

Part 2d: Defending Falsehood With More Falsehood



Pictured is a man described as a “**mad Takfiri**” who appears in Hyde Park and who has come out to display his ignorance and lies in order to defend Munīr’s error with falsehood and in the process he lies against the Book of Allāh and against the Mufassirūn, such as Ibn Kathīr and Shaykh Ibn al-‘Uthaymīn (رحمهُمُ اللهُ), making it appear that Muḥammad Munīr’s statement: **“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 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.”** is the same as the arguments mentioned in the Qur’ān against the Christians and the same as what the scholars mentioned have elucidated. And the exposition of his



MUNEER OR SHAMSI ? | AHMED ALI

lies and feeble attempt to confuse falsehood with truth is with the following:

1. The issue is about the **possibility** and **impossibility** of affairs being ascribed to Allāh. Muḥammad Munīr is affirming the “**possibility**” of Allāh sending a man down to die for everyone’s sins and that “**it could have happened**” and that “**anything is possible**”. So this speech as we said, citing Ibn Taymiyyah, then it is laughed at and is from the most evil of heresies and is not ascribed to the most ignorant and oppressive of kings of the world, let alone the Lord of the World. Munīr affirmed it for Allāh, as a “**possibility**”. And this is world’s apart from what is in the Qur’ān, in fact the very opposite.

2. This ignorant individual tried to use the speech of Ibn Kathīr to confuse falsehood with truth, despite the fact the very resource he linked to in his video, actually refutes Munīr very explicitly. This is a screenshot of the passage from the website resource he linked to:



(Say) -- ‘O Muhammad’ --

﴿إِنْ كَانَ لِلرَّحْمَنِ وَلَدٌ فَأَنَا أَوَّلُ الْعَبِيدِ﴾

(If the Most Gracious had a son, then I am the first of the worshippers.) meaning, ‘if this were so, then I would worship Him on that basis, because I am one of His servants; I obey all that He commands me and I am not too arrogant or proud to worship Him.’ This conditional phrase does not mean that what is described could happen nor that is possible as Allah says:

It is a translation of Ibn Kathīr’s speech: “...meaning, ‘if this were so, then I would worship him on that basis because I am one of His servants, I obey all that He commands me and I am not too arrogant or proud to worship Him.’ **This conditional phrase does not mean that what is described could happen nor that it is possible**, as Allāh says...” then Ibn Kathīr goes on to cite the verses that deny a son for Allāh. Pay attention to what is underlined. Ibn Kathīr says that the conditional phrase (“if al-Raḥmān had a son”)—which is being used in the argument and which itself is actually impossible—does not mean that it **could happen** or is **possible**. This is the polar opposite of what Munīr actually said. It is an **explicit refutation** of Munīr’s statement with respect to sending down a man for the atonement of sins.

Here is a translation of Ibn Kathīr’s other speech relating to a similar verse in Surah Zumar (39:4):¹

“Then, He, the Exalted, explained that He has no offspring, unlike the claims of the ignorant polytheists with respect to the Angels [that they are His daughters], or the obstinate among the Jews and Christians with respect to Ezraḥ (9:30:) and Jesus. So He, the Blessed and Exalted said: **“If Allāh wished to take a son (for Himself), He could have chosen from what He creates whatever He wills (as a son).”** Meaning, the affair would have been other than what they have claimed (of His having or taking a son or daughters for Himself). **And this [i.e. wishing to take a son] is a condition whose occurrence is not necessitated nor permitted. Rather, it is impossible.** He only intended to declare them ignorant

¹ Refer to <http://www.thenoblequran.com/q/#/verse/39/4>

in what they asserted and claimed, just as He, the Mighty and Majestic said: (21:17:), and also (43:81:). So this is from the angle of [stating] the condition, and it is permitted to attach a condition **to what is impossible** on account of the objective of the speaker (in doing so).”

So this makes it clear that it is permitted to use as a condition of an argument what is actually impossible, in order to make the desired point. This is not what Munīr said in relation to the issue of Allāh sending down a man (presumed to be His son in the eyes of the Christians) to atone for humanity’s sins, declaring that **“this could have happened”** and is **“possible”**. This is the very opposite of the verse, and this individual who is defending Munīr has not understood the Qur’ān.

3. As for the speech of Shaykh Ibn Uthaymīn he linked to, then here is a snapshot from it which included a transcript of the audio:

قالوا: الملائكة بنات الله، فيقول عز وجل لنبيه: قل: يعني هؤلاء المدعين أن الله ولدًا، إن كان للرحمن ولد فأنا أول العابدين، يعني فأنا أول من يعبد هذا الولد، ولن أستنكف عن عبادته، ولكن لا يمكن أن يكون له ولد؛ لأن الله تعالى قال: ﴿مَا اتَّخَذَ اللَّهُ مِنْ وَلَدٍ وَمَا كَانَ مَعَهُ مِنْ إِلَهٍ﴾، وإذا كان كذلك فإنه يمتنع أن يكون لله ولد، فهو يقول: لو كان للرحمن ولد فلن أترككم تسبقوني، أو فلن أترككم تسبقوني إليه، فكنت أنا أول من يعبد، ولكنه ليس له ولد؛ لذلك أنا أنكر عليكم أن تتخذوا لله ولدًا. نعم. السؤال:

So the same thing here. The Shaykh says above, “However, that (Allāh having a son) is not possible... for it is impossible for Allāh to

have a son...” So once again, the issue is speaking about what is possible and impossible for Allāh. With respect to what Munīr ascribed to Allāh as something that “**could have happened**” and is “**possible**” for Him, then that is once again in opposition to the meaning of this verse. It has no connection to what Munīr said, and they are two separate issues:

a) Speaking about what is possible and impossible for Allāh, what could have or could never happen. And this is our issue which we explained in the first article dealing with this matter.

b) Using what is impossible to begin with as a condition in an argument, for a particular objective, in this case to show the futility of it.

Conclusion

It is not permissible to lie against the Book of Allāh and to present its āyāt with other than their true angles, contexts and meanings. It is worse, when this is done to defend falsehood. This is a failed attempt to defend Munīr’s error and an opportunistic attempt perhaps to make oneself appear as the just and balanced person in the middle who has spoken the truth and as a means of winning brownie points from tubers and social media followers. In reality, this person has simply come out to defend falsehood with falsehood, without having even grasped the very nature of the initial falsehood he came out to defend in the first place. May Allāh guide this individual to recognise his limit and to accept, instead of deny, the truth.

Abu ‘Iyāḍ

5 Ramaḍān 1440 / 10 May 2019, v. 1.02