they believe in all of His Books and His Messengers, and Muhammad (sallallaahu alaihi wasallam), the Seal of the Messengers. Hence, it is upon all of the creation to follow him and follow what he has legislated from the religion, and this is whatever he has come with from the Book and the Sunnah. Hence, whatever the Book and the Sunnah have come with, then that is the legislation that is obligatory upon the whole of creation to follow, and it is not for anyone to not follow it (i.e. depart and exit from it, in principle [wa laysa li ahadin il-khurooj anhu]). And this is the legislation that the Mujaahideen fight over (i.e. call to it and invite to it, which is the generality of Islaam), and it is the Book and the Sunnah. (pp.364-365).

Have you understood this quote now? Have you understood the debauchery of al-Kanadie? And his wicked lies against Shaikh ul-Islaam? Let us explain:

ONE: Shaikh ul-Islaam says, “...Hence, whoever adhered to the abrogated (mansookh) instead of the abrogator, then he is not upon the deen of Islaam, and nor is he a follower of any of the Prophets...”, in other words whoever did not adopt the Book and the Sunnah and abandon what had been legislated previously (and subsequently abrogated) cannot be upon the deen of any the Prophets, which is Islaam.

TWO: Then he speaks of the one who makes tabdeel of the legislation and brings his own legislation, and says that this is baatil and is not to be acted upon. So he said, “And whoever changed (baddala) the legislation of the Prophets, and innovated a new legislation, then his legislation is baatil (false) and it is not allowed to follow it, as He said, “Or have they partners who have legislated for them in the religion that for which He has given no permission” (Shooraa 42:21).” End quote from Ibn Taymiyyah.

Ibn Katheer says about this verse, “Meaning, that they (the Mushriks) do not follow what Allaah has legislated upon you of the straight and upright religion. Rather they follow what their Shayaateens from the Jinn and Men have legislated for them from their making unlawful for them what they made unlawful (tahreem) such as baheerah, saa'ibah, waseela, haam²¹, and also their making lawful (tahleel) for them the eating of the dead,

²¹ Narrated Said bin Al-Musaiyab: “Bahira is a she-camel whose milk is kept for the idols and nobody is allowed to milk it; Sa'iba was the she-camel which they used to set free for their gods and nothing was allowed to be carried on it. Abu Huraira said: Allah's Apostle said, “I saw 'Amr bin 'Amir Al-Khuzai (in a dream) dragging his intestines in the Fire, and he was the first person to establish the tradition of setting free the animals (for the sake of their deities),” Wasila is the she-camel which gives birth to a she-camel as its first delivery, and then gives birth to another she-camel as its second delivery. People (in the Pre-Islamic periods of ignorance) used to let that she camel loose for their idols if it gave birth to two she-camels successively without giving birth to a male camel in between. 'Ham' was the male camel that was used for copulation. When it had finished the number of copulations assigned for it, they would let it loose for their idols and excuse it from burdens so that nothing would be carried on it, and they called it the 'Hami.' Abu Huraira said, “I heard the Prophet saying so.” (Saheeh Bukhaaree, Kitaab ut-Tafseer).

and consumption of blood, and gambling and other misguided things and ignorant falsehood, which they used to concoct in their Jaahiliyyah, such as making lawful the unlawful (tahleel) and making unlawful the lawful (tahreem) and the various false acts of worship, and the corrupt wealth and possessions. And it is established in the Saheeh, that the Messenger of Allaah (sallallahu alaihi wasallam) said, "I saw Amr bin Luhayy bin Qam'ah (in a dream), with his intestines being dragged in the Fire", because he was the first one who started the custom of releasing animals (as a ritual for the false gods) and this man was one of the kings of Khuzaa'ah, and he was the first to do these things, and he was the one who led Quraish to the worship of idols, may Allaah curse him and disfigure him..." End quote from Ibn Katheer.

At-Tabaree says, "The saying in explanation of the saying of Allaah, the Most High..." then he quotes this verse, then says, "Allaah, Exalted is His Remembrance, says: Do those Mushriks (committing Shirk) with Allaah have partners in their Shirk and Misguidance, who have "legislated for them in the religion, that for which He has given no permission". He says: They have innovated for them (ibtada'oo) in the religion that which Allaah has not permitted for them to innovate..." End from at-Tabaree.

Al-Qurtubi says, "And this (i.e. this verse) is connected to His saying, "He has legislated for you the religion which he enjoined upon Nuh (Shooraa 42:13)" and His saying, the Most High, "Allaah is the one who revealed the Book and Balance in truth" (Shooraa 42:17)". They did not used to believe in it, so do they have any gods (aalihah) who have legislated for them the Shirk that Allaah has not given any permission! And when this is impossible, then Allaah did not legislate for them this Shirk, so from where (have they got this authority) to worship with it?". End from al-Qurtubi.

And all of this is in reference to the tabdeel that we have outlined earlier. So those who follow this tabdeel, believing in it and accepting it from those who make this tabdeel, acting upon this baatil, then they are Mushriks²². And as for those who actually make this tabdeel, then if they claim that their own fabricated judgement is from Allaah, or they make it lawful (Istihlaal), then they are Kuffaar – and this has preceded in the words of Shaikh ul-Islaam earlier in this treatise.

²² Shaikh ul-Islaam said, "And those who have taken their priests and rabbis as lords – when they obeyed them in their making lawful what Allaah had made unlawful, and making unlawful what Allaah had made lawful, then they are of two types: The first of them: that they know that they (the priests and rabbis) have made tabdeel (baddaloo) the religion of Allaah **and hence they follow them in this tabdeel believing (ya'taqidoona) in the lawfulness of what Allaah had made unlawful and in the unlawfulness of what Allaah had made lawful**, following their leaders in that, alongside their knowledge that they have opposed the religion of the Messengers, then this is kufr (disbelief), and Allaah and His Messenger have also made it Shirk – even if they (the followers) do not prayer or prostrate to them. Hence, whoever followed someone else in something that opposes the religion **while knowing that it opposes the religion, and believes (i'taqada) in what he said, as opposed to what Allaah and His Messenger said, then such a one is a Mushrik, just like them**. And the second type: that their belief (i'tiqaad) and faith (imaan) in the lawfulness of what is lawful and the unlawfulness of what is unlawful is established, however, they follow them (the priests and rabbis) in disobedience to Allaah, just as a Muslim does when he commits a sin and believes that he is a sinner, so these ones have the same ruling as those like them from the people of sin." (Kitaab ul-Imaan p.67)

THREE: Then he says, “And it is for this reason that the Jews and Christians disbelieved because they held onto a distorted, abrogated legislation (shar’ mubaddal mansookh)”. And so here has clearly explained the reason for the kufr of the Jews and Christians – because they did not adopt Islaam, and believe in the Messenger and in what he brought, as was obligatory upon them, rather they adhered to an abrogated and distorted Sharee’ah and stuck by it, and what it contained of Shirk, Misguidance, Tahleel, Tahreem and false acts of worship. And hence, by this action of theirs they did not believe in all of the Messengers and all of the Books, as Allaah had obligated upon them, and upon the whole of creation. Rather, they adhered to what their partners with Allaah (Shurakaa) from the Satans from Men and Jinn legislated for them of Shirk, superstitions, gambling, tahleel and tahreem and so on.

So what is Shaikh ul-Islaam talking about, and what is al-Kanadie spluttering and murmuring?! Shaikh ul-Islaam explains the reason for the disbelief of the Jews and Christians in this passage, which is that they did not adopt Islaam and its Sharee’ah, and the previous scriptures had been abrogated, and so they had to adhere to Islaam, but they did not, and so they were no longer following any Prophet – and instead they remained upon their distorted, fabricated, innovated legislation, in which they followed their partners with Allaah in making the halaal to be haraam and the haraam to be halaal, and in falling into Shirk and Misguidance, which was legislated for them!! And al-Kanadie al-Jahool al-Majhool thinks Shaikh ul-Islaam is talking about the difference between ruling by other than what Allaah has revealed in one instance and between what he considers to be at-tashree’ ul-aamm!

Al-Kanadie! Leave aside this deceit and treachery and go and learn the basics of your aqeedah and manhaj, and sit with the scholars and leave aside this pretentiousness. Flee from Aal Qutb and the Haleemic Paradigm, which has but led you to this despicable state!

3. Majmoo’ Fataawaa 35/200

Also, “...like the one who said, This *Taraut* has been changed and it is not allowed to act upon what is in it. And whoever acts upon its laws today, which are changed and abrogated, then he is a *Kaafir*. So these words and words, which resemble them, are true and there is nothing upon the one who says them.” (Al-Fataawa’, Vol. 35/200)

Let us actually reproduce the passage, with a more accurate translation:

It states:

“Shaikh ul-Islaam – rahimahullaah – was asked concerning a man who cursed (la’ana) a Jew, and cursed his religion, and then reviled (sabb) the Tawraat. Is it permissible for a Muslim to revile their book or not?

So he replied: All praise is due to Allaah, it is not for anyone to curse the Tawraat. Rather, anyone who cursed the Tawraat absolutely, then his repentance is to be sought, and so he repents or he is killed. And if he is one who knows that it is revealed by Allaah, and that it

is obligatory to have Imaan in it, then he is to be killed on account of his revilement of it. And his repentance is not to be accepted, according to the stronger of the two opinions of the scholars.

And as for the one who cursed the religion of the Jews, the one that they are actually upon in this particular time, then there is no harm in that. For they are cursed, they and their religion. And likewise, if he cursed the Tawraat which they have, in that he explains his intent, that he intends to make mention of the tahreef (distortion) in it, so for example he says, "The text of this Tawraat has been distorted, changed (mubaddalah), and it is not permissible to act upon what is in it, and whoever acts upon its distorted, abrogated legislations (sharaa'ihaa al-mubaddalah al-mansookhah), then he is a kaafir." So these words and what is similar to them are true, then there is nothing due upon the one who said them, and Allaah knows best." (35/200)

So we say:

ONE: Laa hawla walaa quwwata illaa Billaah. Subhaanallaah, haadhaa Buhtaanun Adheem. This is a wicked and clear lie upon Shaikh ul-Islaam and a total distortion (tahreef) and alteration (tabdeel) of his statement and of the whole context. Fear Allaah O al-Kanadie al-Mujrim al-Atheem.

TWO: The context is of the one who curses the Tawraat from the point of view of indicating its corruption, and that it is abrogated, and indicating that whoever holds onto it, acting upon it, despite its being abrogated is a Kaafir. This is similar to what Shaikh ul-Islaam mentioned earlier. And there is nothing wrong with anyone who says this, as it is the truth, and there is nothing upon him (i.e. by way of repentance and the likes, for saying this)!

THREE: Where is the mention of "legislating" anything, in this passage? Rather it merely alludes to the tabdeel that the Tawraat underwent, and that it is not allowed to act upon it. And this, when compared with the other words of Shaikh ul-Islaam, only supports our viewpoint, which is actually what is explained by Shaikh ul-Islaam, in that the one who makes it lawful to judge by ash-shar' al-mubaddal, or claims that it is actually from Allaah, is a Kaafir. But as for this passage, then it refers to acting upon an abrogated Sharee'ah, and hence the kufr of the Jews and Christians is from this perspective – since they did not adopt what Allaah had legislated of the command to Tawheed and the Sunnah and so on – rather they adhered to what their partners with Allaah legislated for them in their religion of Shirk and Bid'ah and Misguidance and Tahleel and Tahreem – while rejecting the Sharee'ah of Muhammad and his Messengership and so on.

FOUR: What has this got to do with establishing a difference between a Muslim Ruler ruling by other than what Allaah has revealed in one issue and between at-tashree' al-aamm (as al-Kanadie's feeble mind understands it)? And where has Shaikh ul-Islaam made this difference, in this passage? Wicked lies, wicked lies, scandalous deeds, scandalous deeds!!

4. Majmoo' Fataawaa 11/262

And he said, "And the *Sharee'ah*, which has been revealed by Allaah, *ta'ala*; and that is the Book and the *Sunnah*, which Allaah sent to His Messenger with and this *Sharee'ah*; it is not for anyone of the creation to leave it and no one leaves it except the *Kaafir*." (Al-Fataawa', Vol. 11/262)

Let us actually reproduce the passage, with a more accurate translation:

Shaikh ul-Islaam said:

"And many of the people do not differentiate between the creational reality of qadar that is linked with His creative (ability) and His will, and between the commanded religious reality which is linked to His pleasure and love. And so they do not differentiate between the one who establishes the religious reality, being in agreement with what Allaah has commanded upon the tongues of His Messengers, and between the one who acts upon his intuition and impulse, without any consideration of the Book and the Sunnah. Similarly, many people have spoken of the word "Sharee'ah", many people speak about it, but they do not differentiate between what is the revealed legislation (*ash-shar' al-munazzal*) in the view of Allaah, and this is the Book and the Sunnah, with which Allaah sent His Messenger. And it is not allowed for anyone to exit (*khurooj*) from this legislation (*shar'*) and no one exits from this except a *Kaafir*. So they do not differentiate between this and between the legislation that actually consists of the judgement of the *haakim*. For the *haakim* (ruler, judge) can be both correct and wrong. And this is when he is a just and upright scholar, and if he is not then, in the Sunnah there occurs, from the Prophet (*sallallaahu alaihi wasallam*), "Judges are of three types: Two in the Fire and one in Paradise. A person who knows the truth and judges by it, he is in Paradise. A person who judges in the cases of the people upon ignorance. He is in the Fire. And a person who knows the truth and judges in opposition to it, he is in the Fire" (Abu Daawood, Ibn Maajah)..."

Then Shaikh ul-Islaam continues a page later (11/263) and states:

"So the word "Shar'" (legislation) and "Sharee'ah" when the Book and the Sunnah is meant by it, then it is not for any of the Friends (*Awliyaa*) of Allaah or other than them to exit from it (*yakhruja minhu*, i.e. be independent of it). And whoever thinks, that any of the *Awliyaa* of Allaah have a path towards Allaah, without following Muhammad (*sallallaahu alaihi wasallam*), inwardly and outwardly, and then did not follow him inwardly and outwardly, then he is a *Kaafir*."

Then Shaikh ul-Islaam refutes the one who uses the example of Khidr and Moosaa to justify exiting (i.e. not having to act upon) the Book and the Sunnah (11/264).

Then, in the last paragraph at the close of the section, he says:

"As for when anyone attributes to the *Sharee'ah* what is not actually from it, such as fabricated *ahaadeeth*, or (faulty) interpretations of the texts upon other than what Allaah

intended and other such things, **then this is a type of tabdeel**.²³ Hence, it is obligatory to differentiate between the revealed legislation (ash-shar' al-munazzal), the interpolated legislation (ash-shar' al-mu'awwal) and the altered, changed legislation (ash-shar' al-mubaddal) – just like it is to be differentiated between the creational and religious realities, and between a matter for which evidence is sought in the Book and the Sunnah, and merely sufficing oneself with the intuition and impulse of a person.” (11/265).

So we say:

ONE: Where is Shaikh ul-Islaam and where is al-Kanadie? Shaikh ul-Islaam is in one valley, and al-Kanadie is on a different solar system. The context of this quotation is exactly the same as the previous quotations in that it is referring to the one who, in principle, does not adhere to the Islamic Sharee'ah, like the Jew or the Christian and so on. And likewise, amongst the Muslims, those who believe that they can reach Allaah by a Sharee'ah other than the Book and the Sunnah, or believe that they do not have to adhere to it and the likes, this too is kufr. This type of belief is clear kufr. It is kufr in belief.

TWO: This is in fact exactly the same thing that is stated by Shaikh ul-Islaam Muhammad bin Abdul-Wahhaab in his “Nawaaqid ul-Islaam”. He states, “Nine: Whoever believes (i'taqada) that it is permissible for some of the people to not adhere to the Sharee'ah (i.e. be free from having to abide and act upon it [yasa'ahu al-khurooj min Sharee'ati Muhammad sallallaahu alaihi wasallam]), just like Khidr was allowed to not adhere to the Sharee'ah of Moosaa (alaihi-salaam). Such a one is a Kaafir due to the saying of Allaah, **“And whoever seeks a religion other than Islâm, it will never be accepted of him, and in the Hereafter he will be one of the losers.”** (Aaali Imraan 3:85).” End quote.

THREE: So what has all of this got to do with at-tashree' al-aamm, and where has Shaikh ul-Islaam explained the difference between the Muslim ruler who rules by other than what Allaah has revealed in one or a few instances and between at-tashree' al-aamm (as the ignorant, confused forelock of al-Kanadie falsely understands it)?! Rather, this only supports our view, that the one who makes it permissible to follow another Sharee'ah, or claims following the Sharee'ah is not waajib and so on.

FOUR: Pay close attention to the saying of Shaikh ul-Islaam at the end of the section, “As for when anyone attributes to the Sharee'ah what is not actually from it, such as fabricated ahaadeeth, or (faulty) interpretations of the texts upon other than what Allaah intended and other such things, **then this is a type of tabdeel**...”.

Compare this with what we stated earlier on in this treatise:

“In short, in the passage in which Shaikh ul-Islaam mentions, “...As for when he makes a general ruling regarding the religion of the Muslims and makes truth into falsehood, falsehood into truth, sunnah into bid'ah and bid'ah into sunnah, the

²³ We have highlighted this part, because there are some important benefits to be pointed out, which shall be explained later, inshaa'allaah.

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..." (35/388), there is no judgement of takfir, though this is a form of tabdeel of the religion (as later confirmed in the same chapter (in 35/396)²⁴ – because here the person guilty of this has not gone another step further and claimed that his judgement is actually the Sharee'ah or that it is lawful to judge by his judgement (i.e. Istihlaal) and the likes.

But as for when he falls into this general legislation (al-hukm al-aamm) and then claims that his judgement is from the Sharee'ah or is the Sharee'ah or that it is lawful to judge by his saying (as opposed to ash-Shar' al-Munazzal) then this is kufr."

And then compare this with the saying of Shaikh ul-Islaam (which is used by all the neo-Qutubiyah to justify their unfounded baatil):

"And when a person makes the unlawful to be lawful, or makes the lawful to be unlawful or (the one) who changed the Sharee'ah (baddala ash-Shar') - that [from it] which is agreed upon - he is a kaafir, an apostate by agreement of the jurists and it is regarding the likes of this that the [following] verse – according to one of two sayings²⁵ – was revealed, "And whoever does not judge by what Allaah has revealed, they are the disbelievers (5:44)" - meaning that it is the one who declares ruling by other than what Allaah has revealed to be lawful." (Majmoo al-Fataawaa 3/267)

In essence, there is the revealed legislation (al-munazzal) that everyone has to judge by and refer to. Then there is the interpolated legislation (al-mu'awwal) which are the ijtihaads of people, in those matters in which ijtihaad is allowed and no texts exist – and this is like the madhaahib and so on. And there is the altered legislation (al-mubaddal), which are the errors and lies and falsities that have entered into it. Hence, whoever claims that his erroneous, alien judgement on an issue, that is not from or opposes the Sharee'ah, is actually from the Sharee'ah, or that it is lawful to judge by it, then such a one is a Kaafir.²⁶

²⁴ And also in (11/265) as has preceded.

²⁵ And the other saying is that it is in relation to the original Kuffar, like the Jews and Christians. Refer to the Tafsir of at-Tabari.

²⁶ Compare this with what Shaikh ul-Islaam Ibn Taymiyyah has said, **"There is no doubt that the one who does not believe (i'taqada) in the obligation to rule by what Allaah has revealed is a disbeliever. Hence, whoever declares it permissible (istahalla) to judge amongst the people with what he considers to be justice, without following what Allaah has revealed, then he is a disbeliever. There is no nation except that it orders ruling with justice. And sometimes justice, as perceived by its senior leaders, can exist in its religion. Many of those who ascribe themselves to Islaam judge by their customs that Allaah has not revealed, such as the ancestral customs of the bedouins. And the chiefs (umaraa) were obeyed (in this) and they used to consider that it is desirable to judge by these such customs, without the Book and the Sunnah. And this is disbelief** For many people have accepted Islaam but along with this

And all of this has got nothing to do with the hallucination of the Qutubites who use the above quotations to justify the absolutions of Sayyid Qutb and his ardent followers.

FIVE: Repent O al-Kanadie al-Jahool al-Ahmaq!! Take off the pretentious gown of knowledge you are wearing by writing hundreds and hundreds of pages, attempting to refute us, while all you are doing, is preparing an encyclopedia of your own ignorance, foolishness, lies, deceit, treachery and humiliation. By Allaah, for every 1 page of falsehood you write we can write 10 pages in exposition of your scandals – so you had better desist for your own good. Throw away the books of bid'ah and hawaa that have led you to this despicable state and leave aside the likes of Abu Qataadah al-Philasteenee at-Takfiri, and Abu Jahl Ibn Haleemah at-Takfiri and the Puppet of Mohammad Qutb, Safar al-Hawaali. Abandon them and return to Shaikh ul-Islam Ibn Taymiyyah!! Repent before it is too late.

5. Majmoo' Fataawaa 35/372-373

“And whenever the *Alaam* leaves what he knows from the Book of Allaah and the *Sunnah* of His Messenger and he follows the *Hukm* of the *Haakim*, which opposes the *Hukm* of Allaah and His Messenger, then he is a *Mortaad/Kaafir* deserving of punishment in this life and in the Hereafter. He, *ta'ala* said: ***Alif-Lâm-Mîm-Sâd. (This is the) Book (the Qur'ân) sent down unto you (O Muhammad), so let not your breast be narrow therefrom, that you warn thereby, and a reminder unto the believers. [Say (O Muhammad) to these idolaters (pagan Arabs) of your folk:] Follow what has been sent down unto you from your Lord (the Qur'ân and Prophet Muhammad's Sunnah), and follow not any Auliyâ' (protectors and helpers, etc. who order you to associate partners in worship with Allâh), besides Him (Allâh). Little do you remember! And a great number of towns (their population) We destroyed (for their crimes). Our torment came upon them (suddenly) by night or while they were sleeping for their afternoon rest. No cry did they utter when Our Torment came upon them but this: “Verily, we were *Zâlimûn* (polytheists and wrong-doers, etc.). (Araaf, 1 -5) Even if he is beaten and imprisoned and tortured with all different types of torture in order that he would leave what he knew from the *Sharee'ah* of Allaah and His Messenger, which is *Waajib* to follow and then to follow the *Hukm* of other than him; then he is still deserving of the punishment of Allaah. Instead, it is for him to be patient even if he is tortured for Allaah because this is the *Sunnah* of Allaah with respect to the Prophets and their followers. Allaah *ta'ala* said: ***Alif-Lâm-Mîm. Do people think that they will be left alone because they say: “We believe,” and will not be tested. And We indeed tested those who were before them. And Allâh will certainly make (it) known (the truth of) those who are true, and will certainly make (it) known (the******

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).

falsehood of) those who are liars, (although Allâh knows all that before putting them to test). (*Anakbut*, 1 -3) (Al-Fataawa', Vol. 35/373)"

This translation of al-Kanadie, is reasonably accurate in itself, so we will use it. So we say:

ONE: What has this got to do with what the sinful, lying forelock of al-Kanadie has presumed?! This statement is in relation to a scholar who while knowing the correct judgement in a matter pertaining to the religion, from the revealed legislation (ash-shar' al-munazzal), abandons the correct view that conforms to what is in the Book and the Sunnah, and chooses instead to follow (the word used is 'ittibaa) the judgement of the haakim in this matter that pertains to the religion and which is in reality either interpolated legislation (ash-shar' al-mu'awwal) or altered legislation (ash-shar' al-mubaddal)!

TWO: The sentences immediately before this quoted section makes this clear:

Shaikh ul-Islaam says, "The actual judgements of the ruler are not what is intended by the legislation (shar') that is obligatory upon the whole of creation – even if the ruler (haakim) was the best person of his time. Rather, the judgement of the knowledgeable, just haakim is binding upon specific people only, those who refer to him for judgement in specific matters. It is not actually binding upon the whole of creation (i.e. in the manner that the Book and the Sunnah is). And it is not permissible for any scholar from the Muslim scholars to blindly follow the haakim, in either few or many matters, when he has known what Allaah and His Messenger have commanded. Rather, it is not even for a person from the common-folk to blindly follow the haakim in anything. Rather he should seek fatwaa from anyone from whom it is permitted to seek fatwaa, even if he is not a haakim. And when a scholar leaves (taraka) what he knows to be from the Book of Allaah and the Sunnah of His Messenger and makes ittibaa' of the judgement of the haakim which is in opposition to the judgement of Allaah and His Messenger, then he is a Murtad, Kaafir who deserves punishment in this life and the next... and even if he was beaten or imprisoned with harmed with various types or harms so that he may leave what he knows to be from the legislation of Allaah and His Messenger, which is obligatory to be followed, and so that he follows the judgement of others, he would be deserving of punishment of Allaah. Rather it is upon him to be patient..." (35/372-373).

So this has nothing to do with differentiating between a ruler who rules by other than what Allaah has revealed in one or a few matters and between at-tashree' al-aamm (as the forelock of al-Kanadie ignorantly understands it). What it means is when a scholar abandons the truth (that is what is from the revealed legislation, ash-shar' al-munazzal) that he knows to be the truth, and then makes ittibaa' of the judgement of the haakim which is altered legislation (ash-shar' al-mubaddal), then he is a Kaafir, Murtad. And of course the takfir in this matter (on the issue of ittibaa') has the tafseel to it and is actually similar to the issue of obedience.

And to illustrate this, the example of the saying of the creation of the Qur'aan, leaving aside the fact that this saying and belief is itself kufr, when the general legislation (al-

hukm al-aamm) was passed by the caliphs of the time, who imposed this belief and bid'ah of kufr upon the people, making it binding upon them and killing for its sake. Many of the scholars outwardly agreed with it (while inwardly rejecting it), after being imprisoned and tortured and threatened with death²⁷, even though many others faced death and were slaughtered by not agreeing to it. However, those who did agree to it, and spoke with it (outwardly), they did not in reality make "ittibaa'" of the judgement of the haakim as such. But if they had actually believed and accepted this judgement and judged according to it, and made ittibaa' of this judgement of the haakim (just as ittibaa' is made of the Book and the Sunnah) – in opposition to what they knew from the Book and the Sunnah – allowing themselves to follow the judgement of the haakim, then they would have become Kuffaar, Mushriks (for they would have placed this haakim and his judgement on a level with the judgment of Allaah). This applies of course to any saying or judgement of a haakim in this context, whether it is a bid'ah mufassiqah or mukaffirah, or something that opposes the religion, or is an errant ijtihaad, which clearly opposes the Book and the Sunnah, and so on. So when the scholar leaves and abandons the truth that he knows (ash-shar' al-munazzal) and makes ittibaa' of the judgement of the haakim (ash-shar' al-mubaddal), believing in it, accepting it and so on, then he is a Kaafir.

This is the reality of the matter, and again it falls back upon the tafseel that is well known to the Salaf, and which has been explained in the saying of Shaikh ul-Islam quoted above (from his Kitaab ul-Imaam p.67).

THREE: So where is there the so called distinction between the ruler ruling by other than what Allaah has revealed in one issue and between what al-Kanadie al-Jahool thinks to be at-tashree' al-aamm? Where is there any mention of "legislating" anything in this passage. All it mentions is a scholar, leaving the Book and the Sunnah and following the judgement of a ruler!

FOUR: So once more O al-Mujrim al-Atheem! Repent and desist from this pseudo-intellectualism that has led you to such tomfoolery and displaying the antics of clown, pretending to be seeing but in reality blind, pretending to be knowing but in reality a compound ignorant – knowing not, and then not knowing that he knows not – just like the one whose books he has secluded himself with, Abu Jahl Ibn Haleemah!!

6. Majmoo' Fataawaa 8/106

"And it is known that whoever removes an order or a forbiddance, which Allaah sent His Messenger with, then he is a Kaafir with the agreement of the Muslims and the Jews and the Christians." (Al-Fataawa', Vol. 8/106)

ONE: Firstly a more accurate translation is, "And it is known that whoever negates (abolishes) (asqata) the Command and the Prohibition (al-amr wan-nahi) which Allaah sent His Messengers with, then he is a Kaafir, by consensus of the Muslims, Jews and Christians". Al-Kanadie mistranslated what occurs in the text "rusulahu (His Messengers)" as "His Messenger". Though this might seem insignificant it is not, because the context of

²⁷ And alongside that none of the people of knowledge made takfir of the Hukkam and nor did they call for revolutions against them – and the practice of Imaam Ahmad is well known!!

the passage is in relation to the actual concept of Command and Prohibition, as it relates to Qadar. And hence, this applies to all the Messengers, since Allaah conveyed the Command and Prohibition to them all – since what is being alluded to is not a particular sharee'ah or law or laws, but the generic concept of Command and Prohibition (and Allaah's Threats and Promises), as it relates to al-Qadaa wal-Qadar. This is made clear in what occurs in the next point below.

TWO: Then let us look at the context of this particular passage! This quote is taken from Kitaab ul-Qadr in Volume 8 of Majmoo' al-Fataawaa. The whole section where the above quote exists is in relation to a question to Shaikh ul-Islaam about whether Allaah has created this creation for a reason or cause (illah) or without a reason. (8/82).

This is significant because it relates to the Sharee'ah commands and prohibitions, and their relation to the subject of Qadar in general. Shaikh ul-Islaam says, in the second paragraph at the opening of this section, “And the people have spoken in regard to the justification (ta'leel) of the Sharee'ah laws and the Command and Prohibition (al-amr wan-nahi), such as the command of tawheed, truthfulness, justice, prayer, zakaat, fasting, hajj, and such as the prohibition of shirk, lying, injustice, obscene sins (fawaahish) – so has He commanded all of that on account of some wisdom and benefit and reason that actually requires all that? Or is it due merely to Will and Iraadah?” (8/82).

The whole section is actually related to the commands, prohibitions, threats and promises of Allaah – and the confusions and deviations in this regard, as they relate to Qadar and Jabar, and the viewpoints of the various groups (Mu'tazilah, the Qadari Shi'ites, Karraamiyyah, Soofees, Philosophers and others) on this subject, and whether the request to act upon the Sharee'ah laws has a justification behind it, and does Allaah have a reason or cause behind His commands and prohibitions and and so on.

If we just jump 20 or so pages and come to 8/103-104, we find Shaikh ul-Islaam says, “And it is known with everyone who believes in Allaah and His Messenger, that the Mu'tazilah, and the Qadari Shi'ites who actually affirm the Command and Prohibition (al-amr wan-nahi), the Threat and Promise (al-wa'd wal-wa'eed) are better than those who equate between the Believer and the Kaafir, the Righteous and the Sinful, the Truthful Prophet and the False Pretentious Lying Prophet, the Allies of Allaah and His Enemies....”

Then Shaikh ul-Islaam quotes a section from al-Khallaal's “as-Sunnah”, in which al-Khallaal brings narrations from the Salaf in which the issue of being compelled to action (jabar) is mentioned and the position of the Salaf towards it. Of the five or so narrations he mentions, there is, by way of example, the narration of Baqiyyah bin al-Waleed who said, “I asked az-Zubaidee and al-Awzaa'ee about al-Jabar (being compelled to action). So as-Zubaidee said, “The command of Allaah is more great, and his qudrah (power) is more great than that He should compel people or prevent people (from action). However, He does execute his decision (yaqdee) and determine (yaqdur) and He creates (yakhluq), and creates a disposition in people to tend to what He loves.” And al-Awzaa'ee said, “I do not know of any basis for al-jabar in the Qur'aan or the Sunnah, so I am dreadful of saying that, however I do speak of al-qadaa (judgement) and al-qadar (determination) and al-

khalq (creation) and al-jabal (creating a disposition). For this is known in the Qur'aan and the Hadeeth from the Messenger of Allaah (sallallaahu alaihi wasallam).” (8/105).

Then Shaikh ul-Islaam says (8/105), “And what is intended here is that al-Khallaal and others from the people of knowledge, entered those who spoke of al-Jabar (i.e. being compelled) into the Qadariyyah, even though they did not seek to justify sins by way of qadar. So how then is it for the one who actually seeks to justify sins by it? And it is known that such a one enters into the reprimand of the one whom Allaah reprimanded from the Qadariyyah, those who seek evidence by it (i.e. qadar) to negate and abolish (isqaat) the Command and Prohibition (al-amr wan-nahi), even more so than the one who merely rejects it. For the misguidance of this one is greater. And it is for this reason that the Qadariyyah were linked with the Murji'ah in the words of more than one from the Salaf.”

So by now the context is actually quite clear. It is in relation to the dispute about the Command and Prohibition²⁸ of Allaah and whether the creation need to act upon them or not, from the point of view of the question as to whether there is any real cause or justification behind them – all of that in relation to the issue of al-qadar and al-jabar.

THREE: It is here that the statement of Shaikh ul-Islaam in question appears. Let us quote it again, and quote what is after it so the context is clear:

“And it is known that whoever negates, abolishes (asqata) the command and the prohibition (al-amr wan-nahi) which Allaah sent His Messengers with, then he is a Kaafir, by consensus of the Muslims, Jews and Christians. In fact their saying (i.e. those who negate the command and prohibition) is contradictory, and it is not possible for anyone one of them live in accordance with his saying, and nor can the welfare of anyone in the creation be sustained by it, and nor can any two people live in accordance with it. For if qadar was a valid argument (i.e. for being compelled or being prevented from action), then it would be a valid argument for everyone, otherwise, it is not a valid argument for anyone. So if it took place that a man was wronged by a wrongdoer, or he was reviled by a reviler or someone took his wealth, or corrupted his family or other such things, so if he then subsequently, blames this person or rebukes him or asks for him to be punished, then his argument by qadar is falsified. And the one who claims that the one who is acquainted (aarif), that when he witness the qadar, that the command is not longer applicable to him (saqata anhu al-amr) (i.e. he no longer needs to adhere to the command, i.e. the Sharee'ah laws), then these words constitute kufr that even the Jews and Christians are not pleased

²⁸ And what is meant by al-Amr wan-Nahi, is the general concept of Allaah commanding and forbidding and this is not in relation to any specific command or prohibition in the Sharee'ah, but the general idea of commanding and forbidding as it relates to the obligation upon the whole of creation to adhere to it.

Shaikh ul-Islaam says, in the second paragraph at the opening of this section, “And the people have spoken in regard to the justification (ta'leel) of the Sharee'ah laws and the Command and Prohibition (al-amr wan-nahi), such as the command of tawheed, truthfulness, justice, prayer, zakaat, fasting, hajj, and such as the prohibition of shirk, lying, injustice, obscene sins (fawaahish) – so has He commanded all of that on account of some wisdom and benefit and reason that actually requires all that? Or is it due merely to Will and Iraadah?” (8/82).

with. Rather this is impossible to conceive in the intellect and impossible to exist in the Legislation (Shar'). For the hungry person differentiates between bread and dust, and one who is thirsty differentiates between water and sewage. So he loves that which will satisfy his appetite as opposed to that which will not benefit him. And all are the creation of Allaah, so the living – whoever that might be – then he must distinguish between what will benefit and please him from what will harm and make him unhappy. And this is the reality of the Command and Prohibition (al-amr wan-nahi), for Allaah, the Most High, has commanded His servants with that which will benefit them, and Has prohibited them from that which will harm them.” (8/106-107).

FOUR: Subhaanallaah! Shaikh ul-Islaam Ibn Taymiyyah is in one valley, and al-Kanadie al-Jahool al-Ahmaq is in a different galaxy. Shaikh ul-Islaam is talking about those who negate the principle of Command and Prohibition (and the obligation to adhere what is connected to it of Tawheed, Sunnah, Taqwaa, the Sharee'ah and refrain from Shirk, Bid'ah, Fujoor and so on) - all from the point of view the argument of al-qadar and al-jabar, and al-Kanadie thinks he is talking about at-tashree' al-aamm!! By Allaah what blindness and what foolishness, and what greater lies upon our Scholars and what greater deceit than what has preceded!

When will al-Kanadie desist from his evil and his wantonness?! Has he no shame in blatantly lying upon the Shaikhs of Islaam? May Allaah kill this blind desire.

Part 6: Al-Kanadie Passing Judgement Upon Himself

Al-Kanadie stated (after bringing these narrations from Shaikh ul-Isaam!!), on page 93-94 of his document:

And it is interesting that all of what we have presented from *Shaykh Al-Isaam* in this section was mysteriously avoided and these two specific texts, which could be twisted to support the opinion of the author, were included instead. But this is typical from those who follow the *Mutashaabih'* (i.e. not entirely clear) as opposed to the *Muh'kaam* (i.e. clear in meaning) in order to substantiate their own desires. As Allaah, the Most High said about those who interpret His *Ayaat* by their desires: **So as for those in whose hearts there is a deviation (from the truth) they follow that which is not entirely clear thereof, seeking *Al-Fitnah*...** (*Ahl'i-Imraan*, 7)...

...And how amusing it is that this entire section from "The Anbaree Papers: Part 5" was intended in its subject and title, to demonstrate how those who have opposed Al-Anbaree have incompletely narrated or otherwise twisted the words of Ibn Taymiyah to support them in opposition to him....

And in reality, this is a judgement upon himself and his lying sinning, deceiving forelock, for he is the one who has lied upon Shaikh ul-Isaam Ibn Taymiyyah, without any restraint or shame.

All of this based upon no more than three or four pages of al-Kanadie's pathetic compositions. In fact there is even more than this, in which he has accused al-Anbari of twisting Shaikh ul-Isaam's intent, when it is actually al-Kanadie's sinful, confused forelock that has not even understood what Shaikh ul-Isaam is talking about. However, we do not wish to tire ourselves with this pretender to knowledge, more than is necessary. And in this pathetic 112 page document (and also his new 94 page one!), there is such a refutation and humiliation of this imbecile that will soon become clear – by the permission of Allaah. It is not any exaggeration to state that if we to follow up his abundance of mistakes and lies, and mistranslations and misquotes, it would be put into a lengthy volume!

Indeed, al-Kanadie is from the new breed of neo-Qutubiyah, who are actually upon the madhhab of the Qutubiyah like Mohammad Qutb, Ash-Shu'aybee, al-Hawaali and others, and who have entered into the da'wah when they saw some of the differences amongst the ranks of the Salafis on these issues. He thinks he can wear the outergarment of Salafiyyah, while huddling the undergarments of Qutubiyah, without being caught!

Part 7: At-Tashree' al-Aamm (General Legislation) And Replacing the Sharee'ah (Istibdaal)

Fatwaa of the Shaikh, Allaamah, Abdul-Muhsin al-'Abbaad Concerning the Issue of Tashree' al-Aamm and Ruling by Secular Legislations, Dated 16/11/1420H.

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."

Fatwaa of the Shaikh, Allaamah, Imaam Ibn Baaz Concerning the Issue of Tashree' al-Aamm and Ruling by Secular Laws

The Shaikh was 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 (idhaa sanna qaanoonan), 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 (istahallahaa), 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'i)

Fatwaa of the Shaikh, Allaamah, Muhammad bin Saalih al-Uthaimeen Concerning the Absence of Any Distinction Between Inventing ones Own Laws or Using the Secular Laws

Shaikh Ibn Uthaimeen said, "...then built upon this, our ta'weel (explanation of this verse [5:44]) is based upon what has been mentioned, that we judge that ruling by other than what Allaah has revealed is not the kufr that expels from the religion. However, it is the kufr of action, since the haakim, by committing this, has deviated from the correct way. **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").

Fatwaa of the Shaikh, Allaamah, Muhammad bin Saalih al-Uthaimeen Concerning the Issue of Tashree' al-Aamm and Ruling by Secular Legislations, Dated 22/03/1420H.

The question of Shaikh Abul-Hasan al-Misri to Shaikh Ibn Uthaimeen:

Question:

Shaikh Abul-Hasan al-Misri: All praise is due to Allaah and prayers and peace upon the Messenger of Allaah. I bear witness that none has the right to be worshipped except Allaah alone, without any partners and I witness that Muhammad bin Abdullaah is His Messenger.

To proceed: I present this question by way of the telephone and also by way of it being recording over the telephone to the esteemed father and Shaikh, the Allaamah, Muhammad bin Saalih al-Uthaimeen (hafidhahullaahu ta'aalaa) and may He bring about benefit through him and make him and his likes to be a replacement for the esteemed, respected Father (Ibn Baaz) may Allaah's mercy be upon him. And this question is concerning a matter in which disputation has increased between the students of knowledge **and is also a matter in which much of the deduction of evidence has been taken from the words of the respected Father, and Shaikh, Muhammad bin Saalih al-Uthaimeen (hafidhahullaahu ta'aalaa).**

Firstly, I say to the Shaikh, Assalaamu 'Alaykum wa-Rahmatullaahi wa-Barakaatuhu, and may Allaah increase you in knowledge, and may He raise your rank in this life and the Hereafter.

Esteemed Shaikh, may Allaah protect you, there are many of the students of knowledge who continuously talk about **the ruler who brings a Sharee'ah which is in opposition to the Sharee'ah of Allaah, the Mighty and Majestic, and there is no doubt that he orders the people with it, makes it binding upon them, and he**

sometimes punishes the one who opposes this Sharee'ah, and he recompenses or rewards the one who adheres to it with goodness or a gift. And this Sharee'ah (of his) is considered by the Book of Allaah and the Sunnah of His Prophet (sallallaahu alaihi wasallam) to be in opposition to and clashing with the texts of the Book and the Sunnah. **When this ruler makes this Sharee'ah binding upon the people, while he acknowledges that the legislation of Allaah is the truth and whatever is besides it is falsehood and that the truth is what occurs in the Book and the Sunnah,** however due to a doubt or misconception, or due to desire he makes the people adhere to this Sharee'ah. Just as this occurred abundantly amongst the Banu Umayyah, Banul-Abbaas and amongst the oppressive rulers, those who made binding certain matters upon the people, (matters) that are not hidden from you. When they made the people to strictly adhere to that which Allaah, the Mighty and Majestic is not pleased with, such as the affairs that were inherited (i.e. passed on), and they also set up kingship to pass on between themselves, just as the Prophet (sallallaahu alaihi wasallam) informed.²⁹ And they also brought the most evil of people closer to themselves (in assistance) and they distanced the best of people from themselves. **And they brought closer to themselves (in intimacy) whoever agreed with them in their falsehood and they would fight to the end against whoever would order them and forbid them.**

So if the rulers of our times acted upon a similar type of Sharee'ah, does he become a disbeliever on account of this Sharee'ah when he makes it binding upon the people while he acknowledges that he is in opposition to the Book and the Sunnah and that the truth is in the Book and the Sunnah. **By this mere act of his alone, does he become a disbeliever or is it vital that we look at his underlying beliefs in this matter.** Such as the one, for example, who makes usury binding upon the people or the one who opens usurious banks in his country and then he takes interest-based loans from the national banks and then he tries to adapt to its economy. But if you were to ask him he will say that usury is unlawful and it is not permissible but there is an economic crisis or other such matters, he makes excuses like these. Sometimes these excuses may be acceptable and sometimes they may not be, so does he become a disbeliever by this or not. And with the knowledge that many of the youth quote from your esteemed-self that you say that whoever does this is a disbeliever. **And we note that in all the countries of the world that this affair is present, and that it is between the one who only falls into a small part of it, or a great part of it and one who openly makes it clear and one who does not.**³⁰ We ask Allaah for pardon and forgiveness.

We wish for an answer to all of this from your esteemed-self and perhaps Allaah, the Most High and free from all perfections, will bring about benefit through it amongst the students of knowledge and that Allaah, the Mighty and Majestic, may bring about benefit

²⁹ And then there is also the general legislation that was passed on the saying of the creation of the Qur'aan at the time of Imaam Ahmad, and that was a saying and a sharee'ah of intrinsic kufr!!

³⁰ In other words, in the Muslim countries there are varying amounts of the type of tabdeel (changing, distorting) in which it is not claimed that the law is from Allaah, or if you like you can call it Istibdaal (replacement), instead – and in reality all of this is not ruling by what Allaah has revealed!!

through it amongst the callers to Allaah, the Mighty and Majestic, since it will not be hidden to you that differing has had a great effect in calling to Allaah, the Mighty and Majestic. Alongside this, I convey to your esteemed-self the love of your sons and your students, the students of knowledge in this country (Yemen) also their eager desire for listening to your voice, your directions and your advice, regardless of whether it is over the phone or other than that. And Allaah, the Most High and free of all imperfections is the one who is asked to accept the righteous actions of everyone.

I, your son and student, Abul-Hasan Mustafaa Ibn Ismaa'eel as-Sulaimanee present this question to you from Ma'rab, Yemen on the 22nd day of the month of Rabee' al-Awwal in 1420H.

Wassalaamu Alaykum wa-Rahmatullaahi wa-Barakaatuhu." End of his words.

Answer:

Shaikh Ibn Uthaimen: "All praise is due to Allaah, Lord of the Worlds and I send prayers and peace upon our Prophet Muhammad, upon his family, companions and whoever follows him in goodness until the Day of Judgement.

To proceed:

This is the day of Tuesday, 22nd Rabee' al-Awwal, 1420H. I have heard the cassette recorded in the name of our brother Abul-Hasan in Ma'rab. He began with the Salaam so I say to you,

Alaika as-Salaam wa-Rahmatullaahi wa-Barakaatuhu.

And what he has mentioned concerning takfeer then this is great and serious matter and it is not desirable to make a generalised or absolute saying concerning it (itlaaq ul-qawl) except with a student of knowledge who understands and knows the wordings with their meanings and who knows the end results which arise from the judgement of takfeer or its absence.³¹ As for the general folk then their making judgements of takfeer in an absolute and generalised manner or its absence in issues like these, then many evils results from it. And that which I hold is that the youth should not occupy themselves with the likes of this matter and whether a ruler is a disbeliever or not a disbeliever and whether it is permissible for us to rebel against him or not. The youth must occupy themselves with the worship that Allaah has made binding upon them or has made recommendable to them, and they should abandon what He has forbade them, either due its being disliked or being prohibited. They should rush towards making agreement between themselves and to have unity and they should know that having disagreements in the affairs of the religion and knowledge occurred during the times of the Companions (radiallaahu anhum), however it did not lead to separation. Their hearts were one and their Manhaj was one.

³¹ So the likes of the Juhhaal, like Abu Huthayfah al-Kanadie al-Kadhdhaab, the Pseudo-Intellectual Qutubi, should repent to Allaah and refrain from these matters and seek forgiveness for their lies and fabrications.

“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 dhlum (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 'aammam)³² 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 people³³, believing (ya'taqid) that he is an oppressor (dhaalim) in all of that and

³² And here Shaikh Ibn Uthameen refers to al-hukm al-aamm, exactly as Shaikh ul-Islam Ibn Taymiyyah has discussed it, and as we have outlined earlier.

³³ Here Shaikh Ibn Uthameen 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 (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 Allaah³³.

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

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)?”**.

Then these matters (outlined above) do not mean that when we make takfir of someone that it is (automatically) obligatory to rebel against him, since great evils result from this rebellion – more so than (what results) from remaining silent. We are not able right now to give examples of this from what has occurred within the Ummah, the Arab and Non-Arab (part of it). But when we have verified the correctness of rebellion against this person from the Sharee'ah perspective, then it is vital that preparations be made (in terms of physical strength) such that the strength attained is equivalent to that of the ruler or more than that. But as for the people rebelling with knives and spears while the ruler has tanks and bombs and what is similar to that, then this is but stupidity without doubt, and it is also in opposition to the Sharee'ah.” End of Shaikh Ibn Uthaimen's words. (In answer to Shaikh Abul-Hasan al-Misri's questions via telephone. Refer to MNJ050017).

So this is what we hold as our religion, and this is what we consider to be the truth, and as for the sayings of the other Ulamaa, then we believe that most of them are in conformity with this explanation, in that it is not just Istihlaal, or Juhood, but also the expression of I'tiqaad, such as the one who considers what he is judging by to be equal, or better than Allaah's law, even if he does not make Istihlaal, or Juhood. And all of this is in perfect conformity with the Tafseel of the Salaf, which the neo-Qutubite, Kharijites are so keen to abolish, so that the teachings of Sayyid Qutb that they are actually upon, can be spread amongst the people.

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)

Closing Remarks

After all this O Sunni, you will come to have realised the true nature of these people, those who are actually upon the aqeedah of Sayyid Qutb, and whose chain of narration goes back to this Raafidee Heretic by way of Safar al-Hawali, to Mohammad Qutb, to Sayyid Qutb, and also by way of the likes of Abu Qataadah at-Takfiri and Abu Baseer Mustafaa Haleemah at-Takfiri and others, back to their Intelligentsia and back to their Sayyid.

They are the ones who devote days and nights and hundreds of pages in wanting to pull down the Imaams of the Sunnah, and the manhaj of Tasfiyah and Tarbiyah and wish to replace them instead with the Extremist Manhaj of the Imaams of Bid'ah, that of Takfir and Haakimiyyah.

And then they monopolise and scavenge upon the sayings of OUR scholars in order to justify THEIR manhaj of Sayyid Qutb. Indeed there are in the words of the likes of Shaikh Salih al-Fawzaan and Shaikh Ibn Ibraaheem and other scholars which may lend apparent support to what they are upon, of the aqeedah of Sayyid Qutb. But these issues (of the opinions of these scholars and the differences therein) are affairs within Ahl us-Sunnah. Prior to the entrance of this Qutubi Fitnah, these affairs were not under any dispute or contention - and all of these sayings were known.

But when the fitnah of Qutubiyah emerged and the Puppets of Aal Qutb began to preach the doctrines of the Raafidee Heretic, who suddenly became an Imaam of Guidance, and specifically his doctrines of Takfir and Haakimiyyah, then chaos arose – and in the midst of that they monopolised on the differences that existed on some aspects of the issues of ruling by other than what Allaah has revealed, amongst OUR scholars.

But they think that we do not know them and that we cannot differentiate between their Qutubite doctrine and their agenda and their true referent points – and their great filthy neo-practical Irjaa' to the Mockers of Allaah's Messengers, the Revilers of His Caliphs and Mukaffiroon of the Companions and the Mujaddids of Innovation - and between what our Ulamaa are upon of sound aqeedah and sound manhaj and of walaa and baraa based upon aqeedah and manhaj and of refuting the Innovators and Strayers. And they think that their ploy of monopolising on some of the differences between Ahl us-Sunnah, and hiding and concealing themselves in the midst of all of that, posing to be Salafis, claiming to be upon Salafiyyah will not be uncovered – the while their allegiance to the Innovators is all but apparent, and their jahl and talbees readily visible, and the stench of the darknesses of their souls and their cheap intellects all but pungently noticeable.

This is the difference between our scholars (like Shaikh Salih al-Fawzaan and Shaikh Ibn Ibraaheem and others) and between them, for they are newly-arisen foolish-minded, born of the Awakening of Qutubism, who remain silent in the face of the calamities of their sayyid and qutb, Sayyid Qutb, and his acting minister, and the puppet, who in the name of defending the aqeedah, accused the whole Ummah and its scholars of Irjaa' and then praised and aggrandised a Raafidee Heretic who uttered acts of kufr and apostasy and but demolished the aqeedah, declaring him a shaheed unconditionally and made his Imaam

equivalent to the greatest of the Shaikhs of Islaam. By Allaah, what lunacy and what greater sign of toying with innovation! Our Scholars are upon one things and they the Qutubiyah are upon another thing and another agenda.

So they think they can confuse the people and conceal themselves amongst the Salafis by quoting from our scholars – all in order to hide their Qutubi Manhaj. But they have been uncovered and will continue to be uncovered by Allaah's permission.

And as for the Juhalaa' who resound with their new-found slogan, "Is al-Fawzaan Qutubi as well? Is Ibn Ibraaheem Takfiri as well then?" then – may Allaah be merciful to them – they have not managed to perceive the affairs as they really are. They have not distinguished between those who hold what they hold as their view, after having imbibed the Qutubi manhaj, while at the same time showing great loyalty and allegiance to the Innovators and Takfiris, remaining silent about the Raafidee Heretics who have been turned into Imaams of Guidance, assaulting the Salafis from every direction possible (merely because they do not agree with their extremist manhaj), showing loyalty to those who assault the Salafis from every direction (like the well-known Takfiris and Qutubis) – so they have not distinguished between the likes of these and between our Scholars who hold what they hold as their view, and who at the same time, do not praise and aggrandise the Raafidee Heretics, declare them Imaams of Guidance and Shaheeds, remain silent in the face of the great calamities of these Heretics, and show loyalty and disownment for the sake of these Heretics.

There is a great difference between the two. And the fact that we differ with some of OUR Scholars, on issues in which we have support and proof from the greatest of the scholars of the past and present, then this has been used by the Qutubiyah to hijack our da'wah. But let them not think that we do not know them and see them...for they are the most foolish and ignorant of people, the greatest of those who lie upon our scholars, and the greatest of those who twist the words of the Scholars.

Indeed what has enraged them the most is that we have refuted their Qutubism, and exposed its scandal, and made known the condition of their sayyid – following our Scholars in all of that. This is what has enraged them... for when the false teachings in the books of their Sayyid, and what they contain of innovation and misguidance, are exposed, then the spring and fountain is actually cut off for them! Hence, their scurrying upon the earth and their selective use of the words and opinions of our scholars, to justify what they are actually upon of the extremist of their sayyid. They have tried to screen themselves, but to no avail!!

Do you not see O Sunni, how earnestly they write, day and night, about an Imaam of the Sunnah, a Muhaddith, a Faqeeh, Naasir ud-Deen al-Albaani, who was upon the Sunni, Salafi aqeedah, and attempt to let the world know that he was upon Irjaa', doing that intently and with devotion – and at the same time do you not see their treacherous silence about that Raafidee Heretic who uttered kufr and apostasy and who revived the innovation of the Khawaarij alongside scores of others, and whose teachings have led to destruction of the worldly affairs, in many countries and caused wastage and ruin to the da'wah? Do you

see a single word of rejection from them? And do you see a single word of rejection from them to those who praise and aggrandise this Raafidee Heretic and put him in the ranks of the Shaikhs of Islaam and of the Imaams of Guidance? In Allaah is the refuge. Indeed, their's is a wanton condition.

Prayers and peace upon Allaah's Messenger, his family, companions and whoever follows him till the affair is established.