



# Muḥammad Munīr Does Da‘wah in the Park

**Part 2: The Dīn of the Ash‘arī Jahmites in Divorcing Allāh’s Will From His Wisdom and Making Foolish Things Possible:**

**“Everybody, once and for all. If it was the will of God, if it was His will for one man to come down and to die upon the cross for the forgiveness and atonement of all people, then it could have happened, it is not impossible. But we don’t believe that. It is possible... Anything is possible.”**



This is the second part of our series.<sup>1</sup> In the course of debating Christians yesterday at Speakers Corner in Hyde Park, Munīr granted to them that if Allāh willed, He could send down a man to die for the sins of all people, and that it is possible for this to happen, though Muslims do not believe it, and that anything is possible. As soon as he made this statement, one of the Christians thanked him for this admission, and then Munīr realising what he had said, abruptly ended the conversation and started to walk off.

Here is a transcript of the conversation:<sup>2</sup>

**Christian:** “Am I right to understand that you had a problem for someone to take the sins of other people, you have a problem with that, is that what I am understanding.”

**Munīr:** “No. You misunderstood what I said.”

**Christian:** “Can you repeat your claim?”

**Munīr:** “We believe like Christians believe that God Almighty is ever-Omnipotent, He is the most-Powerful, He can do what He wants to do.”

**Christian:** “You didn't answer my question.”

[After some heckling...]

**Munīr:** “Everybody listen carefully... Everybody, once and for all. If it was the will of God, if it was His will for one man to come down and

<sup>1</sup> Refer to <http://www.manhaj.com/manhaj/?kckcv> for Part 1.

<sup>2</sup> <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=LKNhaFbvMzg> from 13:00 onwards.

to die upon the cross for the forgiveness and atonement of all people, then it could have happened, it is not impossible. But we don't believe that. It is possible... Anything is possible.”

In the above dialogue, Munīr makes it clear to the Christians that he does not have a problem with the concept of someone taking the sins of other people, and that it is possible for Allāh to forgive and atone the sins of all people through one man who “comes down” and who is crucified, and that this is not impossible for Allāh because “anything is possible”—to which one of the Christians quickly snapped: “Thank you!”

So in response to this are the following points:

**First:** In al-Jawāb al-Ṣaḥīḥ, Shaykh al-Islām Ibn Taymiyyah responds to the argument of the Christians that Allāh is just, and that it is not from His justice to request any nation to follow a man who did not come to them and for whom there was no book in their own language. They mean by this to justify their absence of following the Prophet (صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ). From the angles of refutation provided by Shaykh al-Islām is that he says:

“The Fourth Angle: That it is amazing that the Christians should consider the likes of this to be oppression that departs from justice, whilst they themselves ascribe such mighty injustice to Allāh upon this principle which no one from any nation has ascribed to Him. Just as they reviled and abused Him with such revilement that no one from any nation has reviled Him. For they are the furthest of nations from His Tawḥīd, His glorification and praise. **This is because they claim that when Ādam ate from the tree, the Lord became**

**angry and punished him, and that that punishment remained among his offspring until the Messiah came and was crucified.** And that his (Ādam's) offspring were held captive by Iblīs, until they even said this about the Prophets such as Noah, Abraham, Moses, David, Solomon and others besides them. And it is known that Abraham's father was a disbeliever and Allāh did not make him accountable for the sin of his father, so how could He make him accountable for the sin of Ādam, and he is the furthest of forefathers. And this is only if it is presumed that Ādam did not repent. How is it then when Allāh has informed us of his repentance? **Then they claim that the crucifixion—which is from the greatest of sins and faults—was [the means] by which Allāh purified and saved Ādam and his offspring from the punishment of Hellfire,** and that through it, He punished Iblīs, even though Iblīs remained disobedient to Allāh, deserving of punishment from the time he refused prostration to Ādam and whispered to him until the sending of the Messiah, and [all the while] the Lord was capable of punishing him, while the children of Ādam were not [deserving of] punishment for the sin of their father. **So those whose saying is of the likes of these types of heresies to which the laughter of the intelligent people is directed, and which are not befitting to be ascribed to the most ignorant and oppressive of kings [of the world] [let alone Allāh, the Lord of the Worlds], then how can they—alongside this—claim that they describe Allāh with justice...<sup>3</sup>** End of quote from Ibn Taymiyyah.

---

<sup>3</sup> Al-Jawāb al-Ṣaḥīḥ (Dār al-Āṣimah, 1419H) 2/107-108.

**Second:** From the statement of Ibn Taymiyyah it is clear that what the Christians claim regarding atonement of sin through crucifixion, and what Muḥammad Munīr grants to them as being possible and as something he does not have a problem with is from the heresies to which the laughter of intelligent people is directed and which are not even befitting even for the most ignorant and oppressive kings of the world, let alone the Lord of the Worlds.

**Third:** In the statement of Munīr is an aspect of the heresy of the **Jahmites** and **Ash'arites** who deny that there are wisdoms and reasons in Allāh's actions (al-ḥikmah wal-ta'īll), and upon this basis, they made it possible for Allāh, if Allāh so willed, for Him to punish the believers in Hell for no apparent sin and reward the disbelievers with Paradise, despite their disbelief, and that there would be no injustice entailed by this at all because they are Jabariyyah, and their Tawḥīd is that **there is no doer, (fā'il) except for Allāh**, and hence, all of His actions are pure irādah (will)—devoid of wisdom—and are neutral, so there cannot be any oppression in anything that is possible for Him. And here Munīr makes it “possible” for Allāh to punish one man through crucifixion for the atonement of the sins of humanity, and he also affirms “Anything is possible”. So this draws from the dīn of those Jahmites and Ash'arites, and all of this is from the jahl of Muḥammad Munīr of the 'aqīdah of Ahl al-Sunnah wal-Jamā'ah. Shaykh Ṣāliḥ al-Fawzān while refuting the aforementioned doctrine of the Jahmites and Ash'arites, said:

“This speech is not sound, it proceeds upon the madhhab of the Ash'aris who deny wisdom in the actions of Allāh, the Mighty and Majestic, so they say, ‘Allāh acts out of pure will, there is no wisdom,

hence it is permitted that He punish the obedient and reward the disbeliever, because He does whatever He wills.’ As for Ahl al-Sunnah they say, ‘This is futile (bāṭil) with respect to Allāh, the Sublime and Exalted, for it is not befitting for Him to reward the disbeliever and punish the believer, it is not befitting for His wisdom, the Sublime and Exalted, and for His mercy and there has come in the evidences in the Book and the Sunnah that He has prepared gardens for the believers and prepared the fire for the disbelievers, this is what has come in the Book and the Sunnah.’ So how can you say, ‘He punishes the creation, without any sin or any crime committed?’<sup>4</sup>

**Fourth:** Thus, when Munīr makes an admission to the Christians, and grants it to them, that it is possible for Allāh to forgive and atone the sins of humanity through the crucifixion of a man—alongside what that entails of oppression and injustice and implies a burden of sin upon humanity which they did not commit and punishment for that one man through crucifixion which he does not deserve—then this resembles the doctrine of the Ash‘arites and the Jahmites. For they, the Ash‘arites, denied wisdoms in Allāh’s actions, and thus, separated between irādah (will) and ḥikmah (wisdom, which they deny as an attribute for Allāh), and this then led them to make plausible such affairs which oppose the ḥikmah of Allāh and His justice and which are but foolishness and injustice, which even the most ignorant of the kings of the earth would be absolved of, as Ibn Taymiyyah pointed out in what was cited from him earlier. And this is the crevice from which Munīr’s statement appears. If he was a

---

<sup>4</sup> Sharḥ al-Safārīniyyah (pp. 121-122).

person grounded in Tawḥīd and 'Aqīdah, he would not be granting these affairs to Christians in the course of argument and debate.

**Fifth:** As for the guiding principle in this matter, Ibn al-Qayyim stated: “Allāh, the Sublime, is Wise. He does not do anything without purpose, and nor without meaning, benefit and wisdom which comprise the intended goal behind the action. Rather, all of His actions, the Sublime, emanate from a far-reaching wisdom for whose purpose He acted. Just as they emanate by way of causes through which He acted. And His speech and the speech of His Messenger have indicated this in places that cannot be enumerated.”<sup>5</sup>

So this is a second affair from which he must recant and repent and clarify the truth. It should be pointed out that the blind-followers and fanatical defenders of people like Munīr, Taḥīr Wyatt, Shadīd and their likes—when their clear errors are made manifest—they come to their defence with irrelevant side issues. This shows that these followers have not been nurtured by them to venerate the truth and to accept the truth regardless of whom it comes from. And thus, the false accusations they make against Salafīs (of taqlīd), really apply to them, and the greatest proof of this is when you see the ways in which they react to these types of refutations on the tube and social media, with mockery, derision and the likes, all but addressing the issues in substance.

Abu 'Iyāḍ

24 Sha'bān 1440 / 29 April 2019

v. 1.01

---

<sup>5</sup> Shifā' al-'Alīl, (Dār al-Turāth) p. 380.