



Refuting Abu Hamza's Slander of Sheikh Abdullah el Faisal

In Defense Of The "Takfiri" Views of Sheikh Abdullah el Faisal:

Refuting Abu Hamza's Slander of Sheikh Abdullah el Faisal



Refuting Abu Hamza's Slander of Sheikh Abdullah el Faisal

The Content for the Refutation has been taken from the 24 Part Video Series on YouTube.com :-

<http://www.youtube.com/user/mjh4eva#grid/user/D060632C2B35D1EE>

I've given the url at the start; so that no one (insha'Allah) can claim that I've taken the words of Abu Hamza out of context.

Therefore it is assumed that the reader of this Defense has already heard/or is hearing and reading what Abu Hamza has said in his lecture *Refutation Of The "Takfiri" Views of Sheikh Abdullah el Faisal*. This is needed for the reader to understand the context within which this Defense has been presented and what is being refuted, at what point of time.

Where was Sheikh Faisal at the time of "refutation" by Abu Hamza –

I have been informed that Sheikh Faisal was imprisoned in the UK at the time the refutation by Abu Hamza took place. It is obvious that he would be unable to attend. Thus, I wonder why Abu Hamza keeps drawing our attention to Sheikh Faisal's absence?!?

Version:

This is the second version (i.e. "v2.0") of the Defense. You can confirm if you have the latest version by visiting [this link](#).

Opinion of Abu Hamza about Sheikh Faisal; As Derived By Watching the Above Video Series:

Sheikh Faisal is –

- A crook;
- A liar;
- A black racist;
- A deviant;
- A conspirator against normal Muslims or average Muslims;
- An evil Sheikh;
- He lies about the explanation of the Noble Quran;
- He follows the methodology of madness;
- He wants to start a cult;
- He is unworthy of being heard/listened to;

Disclaimer: This is not a call/incitement to jihad. Rather this is an academic study for educational purposes. All statements - unless otherwise specified are not the views/statements of Sheikh Faisal.



Refuting Abu Hamza's Slander of Sheikh Abdullah el Faisal

- And he needs to be dumped into the dustbin;
- Also, we can understand from the relatively direct statements of Abu Hamza that Sheikh Faisal is a khawarij – or at the very least on the methodology of the khawarij.
- And Many More Insults....

Unless Abu Hamza has changed his opinion after the release of this lecture (which I'm not aware of); he still believes this about Sheikh Faisal.

This defense of Sheikh Faisal was written for the following reasons:

- Many of the statements of the Sheikh were taken out of context (for example, when Faisal means the "rulers/regime" with regards to IMF); Abu Hamza has taken it out of context and applied these words of Sheikh Faisal to all Muslims.
- Sheikh Faisal has been called many names (I've given a small list above); and I sincerely believe that there is no evidence to support these claims (my reasons for this will be explained later in this Defense of Sheikh Faisal).
- This is to show that we can't trust the many of the "scholars" that are around us today [for example, Abu Hamza leaves the first opinion of ibn Taymiyyah and jumps to the second opinion (just to support his argument); and it is very difficult to believe that he missed the first opinion and directly landed on the second opinion – (I'll cover this too later in this Defense)]
- Also, he doesn't state the correct stance of the scholars nor of the rightly guided Caliphs; or the sahaba – (with regards to certain issues). So I felt that these too need to be clarified.



REFUTATION OF PART 1 OF 24:

Introduction And the Initial Defense of the Statements Made By Sheikh Faisal That Were Played:

The video starts with Abu Hamza in middle; anchored by two of his (presumed) students to his left and right. This "refutation" of theirs actually begins in the 3rd part - where they start by playing lectures of Sheikh Faisal lecture...

False Claim:

"...Those who did not seek knowledge from this individual from particular were at the very least seen as insincere..." :Made by Ibn Umar Part 1/24 | 2:45

This is a false claim. Sheikh Faisal has translated the works of many others – and he has told his listeners that he is translating the book/lecture of so-and-so. The only people Sheikh Faisal has forbidden seeking knowledge are the deviants/sellouts; those who don't have the correct aqeedah or methodology.

Then Abu Hamza makes certain claims that Sheikh Faisal supposedly told him that he is doing such and such wrong and so on. Allahu Alam; what exactly he was told since – we can't verify the conversation between him and Sheikh Faisal.

Misleading Claims:

Then a reference is made to the debate between brother Abu Qatadah and Sheikh Faisal; in which Sheikh Faisal refused to make takfeer on ibn Baaz.

First, let me inform everyone that this debate took place in around the summer of 1998 and more than 11 years (its 2010 now) have passed since then.

Abu Hamza makes the statement that:- 4 years ago (since he says 4 years, I'm assuming that Abu Hamza delivered this so-called refutation earlier than 2003); Sheikh Faisal wasn't even making takfeer on the rulers – but was only making general takfeer.

Let us assuming that this is true and according to Abu Hamza this was not up to standard – so why didn't Abu Hamza present Sheikh Faisal with the information? Allahu Alam – but this doesn't seem to be the way of the salaf (I've to hide knowledge from someone – and then claim that they don't know better).

What happened behind closed doors:

Abu Hamza says that Sheikh Faisal and he along with some of their students had a meeting behind closed doors. I can't defend what has happened behind closed doors on the basis of what Abu Hamza has said, since we have to hear both parties. And that is currently not possible.



The Truth And The Wisdom Behind Why did Sheikh Faisal Not Call ibn Baaz A Kafir In 1998:

The Prophet (sallahu alayhi wasallam) wanted to destroy the Kaaba; and rebuild it according to the correct way (as built by Ibrahim) but he didn't - since the people were not ready for it.

Similarly the Prophet (sallahu alayhi wasallam) avoided direct confrontation with Abdullah bin Ubayy because he was very influential amongst his tribe. To the extent that Abdullah bin Ubayy wasn't punished (killed) for making degrading remarks about the Prophet (sallahu alayhi wasallam); nor was he punished for slandering the wife of the Prophet (sallahu alayhi wasallam).

Why did the Prophet not take the action of dealing with Abdullah bin Ubayy. Because the people were not ready to hear the news that Abdullah bin Ubayy was fake, a munafiq.

Timeline of the Takfeer on Ibn Baaz:

- In 1998 Sheikh Faisal didn't make takfeer on ibn Baaz. Why? Because the people were not ready.
- After some period had passed, once the topics of aqeedah were sufficiently covered by Sheikh Faisal – takfeer was made on ibn Baaz.
- Then after the death of ibn Baaz it was rumored that ibn Baaz had repented. Thus now, Sheikh Faisal said that it was not possible to make takfeer on ibn Baaz anymore.
- Then just last month the Sheikh got in touch with a reliable person who informed the Sheikh that one of his close family members had personally visited ibn Baaz (just before the death of ibn Baaz) and had told ibn Baaz to repent. But ibn Baaz refused. Thus, due to this updated information the current stance of Sheikh Faisal is that ibn Baaz is a kafir.

The Harsh Reality of the Situation Been Told To Those Who Stay In The West:

If anyone comes to the Indian sub-continent, they can see for themselves that more than 50% of those claiming to be Muslims (to be EXTERMELY conservative) are beralwis committing major shirk such as grave worshipping and a form of magic.

Who's Abu Hamza to decide what the ummah of Muhammad needs or does not need, according to his desires and/or personal opinion?

Since it is very well possible (even logically as the population of the earth has exploded only recently) that even though the majority of Muslims are murjiah, etc. they can still be the largest group in Paradise.



REFUTATION OF PART 2 OF 24:

Abu Hamza claims that the sahaba were debating matters of aqeedah themselves:

Abu Hamza includes the "asking of questions" by the sahaba to clear their confusion or misunderstanding as "debating" (please note that at that point of time the concept of Prophethood and pure Islam were quite new to the Arabs then).

Also, I would like to point out that Sheikh Faisal himself believes that debating fiqh issues doesn't make one a kafir. Also, Abu Hamza tries to slander Sheikh Faisal by claiming that Sheikh Faisal will call him a "kafir" if Abu Hamza tries to expose him!

Next Abu Hamza tries to slander Sheikh Faisal by claiming that, Sheikh Faisal calls every salafi he sees (whether that salafi be ignorant or otherwise) a kafir! This seems to be blatant slander.

Accusing The Brothers Who Are In America:

Next his student ibn Umar - and claims to know better than the brothers staying in America – who don't pray their jummah in a masaajid, since they claim that they first need to find out the aqeedah of the Imam.

While, I don't agree that it is an obligation to find out the aqeedah of the Imam before praying behind him (assuming that ibn Umar is saying the truth) – I acknowledge that the reality of the situation in America might be different.

I tell him - give us a list of the scholars in America who you believe in America are of the ahl sunnah wal jammat to these brothers if you really want to help them – rather than slandering them.

He then says a correct hadees that if we miss three jummahs in jamaat with no sound excuse, then Allah (subhan wa tallah) darkens the heart of that person. This statement is correct. But the application of this statement by him is wrong. Because this only applies when the Imam leading the jamaat has the correct aqeedah. Thus this case is different since there are no Imams having the correct aqeedah- according to the findings of the brothers in America.

My Personal Experience - In the country I used to reside - I have prayed in MANY masaajids in different cities - and I swear by Allah (subhan wa tallah), I have not prayed behind a single Imam who's of the aqeedah of ahl sunnah wal jamaat. The best of them (the Imams) vote in elections/allow voting in elections, while the worst of them allow the major shirk of grave worship.

Similarly the brothers in America could also be possibly encountering the same situation. And based on their current reality of the situation they've arrived at the conclusion of not praying jummah behind a sellout/deviant.



Refuting Abu Hamza's Slander of Sheikh Abdullah el Faisal

I end the refutation of the second part of *A Refutation of the Takfiri Views of Abdullah Faisal by Abu Hamza* by saying that many of the accusations of ibn Umar and Abu Hamza are refuted in the later on – since I thought that it would be best to proceed that way, as some of these issues are lengthy and require detailed explanation.



REFUTATION OF PART 3 OF 24:

Then they play parts of the statements of Sheikh Faisal in his past lectures.

Thus, I've given **brief explanations for what Sheikh Faisal actually meant in those parts of the lectures that were played** by ibn Umar [the person on the right of Abu Hamza (according to him)]. And any these statements of Sheikh Faisal - which has been presented as an direct argument against Sheikh Faisal later on in their "refutation" has been dealt with at that time. Thus, mainly the motive here is to provide brief explanations, so that anyone who has not heard that particular lecture is somewhat updated with regards to the context in which these statements were made by Sheikh Faisal.

Brief Explanation For Devil's Deception of the Saudi Salafis | Part 3/24 | 1:25 -

Here Sheikh Faisal is referring to the saudi salafi "scholars" who cement/defend the throne of the kafir rulers i.e. refuse to accept the truth even when evidence is presented and "try" to make excuses such as this is "minor kufr"; among other things. So the argument that Abu Hamza tries to make using this is totally baseless.

And in 2:31 is an **ADVISE for the sisters who are aware the truth about their husband** - and are still cohabiting with them.

Brief Explanation For Devil's Deception of the Murjiah | Part 3/24 | 2:57 -

Sheikh Faisal repeats the same point (and I have already given the explanation for this just above. Also, the students that Sheikh Faisal is referring to "...students of Sheikh bin Baaz and Uthaymeen who go around all over the world..." are not the lay people – but they themselves are scholars.

"O ye who believe! take not the Jews and the Christians for your friends and protectors: They are but friends and protectors to each other. And he amongst you that turns to them (for friendship) is of them. Verily Allah guideth not a people unjust." [5:51]

Thus, the leaders have become kafirs. So aren't the Saudi Salafi leaders cementing the thrones of kafirs / apostates (if they ever were Muslims).

Women Who Are Living With the Sellouts:

And also I would like to add that Sheikh Faisal is referring to specific women (probably wives of some of the Saudi salafi scholars living in Brixton). And it also appears that these women have already been explained the situation they are living in. So I don't see anything wrong with this stance of Sheikh Faisal.



Brief Explanation For Towards Liberating the Holy Lands | Part 3/24 | 6:15 -

Here Sheikh Faisal basically makes the same point the regime (this time specifically referring to regime of "Saudi" Arabia is a kafir regime, the army is a kafir army, the scholars who support the regime are kafirs and the "salafis" who support the scholars are kafirs) – again I repeat here, that scholars and students who Sheikh Faisal is referring to here are either knowledgeable / or the position has been explained to them.

Not every person who claims to be a "salafi" – i.e. following the methodology of the salaf is being called a kafir. I myself consider myself to be a salafi – so it would be pretty ridiculous for me to defend someone who calls all "salafis" kafirs. But I'm 100% sure that this is not the case. So I advise my brothers and sisters to take the words of Sheikh Faisal in context.

Evidences that Sheikh Faisal gives to support his claim that blind following/following munafiqs/apostates/kafirs in any aspect isn't allowed:

"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." [2:166]

"The Day that their faces will be turned upside down in the Fire, they will say: "Woe to us! Would that we had obeyed Allah and obeyed the Messenger."" [33:66]

"O ye who believe! take not the Jews and the Christians for your friends and protectors: They are but friends and protectors to each other. And he amongst you that turns to them (for friendship) is of them. Verily Allah guideth not a people unjust." [5:51]

I repeat again the women that Sheikh Faisal says are committing zina are the women who are knowledgeable / have been made aware with evidences from the Quran and Sunnah that the husband has become a kafir due to his actions/speech and still she refuses to accept it.

Brief Explanation For Kufr in Perspective | Part 3/24 | 8:44 -

Again Sheikh Faisal says the same thing about the government scholars. And gives the saying of Imam Abu Hanifa to further show that this not only his opinion; but is in fact the opinion held by prominent scholars of the past too.

Devil's Deception of the Murijiah | Part 3/24 | 9:38 -

Sheikh Faisal accurately claims that some of the brothers found in Tooting and Finsbury Park don't believe the saudi salafi scholars who are cementing the thrones of the apostate leaders - are kafirs.



REFUTATION OF PART 4 OF 24:

Devil's Deception of the Murijiah | (continued from 3/24) -

Also, Sheikh Faisal says that the brothers found in Tooting and Finsbury Park are "Salafi inclined" [this doesn't mean that they are kafirs]; also Sheikh Faisal says that they are not sincere. This, statement is made based upon the observation / ijthad of Sheikh Faisal – this in no way means that Sheikh Faisal knows the unseen or can look into their hearts. But as Muslims we are to judge from the apparent. Since a sincere person will "hate even the shadow of the person who is cementing the throne of an apostate leader" – as per al wallah al abara [love and hate for the sake of Allah (subhan wa tallah) – which is one of the conditions of our shadada (testimony of faith/Islam)]. But as we will see later on – the words of Sheikh Faisal come true in this attempted "refutation" of *Sheikh Faisal by Abu Hamza*.

Allah (subhan wa tallah) will not let a lay man off - who does major kufr / major shirk / an act that makes one a disbeliever - while following a scholar. Even if he claims that he was just following a scholar. And this statement is true as there is no forgiveness for major shirk IF the repentance is not made BEFORE death.

Evidence given by Sheikh Faisal:

"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." [2:166]

"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." [2:167]

We shall see later on – that Abu Hamza tries to refute this by saying that:

- Abu Hamza says that, this is general statement – and Allah (subhan wa tallah) didn't specifically mention "sheikhs" in that ayah.
- Abu Hamza says that, it can be applied on Sheikh Faisal too (so he tries to say that we shouldn't use something that can be applied on back on us too – duh?! What's your proof Abu Hamza – nothing!).

Well, Abu Hamza – you've just refuted yourself by saying that it can be applied on Sheikh Faisal too (since Sheikh Faisal is not a "leader").

Enough said for now. I've expanded on this a bit later (when Abu Hamza tries to refute Sheikh Faisal) – in detail. So, I'll leave it till then.



Devil's Deception of the 21st Century House Niggers | Part 4/24 | 7:00 -

I'll just say this regarding this for now as I've expand on this later on. Sheikh Faisal is talking about the soldiers in the armies of the taghoot here (in the clip of the lecture played).

"Groups of People" have not been given the titled of kafirs - it is those who have the knowledge (already know)/to whom it has been explained from these groups it is they who have been given the title of kafirs. Or scholars who know better – i.e. ibn Baaz passed a fatwa not only kafir maids to brought into the Arabian Peninsula – citing that no two religions shouldn't be found in the Arabian peninsula and that it was dangerous for the family members (i.e. they might get influenced by the maid). But this same man passed a fatwa allowing the Crusader troops to not only come into the Arabian Peninsula (and they say that it was to defend from Saddam); but even after (i.e. after the Gulf War) that he didn't take back his fatwa – in fact he refused to take back his fatwa of allowing the Crusader troops into the Arabian Peninsula even on his deathbed.

Accusation:

- Ibn Umar tries to claim that Sheikh Faisal views (i.e. takfeer) applies to “each and every inside of this group”. This is a blatant lie – since Sheikh Faisal doesn't apply blanket takfeer with regards to issues such as dismantling of the shariah; etc. – unless the correct position with evidences has been explained to the person.
- Abu Hamza accuses the Sheikh of lying and twisting the ayahs of the Quran.

Devil's Deception of the 21st Century House Niggers | Part 4/24 | 9:10 -

Here Sheikh Faisal was refuting Abu Usamah.

Abu Usamah didn't just try refute Sheikh Omar Abdul Rahman (imprisoned in America) he tried to refute jihad (whether against the taghoot or the born-kafirs (i.e. Christians, Hindus, etc.) and the mujahideen in general. So a person who claims to be Muslim – and isn't against these statements of Abu Usamah – he doesn't deserve the title of being called a Muslim anymore. And this is why Sheikh Faisal calls these people kafirs.

CIA Islam | Part 4/24 | 9:36 -

Sheikh Faisal gives the evidence the dismantling the Shariah is a major issue -

Say: "Shall I inform you of something worse than that, regarding the recompense from Allah: those (Jews) who incurred the Curse of Allah and His Wrath, those of whom (some) He transformed into monkeys and swines, those who worshipped Taghoot (false deities); such are worse in rank (on the Day of Resurrection in the Hell-fire), and far more astray from the Right Path (in the life of this world)."

[5:60]



REFUTATION OF PART 5 OF 24:

Towards Liberating the Holy Lands | Part 5/24 | 1:18 –

Abu Hamza claims that Sheikh Faisal says that Shaykh Hudayfi (the Sheikh whose lecture Sheikh Faisal is translating) lost his job because he attacked the shia. Well, that is only one of the reasons why he lost the job – Shaykh Hudayfi attacked the shia, zionists; crusaders; etc. – so it was probably a combination of all the reasons.

The Devil's Deception of the Murjiah | Part 5/24 | 3:45 –

When Sheikh Faisal says that Muslims (of the correct aqeedah) needs to make takfeer on:

- “king” Fahd,
- ibn Baaz,
- students of ibn Baaz (general takfeer – i.e. it's a group of kufr),
- army of the Saudi Regime (general takfeer – i.e. it's a group of kufr).

Evidence:

“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.” [2:166]

Please note that here by "students" of ibn Baaz - Sheikh Faisal doesn't mean the lay people who are ignorant / i.e. to whom the evidence has not been brought. But here by students of ibn Baaz Sheikh Faisal is referring to the other scholars who are the students of ibn Baaz.

When the Sheikh is referring to Saudi Salafis he is referring to scholars who already have the knowledge (i.e. some of them even have phds – a doctorate degree) so it is next to impossible that they are jaahil.

Note: Murji – is a liberal Muslim.

Also, when Sheikh Faisal mentions that if one listens to their lectures (he is referring to the common people) - but he is NOT calling them hypocrites/apostates, he is talking about what MIGHT happen as a consequence of their ignorance that if they are to listen to these Saudi Salafi lectures then their hearts will become perverted and will lead to hypocrisy/apostasy.



Clarifying the Statements of ibn Umar [the guy on the right of Abu Hamza (according to hin)] between 6:54 to 7:50 -

Then ibn Umar claims that if the individual Muslims don't agree with Sheikh Faisal and doesn't make takfeer on whom Sheikh Faisal says to make takfeer on (with evidence from the Quran and Sunnah) then that individual is a hypocrite OR has elements of hypocrisy in their heart. Yes, I totally agree with Sheikh Faisal regarding this - but this is ONLY when the evidences has been presented to that individual.

Also, I would like to remind the reader that Sheikh Faisal doesn't make takfeer on the jaahil (ignorant) regarding the dismantling of the shariah (i.e. kufr of the leaders and the grant of legitimacy by the support of the scholars) - if that person is jaahil.

Now, ibn Umar and Abu Hamza – claim that a few years ago (relative to the time of his speaking) Sheikh Faisal was not making takfeer on ibn Baaz and “king” Fahd.

For the sake of argument – let me agree with ibn Umar and Abu Hamza.

But even if I agree with them – they would still be refuted. As that would only mean that Sheikh Faisal didn't know about this then. And I bear witness that Sheikh Faisal is NOT the All Knower, he is NOT the All Knowledgeable – thus, like all of us he has to learn knowledge to update his aqeedah – if and when necessary. Also, I would like to remind the reader that this matter is based on our understanding of “fiqh al waqi” (the current reality of the situation – and we might not know everything). So I'm sorry to disappoint Abu Hamza and ibn Umar – but a munafiq (hypocrite), is someone who has the elements of hypocrisy in his heart – knows better, but still doesn't believe.

Lecture Name ??? (Name NOT told by Abu Hamza – I wonder why? – Perhaps he took Sheikh Faisal's words OUT OF CONTEXT?? Allahu Alam!) i.e. Unknown Lecture | Part 5/24 | 8:00

Sheikh Faisal says, "...we were quoting from the sayings of the respected scholars andibn Baaz of Saudi Arabia ...in which he ...that doesn't govern by the Shariah"

[please note: Abu Hamza and his students - keep speaking, so it is difficult to catch what Sheikh Faisal is saying]

But basically what Abu Hamza is trying to say by playing this is, look - since Sheikh Faisal included ibn Baaz amongst the "respected scholars", this means that Sheikh Faisal used to respect ibn Baaz.

While, I can't out rightly disprove his point - because he doesn't even give the name of the lecture. As an avid listener of Sheikh Faisal - I know that Sheikh Faisal uses the terms such as "respected scholars" to describe what the ummah or parts of the ummah consider to be respected scholars.



Debate between Sheikh Faisal and Abu Qatadah | Part 5/24 | 8:26

Also, for the sake of argument - even if the Sheikh didn't make takfeer of King Fahd and ibn Baaz in the past according to them - what has that got to do with his stance now? Nothing.

Clarification by Sheikh Faisal (just a few days before he got arrested in Kenya) -

"I didn't make takfeer on Bin baaz [ibn Baaz] during the debate with Abu Qataada because the crowd wasn't ready to hear that verdict. However when the people learnt more about alwalaa wal baraa; takfeer was made on bin baaz. This debate took place after the fatwa of bin baaz to allow the crusaders in the Holy lands. This debate with abu qataada was about the tape "the devil's deception of the saudi salafis". This debate was around the summer of 98. The "[The Devil's Deception of the] Saudi Salafi" tape was the summer of 97. "The [21st/20th Century] House Niggers" [lecture] was around 98 also..."

Basically what I'm trying to say is that Abu Hamza is trying to mix-match the past statements of Sheikh Faisal, said in different years - and is trying his best to use it to determine the present aqeedah of Sheikh Faisal. For example, Sheikh Sheikh Faisal has praised Salman Awdha in one of his past lectures - but this before Salman sold out.

So it is very important for people to understand the present reality of the situation. For example –

- Even though Abdullah ibn Ubayy has been called the head of the Munafiqs. But the Prophet (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) didn't punish him for spread the slander that Ayesha (RadiAllahu Anha) had committed adultery, even though other people who had spread this were punished.
- Similarly when Abdullah ibn Ubayy - claimed that he was more noble than the Prophet (sallallahu alayhi wasallam);
- And in another scenario Abdullah ibn Ubayy retreated with his group from the battlefield.
- Lastly renowned Imams like Imam Hanbal have themselves said that situation of the people must be taken into account (as agreed by Abu Hamza also).

But the Prophet never publically called him a Munafiq – whose abode is Hell for eternity (there's no forgiveness for the munafiq – if repentance isn't made before death).

The Prophet didn't do this – since he most probably assumed that it would disunite the ummah, and people would say that he was killing his own companions.

Thus, similarly Sheikh Faisal - took the present reality of the situation into account. Therefore, he first strengthened the foundations of aqeedah – before making takfeer on ibn Baaz.

And even if we might disagree with this course of action – it is still a matter of ijtihaad. So for the sake of argument even if Sheikh Faisal was wrong – he still gets one reward, insha'Allah.



REFUTATION OF PART 6 OF 24:

The Way of the Sahaaba | Part 6/24 | 0:30 -

Sheikh Faisal says that the leaders are kafir in general. And Abu Hamza himself admits that this was many years ago. And please read the explanation above again – since this is basically a similar point. Also, Abu Hamza forgets that rejection of the taghoot is compulsory upon every Muslim.

Part 6/24 | 1:45 to 2:30 –

Then Abu Hamza goes on to slander Sheikh Faisal (without evidence) in a childish manner – that doesn't deserve to be mentioned let alone refuted.

Part 6/24 | 2:31 onwards -

9 Points of What Abu Hamza Claims/Understands to be the Aqueedah of Sheikh Faisal:

Please note that these points have been stated as is (if there are any mistakes in transcribing them, please inform me, insha'Allah). Then after listing out all the accusations word for word, that they've made against Sheikh Faisal – I have refuted them based upon their expansion of their accusations.

So without further ado, I give you the accusations/"points" that Abu Hamza brings forth against Sheikh Faisal:

Point 1:

"The first one is that the Salafis have been classified in general as just kuffar. There's no prayer behind them, whoever doesn't make takfeer on bin Baaz is murji. All this is just encapsulated in just one statement." [Refer to Page 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23]

Point 2:

"The women living with salafis have no marriage. Must make bara from their husbands and they are adulterous. Brixton masjid is a masjid of kuffar and whoever doesn't call regime, the army, the scholars and the student kuffar - they are either murjiah, kuffar, hypocrites and/or insincere." [Refer to Page 23, 24]

Point 3:

"Claiming the unseen. And that the brothers in Finsbury and Tooting are insincere and they will be dumped in the fire and so on and so forth.. this person is going to hell, these people - they are insincere, so we are taking the magic wand of the unseen putting it over people and looking into people's internal



Refuting Abu Hamza's Slander of Sheikh Abdullah el Faisal

matters and saying that the people are using things for fame and fortune. Since he has classified the salafi as kuffar, when he is saying that the people are salafi inclined he means these people - they are leaning towards kufr. That they are going towards kufr.” [Refer to Page 24]

[just before break for the salah, Abu Hamza butts in:]

Special Point: *“That Sheikh Faisal has lied against ibn Taymiyyah, ibn Kathir.” [Refer to Page 40, 41, 42, 43, 35, 26, 27]*

[back after the salah:]

Point 4:

“The four general point was, that was taken from the tape - was the common Muslim will not be excused for refusing to make takfeer on ibn Baaz and King Fahd.” [Refer to Page 25,26]

Point 5:

“The fifth point that most Muslims today are kuffar and very few are practicing. 95% of the Muslims - they are Murjiah (i.e. kuffar) and little are practicing.” [Refer to Page 27, 28]

Point 6:

“If you give your money to the IMF, you're a kafir.” [Refer to Page 28]

Point 7:

“Calling the uncle of Prophet (sallahu alayhi wasallam) al Abbas - a kafir, misquotation of the statement regarding the issue of al Abbas being taken at battle at Badr.” [Refer to Page 37]

Point 8:

“Distortion of the statement of ibn Kathir in Maidiah and as well Baqrah 166” [Refer to Page 26, 27, 35]

Point 9:

“Changing fatwa regarding King Fahd and bin Baaz. The takfeer of before that, he didn't make takfeer on them - general takfeer and now the takfeer of those who donot make takfeer on them and then he makes takfeer on them.” [Refer to - Really Covered All Over this Defense]

Other Accusations Made By Abu Hamza Against Sheikh Faisal:

1. *“Distortions of the Quran as well as other areas of takfeer.” [This false accusation by Abu Hamza is defended through the remaining points – to bring out the truth to the reader, insha'Allah]*

2. *“As well as racist statements regarding Adam (alayhi salaam).” [Refer to Page 46]*

Disclaimer: This is not a call/incitement to jihad. Rather this is an academic study for educational purposes. All statements - unless otherwise specified are not the views/statements of Sheikh Faisal.



Clarification of the Accusation Made In Point 1:

The statement of ibn Taymiyyah - that the scholar who leaves off what he learnt from Allah (subhan wa tallah) [i.e. of the Deen] and then he follows the ruler. That makes him becomes a kafir/an apostate and he needs punishment for this life and the hereafter.

Abu Hamza agrees that this statement (above one) has been made by ibn Taymiyyah.

But then claims that this statement is only to "scare" the people, but not to call them kafirs. Excuse me Abu Hamza – but I have to remind you that this statement is for the “scholars”; not for the “lay” people.

Abu Hamza then claims that these are general statements and can't be used against individuals. No proof Abu Hamza – or is this just your own opinion?



REFUTATION OF PART 7 OF 24:

Clarification of the Accusation Made In Point 1 (continued):

Then he goes on to slander Sheikh Faisal – even when the Sheikh Faisal has already cleared that he's only making takfeer on the Saudi Salafi scholars / their students (i.e. student scholars) who are knowledgeable (as expanded upon earlier) and are supporting the taghoot.

Also, Abu Hamza – Sheikh Faisal doesn't make takfeer on the ignorant with regards to this issue. By this same standard – Sheikh Faisal couldn't have make takfeer on himself when he himself was ignorant (like you claim). So Abu Hamza I request you to think clearly, before making accusations.

Incorrect Statement of Abu Hamza:

Abu Hamza says that, we call ourselves a salafi because to be a salafi is to actually follow a salaf e salahi. It is actually something which any Muslim should be proud about and we should be digging to become of that category because these salaf are our predecessors, the sahaba and the tabiyeen which we are being ordered to follow. "And **everybody is happy of follow "a" salaf e salahi**" (A righteous predecessor).

Did you realize that Abu Hamza is promoting a FALSE HADEETH here? That says that "*My companions are like stars, whoever of them you follow, you will be rightly guided*". This is a FAKE HADEETH. And Abu Hamza seems to follow this hadeeth by his own words.

Then Abu Hamza quotes the explanation of Sheikh ibn Tayamiyyah - to "refute" Sheikh Faisal. But what this person doesn't realize that he's actually refuting himself!

Then he says that many of the scholars in the time of ibn Taymiyyah were helping the Mongols. But Abu Hamza doesn't give any evidence for this.

Then he lies - that the sahaba didn't call everyone who didn't pay the zakaat as kuffar.

This is a lie - since Abu Bakr promised to annihilate them ALL (i.e. all their fighters) and take their women and children as salves.

And Muslims don't take the women and children of other Muslims as booty (salves). So this is clear evidence that Abu Bakr consider all those who didn't pay the zakat as kafirs.

So tell me Abu Hamza - how is this possible. These people are clear kafirs, since they left the fold of ahl sunnah wal jamaat.



Refuting Abu Hamza's Slander of Sheikh Abdullah el Faisal

Then he claims that there's a difference when people have isolated themselves and when they are living amongst the Muslim community – without evidence.

Because the sahaba didn't believe this when they barged into the room and killed every one of those munafiqueen in it (those speaking and those silent/listening). When those people were living with the Muslims.



REFUTATION OF PART 8 OF 24:

Firstly, Sheikh Faisal doesn't call the jaahil followers of the Saudi Salafi sheikhs - kafirs.

Then he says that it's not "hujja" what Sheikh Faisal tells someone.

Sheikh Faisal's personal opinion is NOT hujja. Thus, he gives proof from the Quran and authentic hadeeth. And if someone is presented with proof from the Quran and authentic hadeeth - that person can't refuse. The most he can say is that, based upon the evidence and explanation that you have given me it appears that you are right - and I will verify this explanation /evidence from other people whom I trust, if what you've told me is correct then I will follow it **[Is this Abu Hamza's Wickedness - Abu Hamza tries to indirectly bring forth the concept that there can be two conflicting hujjas (evidences) on aqueedah issues!]**.

Proof:

A man asked the Prophet a question. But was not satisfied with the answer, so he went to Umar to find out what was the opinion of Umar. Umar asked the man whether he had gotten the answer of this question from the Prophet. When the man said yes, Umar chopped of the head of that man. And no one told Umar that he had done wrong.

However, if a person out rightly rejects evidence from the Quran and Sunnah (out rightly or even after having it verified), then that person become a kafir.

It would almost be funny - if it wasn't so pathetic:

Abu Hamza goes on that Allah (subhan wa tallah) has asked us to disbelieve in the taghoot and not to call the taghoot a kafir.

I ask Abu Hamza - IS THERE "A MUSLIM TAGHOOT"?!? HAS THERE EVER BEEN A MUSLIM TAGHOOT?!?

Abu Hamaza agrees that disbelieving in the taghoots is commanded by Allah (subhan wa tallah).

To further simplify, let us use basic "Islamic logic":

Belief in [Allah (subhan wa tallah)] + [Taghoot] = Makes you a KAFIR

Belief in [Allah (subhan wa tallah)] - [Taghoot] = Makes you a MUSLIM

And here we are talking about the Taghoot rulers who have within their lifetimes attacked Islam and tried to prevent its establishment on the land and have taken the Jews + Christians (some of them) as their friends and protectors.



Refuting Abu Hamza's Slander of Sheikh Abdullah el Faisal

And there is clear evidence in the Quran, that if we take Jews and Christians as our friends and protectors we become kafirs.

Doesn't organizations like the UN / NATO organizations which have Jews, Christians, Hindus and other religions - and the goal of these organizations is to protect the member nations.

Also, we see that that many of nations such as Saudi Arabia, Pakistan, etc. have support the kafirs to kill the Muslims - who want to establish the Shariah.

Isn't the ruler of such a regime a kafir and by default a taghoot? The answer is yes. So why does Abu Hamza tries to defend such a stance. This can be because of 4 main reasons:

1. He's a sellout.
2. He's a very evil person who wants to misguide the Muslims.
3. He's ignorant.
4. He's a racist.

And I hope that it's just the 3rd one.

Yet, we still see Abu Hamza hesitating.

Next, Abu Hamza tries to redefine "hujja" as "news" that we are giving to some person.

Hujja is translated as evidence.

So when Abu Bakr killed the people who didn't pay the zakat as kafirs, was he giving them "news" OR was he establishing the hujja on them by killing them as kafirs.

Surely it was the latter.

What Abu Hamza fails to understand that no one who claims to be Muslim can dare to refuse the Quran and authentic hadeeth and still claim that the hujja (evidence) has not been brought to them.

The most that these people can say, that I will verify what you have said and if it was the correct explanation then I will follow it or try to follow it.

Abu Hamza – Why Has the Noble Quran Been Called the Furqaan – Or the Criterion!

In the context of our time - this evidence (hujja) has to be from the Quran and authentic hadeeth. And I have already explained this before. And even on the Day of Judgment the Muslims will use the Quran and hujja or evidence to show that Nuh (alayhi salaam) was saying the truth.

Then he indirectly claims that Sheikh Faisal lies in the tafseer / translation of the ayah.

Disclaimer: This is not a call/incitement to jihad. Rather this is an academic study for educational purposes. All statements - unless otherwise specified are not the views/statements of Sheikh Faisal.



Refuting Abu Hamza's Slander of Sheikh Abdullah el Faisal

However, I've already proven that it is Abu Hamza who lies when giving the tafseer of the ayahs of the Quran.

We can also see that Abu Hamza has no understanding of the current reality of the situation since he tries, tries to apply the saying of the Prophet (sallahu alayhi wasallam) that 'a man of paradise will come' and if he does just the five pillars of Islam he will go to paradise to our present situation.

Why can't this be applied?

This can't be applied - since the Prophet (sallahu alayhi wasallam) knew that there would be rightly guided Khilafah after his death.

Then he says that Prophet didn't ask the wives of the munafiqeen to leave them , or make the blood of munafiqeen halal.

This statement of his is correct.

But this was according to reality of the situation of the Prophet (sallahu alayhi wasallam).

Since if we are analyze the Prophet (sallahu alayhi wasallam) also wanted to destroy the Kaaba and have it rebuilt. But he didn't do that.

This we can understand that this is an issue of ijtihaad and scholars like Sheikh Faisal can very well make ijtihaad on issues such as these which are not clear.



REFUTATION OF PART 9 OF 24:

Then Abu Hamza tries to use an argument about the permissibility of using the kuffar as soldiers. But what Abu Hamza doesn't realize that these kuffar soldiers as per the current reality of the situation are used to subdue the rise of Islaam and the reestablishment of the Khilafah (the kuffar leaders of the US, UK have themselves admitted it). And thus thus according to the current reality of the situation there isn't any permissibility of using the kuffar soldiers – because you and I both know that the kuffar soldiers are their only to prevent the Muslims from eliminating the apostates and taking back the power and to stop the Muslims from applying the Shariah.

Clarification of the Accusation Made In Point 2:

I have previously covered this accusation – but I will repeat myself again:

Sheikh Faisal here appears to referring to specific women living locally. And it also appears that these women have been explained the position to them. So I don't see anything wrong with this stance of Sheikh Faisal.

I repeat again the women that Sheikh Faisal says are committing zina - are the women who are knowledgeable / has been made aware with evidences from the Quran and Sunnah that the husband has become a kafir due to his actions/speech and still she refuses to accept it.

Abu Hamza himself says, "A matter of ijtihaad".

So I ask Abu Hamza if it is a matter of ijtihaad. Then why are you trying to criticize Sheikh Faisal, when you should be happy that he has got one reward, even if he is wrong (like you "think" he is).

Next he tries to use the debate between Imam Ahmad and Imam Shafi, that they debated on the point that whoever leaves the salah has become a kafir/a mushrik.

Well from what I know Imam Ahmad was much more strict about the salah - and on those who leaves even a few of their salah. So we can understand that both these Imams of fiqh differed on the understanding / on whom the hadeeth is to be applied. Thus it is obvious that, Imam Ahmad couldn't have declared Imam Sahfi'i a kafir for disagreeing with him with regards to the application.

Abu Hamza then ends with a slander by referring to Sheikh Faisal as a "crook".



REFUTATION OF PART 10 OF 24:

Abu Hamza says he wants an example of someone who was living in the Muslim community, who was called a kafir.

Well Abu Hamza you said that you wanted it. So here it is:

Abu Dawood narrated that al-Bara' ibn 'Aazib said: I met my paternal uncle and he was carrying the banner. I said to him: Where are you going?

He said: The Messenger of Allaah (peace and blessings of Allaah be upon him) has sent me to a man who married his father's wife after he died, to strike his neck and confiscate his wealth. [Classed as saheeh by al-Albaani in Irwa' al-Ghaleel (2351).]

Since the hadeeth says that his wealth was confiscated, we thus know that the man was killed as a kafir.

Clarification of the Accusation Made In Point 3:

Next Abu Hamza makes it sound like Sheikh Faisal is claiming knowledge of the unseen!!

This is untrue. Sheikh Faisal judges people by their action and words (and we know that humans possess eyes, ears and a brain to process information and judge – but perhaps Abu Hamza is unaware of this!?) and obviously Sheikh Faisal doesn't possess knowledge of the unseen. Next, Sheikh Faisal NEVER did not say that they or Abu Hamza will be duped in the fire; nor did Sheikh Faisal say that they are kuffar. These people are putting words in the mouth of Sheikh Faisal.

Next, he tries to get all emotional by claiming that Sheikh Faisal is trying to search their hearts!

And he claims that Sheikh Faisal runs a "cult". He then calls Sheikh Faisal a "liar" who exceeds his limit.

Please provide proof Abu Hamza – as these and other statements not mentioned here, insulting Sheikh Faisal without evidence are very slanderous statements – and you have failed to back them up with evidence.



REFUTATION OF PART 11 OF 24:

Clarification of the Accusation Made In Point 4:

Did you realize that these people (Abu Hamza and his sidekicks) use the term "common Muslim" to twist the words of Sheikh Faisal.

Allah (subhan wa tallah) has divided us into –Muslim; Kafir; Hypocrites (please note that the hypocrites are kafirs by default – and there is NO pardon or forgiveness for them EVEN on the Day of Judgment).

Abu Hamza claims that Sheikh Faisal said that Allah divided us into, “Muslims, Kafirs and Hypocrites”.

[Then Abu Hamza contradicts himself (and appears too dumb to realize it), and himself says that Allah divided the people into -] Abu Hamza even says with his own mouth that he believes that Allah divided, into “**believers, kafirs and hypocrites**”.

Then Abu Hamza says that, "Muslims include believers and hypocrites" .

So Abu Hamza why did Allah (subhan wa tallah) make a separate category for the hypocrites then?

Then Abu Hamza claims without proof that Allah divided the people "with regard to him".

I ask Abu Hamza who was this Quran revealed for, for humans or for Allah (subhan wa tallah).

So I ask Abu Hamza - how he can make lubricious statements such as those in quotes above.

Next he says, "there are still Muslims who are kafirs inside".

Actually Abu Hamza – it's the other way round, “there are still kafirs who appear to be Muslims outside”. Which means that according to Abu Hamza even if we can prove that someone is a hypocrite - we are to call that person a Muslim!

Only a fool would believe such a twisted logic. Next he says, that "hypocrites are kuffar, so he [Sheikh Faisal] doesn't mind to call them kuffar according to his standards".

Allah (subhan wa tallah) has reserved the lowest level of Hell just for the hypocrites (and they will stay there for eternity). There is no intercession for them. No nothing. So yes, Abu Hamza - Sheikh Faisal is absolutely right when he calls the hypocrites kuffar. Since they are kuffar by default.

Then this evil man (Abu Hamza) says that hypocrites are to be considered Muslims in duniya. Even if we found out otherwise from their actions and words (and not their “hearts” as Abu Hamza claims).



PARTIAL CLARIFICATION OF THE ACCUSATION MADE IN POINT 8:

Again, this is what Surah Baqrah 166 translates to, "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."

Abu Hamza himself says that it is a GENERAL ayah. I AGREE. This means that it can be applied to anyone and everyone who fit this description. And I'm sorry to inform you Abu Hamza, but that includes "Sheikhs" and "Rulers" too.

This man uses the example of an army going to try to destroy the Kaaba (in future) and when the Prophet says in reply to the question asked by Allah (subhan wa tallah), what if some of them were forced to come? And the Prophet(sallallahu alayhi wasallam) said that, Allah will raise them up by their intention.

Do you realize that how evil this man is? Abu Hamza tries to include those who are following the army for dunyia (worldly) purposes WILLING, with those who are FORCED to come AGAINST THEIR WILL.

We ask the "knowledgeable" Abu Hamza - who is "forcing" these Sheikhs to become government employees? Who is forcing them not to take back their fatwas even on their death beds (like ibn Baaz), and I can go on and on..



REFUTATION OF PART 12 OF 24:

He says that the ayaat (baqrah 166) is only talking leaders and their followers.

But what he doesn't understand that Sheikh Faisal has already PROVED this in his debate/discussion with Abu Qatadah.

When Sheikh Faisal asked in (1998) who is the leader of the [saudi] salafi movement [at that time]. The room unanimously answered bin Baaz / ibn Baaz.

Then Abu Hamza, contradicts himself again - and says that this ayah can be used for Sheikh Faisal and his followers. Of course, it can. That's what Sheikh Faisal is trying to say - (and that's what you just tried to "refute", you dimwit).

So if it can be used for Sheikh Faisal and his followers (according to you), so why can't it be used for the Saudi Salafi scholars and their followers?

The answer is simple, of course it can.

Next Abu Hamza lies that Sheikh Faisal doesn't cover all the impediments of takfeer.

What Abu Hamza fails to understand that there no two opinions with regards to aqeedah issues. That is there can be NO DIFFERENT TA'WEEL with regards to aqeedah issues.

Thus, since Sheikh Faisal had already covered this topic in another lecture. He didn't repeat it in the Impediments of Takfeer lecture.

Clarification of the Accusation Made In Point 5:

Why can't Abu Hamza understand that even if 95% of the Muslims are murijiah (and they interpret this as "kuffar"), the followers of Prophet Muhammad can still easily be the largest group in Paradise. Since in the time of the Prophet the population of the earth in all probability (according to the scholars) still hadn't reached the 1 billion mark.

So what about the times before Prophet Muhammad - obviously the population was much lower then.

Allah (subhan wa tallah) made the Jews who didn't follow the book into pigs (swine) and those who didn't "cut relations" with them into monkeys.

So what is Abu Hamza trying to say/prove?



Refuting Abu Hamza's Slander of Sheikh Abdullah el Faisal

Also, I would like to point out that Sheikh Faisal does NOT believe that major sins (like drinking alcohol, normal fornication, gambling, etc.) makes you a kuffar.

As for the 73 sects, Sheikh Faisal believes that one will go directly to the Paradise. While the remaining 72 may or may not spend the rest of eternity in Hell depending on the type of sins they've committed (for example - if they've committed clear major shirk, then there is no scope for them).

Never has Sheikh Faisal asked his students to listen ONLY to him. He has allowed listening to everyone as long as they are not deviants.

I can prove this very easily - the Sheikh has translated the lectures / works of others - into English and delivered it to his students, thus this alone should prove that Sheikh Faisal is not against listening to others.

Clarification of the Accusation Made In Point 6:

Regarding IMF (International Monetary Fund) for those of you who don't know what IMF is then check out this link:

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/International_Monetary_Fund

Basically the IMF is funded by the developed/developing nations of the world. And it gives the money collected from these nations generally to poor nations - for the purpose of development/"enslavement", etc. But actually the goal of the IMF is to trap poor nations in a debt trap and then it is able to bend the nation according to its will.

The IMF has its headquarters in USA and controls 17.09% of the quota. While amongst the countries that claim to follow Islam - Saudi Arabia is the leader as it controls 3.21% of the quota.

Many countries of the world - such as Syria, Sudan, Pakistan, Malawi, etc. are indebted to the IMF.

Here Sheikh Faisal is talking about the leaders/regime of the countries giving money to IMF.

So I would advise Abu Hamza and his two students who are sitting beside him to learn the reality of current events, before they try to "refute" someone.



REFUTATION OF PART 13 OF 24:

Also, Abu Hamza if the hypocrites are only kafirs in the Hereafter - but there is no proof for this statement of yours.

Allah (subhan wa tallah) classified "hypocrites" separately. So how the he'll gave you the right to classify them as "Muslims" in this dunya.

If one knows otherwise.

Also, he tries to make it sound as if Sheikh Faisal doesn't believe in minor kufr and major kufr. Sheikh Faisal believes in minor kufr and major. But what Sheikh Faisal is referring to here, is the dismantling of the Shariah which is a major kufr.

Then he says, the Prophet didn't ask the hypocrites to divorce their wives. Correct.

But the Prophet also didn't punish Abd'Allah ibn Ubbay even though he was monumental in spreading the rumor that Ayesha had fornicated, even though Allah (subhan wa tallah) had revealed to the Prophet ayats clearing her name and basically stating that she was pure.

So should you do the same with someone who tries to refute - this ayah of the Quran and still call Ayesha an adulterous?

No. We can't do this, if we have the power as per the current reality of the situation and according to our ijithad that punishment should be given.

But for the Prophet (sallahu alayhi wasallam) the reality of the situation was different. Abd'Allah bin Ubbay was the head of his tribe and punishing him or the members of his tribe (i.e. asking the women to divorce their husbands) would have probably lead to disastrous consequences.

Thus, basically this is a matter of ijithad and whatever decision the scholar / leader makes (as long as it was done with the right intentions) will lead to at least 1 reward, insha'Allah.

Also Abu Hamza, it's not possible to be a kafir of a lesser degree, but it is possible to commit kufr of a lesser degree. And the person who commits that type of kufr is still a Muslim (he doesn't become a kafir of a lesser degree).

Also, he lies about Sheikh Faisal (without providing any evidence) that the Sheikh believes that whoever enters a woman from the backside becomes a kafir.



Refuting Abu Hamza's Slander of Sheikh Abdullah el Faisal

Some authentic hadeeth with regards to this issue, Sunan Abu Dawud Book 11, Number 2157: Narrated Abu Hurayrah: "The Prophet (peace be upon him) said: He who has intercourse with his wife through her anus is accursed."

"Allaah does not look at one who comes to his wife in her anus". [an-Nasaa'ee: Hasan isnaad and supported in "al-'Ishrah"; at-Tirmidhee and Ibn Hibbaan].

"Cursed are those who come to their wives in their anuses." [Aboo Dawood, Ahmad and others with hasan isnaad and is supported].



REFUTATION OF PART 14 OF 24

Abu Hamza claims that someone who has had sex with his wife in her anus or when she was menstruating has become a kafir according to [in all probability this hadith (he doesn't quote the hadith, so I'm assuming it's this hadith):

"Whoever has sexual intercourse with a menstruating woman, or a woman in her anus, or approaches a soothsayer and believes what he is told has disbelieved in that which was revealed to Muhammad."
[Abu Dawood, at-Tirmidhee and others: Saheeh]

Sheikh Faisal says,

"Sex with a menstruating woman is a sin but it doesn't eject the person outside the fold of Islam. It's the same for those who enter their wives in the anus. Going to a soothsayer and believing in him makes the person becomes a kafir if black magic is involve. The ijmaa of the ummah is that magic makes a person becomes a kafir."

My personal view -

To understand this issue let us consider the topic of dealing in interest is considered equivalent to having sex with your mother in the belly of the Kaaba.

While we know that having sex with your mother or any of your father's wives makes you a kafir and you are killed as a kafir and your property is confiscated by the Imam. But taking/dealing with interest doesn't making you a kafir. However, it is a despised act which must be stopped.

Similarly, while believing in a soothsayer makes one a kafir and there is no "payment" to become a Muslim again. That is, it is a major kufr.

The former two – having sex with one's wife in her anus or when she was menstruating seems to be a kufr of a lesser degree, i.e. minor kufr – thus the ruling for it is different. And I repeat that Sheikh Faisal does differentiate between minor and major kufr.

Lastly, we Muslims must always see the context in which the statement was made and the supporting evidence (hadith to prove or disprove an incident). By keeping this in mind, we can arrive at the proper conclusion.

Also, Sheikh Faisal believes that even though some Muslims (men or women) will go to Hell for an appointed period of time. This does NOT make the kafirs/ kafirs of a lesser degree.



Refuting Abu Hamza's Slander of Sheikh Abdullah el Faisal

This only makes the fasiq (weak/sinful Muslims). Also, Sheikh Faisal doesn't believe that taking a bribe for not applying a part of the Shariah on a particular individual or a specific group (i.e. the ruler being relaxed in the case of his son or family members) takes one outside the fold Islam.

However, the permanent dismantling of ANY aspect of the Shariah - does make one a kafir.

Also, when Sheikh Faisal is making takfeer on the Saudi Salafi scholars and their students (who already have the knowledge/ or have been presented with the evidence) - Sheikh Faisal is making general takfeer. Which according to Abu Hamza is fine when applied on the rulers - but he gets very upset when it is applied on the scholars and their students.

So isn't the aqeedah of Abu Hamza lopsided?

Proof: The only specific takfeer that that Sheikh Faisal was on Abu Usamah and on on ibn Baaz. Thus, further proving my point.

Yet another contradiction of Abu Hamza -

Abu Hamza says that Imam ibn Hambal only gave the verdict when - "...And he (Imam ibn Hambal) knew they can bear the truth..."

Could this be the same reason why Sheikh Faisal delayed the verdict to avoid fitna and didn't pronounce ibn Baaz a kafir in his debate with Abu Qatadah. Yes! This is absolutely plausible. Then why does Abu Hamza make excuse from Imam ibn Hambal and not for Sheikh Faisal.

Also, Abu Hamza - scholars can't do ijtihaad when the text (Quran and authentic hadeeth) is clear - so don't try to confuse your students.

To end, I'm sure that some of the students of this man will be wondering if I think him to a kafir. Well, I say this to them - from what I understand the mental ability of Abu Hamza seems to limited at best (for example, he thinks buying ice creams is giving money to the IMF); so unless and until these things are explained to him, one cannot call him a kafir.

However, I would advise him to keep his mouth shut and to VERIFY the context in which the statements have been made by Sheikh Faisal.



REFUTATION OF PART 15 OF 24

Also, it has been brought to my attention that Sheikh ibn Tayyamiyah has made some racist statements (which I prefer not to mention here) - so should we blindly follow this racist statement – since it is Sheikh ibn Taymiyyah who made it? No. In this case, we take for the good and we leave out the bad.

So we can't take each and every statement of a person, since us as humans (except the Prophet [sallallahu alayhi wasallam] with regards to Islam) are bound to make mistakes, and the best of us are those who repent for their mistakes.

Abu Hamza says that never have the Salaf (righteous predecessors) called each other kafirs when they argued. This is not true - since unlike us they didn't "argue" with the CLEAR munafiqs, they chopped off their heads – when they, as per ijthiad and current reality of situation, found out about those people who just falsely claiming to be "righteous".

Also, this argument of Abu Hamza - that our Righteous Predecessors didn't call themselves kafirs when they argued – itself is a ludicrous statement by Abu Hamza. Since, they wouldn't be called our Righteous Predecessors if they were hypocrites (munafiqs).

For example, when the sahabi were going past a house and they heard the people inside it making bad statements about the Prophet (sallallahu alayhi wasallam). They killed everyone in the house (those who had spoken and those who had listened). But most of us are not capable of doing this sort of action - thus, we must at least try to speak out.

Also, I completely disagree with Majmu al Fatawa Volue 12, page 1493 Qadhi Abu Bakr al Arabi al maliki has said - if he is referring to major shirk and major kufr.

Here Abu Hamza doesn't point out whether it is talking about minor kufr/shirk or major kufr/shirk. Since minor kufr/shirk can be forgiven, but major kufr/shirk can't be forgiven.

Next this person says that I and you are news to him. True, "me and you" are news to him only when we are not speaking from the Quran (correct tafseer/application) and authentic hadeeth.

So like I keep repeating myself, the most he can say that according to this (your) explanation this is correct, and I will verify it with those it trust.

This, person is a KAFIR if he out rightly rejects evidence from the Quran and authentic hadeeth.

Next he says that "we are not the Prophets". Did he forget that "scholars are the inheritors" of the Prophet(sallallahu alayhi wasallam) according to a authentic hadeeth?



Refuting Abu Hamza's Slander of Sheikh Abdullah el Faisal

Rasul Allah said, "The virtue of the scholar to a worshipper (Aabid) is similar to the virtue of the moon when it is full to the rest of the stars. And verily the scholars are the inheritors of the Prophets. Verily the Prophets did not leave behind dirhams and deenars, but rather they left behind knowledge. Thus whoever takes it, takes it as a bountiful share." – Authentic, narrated by Abu Dawood, Tirmidhi, and Ibn Majah.

Next, he goes on that - 4 years ago Sheikh Faisal said that he didn't make takfeer of ibn Baaz because people were not ready for it. Let me ask him this, if you have explained important stuff like al wallah al bara, etc. how can you expect them to be ready. You first have to give the individual detailed evidence from the Quran / Sunnah and fiqh al waqi. Also, **Abu Hamza you were making excuses for Imam ibn Hanbal with regards to the exact same issue – so why are you attacking Sheikh Faisal** with regards to the same issue. It just showcases your contradictory position.



REFUTATION OF PART 16 OF 24

PARTIAL CLARIFICATION OF THE ACCUSATION MADE IN POINT 8:

Kufr in Perspective:

Maeda 50: "Do they then seek after a judgment of (the days of) ignorance? But who, for a people whose faith is assured, can give better judgment than Allah."

In other words, as per our current times - are we seeking the judgment of man-made laws instead of the laws of Allah.

All he says that Sheikh Faisal says that it is necessary for all Muslims to fight the leader who doesn't govern by the Shariah.

I ask him (Abu Hamza), shouldn't ALL Muslims enjoin the right and forbid evil to the best of the capability (apparently Abu Hamza seems to disagree) and isn't jihad fard al ayn now?!?

Why because:

1. There is no Shariah (like in Yemen, etc.)
2. The kuffar have attacked (like in Afghanistan, etc.)

So if something is fard al ayn shouldn't all Muslims enjoin in this.

Next another proof that this person doesn't understand fiqh al waqi.

ibn Kathir lived under a regime which in general governed by the Shariah. That is the Shariah was not dismantled in his time, this he couldn't have said that it was a fard al ayn.

What we live in a time when there is no Shariah, this it is fard al ayn on us.

Thus all Muslims need to work towards removing the taghoot.

Since the rejection of the taghoot is one of the conditions of being Muslim.

So Sheikh Faisal is absolutely correct to include that it is an obligation upon all Muslims (here all Muslims - doesn't mean the sick, old, blind, etc. - so if you are going to refute this work of mine, please don't distort the context).



CLARIFICATION OF ACCUSATION MADE IN POINT 7:

Next, he tries to refute Sheikh Faisal by claiming that some Muslims came with Quresh to fight the Muslims. What Abu Hamza doesn't understand / or more correctly doesn't apply - is that these Muslims were FORCED to come with the Quresh and/or made it clear that while they would come with the Quresh they wouldn't fight the Muslims.

So how can you kill these people as kafirs! Thus, this comparison made by Abu Hamza is illogical.

However, most of the scholars now-a-days like for example Abu Usamah are staying in West - they were not forced. Neither is a Muslim, in a taghoot ruled country forced to become a government scholar. They do it for money! So this comparison is totally incorrect.

The Prophet (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) said to his uncle, "...we shall treat TREAT you today as a kafir"

Sheikh Faisal never called the Muslims who were found amongst the kuffar - kafirs, as claimed by Abu Hamza!



REFUTATION OF PART 17 OF 24

CLARIFICATION OF ACCUSATION MADE IN POINT 7 (CONTINUED):

Devil's Deception of the 20th Century House Niggers:

The Prophet (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) said to his uncle, "...we shall TREAT you today as a kafir"

Sheikh Faisal NEVER said that the Prophet called his uncle a kafir, as claimed by Abu Hamza.

So why can't this person (Abu Hamza) understand? And if he doesn't understand - then he should keep his mouth shut.

Look at how insane this man is -

He is using the events of the Day of Judgment - where Allah (subhan wa tallah) is the only Master to base our actions in the dunyia (this life/world)- where we are to judge by the Quran and Sunnah.

Proof [paraphrased]:

The body of a man was passing by the Prophet and the sahabi. And the sahabi said, what an evil man he was. And the Prophet said, so shall it be, so shall it be.

Next, a body of another man passed by. And the sahabi said what a good man he was, what a good man he was. And the Prophet said, so shall it be, so shall it be.

Thus, we know that we are to judge. And how in the world can someone enjoin the right and forbid the evil without judging! This is impossible, but Abu Hamza doesn't seem to understand.

Next he says, "It is not must for us to judge people, it is not for the layman to judge people".

He says, this without proof. And I would like him to point out the difference between a "lay man" and an "ignorant man" - since he seems to be totally unaware of this.



REFUTATION OF PART 18 OF 24

When Sheikh Faisal says, ".....on the Day of Judgment - the people of Nuh, who will judge them? the Muslims."

Since Abu Hamza seems to be unaware of the meaning of "judge", I hereby take the opportunity to provide it:

Meaning of "judge" [as used by Sheikh Faisal]:

- a. To form an opinion or estimation of after careful consideration
- b. To determine or declare after consideration or deliberation.

Now, let us look at the statement made by Sheikh Faisal again (bear in mind that Abu Hamza calls Sheikh Faisal a liar [again]):

".....on the Day of Judgment - the people of Nuh, who will judge them [who will "determine/judge" according to the Quran in which Allah (Subhan wa tallah) has Himself stated that Nuh delivered the message of Islam to his people]? The Muslims.

Now with this explanation can Sheikh Faisal be called a liar? No. Never.

But Abu Hamza with his very limited understanding - seems to jump to conclusions!

What he doesn't understand is that Muslims judge using the Al Furaqan (The Criterion; i.e. the Noble Quran) - means that give our testimony that what is revealed in the Quran is the truth. And thus, we BASE OUR DECISIONS on this. In other words, we judge based on the Noble Quran [and the authentic hadeeth].

Now let me ask Abu Hamza, have the non-Muslims read the Quran - yes. Have many of them learnt it by heart? Yes! Do many of them know the explanation for them? Yes!

Then why will Allah (subhan wa tallah) ask ONLY the Muslims? When the non-Muslims too have witness this?

Since the Muslims believed. That is only the Muslims WITNESSED that the Quran was the truth in this dunya/world. And the non-Muslims didn't believed/refused to witness the truth.

In other words the Muslims were of those who used their intellect to arrive at the truth, or/and to stick on to the truth. And the Muslims were able to judge between the Truth and Falsehood. And followed the Truth.



Refuting Abu Hamza's Slander of Sheikh Abdullah el Faisal

The Khawarij are Muslims. Their property and women can't be taken.

Abu Hamza gives no proof that their property and women can be taken; he only goes on talking about how to fight the deviants like the Khawarij.

He puts the "apostates" and "khawarij" on the same level because "they are deviants". Allahu Akbar!
This, man is either really stupid or very evil.



REFUTATION OF PART 19 And Part 20 **[Combined] OF 24**

[I have combined Part 19 and Part 20 because these two were dealing with the same topic]..

Ali ibn Talib when he fought the Khawarij he buried their dead in the burial grounds of the Muslims. The apostates (those who refused to pay the zakaat) were not buried in the burial grounds of the Muslims and women and children were taken as slaves.

Ali ibn Talib did NOT take the women of the Khawarij as slaves! So how can the apostates and khawarij be compared?!?

But Abu Hamza doesn't seem to understand this.

Abu Hamza believes that the property and the women of the khawarij can be taken (part 19 | 2:35).

Then Abu Hamza gives a "proof" from Bukahri – which can never support his argument. Since we know that the khawarij used to pray and call the adhan /aazan.

Abu Hamza says the attack on Bani Mustaliq, who were Jews is "one evidence".

This first "evidence" of Abu Hamza is baatil since the Khawarij were first debated; before they were attacked. And they were only attacked after they first killed Muslims.

"Other evidence" –

He then translates from the works of Sheikh ibn Taymiyyah, in which Sheikh ibn Taymiyyah talks about the SECOND WAY to fight the Khawarij (it seems that Abu Hamza left out the FIRST way, since it does NOT support his argument).

Sheikh ibn Taymiyyah basically says "some of them" allowed it – and this is much WEAKER opinion as per the evidences (so why does Abu Hamza talk about that and leave out the stronger evidence that I've mentioned below?). And we also understand that there is disagreement between the ulema of the past.

Next, even if Ali ibn Talib took a particular piece of land belonging to the Khawarij. And to the best of my understanding – I understand that this particular land of the Khawarij was only taken because they used this land to fight the Ali ibn Talib. So only this particular piece of land was taken.

He didn't take their women, etc. like it is done when the apostates are fought.



The complete understanding of Ahlus Sunnah wal Jamaah [Exposing the LIES of Abu Hamza] –

Narrated from Hasan, that he said, "When Ali (ra) killed the Haruriyyah [the Khawarij], they (i.e. his companions) said, 'Who are those ones, O Ameer Al-Mu'mineen? Are they kuffar?' He said, 'They fled from kufr.' It was said, 'Then munafiqun?' He said, 'Verily, the munafiqun do not remember Allah except for a little. And those ones mention Allah much.' It was said, 'Then what are they?' He said, 'A people who were stricken by a fitnah, so they became blind and deaf in it.'" (Abdurrazzaq, Musannaf #18656)

Narrated from Tariq ibn Shihab: "I was with Ali when he was asked about the people of anNahr [people of Nahrawan / Khawarij]. It was said: Are they mushrik? He said they are fled from shirk. It was said: Are they munafiq? He said indeed munafiq do not remember Allah except a little. It was said: So what are they? He said A group of people who have transgressed against us." (Ibn Abi Shaybah; Ibn Nasr, Tadheem Qadri salaah and Bayhaqi)

Thus, from the above it is clear that the Ali ibn Talib (a sahabi and a rightly guided Caliph) didn't consider the Khawarij to be kuffar.

And the Prophet (sallahu alayhi wasallam) has asked us to follow the sunnah of the rightly guided Caliphs [paraphrased]:

Those of you who live after me will see great disagreement. You must then follow my Sunnah and that of the Rightly Guided Caliphs [i.e. Abu Bakr, Umar ibn Al-Khattab, `Uthman ibn `Affan, and `Ali ibn Abi Talib]. Hold to it, and stick fast to it. Avoid newly invented matters [in matters of religion], for every new matter is an innovation, and every innovation is an error. (Abu Dawud)

But it is also true, that Ali ibn Talib did take a piece of land from them. However, he didn't take their women as concubines.

So why was this land taken? Allahu alam, one can only speculate (perhaps as compensation for the soldiers of Ali who were killed, etc.):

Ahmad said according to Abu Talib in Harawiyyah, they (the Khawarij) had a piece of land in the village, and they started to go out and kill Muslims and fight Muslims. But the Muslims killed them and their land was given to Muslims. Then the land was divided into fifths (like what you do with the land of the kuffar) and 4/5 of which goes to the fighters than fought them or the amir of the battle can divide it and make it into an endowment for all of the Muslims.

But the point is that only a particular piece of land was taken from them. Their complete wealth wasn't confiscated, nor were their women taken. And Ali ibn Talib himself, considered them (the Khawarij) to be Muslims.



Refuting Abu Hamza's Slander of Sheikh Abdullah el Faisal

Also, Abu Hamza says that Imam Ahmad in one opinion calls the khawarij kuffar and in another opinion doesn't call the khawarij kuffar – which Abu Hamza too acknowledges, so why doesn't he criticize Imam Ahmad for having different opinions on the SAME topic but criticizes Sheikh Faisal – at every available (and presumed available) opportunity.

There is difference of opinion over making takfir on the khawarij, what is well-known is that there are two statements from the Ulama on this. Imam Nawawi stated: "Qadi Iyad said: alMarwazi stated: the Ulama have differed over making takfir of the khawarij and said: the issue has almost become the most problematic from all issues." (Sharh Muslim li'n-Nawawi, 7/160)

Shaykh ul-Islam Ibn Taymiyyah (ra) said: "The Ummah is agreed on censuring the Khawarij and that they have misguidance, they (the Ummah) only dispute regarding making takfir of the Khawarij and fall into two well-known views within the madhhab of Malik, Ahmad and also ash-Shafi'i. For this reason there are two aspects within the madhhab of Ahmad and others: First: there are rebellious transgressors Second: they are kuffar apostates who are allowed to be executed along with any prisoners from them who are caught and the followers of their main leader. Whoever among them is able and repents otherwise they are to be executed, like the apostate." (Fatawa 28/518)

The view which avoids making takfir of the khawarij is the view of Shaykhul-Islam Ibn Taymiyyah, he said: "What proves that the Sahabah did not make takfir of the khawarij is that the Sahabah used to pray behind them and Abdullah ibn Umar (ra) and other Sahabah used to pray behind Najdah al-Haruri. The Sahabah also used to talk to them and address them as a Muslim would to another Muslim, just as Abdullah ibn Abbas answered Najdah alHaruri when he asked some questions to him over an issue, the hadith is in Bukhari. Just as Naafi bin al-Azraq answered the well-known issue wherein Naafi discussed with him over some aspects of the Qur'an just as how Muslims would. The biography of the Muslims has demonstrated this and has not shown that the Muslims considered them to be apostates like those who as-Siddiq fought against.

This is with the command of RasulAllah (saw) within the authentic ahaadith that they should be fought against and what has been relayed in them being the worst of those executed under the heavens, while the best of those murdered is the one who was murdered by them, as mentioned in the hadith on the authority of Abu Umamah and verified by Tirmidhi and others. This means: there are the worst to the Muslims than others and that there is no one worse against the Muslims, neither the yahud nor the nasara. They strove hard in killing every Muslim who did not agree with them, making their blood and wealth permissible and killing their children, making takfir of them. They held firm to this as a deen due to their sheer and utter ignorance and misguided innovation. Yet with this, the Sahabah, may Allah be pleased with them, and those who succeeded them in goodness, did not make takfir of them or consider them as being apostates. They did not transgress against them in speech or action but rather feared Allah in regards to them and traversed a just way with them." (Minhaaj us-Sunnah, 5/247)



Refuting Abu Hamza's Slander of Sheikh Abdullah el Faisal

Shaykhu'l-Islam Ibn Taymiyyah (ra) made clear that the Sahabah, even though they fought the khawarij based on the instruction of RasulAllah (saw) to prevent their evil from the Muslims, did not make takfir of them. Rather, Ali bin Abi Talib held their wealth and honour to be sanctified and did not treat them as the Sahabah treated the other apostates such as Musaylimah and his likes. No one objected to Ali doing this as it was known to be the agreement of the Sahabah that the khawarij were not apostates from the deen. (Minhaaj usSunnah, 5/241) When they rebelled against Ali (ra) in Harura and rebelled against obedience to the Jama'ah, Ali bin Abi Talib (ra) said to them "Our rights upon you are that we neither prevent you from our masajid nor take you right of the fay'." (Minhaaj us-Sunnah, 5/241) Shaykhu'l-Islam Ibn Taymiyyah made clear that Ali ibn Abi Talib (ra) did not make takfir of the khawarij and mentioned from Tariq bin Shihab that he said: "I was with Ali when the call to fight the people of Nahrawan was given. It was said: Are they Mushrikeen? Ali said: They have fled from Shirk. Then it was said: So are they Munaafiqun?

Ali responded: They Munaafiqun do not remember Allah except for a little bit. So then it was asked: So what are they then? Ali answered they are a people who have rebelled against us so we are fighting them." When Ibn Muljam killed Ali bin Abi Talib, he was not considered to be an apostate to be executed and Ali forbade that he be killed in this way. Ali (ra) said: "Do not kill the man, if I survive and am injured then qisas and if I die then execute him." (Minhaaj us-Sunnah, 5/245)

Shaykhu'l-Islam Ibn Taymiyyah (ra) stated: The statement of Ali (ra) in regards to the khawarij indicates that they are not kuffar who have disbelieved in the basis of Islam like apostates, this is well documented with the Imams, such as Ahmad and others. (Majmua alFatawa, 28/518)

Imam Ahmad mostly used to withhold from making takfir of them, al-Khallal reported in asSunnah, with his isnad, saying: "Yusuf bin Musa informed us that Abu Abdullah said to him: do you make takfir of the khawarij? Yusuf said: Maariqah (passers through). He said to him: Are they kuffar?

Yusuf said: they pass through (yamriqun) the deen." (as-Sunnah, 145) alKhallal also reported with an isnad saying: "Muhammad bin Abi Harun informed us that Ishaq narrated to them that Abu Abdullah asked about the Haruriyyah and the Maariqah (the Khawarij who broke away) if they are kuffar are not?

Ishaq said: relieve me from this and just say what is mentioned in the hadith." (as-Sunnah, 146)

Thus, it can be said that according to opinion of Ali ibn Talib (to say the least) the khawarij are not kuffar. Nor did he treat their wealth and honour/honor like that of hypocrites.

So just by this you can understand how evil or how ignorant Abu Hamza is, since he points out only ONE single view and doesn't give the full view.

He also lies that "the sahaba fought them and take their women and take their property". Thus, he makes all the wealth of the khawarij halal. However, even Ali ibn Talib didn't do this (he only took ONE particular piece of land from them).But Abu Hamza generalizes this – which can't be generalized.



REFUTATION OF PART 21 OF 24

First, all Imams agree that whoever leaves prayer in its entirety is a kafir, thus – the student of Abu Hamza who reads Khawarij and Jihaad – Page 75/76 (according to them).

Next, Abu Hamza tries to use a matter of fiqh that is disputed like when does one become kafir for leaving the salaah – i.e. does intentionally leaving even salah makes one a kafir, or never praying even a single salaah (and having the opportunity to do so) makes one a kafir.

Next both Imam Ahmad and Imam Shafi'i agreed that whoever, says his sahaada after that – he again becomes a Muslim.

So he's trying to use this to defend why he doesn't make takfeer on all those (who have the knowledge) of Tawheed Hakimiyyah. But Tawheed hakimiyyah is a matter of aqeedah – and there can be no difference in matters of aqeedah.

So he's basically trying to say that "others might not reach the same conclusion"!

Why Mr. Abu Hamza? Do you have a different Quran or perhaps a different tafseer of the Quran; or perhaps you have "special hadeeths"?

And I don't think that this is the case. So why Abu Hamza do you make excuses?

Abu Hamza says, "that is not denying tawheed hakimiyyah. What has tawheed hakimiyyah got to do with calling my brother a kafir – because he can't see what I see. Tawheed hakimiyyah doesn't mean that you call the person a kafir. It means you call the action is kufr and you correct it."

And even after hearing this, people consider this man to be a scholar! If a person doesn't believe in tawheed hakimiyyah even after it has been explained to him with evidences from the Quran and Sunnah. That person has two options – either to say that he will confirm this with those he trusts. Or he agrees with you.

So what happens if those he disagree with it? We ask him to bring evidence. He brings evidence – we refute it. And this goes back and forth. Until he can't bring any "evidence" to support his argument. Thus, if even now he doesn't agree with tawheed hakimiyyah and apply/try to apply its ruling. Then this person is a kafir – because all his excuses for not accepting the truth have been closed off.

Abu Hamza says, 'I'm asking him to give me an ayah or hadees to say that you have to call people kafir.'

Answer: The Quran tells us of the Jews who were turned into monkey and apes for dismantling the shariah. I ask Abu Hamza to research who were turned into apes and I hope that he will understand what I'm hinting at – since it is impossible to enjoin the right and forbidding the evil without judging.

Disclaimer: This is not a call/incitement to jihad. Rather this is an academic study for educational purposes. All statements - unless otherwise specified are not the views/statements of Sheikh Faisal.



Refuting Abu Hamza's Slander of Sheikh Abdullah el Faisal

Abu Hamza says, "So why you make it as the 3rd part of shaada"

Answer: Since rejection of the taghoot is a condition of the shaadat. But like I said before, we first explain to the person and give him/her all the evidence that he needs.

This person doesn't even understand basic logic. So I will break it down for him:

Allah (subhan wa tallah) has asked us to reject the taghoot. – Agree

So if the taghoots were Muslims – why would Allah (subhan wa tallah) ask us to reject them?

Abu Hamza doesn't have an answer for this.

Abu Hamza agrees that we need to kill them.

So I ask him – do we bury the taghoot in the burial grounds of the Muslims?

He doesn't have an answer for this.



REFUTATION OF PART 22; PART 23 AND PART 24 [COMBINED] OF 24

[The entire question and answer section has been combined]

Question and Answer Session –

Questions have been paraphrased for the most part. But the context hasn't been changed.

Question 1:

Sheikh Faisal asks in one of his talks, "Why didn't you call bin Baaz a kafir but you called the mufti of Chechnya a kafir."

Abu Hamza's answer – *Abu Hamza tries to use a disputed issue of fiqh (selling of alcohol) to defend ibn Baaz! One of the reasons according to Abu Hamza, why we can't call ibn Baaz a kafir: One (the ex mufti of Chechnya) is employed by a kafir. The other (ibn Baaz) is employed by a taghoot.*

Abu Hamza wake up – the taghoot that employ ibn Baaz were "employed" or "put in place" as the rulers by the kafirs – and these rulers even today take the jews and/or Christians as their friends and protectors. And Allah (subhan wa tallah) said that in doing this – it makes that person one of them, i.e. a disbeliever. So there is no actual difference between the two muftis! Then Abu Hamza tries to give his explanation that it was because of "Saddam the apostate". But what Abu Hamza forgets is that the Gulf War happened in 1994. And ibn Baaz died in 1999 (and this lecture also took place after 1998). But ibn Baaz didn't take back his fatwa.

Clarification of Accusation "2.":

Abu Hamza claims that "...because he (Sheikh Faisal) wants a black cult around him".

Abu Hamza makes this statement due to the fact that Sheikh Faisal said that Adam (alayhi salaam) was black.

Sheikh Faisal replies, "The arabic word hama in surah hijr 15:26 means black mud. This is the tafseer of showkaani and sulaiman al ashqar... Showkani was an arab of yemen and he held this view in his tafseer. Ibn kathir mentioned this also in albidaya wan nihaaya. This is not racism but the tafseer of the classical scholars."

Surah Hijr 15:26: "And indeed, We created man from sounding clay of altered black smooth mud"

Thus Abu Hamza you are refuted yet again!



Question 2:

Sheikh Faisal's message [as claimed by Abu Hamza's presumed student, "as salaamu alaykum. this is my message to all of my students, since my arrival in the UK - many people have commanded others to make hijra and at times take them to a strange land, tear up their passports and have them killed. As for the people who have given me their baya - none of you are allowed to make hijra to any destinations anywhere in the world without my permission."

First this type of accusation is very proactive. And we may get arrested if one tries to defend this – thus, this reply is based upon “assumptions”. So what I've replied is already available on the internet in different platforms.

This is a statement which Abu Hamza and his student distorts - since this was a warning posted by Sheikh Faisal with regards to a certain person (not Abu Hamza or his student), who is said to have taken people to Afghanistan at least a decade ago. And after it is rumored that he took them there - he said to have tore up their passports, etc. and then he left them there - while he himself came back to the UK. Thus in all probability, this is what Sheikh Faisal is trying to warn his students about. Also, we know that the students of the Sheikh have travelled to land of the Muslims. Never have I heard Sheikh Faisal forbid hijra or discourage hijra in general.

As for the issue of oath of allegiance - Abu Hamza says that it can't be given to those who are not fighting - but he forgets that warfare in our time isn't just one-to-one fighting. But it encompasses a great deal more. And this is what can be said without crossing the line of "freedom of speech".

Also, according to an authentic hadeeth when there are three people travelling together one of them should be made the Ameer. Thus, this act of giving your allegiance to an Ameer is done when people weren't fighting, but rather travelling – thus disproving Abu Hamza's statement.

Ibn Taymiyyah says: “It is essential that we know that leadership is one of the most greatest obligations of Deen. As a matter of fact, there is no Deen without it. The children of Adam will not fulfil their needs unless they get together for their needs. And when they get together, they must have a leader. For this reason, the Prophet (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) says: “If three are travelling, there must be a leader amongst them.” So, the prophet (saw) mandated that one is to be appointed as the leader in a simple situation where three people are travelling. This is to make us aware of other important types of get-togethers.” [Book As-Siyasah As-Shar'iyah, p.138 & 139]

Lastly, Sheikh Faisal himself believes that the oath of allegiance must be given to the Ameer ul Mumineen. So what is Abu Hamza shouting about?!?

As further proof from my personal experience and interaction with Sheikh Faisal - I myself haven't given any oath of allegiance to Sheikh Faisal.



Refuting Abu Hamza's Slander of Sheikh Abdullah el Faisal

Abu Hamza claims that Sheikh Faisal is a coward – but he forgets (and I repeat) that warfare in our time isn't just about facing the enemy on the ground battlefield. But it encompasses a great deal more. And this is what can be said without crossing the line of "freedom of speech".

Next Abu Hamza tries to falsely claim that even though some of the Believers (Muslims) took the Jews and Christians as friends and protectors – they were referred by Allah (subhan wa tallah) as believers.

Abu Hamza says, "some of them (*Muslims/Believers*) committed the action (taking the Jews and Christians as friends and protectors), but they are still called believers".

Wrong Abu Hamza. They (some of the Muslims/Believers) were talking about taking the Jews and Christians as their friends and protectors, but before they to practice what they had said - the ayah was revealed forbidding this action (before it was committed).

And even if the action (of taking the Jews and Christians as their friends and protectors was already committed) – this was before it was forbidden by Allah (subhan wa tallah). Just as alcohol was allowed before it was forbidden by Allah (subhan wa tallah).

So what exactly are you trying to refute here, Abu Hamza? When you figure it out – please update us!

Closing Note:

Thus, this refutation of Abu Hamza's Slander of Sheikh Abdullah el Faisal has come to an end. And insha'Allah I have proven by many evidences and examples the fallacy of Abu Hamza's statements.

And I pray that this work of mine benefits as many Muslims as possible. And I request all my brothers and sisters on the haqq to make dua for me, insha'Allah.

By Abu Saif.

Rights: All rights of distribution reserved for Muslims only. Please help in the distribution of this work if you found it beneficial.



Refuting Abu Hamza's Slander of Sheikh Abdullah el Faisal

IF you have made any updates/corrections so that this work can be updated here:

<http://sheikhfaisal.s3.amazonaws.com/defense.html>

Assumptions:

1. Whatever the Abu Hamza and his two students have said about the side/lecture name of Sheikh Faisal – is correct.