

الهجر وحكمه
ON BOYCOTTING



Shaikh Muhammad Naasirud-Deen al-Albaani

May Allaah have mercy on him



TRANSLATED BY AHMED ABU TURAAB || DECEMBER 2011

shaikhalbaani.wordpress.com



The First Question

R

REGARDING AN INDIVIDUAL WHO BOYCOTTS [OTHERS] ... IF a person [the boycotted] came to him [the boycotter] and extended his hand to him [offering to shake hands] and tried to speak with him and the other person [the boycotter] refused, what should he do?

AL-ALBAANI: If that's true then it is as though you're feeding him hot ashes, i.e., it is as though you are throwing ash in his eyes: so you do what is obligatory upon you and don't care.

Questioner: How many times should I repeat this?

AL-ALBAANI: Every time you do it, the reward will be multiplied for you, and the sin will become more severe upon him.

Al-Hudaa wan-Noor, 25.



The Second Question

■■■■■ ITS LIMITS ■■■■■



What are the reasons which permit one to boycott another Muslim? And when it becomes permissible, what are the limits [of this] boycotting and cutting off as regards time?

“ **WITHOUT DOUBT, THE REASONS WHICH PERMIT THE BOYCOTTING OF A** Muslim are his persistence on committing forbidden acts which he knows are forbidden in Islaam. So when he persists in that, then boycotting and cutting off from him is permissible.

And the second part of the question?

Questioner: Continuing from the first part of the same question, I say: is boycotting the people of innovation from the same category?

AL-ALBAANI: From the same category. This requires a clarification as I alluded to earlier.

Questioner: That he knows.

AL-ALBAANI: Yes.

Questioner: So what are the limits regarding [this] boycotting, cutting off and the time limit?

AL-ALBAANI: The limits are clear that if the persistent, disobedient Muslim sinner [faasiq], the criminal [faajir], continues upon his disobedience to his Lord, then the boycotting and cutting off persists until he repents to Allaah, the Mighty and Majestic. And if he turns back we turn back to him, and return to interacting/communicating with him as our Lord, the Blessed and Most High, ordered us to. The length of time, therefore, is in the hands of the one who is being boycotted. It is within his hands to lengthen it and it is in his hands to shorten it.

Al-Huda wan Noor, 67.



The Third Question

■■■■■ BOYCOTTING TODAY ■■■■■



Nowadays with the situation we're in, there are many [different] outlooks and the groups have become numerous in terms of [their] creed and interpretation and so on.

So here is the question: nowadays a Muslim brother will never give salaam or return salaam, or visit, or follow the funeral procession of a person who opposes his group, even though he is a Muslim just like him. It also happens that a person will enumerate [the mistakes] of another, [saying], 'This person is such and such,' and he [will go on to] say this and this and that. And [when] we tell him [that], 'This is backbiting. And that person is a Muslim, and you are mentioning his shortcomings and enumerating his flaws.' He says, 'This is hatred for the Sake of Allaah and a clarification of what that person is upon.'

So we want to know how to differentiate between hating for the Sake of Allaah and clarifying mistakes without falling into backbiting which the Prophet ﷺ warned us about, [when they asked him], 'Even if he had [those characteristics] that we are talking about, O Messenger of Allaah?' [He replied,] 'If he has that which you are speaking about then you have backbitten him.'

So what is your opinion about this?

“ I DO NOT KNOW/BELIEVE THAT A MUSLIM WOULD NOT GIVE SALAAM TO HIS Muslim brother [whilst] knowing that he is a Muslim. And this is boycotting which is not allowed Islamically, and the fact that the Muslims differ is not new, but rather old. What is obligatory is for there to be an exchange of mutual advice between the Muslims and that they have harmony and mutual love for the Sake of Allaah, the Mighty and Majestic.

So harbouring mutual enmity and boycotting is something prohibited in Islaam and loving and hating for the Sake of Allaah is sought after in Islaam. But maybe some people do not know how to implement [this properly]. And many times I am asked about a Muslim cutting off from his brother Muslim for some reason ...

Questioner: For nothing more than some difference over a fiqh issue ...

AL-ALBAANI: So I say: boycotting today—even if fundamentally it is something legislated—yet today is not the time for implementing it. Because if you wanted to boycott every Muslim who you criticise on a certain issue, you will be left on your own, [a] harsh [person].

So it is not for us today to deal upon the way of hating for the Sake of Allaah and boycotting for the Sake of Allaah.

Rather, the time for that is when the Muslims become stronger, stronger [also] in how they appear to deal with/treat each other—it is then that an individual who deviates from the Straight Path is boycotted—in such boycotting is a cure for him and an education. As for now, then this is not the time for boycotting.

In places like Syria and Jordan, the youth who abandon and are negligent about the prayer are numerous, and the questions about this situation are numerous too ... a person will ask, ‘I have a friend who used to pray with us. Then he deviated and abandoned the prayer. I advised, admonished and reminded him but he does not take heed nor respond to the advice. Shall I boycott him?’

So I say, ‘No. Do not boycott him.’ For if you do, you would have aided him in the deviance and misguidance he is upon. And if you boycott him, his friends, those who cause corruption in the land, will meet him and his deviance will become stronger. So it is upon you to follow up and attend to him while supervising him by admonishing him from time to time, and maybe Allaah, the Mighty and Majestic, will guide him.

Here in Syria we have a proverb, they say that a man who had abandoned the prayer repented. He came to the mosque for the first time wanting to pray but found that it was closed, so he said, ‘You’re closed and [so] I have a day off [from praying]!’

This man who boycotts, when he does so, he says to the one he is boycotting, 'I don't want to ever see you, don't accompany me and I won't accompany you!'

For this reason, in the present age it is not from wisdom at all that we boycott the people because of their deviation. Whether this deviation is ideological, [connected to] creed [*aqidah*], or a behavioural deviation. It is upon us to have patience in accompanying these people and that we do not declare people to be deviated/misguided and that we do not declare them to be disbelievers.

Because this declaration of someone to be a deviant/misguided or this declaration that someone is a disbeliever does not help us at all. Rather, it is upon us to remind, as He, the Mighty and Majestic, said, “**And remind for verily, the reminding profits the believers.**” Adh-Dhaariyaat 51:55

Interjection: It should be noted that the person who accompanies/associates with such people be someone who is confident about himself, [confident about the fact] that he will not be affected by the views and mannerisms of the deviated individual.

AL-ALBAANI: By Allaah, you have spoken the truth about this ... this is something very important, yes.

Al-Hudaa wan-Noor, 80.



The Fourth Question

THE TYPES OF BOYCOTTING



“ There are two types of boycotting in Islaam. Boycotting ... a Muslim boycotting his Muslim brother is [regarded as being] of two types in the Legislation of Allaah.

The first: Is that he boycotts him due purely to a worldly matter, and it is not important whether this matter is something material or not [related to individual taste]—it is purely worldly.

This [type of] boycotting is forbidden in Islaam.

In situations such as it, there is an allowance of [not speaking for] three days only. So if it continues for more than three days, it is forbidden [*baraam*], and that is his saying ﷺ, *‘It is not allowed for a Muslim to boycott his brother for more than three. They meet and so this one turns away from that one, and that one from this. And the best of them is the one who initiates giving the salutation to his brother.’*

[His saying] *‘More than three,’* i.e., more than three days, its meaning is that it is permissible for three days, an allowance from Allaah the Blessed and Most High, for His believing servants to vent their anger ... by boycotting his brother Muslim for a day, two days, three—any more than that is forbidden [*baraam*] and not allowed. For this reason the Prophet ﷺ described this boycotting by saying, *‘It is not allowed for a Muslim to boycott his brother for more than three days.’*

[And he said], *‘They both meet ...’* i.e., one is going, the other is coming, but instead of one giving *salaam* to the other and the other person replying, *‘...this one turns away from that one, and that one from this ...’* i.e., he ignores his brother who just passed by him. This action is not permissible after three days.

‘...And the best of them is the one who initiates giving the salutation to his brother.’ This last sentence from the *hadith* gives us two things:

The first: that this forbidden boycotting will cease just by the mere giving of *salaam*. And this is a very beautiful policy legislated by the *Sharee'ah*.

Because it is difficult to bring together, all at once, hearts which have boycotted and hate each other. But the All-Wise Legislator [i.e, Allaah] presented us with an easy key, which is that when you have a dispute with your brother regarding a worldly matter and it continues for more than three days, then it is forbidden [*haraam*] for you [to continue boycotting], and it is upon you to break the boycott, and to stop the separation/exodus [from one another].

And it is not necessary for you to go to his house—that would be something good, something beautiful, and that you apologise to him, but this requires extremely strong *eemaan*—and this is rarely found among the people.

Thus the All-Wise Legislator made the way to ending this boycotting and separation easy: when you meet him in the street you give him *salaam*, [saying], '*As-Salaamu alaikum,*' and thus the sin would be lifted. This is taken from his saying, '*... And the best of them is the one who initiates giving the salutation to his brother.*'

There is no doubt that the better of the two is the one who gives the *salaam* first. So this person who gave the *salaam* first has moved from the level of committing a forbidden act to the level of entering into the way of Islaam, through [showing] his brotherhood for his Muslim brother.

The other person without doubt is also someone who has turned away and abandoned his brother, this other person to whom the *salaam* was given by the first ... this [second] person who returns the *salaam* has committed a sin, and that [person who gave the *salaam* first] has been saved from the sin. The best of the two is the one who gives the *salaam* first.

So when the sin of abandoning and boycotting ceases to exist by giving the *salaam*, then this is usually the first step to meeting again, even if [that second meeting is] only through giving *salaam*, then maybe a handshake [will follow] which is regarded as one of the strongest reasons in attaining forgiveness from Allaah, the Blessed and Most High, since the Prophet ﷺ said, '*No two Muslims meet and shake hands except that their sins fall away just like leaves fall off a tree in autumn.*'

You know how in autumn a tree's leaves turn yellow and fall away, and you hear a sound when they fall, the sins of two Muslims who meet and shake hands fall off just like that, their sins fall off just as leaves fall off a tree in autumn.

This is when the boycotting is related to worldly matters, whether material or abstract [but worldly nevertheless].

The second type of abandoning and boycotting is when a Muslim boycotts his Muslim brother to discipline, reprimand and educate him. This is permitted in Islaam—with this good intention, and not by way of cutting off and boycotting [for worldly reasons] which we just mentioned, but rather by way of disciplining him.

And this is not done except when the one being boycotted is openly disobeying Allaah, the Mighty and Majestic, not caring about the people, not fearing Allaah nor being shy from [committing the sin in front of] Allaah's servants—and he has an honest and good friend, who boycotts him when he sees that he has left the proper path, and is not firm and upright on the Straight Path.

The proof for this is the story of the three people who remained behind, the story of the battle of the Prophet ﷺ in Tabook. Some of the Companions remained behind, from them Ka'b ibn Maalik. He didn't leave for the battle with the Prophet ﷺ, but remained behind with some other Companions [as I mentioned].

So when the Prophet ﷺ returned from the battle of Tabook, these three [noble Companions] came as did other people who remained behind [but who] were from the hypocrites. So the hypocrites started making a myriad of false excuses and the Prophet ﷺ was accepting their excuses and entrusting their affair to Allaah.

As for Ka'b ibn Maalik, then he spoke the truth to the Prophet ﷺ and told him about the reality. He said, 'O Messenger of Allaah! I cannot lie to you. Because I know that if I lie to you the revelation will make it clear and will uncover the lie. I became busy plowing, sowing, tending to my livestock' and so on. So the Prophet ﷺ ordered the Companions to boycott these three, from them being Ka'b ibn Maalik, may Allaah be pleased with him, and it continued for a long time.

Then Ka'b ibn Maalik's wife was ordered to leave his house and to go to her family—and thus he was left alone for fifty days. The Prophet ﷺ ordered the Companions not to speak to them. So one of these three would meet a man in the street and give him *salaam* but that other person would not return the greeting.

... this is in order to discipline these people who remained behind from the battle in the Way of Allaah with the Messenger of Allaah ﷺ.

Then forgiveness came down from Allaah to the Prophet ﷺ: Allaah had forgiven the three [who remained behind]. So Ka'b ibn Maalik came to the Prophet of Allaah ﷺ when one of his relatives had given him the good news that Allaah, the Mighty and Majestic, had sent down news of His Forgiveness [in the Quraan]. So he came to the Prophet ﷺ and Talhah stood up and received him and congratulated him on the fact that Allaah had forgiven him. A long story which contains great lessons, and it is found in Sahih Bukhari.

The point is that this boycotting is permissible and it comes under the principle of loving and hating for the Sake of Allaah.

But unfortunately this thing today is something of the past, It is very, very rare that you will find someone who boycotts a Muslim because he has deviated from the [correct] path. But he will [instead] boycott him over something material, [material things] some of which we pointed out previously.

The person who carries out the type of boycotting done for the Sake of Allaah is rewarded for it and is not sinful—and this is the type of breaking off that we are in need of nowadays.

As for cutting off over worldly matters then it is *haraam* and not permissible except for a period of three days only, if it goes on for longer than that then it is *haraam* and the matter is as he ﷺ said in the previous *hadith*, '*The best of the two is the one who greets his brother with salaam first.*' This is the answer to the question you asked, *inshaa Allaah*.

And making peace between people is from the best of actions, and due to its importance in Islaam the Prophet allowed lying to bring about peace between them [i.e.,the disputing parties].

This is something important, but a person must know the causes precisely so that he is able to bring about closeness/establish normal relations and reconcile between the opinions of the two disputants.

Al-Hudaa wan-Noor, 95.



The Fifth Question

BACKBITING AND BOYCOTTING—SIMILAR RULINGS



The topic of boycotting another Muslim, is it allowed, O Shaikh?

Interjection: Regarding boycotting a Muslim, we spoke with the Ustaadh on the phone that day and then later delayed discussing the topic. Namely, the hadiths reported about boycotting a Muslim are well-known as is the great sin a Muslim commits by boycotting his Muslim brother. So we would like the Ustaadh [i.e., Shaikh al-Abaani] to speak about this topic, i.e., we are men ...

“ **THERE IS NO DOUBT THAT THE TOPIC OF BOYCOTTING CONTAINS PRECISION** similar to the precision found in the topic of backbiting. The answer to these two matters is that just as it is not allowed for a Muslim to boycott another Muslim, in the same way it is not allowed for a Muslim to backbite another. And just as backbiting which is forbidden has a well-known exception in the *Sharee'ah*, in the same way boycotting has an exception in the Legislation.

So a Muslim boycotting another for other than a legislated reason is only permissible for three days, permissible for three days only, any more than that is *haraam*, due to the well-known *hadith* reported in the two *Sahibs* from the Prophet ﷺ that he said, *'It is not allowed for a Muslim to boycott his brother for more than three. They meet and so this one turns away from that one, and this one from that. And the best of them is the one who initiates giving the salutation to his brother.'*

So in this *hadith* is a declaration of the forbiddance of boycotting along with an allowance to boycott for these three days or three nights. And in reality this is from the weakness of man which Allaah, the Mighty and Majestic, created and described in His Saying, **'And man was created weak.'** Nisaa 4:28

So our Lord, the Mighty and Majestic, was kind to him and so permitted him to vent some of his anger regarding his Muslim brother so it is permitted for him to boycott him for these three days and then the matter is over. If he increases upon that then the boycotting becomes forbidden according to the text of the *hadith*, at the start of which there occurred, *'It is not allowed ...'*

As for what is exempted from that as we said ... or as we alluded to the exemption from forbidden backbiting, [then as regards the exemption from boycotting] it is only when the impetus for it is to educate the one being boycotted and to try to turn him away from the opposition to the *Sharee'ah* that he may have fallen into.

So when a Muslim boycotts him for this purpose—and it, as is evident, is done with a reformatory goal [in mind] for the person being boycotted—then it is permissible and if it is not done with this goal in mind then it is not permissible and the original ruling remains, i.e., that it is *haram* after three days.

And amongst the people it frequently happens that a Muslim will boycott his brother over something material and not for a legislated purpose or wanting to educate the one being boycotted. Yet he will then falsely imagine that in boycotting his Muslim brother he is doing something good, whereas the reality is that he is not boycotting him because that person is perpetrating a matter or sin which he is continuing upon or sticking to, but [instead he is boycotting him] just to vent his own anger.

For this reason the issue of a Muslim boycotting his Muslim brother with the legislated boycotting is from the most precise affairs which it is obligatory upon the Muslim to be extremely careful from becoming entangled in and [as a result of such meddling] falling into it and thus—without realising or knowing—opposing the aforementioned *hadith* which forbids it.

Namely, is it correct to say that ... that it is the intention that defines the permissibility or not of backbiting?

AL-ALBAANI: Yes, it's just that the intention without doubt is the reference point for all actions, but what I wanted to bring to [your] attention was that a person has to

look at himself and not boycott his brother for a purely worldly reason while imagining that he is only boycotting him with the intention of disciplining him.

And a person may lie, for example, or fabricate something, and so another person will boycott him, but saying such a lie or making such a fabrication is not from the nature of this person who is now being boycotted, so it is upon a person to advise and remind him of the forbiddance of what he has done.

For if not, when the door of boycotting another Muslim is opened just because he has committed a mistake then it would mean that it is obligatory upon the Muslims to boycott each other and to cut off from each other and to turn away from each other and that they not be brothers as Allaah, the Blessed and Most High, described them. This is what I wanted to turn your attention to.

And on top of that the religion is to sincerely advise one another ...

Another Questioner: Namely, if the purpose of disciplining him has been met, who decides that the goal has been reached?

AL-ALBAANI: When repentance and the fact that he has turned back to Allaah become apparent from the person being boycotted, or at the very least an apology for what he did; we cannot ask for any more than that.

Namely, when the one boycotting insists [on boycotting] despite the repentance of the person being boycotted, what is the role of the other Muslims [regarding this]?

AL-ALBAANI: After he has repented?

Yes, the man repented from his mistake, but the one boycotting is still boycotting him and determined on doing so—is there then a role for his friends, relatives or family [to play]?

AL-ALBAANI: It is as though I understand from your question, and Allaah knows best, [that you are asking] what the role of these other people is, not in relation to the one being boycotted but to the one boycotting, i.e., is the situation turned on its head and the one who was boycotting [himself now] boycotted?

... the one boycotted has repented and turned back to Allaah and acknowledged his mistake, but the one boycotting is persisting [in his stance], so should he be left ... or, namely, is there something which should be done by a person working on the issue[/involved in the situation, like] going to the one boycotting him and telling him ...

AL-ALBAANI: That must be done, ... as for the fact that it is advice, then the Shaikh, the *Khateeb* [in this mosque] gave this advice [reminding us in the sermon] that the religion is to sincerely advise one another and this was a reminder of the obligation of advising one another.

So if the one who was being boycotted repented and turned back to Allaah, and the one boycotting continued in his boycotting then he is wrong. We do not now say that the tables should be turned as I alluded to earlier, jokingly, the situation is not turned on its head so that the one who was boycotting is now [himself] boycotted, but he should be told that his role has come to an end.

And if the one being boycotted tried ... two times, three times, but the other person remained firm on his stance of boycotting, is there something that should be required of him ...?

AL-ALBAANI: I'm sorry, the one being boycotted did what?

He tried more than one time to give salaam to the other and approach him but the other refuses and insists [on his stance], how long should he carry on trying, namely, is he, by just trying once, twice or three times, not required to try anymore or should he continue trying for the rest of his life ...

AL-ALBAANI: Abu Yahyaa is speaking about the one being boycotted.

The one being boycotted tried to dispel the enmity with the one boycotting him, trying one time, another and a third, but that person is insisting on his stance. So the role of the one being boycotted now ... he suffices himself by having tried once, twice, three times, and he will lose his mind if he keeps on trying for the rest of his life ...

AL-ALBAANI: This is unreasonable ...

This is my question?

AL-ALBAANI: Okay, after your question has become clear then his part [in trying to rectify the affair] has ended and the situation is turned around in relation to the one boycotting such that he is sinful in boycotting. For this reason we say that he is advised because it is not upon the one being boycotted to do more than what you just mentioned except when the issue branches off into monetary rights, for example, where the one being boycotted is not giving back such rights [to their prospective owners].

[in this case] he has not repented.

AL-ALBAANI: He has not repented.

So if he has not repented nor turned back to Allaah.

AL-ALBAANI: But you are not referring to this ...

... branching off from this question is another which is that in reality the boycotter may not restrict the matter to himself only but generalises it to include his family, his children, preventing them from talking to the other person [being boycotted] and his children and so on, likewise now ...

AL-ALBAANI: And it has become apparent to all that the man has repented and turned back to Allaah.

Yes.

AL-ALBAANI: The same is said [about this situation]: it is not permissible for these people [you just mentioned] to continue upon that.

Okay, the applicability of the situation [to the heirs of the one being boycotted if he died] ... if the person being boycotted died ... his children and family ... bearing in mind that each person is responsible for himself ... i.e., the issue is between those two parties ...

AL-ALBAANI: I.e., Abu Yahyaa, you mean that the one being boycotted has children who are now being boycotted ...

... due to him [i.e., due to the fact that their father was being boycotted].

AL-ALBAANI: Due to him ... this is not allowed. For no soul bears the burden of another.

It's clear from many hadiths, we would like hadiths which show that it is permissible for a Muslim to boycott another [for permissible reasons].

AL-ALBAANI: Boycotting occurred between the Companions, those three who remained behind and who were boycotted for fifty days.

Interjection: The proof is mentioned in the text of the Quraan.

Questioner: Is this proof applicable to all Muslims [in general], or was it specially revealed for a certain situation. I.e., is there another proof clarifying/explaining it for others [in terms of applicability], because this proof ...

AL-ALBAANI: Your asking whether there is another *aayah* regarding it ... this happens very often with me, on the phone [the Shaikh will give someone an answer on the phone and then that person will ask for another proof] and so I say to them, 'This *hadith* didn't please you [such] that you have to ask for another?'

And I [now], for example, have to bring two or three *hadith* about the issue?

This is not conceivable [i.e., it is not conceivable that every question asked will have more than one proof]. If in the Legislation, in the Noble Quraan, it has been established that boycotting is permissible it is not befitting that it then be said, 'Is there any other proof?' Why?

Because this question gives the impression to those present that this proof [from the Quraan] is not enough and for this reason we are asking for another. This is a side point which has no connection with the topic, it's just a reminder of making one's method of questioning good, and asking questions well/correctly is half of knowledge, as was said of old.

After this [point] I say: it has been established that the Prophet ﷺ boycotted his wives for a month, and the thing I fear the most is that another question will come also saying, 'Is there another *hadith* apart from this one? Because this one is connected to the wives of the Prophet and ...'

Listen to the answer now: the purpose of the first boycotting mentioned in the Quraan, and the purpose of the second mentioned in the Prophetic *hadiths* ... a question we should think about is: is it something related purely to worship whose meaning cannot be understood or is its meaning understood?

Its meaning is understood.

AL-ALBAANI: Its meaning is understandable. So, when there is a text whose ruling is understood and it is not something related purely to worship, and we have nothing but this text then we have to stop at it and not go beyond it.

So now in front of us are two texts, why did the Prophet ﷺ order his most noble Companions to boycott those three who remained behind? There is no doubt that the answer is in order to discipline them. Why did the Prophet boycott his wives? [Again,] to discipline them.

So now we say: why did Zaid boycott Amr? If it is in the same manner then the proof from the Quraan and authentic *Sunnah* is enough, but the difference, without doubt, is very clear, in that the boycotting of ... I will not go too far [and will give you an example even closer to home] ... the boycotting of Al-Albaani of Zaid or Bakr or Amr is not like the boycotting of those Companions who were directly ordered to cut off from those [three] who remained behind, and even more so: it is not like the boycotting of the Prophet of his wives, because he is infallible.

[So] what is important is that the boycotter, who in this case is Al-Albaani [as an example], is doing so to discipline/educate. Boycotting to discipline whom? The boycotted person. So if he is correct in doing so then he will be rewarded and his example is [taken from] the Book and the *Sunnah*. And if he is mistaken and there is

room for someone to show him how he is mistaken then we welcome that and say, ‘O Abu Bilaal! May Allaah have mercy on the one who guides me to my faults [so that I can correct them].’

... Shaikh Ali [Hasan al-Halabi] here has reminded us of a *badith* which is that Abdullaah ibn Umar al-Khattaab narrated a *badith* from the Prophet ﷺ one day saying that he said, ‘*Allow the women to go to the mosques at night.*’ So one of Abdullaah ibn Umar’s sons said, ‘By Allaah! I will not allow them to go out.’ So the father said to the son, ‘I tell you that Allaah’s Messenger said such and such, and you say, ‘I will not do it?’ By Allaah! I will never speak to you again.’

I say to you that Allaah’s Messenger said, and you say the opposite of what the Prophet said? By Allaah, I will never speak to you again! And he didn’t speak to him until he died. And the *badith* ... listen ... the *badith* is in Sahih Muslim, what do we think Ibn Umar’s intent was in ...

To discipline/educate him.

AL-ALBAANI: To discipline/educate him.

I have another badith, O Ustaadh.

AL-ALBAANI: Bring it, let’s have a look. Only, *inshaa Allaah*, your *badith* will be like his [i.e., the one Shaikh Ali mentioned], strong.

One of the Companions was hunting by throwing stones, Abdullaah ibn ... another Companion saw him, I don’t recall the names now, he told him that the Prophet ﷺ forbade al-Khadhf which is to ... so he found him ...

AL-ALBAANI: Yes, yes.

So another time he saw this Companion doing the same thing and so said to him, ‘I said to you, ‘The Prophet ﷺ forbade [this] and you’re still carrying on hunting like this ...’ He then said, ‘I will never speak to you.’ [Translator’s note: here is the text of the hadith the questioner is referring to from Sahih al-Bukhaari: The book of Slaughtering

and Hunting, *Al-Kbadhf* (throwing stones with the middle finger and the thumb) and *Al-Bunduqa* (a ball of clay thrown through a hollow stick or the like). Narrated Abdullaah bin Maghaffal that he saw a man throwing stones with two fingers (at something) and said to him, 'Do not throw stones, for Allaah's Messenger ﷺ has forbidden throwing stones, or he used to dislike it.' Abdullaah added, 'Throwing stones will neither hunt a game, nor kill (or hurt) an enemy, but it may break a tooth or gouge out an eye.' Afterwards 'Abdullaah once again saw the man throwing stones. He said to him, 'I tell you that Allaah's Messenger ﷺ has forbidden or disliked throwing stones (in such a way), yet you are throwing stones! I shall not talk to you for such-and-such a period.'

AL-ALBAANI: Yes.

Even his expression, Ustaadh, he says, 'May the same roof not shelter us!' How do we gather between this action and the saying of Allaah's Messenger ﷺ which prohibits [boycotting] for more than three days?

AL-ALBAANI: May Allaah forgive you, may Allaah forgive you. My dear brother, we said that the boycotting which is forbidden is the one done for worldly reasons to vent one's anger against whom? The opponent. As for the legislated boycotting then it is for an educational purpose, so now your question is not applicable.

Okay, Abdullah ibn Umar raising [his son], he's the father, you'd think that Abdullaah ... the boy's father, who brought his son up, he brought his son up, i.e., a Companion from the Companions of Allaah's Messenger, he didn't refrain from what he said ... [Compiler's note: the questioner is trying to say can it be pictured that the son of Abdullaah ibn Umar, being the son of a Companion, wasn't inhibited from doing what he did? So then Shaikh al-Albaani explains below that this is another issue and that Abdullaah ibn Umar boycotted his son because he did not show the correct manners in relation to a saying of the Prophet ﷺ so Abdullaah ibn Umar saw it correct to be stern on his son as a punishment because he is the son of a Companion and because he is from the first generation and if the Companions had been lax with everyone who ignored the Prophetic Sunnah, the Sunnah would be lost.]

AL-ALBAANI: This is another issue, this is another issue, we want to know why it was that Abdullaah ibn Umar boycotted his son and never spoke to him until he died, out of a desire to discipline/educate him, regarding the incorrect stance he had taken in relation to the saying of the Prophet ﷺ.

As for the issue of whether he repented or not this does not concern us as regards the issue [we're discussing at the moment], what concerns us is why Abdullaah boycotted his son: was it to vent his own [personal] anger or was it retaliation on behalf of the saying of his Prophet and in order to champion the *hadith* of his Prophet?

It was, without doubt, for this reason.

So this is the difference ... and the legislated boycotting and the unlegislated one ..., i.e., two people argue with each other, this happens a lot for worldly reasons, so as we said when explaining the *hadith* and commenting on it ... we gave the example that they boycott for three days and then what? The better of the two is the one who gives his brother *salaam* first, because there was no boycotting for the Sake of Allaah in this example.

The boycotting for the Sake of Allaah continues except when it is plainly clear, as we said at the end of the last discussion, [when it is plainly clear] that the boycotted person has repented and turned back to Allaah.

For example, a person doesn't pray so his brother boycotts him, or his friend, or his beloved and so on, and explains the reason he is being boycotted, not hiding that reason from him, [but tells him why, saying,] '[It is] because you don't pray ...,' so he remains like that for a long period, a short period [whatever is the case], and then the person starts to pray to Allaah, the Mighty and Majestic. So [now] the justification to boycott him has gone, and so on ...

Al-Hudaa wan-Noor 154.



The Sixth Question

AS SLY AS A FOX



If there was, O Shaikh, a man from the common folk who prays but who, in character, is as sly as a fox, such that whoever comes across him finds it difficult to deal with him ... a specific dispute occurred between you and him in which he was at fault, he advocated/defended what was wrong. It was not a dispute over a fiqh issue, just something normal, so after the debate/dispute is over, you meet him in the street and say, 'As-Salaamu alaikum,' but he does not reply to you, so you stop greeting him with salaam, and you are happy that he did not reply to your salutation because in that you saw an end to his evil [i.e., you don't have to deal with him anymore]. So is this action legislated [i.e., permissible] or do I have to be happy to give him salaam every time I meet him?

“ IF YOU GAVE HIM SALAAM EVERY TIME YOU MET HIM, THEN THAT IS BETTER, and if you turned away from him, then that is permissible.

Jazaakallaahu khair.

Al-Hudaa wan-Noor, 192.



The Seventh Question

THE HADITH OF WAHSHI



May Allaah reward you with good ... a question, O Shaikh, ... with us in Kuwait is a group of practising Muslim youth who do not like/feel comfortable with others although there are no takes [criticism] on the religion of those others, but [one of these youths may say], 'I just don't like him, personally, I don't feel comfortable concerning him.' And when he is corrected he cites as proof the hadith of Wahshi and the time the Prophet ﷺ said to him, 'Can you hide your face from me?' So they say that here the Prophet's ﷺ personal disposition ... the man [i.e., Wahshi] came having repented [but the Prophet ﷺ still told him to hide his face from him], so they use this hadith as a proof, if you could clarify this for us.

“ THIS HADITH CANNOT BE USED AS A PROOF IN THIS CONTEXT. IT IS TRUE that he came, repentant, but in the soul of the Prophet ﷺ was sorrow which neither the passing of days nor time could wipe out because of the fact that Wahshi killed his uncle, Hamzah.

So [concerning your question] what did this person who that other one does not feel comfortable with do? What he did is nothing.

For this reason citing this as a proof in reality shows us that we live in a time in which people try to walk before they can crawl [Editor's. note: the Arabic proverb the Shaikh used translated literally reads, '... tries to become a dried raisin before he becomes a sour grape ...'], and they feign knowledge whilst being ignorant, and they are not scholars. So this deduction is extremely poor because it is not compatible with the incident [mentioned in the question].

Imagine that a person unjustly, out of oppression and enmity, killed a Muslim's brother and then came to the murdered person's brother, repentant, and from his behaviour

it is apparent that he really has repented, but the murdered person's brother said to him, 'Hide your face from me,' this situation is not like that one [mentioned in the question], because this person killed his brother unjustly, and as a result he doesn't want to disturb the [remaining] peace in his life by looking at his brother's murderer, for example.

So this situation differs [from the one in the question], and we ask Allaah, the Mighty and Majestic, to give us understanding of the religion and to teach us its interpretation.

I.e., is he sinful in doing that, O Shaikh?

AL-ALBAANI: Without doubt, because this is turning away from one another and cutting off.

Is it not from desires?

AL-ALBAANI: It is, without doubt, following desires.

Al-Hudaa wan-Noor, 237.



The Eighth Question

■■■■■■ ON BOYCOTTING INNOVATORS ■■■■■■



Is what we hear correct that in this day and age boycotting the innovators should not be implemented?

“ HE WANTS TO SAY THAT IT IS NOT RIGHT THAT IT SHOULD BE IMPLEMENTED.

Is it correct that it should not be implemented? It is not implemented, because the innovators and the disobedient Muslims sinners [*faasiqs*] and criminals [*faajirs*] are the majority today, but he is trying to say that it is not right that it is implemented, and it is as though the first person the questioner is referring to is me: so I say yes, it is as such, it is not right to implement it, and I have said this openly just now when I gave you that Syrian proverb, ‘You are closed and I have a day off,’ yes.

*But, for example, when an environment is found, and the majority in it are from Ahlus-Sunnah, for example, and thereafter some people who have deviated from the path of truth [*nawaabidh*] are found who innovated into the Religion of Allaah, the Mighty and Majestic, in that situation is it implemented or not?*

AL-ALBAANI: In the *Jamaa’ah* itself?

In that environment which the people of truth dominate and then innovation became apparent in it, what do you say about this situation?

AL-ALBAANI: It is obligatory here to use wisdom. The strong, uppermost group, if it boycotts the group which has deviated from the *Jamaa’ah*—going back to what we already said—will that defend/aid the group which is clinging to the Truth or will it harm them? This is as regards them [i.e., the group on the truth].

Thereafter, will it benefit those being boycotted by the Aided Group or will it harm them, the answer to this has preceded, i.e., it is not right that we act upon these affairs based upon zealotry and emotions but rather with careful deliberation, tolerance and wisdom.

Because we, for example ... [imagine] one of these people deviated [from the truth], he opposed the *Jamaa'ab*, ... [and then the reaction from those who want to cut him off will be], 'Boycott him! Don't be kind to him!' [Rather you should] advise him, guide him, and so on, accompany him for a while, then when you, firstly, despair of him and, secondly, think that his infection will spread to Zaid and Bakr [i.e., other people], then he is cut off when it is believed that boycotting will be the cure, and as is said, the last cure one resorts to is cauterization [i.e., boycotting is the last resort].

Generally, nowadays, I do not advise the use of boycotting whatsoever, because it harms more than it benefits.

And the greatest proof of that is the *fitnah* that is on-going now in the Hijaz. The call of *tawheed* and the call of the Book and the *Sunnah* unites all of them but some of them have specific activities, whether in politics or other views which are not known from any of the people of knowledge before, and it [i.e., what they say] may be correct and it may be wrong. [But] we cannot tolerate anything new that we hear especially if it appears to us to be something which, at first suggestion [i.e., without giving it any careful thought], we don't recognize. We attack it straight away, this is a mistake, my brother:

You want a friend with no faults

And does aloe wood [Oud] give off its fragrance without smoke?

We [earnestly] hope that the *Ikhwaan al-Muslimoon* are with us on *Tawheed* alone [if nothing else], so that we can be with them, for they are not pleased with us even in *aqidah* and they say that rousing these differences splits the ranks and divides the people ... and so on.

These brothers [in the Hijaz] who a group have split away from or who split away from a group [themselves], and Allaah knows best ... they are with us all the way regarding the Book, the *Sunnah* and the methodology of the *Salaf as-Saalib*, but they came with something new, some of it is wrong and some of it is correct.

So why do we spread dissension, partisanship and bigotry amongst ourselves, such that whereas once we were a single block we became two, three, they became ... became Surooris ... and so on, *Allaahu Akbar*.

And nothing divided them which deserved to be split over: there is no difference in the major issues which it cannot be imagined the Salafis would differ in. We all know that the Companions differed in some issues, but their methodology was one.

For this reason if you take it that some individuals from the *Ablus-Sunnah wal-Jamaa'ah* and the Aided Sect have deviated, then we deal with them with kindness and tenderness, *Yaa akhi*, and we try to keep them with the *Jamaa'ah* and we don't ostracise them nor boycott them except when we fear something from them—and this does not become apparent straight away, i.e., just because someone has an opinion in which he disagrees [with the *Jamaa'ah*] and has strayed from the *Jamaa'ah* it is not fitting that we immediately ostracise and boycott him.

But rather we should wait and be patient until maybe Allaah, the Mighty and Majestic, guides his heart or it becomes clear to us that leaving him is better.

Al-Hudaa wan-Noor, 664.



The Ninth Question

DISLIKE THE VIEWS OR THE PERSON WHO HOLDS THEM?



O Shaikh! Regarding hating a person, isn't it so that a person must love his brother for the Sake of Allaah, and hate for the Sake of Allaah, give for His Sake and withhold for His Sake [too] ... by hating, I should hate someone for their ideology not for their person, if he is a Muslim and prays, not hatred ..., I hate, for example, his ideology and not him personally?

“ I DO NOT THINK THERE IS A DISTINCTION BETWEEN THE TWO THINGS except when the dislike of the person who is doing the action which is in opposition to the legislation leads to ostracising him, then [we say that] it is not allowed to hate him to that extent.

Namely, boycotting someone is not done just because a person falls into something which opposes the *Sharee'ah*, for if that were the case then the entire Islamic community would be taken to pieces because not a single one of us is free of something which another person may dislike in him, putting aside whether this hatred is regarding something justifiable—we are now only talking about hatred when it's justifiable, so what do you think if it is for something false.

There is not a single one of us except that another person will dislike something in him. So boycotting is inapplicable due to such a dislike. But we do not imagine that we dislike the evil action committed by this person while [at the same time] not disliking the source of the action. So these are two things which it is not possible for us to split one from the other.

But I say that it is fitting that when we dislike someone for a wrong action he has done it does not necessarily mean that we are allowed to break relations with him, clear?

And this boycotting, without doubt, is a means of educating in Islaam but it, firstly, is implemented only concerning a person who performed a disliked deed which is not

customary of him, and secondly it must be noted whether the boycotting will realize the desired goal, which is to educate this person and bring him back to the correct path. So if the boycotting will realize this goal then it should be done and if not, then it shouldn't.

Many of our practicing brothers always discuss [the issue of] boycotting a person: for example, [boycotting] someone who has left praying or is a backbiter or a tale-carrier or who does some well-known sins, so the question about whether we should boycott him is asked. And this person they are asking about may be a relative, even a close relative through marriage or blood.

So we turn the attention of those asking this question to this principle: do you feel that if you boycott this person who is doing such and such, that it will benefit him or will his stance be, as I mention sometimes, like that of the man who used to be a sinner, someone who had left the worship of his Lord, who then repented and resolved to pray his first prayer at the mosque. He went to the mosque and found it closed, and so said, 'You're closed and I have a day off [from praying].'

So if this person who you want to boycott has no concern about your boycotting him, what is the benefit of it then?

Rather, the opposite is correct—that you stay in touch with him, advising him, reminding him every time the opportunity arises.

So, firstly, boycotting is not done for some trivial reason and secondly, even if it is to be done for something which the person doing it deserves to be boycotted over, it is obligatory upon us to study the situation of the community/society we live in.

And from that about which there is no doubt is the fact that, with deep regret, the community today does not help the Muslims who want to boycott another since the reality is that he will not even care about this ostracism.

Al-Hudaa wan-Noor, 563.

