

# THE SHARP WORD AGAINST THE ONE WHO DOES NOT MAKE TAKFIR OF THE APOSTATE

*Shaykh Sultan al-'Utaybi*

With Additional Fatawa from Muhammad ibn Ibrahim, the old Lajnah ad-Daimah, ibn Baz, 'Ali al-Khudayr, and Nasir al-Fahd



# **The Sharp Word Against The One Who Does Not Make Takfir of The Apostate**

Shaykh Sultan al-‘Utaybi

With Additional Fatawa from Muhammad ibn Ibrahim, the  
old Lajnah ad-Daimah, ibn Baz, ‘Ali al-Khudayr, and Nasir  
al-Fahd





---

## Contents

Translator's Foreword	6
Publisher's Note	8
Author's Introduction	13
They are in doubt in takfir of them due to four matters	14
As for the issue "Verily, they have scholars who issue verdicts for them"	15
As for the issue "They cannot be declared kuffar specifically (mu'ayyan - where a specific person is mentioned)," so it is the issue of making takfir of the specific person	20
The evidence for takfir of the specific individual	23
As for the sayings of the followers of the aimmah regarding takfir, we shall mention just a little of it from its multitude.	41
As for the issue of "Verily, the hujjah has not been established upon them," so this is the matter of establishing the hujjah	51
As for "Verily, they are ignorant," then this is the issue of being excused due to ignorance	71
The lack of an excuse for the people of the fatrah who did have the hujjah or evidences is proof that those who have the Qur'an and Sunnah present are not excused	92

---

What is most commonly found with every mushrik is a doubt which led him into kufr	94
Excusing major shirk due to a mistake necessitates not making takfir of many groups from the kuffar and zanadiqah that the ummah has consensus upon regarding their kufr and the kufr of the one who doubts their kufr	96
Kufr is not restricted specifically to the obstinate person, rather it includes the person who commits kufr while ignorant	97
The evidences for no excuse of ignorance in asl ad-Din	100
The doubt which the opponents always take as proof	105
Epilogue	111
Appendix A: Shaykh Muhammad ibn Ibrahim	112
Appendix B: Lajnah ad-Daimah lil-Buhuth al-‘Ilmiyyah wal-Ifta	114
Appendix C: Shaykh ‘Abdul-‘Aziz ibn Baz	120
Appendix D: Shaykh ‘Ali al-Khudayr	124
Appendix E: Shaykh Nasir al-Fahd	142

---

**Shaykh al-Mujaddid Muhammad ibn  
'Abdil-Wahhab said:**

*O my brothers! Allah Allah! Hold onto the foundation of your din; its beginning, its end, its core, and its head: the testimony that la ilaha illallah. Learn its meaning, love it, love its people, and make them your brothers, even if they are far away. Disbelieve in the tawaghit, oppose and hate them and whoever loves them or defends them or does not make takfir of them, or says that nothing is upon them in relation to them or that "Allah has not obligated me anything with regards to them." Verily, whoever said that has fabricated a lie against Allah. Verily, Allah has obligated to disbelieve in them and to disassociate from them, even if they were your brothers and children. So Allah Allah! Hold steadfast upon that so that perhaps you may meet your Lord not having committed any shirk with Him.*

*O Allah, take us as Muslimin and join us with the righteous.*

---

## **Translator's Foreword**

The original translator Abu Mus'ab said, "Bismillah ar-Rahman ar-Rahim. All praise belongs to Allah, the Most High, the exalted Possessor of might and sublimity. And may the salah and salam be upon the Prophet, the one who smiles while he kills. As for what follows:

This is the translation of the book *The Sharp Word Against The One Who Does Not Make Takfir of The Apostate* by the mujahid, the shahid if Allah wills, Sultan ibn Bijad al-'Utaybi (rahimahullah)... This was translated due to the misguidance which is found between the brothers and sisters in the matter of takfir. So having gone through some books in this regard, I found this to be very useful and beneficial, as it crushes the false claim of the people who fell into the dark pit of irja while they thought that they were trying to get saved from the fire of the Khawarij. This creed which the aimmah of the Sunnah carried, if one were to speak it without mentioning the names of the scholars supporting the statement, he would be labeled as a 'Khariji.' But the silence found after this book was written was due to their worshipping the scholars rather than the evidences. And who can blame them? They were brought up like that! And they thought that they were upon the truth!... I ask the brothers and sisters to read this with calmness, leaving all the bias which the Shaytan brings, and

---

read this making the evidences to be what decides between what is right and wrong.

Although the Shaykh was murdered by the apostate treacherous regime of Al Salul, with the help of the Khawarij scholars who betrayed Islam and its people and left the fold of Islam a long time ago, who labeled him and the mujahidin as ‘Khawarij’ so that they can make the blood of Muslimin halal with it, he will be remembered as a mujaddid by the later generations, if Allah wills. I have known him to be courageous, pious, steadfast, patient, and a person of knowledge and truth. And this is what we hope, and Allah is the reckoner, and we praise none over Allah. I hope to revise this and make [a] PDF copy available in a near future, if Allah wills. May Allah benefit me and all who reads this, amin” (End quote).



---

## **Publisher's Note**

Bismillah ar-Rahman ar-Rahim. All praise belongs to Allah, the All-Powerful, the All-Mighty. And the may the salah and salam be upon he who was sent with the sword as a mercy to the creation. As for what follows:

There is very little to be added after the introduction of Abu Mus'ab (rahimahullah) except that the situation around us is very similar to when he translated the book. As he mentioned, he was not able to go through, edit, and publish the translation but we have carried out the task, and that is truly a blessing from Allah. Even though the book is sufficient by itself, due to the favor of Allah, we have added at the end multiple fatawa related to the topic in order to add certainty on top of certainty, and so "that those who perished would perish upon evidence and those who lived would live upon evidence; and indeed, Allah is Hearing and Knowing."

Today people use the same misconceptions the author addresses to hesitate and/or refrain from takfir of the apostate Sahwat tawaghit, their adamant supporters, and obedient soldiers (be it with the sword or pen) in Sham and elsewhere who raise banners falsely attributing themselves to Islam and tawhid; as well as other tawaghit, mushrikin, and

---

murtaddin who either worship the palaces, parliaments, and elections, or the graves, shrines, and idols.<sup>1</sup>

Fudayl ibn ‘Iyad (rahimahullah) said, “How will you be if you remain to a time when you see people who do not differentiate between the truth and the falsehood, nor between the believer and the kafir, nor between the trustworthy and the treacherous, nor between the ignorant and the knowledgeable. They will not know the good to be good nor the evil to be evil” (*Al-Ibanah al-Kubra*).

Indeed, the matter of takfir is heavy and mighty. Declaring someone a kafir who claims Islam is not a light matter and two people have gone astray in it:

- 1) Those who were lax with regards to it and declared those who are kuffar by the Qur’an, Sunnah, and sayings of the scholars as Muslimin and that those

---

<sup>1</sup> Like the kafir taghut Erdogan, the Murtadd Brotherhood (al-Ikhwan “al-Muslimin”) and its offshoots such as Hamas, the apostate nationalistic group the Taliban, and others. What makes matters worse are those who are affiliated to knowledge diluting this topic of takfir of the apostate such as Abu Qatadah, at-Tarifi, al-Muhaysini, and the seemingly countless other small ones. Compare the speech of these claimants, O seeker of the truth, to the forthcoming speech of scholars the people of the haqq are unanimously agreed upon their guidance and knowledge (not that they are the only scholars who spoke on the issue or are returned back to and derived principles from). May Allah guide you and us to the truth, allow us to live it, and die upon it. Amin amin.

---

who relayed what the texts and scholars said by applying it on our realities as renegade Khawarij!

- 2) Those who went in extremes and declared those whose blood is forbidden to spill as kuffar based on their “intellect” with no shar‘i proof and that those who disagreed with them are kuffar as well!

Shaykh ‘Abdullah Abu Butayn (rahimahullah), the mufti of the lands of Najd, said, “Indeed, the Shaytan has caused many people to go astray in this matter. So he made a group be too lax and as a consequence they gave the ruling of Islam to people who are proven to be disbelievers by the texts of the Book, Sunnah, and consensus. He made another group exceed the bounds and as a consequence they declared people to be disbelievers who are judged as being Muslim by the Book, Sunnah, and consensus. Thus what a calamity for Islam there is in these two groups, and what a trial there is in these two tribulations.”

This book deals with the first group as it is more widespread and is felt more on the ground in which we live in and have to deal with. Ibrahim an-Nakha’i (rahimahullah) said, “I fear the fitnah of the Murjiah for this ummah more so than I do the fitnah of the Azariqah (a sect of the Khawarij)” (*As-Sunnah*). Add to this the fact that the trumpet blowers of irja are still (without the slightest doubt) the loudest and the

---

most dangerous, as it conforms with the din of the tawaghit and is the door from which people enter its religion, become its supporters in falsehood against the truth and its people, thereby losing their din. When one of the Salaf was asked about irja he pointed to this reality and said, “It is a religion in agreement with the desires of the kings by which the Murjiah obtain some of the kings’ dunya and lose some of their own din” (*Al-Bidayah wan-Nihayah*).

From the multiples of misguidance the heads of fitnah and the munafiqin spread is the innovation of completely disregarding takfir of the specific individual, or only speaking about it in a theoretical realm and widening the gap between general kufr and takfir of the specific individual to such an extent that it hardly touches anyone. For “proof” these small ones resort to the same tactics as those who preceded them (their salaf you could say as their hearts are similar) and misquote or misunderstand the words of Shaykhul-Islam ibn Taymiyyah (rahimahullah). The reader will notice the same misconceptions addressed by Shaykh al-Mujaddid Muhammad ibn ‘Abdil-Wahhab, his sons, students, and those who carried the da’wah afterwards, are the same misconceptions the Murjiah and Jahmiyyah of today use.

Also, one should bear in mind while reading that the author is from the first batch of men from the organization of

---

al-Qa'idah in the Arabian Peninsula. The reason this is mentioned is obvious.<sup>2</sup>

May Allah send salah and salam upon our prophet Muhammad, his family, his companions, and all those who sincerely follow him.



---

<sup>2</sup> Return to the speeches of Shaykh Abu Muhammad al-‘Adnani (rahimahullah) “This is not Our Methodology, nor Will it Ever Be,” and “Apologies, O Amir of al-Qa‘idah.”

---

## **Author's Introduction**

All praise belongs to Allah, the Lord of the creation. And may the best salah and most perfect salam be upon our prophet and example Muhammad. As for what follows:

It has reached me from some of the youth the raising of some doubts, issues, and excuses in not declaring takfir of the apostates of this era. And the strange thing is that they know without a doubt these apostates have fallen into kufr from many angles. So I have taken a decision, asking help from Allah and relying on Him, to explain to them the proofs and evidences, so that the truth would be clear for them. And Allah is the One who guides to the path of goodness. I ask Allah ('azza wa jall) that this treatise, in which I have collected the sayings of the people of knowledge, be a clear explanation for them. And I ask Allah that He provide us with sincerity in our sayings and actions, and to keep us firm upon tawhid until we meet Him.

## **They are in doubt in takfir of them due to four matters**

- 1) Verily, with them are scholars who issue verdicts for them for that.
- 2) They cannot be declared kuffar specifically (mu‘ayyan-where a specific person is mentioned), so it is the issue of making takfir of the specific person.
- 3) Verily, the hujjah has not been established upon them, so this is the matter of establishing the hujjah.
- 4) Verily, they are ignorant, and this is the matter of being excused due to ignorance.

---

## **As for the issue “Verily, they have scholars who issue verdicts for them”**

Then the answer to this doubt is given in two ways:

Firstly:

If the scholars are issuing verdicts for the permissibility of kufr,<sup>3</sup> then the scholars would be kuffar apostates before them. Certainly, Allah (ta‘ala) has informed in the Qur’an in more than one place that the torment will be for the blind followers who came before them, and that those who followed are with those whom they followed. And certainly they will argue in the fire and the followers will say, “Our Lord! These misled us, so give them a double torment of the Fire.’ He will say: ‘For each one there is double (torment), but you know not’” (al-A’raf: 38).

And He (ta‘ala) said, “And, when they will dispute in the Fire, the weak will say to those who were arrogant: ‘Verily! We followed you, can you then take from us some portion of the Fire?’ Those who were arrogant will say: ‘We are all (together)

---

<sup>3</sup> Shaykh Sultan al-‘Utaybi said in his footnote, “Our speech here on kufr is with regards to issues that are agreed upon, the apparent matters, and matters known in the Din by necessity, and not with regards to issues that are obscure.”



---

in this (Fire)! Verily Allah has judged between (His) slaves” (Ghafir: 47-48).

And He (ta'ala) said, “But if you could see when the dhalimun (polytheists and wrongdoers, etc.) will be made to stand before their Lord, how they will cast the (blaming) word one to another! Those who were deemed weak will say to those who were arrogant: ‘Had it not been for you, we should certainly have been believers!’ And those who were arrogant will say to those who were deemed weak: ‘Did we keep you back from guidance after it had come to you? Nay, but you were mujrimun (polytheists, sinners, criminals, disobedient to Allah, etc.)’ Those who were deemed weak will say to those who were arrogant: ‘No, but it was your plotting by night and day, when you ordered us to disbelieve in Allah and set up rivals to Him!’ And each of them (parties) will conceal their own regrets (for disobeying Allah during this worldly life), when they behold the torment. And We shall put iron collars round the necks of those who disbelieved. Are they not recompensed except for what they used to do?” (Saba: 31-33).

This is information from Allah and a warning that the followed and the followers are together in the torment and them being blind following will not avail them of anything. That is made clear in this saying of His (ta'ala), “When those who were followed, disown (declare themselves innocent of)

---

those who followed (them), and they see the torment, then all their relations will be cut off from them. And those who followed will say: ‘If only we had one more chance to return (to the worldly life), we would disown (declare ourselves as innocent from) them as they have disowned (declared themselves as innocent from) us.’ Thus Allah will show them their deeds as regrets for them. And they will never get out of the Fire” (al-Baqarah: 166-167).

It is authentically reported from the Prophet (sallallahu ‘alayhi wa sallam) that he said, “Whoever calls for misguidance, there will be upon him from the sin, equal to the sins of those who followed him and it will not decrease anything from their burden.”

And the saying of Allah (‘azza wa jall), “They took their rabbis and monks to be their lords besides Allah, and (they also took) the Messiah, son of Mary...al-ayah”

The rabbis were the scholars, and the monks were the worshippers. Tirmithi and others narrated from Adi ibn Hatim that he heard the Prophet (sallallahu ‘alayhi wa sallam) reciting this ayah: “They took their rabbis and monks to be their lords besides Allah, and (they also took) the Messiah, son of Mary...al-ayah’ So I said to him, ‘We did not worship them.’ He said, ‘Do they not make unlawful which Allah made lawful thus you consider it to be unlawful? And when

they declare lawful which Allah made unlawful, thus you consider it to be lawful?’ I said, ‘Yes.’ He said, ‘That is their worship of them.’”<sup>4</sup>

## Secondly:

If you say “what about the scholars who are near the rulers, who don’t say the truth and are pliable and remaining silent? Then they are pliant and cover the truth with falsehood, misguided and misleading, and there is no escape from either

---

<sup>4</sup> Point of Benefit: It is recorded by at-Tirmidhi, at-Tabari, and others with different chains. Suyuti mentioned it in *Ad-Dur al-Manthur*, and he attributed to at-Tabarani and a number of others. Ibn Taymiyyah, ibn Kathir, ibnul-Qayyim, and Muhammad ibn ‘Abdil-Wahhab attributed it to *Musnad Ahmad*, but according to other scholars it is not found there. There is a disagreement in the authentication of this hadith, as well as the grading of at-Tirmidhi on it. There are two reports from at-Tirmidhi in which he grades it “hasan gharib” and “gharib.” According to az-Zayla’i, ibn Hajr, ibn Taymiyyah, ‘Ali al-Khudayr, and others, at-Tirmidhi considered it as “hasan” and accepted it. Ibn Taymiyyah and al-Albani also graded it hasan. Sulayman al-‘Alwan said its isnad in at-Tirmidhi and other than it are weak, however it is mashhur amongst the people of knowledge (which according to ibn ‘Uthaymin is a type of narration that “is widespread amongst the scholars and thus taken as a valid evidence”) and that it has a witnessing report in the form of a mawquf narration narrated by ibn Jarir. Even though there is weakness in its chains, the majority of scholars accepted it, and as-Sa’di mentioned there is a consensus of the mufassirin on using and accepting this hadith in explaining the ayah in question.

---

of these two matters, from which the sweeter of the two is also bitter.

If these scholars whom you defend made permissible for them worshiping idols and calling to others besides Allah, then what would you say? Are they not kuffar? They are, so then why do you differentiate between this kufr and between whoever judges by the fabricated man-made laws and whoever helps and aids the crusaders against our muwahhidin brothers in Afghanistan, and who prevent jihad in the path of Allah?

This necessitates that you be in doubt about takfir of all the tawaghit, as there is no taghut but there are near him helpers from the rabbis and monks, who beautifies kufr and transgression for him. And that is from the worst misguidance, and the aforementioned proofs are sufficient for whoever Allah has willed for him the truth.

Knowing that the Tatar, those upon whom ibn Kathir declared takfir and he narrated an ijma' on that, with them was a mufti, a judge, and an imam; and likewise Banu 'Ubayd who appointed judges and muftiyyin, and they performed salah Jumu'ah and jama'ah, yet still the scholars formed an ijma' on their kufr, apostasy, [permissibility of] fighting them, and that their land was a land of war (darul-harb). History is

---

full with such, and the scholars did not doubt takfir of them while with them there were evil scholars.

**As for the issue “They cannot be declared kuffar specifically (mu‘ayyan - where a specific person is mentioned),” so it is the issue of making takfir of the specific person<sup>5</sup>**

Allah (‘azza wa jall) said, “O you who believe! If any from among you turn back from his din, soon will Allah produce a people...al-ayah” Allah (subhanahu wa ta‘ala) with this establishes the possibility of a general apostasy from the believers, and the Prophet (sallallahu ‘alayhi wa sallam) said explaining the ruling regarding the one who apostates from the Muslimin, “Whoever changes his din, then kill him,” and this is a specific ruling which cannot be implemented except upon the specific person from amongst the people. If it was not so, how is it possible to kill the type who does this or says

---

<sup>5</sup> Shaykh Sultan al-‘Utaybi said in his footnote, “As for the person who wishes to further study this subject, then he should read the treatise *Takfir al-Mu‘ayyan* by Ishaq ibn ‘Abdir-Rahman ibn Hasan, and it is available in *‘Aqidah al-Muwahhidin*. As well the treatise *Mufid al-Mustafid fi kufri Tarik at-Tawhid* by Muhammad ibn ‘Abdil-Wahhab, and some other letters of the Shaykh in *ad-Durar as-Saniyyah*.”

---

that?! This saying is clear in its falsehood and negation of the rulings of Allah and His hudud.

**So we shall mention what the aimmah said regarding the issue of takfir on the specific person. Shaykh Muhammad ibn ‘Abdil-Wahhab (rahimahullah) said:**

Bismillah ar-Rahmin ar-Rahim

From Muhammad ibn ‘Abdil-Wahhab to Ahmad ibn ‘Abdil-Karim, salam be upon the messengers and all praise belongs to Allah, the Lord of the creation. As to what follows:

Your letter has reached me in which you stated the issue which you mentioned, and you mentioned that you have a problem which you seek to be removed. Then other letters came from you saying that you have come across the words of the Shaykh (i.e. ibn Taymiyyah) which made the misunderstanding you had go away. So we ask Allah that He guide you to the Din of Islam.

Where does his sayings indicate that whoever worships the idols and is more devout in worship than the worship of al-Lat and

al-‘Uzza, and who ridicules the Din of the Messenger (sallallahu ‘alayhi wa sallam) like Abu Jahl, after he bore witness to it, that he cannot be declared a kafir specifically?

Rather, the clear wordings are apparent in his declaring takfir of the likes of ibn Firuz, Salih ibn ‘Abdillah, and their likes because of the kufr that was made apparent and which takes the person out of the Millah. This is also clear and apparent in the sayings of ibnul-Qayyim which you had mentioned and in the sayings of the Shaykh (i.e. ibn Taymiyyah) which removes your misunderstanding regarding the kufr of the one who worships the idol on the grave of Yusuf, and what is similar to it, and their calling on them in times of hardship and ease, and their ridiculing the Din of the messengers after acknowledging it and adopting the worshipping of the idols after acknowledging it (i.e. the Din of the messengers).

If it does not, then there is only one option: you openly pronounce, like ibn Rafi’, ridiculing the Din of the prophets and you return to the worship of ‘Idrus, Abu Hadidah, and their likes. However, the matter is with the Turner

of the hearts. So the first thing I advise you with is that you reflect and ask yourself whether this shirk that is with you, is it the shirk which your Prophet (sallallahu ‘alayhi wa sallam) came to openly prevent the people of Makkah from performing? Or is the shirk of the people of Makkah more severe? Or is that which is with you more severe?

You also mentioned that from the time of the Prophet (sallallahu ‘alayhi wa sallam) to now, that no one has been killed or made takfir upon from amongst the people of the Millah.

## **The evidence for takfir of the specific individual**

**Then he (rahimahullah) said:**

Do you not recall the saying of Allah (ta‘ala), “If the hypocrites, and those in whose hearts is a disease,” to His saying, “Accursed, wherever found, they shall be seized and killed with slaughter” (al-Ahzab: 60). And remember His saying, “You will find others that wish to have security from you and security from their



people. Every time they are sent back to temptation, they yield thereto,” to His saying, “Take them and kill them wherever you find them...al-ayah” (an-Nisa: 91). And remember His saying in the belief of the prophets, “Would he order you to disbelieve after you have submitted to the will of Allah?”

And remember what is authentically reported from the Messenger of Allah (sallallahu ‘alayhi wa sallam) that he appointed a person with a flag to go to someone who married the wife of his father, to kill him and takes his money. So from these two which is greater, marrying the wife of the father or ridiculing the Din of the prophets after he knows it?<sup>6</sup>

And remember that he (sallallahu ‘alayhi wa sallam) thought of going to war with Banu al-Mustalliq when it was said to him that they

---

<sup>6</sup> Shaykh Sultan al-‘Utaybi (rahimahullah) said in his footnote, “I say: which of the two matters is greater: marrying the wife of the father or legislating man-made laws and assisting the crusaders against the people of tawhid in Afghanistan?” I will change this slightly and say: which of the two matters is greater: marrying the wife of the father or forcefully resisting the Shari’ah of Allah and sitting in the same trench with mushrikin in their endeavor to uproot a Khilafah that implements the Shari’ah of Allah in Sham and elsewhere?

---

refused paying the zakah, until Allah clarified the lie of the one who reported that.

And remember his saying regarding the most devout worshipers and the most diligent in this ummah, “If I come across them, I would slaughter them as the slaughter of Ad. Kill them wherever you meet them, for verily there is a reward to whomsoever kills them on the Day of Judgment.” And remember as-Siddiq and his companions killing those who refused paying the zakah and the taking of their children, women, and their wealth as spoils of war.

And remember the consensus of the Sahabah regards to the killing of the people of the masjid in Kufah, and upon their kufr and riddah, when they said a word in the affirmation of the ‘prophethood’ of Musaylamah (the liar). The sahabah only differed whether their repentance should be accepted or not. This is found in *Sahih al-Bukhari* and its explanation in the matter of guardianship.

---

And remember the consensus of the Sahabah when ‘Umar consulted them about the someone who thinks that wine is permissible for special people, taking as proof His (ta‘ala) saying, “On those who believe and do deeds of righteousness there is no blame for what they ate (in the past), when they guard themselves from evil, and believe, and do deeds of righteousness, (or) again, guard themselves from evil and believe, (or) again, guard themselves from evil and do good. For Allah loves those who do good” (al-Maidah: 93). Even though the one in question was from the people of Badr. And the Sahabah formed a consensus upon the kufr of whoever believed in ‘Ali, which is similar to what these people believe about ‘Abdul-Qadir, and on their riddah and on killing them. Thus (radiyallahu ‘anhu) burned them alive, and [only] ibn Abbas disagreed with him in the matter of killing them with fire saying, “They should have been killed with the sword.” All this while they were from the first generation, and they took their knowledge from the Sahabah.

And remember the consensus of the people of knowledge from the tabi’in and other than

them regarding the killing of al-Ja'd ibn Dirham and those like him. Ibnul-Qayyim said, "Every person of the Sunnah was thankful of the sacrifice, for Allah is your worth, in the my brother's sacrifice."

If we were to count those whom were made takfir upon by the scholars while they claimed Islam, then it would be lengthy. However, from one of the later situations that occurred was the story of Banu 'Ubayd, the kings and rulers of Egypt, and their group. They claimed that they were from the household of the Prophet, they established the Jumu'ah and the jama'ah, and they appointed judges and muftiyyin. The 'ulama nevertheless still formed a consensus upon their kufr, riddah, fighting them, that their land is darul-harb, and that it is obligatory to fight them even if some might have been be under duress or hated them.

And remember his (i.e. ibn Taymiyyah) saying in *Al-Iqna* and its explanation about apostasy, how he mentioned many kinds which are found with you. Mansur then said, "The trial has become common with these sects, and they have corrupted many from the people of

tawhid. We ask Allah for pardon and well being,” and this is his own words then he mentions the matter of killing one of them and the ruling of his money. So has anyone from the Sahabah to the time of Mansur said that these are only made takfir upon in general and not specifically?

As for the phrase of the Shaykh (i.e. ibn Taymiyyah) which confused you was greater than all of what was mentioned, and if we say what it states, we would declare takfir upon many parties specifically. So he states clearly that the specific individual would not be declared takfir upon until the hujjah is established upon him, so if the hujjah is not established upon him he would not be declared a kafir. From that which is known is that establishing it does not mean that he understands the words of Allah and His Messenger like the understanding of Abu Bakr (radiyallahu ‘anhu). Rather, when the words of Allah and His Messenger reach him, and he is free from having an excuse (like being deaf or in need of a translator), then he is a kafir, as upon all the kuffar the hujjah is established with the Qur’an. Allah said, “And We have set

veils on their hearts, so they understand it not...”

Then reflect on his (i.e. ibn Taymiyyah) words and how he made a difference between the hidden matters and between what we are in, the matter of making takfir of the specific individual. Ponder over his takfir of their heads (i.e. their leaders): so-and-so, and so-and-so specifically, and mentioned their riddah as clear riddah. Look at his clearness in bringing the mention of a consensus upon the apostasy of al-Fakhr ar-Razi from Islam, while he (i.e. ar-Razi) is amongst your scholars from the four aimmah. So would it be appropriate that you understand from his words, after all this, that the specific individual is not declared as a kafir? (*Ad-Durar as-Saniyyah*, 10/63-73).

**Shaykh ‘Abdullah ibn ‘Abdir-Rahman Aba Butayn (rahimahullah) said:**

Bismillah ar-Rahman ar-Rahim

From ‘Abdullah ibn ‘Abdur-Rahman Abi Butayn to his honorable brother ‘Abdullah ibn Shumar, may Allah give him peace, make him

well, and give him the ability to do what He loves and is pleased with. Salam ‘alaykum wa rahmatullahi wa barakatuh...

What you had asked, “Is it permissible to specify a person with kufr when he commits something from the mukaffirat (things that make one a kafir)?” The matter upon which the Book, the Sunnah, the consensus of the of the scholars are upon is the likes of shirk by worshipping others besides Allah is kufr, so whoever commits anything from this type, or justifies and beautifies it,<sup>7</sup> then there is no doubt regarding his kufr, and there is no problem in declaring such things that are a reality, saying, “So-and-so has disbelieved due to this action.”

This is clarified by the fuqaha when they mention many different issues in the chapter “Ruling on The Apostate,” and the different ways the Muslim can become a murtadd kafir. They open the chapter by stating that one who commits shirk with Allah has certainly disbelieved, and his ruling is that he must be

---

<sup>7</sup> Shaykh Sultan al-‘Utaybi (rahimahullah) said in his footnote, “Meaning, the misguidance of the caller.”

asked to repent. If he repents, leave him or otherwise he must be killed, and asking for one's repentance can only be concerning a specific individual. As well, when some people of innovation said near ash-Shafi'i (rahimahullah) that, "The Qur'an is created," he said, "You have disbelieved in Allah, the Mighty."

The sayings of the scholars regarding takfir of a specific individual are numerous and many. The greatest of which is when one commits shirk by worshiping other than Allah, and this is kufr by consensus of the Muslimin, there is nothing to prevent takfir of those who commit it, and it is as the one who commits zina is called a "zani," and the one who deals in riba is called a "rabi" (*Majmu' ar-Rasail wal-Masail an-Najdiyyah*, 1/657).

**And he (Shaykh Abu Butayn) also said:**

We say regarding the takfir of the specific individual: what is apparent in the ayat, ahadith, and the saying of the majority of the scholars indicates the kufr of the one who commits shirk, so worships with Him others. There is



---

no difference in the evidences between the specific individual and others besides him. He (ta'ala) said, "Allah does not forgive that partners should be set up with Him..." (an-Nisa: 48). And He (ta'ala) said, "Then kill the mushrikin wherever you find them..." (at-Tawbah: 5). This is general regarding everyone from the mushrikin.

All the scholars mention in the books of fiqh the ruling regarding the apostate, the first of which they mention about different types of shirk that is kufr and riddah. So they say, "Verily, whoever commits shirk with Allah disbelieves," and they did not make an exception to the ignorant. As well, whoever thinks that Allah has a companion or a son has disbelieved and they did not make an exception to the ignorant. Whoever slanders 'Aishah has disbelieved, and whoever mocks Allah, or His messengers, or His Books has disbelieved by consensus due to His (ta'ala) saying, "Make no excuse; you have disbelieved after you had believed" (at-Tawbah: 66). They mention many different types which have a consensus regarding the kufr of the one who falls into them, and they did not differentiate with

regards to a specific individual or other than him. Then they would say, “Whoever apostates from Islam is killed after he is asked to repent.” So they judged him with riddah before they judged that his repentance is to be sought, so asking one to repent is after the ruling of his riddah, and the asking for repentance can only be with regards to the specific individual (*Ad-Durar as-Saniyyah*, 10/401).

**Shaykh Sulayman ibn Sahman (rahimahullah ta‘ala) said:**

As for the sayings of Shaykhul-Islam (ibn Taymiyyah) regarding not making takfir on the specific individual, then what was intended was in relation to specific matters which the evidence is hidden from some people,<sup>8</sup> such as matters of qadr, irja, and its like from what was stated by the people of desires. Certainly, some of their sayings include matters of kufr based on proofs from the Book and the widespread Sunnah, so the saying which includes rejection

---

<sup>8</sup> Shaykh Sultan al-‘Utaybi said in his footnote, “Meaning, al-masail al-khafiyah.”

---

of some of the texts is kufr, but the one who said it is not judged with kufr for the possibility of the existence of a preventive factor, like ignorance, and not having knowledge about the (specific) text or what it indicates. Thus, the laws are not binding except only after it reaches a person, and this is why this is mentioned in the speech against the people of innovation and desires. The text concerning this is that he said regarding takfir of specific individuals who said that only after they had admitted to and acknowledged this issue, so he said if it is in the hidden matters then not making takfir can be said, but when it is in the known clear matters or what should be known from the Din by necessity, then making takfir on the one who says it is not brought to a halt (*Kashf Shubabatayn*, p. 83).

**Shaykh ‘Abdur-Rahman ibn Hasan (rahimahullah) said:**

Shaykhul-Islam mentioned that “al-Fakhr ar-Razi wrote a book *As-Sirr al-Maklut fi Ibadah an-Nujum* (*The Hidden Secret in The Worship of The Stars*) and thus he became an apostate except that he repented after that.” So he made takfir of ar-Razi specifically when he beautified

---

shirk... So look at the imam from whom it is narrated, by those whose hearts Allah made perverse, that he did not make takfir of the specific individual. If such was the case, then how did he mention al-Fakhr ar-Razi, Abi Ma'shar, and other than these two from those who are well-known, that they had become disbelieving apostates from Islam? Ponder over his saying, "Until that spread amongst many who ascribe to Islam so that you be informed what occurred in the last parts of this ummah from shirk with Allah." And he mentioned al-Fakhr ar-Razi in his refutation of the people of kalam, and he mentioned his book *As-Sirr al-Maktut* and said about it, "This is clear apostasy by the agreement of the Muslimin" (*Ad-Durar as-Saniyyah*, 11/452-453).

**Shaykh Sulayman ibn Sahman (rahimahullah) said:**

It has already passed in the saying of the Shaykh (i.e. ibn Taymiyyah) in regards to ar-Razi and his writing a book about the religion of the mushrikin, and that it was clear apostasy, and he is a specific individual. And it has passed the saying of Shaykh 'Abdul-Latif (rahimahullah) bringing the consensus of the

Muslimin concerning takfir of Bishr al-Muraysi, and he is a specific man. Likewise, al-Jahm ibn Safwan, J'ad ibn Dirham, at-Tusi the supporter of shirk, at-Tilmasani, ibn Sab'in, and al-Farani from the leaders of heresy and the people of wahdah (wujud), Abu M'ashar al-Balkhi, and others besides them, and in the book *Ifadah al-Mustafid* by Muhammad ibn 'Abdil-Wahhab, concerning takfir of the specific individual is sufficient for the one who seeks the truth and guidance (*Kashf Shubabatayn*, page 96).

**Shaykh Ishaq ibn 'Abdir-Rahman ibn Hasan (rahimahumullah) said:**

Indeed it has reached us, and we have heard from those who claim knowledge, din, and who thinks himself as a follower of Shaykh Muhammad ibn 'Abdil-Wahhab that the one who commits shirk with Allah and worships the idols, that kufr and shirk cannot be issued against him specifically. Some of those who spoke with me about this heard from some brothers that he issued kufr and shirk on a man who made du'a to the Prophet (sallallahu 'alayhi wa sallam) and sought help from him, so he said to the one who made takfir, "Do not

---

issue kufr on him until you make him familiar with it,” and that this person, and his like, do not care about mixing with the mushrikin in their travels and in their lands, but instead they seek knowledge from some of the biggest disbelievers of the mushrikin. They have created some doubts, some of which will come in this treatise in sha Allah, and they have fought with it from some of the lower people from their followers, those who have no knowledge, and those who do not know their situation. Those who have no sense of differentiating nor understanding, who retreat from their brothers physically and from the shuyukh with their hearts. They were afraid and what frightened them was what they showed from doubts and what has become apparent on them from the trials because of their mixing with the evil doers and mushrikin. After looking into the matter they do not make takfir of the mushrik except in general, and they hesitate amongst themselves even from this. Then their innovation<sup>9</sup> and doubt spread until it reached those who are from the closest brothers. The reason for this, and Allah knows

---

<sup>9</sup> Shaykh Sultan al-Utaybi in his footnote said, “So ponder over how Shaykh Ishaq sees not making takfir of the specific individual as a bida’.”

best, is their leaving the books of the fundamentals, their not caring about it, and not fearing misguidance.

They turned away from the treatises of Shaykh Muhammad ibn ‘Abdil-Wahhab (may Allah sanctify his soul) and the treaties of his sons for those would explain all of the doubts, as will come. Whoever has just a little knowledge, when he looks at the status of people today, and the beliefs of the shuyukh mentioned, he would be astonished, and la hawla wa la quwwata illa billah. Because amongst those, whom we have pointed out regarding his saying on this issue that, “We will say to the people of the domes, who used to worship it and whoever is involved in it, ‘Your action is shirk but he is not a mushrik.’” So reflect, you will see and praise your Lord and ask from Him well being. This is from some of the answers in reply to al-‘Iraqi (i.e. Dawud ibn Jarjis) who Shaykh ‘Abdul-Latif refuted (*Hukm Takfir al-Mu‘ayyan wal-Farq Bayna Qiyam al-Hujjah wa Fahm al-Hujjah*, p. 169-170).

---

**Shaykh Muhammad ibn ‘Abdil- Wahhab (rahimahullah) said:**

Abul-‘Abbas ibn Taymiyyah said in his speech about the kufr of those who refrained from zakah, “The Sahabah did not say ‘Do you acknowledge that it’s obligatory or do you deny its ruling?’ This wasn’t known from the Khulafa and the Sahabah. Rather, as-Siddiq said to ‘Umar (radiyallahu ‘anhuma), ‘By Allah, if they were to prevent from me what they used to pay to the Messenger of Allah (sallallahu ‘alayhi wa sallam) even if but a rope for tying a camel or a young she-goat, I would fight them because of their resistance to paying it.’ So he made their resistance to payment the basis for the permissibility of fighting them, not their denial of its obligation. It was reported that a group from amongst them used to acknowledge its obligation but were stingy in paying it, but in spite of this the Khulafa dealt with them all in the same manner: killing their fighters, enslaving their families, taking their wealth as ghanimah, testifying that their fighters are in the Fire, and labeling them all as people of apostasy.



---

This was amongst the greatest merits of as-Siddiq (radiyallahu ‘anhu) in that Allah kept him firm upon fighting them, and he did not hesitate as others besides him did. Those who hesitated at first, he debated them until they returned to his saying. As for fighting those who agreed to the ‘prophethood’ of Musaylamah [the liar] no difference of opinion occurred between them.” This ends the words of ibn Taymiyyah.

So ponder upon his (rahimahullah) saying about takfir of the specific individual and witnessing against him with the Fire when killed, and the taking of his wife and children as captives when they prevented zakah. So this is him (i.e. ibn Taymiyyah) who the enemies of the Din ascribe that he did not make takfir of the specific individual. And he said after that, “The apostasy of these people and entering them under the people of apostasy is established by the agreement of the Sahabah confirmed by the Qur’an and Sunnah...”

Ibnul-Qayyim said in *Ighathah al-Lafban* about denouncing the glorification of the graves, “The matter has reached to a point with these

mushrikin until some of their extremists wrote a book called *The Rituals of Shrines*, and it is not hidden that this is leaving the Din of Islam and entering the worship of idols.” This is what Ibnul-Qayyim mentioned about a man named ibnul-Mufid, who was one of the compilers, and you see what he said about him specifically. So how can one say he rejected takfir of the specific individual?

**As for the sayings of the followers of the aimmah regarding takfir, we shall mention just a little of it from its multitude.**

As for the sayings of the Hanifiyyah: then their saying regarding this is the harshest, until they went as far as making takfir on the specific individual if he says, "A little copy of a mushaf", or, "A little masjid," or if one (intentionally) prays without wudu, or its likes. It says in *An-Nabr al-Faiq*, "And know that Shaykh Qasim said in the explanation of *Durar al-Bihar*, 'Verily the vow (nadhar), which occurs

---

from the most of the commoners when they come to the grave of some of the pious saying, ‘O my leader (sayyid) so and so, if what I have lost is returned to me or if my sick (person) is given health, for you is such and such from gold or silver, or lamps or oil, (then his vow/nadhar) becomes void for many reasons... And from that is to think that the dead can control some of the matters and to believe this is kufr... Verily the people are put to trials with this and especially in the of birthday of Ahmad al-Badawi.’”

So look at his clear explanation that this is certainly kufr, and his saying that it occurs from most of the commoners, and indeed the people of knowledge have been tested in this matter in that they have no capability to rid it.

Al-Qurtubi said when he mentioned the listening of naqr (a musical instrument) or its blowing, he said, “This is haram by consensus.” And I have seen a verdict of Shaykhul-Islam Jamal al-Millah [saying that] the one who considers it to be permissible is a kafir, because when its forbiddence is known by consensus then it necessitates that the one

who considers it to be permissible is to be made takfir of. I have seen the saying of al-Qurtubi and the shaykh from whom he is narrating the apostasy of the person who makes listening and dancing [to music] permissible, while this is less than that which we are in.

Abul-Abbas (i.e. ibn Taymiyyah) (rahimahullah) said, “Ibnul-Khudhayri narrated to me from his father Shaykh al-Khudhayri, who was the imam of Hanafiyyah in his time, that he said, ‘The fuqaha of Bukhara used to say that ibn Sina was a smart kafir.’ So this is the imam of Hanafiyyah in his time who narrated from the fuqaha of Bukhara the collective kufr of ibn Sina, and he (ibn Sina) is a specific person and a writer whose apparent was Islam.

As for the sayings of the Malikiyyah: in this matter there is more than that which could be collected. It is famously reported from their fuqaha their quickness in issuing verdicts for the death of persons who say a word that is not understood by the majority of people. Indeed, al-Qadi al-Iyad mentioned in the end of the book of *Asb-Shifa* a part of that saying,

“Whoever swears by other than Allah in order to exalt a thing disbelieves.” And all that is less than what we are in...

As for the saying of the Shafi’iyyah: The author of *Ar-Rawdah* said, “That the Muslim in his speech was to sacrifice [an animal] for the sake of the Prophet (sallallahu ‘alayhi wa sallam) he would disbelieve.” And he also said, “Whoever doubts the kufr of ibn Arabi’s group disbelieves.” And all this is less than the issue we are in. And ibn Hajar al-Haythami said in *Sharh al-Arba’in* on the hadith of ibn Abbas, “‘When you ask, ask Allah,’ meaning, that if one makes du’a to other than Allah then he is a kafir.” And he wrote a separate book on this matter which is named *Al-I’lam bi-Quwati’ al-Islam* and mentioned many types of words and actions, each of it is mentioned that it takes the person out of the fold of Islam and takfir is declared of the specific individual [due to it]. And most of it does not equal one tenth of what we are in...

From the best of what would remove the misunderstandings and to increase the believer in certainty is what happened with the Prophet,

---

the Sahabah, and the scholars after them, and between those who ascribe themselves to Islam. As it has been mentioned the Prophet (sallallahu ‘alayhi wa sallam) had sent al-Bara, and with him was a sword, to kill the person who married his father’s wife and to take his wealth. In addition to this his intention to fight Banu al-Mustaliq when it was said to him that they resisted the zakah.

Like this the fighting of Abu Bakr and his companions against the people of who resisted zakah, enslaving their women and children, taking their wealth as ghanimah, and labeling them as apostates.

As well the consensus of the Sahabah in the time of ‘Umar upon takfir of Qudamah ibn Madh’un and his companions if they did not repent for what they understood from the saying of His (ta’ala), “On those who believe and do deeds of righteousness there is no blame for what they ate (in the past), when they guard themselves from evil, and believe, and do deeds of righteousness, (or) again, guard themselves from evil and believe, (or) again, guard themselves from evil and do good.

---

For Allah loves those who do good,” that wine is permissible for some specific persons.

As well the consensus of the Sahabah in the time of ‘Uthmān regarding takfir of the masjid which stated a word in agreement to the “prophethood” of Musaylamah [the liar], while they did not follow him. They only differed with regards to the issue of whether or not to accept their repentance.

As well when ‘Ali burned those around him who went to extremes with regards to him.

As well the consensus of the tabi’īn and the Sahabah who remained regards to the kufr of al-Mukhtar ibn Abi ‘Ubayd and those who followed him, even though he was claiming that he was seeking revenge for the blood of al-Husayn and ahlul-bayt.

As well the consensus of the tabi’īn and those who came after them upon the killing of al-J‘ad ibn Dirham, while he was famous for knowledge and din, and so on from the

incidents which cannot be counted nor collected.

No one, from the first to the last, said to Abu Bakr as-Siddiq and other than him, “Why did you kill Banu Hanifah while they said ‘la ilaha illallah,’ did salah, and gave zakah?” Likewise, no one disputed about takfir of Qudamah and his companions if they did not repent, and so on up to the time of Banu ‘Ubayd al-Qaddah who ruled over the Maghrib, Egypt, Sham, and others besides them. Their apparent was that of Islam, and of establishing the Jumu‘ah and the congregation salah, and they appointed judges and muftiyyin, but when they revealed their words and actions, it was not a matter of confusion with anyone from the people of knowledge and din regards to fighting them and no one stopped in that. They appeared in the time of ibnul-Jawzi and al-Muwaffiq, and ibnul-Jawzi wrote a book when Misr was taken from them and named it *The Victory Over Egypt*.

It was not heard, from the first to the last, that anyone denounced this, or that the matter was confusing because they attributed themselves to the Millah, or because their saying ‘la ilaha



illallah,' or because they expressed some things from the pillars of Islam except from what we heard from these accursed people<sup>10</sup> in these times who acknowledge [what many people are upon] is shirk, but whoever does it, or beautifies it, or was with its people, or reproaches tawhid, or fights its people, or hates them for it is not to be considered a kafir because they say 'la ilaha illallah,' or because they come with the five pillars of Islam and takes as a proof that the Prophet (sallallahu 'alayhi wa salam) called it Islam. This was never heard before except from these ignorant heretic dhalimin.<sup>11</sup> Thus if they find any word from the people of knowledge, or one from amongst them, they take it as proof based on their filthy speech, and their stupidity and thus relay it. The matter is as al-Yamani said in his poem:

---

<sup>10</sup> Shaykh Sultan al-'Utaybi said in his footnote, "So ponder, O you who is turning away from takfir of the specific individual, what the Shaykh labeled them as."

<sup>11</sup> Shaykh Sultan al-'Utaybi (rahimahullah) said in his footnote, "The Shaykh mentioned that he did not hear this but from these people, so be aware of that."

---

“Sayings which are not supported by a scholar are not worth a penny” (*Mufid al-Mustafid fi Kufr Tarik at-Tawhid*).

**Shaykh ‘Abdullah and Shaykh Ibrahim, the sons of Shaykh ‘Abdul-Latif and Shaykh Sulayman ibn Sahman (‘alayhim rahmatullah), said:**

As for their saying: “We say that the word is kufr but we do not judge the one who said it with kufr,” making this absolute is pure ignorance, because this phrase does not imply except on the specific individual. The matter of takfir of the specific individual (mu‘ayyan) is a known issue, [that is] if one was to say such a word that is kufr, then it is said whoever says that word is a kafir. However, the speaker would not be judged as a kafir until the hujjah, which is that if a person was to leave it disbelieves, is established upon him, and this is with regards to the hidden matters (al-masail al-khafiyah) which its evidences could be obscure to some people, such as the issue of qadr, irja, and the likes.

Some of the speech from the people of desires include matters of kufr because it includes the

---

rejection of the proofs from the Book and widespread Sunnah. So the saying which includes a rejection of some texts would be kufr, but those are not judged with kufr for the possibility of the existence of a preventing factor like ignorance and a lack of knowledge that it clashes with the text or the proofs. Indeed, the laws are not binding except after it reaches them. Shaykhul-Islam ibn Taymiyyah (may Allah purify his soul) mentioned this in many of his books, and also mentioned takfir upon specific individuals from the people of kalam after affirming these matters. He said, “This, if it (i.e. their kufr) is in the hidden matters, then it may be said that there is no takfir made. As for what occurs from them in the apparent clear matters or what is known from the Din by necessity, then takfir is not suspended.” This word should not be made as a stick that is directed at the neck of the one who makes takfir of a town which resists the tawhid of ‘ibadah and sifat after the hujjah reaches them and the proof becomes apparent” (*‘Aqidah al-Muwahhidin*, p. 227, 526).

---

**As for the issue of “Verily, the hujjah has not been established upon them,” so this is the matter of establishing the hujjah**

The muwahhid needs to be aware what is the exact meaning of establishing the hujjah (qiyam al-hujjah), so as not to confuse the issue.

**So we shall mention what the aimmah of the da’wah said in the matter of establishing the hujjah.<sup>12</sup> Shaykh al-Imam Muhammad ibn ‘Abdil-Wahhab (rahimahullah ta’ala) said:**

Bismillah ar-Rahman ar-Rahim. To the brothers: salam ‘alaykum wa rahmatullahi wa barakatuh. As for what follows:

What you mentioned regarding the statement of the Shaykh (i.e. ibn Taymiyyah), “Everyone who rejects such and such, while the hujjah has been established upon him,” and you are doubtful regarding those tawaghit and their

---

<sup>12</sup> Shaykh Sultan al-‘Utaybi (rahimahullah) said in his footnote, “What is meant by establishing the hujjah is not to prove the description of kufr to the one who is wearing it, but rather to justify the deserving of punishment on the Day of Resurrection.”

followers, has the hujjah been established upon them? This is indeed strange. How can you have doubt about this when I have clarified it for you repeatedly? For indeed, the one upon whom the hujjah has not been established is the one who is new to Islam, the one who was raised in a distant wilderness, or in a matter which its case is obscure, like sarf and ‘atf (types of magic that do not involve shirk). So he does not disbelieve until it is made known to him. And as for the foundations of the Dinn (usul ad-Din) that Allah has clarified and solidified in His Book, then indeed the hujjah of Allah is the Qur’an. So if the Qur’an has reached a person, then the hujjah has reached him.<sup>13</sup> But the source of dispute is that you

---

<sup>13</sup> Shaykh Sultan al-‘Utaybi said in his footnote, “From the manhaj of Shaykh Muhammad ibn ‘Abdil-Wahhab is that he does not excuse in the apparent matters like tawaf, sujud, du’a, dhabh (sacrifice), and ruling with other than the Shari’ah, except if one was new in Islam or the one who grows up in a far away place from Islam. He does not excuse except only in hidden matters, and he does not make takfir upon the one who falls into it until hujjah is established upon him. With this clarification it would become clear to you the misguidance of those who excuse in apparent matters. As for the person who dies upon shirk, even if Islam does not reach him, he is a mushrik, and he is not called a Muslim by consensus. This is his ruling in this world, and the difference of opinion is with regards to punishment on the Day of Judgment. What is correct is that he will not be punished due to His (ta’ala) saying, ‘And never would We punish until We have sent a messenger.’ So Allah does not

---

have not differentiated between establishing the hujjah and understanding the hujjah.<sup>14</sup> Indeed, most of the kuffar and the munafiqin from amongst the Muslimin did not understand the hujjah of Allah though it has been established upon them, as He (ta‘ala) said, “Or do you think that most of them hear or understand? They are only like cattle; nay, they are even more astray from the path.” And the establishment of the hujjah is something, and it reaching [the people] is something, while it has been established upon them. And their understanding it is something else. And their [falling into] disbelief is by it reaching them, even if they do not understand it.

If this has confused you, then look at his (sallallahu ‘alayhi wa sallam) statement about the khawarij, “Wherever you find them, kill

---

punish anyone on the Day of Resurrection until He establishes the hujjah. His ruling in the world is that he is a mushrik, and his ruling in the world is one thing, while his ruling in the hereafter is another. So be aware of this, O seeker of the truth.”

<sup>14</sup> Shaykh Sultan al-‘Utaybi said in his footnote, “And understanding the hujjah is one thing and establishing it is another. Many students of knowledge have erred in this regard because the understanding of Abu Bakr and ‘Umar is not like the understanding of you and I. This difference is bright and clear, so then understanding the hujjah is not a condition [for having it established].”

---

them,” and his statement, “They are the worst killed under the heaven.” And this is despite that they were present in the era of the Sahabah, and a person would look down upon the Sahabah’s acts of worship compared to theirs, and with the consensus of the people that what expelled them from the Din is inflexibility, extremism, and ijtiḥad, yet they believed that they are obeying Allah. The hujjah had reached them but they did not understand it.

And likewise ‘Ali’s killing of the ones who believed in him (i.e. attributed divinity to him), and burning them with the fire, this despite the fact that they were the students of the Sahabah, and despite their worship, their salah, and their fasting, they believed they were upon truth.

And likewise the consensus of the Salaf on the takfir of the extreme Qadariyyah and others, despite their knowledge and their intense worship, and the fact that they believed that they were doing good, but none of the Salaf stopped from pronouncing takfir of them due to the fact that they did not understand. For indeed all of them did not understand. If you

know this, then this which you are upon is kufr. The people are worshipping the tawaghit, and opposing the Din of Islam, and they claim it is not riddah because perhaps they did not understand the hujjah. All of this is obvious. And the most apparent of what has preceded is of those that ‘Ali burned, for it resembles this (*Ad-Durar as-Saniyyah*, 10/93-95).

**Shaykh Ishaq ibn ‘Abdir-Rahman (rahimahullah ta‘ala) said:**

So ponder over the saying of the Shaykh (i.e. Shaykh Muhammad ibn ‘Abdil-Wahhab), and we ask Allah to grant you the correct understanding and cure you from being biased. Ponder over the saying of the Shaykh (rahimahullah) that everyone whom the Qu’ran has reached then the hujjah has been established on him, and if he does not understand that then this is the reason for the mistake, and that he (Shaykh Muhammad) made clarifying in issues that are obscure.

And he whom we quoted made clarifying in asl ad-Din, and is there any clarification after Allah and His messenger? Then he says this is our



and our scholars belief, we seek refuge with Allah from loss after increase. This issue is mentioned many times in the books of the Shaykh as the scholars from the mushrikin of his time used to debate him in the matter of takfir of the specific individual. Then the explanation of the hadith of ‘Amr ibn Abasah, from its beginning to its end, all of it, is in the issue of takfir mu‘ayyan, until he even narrated from Shaykhul-Islam ibn Taymiyyah (rahimahullah) that whoever calls upon ‘Ali disbelieves, and whoever does not make takfir of him disbelieves. So reflect over the Shari’ah proofs he brought which if a just person with a sound intellect, let alone the believer, was to examine them, then the matter would become easy, and only one in whose ‘aqidah something has entered would find it difficult (*Hukm Takfir al-Mu‘ayyan wal-Farq Bayna Qiyam al-Hujjah wa Fahm al-Hujjah*, p. 178).

**And he (rahimahullah) said:**

Then the Shaykh (i.e. Muhammad ibn ‘Abdil-Wahhab rahimahullah ta‘ala) said in that letter after mentioning the multitudes of those who became apostates from Islam after the

---

Prophet (sallallahu ‘alayhi wa sallam), like those in the time of Abu Bakr who were judged with riddah due to their resisting the zakah. And like the companions of ‘Ali, the people of the masjid in Kufah, and Banu ‘Ubayd al-Qaddah, all of which were judged with apostasy specifically. Then he said, “As for the phrase of the Shaykh (i.e. ibn Taymiyyah) which confused you was greater than all of what was mentioned, and if we say what it states, we would declare takfir upon many parties specifically. So he states clearly that the specific individual would not be declared takfir upon until the hujjah is established upon him, so if the hujjah is not established upon him he would not be declared a kafir. From that which is known is that establishing it does not mean that he understands<sup>15</sup> the words of Allah and His Messenger like the understanding of Abu Bakr (radiyallahu ‘anhu). Rather, when the words of Allah and His Messenger reach him,

---

<sup>15</sup> Shaykh Sultan al-‘Utaybi (rahimahullah) said in his footnote, “What is meant from understanding the words of Allah here means that the slave understands what Allah wants from the proof, and gather what was intended by the proof. Its meaning is not that one understand the meanings of the words... Allah said, ‘And We sent not a Messenger except with the language of his people, in order that he might make (the Message) clear for them.’”

and he is free from having an excuse (like being deaf or in need of a translator), then he is a kafir, as upon all the kuffar the hujjah is established with the Qur'an. Allah said, 'And We have set veils on their hearts, so they understand it not...'" (*Hukm Takfir al-Mu'ayyan wal-Farq Bayna Qiyam al-Hujjah wa Fahm al-Hujjah*, p. 173).

**And he (rahimahullah) said:**

And this is our issue: the worship of Allah alone with no partner, and bara from the worship everything besides Him. Whoever worships with Allah other than Him has indeed committed major shirk which removes one from the Millah, and this is the foundation of the usul. With it Allah sent the messengers and sent down the Books, and the hujjah has been established upon the people by the Messenger and the Qur'an.

This is how you would find the aimmah of the Din replying in regards to the fundamental principle of takfir of whoever commits shirk with Allah. Indeed, he is sought to repent, or else he is killed. They did not mention that a

clarification is needed in with the matters of the fundamentals of the Din. But they do mention a clarification in hidden matters which, at times, its proof remains obscure to some of the Muslimin, matters which some of the innovative groups such as the Qadariyyah and Murjiah debated on, or like a hidden matter of sarf and ‘atf. How would one clarify the issue to the worshipers of the graves when they are not Muslimun nor do they enter into the name of Islam, and does any action remain with shirk? Allah (ta‘ala) says, “And they will not enter Paradise until the camel goes through the eye of the needle,” to other than that from the ayat.

This belief necessitates something rotten, and that is that the hujjah has not been established on this ummah by the Messenger and the Qur’an, we seek refuge with Allah from this corrupt understanding which made them forget the Book and the Messenger (*Hukm Takfir al-Mu‘ayyan wal-Farq Bayna Qiyam al-Hujjah wa Fahm al-Hujjah*, p. 171).

**Shaykh Sulayman ibn Sahman said:**

---

Our Shaykh, Shaykh ‘Abdul-Latif (rahimahullah) said, “The difference between the establishment of the hujjah and understanding the hujjah must be known. As whoever has been reached by the da’wah of the messengers, then the hujjah has been established upon him, if he was in a state in which knowledge was possible. And it is not a condition in the establishment of the hujjah that he understands what is understood from Allah and His messenger by the people of iman, acceptance, and following of what the Messenger came with. So understand this, as it will remove from you many misunderstandings regarding the issue of establishing the hujjah. Allah (ta‘ala) said, ‘Or do you think that most of them hear or understand? They are only like cattle; nay, they are even farther astray from the path,’ and He (ta‘ala) said, ‘Allah has set a seal on their hearts and on their hearings, and on their eyes there is a covering’” (End of the quote).

I (Sulayman) say: the meaning of his (rahimahullah ta‘ala) statement “if he was in a state in which knowledge was possible,” then what is meant by it is that he is not lacking a

---

sound mind and the ability to differentiate, like the child and the insane one. Or that he is from those who do not understand what is being addressed to him, and there is no translator present to translate for him, and the likes of these. So whoever has had the Message of Muhammad (sallallahu ‘alayhi wa sallam) and the Qur’an reach him, then the hujjah has been established upon him (*Kashf ash-Shubhatayn*, p. 91).

**The Mashayikh ‘Abdullah and Ibrahim, the sons of Shaykh ‘Abdul-Latif and Sulayman ibn Sahman said:**

As for his (i.e. one of those who argue on the behalf of the mushrikin) statement that those people did not understand the hujjah, then this indicates his ignorance. He did not differentiate between understanding the hujjah and the reaching of the hujjah, so understanding it is a thing and reaching it is another thing. Verily, the hujjah is established even upon the one who does not understand it (*Ad-Durar as-Saniyyah*, 10/433).

**Shaykh Muhammad ibn Nasir ibn Mu’ammam said:**

---

So everyone whom the Qur'an has reached, then he is not excused. For verily, the major fundamentals which are the asl of the Din al-Islam, Allah has explained and made it clear thereby establishing the hujjah upon His slaves. And the intended meaning of establishing the hujjah is not that man understands it with a clear understanding like the person whom Allah has guided, given success, and complies with His orders. Indeed, the hujjah of Allah is established upon the kuffar with His informing that He has placed veils upon their hearts so they understand not, so He said, "But We have set veils on their hearts, so they understand it not, and deafness in their ears."

The ayat with this meaning are many in which He (subhanahu) informs that they did not understand the Qur'an, neither did they comprehend, and that He has put veils on their hearts and barriers on their hearings, and that He has sealed their hearts, hearing, and sight. But He did not excuse them with all this, rather He judged them with kufr (*An-Nubdhah as-Sharifah an-Nafisah fi ar-Radd 'ala al-Quburiyyin*).

---

**Shaykh ‘Abdullah Aba Butayn said commenting on the words of ibn Taymiyyah in his refutation against the one who claims that Shaykhul-Islam ibn Taymiyyah and ibnul-Qayyim said that the one who does these actions (i.e. shirk) cannot be termed as a kafir mushrik absolutely until the hujjah is established on him, so he said:**

He (i.e. ibn Taymiyyah) did not say whoever does something from these shirki matters it cannot be absolutely applied that he is kafir mushrik until the Islamic hujjah is established him. He did not state this regarding major shirk and the worship of other than Allah and its likes from major kufr. Rather, he mentioned this is applicable in the hidden matters, as we have previously presented his saying, “And this is when it is in the hidden matters, so it can be said the hujjah has not been established upon him, by which its person becomes a kafir.”

So he did not negate his kufr but mentioned “it can be said.” And he said, “And this may occur in some of their groups, which are issues known to the general public and specifically, even the Jews and Christians knows that Muhammad was sent with it and to declare



takfir of those who differ in regards to the worship of Allah alone with no partner with Him and his forbidding the worship of any other besides Him, for verily these are the most apparent and clear symbols of Islam” (*Majmu’ ar-Rasail wal-Masail an-Najdiyyah*, v. 4, p. 474-475).

Shaykhul-Islam ibn Taymiyyah (rahimahullah) said, “Everyone whom the Qur’an reaches from a human or Jinn, then verily the Messenger has warned him by it” (*Majmu’ al-Fatawa*, 16/149).

**And he (rahimahullah) said:**

He (ta‘ala) said, “Do they not then think deeply over the Qur’an, or are their hearts locked up?” and He (ta‘ala) said, “Have they not pondered over the Word, or has there come to them what had not come to their fathers of old?” and He (ta‘ala) said, “Do they not consider the Qur’an carefully? Had it been from other than Allah, they would surely have found therein many contradictions.” So when He incited the kuffar and the munafiqin to ponder over it, it is known that its meaning is what the kuffar and

---

the munafiqin have the ability to understand and know” (*Majmu’ al-Fatawa*, 5/158).

**And he (rahimahullah) said:**

So His (subhanahu) ayat obligates two things:

One of them: to understand it and ponder over it, so to know what it consists of.

And secondly: His worship and complying to it when heard. So its recitation and its hearing of it obligates this and that. If a person hears it but doesn’t understand it, he is criticized. And if he understands it, yet doesn’t act upon it, he is criticized. Rather, it is obligatory for everyone when he hears it to understand it and act on it. It is obligatory for everyone to listen to it with keenness, so the one who turns away from keenly hearing it, is a kafir. And the one who doesn’t understand what is commanded within it is a kafir. And the one who knows what is commanded within but does not acknowledge its obligation and act according to it is a kafir. So He (subhanahu)

---

criticizes the kuffar by this and that (*Majmu' al-Fatawa*, 23/147).

**And ibnul-Qayyim (rahimahullah ta'ala) says in commenting upon His (ta'ala) saying, "They will further say: 'Had we but listened or used our intelligence, we would not be among the companions of the blazing Fire'":**

So the hearing which is negated from them is the hearing of understanding and comprehension, and His (ta'ala) saying, "If Allah had found in them any good, He would indeed have made them to listen," meaning, He would make them understand, and hearing here is the hearing of understanding. Verily, they heard the call, and with it the hujjah of Allah is established on them" (*Miftah Dar as-Sa'adah*, 1/81-105).

**Shaykh Ishaq ibn 'Abdir-Rahman (rahimahullah) said:**

The people of the fatrah whom the Message and the Qur'an did not reach and died upon jahiliyyah, they are not labeled as Muslimin by consensus, and forgiveness is not sought for them, and what the people of knowledge

differed about was regards to their punishment in the Hereafter (*Hukm Takfir al-Mu'ayyan wal-Farq Bayna Qiyam al-Hujjah wa Fahm al-Hujjah*, p. 171).

**And he (rahimahullah) said:**

Allah judges between His slaves with His justice and His wisdom on the Day of Judgment, and He does not punish anyone except upon whom His hujjah was established by the messengers... As for the question was the hujjah established on Zayd or 'Amr specifically? Then that is not possible for us to enter into which is an issue between Allah and His slaves.

Rather, what is obligatory over the slave is to believe that whoever follows a way other than the Din of Islam is a kafir, and that Allah (ta'ala) will not punish anyone until after He establishes the hujjah upon him by the Messenger. This is in general, and what is specific is left to the knowledge of Allah and His judgment, and is the issue of reward and punishment. As for the rulings of the world, then it is based on what is apparent (*Hukm*

---

*Takfir al-Mu'ayyan wal-Farq Bayna Qiyam al-Hujjah wa Fahm al-Hujjah*, p. 184).

**Shaykh Husayn and Shaykh ‘Abdullah, the sons of Muhammad ibn ‘Abdil-Wahhab (may Allah have mercy on them all) said:**

Whoever dies from the people of shirk before this message reaches, then that which is judged upon him is if it was known that he was committing shirk and took that as a din and dies upon it, then what is apparent is that he died upon kufr. He is not made du'a for him, sacrificed on his behalf, or charity be given in his name. As for the reality of his matter then that is left to Allah (ta'ala). If the hujjah was established upon him in his life and he arrogantly opposed it then he is a kafir in the apparent and then hidden. And if the hujjah was not been established upon him, then his matter is left to Allah (ta'ala) (*Ad-Durar as-Saniyyah*, 10/142).

**Shaykh Ishaq ibn ‘Abdir-Rahman said:**

As for the sayings of Shaykh ‘Abdul-Latif ibn ‘Abdir-Rahman (rahimahullah ta'ala) in these

issues are many, so we will just mention a very little part of it, because the matter is easy... So we will mention from his words what makes you vigilant against the doubt by which whom I mentioned took as proof in regards to the one who worships the dome of al-Kawaz, and that the Shaykh stopped in making takfir of him.

We first should mention the reason why this was brought up, and that is because Shaykh Muhammad (rahimahullah), and the one who narrated this story from him, mentions that he excused him because of what he said in reply to the one who was arguing with him and accusing him of making takfir of the Muslimin... And the one whose insight has been opened by Allah and is cured from blind bias would see he has taken well care in explaining this matter, and he firmly established the kufr of the specific individual in all of his writings and he doesn't refrain from it (*Hukm Takfir al-Mu'ayyan wal-Farq Bayna Qiyam al-Hujjah wa Fahm al-Hujjah*, p. 179).

**And he (rahimahullah) said:**

---

Shaykh Sulayman ibn ‘Abdillah (rahimahullah ta‘ala) mentioned in the explanation of [Kitab] at-Tawhid in many places that whoever says the kalimah of tawhid, does salah, and gives zakah but goes against it with his actions and sayings, like praying to the righteous and asking help from them or sacrificing for their sake, that he is similar to the Jews and Christians in their saying the kalimah of tawhid and going against it. Based upon this it becomes necessary upon the one who says that the mushrikin should be explained to [before making takfir] that he say that it is necessary that the Jews and Christians are explained to, and that they are not declared as kuffar until that (*Hukm Takfir al-Mu‘ayyan wal-Farq Bayna Qiyam al-Hujjah wa Fahm al-Hujjah*, p. 178).

## As for “Verily, they are ignorant,” then this is the issue of being excused due to ignorance<sup>16</sup>

So we shall mention what the aimmah of the da’wah an-Najdiyyah (rahimahumullah ta’ala) said in this matter. Shaykh Ishaq ibn ‘Abdir-Rahman (rahimahumullah ta’ala) said:

Ibnul-Qayyim (rahimahullah ta’ala) said in the book of *Tabaqat al-Mukallafin* after mentioning that the heads of the kuffar who prevented people from the path of Allah that their torment would be doubled, then he said, “The

---

<sup>16</sup> Shaykh Sultan al-‘Utaybi said in his footnote, “Attention: whosoever falls into kufr or shirk is a kafir and a mushrik, this is his ruling in the world. As for the akhirah then there is a disagreement, and what is correct is that Allah (‘azza wa jall) will not punish anyone until He establishes the hujjah upon him, due to His (ta’ala) saying, “And never would We punish until We send a messenger.” So whoever is raised in a far away place where Islam is not heard of or if he was new in Islam and he falls into kufr, then his ruling in the world is that he is a kafir but not punished on the Day of Judgment, because the hujjah has not been established upon him. So his ruling in this world is a thing and in the hereafter it is another thing. This is so except in the hidden matters, such a person is not declared as a kafir until he is explained to. This is the general manhaj of ibn Taymiyyah, ibnul-Qayyim, Muhammad ibn ‘Abdil-Wahhab, and the aimmah of the da’wah, and their sayings will come soon (rahimahumallah ta’ala).”



---

seventeenth category: the category of the blind followers, the ignorant disbelievers, and their donkeys (laymen) who are their followers, they say ‘We found our fathers to be upon a way and we take that as an example,’ and with this they are peaceful to the people of Islam and not waging war against them... With regards to this this category it is agreed upon that they are kuffar even if they are ignorant blind followers to their heads<sup>17</sup> and their leaders, except for what is narrated from some people of innovation that these people are not judged with fire, and they made their category equal to the people to whom the da’wah did not reach. This mathhab was not spoken by anyone from the aimmah of the Muslimin, nor from the Sahabah, nor the tabi’in, nor the people who came after them. This is known only from some of the people of kalam who innovated in

---

<sup>17</sup> Shaykh Sultan al-Utaybi said in his footnote, “So ponder over the words of ibnul-Qayyim, he did not excuse the ignorants, and he declared takfir of them. Note that even the blind followers to their heads or scholars enter into this if they obey them in kufr. So beware, O brother of tawhid, and ask Allah and beseech Him in search of the truth. Beware of blind following, and make your manhaj to be the Qur’an and Sunnah. Beware, beware from misguidance, and we ask Allah to make us and you firm upon the straight path.”

Islam” (*Hukm Takfir al-Mu‘ayyan wal-Farq Bayna Qiyam al-Hujjah wa Fahm al-Hujjah*, p. 183).

**Shaykh ‘Abdur-Rahman ibn Hasan (rahimahullah ta‘ala) said:**

‘Allamah ibnul-Qayyim (rahimahullah ta‘ala) said in categories of people, from this ummah and others besides it: “The seventeenth category: the category of the blind followers... And verily Allah informed in the Qur’an in more than one place about the punishment of the blind followers from those before them of the kuffar and that they would debate in the Fire, ‘Our Lord! These misled us, so give them a double torment of the Fire.’ He will say: ‘For each one there is double (torment), but you know not.’” (This ends the summarized quote.)

And this is the view of Shaykhul-Islam which is in agreement to what we have previously mentioned from him in this answer in which he said, “The most well known people of riddah, and those who opposed Abu Bakr (radiyallahu ‘anhu) and his followers, are those like Musaylamah the liar and his followers, and others besides them, and also from the most

apparent of people in apostasy, are like al-Ghaliyyah whom ‘Ali burned with fire when they attributed ilahiyyah to him, and the followers of ibn Sab’a, who started the cursing of Abu Bakr and ‘Umar. And the first one to claim ‘prophethood’ from those who attribute themselves to Islam was al-Mukhtar ibn Abi ‘Ubayd, and he was from the Shi’ah.<sup>18</sup> It is known that amongst people, the majority who become apostates are from the Shi’ah, more so than what is found in other sects. Due to that, it is not known of a more severe apostasy than what occurred from the Ghaliyyah, like the Nusayriyyah, the Isma’iliyyah al-Batiniyyah, and their likes.”

And from what is known is that most of those people thought they were upon the truth, yet

---

<sup>18</sup> Shaykh Sultan al- ‘Utaybi (rahimahullah) said in his footnote, “The Shi’ah are the Rafidah, and they are disbelievers in Allah. From their beliefs is that they slander ‘Aishah (radiyallahu ‘anha) with fornication, and Allah cleared her and has informed of her innocence in the Qur’an. And they say that Qur’an is incomplete. Ibn ‘Abbas said, “Whoever disbelieves in one letter of the Qur’an has disbelieved in the whole Qur’an.” And they curse Abu Bakr and ‘Umar and from them are those who made ‘Ali an ilah. The correct opinion is that they are kuffar, they and their ignorant laymen. If one wants to investigate more about the Rāfidah then look at the short book *Min Aqaid ash-Shi’ah*.”

---

Shaykhul-Islam still ruled them with a severe apostasy (*Ad-Durar as-Saniyyah*, 11/479-482).

**Shaykhul-Islam ibn Taymiyyah (rahimahullah ta‘ala) said:**

The word “ad-dalal (misguidance)” when used generally includes whoever goes astray from the guidance, be it intentionally or due to ignorance, it necessitates that he will be punished, as in His saying, “Verily, they found their fathers on the wrong path; So they (too) made hastened in their footsteps.” And in His saying, “And they will say: ‘Our Lord! Verily, we obeyed our chiefs and our great ones, and they misled us from the way. Our Lord, give them double torment and curse them with a mighty curse” (*Majmu’ al-Fatawa*, 7/166).

**And he (rahimahullah) said:**

And what is intended here is that amongst those who acknowledge His general message apparently believes internally what negates that, so he becomes a hypocrite. He claims about himself and others like him that they are friends of Allah with their kufr internally in

---

what the Messenger (sallallahu ‘alayhi wa sallam) came with, either due to arrogance or ignorance” (*Majmu’ al-Fatawa*, 11/168-169).

And he (rahimahullah) also said, “The misguidance of the sons of Adam from their rejection and denial without knowledge is more so than their misguidance of what they had established and believed in” (*Majmu’ al-Fatawa*, 17/336).

And he (rahimahullah) also said, “Generally, whoever says or does kufr disbelieves, even if he did not intend to become a kafir, as none intends to disbelieve except what Allah willed” (*As-Sarim al-Maslul*, p. 178).

And he (rahimahullah) said, “And one may be tested by a place and time of ignorance where many people commit major shirk while they do not know” (*Majmu’ al-Fatawa*, 22/387).

**Ibnul-Qayyim (rahimahullah) said:**

If it is said, “What made the worshipers of the grave fall into that fitnah, with their knowledge that its residents are dead, who neither have the power to harm or benefit them, nor any power over death, life, nor resurrection?” Then it is said that the matters that eventually made

them fall into it vary, and from them is ignorance of the true nature of which Allah sent the His messenger with, rather, all of the messengers from fulfilling tawhid and cutting off all means of shirk. Their share in that is very little, so the Shaytan called them for this fitnah, and they did not have with them the knowledge that rejects that call, and they accepted it according and based upon their ignorance and were only saved from going further according to the amount of knowledge they had (*Ighathah al-Lafhan*, 1/332).

**Shaykh ‘Abdullah ibn ‘Abdir-Rahman Aba Butayn (rahimahullah) said:**

And what has preceded from the statements of Shaykhul-Islam Muhammad ibn ‘Abdil-Wahhab (rahimahullah) is a consensus of the Muslimin that whoever places between himself and Allah an intercessor and relies upon that intercessor and asks from them to bring benefit or avert harm, then he is a kafir mushrik, including the ignorant one and others besides him. Because from that which is known is when a person acknowledges the message of Muhammad (sallallahu ‘alayhi wa

sallam), believes in the Qur'an, and hears Allah (subhanahu) mention in His Book the severity of shirk, in that He will not forgive it and its doer will remain in the Fire, then he goes and performs it while he knows it is shirk; this is not done by any sane person. This only occurs from those who are ignorant that it is shirk (*Majmu' ar-Rasail wal-Masail an-Najdiyyah*, vol. 4, p. 477).

**Shaykh Muhammad ibn 'Abdil-Wahhab (rahimahullah ta'ala) said:**

So when you have known that a man can become a kafir due to a word that leaves his tongue, and he could say it while he is ignorant, yet he is not excused due to ignorance. He might say it thinking that it draws him closer to Allah (ta'ala) just as the mushrikin thought. More specifically, what will make you understand this is the story Allah mentioned about the people of Musa who, even with their righteousness and knowledge, said, "Make for us an object of worship just as they have objects of worship." So now your fear and

---

eagerness will increase in order to avert this and anything similar to it (*Kashf ash-Shububat*).

He (rahimahullah) mentioned some nullifiers of Islam and that the ruling is equal whether done intentionally, out of jest, or fear except the one who was forced. He did not make any other type the exception such as the ignorant, or the one who had a tawil, or was mistaken.

He (rahimahullah) said at the end of the nawaqid, “There is no difference in all these nullifiers between the one who did them in jest, or intentionally, or in fear,<sup>19</sup> except for the one who was forced” (*Nawaqid al-Islam*).

**Shaykh ‘Abdullah ibn ‘Abdir-Rahman Aba Butayn said:**

We say: whoever does that today by the graves is a mushrik kafir without doubt, based upon the evidences in the Book, Sunnah, and consensus. We know that whoever was to perform that from those who affiliate themselves to Islam, then the only thing that led them fall into it was ignorance. If they knew that it distances them from Allah greatly,

---

<sup>19</sup> Shaykh Sultan al-Utaybi said in his footnote, “If he fears the demise of his kingdom, or status, or position, then he is not excused. Rather, he is a kafir, and we seek refuge with Allah, with the condition that he fell into kufr.”



and that it is the shirk which Allah prohibited, then they would not have done it. The scholars nevertheless made takfir of them and did not excuse them due to their ignorance as some of the misguided claim and say that “these people are excused due to ignorance.” And that is speaking about Allah without knowledge (*Ad-Durar as-Saniyyah*, 10/404-405).

**Shaykh Sulayman ibn Sahman (rahimahullah) said:**

There is no excuse for not having iman in Allah, His angels, His Books, His messengers, and the Last Day, there is no excuse after that for ignorance. Indeed, Allah (subhanahu) mentions the ignorance of many kuffar and still clearly states their kufr. He described the Christians as being ignorant, yet a Muslim will not doubt their kufr... Indeed, most of the Jews and Christians today are ignorant blind followers, and we believe in their kufr, and we believe in the kufr of the one who doubts in their kufr. And the Qur'an has indicated the kufr of whoever doubts in usul ad-Din... There is no excuse for whoever's situation is like that due to failing to understand the proofs and evidences of Allah because after it (i.e. the

proofs and evidences) reaches him there is no excuse, even if he failed to understand them (*Kashf Shubhatayn*, p. 92).

**Shaykh ‘Abdullah ibn ‘Abdir-Rahman Aba Butayn (rahimahullah) said:**

And what clarifies that ignorance is not an excuse is his (sallallahu ‘alayhi wa sallam) speech regarding the Khawarij, and what he mentioned of their great acts of worship. From that which is known is that they only did what they did due to their ignorance. So was ignorance an excuse for them? What further makes what we mentioned clear is that the scholars in every mathhab mention in the books of fiqh “Chapter: Ruling on the Apostate,” and he is the Muslim who becomes a kafir after his Islam.

The first thing they start with from the types of kufr is shirk. So they say, “Whoever commits shirk with Allah disbelieves,” because shirk according to the scholars is the severest forms of kufr. They did not say that except if he was ignorant, like they mention about issues less than that. Indeed, the Prophet (sallallahu

‘alayhi wa sallam) said when he was asked, “What is the greatest sin in the sight of Allah?” He said, “That he set up a rival with Him while it is He who created you.” So if the ignorant or blind follower was not to be ruled upon with apostasy when he commits shirk, then they would not have ignored mentioning that. This is apparent.

Indeed, Allah (subhanahu) describes the people of the Fire with ignorance, like<sup>20</sup> His (ta‘ala) saying, “And they will say: ‘Had we but listened or used our intelligence, we would not have been among the dwellers of the blazing Fire.’” And He said, “And surely, We have created many of the jinns and mankind for Hell. They have hearts wherewith they understand not, they have eyes wherewith they see not, and they have ears wherewith they hear not. They are like cattle, nay even more astray; those, they are the heedless ones.” And He said, “Say: ‘Shall We tell you the greatest losers in respect of (their) deeds? Those whose efforts have been wasted in this life while they thought that

---

<sup>20</sup> Shaykh Sultan al-‘Utaybi said in his footnote, “These are the proofs that there is no excuse of ignorance in the clear and apparent matters (al-masail ath-thahirah).”

they were acquiring good by their deeds.” And He (ta‘ala) said, “A group He has guided, and a group deserved to be in error; [because] they took the devils as awliya instead of Allah, and consider that they are guided.” Ibn Jarir said in the tafsir of this ayah that this proves that the ignorant one is not excused.<sup>21</sup>

Also, from that which is known is that the people of bida’ who the Salaf and the scholars after them declared their kufr, that there were amongst them people of knowledge, worship, and zuhd, and it was only ignorance that led them to fall into that which they committed. Those people who ‘Ali ibn Abi Talib burnt with fire, was their problem anything but ignorance? If a man was to say, “I doubt the resurrection after death,” no one with even the least bit of knowledge would refrain from declaring his kufr, and the one who doubts is ignorant. He (ta‘ala) said, “And when it was said: ‘Verily, the promise of Allah is the truth, and there is no doubt about the coming of the

---

<sup>21</sup> Shaykh Sultan al-‘Utaybi said in his footnote, “Hafidh ibn Kathir (rahimahullah) narrated from Imam at-Tabari his saying about this ayah and affirmed it. Imam al-Baghawi said with regards to it, ‘And in this there is proof that the kafir who thinks he is upon the truth and the one who arrogantly denies are equal.’”

Hour,' you said: 'We know not what is the Hour, we do not think it but as a conjecture, and we have no firm convincing belief (therein).'"

Allah (ta'ala) said about the Christians, "They (Jews and Christians) took their rabbis and their monks to be their lords besides Allah, and [they also took as a lord] the Messiah, son of Maryam." 'Adi ibn Hatim said to the Prophet (sallallahu 'alayhi wa sallam), "We did not worship them." He (sallallahu 'alayhi wa sallam) said, "Do they not make permissible what Allah forbade, thus you saw it lawful, and did they not make what Allah made as lawful to be unlawful, thus you made it unlawful?" He said "Yes." He said, "That is your worship of them."

Thus Allah rebuked them and labeled them as mushrikin, while they did not know that their action with those people was considered a worship of them, so He did not excuse them with ignorance.

If a person was to say about the Rafidah in this era that they are excused for their cursing Abu

Bakr, ‘Umar, and ‘Aishah due to their ignorance, then everyone would reject that. And it has preceded from the words of Shaykhul-Islam a consensus of the Muslimin that whoever places between himself and Allah an intercessor and relies upon that intercessor and asks from them to bring benefit or avert harm, then he is a kafir mushrik, including the ignorant one and others besides him...

The Qur’an refutes the one who said that the blind follower in shirk is excused. Verily, he has lied upon Allah. Indeed, Allah (ta‘ala) said about the blind followers that they are from the people of the Fire. “And they will say: ‘Our Lord! Verily, we obeyed our chiefs and our great ones, and they misled us from the way.’” And He (ta‘ala) said narrating from the kuffar their saying, “We found our fathers following a certain way, and we guide ourselves by their footsteps.” And in another ayah, “We found our fathers following a certain way, and we will indeed follow their footsteps.”

So the scholars took the evidence from this and those like it, that it is not permissible to blind follow in Tawhid and usul ad-Din. And

that it is obligatory upon every one who is morally obligated to know tawhid and usul ad-Din with its proof, because these fundamentals are apparent, thanks to Allah, and not just known by the scholars (*Ad-Durar as-Saniyyah*, 10/194-391).

**And he (rahimahullah) said:**

What is astonishing is that when some people hear one speaking about the meaning of this kalimah (i.e. shahadah la ilaha illallah) and its negation and affirmation, they criticise that and say “We are not burdened with people and to speak about them.”<sup>22</sup>

So it is said as a reply to him that you are obliged to know the tawhid which Allah created the jinn and men for, and which He sent all the messengers to call towards, and to know its opposite which is shirk and which is not forgiven nor is one who is morally obligated excused due to ignorance with regards to it, and it is not permissible to blind follow in this matter because it is the

---

<sup>22</sup> Shaykh Sultan al- ‘Utaybi (rahimahullah) said in his footnote, “So how about the one who says “I am afraid of speaking about the people?”

foundation of the usul. One who does not know the good nor denies evil is doomed, and the greatest good is tawhid and biggest evil is shirk (*Al-Intisar li Hizb Allah al-Muwahhidin*, p. 16).

**Shaykh ‘Abdur-Rahman ibn Hasan (rahimahullah) said:**

It is said that every kafir has made a mistake, and that the mushrikin have tawil that they believe their shirk with the righteous, and raising their status up will benefit them or prevent harm from them. They were not excused due to this mistake nor with that tawil, rather Allah (ta‘ala) said, “And those who take awliya (protectors and helpers) besides Him [say]: ‘We worship them only that they may bring us near to Allah.’ Verily, Allah will judge between them concerning that wherein they differ. Truly, Allah guides not him who is a liar, and a disbeliever.”

The scholars (rahimahullah ta‘ala) walked upon the straight methodology; they mentioned in the chapter on the ruling of the murtadd, and not one of them said that if one does or says kufr while he does not know that nullifies the



---

shahadatayn that he does not become a kafir due to his ignorance. Indeed, Allah has made it clear in His Book that some of the mushrikin were ignorant blind followers and that did not prevent them from the punishment of Allah, as He (ta‘ala) said, “And among mankind is he who disputes concerning Allah, without knowledge, and follows every rebellious shaytan,” to His saying, “... and will drive him to the torment of the Fire” (*Ad-Durar as-Saniyyah*, 11/478-479).

**Shaykh Sulayman ibn Sahman (rahimahullah) said:**

Indeed, the major shirk from the worship of others besides Allah, directing it those whom shirk is committed with Allah from the prophets, awliya, and the righteous, then no one is excused for ignorance in this regard. Rather, it is from the necessities of Islam that one knows this and believes in it, and it is obligatory on each and every Muslim to have enmity towards the people of shirk, to hate them, to point out their faults, and to openly criticise them. The benefit in severely rejecting

---

it is greater than the corruption of leaving it in every way (*Kashf Shubhatayn*, p. 63-64).

**Shaykh ‘Abdullah ibn ‘Abdir-Rahman Abu Butayn** explaining the difference between Ahlus-Sunnah and the Mu’tazilah in the validity of the iman of the blind follower said:

It is obligatory upon everyone to know tawhid and the pillars of Islam with proof, and blind following is not permissible in that. However, the layman who does not know the proofs, when he believes in the oneness of the Lord (subhanahu), and in the Message of Muhammad (sallallahu ‘alayhi wa sallam), and believes in the resurrection after death, Jannah and the Fire, and that the shirk which is committed by the graves and elsewhere are invalid and misguidance; when he believes in all that firmly with no doubts then he is a Muslim even if he does not know the proof. Because the general body of the Muslimin, even if they are given the evidences, they would not understand it fully (*Ad-Durar as-Saniyyah*, 10/409).

---

**Shaykh Ishaq ibn ‘Abdir-Rahman (rahimahullah) said:**

It is necessary to mention here details so a confusion might go away. That is, the difference between a blind follower who has the capability to gain knowledge and know the truth but turns away from it, and the blind follower who does not have that capability. These two types are both found in reality. Thus the one who is capable and turns away is a wrongdoer and left that which is obligatory upon him; there is no excuse for him in front of Allah. As for the person who is incapable of asking and seeking knowledge, unable to know anything in any way, shape, or form; then two types come about:

One of them: who wants guidance, moved by it, and who loves it but is not capable of seeking it due to the absence of one to guide him, so the ruling upon this one is the same ruling of the people of fatrah (the gap between two messengers) and those to whom da’wah has not reached. The second one: a person who turns away and it does not cross his mind of any other way except what he is upon. The first one says, “O my Lord, if I know a way

---

which is better than what I am upon, I would surely adopt it and leave what I am upon, but I don't know anything other than what I am upon, and I am not able to know anything other than that, this is the utmost level of my striving and the end of my knowledge.” The second: is satisfied with what he is upon and nothing affects him and his soul doesn't desire anything other than that, so there is difference with him with regards to capability or not. Both of them are incapable, and the latter does not love and want to search for the truth like the first, and this is the difference between them both.

The first one is like the one who seeks the Din in the era of the fatrah but was not able to achieve it... And the second is like the one who did not search for it and died upon his shirk... So this is the difference between the incapability of the one who searches and the one who turns away (*Hukm Takfir al-Mu'ayyan wal-Farq Bayna Qiyam al-Hujjah wa Fahm al-Hujjah*, p.184).

---

**The lack of an excuse for the people of the fatrah who did have the hujjah or evidences is proof that those who have the Qur'an and Sunnah present are not excused**

**Shaykh ‘Abdul-Latif ibn ‘Abdir-Rahman (rahimahumallah ta‘ala) said:**

For that reason he judged the specific individuals from the ignorant, illiterate Arab mushrikin because of how clear and apparent the proofs and evidences are, as in the agreed upon hadith, “Whoever you pass from the grave of a Dawsī or Qurayshī, then tell it, ‘Verily, Muhammad gives you the tidings of the Fire.’”

This while they were people of the fatrah, so how about the one who grew up in this ummah, hears the ayat of the Qur’an, the ahadith of prophethood, and the rulings of fiqh in calling towards tawhid and the command for it, and the prohibition of shirk and warning from it? If he is one who recites

the Qur'an then the issue is even greater. And especially if he is making permissible shirk and calling towards the worship of the righteous and awliya, believing it to be recommended and that the Qur'an is a proof for that. This kufr of his is clearer than the sun at midday, and no one who knows Islam, its rulings, principles, and meaning would stop in takfir of him<sup>23</sup> (*Minhaj at-Ta'sis wat-Taqdis*, p. 102).

**Shaykh 'Abdur-Rahman ibn Hasan (rahimahullah) said:**

There is no doubt that Allah (ta'ala) did not excuse the people of ignorance who did not have a book with them informing them of this major shirk, as in the hadith of 'Iyad ibn Himar from the Prophet (sallallahu 'alayhi wa sallam) that he said, "Indeed, Allah looked at the people of the earth, and was displeased with both the Arabs and non-Arabs, except for a few people from the people of the Book." So how can an ummah be excused with the Book

---

<sup>23</sup> Shaykh Sultan al-'Utaybi (rahimahullah) said in his footnote, "Reflect over this and realize the ignorance of the one who excuses the grave worshipers in Egypt and Sudan. We seek refuge with Allah from misguidance."

of Allah between their hands, reading it, and listening to it, while it is the hujjah of Allah against His slaves as in His (ta‘ala) saying, “This is a message for mankind, in order that they may be warned thereby, and that they may know that He is the only one Ilah, and that men of understanding may take heed” (*Ad-Durar as-Saniyyah*, 11/466).

## **What is most commonly found with every mushrik is a doubt which led him into kufr**

**Shaykh ‘Abdul-Latif ibn ‘Abdir-Rahman (rahimahumallah) said:**

What is most commonly found with every mushrik is a doubt which led him into kufr and shirk.<sup>24</sup> He (ta‘ala) said, “If Allah had willed, we would not have taken partners (in worship) with Him, nor would our fathers...” And He said, “If Allah had so willed, neither we nor our fathers would have worshiped others besides Him.” They presented the doubt of qadr, and

---

<sup>24</sup> Shaykh Sultan al-‘Utaybi said in his footnote, “Not everyone who comes to us with a doubt is excused.”

---

they rejected His command, His Din, and His legislation with His universal will.

The Christians also present their doubt in the matter of prophethood and the trinity due to the Messiah being created without a father, but instead by a word. So the matter became confusing to them, and they were known among other nations for their lack of understanding in matters of Din. They thought the word taught the people and that the Messiah was the word, and they did not differentiate between the creation and the command. And they do not know that the creation is by the word, and that he is not himself the word.

Indeed, Allah pointed out their doubt and absolutely refuted it in many places in His Book, as in His (ta'ala) saying, "Verily, the likeness of Jesus in the sight of Allah is the like the likeness of Adam." And His saying "And His word, ("Be!" - and he was) which He bestowed on Maryam." And most of the enemies of the messengers presented to them



---

doubts and misconceptions (*Minhaj at-Ta'asis  
mat-Taqdis*, p. 102-103).

**Excusing major shirk due to a mistake necessitates not making takfir of many groups from the kuffar and zanadiqah that the ummah has consensus upon regarding their kufr and the kufr of the one who doubts their kufr**

**Shaykh 'Abdul-Latif ibn 'Abdir-Rahman (rahimahumallah ta'ala) said:**

Have the Ittihadiyyah and Hululiyah fallen into clear kufr, shirk, and denial of the real existence of the Lord of the 'alamin except due to their mistakes in this matter and due to their ijtiḥad; thus they became astray and led others astray from the path? And was al-Hallaj killed, with the agreement of the people of fatawa with regards to his killing, except due to the misguidance of his ijtiḥad? And was not the kufr of the Qaramitah and what they claimed and exposed of filth, and the removal of the bonds of the Shari'ah only due to their ijtiḥad?

And have the Rafidah said what they said and made permissible what they made permissible from kufr and shirk, the worshiping of their twelve leaders and others besides them, and cursing the Companions of the Messenger (sallallahu ‘alayhi wa sallam) and the mother of the believers the Siddiqah bint as-Siddiq (radiyallahu ‘anha) except due to their ijtihad? (*Minhaj at-Ta’sis wat-Taqdis*, p. 218).

**Kufr is not restricted specifically to the obstinate person, rather it includes the person who commits kufr while ignorant**

**Shaykh ‘Abdullah Abu Butayn said:**

He (rahimahullah) said, meaning Shaykhul-Islam ibn Taymiyyah, in the course of his talk, “And that is why they said whoever disobeys while being arrogant like Iblis disbelieves by consensus, and whoever disobeys out of desires does not become a kafir according to Ahlus-Sunnah, and whoever commits the haram while making it halal, then he is a kafir according to consensus.”

---

And he said, “Istihlal is believing that this is allowed, and that is sometimes due to believing that Allah did not make it prohibited and sometimes could be without the belief that Allah prohibited it. This is due to a defect in iman with regards to rububiyyah or in the message. It could be from pure denial without anything else, and other times he could know Allah prohibited it but he refuses to abide by it out of obstinance, and this is the worst kufr.”

His (rahimahullah) speech that is similar to this are many. Thus he did not restrict takfir to the obstinate person. He made it clear cut that many of these are ignorant who do not know that what they do or say is kufr, and he did not excuse them due to ignorance in the likes of these things (*Ad-Durar as-Saniyyah*, 10/369-370).

**And he (rahimahullah) said:**

If the person who commits major shirk is excused due to his ignorance, then who is the one who will not be excused?! This saying implies that the hujjah of Allah is not established upon anyone except the obstinate

---

person, and the one who says this can not avoid his principle, rather if he does he will surely contradict himself. Indeed, it is not possible for him to refrain from takfir of one who doubts in the message of Muhammad (sallallahu ‘alayhi wa sallam), or doubts in the resurrection, or other than that from usul ad-Din; and the one who doubts is ignorant. The scholars mention in the books of fiqh the ruling of the murtadd, who is the Muslim who becomes a kafir after his Islam, due to a saying, or doubt, or belief. The reason for doubt is due to ignorance, and this necessitates that he say, “I do not make takfir on the ignorant ones from the Jews and Christians<sup>25</sup> nor those who prostrate to the sun, moon, and the idols because of their ignorance. Neither upon those whom ‘Ali ibn Abi Talib (radiyallahu ‘anhu) burnt with fire.” This is what that saying implies because we know for certain that they are ignorant, and that the Muslimin have a consensus with regards to the kufr of whoever does not make takfir of the Jews and Christians

---

<sup>25</sup> Shaykh Sultan al-‘Utaybi said in his footnote, “So be aware of the danger that this saying implies.”

---

or doubts their kufr. Indeed, we are certain that most of them are ignorant.

## **The evidences for no excuse of ignorance in asl ad-Din**

**Then he (rahimahullah) said:**

Shaykh Taqi ad-Din (i.e. ibn Taymiyyah rahimahullah ta'ala) said, "Whoever curses the Sahabah (ridwan Allah 'alayhim), or one of them, or combines with his cursing claiming 'Ali is an ilah or a prophet, or that Jibril made a mistake, then there is no doubt in his kufr. Rather, there is no doubt in the kufr of the one who refrains from making takfir of him." He said, "Whoever thinks that the Sahabah became apostates after the Messenger of Allah (sallallahu 'alayhi wa sallam) except for a small group that does not reach a few dozen, or that they are fussiaq, then there is no doubt in the kufr of whoever said that. Rather, whoever doubts in his kufr is a kafir."<sup>26</sup> He said,

---

<sup>26</sup> Shaykh Sultan al-'Utaybi said in his footnote, "Shaykhul-Islam ibn Taymiyyah does not give an excuse due to ignorance. These words are clear and it did not exclude the ignorant. What is mentioned from him that he excused the Jahmiyyah and did not make takfir of them, then this

“Whoever thinks that His (ta‘ala) saying, “And your Lord has commanded that you worship none but Him,” means pre-decree and that Allah (subhanahu wa ta ‘ala) does not decree anything except for what happens, so he made with that the worshiper of the idols as worshipers of only Allah, then indeed, this person is from the greatest of people in kufr according to all the revealed Books.” This ends his words.

There is no doubt that the people of this sayin; people of knowledge, zuhd, and worship, that the reason they claimed this is ignorance. Indeed, Allah (subhanahu) has informs about the kuffar that they are in doubt about what the messengers call them towards, and that they doubt in the resurrection. They said to their messengers, “We are in grave doubt concerning that to which you invite us,” and He (ta‘ala) said, “Indeed, we are in grave doubt concerning it.” And He (ta‘ala) narrates from them, “We do not think it but as a conjecture,

---

is with regards to the issue of asma wa sifat in the obscure issues. As for matters that are apparent like supplication to the awliya, or tawaf around the graves, or sacrificing to other than Allah, then ibn Taymiyyah does not excuse. And in entirety our reference is the Book and the Sunnah, and ibn Taymiyyah and others from the scholars are not infallible.”

and we have no firm belief,” and He (ta‘ala) informs about the kuffar, “Indeed, they took the shayatin as allies besides Allah and consider themselves guided.” And He (ta‘ala) said, “Shall We tell you the greatest losers in respect of [their] deeds? Those whose efforts have been wasted in this life while they thought that they were acquiring good by their deeds.”

Allah (subhanahu) described them with the utmost ignorance, as in His (ta‘ala) saying, “They have hearts wherewith they understand not, they have eyes wherewith they see not, and they have ears wherewith they hear not (the truth). They are like cattle, nay even more astray; those! They are the heedless ones.” And Allah rebuked the blind followers in His saying about them, “We found our fathers following a certain way and religion, and we guide ourselves by their footsteps,” even with that He declared their kufr.

Shaykh Muwaffiq ad-Din Abu Muhammad ibn Qudamah (rahimahullah ta‘ala) completing his speech said, “And is every mujtahid a person who reaches the correct answer? Preference is given to the majority, that not every mujtahid is

---

person who comes to the correct answer, rather the truth is in one of the sayings from the mujtahidin... And al-Hafidh thought that whoever goes against the Millah of Islam when he looks but was incapable of reaching the truth is excused... As for where al-Hafidh went then it is falsehood with certainty and kufr in Allah and rejection of Him and His messenger. We know with certain knowledge that the Prophet (sallallahu ‘alayhi wa sallam) commanded the Jews and Christians with Islam and to follow it, and rebuked them for their insistence, fought against them all, and killed the ones who had reached maturity. We know that the knowledgeable obstinate ones are few, and that the majority are blind followers who blindly follow the way of their fathers, and they do not know the miracle of the Messenger and his truthfulness. The ayat proving this are many, such as His (ta‘ala) saying, ‘That is the consideration of those who disbelieve,’ and His saying, ‘And that thought of yours which you thought about your Lord, has brought you to destruction,’ and His saying, ‘They have no knowledge of it, they only conjecture.’ And His saying, ‘And they think that they have something (to stand



---

upon),’ and His saying, ‘They think that they are guided aright!’ And His saying, ‘Say: ‘Shall We tell you the greatest losers in respect of (their) deeds? Those whose efforts have been wasted in this life while they thought that they were acquiring good by their deeds.’ ...’ This ends the quote of ibn Qudamah.

The scholars mention whoever denies the obligation of worship from the five worships (salah) or says about one of them that it is sunnah (optionable here) not wajib, or denies the permissibility of bread, or denies the prohibition of wine, or things of that sort, or doubts in issues similar to it, that if he is not ignorant disbelieves. If he was ignorant then he is taught and explained, then if he insists after the explanation he disbelieves and is killed. The scholars did not say: so when the truth is clarified and it becomes clear to him, and he obstinately rejects he disbelieves.

Furthermore, we do not know whether he is someone who is obstinate until he says something like, ‘I know that that is the truth,

---

but I will not comply with it,” or, “I will not say it.” This is hardly ever found.

Indeed, the scholars from every school of thought mentioned a variety of things; from sayings, actions, and beliefs, that can not be collected here, that whoever comes with it disbelieves, and they did not make this specifically for one who is obstinate. So the one who claims that one can commit kufr and be excused if he has a tawil, or makes an ijthihad, or makes a mistake, or is a blind follower, or is ignorant has gone against the Book, Sunnah, and consensus without doubt. There is no avoidance with him that he will contradict his own principle, and if he did not then he would undoubtedly disbelieve, like if he refrained from takfir those who doubt in the messengership of Muhammad (sallallahu ‘alayhi wa sallam) and what is similar to that (*Ad-Durar as-Saniyyah*, 12/69-73).

## **The doubt which the opponents always take as proof**

**Shaykh ‘Abdullah ibn ‘Abdir-Rahman Abu Butayn said:**

The people who argue on behalf of the mushrikin take as proof the story of the person who advised his family to burn him after his death, [saying] that the person who commits kufr while he is ignorant will not become a kafir, and only an obstinate person will become a kafir.

The reply to all of that is that Allah (subhanahu wa ta‘ala) sent His messengers as givers of glad tidings and as warners so that mankind would have no plea against Allah after the messengers. The greatest of that which they were sent with and called towards was the worship of Allah alone with no partners, and forbidding shirk which is the worship of others besides Him. So if the one who commits major shirk is excused due to his ignorance, then who is not excused?

---

As for the man who advised his family to burn him, Allah forgave him for his doubt in an attribute from the attributes of the Lord (tabaraka wa ta'ala). Thus He forgave him due to the message not reaching him. No one from the scholars said something different than that. This is why Shaykh Taqi ad-Din said, "Whoever doubts in an attribute from the attributes of the Lord (ta'ala) like him and he is not ignorant disbelieves, and if he was ignorant like him then he does not disbelieve." He said, "This is why the Prophet (sallallahu 'alayhi wa sallam) did not make takfir of the man who doubted in the power of Allah (ta'ala) because he does not disbelieve except after the message reaches him. Ibn 'Aqil likewise mentioned that and considered the matter as the da'wah did not reach him."

Shaykh Taqi ad-Din chose in the matter of attributes that one who is ignorant does not disbelieve, as for matters of shirk and its like, then no, as you will find in his coming words, in sha Allah (ta'ala). Indeed, we already mentioned some of his sayings regarding the

---

Ittihadiyyah and other than them, his takfir of them and whoever doubts in their kufr.

He stated, “The murtadd is whoever commits shirk with Allah, or hates His messenger (sallallahu ‘alayhi wa sallam), or what he came with, or left rejecting every munkar with his heart<sup>27</sup>... or rejected a branch that was decisively agreed upon, or put between him and Allah intercessors whom he relies upon, supplicates, and asks, disbelieves by consensus. As for whoever doubts in an attribute from the attributes of Allah (ta‘ala) and he is not ignorant of it then he is an apostate. However, if he was ignorant of it then he is not an apostate. That is the reason why the Prophet (sallallahu ‘alayhi wa sallam) did not make takfir of the person who doubted in the power of Allah.”

So from what he mentioned of things that are kufr he made absolute, and he differentiated in the matter of the attribute between the ignorant and others besides him. With that the opinion of the Shaykh is to refrain from takfir

---

<sup>27</sup> Shaykh Sultan al- ‘Utaybi (rahimahullah) said, “Pay attention to that, O my brother of tawhid.”

---

of the Jahmiyyah and others like them, which clashes with the texts of [Imam] Ahmad and other aimmah of Islam.

Majd (rahimahullah ta‘ala)) said, “With every bid’ah, we declare takfir of whoever calls to it, and we call those who blind follow in that fussaqa. For example, whoever says ‘the creation of the Qur’an,’ or that ‘the knowledge of Allah is created,’ or ‘His names are created,’ or that ‘He is not seen in the hereafter,’ or who curses the Sahabah (radiyallahu ‘anhum) and takes that as a din, or who says iman is only an inward belief, or what is similar to that, so whoever has knowledge of these innovations and calls towards it, or argues in favor of it, he is ruled with kufr as the text of [Imam] Ahmad can be found in many places.”

So notice how they were ruled with kufr even with their ignorance (*Ad-Durar as-Saniyyah*, 12/68-74).

**Shaykh ‘Abdul-Latif ibn ‘Abdir-Rahman (rahimahullah) said:**

---

The hadith of the man who ordered his family to burn him was a muwahhid and not from the people of shirk. Indeed, it is established from the path of Abi Kamil from Hammad from Thabit from Abi Rafi' from Abi Hurayrah that, "He did not do any good at all except for tawhid." So that which they attempt to take as proof in this matter is void (*Minhaj at-Ta'sis wat-Taqdis*, p. 218).

**The conclusion of what is being said is that no one is excused due to ignorance in matters of usul ad-Din.**

## Epilogue

My muwahhid brother... after this clarification and explanation with Shari'ah evidences and the sayings of the people of knowledge, is there any hesitation in making takfir of the apostates?

I remind you that I have mentioned nine doubts and refuted that with what I am capable in my book *Al-Haqq wal-Yaqin fi 'Adawah at-Tughbah wal-Murtaddin* and it is found on the website *Minbar at-Tawhid wal-Jihad*,<sup>28</sup> so refer to it if you wish.

I ask Him (subhanahu) that He take away all the doubts and misconceptions in front of you so that you can know the truth from falsehood.

And if you return, we will return, with the permission of Allah.

Abu 'Abdir-Rahman al-Athari 5/11/1422 Hijri

---

<sup>28</sup> It can be found on *ilmway.com*, but it is not translated as of yet.



---

## **Appendix A: Shaykh Muhammad ibn Ibrahim Al ash-Shaykh**

**Shaykh Muhammad ibn Ibrahim (rahimahullah), the former mufti of the Arabian Peninsula, said:**

There is no difference between those whose kufr is due to ʿinad (obstinate resistance) or due to ignorance. It is kufr whether what comes from him is ʿinad or what comes from him is ignorance. It is not a condition for the establishment of the hujjah upon a kafir that he understands it. Rather, the one upon whom the hujjah has been established in a manner which someone like him could understand, then he is a kafir regardless of whether he understood it or not. If understanding the hujjah was a condition, then kufr would have been only one type, juhud (denial). However, there are different types of kufr, from them is ignorance and others (*Sharh Kashf ash-Shubuhah*).

**And he (rahimahullah) said:**

Indeed, those who refrained from takfir of the specific individual concerning those matters

---

whose evidence has become obscure; so he is not made takfir on until the hujjah risaliyyah is established by confirmation and proofs. If then the hujjah has been clarified to him with a sufficient explanation, he would disbelieve regardless of whether he understood or said, “I haven’t understood,” or he understood but rejected it, since not every type of kufr of the kuffar comes from ‘inad (obstinate resistance).

As for what is known by necessity that the Messenger of Allah (sallallahu ‘alayhi wa sallam) as come with and he opposes it, then this person disbelieves at that moment, and it does not require any explanation, whether in matters of usul or furu’, as long as he is not someone who recently entered into Islam (*Majmu’ al-Fatawa*, 1/47).

---

## **Appendix B: Lajnah ad-Daimah lil-Buhuth al-‘Ilmiyyah wal-Ifta**

**Question:** Is the person who commits any act of kufr or shirk out of ignorance considered a kafir? Can they be excused because of their ignorance? Please provide us with evidence.

**Answer:** A mukallaf (person meeting the conditions to be held legally accountable for their actions) cannot be excused for worshipping other than Allah, or offering sacrifices as a means of drawing closer to other than Allah, or making a vow to other than Allah, and other acts of worship that should be devoted to Allah alone. They may only be excused if they live in a land of kufr and the da’wah has not yet reached them. In such a case, they can be excused for not being informed and not just for being ignorant. This is supported by a hadith recorded by Muslim on the authority of Abu Hurayrah that the Messenger of Allah (sallallahu ‘alayhi wa sallam) stated, “By Him in whose hand is the soul of Muhammad, any Jew or Christian from this ummah who hears of me, and then dies without believing in that with which I have been sent, will be among the dwellers of the Fire.” Thus, the Prophet (sallallahu ‘alayhi wa sallam) did not excuse anyone who had heard of him. Whoever lives in a Muslim country must have heard of the Messenger (sallallahu

---

‘alayhi wa sallam), and therefore cannot be excused due to ignorance for not knowing about the fundamentals of iman.

As for the story of those who asked the Prophet (sallallahu ‘alayhi wa sallam) to assign to them a dhat anwat (lote-tree) for them to hang their weapons on (as the disbelievers had one), those people had newly abandoned disbelief and they only requested this, but did not act on it. What they were requesting went against the Shari‘ah, and the Prophet’s reply to them indicated that if they had done what they asked for, it would have been an act of kufr.

May Allah grant us success. May peace and blessings be upon our prophet Muhammad, his family, and companions.<sup>29</sup>

**Question:** Allah (ta‘ala) says, “And We never punish until We have sent a messenger (to give warning).” Has the proof from Allah been established against the people of the present time, leaving them no excuse for disbelief, or it still has not been established and scholars have to establish it?

**Answer:** If the da’wah reaches anyone among the people living at this time, proof from Allah has been established against them (leaving them no excuse for disbelief and entailing punishment). Anyone who has not yet been informed of the da’wah, proof cannot be established against

---

<sup>29</sup> The first question of fatwa no. 9257.

---

them, as was the case with all past times, and it remains the duty of scholars to convey and explain Islam as far as they can.

May Allah grant us success. May peace and blessings be upon our prophet Muhammad, his family, and companions.<sup>30</sup>

**Question:** There are those who say, “Whoever accepts the Message of Muhammad (sallallahu ‘alayhi wa sallam) and faces the qiblah in salah is a Muslim, even if they make sujud to their teacher, and that they do not disbelieve nor called mushrikin.” These people even claim that Muhammad ibn ‘Abdil-Wahhab was wrong when he stated that those who commit shirk will be consigned to eternal punishment unless they repent. They maintain that the mushrikin among this ummah will be punished [for a while] then will enter Jannah and that none of the followers of Muhammad will remain eternally in the Fire.

**Answer:** Anyone who believes in the message of our prophet Muhammad (sallallahu ‘alayhi wa sallam), and what he came with from the Shari‘ah; if he prostrates after that to anything other than Allah, whether a wali, or someone in a grave, or a teacher from the Sufiyyah, then he is a kafir murtadd from Islam and a mushrik with Allah, even if he says the shahadatayn while he is in sujud. This is so because he came

---

<sup>30</sup> The fifth question from fatwa no. 6310.

---

with something that nullified his testimony; his sujud to other than Allah. However, he could be excused from punishment due to his ignorance, and it would not be applied on him until the hujjah is established against him... So informing of, and the establishment of the hujjah is only to excuse them before applying the punishment on them, not with regards to calling them disbelievers only after the matter is clarified to them. Indeed they are called kuffar once they make sujud, vow, or sacrifice to anyone other than Allah, and the Book and Sunnah indicate that whoever dies upon shirk is not forgiven and will remain in the Fire because of His (ta'ala) saying, "Verily, Allah forgives not that partners should be set up with Him, but He forgives except that [anything else] to whom He wills," and His saying, "It is not for the mushrikin to maintain the houses of Allah, while they witness against their own selves disbelief. The works of such are in vain and in Fire shall they abide."

May Allah grant us success. May peace and blessings be upon our prophet Muhammad, his family, and companions.<sup>31</sup>

**Question:** Do scholars have a right to declare someone as a kafir?

**Answer:** It is permissible to describe unspecified people as disbelievers based on their actions. Therefore, it is not wrong

---

<sup>31</sup> The second question from fatwa no. 4400.

to describe anyone who seeks help from people other than Allah for something which can only be sought from Him as kafir. This includes beseeching a prophet or a wali (pious person) to cure oneself or one's children.

On the other hand, specific people may be declared as kafir, [for example] when they deny a matter which is known in the Din by necessity; such as salah, zakah, or sawm. In such cases, the person in question should be informed of the ruling and called to repent. If they do not repent, the ruler is obliged to execute them for their disbelief. *If takfir of specific individuals due to a legitimate reason had not been allowed, the hadd for riddah would have not be applicable.*

May Allah grant us success. May peace and blessings be upon our prophet Muhammad, his family, and companions.<sup>32</sup>

**Question:** It is said that riddah (apostasy) may be committed either by words or actions. I hope that you briefly clarify for me the verbal, practical and doctrinal forms of riddah.

**Answer:** Riddah is going to kufr after accepting Islam. It may be by word, action, erroneous belief, or doubt. Consequently, whoever associates other partners with Allah; denies His lordship, His oneness, one of His attributes, or some of His Books or messengers; curses Allah or His messenger; denies

---

<sup>32</sup> The second question from fatwa no. 6102. The italics are mine.

---

any of the consensually forbidden things or renders them lawful; denies one of the five pillars of Islam or doubts their obligation; doubts the resurrection; the truthfulness of Muhammad (sallallahu ‘alayhi wa sallam) or any of the prophets; or prostrates to an idol, a planet, or the like, has disbelieved and apostatized from Islam. Please read the chapters discussing riddah in the books of fiqh, as the scholars have elaborated on this topic.

Based on the above explanation, you can understand the verbal, practical, and doctrinal forms of riddah.<sup>33</sup>

---

<sup>33</sup> The second question from fatwa no. 7150. They said in the answer to the next question, “The types of riddah that were pointed to previously, it is not a condition for the apostate to say, ‘I apostate from Islam,’ but if he were to say that it would be another type of riddah.”



---

## Appendix C: Shaykh ‘Abdul-‘Aziz ibn Baz

**Question:** What is the ruling on giving an excuse due to ignorance in matters related to ‘aqidah?

**Answer:** A person is excused for their ignorance of unclear matters but not for the well-established tenants of belief such as issues related to tawhid and salah. If a Muslim lives among Muslimin and does not know that salah, zakah, and sawm are obligatory he will not be excused due to ignorance. Likewise, a Muslim will not be excused for being ignorant of not knowing that zina, homosexuality, and consuming khamr are prohibited.

On the other hand, a person is excused for denying some of Allah’s attributes which they did not know. The common person or those who grow up in a remote society away from Muslim lands, like those living in the far ends of America or the far coasts of Africa might not be aware of all the attributes of Allah, they will be treated like ahlul-fatrah. In this case, Allah’s attributes should be clarified for them, and they are not considered disbelievers until everything is made clear to them. If they insist on their disbelief, they are to be sentenced to capital punishment...<sup>34</sup>

---

<sup>34</sup> *Majmu’ al-Fatawa*, v. 28, p. 218.

---

**Question:** Can a person be excused for their ignorance regarding the fundamentals of tawhid which represent the foundation of the Din? What is the ruling on judging specific people as being disbelievers for committing actions of shirk out of their ignorance?

**Answer:** No person can be excused for their ignorance regarding issues of tawhid so long as they live amongst Muslimin. However, whoever lives far away from Muslim lands and is ignorant of Islam, they will be judged by Allah (subhanahu). They will be dealt with in the same way as ahlul-fatrah on the Day of Resurrection; they will be tested there and judged accordingly. On the other hand, whoever lives amongst Muslimin and hears the word of Allah and His messenger without adhering to them but instead worships the graves and seeks their help or insults the Din, such people are disbelievers. Muslim authorities have to ask such people to repent and if they do not, they have to be killed for their kufr. The same applies to whoever mocks the Din, considers halal things that Allah declares as being haram such as zina, khamr, applying man-made law, judging by laws other than what Allah has revealed, or claiming that such laws are better than the laws which are set by Allah. Declaring any of the foregoing as halal is tantamount to apostasy, we seek refuge with Allah from this.

---

It is thus obligatory on every Islamic government to apply Shari‘ah, to advise whoever indulges in any of the practices which nullify their Islam to make tawbah, and to kill them if they refuse to give up their kufr. Proof for this is the hadith in which the Prophet (sallallahu ‘alayhi wa sallam) said, “Whoever discards their din, kill them” (*Sahih al-Bukhari*). Moreover, it is reported in the two books of sahih ahadith on the authority of Mu‘adh ibn Jabal (radiyallahu ‘anhu) that he ordered some rulers to kill the apostates if they do not make tawbah. Mu‘adh said, “This is the judgment of Allah and His messenger.”

However, such a judgment has to be applied by the Muslim ruler and through the shar‘i courts. This is to ensure that the ruling of Allah is implemented on the basis of true knowledge and insight of Muslim authorities. May Allah set right the affairs of us all. Verily, Allah is the All-Hearer, the Most Near.<sup>35</sup>

**Question:** Is the president of ‘Iraq (Saddam at the time) and the members of the Ba‘athist party he led disbelievers?

---

<sup>35</sup> *Majmu’ al-Fatawa*, v. 9, p. 79.

**Answer:** All Ba‘athists are disbelievers, including the president of ‘Iraq, as they oppose the Shari‘ah and feud with it.<sup>36</sup>

**Question:** The disagreement in the issue of excuse of ignorance, does it fall under the matters that are differed upon?

**Answer:** This is a great matter, and the foundation is that one is not excused if he was to live between the Muslimin, and the Qur’an and Sunnah had reached him; there is no excuse. Allah (‘azza wa jall) said, “And this Qur’an was revealed to me that I may warn you thereby and whoever it reaches.” So whomever the Qur’an and Sunnah reached is not excused...

**Question:** But is this an issue of matters that are disputed?

**Answer:** This is not from the issues that are disputed, except in a time which [some] matters become hidden like the story of the man who told his family to burn him...

**Question:** Some people say that the specific individual does not become kafir.

---

<sup>36</sup> *Majmu’ al-Fatawa*, v. 28, p. 269. This is a clear example of making takfir of specific individuals.

**Answer:** This is ignorance, if one comes with something that is kufr, he disbelieves.<sup>37</sup>

---

<sup>37</sup> *Sharh Kashf ash-Shububat.*

---

## Appendix D: Shaykh ‘Ali al-Khudayr

**Question:** Is there or is there not an excuse of ignorance in ‘aqidah? And if there is an excuse of ignorance can we say that his deeds have not become worthless due to his ignorance or is it that his deeds have become worthless?

**Answer:** In the section of major shirk there is no excuse of ignorance by consensus. The consensus regarding this was mentioned by ibnul-Qayyim in *Tariq al-Hijratayn* and it was cited by the aimmah of the da’wah. Thus anyone who falls into major shirk such as sacrificing to other than Allah, or seeking refuge in the awliya or those in the graves, or legislates a law, and so on, then he is a mushrik even if he was ignorant, or had a tawil, or was mistaken.

Ibn Taymiyyah said in his fatawa (37-20/38), “The label of shirk is established before [the coming] of the Message due to him committing shirk with his Lord.” The meaning of the words of ibn Taymiyyah here is that one is labeled and called a mushrik whenever he commits shirk with his Lord, even “before [the coming] of the Message,” meaning, even if he was ignorant.

---

If you want a detailed explanation regarding this matter, then I mentioned it in my following books:

- 1) *Kitab ar-Risalah al-Mutamimmah li-Kalam Aimmah ad-Da'wah fil-Jahl fi ash-Shirk al-Akbar*
- 2) *Kitab al-Jama' wat-Tajrid Sharh Kitab at-Tawhid, Chapter: al-Khawf min ash-Shirk*
- 3) *Kitab at-Tawdih at-Tatammah 'ala Kashf ash-Shubabat, fi ar-Rubu' al-Awl minhu*

As for matters that are apparent, that which is generally known, then the one who does not live between the Muslimin and is in a far away desert, or just left kufr, or lives and grew up in the lands of the kuffar is excused if he was ignorant or had a tawil until he comes to know.

As for matters that are hidden, that which is not generally known except by the scholars or in specific cases, then there is an excuse of ignorance and tawil until he shows obstinate rejection and his doubt is removed. This mostly occurs in a time when there is widespread ignorance.

---

There is no difference in the matters mentioned of apparent or hidden with regards to matters of ‘aqidah or matters of fiqh and ahkam, all of them are treated equally as one.

As for the issue of deeds becoming worthless then this relates to death and what one dies upon due to His (ta‘ala) saying, “And whoever of you leaves his din [to disbelief] and dies while he is a disbeliever – for those, their deeds have become worthless in this world and the Hereafter, and those are the companions of the Fire, they will abide therein eternally.”<sup>38</sup>

**Question:** Some opponents of ad-Da’wah as-Salafiyah claim that in the books of the Salafī da’wah, in particular from the past two centuries in Najd, there is takfir, no excuse of ignorance, many mistakes, and that today’s mashayikh do not agree with the older ones. But, [they say] their mistakes are not clarified under the guise of respect for the scholars, as if they (i.e. opponents) are immune to mistakes. The question is that which I see it and that is the da’wah of Shaykh Muhammad ibn ‘Abdil-Wahhab has been severely altered by the Murjiah or that the Shaykh is a takfiri as the opponents claim because looking at the reality and speech of the older and later scholars is clear. So am I wrong in my understanding Shaykh? And to make the question clearer: if Imam Muhammad ibn ‘Abdil-Wahhab came out in the

---

<sup>38</sup> A question originally posed to him on an old website that has been taken down. The Arabic can be found on *ilmway.com*.



---

Arabian Peninsula in these circumstances then what would they say about him based on his principles and manhaj? We request the Shaykh for details and not a short summary.

**Answer:** The aimmah ad-da‘wah since Imam al-‘Allamah ash-Shaykh Muhammad ibn ‘Abdil-Wahhab to the present day have agreed without exception that there is no excuse of ignorance in major shirk; whether it is slaughtering for other than Allah, or seeking refuge and calling on the dead, or the sarf that involves worship to other than Allah, or shirk with Allah in legislation. They would call him a mushrik even if he was ignorant, or had a tawil, or was a blind follower. This was said by Muhammad ibn ‘Abdil-Wahhab and it was said by his sons ‘Abdullah and Husayn and also by Hamad ibn Mu‘mmar and ‘Abdul-‘Aziz al-Hasin; these were the aimmah after Shaykh Muhammad.

And it was said by the second mujaddid Imām al-‘Allamah ‘Abdur-Rahman ibn Hasan in his treatises *ad-Durar*, and *Majmu’ as-Rasail wal-Masail* is a witness to that. He was assisted in this by his student Shaykh ‘Abdullah Aba Butayn. Then it was said by Imam al-‘Allamah ‘Abdul-Latif ibn ‘Abdir-Rahman, the third mujaddid, and his brother Ishaq ibn ‘Abdir-Rahman supported him in that with his valuable book *Takfir al-Mu‘ayyan*. Then it was said by ‘Abdullah and Ibrahim, the sons of Shaykh ‘Abdul-Latif, and they were supported in that by Shaykh ibn Sahman. Then Shaykh

---

Muhammad ibn Ibrahim and his students; there is no distinction, to my knowledge, between any of them.

Then upon that was the mashayikh ‘Abdullah ibn Humayd and ‘Abdul-‘Aziz ibn Baz (rahimahumallah) and the members of the Lajnah ad-Daimah headed by Shaykh ‘Abdul-‘Aziz ibn Baz (rahimahullah). And also upon that our shaykh al-‘Allamah Hamud ibn ‘Uqla ash-Shu’aybi (rahimahullah). You will not find one of them differing in this. So where is the one who differed from them?!

The differing came from the later ones who abandoned the books of the aimmah ad-da’wah and [according to their opinion] saw ghulu (extremism) in them. Even if they had high ranks in universities and graduated from them, they are the ones who covered up this issue to the people and understood from the words of ibn Taymiyyah other than what he intended in the section related to major shirk.

It was noted many times by the aimmah ad-da’wah in their transmission from ibn Taymiyyah when he speaks about the people of bida’ and ahwa that they have an excuse of ignorance and tawil. So they (i.e. the opponents) applied that with regards to major shirk. They did not realize and did not understand that ibn Taymiyyah made a distinction between these two matters. He (i.e. ibn Taymiyyah) said in his fatawa (37 – 20/38), “The label of shirk is established before [the

coming] of the Message due to him committing shirk with his Lord.” And refer to his words in *Ar-Radd ‘ala al-Bakri* and his words on the juhhal (ignorants) from the Tatar who worshiped other than Allah; he calls them mushrikin and worshipers of other than Allah even with their ignorance.

Those who want to look at their words then I quoted them in my following books:

- 1) *Kitab ar-Risalah al-Mutamimmah li-Kalam Aimmah ad-Da’wah fil-Jahl fi ash-Shirk al-Akbar*
- 2) *Kitab al-Jama’ wat-Tajrid Sharh Kitab at-Tawhid, Chapter: al-Khawf min ash-Shirk*
- 3) *Kitab at-Tawdih at-Tatimmat ‘ala Kashf ash-Shubahat, fi ar-Rubu’ al-Awl minhu*<sup>39</sup>

**Question:** Who has the right to do takfir of a specific person? Is it permissible for a normal person to do specific takfir of a person who fell into clear kufr if he knows the principles of takfir and its barriers? Or do we say to him: no, don’t do so, and leave this for the judge, mufti, and the scholar? Please explain, as there is much confusion in this issue.

---

<sup>39</sup> Ibid.

---

**Answer:** As you mentioned, the normal person who knows the principles of takfir and its barriers has the right to do takfir.

This is what the we have seen since the time of the Messenger (sallallahu ‘alayhi wa sallam) to now.

As for the one who does not know, then it is not permissible for him. “Whoever says to his brother ‘O kafir,’ then one of them is as such.”

And takfir is not from the particulars of the judge, mufti, or scholar. It is wrong to believe so.<sup>40</sup>

**Question:** What are the barriers of takfir?

**Answer:** Before knowing the mawani’ (barriers) we should know the reasons for kufr; they are belief, saying, action, and/or doubt. This is because the definition of kufr is every saying, or action, or belief that the texts make takfir due to it and removes its doer from the Millah.

Its elaboration is as follows:

---

<sup>40</sup> Ibid.

---

Barrier to the label of shirk: it is ikrah. He (ta'ala) said, "Whoever disbelieves in Allah after his belief, except for one who is forced while his heart is secure in faith."

Barriers of takfir in issues that are obscure; which are those matters that are known only to specific people and what is intended by it (obscure issues) are the issues related to the people of desires and bida', such as matters of asma and sifat, iman, qadr, and other issues similar to that. The mawani' here are:

- 1) Ignorance
- 2) Tawil
- 3) Blind following
- 4) Ikrah
- 5) Lack of texts to know the truth
- 6) Or it reached him but it was not confirmed with him
- 7) Or it was confirmed but he was not able to understand it

- 
- 8) Or it was confirmed with him but a contrary argument was shown which led him to a tawil
  - 9) Or a misconception overcame in which Allah will excuse him
  - 10) Or he was a mujtahid in search of the truth

Barriers of takfir in the matters that are apparent (those issues that the scholars and laymen know):

- 1) Ignorance due to living in a remote desert, or ignorant due to just leaving kufr, or due to living and growing up in the lands of kufr. As for whoever lived amongst Muslimin, then he is not excused in matters that are apparent, and he is either someone who is a transgressor or who turned away.
- 2) Ikrah

As for the barriers of kufr as a whole they are (and here it is with regards to the doer):

- 1) Has not reached purity
- 2) Not of sound mind; that is a lack of cognitive capacity due to insanity, unconsciousness, sleep, or a state of

---

intoxication, or excessive joy or anger, such as the one who made a mistake due to being overwhelmed with joy when he found his camel.

- 3) Lack of intention to do the act of kufr, or lack of intention to what it implies, or its outcome. However, if the action was intended and he wanted to do that but did not want kufr or to disbelieve due to that action, or if he knew it was kufr if he did not do it, then this is not what we are intending. What is meant by intending an action or a saying but but intending kufr is like the one who steps on a piece of paper not knowing anything about it. When in actuality it was the Qur'an, so he did not intended to step on it (i.e. the Qur'an) and insult it. That contrasts to the one who tears the mushaf. That is intending to tear it, so one disbelieves by it even if he did not intend to disbelieve.
- 4) Barriers in relation to the reason that the action or saying is done or said, and it is not outright or clear in its kufr.
- 5) The implication and outcome when he did not intend that or imply that, so the lack of intention and what it implies is a barrier.

- 
- 6) Barriers in the proof that establishes his kufr with evidence and confirmation.
  - 7) The hujjah has not been established upon him in which he would disbelieve by it.
  - 8) Lack of options, and this is ikrah...

Those are the barriers that should be taken under consideration. And here are the barriers which should not be looked at but some consider them as such:

- 1) Fear
- 2) Not intending kufr
- 3) Making kufr to be only by belief only
- 4) Being from the rulers, scholars, du'ah, or mujahidin prevents from their takfir, even if they come with clear and outright kufr<sup>41</sup>
- 5) Bad upbringing

---

<sup>41</sup> Pay attention to that and remember it, O seeker of truth.



- 
- 6) Maslahah of the da'wah or interests; what is being circulated around today is that intention of maslahah, even if it is an act of kufr, does not make one a kafir
  - 7) Jestng or lack of seriousness, so one does not disbelieve except if serious
  - 8) Lack of necessary laws and punishments, and some make that a barrier to the one who comes with clear and open kufr saying he does not disbelieve because if you make takfir he is not killed nor rebelled against, and the result would be not inheriting and the separation from his spouse and since that does not happen then there is no takfir!

We say to that: there is a difference between the labels and the rulings, and the lack of ability to carry out the ruling does not prevent the corresponding label.

**Shaykh 'Abdul-Latif said** to whoever thinks and believes that the speech of the people of knowledge and restricts them with the establishment of the hujjah and the da'wah reaching a people that it negates the labels of kufr, shirk, and fujur, and the likes from actions and sayings which were labeled by the Legislator with those name:

---

The absence of the hujjah being established does not change the Shari'ah labels, rather the label sticks to what Legislator labeled as kufr, shirk, and fisq. There is no prevention for this label due to the doer not being punished because the hujjah was not established, and there is difference between a sin being kufr and takfir on its doer (*Al-Minhaj*, p. 316).

With this I would like to highlight the manhaj and usul of the Murjiah today, the defeatists and modernists, and clarify their principles with regards to takfir:

- 1) Warning against takfir in general without any elucidation
- 2) Making the difference between the saying and the speaker, and the action and the doer always and in every issue, whether in the matter of major shirk or in the matters that are apparent to whom the hujjah was established against; saying that the action or saying is kufr... but the doer or speaker ... then he does not disbelieve, even though the causes are met and the barriers are removed. For this reason, there are no specific individuals they make takfir of except what is explicitly mentioned in the Book and Sunnah.

- 
- 3) Abandoning the knowledge and understanding in the matter of takfir, and warning from learning it and gaining understanding of it, and not teaching it or writing about it. As well, warning from the books of the aimmah of the Da'wah an-Najdiyyah and considering the studying of the usul of tawhid and repeating *Kitab at-Tawhid* by Shaykh Muhammad ibn 'Abdil-Wahhab as unnecessary. And abandoning teaching the nullifiers of Islam and considering it to be fitnah and recklessness of takfir.
  - 4) Lack of attention in the issue of wala and bara, and hatred and enmity. And a lack of concern in the issue of kufr bit-taghut, repeatedly saying that they are not worshipers with that and Allah will not ask us about it and there is no benefit in that knowledge.
  - 5) Unrestricted statements in the issue of excuse of ignorance and widening it until it is given to the ignorant ones of the Jews and Christians.
  - 6) The call to tolerance and constantly repeating it.
  - 7) Warning against takfir of the tyrants (literally "tughah") and disregarding their kufr and making their enmity based on this foundation.

- 
- 8) Making certain personalities from those politically active the scale and litmus, so whoever makes takfir of them, even if they did clear kufr and their were no barriers, then he is a Haruri takfiri, a person of fitnah, and not from Ahlus-Sunnah or not a Salafi (rather not a Talafi). Although the issue of takfir on a specific person is from the matters related to ijihad, the foundation is that we say for example that “Whoever worships other than Allah is a mushrik, and whoever mocks the Qur’an is a murtadd,” and what is similar to that. Thus, this foundation does not allow any difference of opinion, and whoever opposes it is misguided and not from Ahlus-Sunnah, and as for the specific individual it is another matter.

**Attention:** here are some selected usul that we want the brothers to benefit from:

- 1) Indeed, Islam is the worship of Allah alone with no partners and having iman in the Messenger (sallallahu ‘alayhi wa sallam) and following him in what he came with. If the slave does not do so, then he is not a Muslim.
- 2) Indeed, whoever is covered with major shirk is a mushrik except if he was forced.

- 
- 3) The result of one whom it is established performed major shirk is that the label of shirk is put on him even before the establishment of the hujjah.
  - 4) The obligation to make a distinction between the establishment of the hujjah and understanding the hujjah.
  - 5) The condition of establishing the hujjah in which a mushrik deserves punishment is that the message has reached him and is not prevented from it.
  - 6) The conditions of establishing the hujjah in the Shari'ah is that one has the ability to gain knowledge and the ability to act on it.
  - 7) The condition for takfir of the people of desires and bida' is that the hujjah should be established and the misconception removed.
  - 8) The barriers of takfir of the people of desires and bida' are: absence of texts necessary to learn the truth; or they reached him but they were not established with him; or they were established but he was unable to understand them; or they were established but a counter argument was presented which led him to a tawil; or a misconception overcame him in which he is excused in front of Allah for; or he was a mujtahid in search of the truth.

- 
- 9) The hujjah is established upon the morally obliged person by understanding the speech (meaning, in a language he knows), not by knowing the truth and the correct path.
  - 10) The obligation to make a distinction between the matters that are apparent and obscure.
  - 11) Whoever denies a matter known in the Din by necessity disbelieves with the exception of one who just left kufr, or lives in a far away desert, or in the lands of kufr [which the da'wah has not reached].
  - 12) One does not disbelieve if he opposes a matter from the issues that are obscure except after the conditions are fulfilled and the barriers are removed.
  - 13) Whoever makes ijtiḥād in pursuit of the truth in the issues that are obscure and does not attain it is rewardable, and the one who oversteps the boundaries is sinful.
  - 14) The applicable threats towards the people of fisq and disobedience rests on the absence of barriers.<sup>42</sup>

---

<sup>42</sup> Ibid.

---

## **Appendix E: Shaykh Nasir al-Fahd**

**Question:** Would it be possible for you, may Allah preserve you, to mention for us a short summary regarding the issue of the excuse of ignorance?

**Answer:** The excuse due to ignorance is differed upon into three sayings:

- 1) Those who give excuse of ignorance absolutely.
- 2) Those who do not excuse the people with ignorance in tawhid, completely, regardless if it was regarding the labels in this world or the hukm in the hereafter. Thus they consider him to be in the Fire eternally, even if the Message did not reach him, and they used the first covenant (taken by the sons of Adam) as proof.
- 3) And this is the correct view, that there are some types ignorance which can be excused, and others which are not:
  - a) There is an excuse in the obscure issues such as matters related to qadr, iman, sifat, and in issues from the apparent Shari‘ah rulings that is

---

other than tawhid; such as salah, zakah, the prohibition of khamr, and what is similar.

b) There is not an excuse in the tawhid of worship because this is asl ad-Din and the Din of all messengers; like du'a, sacrificing, vowing, and what is similar. The ignorant one here is also divided into two categories:

i. The ignorant one who is not excused in this world and the next, meaning, he will remain in the Fire (we seek refuge with Allah from that). He is the one who the hujjah was established against by having the Message reach him, whether or not he searched for but did not understand it or he opposed it.

ii. The ignorant one who is excused in the next world, but not in this one. He is the one who has not had the hujjah established upon him like the one who grew up in the far away desert, or a high mountain, or was from ahlul-fatrah, and the likes. This one is dealt with as a mushrik in this world, but in the next the matter is left to Allah, and what is



---

the soundest regards to what has been mentioned regarding him is that he will be tested.

And Allah knows best.<sup>43</sup>

**Question:** What is the process of establishing the hujjah, and who is the one that establishes it? I would like a detailed explanation of that.

**Answer:** The issue of establishing the hujjah, who establishes it, how to establish it, and what pertains to that differs depending upon the issues in the following aspects:

- 1) What pertains to the asl ad-Din, and it is the matter of tawhid and shirk; so whoever opposes it is a kafir whether the hujjah has been established or not. However, we do not rule upon him by killing in this world, nor judge him to be in the Fire in the hereafter, except whoever the hujjah has been established upon, and the hujjah in asl ad-Din is by only having the Message reach him. So whoever has Islam or the Qur'an reach him, or he hears about the Prophet (sallallahu 'alayhi wa sallam) and similar to this, then the hujjah has been established upon him, whether it reached him from a Muslim or a kafir, or he is able to

---

<sup>43</sup> *Al-Fatava al-Ha'riyyah.*

---

seek knowledge about Islam but refuses to do so. They are kuffar in the this world and the next, and there are no conditions that need to be stipulated upon them regarding establishing the hujjah to begin with. So the grave worshippers in the lands of the Muslimin are kuffar in this world and the next, even if one of them was more ignorant than his family's donkey, because the hujjah has reached them, which is Islam, and they have the Qur'an. However, Allah has set a seal upon their hearts, so they cannot comprehend, and Allahul-musta'an. It has been narrated in the *Sahih* from Abi Hurayrah, "By Him in whose hand is the life of Muhammad, he who amongst this ummah from the Jews or Christians hears about me, but does not affirm his belief in that with which I have been sent and dies in this state (of disbelief), he shall be but one of the denizens of the Fire." So from here, we find that the majority of those who are in our time have the hujjah established upon them in asl ad-Din. They have either heard of Islam, and this is sufficient, or they are able to require knowledge about it but they opposed that. The hujjah has been established upon both of these parties, and Allah knows best.

- 2) What pertains to the clear ordainments of Islam, such as the obligation of the four pillars, the prohibition of

---

zina, khamr, and similar to that from the widespread matters. So in this case, a person who is not able to acquire knowledge is excused in it, such as the one who recently entered into Islam or was raised far away from the lands of Islam. Thus if he perfects asl ad-Din, however he rejected the obligation of salah or legalised alcohol for example, and he is someone who is truly ignorant of this, then he does not become a kafir except if the hujjah has been established upon him. And the hujjah in this situation is showing the proofs of the issue, so whoever has been shown the proofs, then he has the hujjah established upon him even if the one showing the proofs is from the general masses of the Muslimin and is not from the students of knowledge, because these issues are clear and widespread.

- 3) What pertains to the unclear matters and other than that, because it differs depending on the time, place, and people, and the issue is disputable. Shaykhul-Islam said to a group among the Jahmiyyah al-Haluliyah (i.e., those who believe Allah is everywhere), “If I were to say what you said I would disbelieve, however I do not see you as disbelievers because of your ignorance,” or as he stated in *al-Istighathah*, and the aimmah of the Da’wah an-Najdiyyah differed with him on this. But the point

---

here is that these Jahmiyyah would say “Allah is everywhere,” so Shaykhul-Islam viewed that it was because of their ignorance pertaining to this matter and that the hujjah has not been established upon them due to their strong misconception and what they were raised upon, and the aimmah of the Da’wah an-Najdiyyah differed with him as I mentioned. The tahqiq (fixed statement/principle) in the matter is that it returns back to one matter, which is belying. So whoever sees that tawil in these issues results in reality towards belying, or he argues with them and sees that they belie the text, then they disbelieve, and whoever sees that they do not bely the text, rather they affirm it, even if they distorted it from its true meaning, then they do not disbelieve.

This is the summary in the issue even though it might require further breaking down, and Allah knows best. So you will find establishing the hujjah in the three categories differs:

- 1) The *asl ad-Din*: merely being shown or hearing is sufficient, even if it was from a kafir.
- 2) The apparent matters: being shown the proofs in the matter is sufficient, from any Muslim.

- 3) The obscure matters: it requires removing the misconception, and this cannot be done by just anyone.<sup>44</sup>

**Question:** There has been much discussion surrounding tawil in the apparent matters, and surrounding its criterion, and what is used as proof is the action of Qudamah (radiyallahu ‘anhu), with its various narrations, so what is the criterion for tawil that excuses an individual?

**Answer:** This has been responded too previously, and it returns back to belying or rejection. So if his tawil was acceptable, and had a valid viewpoint, then this is indicative that this individual is not belying or a rejector of the text, so he does not disbelieve. However, if this was not the case, and it becomes clear that this individual is either denying or rejecting the text, refusing to abide by it, then he becomes a kafir.<sup>45</sup>

**Question:** What is meant by understanding the hujjah in which an individual is excused or is not excused by in the matter pertaining to establishing the hujjah?

**Answer:** What is meant by understanding is:

---

<sup>44</sup> Ibid.

<sup>45</sup> Ibid.

- 
- 1) Knowing the meaning: this is a condition.
  - 2) Convinced that it is the truth: this is not a condition.

The hujjah in asl ad-Din is the showing of the Message in any way. And the hujjah in the widespread apparent matters is showing the proofs to those who are truly excused. And the hujjah in the obscure matters is by removing the misconception, and the third category is unlike the first two categories. And Allah knows best.

**Question:** What is meant by inability to understand with regards to establishing the hujjah?

**Answer:** Inability to understand means two things:

- 1) Unable to know the meanings of the words: so this is an excuse with regards to establishing the hujjah in that the individual must know the meanings, such as the non-Arab, for instance, if he was addressed in the Arabic language.
- 2) The work of Allah on the hearts of the kuffar and their inability to understand these words as being the truth: then this is not an excuse, rather Allah has set a seal upon their hearts so that they will not understand, and from the most explicit proof is His (ta'ala) saying,

“Had Allah known any good in them, He would have made them hear.” Meaning, He would have allowed them to see the truth of what reached them, then He said, “And if He had made them hear.” Meaning, and even if we made them see it as the truth, “They would [still] have turned away, while they were refusing.” And who is more truthful in speech besides Allah?!

So He mentioned that the ignorance of the kuffar whom Allah has set a seal upon their hearts, that even if their scholars came to realise the truth of what reached them they would remain upon their disbelief, does anything after this require an explanation?! And Allah knows best.<sup>46</sup>

**Question:** Is talbis an excuse in matters pertaining to shirk and asl ad-Din?

**Answer:** Talbis not an excuse in major shirk, so whoever falls into kufr without ikrah is a kafir, and most of the kuffar did not fall into their kufr except due to the talbis of their leaders and scholars. Indeed, He (ta‘ala) said, “They have taken their scholars and monks as lords besides Allah,” and it is a rebuking of them, not an excuse. He (ta‘ala) said about them, while they are in the Fire, “And they will say: ‘Our Lord! Verily, we obeyed our chiefs and our great ones, and they misled us from the way.’” And He (ta‘ala) said, “But if you

---

<sup>46</sup> Ibid.

---

could see when the dhalimun (polytheists and wrongdoers, etc.) will be made to stand before their Lord, how they will cast the (blaming) word one to another! Those who were deemed weak will say to those who were arrogant: ‘Had it not been for you, we should certainly have been believers,‑‑’ and other than than from the ayat.

It is also in the famous hadith, hadith ‘Abdullah ibn ‘Amr (radiyallahu ‘anhuma) in the taking away of knowledge (and it is mutawatir from him), “People will take as their leaders ignorant persons who when consulted will give their fatawa without knowledge. So they will go astray and will lead the people astray,‑‑” and the texts regarding this are plenty.

Whoever wants to excuse due to talbis must also excuse all the kuffar without exception because all of them have the talbis of Iblis. “But I had no authority over you except that I invited you, and you responded to me. So do not blame me; but blame yourselves.” Those affiliated to knowledge who deceive the mushrikin are shayatin, shayatin of men. Allahul-musta‘an.<sup>47</sup>

**Question:** Is talbis of the scholars considered an excuse in refraining from takfir?

---

<sup>47</sup> Ibid.



---

**Answer:** The discussion regarding the excuse in kufr is very lengthy, wherein I wrote an unfinished draft in prison, a book by the name *At-Tafsil lil-Udhr bil-Jabl wat-Ta'wil*, and what is correct is that there is no excuse for falling into kufr except for ikrah alone, as it is mentioned in the ayah. As for the rest of the excuses:

- 1) It is either not an excuse to begin with, such as whoever goes into extremes in the issue of excuse of ignorance, until excused the grave worshipers for their ignorance!
- 2) Or that the Muslim did not fall into kufr to begin with, like the issue of mistakes and interpretation. The discussion regarding the elaboration of this is very lengthy, and it requires a complete book except that what I mentioned is only pointing towards this matter.

So if you know this, then we shall speak about talbis of the evil scholars upon the general masses, and is it an excuse? So we say this is divided into two categories:

- 1) That the Muslim falls into an action of kufr himself; such as associating partners with Allah and similar to that, then he is not excusable as I previously stated except for ikrah alone. As for the talbis of the scholars and their fatawa, then it is not an excuse or else those

---

who said, “Our Lord! Verily, we obeyed our chiefs and our great ones, and they misled us from the way,” would be excused. And those who Allah said about them that, “They have taken their scholars and monks as lords besides Allah,” would be excused. And those which the authentic hadith mentioned regarding knowledge being taken away, “People will take as their leaders ignorant persons...” would be excused, and other than that.

- 2) That the Muslim does not fall into kufr, however he does not make takfir of whoever does because of a misconception that has befallen him; such as the talbis of these scholars and the likes. So this person does not disbelieve because he did not commit kufr, and he did not reject a text or consensus. This is a sub-branch of the issue, “Whoever does not make takfir of the kafir, then he is a kafir,” and many mistakes occur within it. Hence I will simplify the discussion regarding it, so I say:
  - a) The kafir asli, such as the Jew and Christian, whoever does not make takfir upon him, then he is kafir due to rejecting the texts and consensus.

- 
- b) The kafir murtadd who openly proclaims leaving Islam after he was a Muslim; either for another religion, atheism, and similar to that, then he is like the first type as well.
  
  - c) The kafir murtadd who commits a nullifier from the agreed upon nullifiers of Islam, such as mocking the Din while he claims to be a Muslim, so whoever refrains from performing takfir of him, then he is one of two men:
    - i) Either he affirms that the action or statement which the text and consensus has mentioned is kufr, however he refrains from performing takfir of him due to a misconception that appeared to him, or was extremely fearful [to pass a verdict], and similar to that, then this person does not disbelieve because he did not reject the text or consensus.
  
    - ii) Or he either disputes regarding the action or the statement, and that it is not kufr, so then the hujjah is established upon him by showing the

---

evidences and consensus regarding that; so either he affirms it or he disbelieves.

- d) The kafir murtadd who commits a nullifier which is differed upon, such as abandoning salah, so whoever withholds from performing takfir of him does not disbelieve.<sup>48</sup>

**Question:** As-salamu ‘alaykum wa rahmatullahi wa barakatuhu our noble Shaykh. What are the guidelines of takfir? And who has the right to perform takfir upon a specific individual? And do the laymen have the right to make takfir upon whoever insults the Messenger or allies with the kuffar, whether he was ignorant or knowledgeable? And what is your opinion regarding those who abstain from takfir and warn against it? And what is your opinion regarding the one who calls for discussion and debate in the way which is best? May Allah aid you and give you success, and lead your steps on the straight path, and make Jannah our abode and your abode.

**Answer:** Wa ‘alaykum as-salam wa rahmatullahi wa barakatuhu, as for what follows:

The discussion regarding the guidelines of takfir has very long details attached to it, however I’ll summarise it for you. So

---

<sup>48</sup> Ibid.

---

from the most important guidelines of takfir are three matters:

- 1) That there is established proof on the reason behind performing takfir.
- 2) That the action of the individual for this reason behind performing takfir is clear, and does not have any doubtful possibilities in it.
- 3) The barriers [of takfir] are removed, and they are four: ikrah, ignorance, tawil, and a mistake.

Every barrier from these impediments [of takfir] have details attached to it, and everyone who has knowledge in an issue has the right to make a judgement in it, even if he was from the laymen. Thus the one who knows that leaving salah is kufr, then he sees someone who does not perform salah; he has the right to make takfir of him, and also like the one who hears someone mocking the Din, and similar to that. But as for performing takfir upon specific individuals:

Then know, may Allah bless you, that the mathhab of irja in this time of ours deeply penetrated into those who affiliate themselves to Salafiyah, so they became two types:

- 1) Whoever states with his tongue or in his articles: there is no speech or actions that constitute kufr, rather all that falls back to belief in the heart.
- 2) The one who affirms that there are sayings and actions which constitutes kufr, however he does not see anyone as a kafir.

There is no doubt that both these schools of thought are false, and the first one is more absurd than the second. The one who ponders over the life of the Prophet (sallallahu ‘alayhi wa sallam), his companions, and the aimmah will know the falsehood of these schools, as the first thing that the Companions did after the Prophet (sallallahu ‘alayhi wa sallam) passed away was make takfir of a group of people and fighting them. And what has become most prevalent and famous from the Salaf is their takfir of the Jahmiyyah and the heads of the Jahmiyyah; such as al-Jahm, al-Ja’d, Bishr al-Marisi, ibn Abi Du’ad, and others. And the most prevalent thing which gathered the innovators against Shaykhul-Islam ibn Taymiyyah (rahimahullah) was his takfir of those who they believe are amongst the awliya; such as ibn ‘Arabi, ibn al-Faridh, at-Tilmisani, al-Qunawi, and others. And the most prevalent thing which Shaykhul-Islam Muhammad ibn ‘Abdil-Wahhab (rahimahullah) was most hated for was the

---

issue of him performing takfir of the grave worshippers and other than them.

Shaykh Muhammad ibn ‘Abdil-Wahhab (rahimahullāh) said in the third treatise from his *Rasail ash-Shaykhsiyyah*, “If they were for more than twenty years affirming day and night, secretly and openly, that the tawhid which this man displayed is the Din of Allah and His messenger, however the people do not obey us, and that what he rejected was shirk while he was truthful in his rejection [saying]: only if he would abstain from takfir and fighting, he would be upon the truth.”

And he said in his twenty ninth treatise, “And you know what they say, that if the people of confrontation (i.e. Muhammad ibn ‘Abdil-Wahhab) would abandon takfir and fighting, they would be upon the Din of Allah and His Messenger.”

And he said in his thirty eighth treatise, “However, today they argue with one misconception, so know the answer to it, and what they say is that all of this is the truth, we bear witness that it is the Din of Allah and His messenger, except for takfir and fighting. And what is astonishing is the one who is not able to answer this [misconception]. If they affirmed that this is the Din of Allah and His messenger, how can we not make takfir of the one who rejects it, kills those who commands it, and imprisons them? How can the one who sends orders to imprison them not be a kafir? How can the

---

one who comes to the people of shirk and urges them to hold onto their religion and adorns it for them, and encourages them in killing the muwahhidin and taking their wealth not be a kafir? How can he not be a kafir if what he urges and encourages is what the Messenger (sallallahu ‘alayhi wa sallam) rejected? He forbade it and called it shirk with Allah, and he testified that the one who has enmity to them and hates their people, and orders the mushrikin to be killed is the Din of Allah and His messenger. Know [O Muslim] that the proofs supporting making takfir of a righteous Muslim if he commits shirk with Allah, or he assisted the mushrikin [in fighting] against the muwahhidin, even if he did not commit shirk, are too much to be counted from the words of Allah, His messenger, and the sayings of all the scholars.”

**Question:** What is your opinion regarding the one who says that it necessary to look at whether the conditions have been met and the preventions of takfir have been removed with regards to the one who has committed kufr; such as shirk, sihr, or mocking, and similar to that from the nullifiers, until we can individually rule upon him with kufr?

**Answer:** This is not correct because looking into the conditions, and similar to that, is within the matters which become unclear. As for the matters of usul that you mentioned in the question; shirk, sihr, mocking, and similar



---

to that, then the person who does that disbelieves with no dignity, except in the case of ikrah. The fundamental principle and criterion is: every person who has fulfilled what negates his submission to Allah, then he is a kafir, except for the mukrah (i.e. one in ikrah). So make your judgement based upon this principle in all scenarios, as we know that submission to Allah is nullified by two things:

- 1) That he submits to Allah and to other than Allah; this is shirk.
- 2) That he does not submit to Allah, and this is rejection, arrogance, and similar to that.

Regardless whether this nullifier was in one issue or more, for example:

- 1) Whoever worships other than Allah because he was ignorant; shirk is established upon him.
- 2) Whoever legalises alcohol because he was ignorant, and he is someone who is truly ignorant; no nullifier is established upon him.

- 
- 3) Whoever legalises alcohol, and he is someone who is not truly ignorant; denial and rejection [of the text] is established upon him.
  - 4) Whoever interprets tawhid or the matters pertaining to wala and bara; denial and rejection is established upon him.
  - 5) Whoever interprets some of the attributes of Allah such as istiwa, and qadr because of a misconception; no negater of Islam is established upon him.

Likewise with the rest of the scenarios. And Allah knows best.<sup>49</sup>

**Question:** What is the evidences for differentiating between the issues (asl ad-Din/apparent/obscure)? With an explanation of their meanings.

**Answer:** The answer to this question requires a complete treatise, and I will summarise the answer for you here:

Islam is submission to Allah, and it is nullified by two things:

---

<sup>49</sup> Ibid.

- 1) That he submits to Allah and to other than Him, and this is shirk; whether it is done in one act of worship or more.
- 2) That he doesn't submit to Allah, and he is the arrogant one, the one who refuses, and similar to that; whether it is in one ordinance or more.

So whatever negates Islam completely that is what is known by *usul ad-Din*, and it is what was mentioned first. So a *mushrik* is not a Muslim to start until the reasons of entitlement is looked at to then rule upon him. And whatever does not negate Islam except with the condition of showing the evidences, then that is what is meant by the apparent matters, and it is what was mentioned second. What must necessitate as a outcome to place *kufr* on a person is arrogance, refusal, denial, or similar to that, in order that Islam is negated from him. This does not occur except with proofs shown to him, because if he was ignorant of it then no nullifier of Islam has been established on him, since he did not show arrogance or deny.

As for the matters that are obscure, then it differs from the apparent in terms of the *Shari'ah* and rationally, as it is well known. So in order to make *takfir* of the individual, you must establish upon him what negates Islam from denial or arrogance, and this does not occur with the misconceptions

---

and interpretations that he has with him. He is not considered by that arrogant or a denier, however if this misconception was removed in the correct way, and the hujjah is established upon him until his arrogance and denial becomes definite afterwards, if he remains upon his statement then he becomes a kafir. This is all well known by examining the proofs of the Shari'ah and the sayings of the scholars. And Allah knows best.<sup>50</sup>

**Question:** The Tatar and the words of Shaykhul-Islam regarding them has greatly confused me, did he rule them with kufr?

**Answer:** The Tatar who would wage war against the Muslimin, the Shaykh (rahimahullah) would make takfir upon them. This is apparent in his fatawa, proofs, and actions. And Allah knows best.<sup>51</sup>

**Question:** Is bulugh al-hujjah (having the evidence reach an individual) a condition to judge one with kufr?

**Answer:** Kufr is of two types with regards to applying it:

---

<sup>50</sup> Ibid.

<sup>51</sup> Ibid.

- 1) It could be applied to mean general kufr: and it is every person who does not comply with the Din of Islam, whether the hujjah has been applied or not.
- 2) It could be applied to mean specific kufr: and it is rejecting the truth and denying it after the bulugh (evidence reaching an individual), and this is specifically for the one that the hujjah has been applied on, and this is the kufr that punishment revolves around.

As for the general kufr, firstly, ahlul-fatrah and the likes enters into it; of those whom the hujjah has not been established on. And even though they are called kuffar they are not punished except after establishing the hujjah. Based on this you can make sense the saying of Imam Muhammad ibn ‘Abdil-Wahhab (rahimahullah) with regards to his refraining takfir of whoever worshipped the dome of Kawaz, ‘Abdul-Qadir, and similar to them, due to their ignorance. So what he intended by that is the specific kufr in which establishing the hujjah is a condition, not the general kufr that is contrary to Islam.<sup>52</sup>

---

<sup>52</sup> Ibid.

---

**Question:** The separation between general and specific, for example, a particular group is kafir but not the individuals, is there any basis for this?

**Answer:** The asl (foundation) is that whoever falls into kufr, then he is kafir. Rather, the issue of separating between the general and specific spread by the spread of irja. Irja could be by narrowing disbelief in Allah to i'tiqad (belief), or it could be by not applying it upon individuals, as is the case today, that even some of the “intellectuals” said (based upon the statements of the Murjiah) that no one will ever enter the Fire except for kufr alone, because there is no kafir!!

This does not mean putting aside the barriers and conditions, but it is not this image which is present today. And the biggest proof for that is the Riddah Wars, and I advise you to read the treatise of Shaykh Ishaq ibn ‘Abdir-Rahman from the aimmah of the da’wah regarding takfir of an individual and the excuse of ignorance. He has responded and refuted those people who say the action is kufr, however the person who does it does not disbelieve. And Allah knows best.<sup>53</sup>

**Question:** Is it narrated from the Salaf that they made individual takfir of the khulafa who claimed that the Qur’an was created?

---

<sup>53</sup> Ibid.

**Answer:** Yes, it is proven from some of the Salaf that they made takfir of them.

As for al-Ma'mun: al-Khallal narrated in *As-Sunnah* from Abi Talib that he said to Ahmad, "They passed by a man's grave in Tarsus (they did not mention his name but who is intended is al-Ma'mun), so they said, 'The kafir, may Allah have no mercy upon him.' Ahmad said, 'Na'am! May Allah have no mercy upon him, he is the one who established this and came with this.'"

As for al-Wathiq, then Ahmad ibn Nasr al-Khuza'i made takfir of him (refer to *Tarikh ibn al-Athir*, the incidents in the year 230 H or close to that, and Allah knows best).

Abu Dawud said in his *Masail*,<sup>54</sup> "I heard a man say to Ahmad that a man said, 'The names of Allah are created, and the Qur'an is created,' so Ahmad said, 'Clear kufr.'"

And he also said in his *Masail*,<sup>55</sup> "I asked Ahmad about the days he used to perform Jumu'ah behind the Jahmiyyah, I said to him, 'The Jumu'ah?' He said, 'I would repeat [my salah], and whenever you perform salah behind someone

---

<sup>54</sup> 1696.

<sup>55</sup> 305.

---

who says that the Qur'an is created, then repeat [your salah].'  
I said, 'And even in 'Arafah?' He said, 'Yes.'"

This is a response and refutation against those who quote from Imam Ahmad that he did not perform takfir upon their individuals, that he used to perform salah behind them, and that it is not narrated that he used to repeat [his salah]. And Allah knows best.<sup>56</sup>

---

<sup>56</sup> *Al-Fatava al-Ha'riyyah.*



