



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

Part 10: Refutation of Sulaymaan al-Ulwaan and His Distortion of the Position of Ibn 'Abbaas and Shaykh ul-Islaam Ibn Taymiyyah In Order to Accuse the Vast Body of Ahl us-Sunnah with Irjaa'.

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

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

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

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

Abstract

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

We replied to his falsehood in GRV070017, however now he continues to propagate his lies against the Sahaabah by continuing to promote the falsehood of Sulaymaan al-Ulwaan, from whom he took his original ideas. Sulaymaan al-Ulwaan’s ideas were refuted by Imaam Ibn Uthaymeen, who explained that those who reject Ibn ‘Abbaas’s tafseer have paucity of Sharee’ah knowledge, paucity of understanding and an evil intention. But this has not sufficed al-Kanadie, after we established that the aathaar of Ibn ‘Abbaas are Saheeh to him, and that the various ta’weels made by the Qutubiyah in order to explain away those words that are authentic to Ibn ‘Abbaas – that they are all baseless and false. So he continues in his lies and deceit, and this paper is a follow up to GRV070017.

SalafiPublications
January 2002

Introduction

All praise is due to Allaah and prayers and peace be upon Muhammad. To proceed: An individual from Canada by the name of Abu Huthayfah Yusuf al-Kanadie was recently propagating some of the baseless views of some of the Harakiyyoon, who have been prevented by the scholars from giving verdicts due to their paucity of knowledge and lack of understanding or firm grounding in the affairs of da'wah and rectification and the manhaj of the Prophets in reformation. And amongst them Hamood bin Uqlaa ash-Shu'aybee and Sulaymaan al-Ulwaan.

Amongst the views he presented in his refutation of SalafiPublications.Com was what he had quoted from Sulaymaan al-Ulwaan that Shaykh ul-Islam Ibn Taymiyyah made a differentiation between the kufr with the definite article ("al") the kufr that is mentioned without it – and so he built upon this that when "al" is prefixed to kufr, it refers to major kufr, and when it is not, it refers only to minor kufr. Then built upon this, he used it to prove that the verse in Surah al-Maa'idah (5:44), which mentions "al-kaafiroon" that this is in reference to major kufr and that this is the apparent meaning of the verse (without any tafseel).

We refuted this baatil, in the paper GRV070017, and exonerated the Companions of Allaah's Messenger (sallallahu alaihi wasallam), Ibn Abbaas and Ibn Mas'ood (as well as others, such as Shaykh Ibn Ibraaheem, Shaykh ul-Islam Ibn Taymiyyah) from the wicked lies of al-Kanadie, which he had merely transmitted from the likes of al-'Ulwaan and ash-Shu'aybee, [Abu Baseer] al-A'maa, Abu Qataaadah at-Takfiri and others.

However, it has become clear that he has not repented from his lies and slanders and persists upon this, as in the past few days we received from him the book that he has translated called "Verily, the Victory of Allaah is Near", by Sulaymaan al-'Ulwaan. As one would expect, the book contains nothing but focus upon the Rulers, the issue of ruling by the secular laws, accusations of Irjaa' against those who do not hold to the absolutes of the Qutubiyah in the issue of rulership, discussion of suicide missions, calls for the removal of "the Jaahiliyyah" which is embodied in the secular laws and other such affairs, all of which indicates that the likes of these Harakiyyoon are far from the methodology of the Prophets in rectification, and ignorant of its realities, its priorities, precursors, and so on.

And whoever compares between the manhaj of the Harakiyyoon and the manhaj of the likes of Imaam Ibn Uthaymeen, Imaam Ibn Baaz, Imaam al-Albaan, Shaykh Salih al-Fawzaan, Shaykh Rabee' bin Haadee, Imaam Muqbil and others, in the rectification of the society one will see a difference like that between the East and the West.

Stated Shaikh Salih al-Fawzaan, "So whichever call is not built upon these foundations, and whose manhaj (methodology) is not the methodology of the Messengers - then it will be frustrated and will fail, and it will be toil without benefit. The clearest proof of this are those present day Jamaa'at (groups) which set out a methodology and programme for themselves and their da'wah, which is different to the methodology of the Messengers.

These groups have neglected the importance of aqeedah (correct beliefs and creed) - except for a very few of them - and instead call for the correction of side issues. So one group calls for the correction of rule and politics and demands establishment of the hudood (prescribed punishments), and that Sharee'ah (Islaamic Law) be applied in judging amongst the people - and this indeed is something very important, but it is not what is most important: Since how can one seek to establish and apply Allaah's judgement upon the thief and the fornicator, before seeking to establish and apply Allaah's judgement upon the mushrik - the one who attributes worship to others besides Allaah. How can we demand that Allaah's judgement be applied to two men disputing about a sheep or a camel, before demanding that Allaah's judgement be applied upon those who worship idols and graves, and those who deny or hold heretical beliefs with regards to Allaah's Names and Attributes - divesting them of their true meaning, or distorting them. Are these people not greater criminals than those who fornicate, drink wine and steal?!! Since those are crimes against mankind, whereas shirk and denial of Allaah's Names and Attributes are crimes against the Creator - the One free from all imperfections - and the right of the Creator has precedence over the rights of creation.

Shaykhul-Islaam Ihn Taymiyyah (d.728H) says in his hook: al-Istiqaamah(1/466): "So these sins along with correct tawheed are better than corrupted tawheed in the absence of these sins."

Then another Jamaa'ah (group) affiliates itself with da'wah, except that their methodology is also at variance with the methodology of the Messengers. They give no importance to correct aqeedah, rather they give importance to some acts of worship and practicing dhikr (remembrance of Allaah) in the way of the Soofees. They concentrate upon khurooj (going out) and touring the lands, and what is important to them is that they manage to attract the people to join them without caring about their aqeedah. And all of these are innovated ways, taking as their starting point, matters which were left until last in the call of the Messengers. This is just like the case of someone who seeks to cure a body whose head has been decapitated - since the place of aqeedah in the religion, is like the head with regard to the body.

Thus it is necessary for these groups to correct their concepts and understanding, by referring back to the Book and the Sunnah, in order to know the methodology of the Messengers in calling to Allaah. For indeed Allaah - the One free from all imperfections - informed that correct rule and sovereignty, which is the central part of the call of the former jamaa 'ah whom we mentioned, cannot be achieved except after correcting aqeedah, such that all worship is for Allaah alone and worship of everything else is abandoned. Allaah - the Most High - says:

Allaah has promised to those amongst you who truly have Imaan (true faith and belief) and act in obedience to Allaah and His Messenger, that He will grant them rulership upon the earth, just as He granted it to those before

them, and that He will establish their Religion for them and grant them the authority to practice their Religion which He chose and ordered them with. And He will certainly change their situation to one of security, after their fear. Providing that they worship and obey Me, not associating anything else in worship with Me. Then, whoever rejects this favour by disobedience to their Lord - then they are the rebellious transgressors. Soorah an-Noor 24:55

So these people wish to establish the Islaamic State before purifying the lands of idolatrous beliefs which take the form of worship of the dead, and devotion to the tombs - such as is no different to the worship of al-Laat, al-Uzzaa and the third of them Manaat, rather it is worse. So they are attempting that which is impossible:

*And whoever seeks greatness without effort and exertion,
Will only be wasting his life in seeking something impossible.*

Indeed, establishment and application of the Sharee'ah and the prescribed punishments, and the establishment of the Islaamic State, and avoidance of whatever is prohibited, and achievement of whatever is obligatory - all of these things are from the rights of Tawheed; and matters which perfect it and follow on from it. So how can we give attention to that which is subsidiary whilst neglecting that which is of primary importance?" (Manhaj ul-Anbiyaa fid-Da'wah Ilallaah pp.14-16).

And this is the great problem with those who have been put to trial with the Qutubi, Haraki manhaj, whose sole focus and concern is the rule and rulership – and as a result of which they seek to make istidlaal (deduce proof) for their positions based upon ignorance, distortions and lies.

And after all this, they tie this matter to the issue of Irjaa' and accuse those who do not agree with them to be Murji'ah, as we shall see in the summary to this paper.

Without further ado, let us proceed with the discourse:

Quotation from the Book “Verily, the Victory of Allaah is Near” by Sulaymaan al-‘Ulwaan

The passage below is the one under discussion, and al-Kanadie, as it has become clear, was merely transmitting the falsehood of al-‘Ulwaan in his own refutation of us. One can refer to the reply to him in GRV070017. Note that the Arabic text included in the quotation below does not appear in the PDF version of this document.

And whosoever does not judge by what Allâh has revealed, such are the Kâfirûn.¹⁴

And when the (word) ‘*Kufî*’ is generalized and it is preceded with the ‘*Alif* () and *Lam* ()’, then what is meant by it is major (*Akbaar*).¹⁵ And what is said from Ibn ‘Abbass, may Allaah be pleased with him, that he said, “Disbelief (*Kufî*) less than disbelief (*Kufî*),”¹⁶ is not authentic from him as it is narrated by Al-Marwizee in “*Tah’theem Qadr As-Salaat*” (2/512) and Al-Haakim in his “*Mustadrak*” (2/313) from the path of Hishaam bin Hujayr from Tawoos from Ibn ‘Abbass.

However, Hishaam was weakened by *Imaam* Ahmad and Yahya bin Ma’een and Al-‘Uqaylee¹⁷ as well as another group. And ‘Alee Al-Madeenee said, “I read upon Yahya bin Sa’eed, “Narrated to us, Ibn Jurayj from Hishaam bin Hujayr...” So Yahya bin Sa’eed said, ‘It is befitting that I disregard him.’ I said, “Should I cross out his *Hadeeth*?’ He said, ‘Yes.’ And Ibn ‘Uyaynah said, “We did not used to take from Hishaam bin Hujayr, that which we did not find with other than him.”

And this (statement of Ibn ‘Abbass) is something that Hishaam narrated alone (i.e. without being affirmed by others) and furthermore, he contradicted others besides him from the trustworthy (narrators) as it was mentioned by ‘Abdullah bin Tawoos from his father who said, “Ibn ‘Abbass was asked about His, the Most High’s statement: **“And whosoever does not judge by what Allâh has revealed, such are the Kâfirûn.”** He said, ‘It is disbelief (*Kufî*).’¹⁸ And in a narration: “It is disbelief (*Kufî*) in him.”¹⁹ And in another: “This is sufficient for his disbelief (*Kufî*).”²⁰ – narrated by ‘Abdur-Razaaq in his *Tafseer* (1/191) and Ibn Jareer (6/256) and Wakee’ah in “*Akbaar Al-Qudhaat*” (1/41) and others with an authentic (*Saheeh*) chain. And this is what is confirmed from Ibn ‘Abbass, may Allaah be pleased with him, as he generalized the phrasing and did not restrict it. And the path of Hishaam bin Hujayr is *Munkar*²¹ from two angles: **The first angle:** The isolated (unsubstantiated) narration of Hishaam **The second angle:** His contradiction of those who are more trustworthy than him.

And his saying, “It is disbelief (*Kufî*),” and the other phrase, “It is disbelief (*Kufî*) in him,” means that the verse is upon its generalization.²² And the basis (‘*Usl*) concerning *Kufr* is that it is major *Kufr* [*Kufr Akbaar* (i.e. the type which expels one outside the realm of *Islam*)] as *Shaykh Al-Islam* (Ibn Taymiyyah), may Allaah be merciful to him, said in “*Al-Iqtidhaa*” (1/208)²³ unless it is restricted or something comes to alter it.

And the statement of the wife of Thaabit bin Qais, "But I hate the disbelief (*Al-Kufr*) in *Al-Islaam*." – narrated by Al-Bukhaaree (#5,273) from Ibn 'Abbass, does not contradict this rule and does not negate this approved basis ('*Usl*), in this section, as she said, "...in the *Islaam*." And this is a clear alteration, that (indicates) the meaning of '*Kufr*' here is less than major (*Akbaar*) and it is not correct to say that major disbelief (*Kufr Akbaar*) can exist within *Islaam*. And if it had been generalized, while being preceded with the *Lam* (), and not being restricted, then it would have come to the minds, the reality of the phrase and what it was used/ for (i.e. people would assume that she meant *Kufr Akbaar*). So she negated that misunderstanding with this restriction (i.e. "...in the *Islaam*.") and this is clear to he who contemplates.²⁴

Footnotes

14 *Al-Maa'idah*, 44

15 Trans. note: The '*Alif Lam* (), which precedes the word *Kaafiroon* () in the aforementioned verse, means that it takes the form *Al-Kaafiroon* () or "The Disbelievers", and can only take the form of major disbelief (*Kufr Akbaar*), which causes one to leave the realm of *Islaam*, unlike the minor disbelief (*Kufr Ashgaar*), which does not nullify a person's faith (*Eemaan*) completely. The author clarifies this rule shortly. And the argument of those who say, "It could be that Allaah called them *Al-Kaafiroon* meaning that they are disbelievers with the minor form of *Kufr* (*Kufr Asghaar*)," is false as this would mean that it would be acceptable to say about a person, who is guilty of some minor form of *Kufr* (*Kufr Asghaar*), "He is *Al-Kaafir*," in an unrestricted form with nothing to alter the meaning. Would anyone accept this?!

16 Trans. note: Arabic: Transliteration: "***Kufr dun Kufr.***" Translation: "**Disbelief (*Kufr*) less than disbelief (*Kufr*).**"

17 Look to "*Adh-Dhu'afaa* " by Al-'Uqaylee (4/337-338) and "*Al-Kamal* " (7/2569) by Ibn 'Adee and "*Tah'theeb Al-Kamal* " (30/179-180) and "*Hadee As-Saaree* " (447-448).

18 Trans. note: Arabic: Transliteration: "***Heeyah Kufr.***" Translation:

19 Trans. note: Arabic: Transliteration: "***Heeyah beehee Kufr.***" Translation: "**It is disbelief (*Kufr*) in him,**" or it could take the meaning, "**In it, there is disbelief (*Kufr*).**"

20 Trans. note: Arabic: Transliteration: "***Kafaa beehee Kufruhoo.***" Translation: "**This is sufficient for his disbelief (*Kufr*).**"

21 Trans. note: *Munkar* literally means objectionable; however, in *Hadeeth* terminology and classification it refers to a narration, which is weak due to a defect in its chain as well as its contradiction of an authentic text concerning the same subject.

22 And the ruling by other than what Allaah revealed is at different levels and the discussion at this point is concerning those who fabricate laws which oppose the legislation of Allaah and the ruling (*Hukm*) of Allaah and the ruling (*Hukm*) of His Messenger ()

23 Trans. note: The statement of Ibn Taymiyyah, may Allaah be merciful to him: “There is a difference between the *Kufr*, which comes attached with ‘*Alif Lam*, as in the Prophet’s saying, ‘There is nothing between the slave and *Al-Kufr* or *Al-Shirk*, except abandoning the *Salaat*,’ and between *Kufr* which is not attached with *Alif Lam*.” – “*Al-Iqtidhaa As-Siraat Al-Mustaqeem*”

24 Trans. note: And there are several other texts, which include *Kufr* preceded with the ‘*Alif Lam* whereby other texts exist which restrict its usage and alter its meaning to indicate minor *Kufr*. However this is not the place for a detailed discussion on this subject.

Response to the Claims of Sulaymaan al-'Ulwaan

There are a number of issues:

[1] The claim that kufr attached with “al” is major kufr, [2] The claim that the narrations from Ibn ‘Abbaas concerning the lesser kufr are weak and unacceptable, [3] Concerning the ta’weel of the sayings of Ibn ‘Abbaas, “it is sufficient for his kufr” “in it there is kufr” and “it is kufr” that it is major kufr, [4] Concerning what has been stated by Shaykh ul-Islaam Ibn Taymiyyah and which ‘Ulwaan has used as a basis for his rule, [5] Concerning the explaining away of what contradicts this rule from the sayings which mention kufr with “al” but which are in reference to the minor kufr.

So we say:

[1] Concerning the Saying of al-'Ulwaan

“And when the (word) ‘*Kufi*’ is generalized¹ and it is preceded with the ‘*Alif* () and *Lam* () , then what is meant by it is major (*Akbaar*).”

As for this rule, then what is correct is that kufr, when it is in reference to the absolute meaning, then regardless of whether “al” is attached to it or not, it is in reference to major kufr (as we shall see further below in [4] from the explanation of Shaykh ul-Islaam of this rule). Thus the definite article (“al”) is irrelevant, if by the word kufr (or al-kufr) for that matter, the absolute meaning is intended.

And this rule (concerning the definite article “al”), in the way that al-'Ulwaan intends it (as we shall see later in his application of it in the issue of al-hukm, as explained by Shaykh Ibn ‘Uthaymeen) has nothing to support it, neither in the Qur’aan, nor in the Sunnah, nor in the language, and nor in the usage of the scholars. Rather, this is a mere claim, as we shall see in what is yet to come (as we shall see in Shaykh Ibn Uthaymeen’s refutation of the claim of al-'Ulwaan). However, this is just the precursor to enable speaking with the apparent meanings of the verses in al-Maa’idah (which is the view of al-'Ulwaan) and then to accuse anyone who does not agree with this to be from the Murji’ah, as we shall see later.

And as for this rule, then there are number of matters:

[a] Does this rule also mean that when fisq is used without “al” it is minor fisq and when used with “al” it is major fisq (i.e. major kufr)? Similarly with “dhulm”? So how and why does this rule apply only to “kufr” and not to the other two terms used “And whoever does not judge by what Allaah has revealed, they are al-Faasiqoon”, “Whoever does not judge by what Allaah has revealed, they are adh-Dhaalimoon”. So what is the actual underlying overall comprehensive principle, which is made unique for “kufr” but not for “dhulm” and

¹ This should actually be “absolute” as it is more accurate, but this is from the translator which is al-Kanadie.

“fisq”, and is this a linguistic matter (in which case it should apply equally to all three) or is it a matter based upon Sharee’ah evidences, and the statements of the Sahaabah? So what is the guiding principle? This is because Allaah in the Qur’aan refers to the disbelievers as al-Faasiqoon, just as he calls the sinful Muslims al-Faasiqoon. And likewise with adh-Dhaalimoon, this is used for both the Kuffar and Muslims.

[b] Ibn al-Qayyim, in his book “as-Salaat, wa Hukm Taarikihaa”, explains that there are two types of kufr (and then quotes the sayings of Ibn ‘Abbaas in this regard) and then also explains that Dhulm is of two types, and also Fisq is of two types. So he quotes verses from the Qur’aan in which the word “adh-Dhaalimoon” is used, but it is not in reference to major dhulm (i.e. major kufr), such as Anbiyaa 21:87, which is the saying of Yunus (alaihi-salaam) “... indeed I was of adh-dhaalimoon (the wrong-doers)”. And likewise he quotes a verse from the Qur’aan in which the word “al-Faasiqoon” is used, but it is not in reference to major fisq (i.e. major kufr), such as in an-Noor 24:4, which is the saying concerning those who accuse chaste women of indecency without four witnesses, that they are to be lashed, and their witness rejected and that they are “al-Faasiqoon” (the rebellious sinners).

[c] Summarising the above, the point here is that we need to explain what exactly is the underlying principle:

- i) Is it based upon whether the meaning of al-ism al-mutlaq (the absolute label of kufr) is intended or the restricted meaning of the label of kufr is intended. So is this the actual underlying issue, which would mean that irrespective of whether “al” is attached or not, the issue comes down to whether the absolute or restricted meaning is being employed.
- ii) Or is the underlying principle, the attachment of “al”, such that when it is attached, the absolute meaning necessarily follows and that when it is not attached, the restricted meaning is being referred to? So this is a linguistic matter, in which case why is this unique to kufr, and why is it not also applied to “dhulm” and “fisq”?
- iii) Or is it a combination of both, so that when the absolute meaning is intended AND “al” is used, then it is major kufr?

So it is apparent from al-‘Ulwaan’s words that he assumes (right from the very beginning) that the verse in question (5:44) is in reference to major kufr, that the absolute meaning (al-kufr al-mutlaq) is intended by it, then, reinforcing this, the attachment of “al” makes it major kufr unrestrictedly.

And this is not sound, as first of all the verse in question – in relation to this Ummah – then it does not carry the absolute meaning to begin with. This is actually a false assumption as other evidences indicate that the kufr in the verse is restricted, in the case of this Muslim Ummah, and this is known by way of authentic texts from Ibn ‘Abbaas, and by way of Ijmaa’ of the Mufasssiroon and all of Ahl us-Sunnah. When this assumption is

falsified, then what follows from it (which is whether “al” is attached to it or not) is irrelevant – as we shall see in what follows, since this rule is not actually sound to begin with.

[2] As for the claim of the narrations of Ibn ‘Abbaas:

Then this is opposed to the Ijmaa’ of the whole Ummah, that the narrations of Ibn ‘Abbaas, even if there are weaknesses in some of its chains, from aspects, the narrations that indicate that the verses in al-Maa’idah are in reference to minor kufr, for this Ummah, are acceptable and authentic.

Shaikh Ibn Uthaimen said, “Shaikh al-Albaanee has used this athar (narration) of Ibn ‘Abbaas (radiiallaahu anhu) as proof, and likewise other Ulamaa have taken this athar with acceptance, even there is in its chain of narration what there is². Nevertheless, they have taken it with acceptance, due to its truthfulness in its reality, as indicated in many texts. For the Prophet (sallallaahu alaihi wasallam) said, “Reviling a Muslim is fusooq (sinfulness) and fighting him (to kill him) is kufr”, yet despite this, his fighting against him does not expel a person from the religion, for the Most High has said, “And if two parties from amongst the Believers fight each other, then reconcile between them...” up until he said, “...Verily the Believers are brothers, so reconcile between your two (sets of) brothers”. However, when this did not please those who have been put to trial (maftooneen) with takfir, they began to say, “This narration is not acceptable! It is not authentically related from Ibn ‘Abbaas!” So it is said to them, how can it not be authentic when it has been accepted and adopted by those who are greater than you and more knowledgeable of you of hadeeth?! And you say, “We shall not accept it”.

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

² Alluding to weakness in one of the routes of transmission.

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

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

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

As for the authenticity of these narrations, then refer to GRV060016 for the tahqeeq and takhreej of these narrations.

Allaahu Akbar! Paucity of Sharee'ah knowledge! Paucity of understanding! Evil understanding, behind which is an evil intent!

[3] Concerning the ta'weel of what has been said by Ibn 'Abbaas to mean "the major kufr"

And this is the greatest of foolishness and greatest of contradictions, and if this issue alone was sufficient to illustrate the baatil of the claims of 'Ulwaan, it would be sufficient. And this is for reasons:

[a] Firstly, the statements,

"It is a trait of kufr in him. And it is not kufr in Allaah, His Angels, His Books and His Messengers"

And also the statement,

"When he does that, it is a trait of kufr in him, and it is not like the one who disbelieves in Allaah, and the Last Day and such a such thing"

Are both **SAHEEH** to Ibn 'Abbaas (refer to GRV070017). But when this did not please those thirsty and lustful for takfir, they decided to make ta'weel of these words.

[b] Secondly, Ibn 'Abbaas in his tafseer said "hiya kufr" and did not say "hiya al-kufr". And he said "hiya bihi kufr" and did not say "hiya bihi al-kufr" and likewise, "kafaa bihi

³ And this is the paragraph that Al-Jahool, Abu Huthayfah Yusuf al-Kanadie quoted from Shaikh Ibn Uthaimen(!), attempting to illustrate that we believe first and then seek evidence, during his attempts to prove that the sayings of Ibn 'Abbaas are weak!!!! Refer to GRV070017 for more details (p.7-9).

kufrihu” and this refutes the understanding they have taken from the words of Shaykh ul-Islaam Ibn Taymiyyah, rather their own understanding is refuted by this (more on this below), i.e. by the fact that Ibn ‘Abbaas did not choose in his explanation to use the word “al-kufr”, in what they have accepted as authentic from him.

[c] Further, even if this had been used, then as we shall see later, there is still nothing that would indicate that this is actually major kufr, since the word “kufr” attached to “al” is also used in the context of minor kufr (as we shall see later).

[4] Concerning what has been stated by Shaykh ul-Islaam Ibn Taymiyyah and which ‘Ulwaan has used as a basis for his rule

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

As for the correct saying from Shaikh ul-Islaam Ibn Taymiyyah, then it is his distinction - rahimahullaah – between kufr with the definite article (al-kufr) and the kufr without it (kufr). So as for the wasf (description), then it is correct if we say concerning it, “they are disbelievers (haa’ulaa kaafiroon)”, or “they are the disbelievers (haa’ulaa il-kaafiroon)”, based upon the kufr that they have been described with, of the kufr that does not expel from the religion. Hence he distinguished between the act being described, and the person doing the act being described⁴.

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

⁴ And from Shaikh Ibn Uthaimen’s explanation it is clear that the real intent of Shaikh ul-Islaam is that regardless of whether “kaafiroon” is being used or “al-kaafiroon” is being used (or whether “kufr” or “al-kufr” is used) the distinction that is actually made is between the act that has emanated from a person from being described and between the actual person himself being described. So this is the true and real meaning of the passage from Shaykh ul-Islaam, which is actually quoted below.

[b] Further, whoever refers back to the actual passage from Shaykh ul-Islam will see the evil understanding that al-'Ulwaan has employed.

Shaykh ul-Islam said in Iqtidaa Siraat il-Mustaqeem, (1/237-238), "And Muslim reports in his Saheeh, from al-A'mash, from Abu Saalih, from Abu Hurairah, radiiallaahu anhu, who said: Allaah's Messenger (sallallaahu alaihi wasallam) said, "There are two characteristics in my Ummah which are traits of kufr in them (humaa bihim kufr)", reviling the genealogy and wailing over the dead". So his saying "humaa bihim kufr", meaning that these two characteristics are both kufr which occur amongst the people. Hence, the mere characteristics are kufr, from the angle that they were from the actions of the Kuffaar, and they can exist in the people.

However, it is not the case that when a person falls into a branch from the branches of kufr that he becomes a kaafir, with the absolute kufr, not until the true and real kufr (haqeeqat ul-kufr) arises from him. Just like a person who brings a branch from the branches of Imaan does not become a Believer, until the asl, (basis) of Imaan is found with him.

And there is a difference between al-kufr which is preceded by the definite article (i.e. alif, laam "al"), such as in his (sallallaahu alaihi wasallam's) saying, "There is nothing between a servant and between al-kufr – or ash-Shirk – except the abandonment of prayer", and between kufr which is indeterminate (i.e. without "al") in [the place of] affirmation (munakkarun fil-ithbaat).

And there is also a difference between the meaning of an absolute name such as when it is said, "Kaafir"⁵ or "Mu'min" and between a restricted meaning of a name in all the various places it occurs, such as occurs in his saying, "Do not become disbelievers (kuffaar) after me, striking the necks of each other". So his saying, "...striking the necks of each other..." is an explanation of the Kuffaar (al-Kuffaar)⁶ referred to in this place, and they are actually called "Kuffaar", but with the name that is restricted (in its meaning), and they do not enter into the absolute name such as when it is said "Kaafir" and "Mu'min". End quote.

[c] Further, the above quote from Shaykh ul-Islam only reinforces the point we made earlier, which illustrates the contradiction of al-'Ulwaan, and also of al-Kanadie al-Jahool who has followed al-'Ulwaan in his baatil, which is as follows:

Shaykh ul-Islam said, "that there is a distinction between al-kufr with the definite article ("al")... and between kufr which is indeterminate (i.e. without "al" in affirmation." And

⁵ And note here, that Shaykh ul-Islam did not say "al-Kaafir" to illustrate the difference between the absolute meaning and the restricted meaning. So this again is a refutation of al-'Ulwaan and his evil understanding of these words.

⁶ Again Shaykh ul-Islam says that this phrase "...striking the necks..." is an explanation of "al-kuffaar" referred to in the hadeeth, and Shaykh ul-Islam used, in his own words, "al-kuffaar" to refer what was referred to in the hadeeth as "kuffaar". So again, this shows that the issue has nothing to do with the definite article ("al"), but it refers back to whether the absolute meaning is intended or the restricted meaning is intended. Otherwise, we could say that Shaykh ul-Islam is contradicting himself by referring those referred to as "kuffaar" in the hadeeth as "al-kuffaar" in his own words, immediately after the hadeeth.

al-Kanadie did not translate the last two words that occur at the end of this sentence (fil-ithbaat).

This means that there is a difference when “al-kufr” is used and when kufr is used in places of affirmation, without the definite article. Hence, in the hadeeth Shaykh ul-Islam quoted first about the two things that are kufr amongst the people, the wording used was “humaa bihim kufr” and here the word kufr has been used, indeterminately, (without “al”), in the form of affirmation (i.e. affirmation of kufr in these two qualities).

And this is similar to what has been used by Ibn ‘Abbaas in the various narrations from him in which he describes the kufr in the verse as “hiya kufr” and also “hiya bihi kufr” and also “kafaa bihi kufruhu”. And all of this, if we were to accept the rule that has been imagined by al-‘Ulwaan and hallucinated by al-Kanadie, then it is a refutation of their baatil tafseer of the verse, since in this case Ibn ‘Abbaas is actually explaining it as the minor kufr, using the word kufr without “al” (i.e. indeterminate in affirmation), which is in accordance with their own evil understanding of the words of Shaykh ul-Islam.

However, al-‘Ulwaan has not understood the saying of Shaykh ul-Islam properly, and thus has erred and caused the ignorant fools to err also.

[5] Concerning the explaining away of what contradicts this rule from the sayings which mention kufr with “al” but which are in reference to the minor kufr

As for the attempt of al-‘Ulwaan at the end to reply the refutation of this rule that he has imagined from the words of Shaykh ul-Islam Ibn Taymiyyah, by explaining the statement of the wife of Thaabit bin Qays, “But I hate al-kufr in Islaam”, then this is not major kufr, in agreement with the correct understanding of what Shaykh ul-Islam himself has established (but not upon the understanding of al-‘Ulwaan of it).

[a] However there are other texts:

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

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

And Ibn Battah also narrates with a saheeh isnaad by way of Ibn Taawoos from his father Taawoos, who said, “Ibn ‘Abbaas was asked about the one who enters a woman through

her anus, so he replied, “This person is asking me about **al-kufr** (haadhaa yas'alunee anil-kufr).” (2/738).

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

[b] This latter statement is actually used by the Khawaarij of today, to speak with the apparent meaning of the verse, as has been done by the likes of al-Kanadie – who is merely propagating the Kharijite notions of the likes of Abu Qataadah at-Takfiri and Abu Baseer al-A'maa - (refer to GRV060017). Shaikh ul-Islaam Ibn Taymiyyah mentions those sins on account of which a person does not become a disbeliever saying, “And as for those sins which do not have a specific hadd punishment...” then he mentions amongst them “...or the one who gives false testimony or the one who takes bribes in judgement (yartashee fee hukmihi), or who rules by other than what Allaah has revealed...” (Majmoo' Fataawaa 28/343). So this indicates that bribery in the hukm (judgement) is not the kufr that expels from the religion, rather this statement of Ibn Mas'ood is synonymous in meaning as the various other references to “al-kufr” which is not the major kufr. And also, al-Qurtubi said in his tafseer, “And al-Qushairi said, “And the madhhab of the Khawaarij is that the one who takes a bribery and judges by other than what Allaah has revealed is a Kaafir”, and he ascribed this to al-Hasan and as-Sudee”. (2/191). And this is exactly what al-Kanadie – the propagator of the madhhab of the Khawaarij in the issue of al-hukm – claimed and attributed to Ibn Mas'ood in his document (again refer to GRV060017).

[c] And if it is argued that in all the above examples, there is evidence (from other texts) to show that the absolute meaning (of kufr) is not intended, then likewise in the case of the verses in Surah al-Maadi'ah and 5:44 in particular (they are al-Kaafiroon), there is evidence to show that the absolute meaning is not intended, from what is authentic from Ibn 'Abbaas, and Taawoos and others, who are more knowledgeable of the Qur'aan than al-'Ulwaan and his likes. Rather, from the vast majority of the scholars of the Ummah from the earliest times to the present times, who are agreed upon the general, foundational, meaning of the verse, which is that it is minor kufr for this Ummah, unless it is accompanied with Juhood, Istihlaal, I'tiqaad and the likes.

[d] Then further, if we accept for argument's sake that all the narrations from Ibn 'Abbaas are weak except for the ones that state “hiya kufr” (it is kufr) and “hiya bihi kufr” (it is a trait of kufr) and “kafaa bihi kufrihu” (it is sufficient for his kufr), then there are two points:

- i) The tafseer given of the sayings of Ibn 'Abbaas by his students like Taawoos and others, is that it is not the kufr that expels from the religion, thus they are more knowledgeable of what was intended by Ibn 'Abbaas, and they explained the meaning of these words to indicate that it is not major kufr, and they

actually took from Ibn 'Abbaas, hence they would not explain other than what they acquired from him.

- ii) That the words used by Ibn 'Abbas in explanation of this verse themselves do not indicate that it is major kufr, since according to your own rule, which you imagined from the words of Shaykh ul-Islaam, Ibn 'Abbaas's words are actually in reference to the minor kufr since he never used the word "al-kufr" in his tafseer of the verse. This also refutes your position – by your own rules.

So this indicates that these people have no sound proof at all, but only contradictions and false principles.

SUMMARY

Sulaymaan al-'Ulwaan said, "And ruling by what Allaah has revealed is from the requirements of the testimony that none has the right to be worshipped except Allaah alone and that Muhammad is His Messenger. Hence, the Islaam of a person is not sound until he judges by what Allaah has revealed. Rather, there is no Islaam for him until he complies and submits to Allaah's and His Messenger's judgement. And making juhood of the judgement of Allaah, or having belief (i'tiqaad) that it is not suitable for this time and what is similar to that is not actually a condition for the kufr of the one who does not judge by what Allaah has revealed. Rather, the mere absence of judging by it, and rejecting it (radduhu), and pausing in front of the one who wishes to judge by it is kufr and apostasy from Islaam, in opposition to the Murji'ah of the Era who do not make takfir except by way of belief (I'tiqaad)." (At-Tawkeed Fi Wujoob al-I'tinaa bit-Tawheed, which is contained in the book, Tanbeeh al-Ummah 'alaa Wujoob al-Akdh bil-Kitaab was-Sunnah, p.55-56).

And this is but the madhhab of the Khawaarij, who make takfir by way of itlaaq, and is also an attack against the likes of Imaam al-Albaani, Imaam Ibn Baaz, Imaam Ibn Uthaymeen, Imaam Muqbil, Shaykh Rabee, Shaykh Abdul-Muhsin al-'Abbaad, rather the Permanent Committee itself in many of its previous verdicts issued on this subject, and accusing them with that which is falsehood, rather accusing the vast majority of the Scholars of Ahl us-Sunnah in all the ages of being Murji'ah. And this indicates that these people, the Harakiyyoon, revolve their da'wah around the concept of rule and rulership, and have thus, deviated far, far away from the methodology of the Prophets in calling to Allaah and rectifying the Ummah. So 'Ulwaan in his book "Verily, Allaah's Help Is Near", did not even depart from issues of rule, rulership, takfir, irjaa', the murji'ah and the likes, all of which indicates their great deviation from the Prophetic Methodology.

As for the blindness of this firqah, then first of all they argue that in the early times of the Ummah, there was not witnessed what is witnessed today of the desertion of Allaah's Law, and hence, the various explanations of the Sahaabah in relation to the rulers, and the issues of rule and rulership and the tafseer of the verses in al-Maa'idah, that all of that was in accordance with what they witnessed and observed, and that they were not referring to what is witnessed today.

Then if we accept this, then it means that the tafseer of the Sahaabah of these verses means that they saw it to be in reference to minor kufr as the asl, foundation, for this Ummah and not major kufr exactly as has been held by the vast majority of the Scholars of Ahl us-Sunnah throughout the ages – all of who outlined the tafseel in this matter – that the one who rules by other than what Allaah has revealed is not a kaafir with the major kufr, unless, he makes Juhood, or makes Istihlaal, or holds beliefs that necessitate kufr and what is like that.

And those amongst Ahl us-Sunnah who hold that ruling by the secular laws in the totality of the state is major kufr, such as Shaykh al-Fawzaan and Shaykh Ibn Ibraaheem and others, then they affirm the tafseer of Ibn 'Abbaas and speak with it, and say that this is

the actual tafseer of the verse, that its foundation is the minor kufr, and this is the general rule (and they outline this in their works). Then they make an exception in the case of the one who replaces the Sharee'ah completely, from top to bottom, in all the affairs of the state (not partially). So this is their understanding. They affirm the tafseer of Ibn 'Abbaas and speak with it, and know that that is the general rule, and then they except from this rule, what is observed today – and all of this is in conformity with what the Salaf of this Ummah are upon concerning this issue.

As for the Qutubi Intelligentsia, then they attempt to reverse the situation and say that the asl, foundation is that the verse refers to major kufr for this Ummah. And that the only exceptions are those exceptions that were found in the times of the Sahaabah. To this end they explain away the statements of Ibn 'Abbaas (that is those amongst them who accept that they are authentic).

Or they try to make ta'weel of these statements (those select narrations that they accept as authentic) and interpolate them to mean major kufr (just like al-'Ulwaan did) using false arguments. And this latter approach is the most deceitful, for they acknowledge that those instances in the times of the Sahaabah were not examples of ruling by the secular laws, like you have today, and then at the same time, they claim that the Sahaabah understood these verses to be in reference to major kufr for this Ummah – without them even having witnessed what is witnessed today. And this shows their deceit and untrustworthiness and the falsehood of their position and the contradictions that abound in their words.

Then, anyone who does not agree with their speaking with the apparent meanings of the verses, and their making takfir bil-itlaaq in this issue, is labelled a Murji' – and this includes the vast majority of Ahl us-Sunnah from the early times to the current times.

And all of this indicates the great bewilderment that is with these people, and their arguing with falsehood, in order to promote their haraki, deviant manhaj, which has its sole concern with the issues of rule and rulership, which they derived from Aal Qutb.

Al-Kanadie al-Jahool, does not cease to speak with the apparent meanings of the verses in al-Maa'idah, even after we refuted the falsehood of al-'Ulwaan, from the words of Imaam Ibn Uthaymeen and other than that (GRV070017), and he continues to propagate the madhhab of the Khawaarij, which is to claim that the verse is in reference to major kufr, in its asl (foundation), and to then accuse anyone who does not make takfir bil-itlaaq as being from the Murji'ah. And he continues in his rejection of what is authentic from Ibn 'Abbaas as there are two SAHEEH narrations from him which indicate that he held it to mean the lesser kufr, and he continues to propagate the baatil ta'weel of those who have suckled him.

The Imaam, al-Khateeb al-Baghdaadee has reported in his 'Taareekh' (10/186) that: A man from the Khawarij was entered upon al-Ma'moon who said to him, "What has led you to oppose us?" He replied, "An aayah from the Book of Allaah, the Most High." Al-Ma'moon said, "And what is it?" He replied: "And whoever does not judge by what Allaah has revealed, they are the Disbelievers" (5:44). So al-Ma'moon replied to him, "Do you

have knowledge that this is a verse that has been revealed [by Allaah]?" He said, "Yes". Al-Ma'moon then asked, "And what is your proof?" He replied, "The ijmaa' (consensus) of the Ummah". So al-Ma'moon replied, "Then just as you are satisfied about their consensus that this is a revealed ayah, then also be satisfied about their consensus regarding its explanation." The man then said, "You have spoken the truth. May peace be upon you O Ameer ul-Mu'mineen"!

And indeed, this man from the Khawarij was more sensible than the Khawarij of today, and actually recognised his limits.

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

And Shaykh ul-Islaam, numerous times in his Kitaab ul-Imaan, affirms the tafseer of Ibn 'Abbaas, and says, "... and Imaam Ahmad bin Hanbal and others from Ahl us-Sunnah followed him in that..." (7/312), and also "And Ibn Abbaas and more than one from the Salaf said..." (7/522), and he also said, "...and Ahmad has mentioned that, and al-Bukhaari, and other than them both..." (7/522), and he also said, "...and this is also said by Ahl us-Sunnah, such as Ahmad bin Hanbal and others", and he said, "... and some of the Sahaabah said..." (7/355), and he also said, "...and it is the saying of the generality of the Salaf..." (7/350 and so on, all in reference to the tafseer of Ibn 'Abbaas.

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

And one can also refer to what has been said by Shaykh 'Abdul-Azeez Aal ash-Shaykh concerning those who attribute lies to Ibn 'Abbaas in this issue (SA17 @ SalafiAudio.Com)

and also the saying of Shaykh 'Abdul-Azeez ar-Raajihee on those who accuse the three Imaams of our times of Irjaa' (in their position on ruling by other than what Allaah has revealed), calling these accusers "Juhhaal" and that they ought to repent and the likes (SA20 @ SalafiAudio.Com).

Conclusion

It is necessary for al-'Ulwaan to take back his lies against Ibn 'Abbaas, and take back his baatil ta'weel of the sayings of Ibn 'Abbaas (that he spoke with the major kufr for this aayah), and to abandon his opposition to the totality of the Ummah and its Ijmaa' in this issue, that the verses in al-Maa'idah, for this Ummah, are the lesser kufr, as the foundation. And also to make tawbah for his vicious slanders against the vast majority of this Ummah who adhere to tafseel in the matter, that they are Murji'ah, and to abandon the way of the Khawaarij, which is to make takfir by the mere abandonment of ruling by what Allaah has revealed, without tafseel, and this is the madhhab of the Khawaarij, as is known.

And if he was to hold the view of some of the scholars, such as Shaykh Ibn Ibraaheem, and Shaykh Salih al-Fawzaan, then he should abandon his own manhaj of evil understandings, and instead adopt their manhaj, which is to affirm that the verses in al-Maa'idah, in principle, for this Ummah, contain the lesser kufr, and that the tafseer of Ibn 'Abbaas is authentic and established and true, and that it is the Ijmaa' of the Ummah – but that there is an exceptional situation that the tafseer of Ibn 'Abbaas does not apply to, which is the case of the one who rules by the secular laws in the totality of his state. So if he were to adopt this as his beaten track, then there would be no harm, and it would not lead him to agreeing with the Khawaarij in their tafseer of this verse.

But as for lying upon Ibn 'Abbaas, attributing to him false tafseers of this verse, claiming he speaks with major kufr for these verses, and making baatil, baseless, ta'weels of his statements (hiya bihi kufr, hiya kufr, kafa bihi kufruhu) – all of which have no support at all - and then claiming that this is the asl, foundation of the verse, and that anyone who opposes this that they are Murji'ah – then this is a disastrous path.

Just like it is upon Abu Huthayfah Yusuf al-Kanadie, the charlatan, who continues to propagate this falsehood, and who has not repented from all of his lies upon Shaykh ul-Islaam, making tahreef of his words (refer to GRV070016 for full details), his clipping and fabricating lies upon Shaykh ul-Islaam and much more – it is upon him to repent from this falsehood, whose inherent and blatant contradiction is apparent and whose opposition to the Ijmaa' of the Ummah is apparent and whose opposition to the aathaar that are SAHEEH to Ibn 'Abbaas is apparent.

Prayers and peace upon Allaah's Messenger, his family and his companions.