

تكفير المشركين وعلاقته بالكفر بالطاغوت

Takfīr on the mushrikūn
and its relation to *Al-Kufr Bit-Tāghūt*

By

Shaykh Ahmad ibn ‘Umar Al-Hāzimī

May Allāh preserve him

Shaykh Ahmad ibn ‘Umar Al-Hāzimī – may Allāh hasten his release – said when explaining declaring takfīr upon those who commit shirk with Allāh in the worship of Him the Exalted:

“In the Name of Allāh the Most Merciful the Most Beneficent.

All praise is due to Allāh, and may the peace and blessings of Allāh be upon our Prophet Muhammad and upon his family and companions.

And thereafter:

We point to an issue which is related to what have gone forth. And that is that it has been established many times that leaving *shirk* is included in *al-kufr bit-tāghūt* (the rejection of *tāghūt*). So whoever does not leave *shirk* (by not performing it) then he has not fulfilled *al-kufr bit-tāghūt*. And it is also included (in *al-kufr bit-tāghūt*) – just as we have mentioned yesterday many times – that the one who excuses the *mushrik* in his *shirk*; the one who does not judge him as being upon *kufr* – then he has also not fulfilled the description of *al-kufr bit-tāghūt*.

And the description of whether a person has rejected *tāghūt* or not is built upon four things:

- The belief in the invalidity of the worship of others than Allāh
- Leaving (the worship of *tāghūt*)
- And also the *takfīr* (of the one worshipping *tāghūt*)
- And the hate and enmity.

All these things are included in what is called *al-kufr bit-tāghūt*. There is *ijmā’* (agreement) regarding this along with the verses of the Qurān that proves this. And therefore we have previously mentioned that His – the Mighty and Majestic – words:

فَمَنْ يَكْفُرْ بِالطَّاغُوتِ وَيُؤْمِنِ بِاللَّهِ

“Whoever disbelieves in *tāghūt* and believes in Allāh.” (Al-Baqarah 2:256)

(Through this) we learn that these are two conditions or two pillars and the description of Tawhīd is not fulfilled except by fulfilling the two pillars. But we still find the question regarding His – the Mighty and Majestic – words: ‘Whoever disbelieves in *tāghūt*’. Is this summarized or explained in detail in this text in the verse in surah Al-Baqarah?

فَمَنْ يَكْفُرْ بِالطَّاغُوتِ وَيُؤْمِنِ بِاللَّهِ

“Whoever disbelieves in *tāghūt* and believes in Allāh.” (Al-Baqarah 2:256)

Are these two pillars explained in detail or are they summarized (in their description)? There is no doubt that they are the second (i.e. summarized) because the question occurs: If this is mentioned to a *kāfir aslī* (a person who has never entered into Islām) and it is said to him: ‘Fulfill the description of *al-kufr bit-tāghūt*’, then he will verily ask: ‘How do I reject and what is *tāghūt*?’ So first he must learn the reality of *tāghūt* and then he must learn the reality of rejecting *tāghūt*. So the verse is summarized. And if it is summarized then how can he interpret it? We must go back to the verses that have come regarding this issue.

We have verily learned that *al-kufr bit-tāghūt* and *al-īmān billāh* (the belief in Allāh) is the *millah* (religion) of Ibrāhīm (*alayhi as-salām*), about which Allāh – the Exalted – has commanded that it must be followed. The *millah* of Ibrāhīm has verily clearly and obviously been provided for in many texts that clarify the reality of the *millah* of Ibrāhīm. So (we interpret it) by adding the explaining verses to what must be explained, which is *al-kufr bit-tāghūt*. So the result is that the reality of *al-kufr bit-tāghūt* already is clarified in the Islamic Law. So there cannot come anyone and make his own *ijtihād* (independent judgment) and say: ‘Disassociating oneself from what is worshipped besides Allāh is not from *al-kufr bit-tāghūt*’ or ‘the disassociation and declaring *takfīr* upon the *mushrikūn* is not from *al-kufr bit-tāghūt*’, because this would be an *ijtihād* which opposes the text (of Qurān and *Sunnah*) and therefor it is invalid. And when it is like this then it is not even considered a *shubha* (doubt) or *tawīl sāigh* (acceptable interpretation). This is due to what we have learned; that this issue is not open for any personal *ijtihād*, as Imām Ash-Shāfi’ī – *rahimahullāhu ta’ālā* – has said regarding issues related to Tawhīd. In these clear issues it is not accepted to have a mistake in information – as he said – and it is not accepted to have *tawīl* nor is it acceptable to disagree in these issues. So no one should come and claim that there is disagreement in this issue. Instead we return to the texts of the Qurān and *Sunnah*.

So when it is like this then it is established that declaring *takfīr* upon the *mushrikūn* is included in *al-kufr bit-tāghūt*.

إِذْ قَالُوا لِقَوْمِهِمْ إِنَّا بُرَاءٌ مِنْكُمْ

“When they said to their people: ‘Verily, we are free from you.’” (Al-Mumtahanah 60:4)

We have verily learned that *minkum* (from you), is an addressed speech. Is it for the statements and actions (of *kufr* and *shirk*) themselves or is it for the persons (committing them)? Without any doubt for the persons (who come with these statements and actions). And it will never occur for the one who has the slightest bit of sense that he says: ‘This is

addressed to the statements and actions (of *kufir* and *shirk*) and not to those who do it'. The speech here is directed to the persons.

إِنَّا بُرَاءُ مِنْكُمْ وَمِمَّا تَعْبُدُونَ مِنْ دُونِ اللَّهِ

“Verily, we are free from you and whatever you worship besides Allāh.” (Al-Mumtahanah 60:4)

This disassociation (*barā*); we have learned to look at it from the perspective of the (arabic) language to find out its meaning and how to use it in the Islamic Law. We have verily clarified this in what there is no need to repeat in “the explanation of *asl ad-dīn*”¹. So it is looked at and taken into consideration from its linguistic meaning and it (the disassociation) necessitates the boycotting from all aspects. So the central point of this word (*barā*) is boycotting so there must be a complete boycott.

إِنَّا بُرَاءُ مِنْكُمْ وَمِمَّا تَعْبُدُونَ مِنْ دُونِ اللَّهِ

“Verily, we are free from you and whatever you worship besides Allāh.” (Al-Mumtahanah 60:4)

Thereafter He explained some of what is included in the disassociation so He said:

كَفَرْنَا بِكُمْ وَبَدَا بَيْنَنَا وَبَيْنَكُمْ الْعَدَاوَةُ وَالْبَغْضَاءُ أَبَدًا

“We have rejected you, and there has started between us and you, enmity and hatred for ever.” (Al-Mumtahanah 60:4)

So the takfīr and the enmity and hatred are included in *al-kufr bit-tāghūt*. Why? Because this verse (60:4) contains the two pillars:

فَمَنْ يَكْفُرْ بِالطَّاغُوتِ وَيُؤْمِنِ بِاللَّهِ

“(1) Whoever disbelieves in *tāghūt* and (2) believes in Allāh.” (Al-Baqarah 2:256)

‘And believes in Allāh’, where do we find this is the verse (of Mumtahanah)?

¹ A series of lectures by the Shaykh where he explains the *risālah* “*Asl Ad-Dīn Al-Islām wa Qā'idatuhu*” by Shaykh Al-Islām Muhammad ibn ‘Abdul-Wahhāb – *rahimahullāhu*.

كَفَرْنَا بِكُمْ وَبَدَا بَيْنَنَا وَبَيْنَكُمُ الْعَدَاوَةُ وَالْبَغْضَاءُ أَبَدًا حَتَّى تُؤْمِنُوا بِاللَّهِ وَحْدَهُ

“We have rejected you, and there has started between us and you, enmity and hatred for ever, until you believe in Allāh Alone.” (Al-Mumtahanah 60:4)

So what comes after ‘until’ is a substitute for ‘and believes in Allāh’. And what is before ‘until’ is a substitute for His words ‘Whoever disbelieves in tāghūt’. So is ‘we have rejected you’ included in the meaning of *al-kufr bit-tāghūt* or not? We say that it is included in *al-kufr bit-tāghūt*. There is agreement regarding this and the text and evidence for this is from two angles.

1. Looking at the words of the Creator – Mighty and Majestic is He – and that the words ‘Whoever disbelieves in tāghūt’ are summarized and has an association (with other verses) which requires going into details and lifting the summarization. This is firstly done with the Book of Allāh the Exalted and there next with the *Sunnah* of His Prophet (*sallAllāhu alayhi wa sallam*).
2. There is agreement in this issue as we previously have established. Just as Ibn Taymiyyah – *rahimahullāhu ta’ālā* – said:

فهو كافر، كمن يشك في كفر اليهود والنصارى والمشركين

“Then he is *kāfir*, just like the one who doubts regarding the *kufr* of the Jews and the Christians and the *mushrikūn* (those who commit *shirk*).”

(Majmu’ Al-Fatāwā 2/368)

So anyone who doubts regarding the *kufr* of the Jews, then he is *kāfir* with *ijmā’* (agreement). And anyone who doubts regarding the *kufr* of the Christians, then he is *kāfir* with *ijmā’* (agreement). So why do we come to the third type, which is doubting regarding the *kufr* of the *mushrikūn*, and then we say there is disagreement in this issue? While the agreement already have been spoken in one place, in one report.

After that he mentioned some things regarding federalism and the likes of these people; that whoever doubts regarding their *kufr*, after knowing their situation and knowing the meaning of Islām, is just like the one who doubts regarding the *kufr* of the Jews, the Christians and the *mushrikūn*. So there is no difference between the one who doubts regarding the *mushrikūn*, which means that he does not declare *takfir* upon and do not

implement the *hukm* of *takfīr* upon them, and the one who doubts the *kufr* of the Jews and the Christians. And there are several agreements which are connected to this.

So when you know the explanation of the Lord – the Mighty and Majestic – of the *millah* of Ibrāhīm which consists of *al-kufr bit-tāghūt* and *al-īmān billāh*, along with the agreements of the Muslims, then you will know that declaring *takfīr* upon the one who commits the major *shirk* is from what is known from the religion by necessity and it is established in Tawhīd which means that it is a part of which cannot be separated from it.

And the scholars of the *da'wah* (of Najd) – may Allāh have mercy upon them – in *Ad-Durar (As-Saniyyah)* and other books, such as Shaykh Al-Islām Muhammad ibn ‘Abdul-Wahhāb, they all explain *al-kufr bit-tāghūt* with this meaning. And they included the rejection and declaring *takfīr* as a part of the word of Tawhīd (*Lā ilāha illa Allāh*), so it is not excluded from what is called *al-kufr bit-tāghūt*. And therefore Shaykh Muhammad – *rahimahullāhu ta’ālā* – said:

اعلم رحمك الله تعالى أنّ أول ما فرض الله على ابن آدم الكفر بالطاغوت والإيمان بالله

“Know – may Allāh have mercy upon you – that the first thing Allāh made obligatory upon the children of Adam is *al-kufr bit-tāghūt* and *al-īmān billāh*.”

(Risālah Ma’nā At-Tāghūt)

And why is this? Because it is Tawhīd. And Tawhīd is the first of all obligations. The first thing that is obligatory upon the *mukallaf* (legally competent) is Tawhīd. And the reality of Tawhīd is *al-kufr bit-tāghūt* and *al-īmān billāh*. And it is a must that these two words are explained, while the explanation of them are what has come in the Qurān, the *Sunnah* and likewise in *al-ijmā’*.

He (Shaykh Muhammad) – *rahimahullāhu ta’ālā* – continued to say:

فأما صفة الكفر بالطاغوت أن تعتقد بطلان عبادة غير الله وتركها وتبغضها وتكفر أهلها

“The description of *al-kufr bit-tāghūt* is that you believe in the invalidity of worshipping others than Allāh and that you leave it, hate it and declare *takfīr* upon whoever does this.”

So all this is included in what is called *al-kufr bit-tāghūt*. So whoever claims that the Shaykh – *rahimahullāhu ta’ālā* – excluded declaring *takfīr* upon the *mushrikūn* from *al-kufr bit-tāghūt*, then he has verily lied upon him and invented untruth (against him). The *aimmah* (pl. *īmām*)

of the *da'wah* are upon (the opinion) that the two testimonies (*Lā ilāha illa Allāh Muhammadu Rasūlullāh*) cannot be fulfilled except by declaring *takfīr* upon the *mushrikūn*. So whoever doubts regarding their *kufr* or judges them as Muslims, then this person is not at all from the Muslims and there is agreement regarding this.

He (Shaykh Muhammad) – *rahimahullāhu ta'ālā* – continued to say:

وتكفّر أهلها وتعاديهم.

“And declare *takfīr* upon whoever does this and show them enmity.”

So he made all these issues as a part of *al-kufr bit-tāghūt*. So no one should come and say: ‘the first, second and the third are all a part of *al-kufr bit-tāghūt* while the fourth is only considered a *lāzim* (requirement) to it’, as it will come later.

He (Shaykh Muhammad) – *rahimahullāhu ta'ālā* – continued to say:

وأما معنى الإيمان بالله أن تعتقد أنّ الله هو الإله المعبود وحده دون سواه. وتخلص جميع أنواع العبادة كلها لله. وتنفيها عن كل معبود سواه، وتحب أهل الإخلاص وتواليهم. وتبغض أهل الشرك وتعاديهم. وهذه ملة إبراهيم

“Regarding the meaning of *al-īmān billāh* then it is that you believe that Allāh is the only *ilāh* worthy of worship besides anything else and that you dedicate all types of worship sincerely for Allāh alone and negate it for everything worshipped besides Him. Also that you love the people of *ikhlas* (sincerity) and are loyal to them, and that you hate the people of *shirk* and show them enmity. And this is the *millah* of Ibrahim.”

The *millah* of Ibrahim which is built upon the complete *barā* (disassociation) from (1) whatever is worshipped, from (2) the *shirk* itself and from (3) those who worship (something else than Allāh). So whoever differentiates between these three things then he must have a proof for this and there is not the slightest of proofs in Qurān and *Sunnah*, that there is a difference between the *shirk* itself, the worshipped object and those who worship it.

And we have already mentioned in the answer to the Tunisian *fatwā*, transmitted from Ibn Al-Qayyim (*rahimahullāh*), that all of these three are joined together by the evidence of Surah Al-Kāfirūn according to the text which came from the Prophet (*sallAllāhu alayhi wa sallam*) that this Surah is *barā* (disassociation) from *shirk*. (This is) despite of the fact that it (i.e. the Surah) is opened with the *barā* from those committing *shirk*.

“Say: ‘O you...’” What? *Kufr*? Or *kufr* statements or *kufr* actions? Or the persons (committing it)? It is the persons. So it is *barā* from the disbelievers.

لَكُمْ دِينُكُمْ وَلِيَ دِينِ

“**You have your religion and I have my religion.**” (Al-Kāfirūn 109:6)

This is complete *barā* which points out that His – the Mighty and Majestic – words on the tongue of Ibrāhīm and the rest of the prophets:

إِنَّا بُرَاءٌ مِنْكُمْ

“**Verily we are free from you.**” (Al-Mumtahanah 60:4)

What is intended with it is the complete detachment and this detachment will not be fulfilled except by keeping away from them in all aspects and applying the *shar’ī hukm* (i.e. the judgement of the Islāmic Law) upon them; that they are disbelievers. While His words:

حَتَّى تُؤْمِنُوا

“**Until you believe...**” (Al-Mumtahanah 60:4)

(These words) point out that the complete *walā* (loyalty, alliance, love) is confirmed through *īmān* (in Allāh alone) and the opposite of this is the complete disassociation which only exist with the one who is upon *kufr*. So there exist *al-walā* and *al-barā*, and the reality of *īmān* and Tawhīd is *al-walā* and *al-barā*.

He – *rahimahullāhu ta’ālā* – continued to say:

وهذه ملّة إبراهيم التي سفه نفسه من رغب عنها. وهذه هي الأسوة التي أخبر الله بها في قوله تعالى : قد كانت لكم

“*And this is the millah of Ibrāhīm; whoever leaves it is the one who fools himself. And it is the example that Allāh has informed about in His words: ‘Indeed there has been for you ...’ (60:4)*”

So this (verse) is considered to be *tafsīr* (interpretation) – pay close attention to this.

“**Whoever disbelieves in tāghūt.**” In this is a summarization which means that it needs to be explained, just like the words of Allāh: ‘Establish prayer.’ Is this true or not? Establishing prayer needs the questions: What is the prayer and how do you perform prayer? So we need a clarification and where does this clarification come from? From the own intellect or from

the Law (i.e. Islāmic sources - Qurān and *Sunnah*)? From the Law (of course). So whoever adds a single letter regarding the prayer which has not come in the Law then we say: ‘Your statement is false’. Because the prayer is based upon the Law, it is worship. And we do not worship Allāh in any fashion except that it is based upon some text (from Qurān and *Sunnah*). And therefore any saying and any opinion that enters anything extra in the prayer then it is rejected for the one who comes with this.

And the same principle applies for what is connected to the description of *al-kufr bit-tāghūt*. The question must be asked: ‘How do we fulfill *al-kufr bit-tāghūt*?’ We return to the clear verses from Qurān; His words in what He said regarding Ibrāhīm which are clear and numerous:

وَأَعْتَزَلُكُمْ وَمَا تَدْعُونَ مِنْ دُونِ اللَّهِ

“And I turn away from you and whatever you worship besides Allāh.” (Maryam 19:48)

So here (in this verse), is there a detachment or not? There is detachment. And the detachment will not be fulfilled except by declaring takfīr, and He gave evidence for this, this is not *ijtihād*: ‘We have rejected you.’ So to include the *bughd* (hatred) in the description of *al-kufr bit-tāghūt* and at the same time to exclude the takfīr, this is without a doubt considered to be playing with the holy texts. The text is clear that all the mentioned things before ‘until’ all are included in *al-kufr bit-tāghūt* and what is after ‘until’ what is meant by this is *al-īmān billāh*. And therefor did the Shaykh – *rahimahullāhu ta’ālā* – say that the verse in Mumtahanah (60:4) is a *tafsīr* of the *millah* of Ibrāhīm. And so it is. And the *millah* of Ibrāhīm which is to things – rejection and affirmation – is the *tafsīr* of His words:

فَمَنْ يَكْفُرْ بِالطَّاغُوتِ وَيُؤْمِنِ بِاللَّهِ

“Whoever disbelieves in tāghūt and believes in Allāh.” (Al-Baqarah 2:256)

And this sentence ‘whoever disbelieves and believes’ is the *tafsīr* of the meaning of *Lā ilāha illa Allāh*. So all these meanings give explanation to each other and they are not in need of the opinion of anyone from the people or the *ijtihād* of anyone else. And if anyone makes *ijtihād* in this issue then his *ijtihād* is rejected for him.

He – *rahimahullāhu ta’ālā* – continued to say:

التي أخبر الله بها في قوله تعالى:

“That which Allāh has informed about in His saying:

قَدْ كَانَتْ لَكُمْ أُسْوَةٌ حَسَنَةٌ فِي إِبْرَاهِيمَ وَالَّذِينَ مَعَهُ

“Indeed there has been for you an excellent example in Ibrāhīm and those with him.”

(Al-Mumtahanah 60:4)

(“Those with him”) means: the rest of the prophets.

إِذْ قَالُوا لِقَوْمِهِمْ إِنَّا بُرَاءٌ مِنْكُمْ

“When they said to their people: ‘Verily, we are free from you.’” (Al-Mumtahanah 60:4)

This is addressed to some persons; to the people. We have declared ourselves free from you. He even let the *barā* from the *mushrikūn* come before that which is connected to it (the *barā* from the worshipped objects).

إِنَّا بُرَاءٌ مِنْكُمْ وَمِمَّا تَعْبُدُونَ مِنْ دُونِ اللَّهِ كَفَرْنَا بِكُمْ

“Verily, we are free from you and whatever you worship besides Allāh, we have rejected you.” (Al-Mumtahanah 60:4)

This is an internal *tafsīr* regarding the meaning of *barā*. So whoever claims that declaring *takfīr* upon *mushrikūn* is not included in *al-barā*, then he has verily invented a lie against Allāh. And he must bring some proof to establish this, and far far away is he from being able to bring even one letter.

كَفَرْنَا بِكُمْ وَبَدَا بَيْنَنَا وَبَيْنَكُمْ الْعَدَاوَةُ وَالْبَغْضَاءُ أَبَدًا حَتَّى تُؤْمِنُوا بِاللَّهِ وَحْدَهُ

“We have rejected you, and there has started between us and you, hostility and hatred for ever, until you believe in Allāh Alone.” (Al-Mumtahanah 60:4)

And Shaykh Muhammad – *rahimahullāhu ta’ālā* – said as it is written in ‘Ad-Durar (As-Saniyyah)’ volume 2 page no. 121:

ومعنى الكفر بالطاغوت: أن تبرأ من كل ما يعتقد فيه غير الله، من جنى، أو أنسى، أو شجر، أو حجر، أو غير ذلك؛ وتشهد عليه بالكفر، والضلال، وتبغضه، ولو كان أنه أبوك أو أخوك؛

“And the meaning of al-kufr bit-tāghūt is that you declare yourself free from everything which is believed in except Allāh from jinn, men, trees, stones or other than this, and bear witness that it is upon kufr. Even if he is your father or your brother.”

So (it includes) to bear witness that he is upon *kufr* which means that he has performed *kufr*. And if he has performed *kufr* then what is your opinion regarding him in the Islāmic Law, that you should judge him as what? That he is *kāfir*. And if he practices Islām then you judge him as being a Muslim. And it is not allowed for you to say that the description of Islām is excluded from the reality of Tawhīd, no. So if he comes with Tawhīd in its correct form then it is obligatory to describe him with Islām. So along with performing something comes its name. So if he performs *kufr* then it is obligatory for you – even if you have left *shirk* and do not perform it yourself – then it is obligatory for you to judge the person who is committing *shirk* as being *mushrik*, and that you bear witness that he is upon *kufr* and misguidance and that you hate him even if he is your father, your brother, your *shaykh*, your like or your leader. No matter whom it is. So you judge him as Allāh – the Exalted – has judged him even if he is your father or brother.

He (Shaykh Muhammad) – *rahimahullāhu ta’ālā* – continued to say:

فأما من قال أنا لا أعبد إلا الله، وأنا لا أتعرض السادة، والقباب على القبور، وأمثال ذلك، فهذا كاذب في قول لا إله إلا الله، ولم يؤمن بالله، ولم يكفر بالطاغوت.

“But regarding the one who says: ‘I do not worship anyone but Allāh, but I do not oppose the leaders nor the domes that are on the graves’, and similar to this, then this person is a liar when he says Lā ilāha illa Allāh. And he has not believed in Allāh nor disbelieved in tāghūt.”

So if he does not bear witness that they are upon *kufr* – which means that he does not declare *takfir* upon them – and he judges them as being upon Islām, then he has not disbelieved in *tāghūt*. And therefor do not buzz around the issue of him having performed the third nullifier of Islām – which is also correct – but before that and even more important is to take into consideration that *al-kufr bit-tāghūt* has disappeared (i.e. not been performed). This means that whoever does not declare *takfir* upon the worshippers of the graves then the description of him making *al-kufr bit-tāghūt* has disappeared.

He (Shaykh Muhammad) – *rahimahullāhu ta’ālā* – said:

فهذا كاذب في قول لا إله إلا الله، ولم يؤمن بالله، ولم يكفر بالطاغوت.

“Then this person is a liar when he says *Lā ilāha illa Allāh*. And he has not believed in Allāh nor disbelieved in *tāghūt*”

Because he did not bear witness that they are upon *kufr*. Verily did Allāh – the Exalted – say regarding Ibrāhīm (*alayhi as-salām*) and those who were with him: ‘**We have rejected you**’. So it is obligatory to say: ‘We have rejected you’, which means: ‘We believe that you are *kuffār*’. But regarding saying this with the tongue then we have spoken about this many times; that this is dependent upon *maslahah* (advantage) and *mafsadah* (harm). You do not have to speak out about everyone that you declare *takfīr* upon, but it is obligatory for you to believe (that they are not Muslims). And testing people regarding what they believe regarding individual persons this is opposing the *Sunnah*, and some of the scholars have even made it from *bida’* (innovation). So do not test people and ask them about individual persons instead look into what is related to the foundation (of their belief). What a person believes about or if he declares *takfīr* upon Zayd among the people or not, this is his religion between him and Allāh – the Exalted. It is his religion; it is not allowed for anyone to ask why do you declare *takfīr* upon this person or why do you not declare *takfīr* upon this person. Instead the foundation is taken into consideration.

So the belief (that they are upon *kufr*) is a must, and you will not have fulfilled Islām and Tawhīd except if you believe that the *mushrikūn* and the one who does not declare *takfīr* upon the *mushrikūn* are upon *kufr*. This belief must be present and this *takfīr* is the specific *takfīr* and not the general *takfīr*. This means that we do not need to establish the *hujjah* (argument, evidence, proof) upon the one who does not declare *takfīr* upon the *mushrikūn*, because these issues are clear, apparent and evident like the sun so we do not need to establish the *hujjah*.

Shaykh ‘Abdul-Latīf ibn ‘Abdur-Rahmān said in ‘Al-Ittihāf fi Ar-Rad ‘alā As-Sahāf’:

ومن كَفَّرَ المشركين ومقتهم

“And whoever declares *takfīr* upon the *mushrikūn* and detests them...”

This (i.e. the *mushrikūn*) means the worshippers of the graves, and ‘detests them’ means: hates them. So *al-kufr bit-tāghūt* is not only to hate, while the *takfīr* is not necessary and excluded from the meaning of *al-kufr bit-tāghūt*.

He continued to say:

ومن كَفَّرَ المشركين ومقتهم، وأخلص دينه لله، فلم يعبد سواه فهو أفضل الأئمة وأحقهم بالإمامة؛ لأن التكفير بالشرك والتعطيل هو أهم ما يجب من الكفر بالطاغوت.

“And whoever declares takfir upon the mushrikūn and detests them, and dedicates his religion exclusively to Allāh and do not worship anyone besides Him, then he is the best of leaders and most suitable of them to leadership. This is because declaring takfir due to shirk and ta’til (rejection) is the most important of what is obligatory from al-kufr bit-tāghūt.”

The most important of what is obligatory! The *barā* (disassociation) is of different degrees and the biggest of what is included in *barā* and enmity and hatred is to believe that they are *kuffār*. But if you disassociate from them and hate them, and still they are brothers which means they are Muslims if you judge them as being Muslims. Because if you do not judge them as being *kuffār* then they are Muslims, and then the *walā* (loyalty, love, friendship) is obligatory. Then they are kept at distance just like the people who commit sins or the people of *bida’*. And then they are looked at from two angles. One angle of *walā* and one angle of *barā*. But where is the complete *barā*? Verily did the Quran come with the complete *barā* (from the *mushrikūn*) and it did not restrict it. Only the Muslim is the one where it is restricted from one point of view and not another. So whatever comes from him (the Muslim) of sins is hated and there is no doubt regarding this, and whatever he has of belief and Tawhīd is loved and remained loyal to. But regarding the *kāfir* and *mushrik* then the *barā* is complete from every point of view. So the verse:

إِنَّا بُرَاءُ مِنْكُمْ

“Verily we are free from you.” (Al-Mumtahanah 60:4)

(The verse) proves that the *barā* is complete, and this cannot be except when they are described with *kufr* and *shirk* (i.e. as *kuffār* and *mushrikūn*).

He – *rahimahullāhu ta’ālā* – continued to say:

لأن التكفير بالشرك والتعطيل هو أهم ما يجب من الكفر بالطاغوت.

“This is because declaring takfir due to shirk and ta’til (rejection) is the most important of what is obligatory from al-kufr bit-tāghūt.”

And Islām is not fulfilled except by *al-kufr bit-tāghūt*. He (‘Abdul-Latīf ibn ‘Abdur-Rahmān) also said in ‘Misbāh Adh-Dhalām’:

وتقرير الشيخ على هذا الحديث

“And the statement of the Shaykh regarding this hadīth”

This means: The Shaykh Muhammad ibn ‘Abdul-Wahhāb – *rahimahullāhu ta’ālā* – regarding the *hadīth*:

مَنْ قَالَ : لَا إِلَهَ إِلَّا اللَّهُ ، وَكَفَرَ بِمَا يُعْبَدُ مِنْ دُونِ اللَّهِ

“Whoever says *Lā ilāha illa Allāh* and rejects everything which is worshipped besides Allah.”

Until the end of the *hadīth*². He said:

وتقرير الشيخ على هذا الحديث من أحسن التقارير وأدلها وأبينها، فإنه استدل بالجملة المعطوفة الثانية على أن الكفر بالطاغوت وما عبد من دون الله (شرط في تحريم الدم والمال، وأن لا عصمة

“And the statement of the Shaykh regarding this hadīth is among the best, the most conclusive and most clear statements. Because verily he used the second sentence (of the hadīth) as evidence for that the rejection of *tāghūt* and everything which is worshipped besides Allāh is a condition for the prohibition of the blood and wealth, and that there is no protection...”

When is the protection established? When Islām is established. So if the protection disappears then that means that Islām has disappeared, because the discussion here is not regarding a *dhimmi* (i.e. a non-Muslim living under the protection of a Muslim state) or someone who fights (the Muslims) or other than these. The discussion here is regarding *īmān* and *kufr*. So when the protection disappears and his (*sallAllāhu alayhi wa sallam*) words points this out:

مَنْ قَالَ : لَا إِلَهَ إِلَّا اللَّهُ

² The *hadīth* referred to is narrated in *Sahīh* Muslim from Abū Mālik Al-Ashja’ī who said that the Prophet (*sallAllāhu alayhi wa sallam*) said:

مَنْ قَالَ : لَا إِلَهَ إِلَّا اللَّهُ ، وَكَفَرَ بِمَا يُعْبَدُ مِنْ دُونِ اللَّهِ ، حَزَمَ مَالَهُ ، وَدَمَهُ ، وَحَسَابُهُ عَلَى اللَّهِ

“Whoever says *La ilaha illa Allah* and rejects everything which is worshipped besides Allah, his wealth and blood is forbidden (to take) and his account is with Allah.”

“Whoever says Lā ilāha illa Allāh..”

So in this case he is not a Muslim. He continues to say:

وَأَنْ لَا عَصْمَةَ بِمَجْرَدِ الْقَوْلِ وَالْمَعْرِفَةِ وَلَا بِمَجْرَدِ تَرْكِ عِبَادَةِ مَا عْبَدَ مِنْ دُونِ اللَّهِ بَلْ لَا بَدَّ مِنَ الْكُفْرِ بِمَا عْبَدَ مِنْ دُونِ اللَّهِ، وَالْكَفْرَ فِيهِ بَغْضُهُ وَتَرْكُهُ، وَرَدَّهُ، وَالْبِرَاءَةَ مِنْهُ وَمَعْرِفَةَ بَطْلَانِهِ، وَهَذَا لَا بَدَّ مِنْهُ فِي الْإِسْلَامِ. قَالَ تَعَالَى :

“And that there is no protection by the mere utterance and knowledge (of Lā ilāha illa Allāh) and not by only leaving the worship of everything which is worshipped besides Allāh, rather everything which is worshipped besides Allāh must be rejected, while rejecting it means to hate it and leave it and speaking against it and disassociating oneself from it and knowing its invalidity. All this must be performed in Islām. Allāh – the Exalted – said:

فَمَنْ يَكْفُرْ بِالطَّاغُوتِ وَيُؤْمِنِ بِاللَّهِ

“Whoever rejects tāghūt and believes in Allāh.” (Al-Baqarah 2:256)

فجمع بين الإيمان بالله والكفر بالطاغوت في هذه الآية ولها نظائر في كتاب الله. كقوله تعالى عن إبراهيم :

So Allāh combined the belief in Allāh and the rejection of tāghūt in this verse. And this verse has many equals in the book of Allāh. Such as His – the Exalted – words regarding Ibrāhīm:

وَإِذْ قَالَ إِبْرَاهِيمُ لِأَبِيهِ وَقَوْمِهِ إِنَّنِي بَرَاءٌ مِمَّا تَعْبُدُونَ

“And (remember) when Ibrāhīm said to his father and his people: ‘Verily, I am innocent of what you worship.’” (Az-Zukhruf 43:26).”

‘His people’ means who? It means the persons. So they performed the action of *shirk* and he disassociated himself from them. There’s a text proving it. And likewise he said it to his father, so there’s also a text proving that. So the people who perform the act of *shirk* then disassociating one’s self from them is in the specific sense (i.e. disassociating from these specific individuals who performs *shirk* and not only their deeds) and it is included in the meaning of *al-kufr bit-tāghūt*.

He continued to say:

فدلت هذه الآية وما قبلها على أن الكفر بالطاغوت شرط لا يحصل الإسلام بدونها، وهكذا هذا الحديث مثل هذه الآيات، فإن الإيمان بالله هو شهادة لا إله إلا الله، ومع ذلك ذكر الكفر بالطاغوت معه في حصول الاستمسك بالعروة الوثقى.

“So this verse and what comes before it proves that al-kufr bit-tāghūt is a condition that Islām cannot be fulfilled without. And this hadīth is the same as these verses. Because verily the belief in Allāh is the testimony of Lā ilāha illa Allāh, and at the same time He mentions al-kufr bit-tāghūt along with it in achieving holding on to Al-‘Urwah Al-Wuthqā (the strongest handhold – Lā ilāha illa Allāh).”

This means that He provided a text due to the fact that it is included in the meaning of *Lā ilāha illa Allāh*. And that is why in the version of Īmām Ahmad it says:

مَنْ وَحَدَّ اللَّهُ ، وَكَفَرَ بِمَا يُعْبَدُ مِنْ دُونِ اللَّهِ

“Whoever unifies (wāhhada) Allāh and rejects everything which is worshipped besides Allāh.”

And we have come to know several times – O sane people and O those who seek the truth – that The Creator – Mighty and Majestic is He – if He attached the *hukm* of barā towards that which is worshipped, then what is wanted is not only that you disassociate yourself from only a tree or a stone and thereafter give the *hukm* of Islām to those worshipping the tree or the stone. It is not even allowed for a person to imagine that Allāh orders the slaves to do this; that they disassociate themselves and believe in the invalidity of the tree and stone – which also is demanded from you, that you believe that it is not an *ilāh* and it is not worthy of being worshipped – but even more important than this is what is related to the one worshipping these objects. There must first be disassociation from the worshipper before the disassociation from the worshipped objects.

He – *rahimahullāhu ta’ālā* – continued to say:

ومع ذلك ذكر الكفر بالطاغوت معه في حصول الاستمسك بالعروة الوثقى. وقد يفرد الإيمان ويخص بالذكر، فيدخل فيه الكفر بالطاغوت، كشهادة أن لا إله إلا الله،

“And at the same time He mentions al-kufr bit-tāghūt along with it, in achieving holding on to Al-‘Urwah Al-Wuthqā (the strongest handhold). And verily is īmān mentioned alone while al-kufr bit-taghut is included in it, just as the testimony of Lā ilāha illa Allāh.”

So when the testimony of *Lā ilāha illa Allāh* is mentioned and *al-kufr bit-tāghūt* is not mentioned along with it, then *al-kufr bit-tāghūt* is still included in it. So when leaving *shirk* is included in *al-kufr bit-tāghūt* then leaving *shirk* is (automatically) included in *Lā ilāha illa Allāh*. And when declaring *takfīr* on the one who commits *shirk* is included in *al-kufr bit-tāghūt* then it is also included in what is understood from *Lā ilāha illa Allāh*. This proves that whoever does not leave *shirk* then *Al-Kalimah (Lā ilāha illa Allāh)* is nullified with him and the one who does not declare *takfīr* upon the *mushrikūn* then *Al-Kalimah* is nullified with him. This is because the affirmed pillar of *al-kufr bit-tāghūt* which comes before *al-īmān billāh* has been nullified. So this is a necessity in the clarification of the meaning of *al-kufr bit-tāghūt*.

He continued to say:

كشهادة أن لا إله إلا الله، فإنها دالة على الإيمان بالله المتضمن للكفر بالطاغوت

“...just as the testimony of *Lā ilāha illa Allāh*. Because it verily points out *al-īmān billāh* which includes *al-kufr bit-tāghūt*.”

So it points this out by way of it being included. *Lā ilāha illa Allāh*: Whoever rejects *tāghūt* and believes in Allāh. So rejecting *tāghūt* is a part of what is pointed out by *Al-Kalimah* just like believing in Allāh is a part of what is pointed out by *Al-Kalimah*.”

By: Shaykh Ahmad Ibn ‘Umar Al-Hāzimī – may Allāh preserve him and hasten his release.

Source:

http://alHazme.net/listen_window.aspx?file_no=5072&article_no=2051&file_read_count=2006

Or

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=9Fvz6QxEREA>