



## **Readings in Kashf ush-Shubuhaat (Removal of the Doubts) : The Eleventh Study**

### **INTRODUCTION**

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

To proceed: this is the treatise of the Shaikh ul-Islaam, Establisher of Tawheed, and Reviver of the Religion, Muhammad bin Abdul-Wahhaab entitled “the Removal of the Doubts” and it is one of the most essential and fundamental writings on the subject of Tawheed and what is connected to it. The translation of the text has been taken from the work of Muhammad bin Abdur-Rahmaan al-Khumayyis who has added some brief explanatory notes and some additional footnotes pointing out some other doubts that the enemies of Tawheed use and spread amongst the people. The whole book is serialised in sections and explanatory titles have been given to each portion of the text to aid understanding, study and revision.

We pray that Allaah revives the light of Tawheed and the Sunnah and that He removes what remains of the darkneses of Shirk and Bid’ah, and that He corrects the affairs of the Ummah, by granting them success in correcting their own souls, following in all of that the Methodology of the Inheritors the Prophets in every generation, that of Imaam Maalik, that of the Prophets and Messengers themselves.

To proceed: The Eleventh Study...

## **The Eleventh Study: On the Disbelief of the One Who Falls Into the Nullifiers of Islaam – Even If He Professes and Practises Islaam**

The Shaikh of Islaam, Muhammad bin Abdul-Wahhaab continued:

### **[11.1] A Doubt Used to Reject Everything That Has Preceded In This Discourse**

When it has been established that those whom the Messenger (sallallaahu alaihi wasallam) fought, were of sounder intellect, and less severe in their Shirk than these (contemporary) ones, then you should know that the contemporaries have a doubt which they present in reply to what we have mentioned, and this is from the greatest of their doubts. So pay careful attention to the answer to it.

So this (doubt) is:

That they say, “Verily, those upon whom the Qur’aan was revealed did not testify that “None has the right to be worshipped in truth except Allaah”, and they rejected the Messenger (sallallaahu alaihi wasallam) and they rejected the Resurrection, and they rejected the Qur’aan, and they declared it to be magic... Whereas we testify that none has the right to be worshipped in truth except Allaah, and that Muhammad is His Messenger, and we believe in the Qur’aan, we have faith in the Resurrection, we pray, and we fast, so how can you make us to be like those (Kuffaar)?<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> **Shaykh Ibn Uthaymeen:** “In this sentence he (rahimahullaah) explains a great doubt from amongst their doubts and he also replies to it, so he says: When you have established that the Mushriks in his time (alayhis salaatu was salaam) were of sounder intellect and less severe in Shirk than these (contemporary) ones, then know that they bring a doubt in that they say the Mushriks in the time of the Messenger (sallallaahu alayhi wasallam), they did not witness that none has the right to be worshipped except Allaah alone, and that Muhammad is the Messenger of Allaah, and nor did they believe in the Resurrection, and nor the Reckoning, and they rejected the Qur’aan, and as for us (meaning the Mushriks of our times), then we testify that none has the right to be worshipped except Allaah, and that Muhammad is the Messenger of Allaah, and we believe in the Qur’aan and in the Resurrection. Further, we establish the prayer, give the zakaah, and fast in Ramadaan, so how can you make us to be like them. So this is a great and mighty doubt.”

So the answer is:

### **[11.2] The First Reply to This Doubt**

That there is no difference amongst all the Scholars that if a man believes the Messenger of Allaah (sallallaau alaihi wasallam) in something and disbelieves him in something, that he is a Kaafir, who has not entered into Islaam. And likewise (it is so), when he believed in part of the Qur'aan and then rejected part of it. Such as the one who affirmed Tawheed, and then rejected the obligation of prayer. Or affirmed Tawheed and the prayers, and then rejected the obligation of zakaah. Or affirmed all of this, but rejected the obligation of fasting, or affirmed all of this, but rejected the obligation of Hajj. When the people in the time of the Prophet (sallallaahu alaihi wasallam) did not comply (inwardly) with the obligation of Hajj, then Allaah revealed (this verse) concerning them, **“And Hajj (pilgrimage to Makkah) to the House (Ka’bah) is a duty that mankind owes to Allâh, those who can afford the expenses (for one’s conveyance, provision and residence); and whoever disbelieves [i.e. denies Hajj (pilgrimage to Makkah)], then he is a disbeliever of Allâh,**

---

**Shaykh Ibn Ibraaheem:** “[The Mushriks say]: So how have you made us to be like them? How can you make us the same as those who affirm all of these great matters (i.e. the kalimah, the prayer, fasting, zakaah, hajj, the resurrection) as those who feign ignorance of them? He means, that you have made equal those who are separate from each other and have united between those that differ with each other – rather, you did not fall short, but even made us to be more ignorant and astray than those.

So you will come to know that they (the Mushriks) actually oppose and contend with what the author has affirmed and established, and then they say “We are not from amongst them, yet you have made us to be even worse than them, and how can you make the one who has such qualities that he has (i.e. belief in the obligations) to be just like the one who has none of these qualities?”

So the reply will come to you from the author, that these differences between them (and the first Mushriks) do not affect (the judgement in) the Book and the Sunnah and Ijmaa’. Rather, these differences only make their disbelief more severe, since an original disbeliever who has not affirmed any of these matters (i.e. the obligations etc.) is less severe in his disbelief than the one who affirmed the truth and rejected it. For this reason the apostate is greater in his disbelief than the original kaafir, with respect to the rulings pertaining to him.”

**then Allâh stands not in need of any of the ‘Alamîn (mankind and jinns).’** (Aali Imran 3:97)

And the one who affirmed all of this (i.e. the Five Pillars), but then rejected the Resurrection, he is a Kaafir by concensus, and his blood and wealth become lawful (to be taken), just as He, the Lofty and Majestic, said, **“Verily, those who disbelieve in Allâh and His Messengers and wish to make distinction between Allâh and His Messengers (by believing in Allâh and disbelieving in His Messengers) saying, “We believe in some but reject others,” and wish to adopt a way in between. They are in truth disbelievers. And We have prepared for the disbelievers a humiliating torment.”** (An-Nisa 4:150-151).

Hence, when Allaah has made it explicitly clear in His Book that whoever believes in a part of it and disbelieves in a part of it, then he is the Kaafir in truth, then this doubt comes to an end. And this is (the doubt) that one of the people of al-Ahsaa mentioned in his book that he sent to us.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup> **Shaykh Ibn Ibraaheem:** “So the answer to what they have objected against with respect to these differences (between them and the Mushriks) and that they are valid, then the likes of these differences are of two types. Those that affect (the judgement) and those that do not.

And it is the Ijmaa’ that the likes of these differences (that the Mushriks) have pointed out do not affect (the judgement), since there is no difference between the scholars that if a man was to believe the Messenger (sallallaahu alaihi wasallam) in something and then reject him in something else, he is a disbeliever, who has not entered into Islaam, and this is by Ijmaa’. Meaning, that he is not a Muslim and he does not even possess a hair’s amount of Islaam. For when he rejects him in a single thing, and then believes him in thousands of others, including the prayer, charity and others, then that single rejection is actually a judgement upon all the other thousands (that he has affirmed). So when it is the case that the one who believes in him in something but rejects him in something else is a disbeliever, then how will it be for Tawheed which is the greatest obligation that the Prophet (sallallaahu alaihi wasallam) came with, and then set up a partner in worship for the Originator of the Heavens and the Earth, so he directed supplication to it, supplication which is the essence of worship. So he either calls upon other than Him all the time, or he makes this thing a partner to Him (and so calls upon Allaah and this partner in worship he set up).

So when it is the case that the likes of these differences (i.e. that they utter the kalimah, pray, fast, give charity, make hajj, etc.) do not have an affect (upon the ruling) then how will it be in the case of Tawheed. However, and with Allaah is refuge, Shirk has made their hearts blind.

...Such as the one who affirms Tawheed, in both wording and meaning, and then he rejects one of the subsidiary matters of the Sharee'ah, about which it is known that the Messenger came with, (such as) the obligation of prayer. The one who rejects the obligation of the five prayers is a disbeliever by Ijmaa', even if he was to perform it, and brought Tawheed, or if he affirmed Tawheed, and prayer and then rejected the obligation of zakaah, even if he gave zakaah, then he is a disbeliever by Ijmaa' of the Ummah, or if he affirmed all of this, and then rejected fasting, even if he performed it, then he is a disbeliever by Ijmaa' of the Ummah, due to his disbelief (takdheeb) of Allaah and the Messenger. Or if he affirmed all of this, and then rejected the obligation of Hajj to the House, even if he performs Hajj, then he is a disbeliever due to his rejection (takdheeb) of Allaah and His Messenger and his rejection of the Ijmaa' of the Ummah... And as for the one who abandoned prayer out of neglect, then the choice of Ahmad, and he quotes Ishaq bin Raahawaih, is that he disbelieves, by concensus. And the one who affirms all of this, and then rejects the Resurrection, meaning the resurrection of these bodies, after their being tried (in the grave) and returning their souls to them on the Day of Judgement, then he has disbelieved by Ijmaa', due to the Ijmaa' of the people of knowledge, and his blood and wealth are lawful – and whatever he affirmed besides this, will not benefit him. Just as Allaah, the Most High said, **“Verily, those who disbelieve in Allāh and His Messengers and wish to make distinction between Allāh and His Messengers (by believing in Allāh and disbelieving in His Messengers) saying, “We believe in some but reject others,” and wish to adopt a way in between. They are in truth disbelievers. And We have prepared for the disbelievers a humiliating torment.”** (An-Nisa 4:150-151).

So in this verse Allaah the Most High made it clear that such a one is a disbeliever in truth, and so it shows that it is not a condition that it is only disbelief when he disbelieves in all of that, since this is the kufr of type (or form). And kufr is of two types: a) kufr naw'iyy (i.e. partial disbelief) b) kufr kullee (total disbelief), and so whoever disbelieved in some, then it is like the one who disbelieves in all, and there is no doubt.

...And on account of this, it will become clear and apparent that there are to be found differences (between the contemporary Mushriks and the earlier ones) but that they are of no avail. Since, apostasy is of two types: [firstly], absolute apostasy, which is to recant from what the Messenger (sallallaahu alaihi wasallam) came with in its entirety, and secondly, that he disbelieves in some of what he came with. For it is a consensus amongst the people of knowledge that the one who apostatises from only some of the religion is a disbeliever. Rather, they consider that even a single belief, or a single word can expel a person from the entire religion.

### [11.3] The Second Reply to This Doubt

It can also be said that if you affirm that the one who believes the Messenger in everything, and then rejected the obligation of prayer, then he is a Kaafir whose blood and wealth become lawful, by consensus, and likewise, if he affirms everything except the Resurrection, and likewise, if he rejects the obligation of fasting, but believes in everything else. And the various schools of thought do not differ on this, since the Qur'aan itself has spoken of this.

Thus, it is known that Tawheed is the greatest obligation that the Messenger (sallallaahu alaihi wasallam) came with, and it is greater than prayer, zakaah, fasting and Hajj. So how can it be that when a man rejects any of these matters he disbelieves, even if he acted upon everything that the Messenger (sallallaahu alaihi wasallam) came with, and yet if he rejects the Tawheed that is the deen of all of the Messengers, he does not disbelieve? Subhaanallaah! How amazing is this ignorance.<sup>3</sup>

---

And by this, the doubt will be uncovered and removed, and it will be known that differentiating on account of the differences that have been mentioned (by the contemporary Mushriks), are from those differences that are of no avail or effect.”

<sup>3</sup> **Shaykh Ibn Uthaymeen:** “This is the second reply, and its essence is that when you have come to know and have affirmed that the one who rejects the prayer, or zakaah, or fasting or hajj, or the Resurrection, is a disbeliever in Allaah the Mighty, even if he affirmed everything that the Messenger (sallallaahu alayhi wasallam) came with besides that (which he rejected), then how can you reject that the one who rejects Tawheed and associates partners with Allaah the Most High is a disbeliever (also)? This is a very strange thing indeed, that you make the one who rejects Tawheed a Muslim and the one who rejects the obligation of these affairs (of worship) to be a disbeliever, alongside the fact that Tawheed is the greatest thing that the Messengers (alayhim us salaatu was salaam) came with. Just as the Exalted said, **“And we have not sent a Messenger before you, except that we inspired to him that there is none that has the right to be worshipped except Me, so worship Me alone”** (Anbiyaa 21:25). And this (i.e. Tawheed) is the foundation for all of these acts of worship – those which if a person was to reject their obligation he would become a disbeliever, since they cannot be correct and sound, except by this Tawheed. Just as Allaah the Most High said, **“And it has been revealed to you and to those before you that if you were to associate partners (with Allaah), then your deeds would be vain and nullified and you would be amongst the Losers. Rather, worship Allaah alone, and be amongst the grateful ones”** (Zumar 39:65). Hence, when it is the case that the one who rejects the

### [11.4] The Third Reply to This Doubt

It can also be said that those Companions of Allaah's Messenger (sallallaahu alaihi wasallam) fought Banu Haneefah, and yet they had accepted Islaam with the Prophet (sallallaahu alaihi wasallam), and they testified that none has the right to be worshipped alone, and that

---

obligation of prayer, or fasting or zakaah, or the Resurrection, is a disbeliever, then the one who rejects Tawheed is more severe in disbelief, and his disbelief is more clear and apparent."

**Shaykh Ibn Ibraaheem:** "...So when this is the case regarding the one who rejected (the obligation) of a single pillar of Islaam, how then is it for the one who rejects Tawheed which is the basis of the religion? For it is greater. Hence, his belief in everything that the Messenger (sallallaahu alaihi wasallam) came with will not benefit him, since he rejected the foundation (of all of that). Since, if rejecting a branch from the branches of the religion is disbelief, then how about rejection of the foundation that is Tawheed?

This disputant does not reject that isolated matters (i.e. rejection of some of the pillars or rejection of the resurrection etc.) can expel from the religion, then they make the one who demolishes the foundation of the religion, morning and evening, to be a Muslim, merely because he claims Islaam, and yet the one who rejects the obligation of zakaah, even if he was to give it, is a disbeliever by consensus! For the ignorant of these people is the most amazing of ignorance. That one of them affirms that the rejecting prayer is disbelief by consensus, or rejecting other than it from the pillars of Islaam is disbelief, yet rejection of Tawheed is not disbelief?!

So the conclusion is that if it was the case that Tawheed is merely equivalent to some of the things that have been mentioned (i.e. the prayer, zakaah, fasting etc.), then rejecting it would still be disbelief. So how then when it is the very foundation of all of that? Rather, Tawheed by itself can sometimes be sufficient for the Islaam of a servant and his entry into Paradise. For when he speaks with the word of Tawheed, then he dies before anything from the subsidiary matters is obligatory upon him, then Tawheed by itself is sufficient. And Tawheed is not in need of these matters (i.e. the obligations), rather these obligations are in need of it (i.e. Tawheed) for them to be considered correct and valid.

So there is nothing more amazing, or more repugnant than the ignorance of this one. For when he affirms that the one who rejects anything from these branches that he is a disbeliever. And yet one does not reject it, but when he rejects Tawheed, which is actually the root and foundation, and whatever comes after it is actually a branch, that he does not disbelieve – [so when he affirms the likes of this] then there is nothing more strange than the ignorance of the one who was ignorant of this."

Muhammad is the Messenger of Allaah, and they prayed and would pronounce the aadhaan. So if he (i.e the Mushrik) says, “But they say that Musaylamah is a Prophet”, then we say in reply, “This is what is desired”.

For if a person who raises a man to the level of the Prophet (sallallaahu alaihi wasallam) disbelieves, and his blood and wealth rendered lawful, and for whom the Shahaadatayn (two testimonies of faith) are of no benefit, and nor the prayer, then how is it for the one who raises “Shamsaan” and “Yoosuf” or a Companion, or a Prophet to the level of the Jabbaar of the Heavens and the Earth?! Subhaanallaah! How great is His affair, **“Thus does Allaah seal the hearts of those who do not know”** (ar-Room 30:59).<sup>4</sup>

### [11.5] The Fourth Reply to This Doubt

It is also said that those whom Alee bin Abee Taalib (radiiallaahu anhu) burned with the Fire, all of them claimed Islaam, and they

---

<sup>4</sup> **Shaykh Ibn Ibraaheem:** “...This is what we actually mean, for nothing arose from those except that they said that he is a prophet, and so they committed a crime pertaining to the affair of Messengership (risaalah), and thus it nullified their Tawheed and their religion – For if a person who raises a man to the level of the Prophet (sallallaahu alaihi wasallam) disbelieves, and his blood and wealth rendered lawful, and for whom the Shahaadatayn (two testimonies of faith) are of no benefit, and nor the prayer, and nor fasting, and nor the adhaan, and you (O disputant) affirm all of this, and this is no doubt a crime, to raise someone from the creation to the level of someone else from the creation (a Prophet), then what is the case of the one who commits a crime pertaining to Uloohiyyah (Allaah’s unique, sole right to be worshipped), and so he raised one from the creation to the level and status of the Creator. The scholars declared a disbeliever the one who transgressed concerning the Messengership, so how about the one who transgressed concerning Uloohiyyah? For the one who worships others alongside Allaah, has transgressed – rather there is nothing greater than his crime.

And this is more worthy of being misguidance and disbelief, since he directed to someone from the creation, forms of worship that only the Creator deserves.

In such a manner is the seal upon the heart of this ignoramus, how can he imagine that the one who raises a person to the level of another man is a disbeliever, and when he raises a man to the level of the Compeller of the Heavens and the Earth, he does not disbelieve?!”



were from the associates of Alee (radiallaahu anhu), and they acquired knowledge from the Companions. However, they believed concerning Alee a belief similar to what is held concerning “Yoosuf” and “Shamsaan” and whoever is like them. How then did the Companions agree upon their disbelief and killing of them? Do you think that the Companions declare Muslims to be disbelievers? Do you think that holding this belief concerning “Taaj” and his likes does not harm. And yet holding this belief concerning Alee bin Abee Taalib is disbelief?<sup>5</sup>

---

<sup>5</sup> **Shaykh Ibn Ibraaheem:** “And they are of the Extremist Shi’ah from the associates of Alee, they exaggerated in their love for him and exceeded the limit. And this [matter entered] due to the plot of some people who were hypocrites, then schemed this plot so as to corrupt the deen of the people, the followers of Abdullaah bin Saba’, who claimed Islaam and desired to destroy the people of Islaam and enter Shirk into them. So they exceeded the limit in the love of Alee and veneration of him, and they even claimed Ilaahiyyah for him. They all claimed Islaam, and they would perform the acts of Islaam, but then this statement of apostasy emanated from them when they held their belief in Alee, a false belief, they believed Uloohiyyah for him – just like the belief that is held in Yoosuf, Shamsaan and their likes, and also such as Abdul-Qaadir, and Eedrous, and this is similar to the belief held the people of our time.

So when Alee (radiallaahu anhu) saw that from them, he dug a pit for them and kindled a fire within it for them, and threw them into it, on account of their statement regarding him. And this matter from Alee (radiallaahu anhu) was agreed upon by the rest of the Companions, and they saw that these people are indeed apostates, and fighting them is the truth. And Ibn ‘Abbaas and others also held this, except that he said, “If only he had killed them with the sword, since no one punishes with the Fire, except the Lord of the Fire.” And the action of Alee (radiallaahu anhu) was brought about due to ijtihaad on his behalf, he saw that burning them befitted the severity of their kufr, just as Abu Bakr burned some of the apostates.

How then did the Companions agree upon their disbelief and killing of them? Do you think that the Companions declare Muslims to be disbelievers? Do you think that holding this belief concerning “Taaj” and his likes does not harm. And yet holding this belief concerning Alee bin Abee Taalib is disbelief? So therefore, when you have established and also come to know that this action occurred from Alee, during the time of the Companions, then one of three matters are binding upon those people who adhere to this doubt:

ONE: Either they say that the Companions erred, made a mistake and that they declared Muslims to be disbelievers, and they killed those who did not deserve [the label of] kufr and to be killed, and thus they, are upon misguidance. And they will not say this, due to this matter being very clear in the books of siyar (biographies) and

### [11.6] The Fifth Reply to This Doubt

And it is also said that Banu Ubayd al-Qaddaah<sup>6</sup>, those who took over Morocco and Egypt during the time of Banul-Abbaas, all of them testified that there is none that has the right to be worshipped except

---

history. And if they were to say it regarding the Companions, then this in itself is sufficient as a refutation against them, since they will have become like the Khawaarij who make takfeer of the Companions and revile them.

TWO: Or that they say that holding belief in the likes of Taaj, and making tawassul by way of the righteous and asking them for the fulfilment of needs, and removal of hardships, and the removal of grief and sorrow, that all of this does not harm, and [on the other hand] to hold a similar belief concerning Alee bin Abee Taalib actually entails disbelief. And again they do not say this either, for if they were to say it that a person does not disbelieve (by way of this), then it is sufficient that it is kufr and shirk. And hence, the greatness of their ignorance becomes manifest due to the superiority of Alee over the likes of these (i.e. Taaj, Shamsaan and others) by a long way. And if there had been a permissibility for calling upon other than Allaah, or if had been easier, then it would have been calling upon Alee (not the likes of those).

THREE: Hence, [when they do not say the above two saying] the third matter is binding upon them, which is that they submit and accept that whoever becomes attached to other than Allaah by way of any of the types of worship, then he is a disbeliever, outside the religion, an apostate, and he is more severe in his kufr than the one who does not have any of these actions with him – and that his affirmation of the two testimonies (of faith), and performance of the prayer, and zakaah and whatever is like that is a difference (between him and the earlier Mushriks) does not have any effect and is of no benefit.

So by this it becomes clear that they are astray in their doubts that they spread, for the extremists, those who exaggerated concerning Alee (radiallaahu anhu), they only believed concerning him what (the contemporaries) hold with respect to Taaj and his likes, from amongst these idols. And if they say, this is not exaggeration (ghuluww), then in the first part of (this book), there is what explains that it is exaggeration, by worshipping the creation alongside Allaah.”

<sup>6</sup> **Shaykh Salih al-Fawzaan:** “In the time of the Abbaasids the sect of the Ubaydiyyoon appeared, and they are a faction of the Ismaa’eeli Shee’ah, as they associate themselves with Ismaa’eel bin Muhammad bin Ja’far, and this is why they are named Ismaa’eeliyyah and Faatimiyyah because they claim they are from the progeny of Faatimah, and this is why it is said to them “Faatimiyyoon”. In reality, they are actually from the Jews, they manifested Islaam but acts of disbelief appeared from them, and at the end, their rulers actually claimed uloohiyyah (divinity), such al-Haakim al-Ubaydi.”

Allaah and that Muhammad is the Messenger of Allaah, and they claimed Islaam, prayed the Jumu'ah and the Jamaa'ah. However, when they manifested some opposition to the Sharee'ah, different to that which are upon, the Scholars were united concerning their disbelief, and fighting against them, and that their land is a land of war (dar ul-harb). And so the Muslims made expeditions against them, until they delivered the lands of the Muslims from their hands.<sup>7</sup>

<sup>7</sup> **Shaykh Ibn Ibraaheem:** "This is the fifth reply to the doubt, the Banu Ubayd al-Qaddaah, those who claimed that they are the "Faatimiyyoon", and whoever assisted them. And in reality they are just claimants, they are not in fact "Faatimiyyoon", their father, and the story of his marriage to a woman, and also their history and is known. [The trusted scholars of the Ummah have never ceased to revile them in their deen and their genealogy, and they mention that they are from the offspring of the Magians or the Jews. Refer to Majmoo al-Fataawaa of Shaykh ul-Islaam, 35/128-135]. Their kings were called "al-Haakimiyyoon", so they would say "al-Haakim so and so" and "al-Haakim so and so". All of them would testify that none has the right to be worshipped except Allaah alone and that Muhammad is the Messenger of Allaah, and they claimed Islaam, and prayed the Jumu'ah and the Jamaa'ah. But when they manifested some opposition to the Sharee'ah in certain affairs, such as their declaring some of the prohibited things to be lawful (istihlaal), such as their permitting the marrying of two sisters at the same time, then the scholars of that time were united and agreed upon their disbelief and fighting them.

And they did not make the fact that they uttered the two testimonies of faith or performed the prayer, zakaah, jumu'ah and the jamaa'ah to be a difference (between them and the earlier Mushriks) to be a difference that is counted or effective. This is because they found from these people that which expels from the religion (mukaffir), and thus whatever they were upon (of the other aspects of the deen) did not benefit them. And they (the scholars) also agreed in their time, that their land was a land of war (dar ul-harb), and that making Jihaad against them is the virtuous Jihaad. And so the Muslims made expeditions against them, until they delivered the lands of the Muslims from their hands. And Ibn al-Jawzee authored a book called "An-Nasr alaa Misr" (The Aid over Egypt). So how will it be with our situation in which the deen of Islaam is made apparent and manifest alongside the nullification of the very basis of the religion by worshipping others besides Allaah?

And there is not difference between the one whose kufr is due to 'inaad (stubborn resistance) or the one whose kufr is due to jahl (ignorance). Since, from kufr is that which is 'inaad and that which is jahl. And it is not a condition of the establishment of the proof upon a disbeliever, that he understands it (i.e. the proof). Rather the one upon whom the proof has been established in a manner in which someone equivalent to him is able to understand, then he is a disbeliever, regardless of whether he understood it or he did not understand it [\*]. And if understanding the proof was a condition then kufr would only have been a single type, which is the kufr of "juhood"

### [11.7] The Sixth Reply to This Doubt

And it can also be said that when the very first ones did not disbelieve except due to their combining between Shirk and disbelieving the Messenger (sallallaahu alaihi wasallam) and the Qur'aan, and the Resurrection and other such affairs, then what exactly is the meaning of the chapter that the Scholars of every school of thought have mentioned, "Chapter: The Ruling Upon the Apostate"? And this (the apostate) is the one who disbelieves after his Islaam. Then they mentioned many types (of beliefs, statements and actions), every one of which necessitates disbelief, and makes lawful a man's blood and wealth. Until they even mentioned some matters that would be considered very light to the one who committed them, such as a statement he makes with his tongue as opposed to his heart, or a word that he says out of jest, and playing around.<sup>8</sup>

---

(i.e. rejection). Rather, kufr is of types, amongst them is the kufr of jahl (ignorance) and also other than it. And the intent here is that the scholars agreed upon fighting them and their disbelief, and the Ummah does not unite upon misguidance. And by this you will have come to know of the uncovering of this doubt, which is that uttering the two testimonies (of faith) is not sufficient alongside what is added to it of the various acts of obedience, when any one of those things that expel from the religion (al-mukaffiraat) are found."

[\*] Refer to Article MNJ090005: Shaykh ul-Islaam Ibn Abdul-Wahhaab on Those Whom Takfir is Made Of And Principles Concerning Takfir of the Ignorant

<sup>8</sup> **Shaykh Ibn Ibraaheem:** "So what has been mentioned in the chapter (in these books pertaining to apostasy), then it is a matter of consensus (ijmaa') amongst them, that even if a person uttered the two testimonies of faith, then a single belief (that he held) can expel him from the religion, or a single action, or a single statement, just this is sufficient, by the unanimous agreement of the Muslims, and they do not differ concerning this...So they said "Whoever said such and such or believed such and such, then he is disbeliever, and that all of what he acted upon will not benefit him. And some of them people of the madhaahib (schools of jurisprudence) even declare the one who belittles the name "mosque" or "mus.haf" (the Qur'aan) to be a disbeliever.

So in summary, whatever they have mentioned is that there are found certain things on account of which a person becomes an apostate, even if he utters the two testimonies (of faith) and prays. Rather, even if he added to that the abandonment of the prohibited matters, but then came with one of those things that expel from Islaam, it would destroy everything that he has of Islaam. For the presence of those

**[11.8] The Seventh Reply to This Doubt**

And it is also said that those about whom Allaah said, “They swear by Allâh that they said nothing (bad), but really they said the word of disbelief, and they disbelieved after accepting Islâm” (at-Tawbah 9:74), have you not heard (for yourself) that Allaah declared them Kuffaar by a mere word they uttered, alongside their being from the time of the Messenger of Allaah (sallallaahu alaihi wasallam), and their having fought alongside him (in Jihaad), prayed with him, given zakaah, made hajj and singled out Allaah in Tawheed?

And likewise those about whom Allaah said, “Say: “Was it at Allâh, and His Ayât and His Messenger that you were mocking?” Make no excuse; you have disbelieved after you had believed. (At-Tawbah 9:65-66).

So those who were with the Messenger of Allaah (sallallaahu alaihi wasallam) in the expedition of Taabuk, and about whom Allaah made it clear that they disbelieved after having faith, they uttered a

---

things that expel from the religion, on account of which a person becomes an apostate are very many, which cannot be enumerated here.

And one of the causes of apostasy is that person gives to anyone, one of the rights of the Lord of the Worlds, and this is sufficient for his disbelief. And that he takes an ilaah (object of worship), even if that was not from every angle, rather just merely making something to be appropriate for one of the rights of the Lord of all the worlds is sufficient.

And by this the doubt is uncovered, that even if he utters the two testimonies, prays and fasts, then he becomes an apostate (on account of one of his Shirk), and he becomes more evil than the who does not have the foundation of Islaam to begin with, in the view of the scholars.

And what is correct from the two sayings of the scholars is that the Kuffar of our times (i.e. those who associate with Islaam but are upon Shirk) are apostates - that they utter “None has the right to be worshipped except Allaah” in the morning and evening, and then they nullify it morning and evening. For declaring “None has the right to be worshipped except Allaah” enters a person into Islaam. And the second saying is that they are original Kuffaar, for they have not singled out Allaah in worship for even a day, such that they should be judged as having Islaam.”

word and then they mentioned that they only said it in jest (i.e. mockery).<sup>9</sup>

### **[11.9] The Most Beneficial of That Which Is In This Book**

So reflect upon this doubt, which is their saying, “You declare to be disbelievers those from the Muslims who testify that “None has the right to be worshipped except Allaah” and who pray and fast. And then reflect upon its answer, for it is amongst the most beneficial of what is in these papers.<sup>10</sup>

---

<sup>9</sup> **Shaykh Ibn Ibraaheem:** “And they used to utter the two testimonies, and would practise the religion of the Muslims outwardly. So how would it be for the one who makes rivals, equals (andaad) to be his refuge, and his recourse in his needs and aspirations, as occurs amongst the grave-worshippers, and refuge is with Allaah. His tongue says “None has the right to be worshipped but Allaah” and his action says, “None has the right to be worshipped but so and so”.

So these people (who uttered this speech), they disbelieved by a single phrase, and they at the same time were performing the Sharee’ah actions and would perform the actions of the Muslims, but then they became disbelievers after their faith, when only a single thing occurred from them, they became disbelievers, apostates.

So by this, the doubt of the one who causes doubts by it, is uncovered.”

<sup>10</sup> **Shaykh Ibn Ibraaheem:** “So reflect upon this doubt, which is their saying, “You declare to be disbelievers those from the Muslims who testify that “None has the right to be worshipped except Allaah” and who pray and fast. And then reflect upon its answer, for it is amongst the most beneficial of what is in these papers. For it is the most beneficial of what the author has mentioned in this work, and this is because it is a doubt that is sometimes used upon the one who does not know and does not understand, so he thinks that what has been mentioned by the doubter (concerning the so called differences between the earlier Mushriks and contemporary ones) are differences which are counted and real. And on account of what the author has mentioned (rahimahullaah), it will become clear to you and they are differences that have no effect, for the people of knowledge are agreed that these differences have no effect.”

## Points to Note

11A. When the Mushrik has no reply to what has preceded in the discourse – and which is far reaching and decisive – then he resorts to that which is actually the greatest of all of their doubts. To argue based upon the differences he sees between himself and the Mushriks of old. Namely, that he, unlike the ancestors, testifies that none has the right to be worshipped but Allaah, testifies to the Messengership of Muhammad (sallallaahu alaihi wasallam), performs the pillars, believes in the Resurrection and many others affairs. So how then can he be placed alongside the Mushriks, when they do not affirm or conform to the likes of these affairs?

11B. And there are numerous lies to this doubt and this false differentiation, and they can be summarised as follows:

1. Believing in part of Islaam and rejecting another part is disbelief, such as the one who accepts the two testimonies but rejects the prayer, or who affirms all of this but rejects the fasting. Or the one who affirms all the pillars but denies the Resurrection and so on. This is a matter of consensus.
2. That when it is the case that believing in a part and rejecting a part entails disbelief and that a person becomes a disbeliever by rejecting those affairs which are the branches, such as prayer, fasting, hajj, zakaah and so on, then Tawheed itself is the foundation, the root and basis of Islaam. So how can it not be so that if he rejects this in his action, that he remains a believer, yet when he rejects the fasting or the prayer he is a disbeliever?
3. That Banu Haneefah considered Musaylamah to be a Prophet, alongside their speaking with Islaam and acting upon its requirements. So they gave one of the creation the same rank and level as another one from the creation, the Prophet Muhammad (sallallaahu alaihi wasallam), and so they were declared disbelievers and fought. So how then for the one who raises one from the creation to the level of the Creator Himself! His disbelief is more severe.
4. That Alee (radiallaahu anhu) killed those who raised him and ascribed divinity to him, and the Companions agreed upon that

and were united upon their apostasy and upon fighting them. Yet, they were the associates of Alee, and learned from the companions, and spoke with Islaam and performed it outwardly with the rest of the Muslims.

5. The Banu Ubayd al-Qaddaah, who were Shi'ah, they too outwardly manifested Islaam and practised its pillars, but their oppositions to the Sharee'ah led the Scholars of time to pronounce disbelief upon them, and made their land a land of war, and so they were fought and removed.
6. That the Fuquhaa (jurists) in their books have devoted a whole separate chapter on the ruling pertaining to the apostate, and they included within this chapter many affairs, amongst the beliefs, statements and actions, which expel a person from Islaam, after his entry to Islaam. So what exactly is the meaning of this? And they mentioned in these chapters some very light things, such as making fun of aspects of the religion in one's speech and what is like that.
7. That there were those who were with the Messenger (sallallaahu alaihi wasallam) in the expedition of Tabuk, and who entered faith, but then they uttered words of mockery and jest, and so Allaah revealed their disbelief. And these were people who uttered the two testimonies and performed the pillars and even went out on Jihaad alongside the Messenger and the Companions. So none of that availed them when they brought something that expels from Islaam.

11C. That the answer given by Shaykh ul-Islaam is in response to the greatest of their doubts, and hence it is also the greatest and most beneficial of what is in this book. Hence, concern should be given to it.



## **Action Plan of the Muwahhid**

1. Understand that after all that has preceded the Mushrik will come with his best shot yet – thinking that he has finally managed to differentiate himself from his Mushrik Ancestry of old.
2. Understand that this argument is based upon his outward profession of Islaam and also his acting upon its dictates, its pillars and requirements – none of which is found with the Mushriks.
3. Memorise the seven examples given by Shaykh ul-Islaam Muhammad bin Abdul-Wahhaab and realise that all of them revolve around the fact that it is possible for a person to utter the two testimonies, bring all the pillars of Islaam, do all the acts of obedience and refrain from the acts of disobedience, and then to have all of that nullified by a single belief he holds, or a single action he performs or a single statement he utters – which expels him from Islaam and renders him an apostate.
4. Think, ponder and reflect over all of this. Then, when you are satisfied with your understanding and acquisition, then proceed to Part 12, seeking Allaah's aid and assistance in all of that.

And may the prayers and peace be upon Allaah's Messenger, his family, his companions and those who follow him upon Tawheed and the Sunnah till the affair is established.